
THE GALLATIN RESEARCH JOURNAL

issue 4

**THE GALLATIN
RESEARCH
JOURNAL**

EDITOR IN CHIEF

Henry Topper

CREATIVE DIRECTOR

Audra LaBrosse

MANAGING EDITOR

Libby Goss

EDITORIAL BOARD

Arielle Friend

Rachel Francavillo

Chris Hoffman

Harita Koya

Jake Madoff

12 GRAHAM'S CRACKERS CRUMBLE
Samuel Magida

**26 REIMAGING RACE AND AMERICAN DEMOCRACY
THROUGH THE HISTORICAL IMPLICATIONS OF
DOMINANT COLD WAR IDEOLOGY**
Arielle Friend

**44 DEVELOPMENT AND THE KITSCHIFICATION OF
THE PAST IN NEW YORK CITY**
Henry Topper

**54 ENVIRONMENTAL PHOTOGRAPHY AND ITS
BACKGROUND OF TENSION**
Jake Madoff

**80 UNESCO APPROVED: THE POLITICS OF CULTURAL
HERITAGE AND ANTIQUITY**
Carolyn Balk

AUTHOR BIOS

CAROLYN BALK is a senior at Gallatin studying global interactions and culture with a minor in environmental studies. In the second grade for her school's International Fair, Carolyn made an Eiffel Tower out of popsicle sticks and baked croissants--the beginning of an interest in cultural exchange that blossomed into a more critical passion beyond *Pillsbury*. Her paper "UNESCO Approved" synthesizes research done at Gallatin and also abroad in the field in India, Indonesia, and Cambodia. Carolyn is part of Gallatin's Americas Scholars, a Global Human Rights Fellow (2013), on the Undergraduate Academic Advising Committee, and the editor-in-chief of NYU CSALS' Baedeker Magazine. She loves photography, glitter, British reality television, Valentine's Day, Mario Vargas Llosa novels, Asian-Pacific-American studies, and the smell of lemongrass. This June, Carolyn leaves for the Federated States of Micronesia and Palau to teach English with the Peace Corps.

ARIELLE FRIEND is a Gallatin sophomore who feels that her concentration at present may best be represented as a dialectic of not-being-sure-yet with articulations of media, Marxist, and literary theory (as well as religion?) along the way. She enjoys reading, thunderstorms, and beautiful dogs. Meow.

JAKE MADOFF is a sophomore at Gallatin, pursuing a self-created degree in Comprehensive Environmentalism; environmental studies in the fields of ethics, architecture, biogeochemistry and policy. Additionally, he is minoring in Economics and complet-

ing a Cross-School Study Partnership in Environmental Studies. Jake has had a passion for the environment ever since his youth, when a thorn became lodged in his arm by the abrasive brush of a wayward branch. The embedded thorn imbued in him an ardent reverence for ecosystems of all kinds; he not only considers himself one with nature, but one of nature. He is currently working as a Research Scholar for Global Design NYU and interning as an Event Ambassador for New York Energy Week 2014. The NYU community is an important part of Jake's pursuits; he is the Vice President of The Gallatin Greening Committee and a Green Grants Selection Committee Member at The Office of Sustainability. Jake likes "The Office," Franz Ferdinand (the band, not the archduke), Frank Lloyd Wright, and Vincent van Gogh. He is known for his sense of humor. This June, Jake leaves for Venice, Italy for the 14th International Architecture Exhibition of the Venice Biennale to research how sustainable design can adapt to growing populations.

SAMUEL MAGIDA, from Southbury, CT, is a senior at Gallatin studying community development within the field of education. He believes that a school is most productive when it is a destination for community activity and when it engages all of its stakeholders – the students, parents, school staff, and local neighborhood institutions. Sam also has an interest in creative historical writing, which started during his freshman year at Gallatin when he took Scott Korb's "Writing History" first year research seminar. In Fall 2013, Sam worked with Scott again during an Individualized Study called "Writing History Workshop." With Scott's help, Sam produced a three part series of historical essays - one narrative history piece, one historical fiction piece, and one transcription piece - that each told a historical story about the three different ingredients of a S'more. The narrative piece about the Graham Cracker is presented in this Journal and the entire three part series will be published on Gallatin's Confluence WebSite.

HENRY TOPPER is a junior at Gallatin studying philosophy and urban studies. He is particularly interested in gentrification, place identity, and the relationship between the built landscape and memory— topics which he has researched as the recipient of the Gallatin Jewish Studies Research Grant and the Dean's Award for Summer Research. He is the proud editor-in-chief of the Gallatin Research Journal and the executive editor of the Gallatin Journal of Global Affairs. He loves New York City, blues, jazz, bourbon, and Germany. As the recipient of the new Gallatin Fellowship in Urban Practice, Henry will spend this summer in Berlin working at Prinzessinnengarten— a community garden and social space in the center of the city— and researching how cities can develop without displacing longstanding populations. Ultimately, he intends to become mayor of New York but is not sure what to do in the interim.

LETTER FROM THE EDITOR

Gallatin is a community housing a sundry array of scholars and thinkers, each with goals hewn from his or her own unique set of interests. The Gallatin Research Journal, in this spirit of unity in diversity, seeks to provide a platform to showcase the breadth and quality of work conducted by Gallatin students. As the Editor-in-Chief of this publication for the first time, I take great pride in continuing that legacy another year. I trust there are many more to come.

This is the fourth issue of the Gallatin Research Journal and I am confident that, in keeping with the journal's short but storied history, readers will find in it an exceptional and intellectually engaging set of papers. The journal does not favor particular academic disciplines or subjects and, as such, readers will find that the pieces comprise some common and some disparate intellectual themes. This year, the journal features disciplines ranging from historical narrative, philosophy, politics, and environmental studies to navigate such topics as American utopianism, gentrification and authenticity, both historical and environmental preservation, the civil rights movement, and others. I believe that this diversity of work fulfills the GRJ's mission and I am proud of the results.

I would like to thank the authors, the editorial board both past and present, and everybody in the administration who makes this publication possible; the Gallatin community is deeply indebted to the work you do to foster academic and social ties between its members. I hope that this issue not only informs the community, but that it also encourages students to keep up the outstanding work and continue their academic pursuits that make this such an extraordinary place.



Henry Topper

Graham's Crackers Crumble

BY SAMUEL MAGIDA

The following piece was produced for an independent study entitled “Writing History” and is written in a narrative history storytelling style. This piece tells the dramatic story of Sylvester Graham’s controversial diet reform during the Popular Health Movement of 1830s America. Graham was a “celebrity and a force” of a man that promoted sexual and dietary reform along the East Coast of the United States and the staple food of his new “Grahamite” lifestyle was the Graham cracker, which looked very different from the cracker people enjoy today. Specifically, this is the story of when the Grahamite lifestyle was implemented at Oberlin College, where students were forced to sneak down to town for a hot meal to escape the exclusively Graham cracker and water diet at the school and where a professor was fired for bringing a pepper shaker to the dining hall. Through this narrative the important difficulties inherent to trying to bridge the gap between theory and implementation are exposed and addressed.

AREAS OF INTEREST:
American History, Utopianism, Education,
Narrative History, Food Studies

Graham Bread Recipe from *The New Hydropathic Cook-Book*

13. Wheat-Meal Bread-Graham Bread.

In every cook-book I have examined, and in all the medico-dietetical works I have consulted, I find saleratus or pearlsh, and salt always in the recipe for making what those books call *brown*, *dyspepsia*, or *Graham bread*. Those two drugs ought always to be left out. Molasses or brown sugar is also a fixture in the ordinary receipt books, and as a small quantity—a tablespoonful to a common loaf—is not harmful, the saccharine element may be left to taste. Make the sponge of unbolted wheat-meal in the ordinary way, with either hop or potato yeast, but mix it rather thin. Be sure and mold the loaves as soon as it becomes light, as the unbolted flour runs into the acetous fermentation much more rapidly than the bolted or superfine flour, and bake an hour an a quarter or an hour and a half, according to the size of the loaf (Trall, 1855, p. 162).

In one of Sylvester Graham's more influential lectures, his 1829 *A Lecture to Young Men on Chastity: Intended Also for the Serious Consideration of Parents and Guardians*, his Preface seems characteristically self-important. Although the historical details of Graham's delivering this lecture are scarce, the lecture's purposeful and self-important attributes ooze from its written documentation. According to Graham, it took courage to discuss a topic of "delicacy and difficulty" – namely, that of sensual appetites – and it seems Graham thought that only he had the true nerves to demand extreme dietary and sexual reformation. This self-importance is particularly apparent in this passage from the lecture's first edition Preface, where Graham notes:

[I]t did not, in any degree, enter into my plan, to treat on this delicate subject: but the continual entreaties, and importunities, and heart-touching – and I might truly say heart-rending – appeals which I received from young men, constrained me to dare to do that which I was fully convinced ought to be done; and the result has entirely justified my decision and conduct... Hundreds who have listened to the following Lecture, have thereby been saved from the most calamitous evils: and great numbers... have urged me to publish it. On this point, I have long hesitated; – not, however, because I doubted the intrinsic propriety of publishing it, but because I doubted whether the world had sufficient virtue to receive it, without attempting to crucify me for the benefaction (Graham, 1848, p. 12).

Graham did not only explain the need for societal reform but he also offered solutions. He identified that man has two grand functions of his system – nutrition (digestion) and reproduction – and because they were connected, dietary reformation could be a step in the right direction for avoiding the negative sensibilities "of the genital organs [and] their influence on the functions of organic life" (p. 47). Graham bread, and its derivative the Graham cracker, were his dietary reformation's keystone.

Graham bread, first made in 1829 from wheat that was unbolted and “unpalatable,” was to be used as a substitute for the “stimulating and heating substances, high seasoned-food, [and] rich dishes” that were making life in Antebellum America impure (Ibid). The Graham cracker and the Graham diet, however, rather than ever being successfully applied, only highlighted how theories can fail to bridge the gap between thought and implementation.

Nonetheless, the timing seemed perfect for Graham's theoretical reforms. The Popular Health Movement of the 1830s was a product of the broader Jacksonian democracy that worked toward empowering the “Common Man” and building up his political influence. John C. Gunn, author of the 1830's *Gunn's Domestic Medicine or Poor Man's Friend, In the Hours of Affliction, Pain and Sickness*, a medical tome whose purpose was to “[point] out, in plain language, free from doctors' terms” medical remedies helpful to families, characterized the Popular Health Movement like this (1860): “political equality becomes synonymous with ‘equality in knowledge,’ and tyranny is fought by the ‘equalization of useful intelligence’ among American citizens.... Health becomes crucial in these Jacksonian equations because, without health, intelligence, the building block of republican government, becomes impaired and feeble. Citizens must be healthy in order to be politically free” (p. title page; Burbick, 1994, p. 37). Combined with the Evangelical Protestants' missionary-style tendency to reform, the Popular Health Movement aimed to purify the American life, and the American diet specifically. As Daniel Sack writes in *White Bread Protestants* (2000), “For many of these evangelical reformers, the American diet was as scandalous as slavery and drunkenness” (p. 188). The Graham cracker and its creator addressed these concerns with sobering lifestyle modifications.

Sylvester Graham and his theories, which seemed ingrained in Graham's life story, fit in nicely at the forefront of the time's dietary crusade. Born in Suffield, Connecticut, in 1794 when his minister father was 72, Graham was a sickly child whose interest in dietary health may have been motivated by this experi-

ence (Ibid). Graham was ordained as a Presbyterian minister in 1829, and after becoming the General Agent for the Pennsylvania Temperance Society in 1830, he delivered a series of lectures along the East Coast of the United States. These lectures, which made him a “celebrity and a force,” were often about vegetarianism, life without luxury, and the dangers of masturbation (Ibid; Carson, 1957, p. 43). The biographer James Parton, a contemporary of Graham, noted the level of Graham's celebrity when he wrote that he “arose and lectured and made a noise in the world, and obtained followers.... Graham was a remarkable man...[,] one of the two or three men to whom this nation might, with some propriety, erect a monument” (p. 44). Graham's force was perhaps unexpected, as Gerald Carson, in his book *Cornflakes Crusades*, explains: “Despite his pinched life as a quasi-orphan, his father dead, his mother gone mad, despite a patchwork education, incipient tuberculosis, a late start in life, the burden of a wife who sometimes took a little wine or gin for her stomach's sake, and a brood of children, Graham tackled life confidently with the forces at his disposal” (p. 45).

Perhaps even more bewildering was Graham's elusiveness. As John P. Coleman says in his paper, “Casting Bread On Troubled Waters: Grahamism and the West,” published by Siena College (1986), “The public was quick to label as ‘Grahamism’ the system outlined in *A Lecture to Young Men*. Its author, however, had only minimal contact with the societies, boarding houses, and the journal established to promote his ideas.” Graham did not even initiate the journal that bore his name, the *Graham Journal of Health and Longevity*, which was instead started by David Cambell in 1837 to promote Graham's ideas throughout American society. Graham seemed to have created and announced his system and then left it to others to implement. Perhaps this helps explain why Graham's philosophy had such trouble realizing itself in practice. Not having the charismatic leader around to implement his theory proved difficult, especially when the theory was one that, in suggesting a severe lifestyle change, sometimes caused dramatic backlash.

Implementing theory is not easy. People are bound to disagree with suggested reform. And not everyone appreciated Graham's suggestions; some even had visceral reactions. Consider this section of an article published on March 10, 1908, in the *San Francisco Call*:

Graham met with great opposition, however, from butchers and bakers. They became so angry one day in Boston in 1847 over his series of lectures, in which he advocated people giving up meat eating, that a mob of butchers and bakers surrounded the hall in which he was lecturing and threatened violence. Some of the followers of Graham, strict vegetarians, thought out a scheme to disperse the crowd even if the Boston police couldn't. They procured some slaked lime and shoveled it out the windows of the hall where Graham was lecturing onto the heads of the mob below. Slaked lime was altogether too much for even a Boston mob to face and they presently left the neighborhood and let the Grahamites have their way ("How Graham Bread Came to Be Made," 1908).

By 1947 Graham clearly had to be careful as he pushed his reforms on the general American public. They stirred up volatile reactions for those who were not committed Grahamites. While Graham himself could be an elusive figure – he was known to show up, give a lecture that agitated locals, and then leave – his theory required a home base that was less unpredictable. In 1840, before his ideas spurred such volatile reactions in Boston, his theory gained traction in what should have been the perfect time and place for its implementation: during the Popular Health Movement at Oberlin College, a place that was desperately seeking purity in a remote and controllable environment.

Religion and living the pure life were paramount in Oberlin's earliest days, and in their pursuit of purity, dietary reform was important. When Oberlin was founded, between 1832 and 1833, the Oberlin Covenant was drafted and contained a series of

articles of agreement. This was its spirit: "Lamenting the degeneracy of the Church and the deplorable condition of our perishing world, and ardently desirous of bringing both under the entire influence of the blessed gospel of peace..." (Fairchild, 1860, p. 4).

The men and women of Oberlin were therefore expected to make righteous life choices, and an important part of this charge included dietary restraint. The fifth article of the Oberlin Covenant stated, "That we may have time and health for the Lord's service, we will eat only plain and wholesome food, renouncing all bad habits, and especially the smoking and chewing of tobacco, unless it is necessary as a medicine, and deny ourselves all strong and unnecessary drinks, even tea and coffee, as far as practicable, and everything expensive, that is simply calculated to gratify the palate" (Ibid). Maintaining a righteous, bland diet was required by the school's creed and so the Graham cracker should have been welcomed into Oberlin society.

Not only was Oberlin ideologically ready to receive Graham's theories, but its remote setting offered an environment that ought to have been insulated from the type of Bostonian mob scene that Graham later encountered. James Harris Fairchild, a freshman the year Oberlin opened and the institution's third president, explained in his 1860 address to alumni, *Oberlin its Origin, Progress and Results*, just how remote the college was: "There are probably ladies among us to-day who were obliged, in coming to the school from their Eastern homes, to walk the last two or three miles through mud and water to the ankle" (p. 9). Oberlin's location was not just remote, but it also seemed preordained to be a place of spiritual purity. Extreme faith and purpose convinced the founders of the school that this rocky land, left untouched by previous settlers, was to be the site of their pure school. In his same 1860 alumni address Fairchild explained, "There is no question that Northern Ohio presented many more desirable localities; but there was probably no other where Oberlin could have been built. Places could have been found in 1620 – excuse the comparison – presenting a more genial climate and soil than Plymouth on the

bleak New England coast, but who would now dare to remodel history and direct the Mayflower to the mouth of the Hudson or of the Savannah? "The foolishness of God is wiser than men" (p. 6). Safe from urban mobs and defending its secluded location as preordained, Oberlin offered the perfect place to implement Graham's severe and pure dietary theories. If it couldn't be done here, how could Grahamism be implemented anywhere?

Graham himself seems never to have appeared at Oberlin, and perhaps this characteristic aloofness helps account for why his theory had trouble making the jump into viable practicality. Nonetheless, despite the leader of the movement's absence, the Graham lifestyle was established at Oberlin. The religious leaders of the school, including the Presbyterian minister co-founders John Jay Shipherd and Philo P. Stewart, professor of theology Charles Grandison Finney, and the U.S. Congregational clergyman and Oberlin's first president Asa Mahan, were all dedicated Grahamites. In fact, just as the Popular Health Movement and the Oberlin Covenant acknowledged, they too saw dietary reform as important steps towards pursuing purity. As Asa Mahan explained in an 1839 address before the American Physiological Society: "The individual who voluntarily destroys his life, or injures his health, voluntarily annihilates or diminishes his power of doing good; in other words of accomplishing the purposes of his moral being" (Mahan, 1839, p. 154). Health was of the utmost importance and, beginning with the dietary restrictions of the Oberlin Covenant, the school's dietary rules grew stricter year by year in pursuit of implementing a Grahamite diet.

By 1834 the school was living quite closely under Graham's teachings. At first, diet was regulated in the dormitory by a Mr. and Mrs. Stewart—likely the same Philo P. Stewart who co-founded the school. But, in 1836, when the Stewarts departed, a joint student-faculty group started regulating the diet, and there was worry that the regulation was not aligned closely enough with Graham's theory (Fletcher, 1943, p. 321). So in the pursuit of purity, Oberlin invited up David Cambell, the editor of the *Graham*

Journal of Health and Longevity and secretary of the American Physiological Society, to really put Graham's theory into practice.

Doing this meant creating a sort of a Grahamite cult at Oberlin, which the school culture seemed ready to accept. As the leader of this cult, Cambell, whose wife also came with him to Oberlin, made quite the entrance on the scene. Robert Samuel Fletcher explains in his *A History of Oberlin College*: "The two Cambells caused no little excitement when they arrived in Oberlin in May of 1840, bringing a cask of rice, a cask of tapioca, a box of sago and a copy of *Nature's Own Book*, containing recipes for Graham bread... and other reformed dishes!" (p. 324). The menu at the boarding house changed dramatically and Graham bread was a staple and celebrated part of the cult: in July of 1839 Sarah P. Ingersoll, a student at Oberlin wrote home saying, "I want to have the privilege of baking as much as once for you, and I want you to provide a quantity [of] *first rate* Graham flour, that you may have *at least* one oven full of coarse food if not more. I know father will like it, and I think mother and the children will" (p. 325). Oberlin, it seemed, was embracing Graham's theory. But given Cambell's application of Grahamism, the school was not equipped with a successful way of responding to any nonconformists.

Those who did not abide by the rules of the cult were either inconvenienced for their nonparticipation or exiled from the community altogether. For example, those students who, as Robert Fletcher explains, "required" meat, which Cambell felt he could not rightly serve, had to wait eleven months while the Oberlin "Prudential Committee" met and conferred with faculty about the issue. Only after this long delay was meat finally brought to the halls, and it was delivered in such a way that the Cambells did not need to manage it (Ibid). Other nonconformists were dismissed from the cult, as when professor John P. Cowles, "an unmarried professor who took his meals at the boarding house," brought a peppershaker to the table and the trustees forced him to remove it. Cowles was dismissed from his teaching post soon after (p. 326).

Through Cambell, Grahamite theory was put into practice

at Oberlin, and although it was able to manage some disturbances, the cult soon met heavy opposition. This backlash, if you will, was likely brought on, especially at the beginning of the “Cambell cult,” because many students lived on a diet of bread and water or bread and salt alone. An entire college was eating Graham crackers and water day in and day out. As one might expect, discomfort ensued; one student wrote home to his father that he was “absolutely hungry a good part of the time” (p. 327). Besides those discomforted or suffering hunger pains, there were those who spoke out about the ludicrousness of the “Cambell cult.” Professor Cowles, for example, who had been dismissed for bringing the peppershaker to the meal table, charged that “the physiological reform at Oberlin went ‘beyant all the beyants entirely” (p. 328). To the *Cleveland Observer*, Cowles blamed the Graham system with having caused a female student’s death: “But you [the Oberlin trustees]... have simplified simplicity, and reformed reformation, till not only the health and lives of many are in danger; but some, I fear, have already been physiologically reformed into eternity” (Ibid). In practice, Graham’s theory was just too coarse, even for those desperately seeking purity at Oberlin.

Implementation of Graham’s system continued to flail as loud and creative voices continued to rail against Grahamism. In the midst of these “attacks,” Delazon Smith, “Oberlin’s most unrelenting critic,” raised his voice veraciously against the dietary torture of Cambell, against Graham’s theory, and against the terrible tasting Graham bread (Ibid). I defer to Robert Samuel Fletcher’s account of Mr. Smith’s criticisms:

[Delazon Smith] declared that the food at the boarding house was “State Prison Fare!” He was more explicit: “As for their water gruel, milk and water porrages, crust coffee &c., they are really too filthy and contemptible to merit a comment. They are usually known among the students by their appropriate names, such as *Swill*, *starch slosh*, *dishwater*, &c., &c. One of the above with an *apology* for bread, constitute the essentials of each meal.” He held that “if

students could not purchase other articles of food at the stores, tavern, &c., it would be utterly impossible for any of them to sustain their healths, if not their lives, or be obliged to leave these heights of zion.” The people of the neighboring towns, he said, had become so well acquainted with the effects of Oberlin diet that they could identify a young man from Oberlin by his “leak, lean, lantern jawed visage!” Smith quotes an Oberlin poet as expressing the situation perfectly:

Sirs, Finney and Graham first—’twere shame to think
That you, starvation’s monarchs, can be beaten;
Who’ve proved that *drink* was never meant to *drink*,
Nor *food* itself intended to be *eaten*—
That Heaven provided for our use, instead,
The *sand* and *saw-dust* which compose our bread
(p. 329).

With people hungry and sending letters to reporters, with students sneaking out to supplement their diets at the local taverns and restaurants, with creative faultfinders using their art to express their disdain, and with Dalezon Smith against it, Graham’s theory was failing. Oberlin was the perfect place for Graham’s teaching to be put into practice. And yet, in March 1841, not long after Cambell’s arrival, a mass meeting was called, during which it was argued that “the health of many of those who board there [at the Hall] is seriously injured...not only in consequence of a sudden change of diet, but also by the use of a diet which is inadequate to the demands of the human system as at present developed” (Ibid). Cambell, forced by “public opinion and private pressure,” resigned his stewardship over Oberlin’s food that April, 11 months after he first arrived at the school (p. 330). At the college, as was happening all across the country, Graham’s following was rapidly declining. Even in the most ideal setting, theory had failed in its implementation.

REFERENCES

Burbick, J. (1994). *Healing the republic: The language of health and the culture of nationalism in nineteenth century America*. (p. 37). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. Retrieved from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Popular_Health_Movement.

Carson, G. (1957). *Cornflakes crusades*. (p. 43). New York, NY: Rinehart & Company, INC.

Coleman, J. P. (1986). Casting bread on troubled waters: Grahamism and the west. *The Journal of American Culture*, 9(2), 2. doi: 10.1111/j.1542-734X.1986.0902_1.x. Retrieved from <https://www.siena.edu/uploadedfiles/home/neh/readings/Casting-Bread.pdf>.

Doctor, G. (1835). Sylvester graham: Pelting with roses public lecturer on the science of human live. *The New - England Galaxy and United States Literary Advertiser*, 18(7), 1-2. Retrieved from <https://ezproxy.library.nyu.edu/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/127960644?accountid=12768>

Fairchild, J. H. (1860). *Oberlin its origin, progress and results: An address, prepared for the alumni of oberlin college*. (p. 4) Oberlin, OH: Shankland and Harmon. Retrieved from <http://books.google.com/books?id=C3wMAAAAYAAJ&pg=PA9&lpg=PA9&dq=>.

Fletcher, R. S. (1943). *A history of Oberlin college: From its foundation through the civil war*. (pp. 321). Chicago, IL: R.R. Donnelley& Sons Co. Retrieved from <http://ia700802.us.archive.org/12/items/historyofoberlin01flet/historyofoberlin01flet.pdf>

Graham, S. (1848). *A lecture to young men on chastity: Intended also for the serious consideration of parents and guardians* (p. 12 - 13). Boston,

MA: Light & Stearns, Crocker & Brewster. Retrieved from <http://ia700501.us.archive.org/1/items/lecturetoyoungme00grah/lecturetoyoungme00grah.pdf>.

Gunn, J. C. (1860). *Gunn's domestic medicine or poor man's friend, in the hours of affliction, pain and sickness*. (p. title page). New York, NY: C.M. Saxton, Barker & Co., 25 Park Row. Retrieved from http://books.google.com/books?id=U90_-5e4d1wC&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0.

How graham bread came to be made: Invention of Sylvester Graham, first real vegetarian of our times: He was mobbed by the bakers and butchers of Boston in 1847 (1908, Month 10). *The San Francisco Call*. Retrieved from <http://cdnc.ucr.edu/cgi-bin/cdnc?a=d&d=SFC19080310.2.78>.

Mahan, A. (1839). Intimate relation between moral, mental and physical law. *The Graham Journal of Health and Longevity*, 3(10), 154. Retrieved from http://books.google.com/books?id=HNMsAAAAYAAJ&pg=PA154&lpg=PA154&dq=#v=onepage&q&f=false&source=bl&ots=nVx18PGqMe&sig=Hg6a172LIHSY5_1G1Jthw0gXaqE&hl=en&sa=X&ei=KV9cUtmRB4_j4AOF3YDgCw&ved=0CC4Q6AEwAA.

Sack, D. (2000). *Whitebread protestants*. (p. 188). New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.

The story of graham flour. (1907, August 12). *Los Angeles Herald*. Retrieved from <http://cdnc.ucr.edu/cgi-bin/cdnc?a=d&d=LAH19070812.2.50>.

Trall, R. T. (1855). *The new hydropathic cook-book*. (p. 162). New York, NY: Fowlers and Wells, Publishers. Retrieved from <http://www.americancenturies.mass.edu/collection/itempage.jsp?itemid=11095&level=advanced&transcription=0&img=1>.

Reimagining Race and American Democracy

through the Historical Implications of Dominant Cold War Ideology

BY ARIELLE FRIEND

This paper explores and questions the ways in which prevailing narratives of the Cold War and Civil Rights Movement are often and uncritically, presented as isolated episodes in normative portrayals of American history, particularly as such renderings of this history belie the exceptional politics and ideology of what may be understood perhaps more cogently as the workings of a plausible American empire. As more nuanced readings of these renderings reveal, the lesser privileged reality that early Civil Rights sought international platforms in the context of post-WWII internationalism exposes difficult reciprocity and interventions in response to the conditions of Cold War hegemony and the history of American racism and imperialism.

AREAS OF INTEREST:
Media Theory, Comparative Literature,
Marxist Theory

In the introduction for their argument concerning the complex components of Imperial formations entitled “Refiguring Imperial Terrains,” Ann Stoler and Carole McGranahan (2007) quote Fernando Coronil to argue the notion that it is “the privilege of empires to make their histories appear as History.” Just how they do so may vary, but “modalities of representation predicated on dissociations that separate relational histories, that reify cultural differences and turn difference into hierarchy’ are critical epistemological features with deep political effects.” (p. 11)

Perhaps then, looking towards the context of a plausible American Empire, it is part of the “privilege” of American History that the prevailing narratives of the Civil Rights Movement and the Cold War are often considered essentially, if not entirely, disparate episodes of this History, even despite their inherent chronological overlaps (Dudziak, 2000, p. 15). As more recent

historians have attempted to reveal, this History ignores the more nuanced and reflexive ways in which civil rights took on an international component in relation to the Cold War and how Cold War internationalism was simultaneously influenced by attention to race relations through both domestic and foreign struggles (Berg, 2007, p. 25). Can these considerations be understood as reciprocal? Furthermore, what can be made of the reality that during the Cold War years, when international perceptions of American democracy were thought to affect the nation’s ability to maintain its leadership role, and particularly ensure that democracy would be appealing to newly independent nations in Asia and Africa, the diplomatic implication of race in America was especially stark.” (Dudziak, 2000, p. 6)

Especially as the cultural explanation of this reality was instead far from stark—depending on ideology that presented a more complicated, even paradoxical paradigm in which American politicians likened those under communist rule to “slaves” and free society could only be rendered through democratic society? (Stephanson, 2006, p. 84). Is this contradiction itself evidence of a particular “American dilemma” that emerges in this history, or is this perhaps another attempt to find an exceptional cogency in an American narrative that does not necessarily reflect reality? (Dudziak, 2000, p. 8). Can this contradiction instead be traced more concretely through Cold War logic, inherent racism, and US fears of de-colonialization as perhaps evidence of how greater “imperial formations manage and produce their own exceptions?” (Stoler and McGranahan, 2007, p. 8). With this in mind, I would like to attempt to understand claims that “The anticommunist hysteria of the early Cold War put tremendous pressure on the civil rights movement. As consequence, unity was destroyed and its radical left wing fell victim [...] the civil rights mainstream joined the camp of Cold War liberalism” (Berg, 2007, p. 76) — furthermore as “dynamic, nonstatic” transformations (Stoler and McGranahan, 2007, p. 5). In order to do so, I will attempt to analyze historian Anders Stephanson’s (2006) speculation of

dominant Cold War ideology as it is complicated, confirmed, and challenged by platforms of Civil Rights, racism, and development as seen through the primary language of *We Charge Genocide the Historic Petition to the United Nations for Relief from a Crime of the United States Government Against the Negro People* (1951), Richard Wright's *The Color Curtain* (2008), and Malcolm X's "The Ballot or the Bullet" (1964) while also understanding the ways in which this interaction may itself represent, without being limited to, the "contexts in which 'national interest' and 'human rights' are the terms that replace and effect imperial intervention" (p. 12).

As a backdrop for understanding the role of ideology in this relationship, Anders Stephanson's (2006) argument in "Liberty or Death: The Cold War as US Ideology" that a deep, domestic US narrative is forged in Cold War policy culminating in the criteria of an 'American way' is interesting to consider (p. 84). Here merges the historic, political, and cultural formation of the government's grand rhetorical stage during times of conflict and contest, as conflict that is continuously explained through the language of "freedom and slavery" (p. 84). Stephanson deems this language "unthinkable anywhere else"; yet thinking back to Stoler and McGranaham's conditions of empire, perhaps it is worthwhile to examine why this language presented itself as exclusive, alongside exactly *what* it attempted to exclude. Can Stephanson's analysis of the language of Cold War ideology be understood as the tools of imperial validation? Especially as exceptionalism, moral contest, and the "dynamic notion that freedom is always under threat" expanded to characterize the 'American way' (p. 85). Here then, perhaps it is revealing to acknowledge the ways in which Stephanson's argument often ignores *actual* discussions of race and excludes entirely the context of Civil Rights in his 'deep' description of the scope of America through Cold War ideology—even as this scope relies on histories of slavery and abolition and his argument maintains that the *conceptual* binary of slavery and freedom in fact dominated the political language in the 1940s and 50s (p. 84). Perhaps tracing where Stephanson's

analysis begins in relation to this paradigm can help to understand why it and the very imagining of American ideology, history, and race may sow the seeds of its own pre-reflective exclusion.

Stephanson, in fact, begins his argument for tracing the salient and culturally rooted application of Cold War ideology with an example that reveals the racism-alongside-democracy paradox taken for granted in its very construction. He cites the circumstances of Dean Acheson's Truman-Doctrine-inflected address to the Delta Council—an attempt to persuade the audience of America's obligation to provide economic aid to struggling "free peoples" in order to protect the stability of the United States and the salience of its democratic principles (p. 81). Acheson's audience was comprised of Dixiecrats, "lily white in composition and segregationist in spirit" upholding democratic principles only for the white man who *did not* have to acknowledge, complicate, or even locate difference in their respective political ideologies (p. 81). Both, Stephanson compares, could easily share claims to the superiority of American democracy—a concept that could serve a 'common ground' throughout the Cold War through an exclusionary treatment of all others (p. 81-82). So, since racism is ignored in the conceptual exchange of Cold War doctrine, it must also rely on a historical imagining as such.

Stephanson cites how Cold War politicians utilized the multifaceted language of modern liberal discourse derived from the Revolutionary War, in which individual liberty is not only protected, but also "unconstrained by government" to frame the freedom-granting superior tenants inherent in American Society and furthermore, to frame the idea that the US government itself must necessarily defy the act of enslavement (p. 86). Stephanson also implicates abolitionist rhetoric in Cold War ideology under a section entitled, "*The American way of conflict*," here revealing how the history of black slavery and its contestation actually forges this "American way" (p. 91). Stephanson asks the reader to "Consider, for example, the bizarre notion of 'Captive Nations,' coupling black slaves in the 1850s with Soviet 'satellites' in the 1950s" (p. 91).

According to the abolitionist narrative which belies this metaphor, the slave holder must be evil and incompatible with American principles—without even having to draw in the complicated (and problematic) notion of racism—because the “slave power’ cannot tolerate free labor” (p. 91). Instead, this despotic communist ruler must rely on organized oppression and aggression that is a threat to all by the very nature of its hegemonic being (p. 91). In this paradigm then, the safety and stability of American society, not slaves, is at risk. Slavery here is conflated to a matter of power, with America (and hence the American way) rendered the only victim. It is also taken for granted here that abolition ultimately fought and solved the problem of slavery in American society, as Stephanson furthermore claims that the “unconditional surrender” of the Confederacy marked slavery as the “deeply un-American” antithesis of prevailing liberal freedom (p. 92). However, isn’t it worthwhile to notice and attempt to understand *why* this so-called antithesis could exist in the ideological mainstream, even as the society it claimed to be born of managed to perpetuate profoundly racist and oppressive logic through state-sanctioned white supremacist terror, apartheid, and an exceptional ability for government apparatuses to retroact the 14th and 15th Amendments throughout the era in which Stephanson locates the Cold War? Perhaps, then the backdrop of black slavery Stephanson considers *within history* should furthermore be understood as the continuing cultural backdrop of race-relations in Cold War society as well, especially in the highly publicized, central, and controversial realms of Civil Rights contest and the stage of international human rights/development. Perhaps from here, it will then be possible to understand further the ideological scope of the Cold War that Stephanson traces as it demonstrates both the category-constructing hegemonic influences of American empire as well as how this ideology influences and is influenced by American culture.

Historian Carol Anderson (1996), for instance, even argues that through the international platform,

African Americans now wanted to see a Truman Doctrine for the United States. Instead, they got a Democratic administration tied in knots by its powerful Southern contingent [...] frustrated by its inability to ‘rollback’ communism in Eastern Europe, and mesmerized by a ‘new and ruthless’ definition of democracy that had only one meaning—anticommunism (p. 27).

However, I would argue that perhaps what “African Americans wanted to see” (as far as such an encompassing notion can be speculated) through the international component of Civil Rights was something much more complicated than a domestically-inverted Truman Doctrine. In fact, by comparing Stephanson’s analysis of the ideology embedded in the Truman Doctrine Cold War policy discourse to the language of William Patterson’s petition to the United Nations’ *We Charge Genocide* (1951), I would argue that this implication appears rather to challenge Cold War ideologies’ underlying cultural assumptions, especially those assumptions that attempted to define democracy as exclusionary and only in the terms of a white-property-holding-male centric vision of American history.

In fact, *We Charge Genocide* (1951) provides its own telling of African American history for the purpose of its argument, furthermore implementing the document itself as a part of this history. The petition implies two overarching dominant political ideologies to further explain the case for righting the problem of legally sanctioned racism in American society: the tenants of democracy (as Anderson sees to echo of Truman Doctrine) and the language of the United Nations Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (p. 6). As the petition claims,

We shall show, more particularly, how terror, how the ‘killing of members of the group’ in violation of [...] the Genocide Convention, has been used to prevent the Negro people from voting in huge and decisive areas of

the United States in which they are the preponderant population, thus dividing the whole American people, emasculating mass movements for democracy and securing the grip of predatory reaction on the federal, state, county, and city governments (p. 6).

Furthermore, as the opening states, “We believe that in issuing this document we are discharging an historic responsibility to the American people, as well as rendering a service of inestimable value to progressive mankind” (p. 1). Exactly what, then, is this history, and how does this “historic responsibility” congeal in the present of the document? Patterson (*We Charge*, 1951) begins this argument by locating the Black Belt as the place of origin for this historic and enduring genocide in American society, underlining the emphasis of economic conditions in this oppression (p. 22-23). Key to *We Charge Genocide’s* historical argument is the notion that the Civil War was a “revolutionary war” against the slaveocracy, pivotally coinciding with the rise of industrialism (p. 24). As this history is explained, “It was during this progressive period, before industry had pyramided in to monopoly, and in an effort to complete the revolutionary struggle, that the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments to the Constitution were passed” (p. 24). In fact, Patterson envisions that “democracy flourished” within the immediate post-Civil War Federal Government through the (Northern-aligned) Republican Party (p. 25). It was entirely due to the betrayal of the Republican Party through their “‘deal’ with Southern Democrats” that the period of Reconstruction turned sour—instead returning power to Southern slaveholders under a new American cultural paradigm: the pursuit of monopoly (p. 25). Patterson’s argument here extends Stephanson’s location of the ideological binary of freedom (as democracy) versus slavery to include the traps of bi-partisan industrialized American capitalism (p. 25). As Patterson understands, “It is genocide for profit. The intricate superstructure of ‘law and order’ and extra-legal terror enforces an oppression that guarantees profit” (p. 23). The

practically re-enslaving conditions of this genocide then, do not simply emerge from a linear history of American society’s (albeit complicated) negotiation of slavery in theory; instead, Patterson argues the ways this oppression is conditioned through active practice. Furthermore, this practice is not rooted in vague claims to inherent racism, but to the economic conditions of American society—an explanation, which in fact incorporates Marxist arguments. As exemplified by Patterson’s quotation of Harry Haywood’s *Negro Liberation*: “It presents the curious anomaly of virtual serfdom in the very heart of the most highly industrialized country in the world. Slave-whipping barbarism at the center of ‘enlightened’ twentieth century capitalist culture—that is the core of America’s race problem” (p.23).

In this way, Patterson begins to more comprehensively reveal the paradox taken for granted as absent in official Cold War ideology’s application of the ‘freedom versus slavery’ metaphors traced by Stephanson. In fact, beyond the call to genocide, I would argue that herein lies the underlying complexity of the *Charge’s* framing which rendered it so controversially popular abroad while it was rejected by the Federal Government: its claim that slavery and oppression is actually intrinsic to the progression of industrial capitalism in American society (Dudziak, 2000). Here, Patterson clearly challenges official Cold War ideology’s implication that America’s liberal democratic capitalist system must equal prevailing freedom (Stephanson, 2006).

With this complication in mind then, it is meaningful to return to Stephanson’s analysis of the idea that a “slave power” cannot tolerate free labor” (p. 84). In this light, Cold War ideology did more than simply naturalize Soviet evil. Perhaps in doing so, this ideology also did more than implicitly naturalize the place of racism and oppression in American culture, and instead Patterson’s argument serves as evidence for the requirement that this naturalization had to happen *actively*. Perhaps the Cold War’s positing of slavery as a function of communism worked also to ignore the ways slavery’s complicated abolishment and murky

legacy could be ignored in considerations of the “Negro problem,” especially as a problem that did not want to face the flaws residing within its own economic and legal systems (Dudziak, 2000, p. 7).

And while much of the document’s language does reiterate a more normative conception of American democracy as inherently exceptional and based on transcendent qualities such as liberty and freedom, it remains critical of this theory’s application with ample evidence. Furthermore, Patterson (“*We Charge*,” 1951) acknowledges (even farther away from any echoes of the Truman Doctrine) that the logic that enabled the enduring economic exploitation of African Americans also coincided with the rise of imperialism, stating that “side by side went terror unleashed abroad, as American imperialism entered the international arena by subjugating the Filipino, Puerto Rican and Cuban peoples and reduced many Latin-American countries to economic and political vassalage” (p. 25). And even while the petition was never passed, an action which some historians believe determinately narrowed the scope of Civil Rights forever away from structural economic/ideological criticism in favor of the political imperatives of desegregation and bills, I would nonetheless argue that the challenges presented by the document neither disappeared nor became nonexistent in the Cold War’s wake, especially as the 60s international order of American superiority through development amidst an iron-curtained world implied new racist and deep-rooted ideological assumptions (Dudziak, 2000, p. 252). As Mary Dudziak (2000) admits, “The story of race in American, used to compare democracy and communism, became an important Cold War narrative,” however, “American race relations would not always stay neatly within this frame” (p. 13).

Richard Wright’s *The Color Curtain a Report on the Bandung Conference* (2008) presents another instance in which Cold War ideology is both challenged and enforced from the perspective of race relations, however this time with a focus on “world order” as opposed to Civil Rights. In this context, I am interested in what *The Color Curtain*, alongside the culture of American

foreign diplomacy in relation to racism reveals about the logic of American international interests and how this racism was transcribed domestically and abroad as perhaps the application of an Empirical categorization of difference. As Mary Dudziak (2000) analyzes, “At a time when the United States hoped to reshape the postwar world in its own image, the international attention given racial segregation was troublesome and embarrassing” (p. 12). Further “embarrassing” was the oftentimes overtly racist lack of hospitality, discrimination, and even violence extended foreign diplomats such to call that, “Lobbying on behalf of the civil rights bill was an extension of State Department efforts to address the embarrassment that discrimination in housing, restaurants, theaters, and hotels had caused the administration” (Dudziak, 2000, p. 184). Clearly, these episodes serve as more concrete evidence that racism was very much present in the realm of American diplomacy, and furthermore, perhaps this is a factor that can be found in diplomatic treatment of other nations themselves as an extension of (imperialy rooted) development logic. Even Wright’s text (2008), an attempt to first-hand and subjectively understand the role of race, development, and political formation in the Bandung Conference—a meeting of the “underdogs of the human race”—nonetheless perpetuates this logic (p. 12).

In fact, the very notion of a “color curtain” reveals Wright’s overarching conceptual work of the text—that is, to not only identify cultural categories of race, religion, and national identity, but to prove that they in fact structure the world, with East-West (developed/underdeveloped) serving a precarious binary (Wright, 2008, p. 175-176). Race *is* experienced according to Wright, but this experience can easily be codified, made evident in Wright’s universal claims to the “Asian consciousness” or conversely, the rational/racist Western mindset, to name a few (p. 25-26). In many ways, Wright’s assessment serves to reify race as not a cultural concept, but as a reality of human society, a society literally divided by this curtain of color—as the anecdote of the black woman who straightened her hair in the dark to her white

roommate's incomprehension explains, this curtain cannot be mediated or seen past (p. 187). How this figures into the language of development then calls for a process which in Wright's mind, both acknowledges the disparity of the east and west (along the assumption of western superiority in development) and harnesses this superiority to get at a 'better quality' of eastern existence modeled after a western one. Eastern nations won't necessarily need to be thought of as inferior, immature, illogical actors if they are raised a little to the rational level—according to this logic—they can then instead grow up to attain a place in a liberal world economic order dictated by the west (p. 217). As Wright states,

It is far preferable that the Western world willingly aid in the creation of Jack London's 'Yellow Peril' in terms of Asian's and African's processing their own raw materials, which would necessitate a radical adjustment of the West's own systems of society and economics, than to face militant hordes buoyed and sustained by racial and religious passions. Industrialized Asia and Africa would be rational areas to be dealt with; even the aims, then, of intercontinental wars would be clear, the military objectives of both sides understandable. (p. 216-217)

This worldview culminates in a framework, which denies the codification of race as a problem, allows for rights only as they are stratified (labor rights, for instance, don't have to exist in all places), and structures the world according to economies of development. "Quality of life" is a scale that can be quantified for economic ends, while social realities are conveniently quieted. And while considering this logic is nothing new, perhaps placing its modern formation in this Cold War context can help to reveal the ways US fears of decolonialization and a loss of power in relation to the developing world may have served to frame these very policies from the start.

Finally, considering the language of Malcolm X's speech (1964) "The Ballot or the Bullet" in the context of US

international image during the Cold war can perhaps further reveal considerations for both the limits and scope of critique under these imaginings. As Dudziak (2000) explains, "U.S. government efforts to present a positive picture of race in America were hampered by African receptivity to the message of Malcolm X. Both at home and abroad, Malcolm X was not about to contain his critique of American racism within the boundaries of Cold War liberal discourse" (p. 221). "The Ballot or the Bullet" instead challenges these boundaries in the ways it represents clear rhetorical and ideological breaks from even early-Cold War liberal Civil Rights discourse. Rather than present its own historical argument to argue against the official, reconciliatory normative one of Cold War ideology, Malcolm's language estranges these very notions. For example, Democrats are made the same as "Dixiecrats," and he holds that "revolutions overturn systems" rather than simply implicate them. In fact, much of the dominant narrative is here overturned: the idea of a North/South dichotomy that limits the scope and severity of racism, the "white man's" victory abroad is proclaimed to be over, as exemplified through Vietnam and decolonial revolutions, the UN is rendered obsolete as an platform ventriloquized by American international interest, and the Uncle Sam of the Cold War presents the hypocrisy of "a crook" pretending to be leader of free world (Malcolm, 1964). These sentiments culminate in Dudziak's quotation of Malcolm X (2000):

Many of you have been led to believe that the much publicized recently passed civil-rights bill is a sign that America is making a sincere effort to correct the injustices we have suffered there. This propaganda maneuver is part of her deceit and trickery to keep African nations from condemning her racist practices before the United Nations (p. 222).

As Dudziak further explains, such sentiments caused the federal government to become anxious of Malcolm X's influence

and led to active attempts to circumspect his influence abroad (p. 224-225). Yet even the extremity of this perceived threat of Malcolm X obscures a certain reality: namely, that he still spoke and performed through the context of Civil Rights, even as he broke with the dominant Civil Rights platform of the United State, considering it to be aligned with the interests of the Federal Government—the ‘ballot’ is nonetheless called for.

It seems to be a common theme for many of the critical historians on this topic that the Cold War contextualization of American politics did much to limit the scope/salience of the Civil Rights movement’s historical trajectory. However, the more I interacted with their arguments, I began to encounter the limits that such arguments called for—especially as such claims to what official contexts invariably imposed on passive subjects might in turn limit and deny the very cultural categories—here a more broad and complex understanding of race relations through America—at stake. Perhaps this may also reveal the ways in which it is important to be wary of attempting to locate the “problem of race in American history,” as this can tend to reiterate the very same logic explored in this paper—which names racism here a distinctly American problem that as such can be manipulated to reflect the realities of said narrative’s application and limit the scope of meaning and challenge. While such approach may be useful for analyzing how race is constructed through politics, it may nonetheless overlook how race is performed. However, active criticism alongside attempts to reintegrate versions of history—here the contexts of both official Cold War ideology and the international component of Civil Rights—can perhaps help to more comprehensively understand both aspects, especially as cultural formations. As Stoler and McGranaham’s argument contends, “blurred genres of rule are not empires in distress but imperial polities in active realignment and reformation” (2007, p. 10). Recognizing the fluidity and contrived malleability of Empire here exercised through the Cold War imperative as reflectively challenged by and incorporated within international and Civil

Rights discourse should attempt to more thoroughly recognize the complex implications of race relations as they may be embedded within the ‘American way,’ especially as this American way is “predicated on dissociations that separate relational histories that reify cultural differences and turn difference into hierarchy” (Stoler and McGranaham, 2007, p. 10). America should not be considered so far away from this understanding that somehow any narrative of the ‘American way,’ even as it actively implicates race, has everything to do with freedom, democracy, and the global order but nothing to do with the legacy of colonialism and deeper, as opposed to surface, narratives of history and how remaining imperial logics might thus be perpetuated.

REFERENCES

Anderson, Carol. (1996). Symposium: African Americans and U.S. Foreign Relations. *Diplomatic History*, 20(4). 531-650. *Humanities Source*. Web. 16 Apr. 2013.

Berg, Manfred. (2007). Black Civil Rights And Liberal Anticommunism: The NAACP In The Early Cold War. *The Journal Of American History*, 94(1). Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25094777>

Dudziak, Mary L. (2000). *Cold War Civil Rights: Race and the Image of American Democracy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University.

Stoler, Ann Laura, and Carole McGranaham. (2007). Introduction: Refiguring Imperial Terrains. *Imperial Formations*, 3-42. Retrieved from <http://www.colorado.edu/anthropology/people/bios/documents/ImperialFormationsIntroduction.pdf>

Stephenson, Anders. (2006) Liberty or Death: The Cold War as US Ideology. *Reviewing the Cold War Approaches, Interpretations, Theory* (pp. 81-100). Ed. Odd A. Westad. New York: Frank CASS.

We Charge Genocide The Historic Petition to the United Nations for Relief from a Crime of the United States Government Against the Negro People. (1951). New York: Civil Rights Congress.

Wright, Richard. (2008). *The Color Curtain. Black Power: Three Books From Exile* (pp. 429-630). New York: Harper Perennial.

X, Malcolm. (12 April, 1964) The Ballot or the Bullet. *Research and Study Group on Information Security and Protection of Critical Infrastructure*. Retrieved from [http://www.cis.aueb.gr/Besides%20Security/TALKS/TALKS-10-X%20\(The%20Ballot%20or%20the%20Bullet\).pdf](http://www.cis.aueb.gr/Besides%20Security/TALKS/TALKS-10-X%20(The%20Ballot%20or%20the%20Bullet).pdf)

Development and the Kitschification of the Past in New York City

BY HENRY TOPPER

Cities are dynamic entities, adapting constantly to meet social and political pressures. This is perhaps nowhere more evident than in New York City, where the built landscape mutates by the minute. But in recent years this change is accelerating at unprecedented speed, with neighborhoods rapidly gentrifying and experiencing new developments. As such, the delicate balance struck between the city's past and present becomes increasingly precarious, placing in jeopardy the storied history that underpinned the city's cultural identity. There has emerged in response to this vanishing a new kind of development that seeks to incorporate notions of the authentic into its business model, recreating in its aesthetic a purported preservation of the past. Through several case studies of what I call authentrification, this paper argues: (1) that these "authentic" developments, in their miming gesture, only simplify and sentimentalize a more complex political situation and (2) in doing so, these developments divert attention away from the enduring reality that they are of the same nature as the more brazen forms of gentrification that preceded them.

AREAS OF INTEREST:

Urban Studies, Gentrification, New York City,
Cultural History, Philosophy

Cities, those great aggregations of humanity that litter the landscape, are dynamic entities, adapting constantly to meet social and political pressures. This is perhaps nowhere more evident than in New York City, where the built landscape mutates by the minute—a palimpsest of bygone ages bleeding into the structures of today. To cite the old and seemingly inexhaustible platitude: the city is constantly changing. But in recent years this change is accelerating at unprecedented speed, with neighborhoods rapidly gentrifying and experiencing new developments. As such, the delicate balance struck between the city's past and present becomes increasingly precarious, placing in jeopardy the storied history that underpinned the city's cultural identity. There has emerged in response to this vanishing a new kind of development that seeks to incorporate notions of the *authentic* into its business model, recreating in its aesthetic a purported preservation of the

past. Yet these “authentic” developments, in their miming gesture that simplifies and sentimentalizes a more complex political situation, divert attention away from and only thinly veil the enduring reality that they are of the same nature as the facade-less efforts of gentrification that preceded them.

CBGB was an iconic rock club on Manhattan's Bowery that achieved a veritably cultish following over the years. The bar opened in 1973 on what was, at the time, a street notorious mostly for its flophouses and drunkards. Charminglly grimy and home to a dedicated community of club-goers, CB's was the hub of the now-legendary punk movement in New York. As Richard Hell explains it in a New York Times article,

It's the most famous rock 'n' roll club in the world, the most famous that there ever has been, and it's just as famously a horrendous dump. It's the archetypal, the ur, dim and dirty, loud, smelly and ugly nowhere little rock 'n' roll club. There's one not much different from it in every burg in the country (Hell, 2006).

The story of the club's demise as such seems quite familiar: by the early 2000's, the neighborhood is in vogue—flops yielding to financiers—the demographics change, rents go up, and the club is forced to close its doors after a rent dispute in 2006 (Sisario, 2006). John Varvatos, a luxury fashion retailer that offers, per its website, “the highest quality and modern men's clothing, shoes, accessories, bags and fragrances,” moved into the space shortly thereafter (“About John Varvatos,” n.d.). The story as such, of the little, longstanding establishment being pushed out by big money, seems so blatantly cinematic so as to be a cliché—merely another anecdote in the ongoing saga of gentrification in cities. Yet upon further examination, the apparently stark lines of this narrative become blurred; that is, to say that development (in this case embodied by John Varvatos) came in and erased all vestiges of the past (CBGB)—the stock story of economic development in the metropolis—is to tell only half of the story.

After moving into the space at 315 Bowery in 2008, John Varvatos proceeded with the anticipated renovations, gutting the space, stripping the walls of their decades'-worth film of band stickers and sundry bodily fluids, removing the "stalactites of grime dangling from the ceiling and miles of ancient posters and graffiti all around" (Sisario, 2006). Yet after the (presumably) laborious process of sanitation, the space was not transformed into some unrecognizable fashion boutique, with the storied history of the space invisible; rather, after the gutting, John Varvatos painstakingly (re)created the retail space in CBGB's own image. The distinctive pill shaped awning was reupholstered with John Varvatos signage; the walls re-covered in band stickers; the wooden slats of the floorboards made to look worn; the ventilation exposed along the ceiling; the perimeter of the space adorned with guitars, music memorabilia, and vintage records. At the store's private grand opening event, "Varvatos employees wore headsets, and staff for the event darted around in black T-shirts with 'Birthplace of Punk' printed on back" (Sisario, 2008; Moss, 2008). Despite a crowd outside protesting the putative loss of culture in the East Village, Varvatos himself suggested that "if he didn't take the space over, it was 'probably going to be a different kind of commercial venture, whether it was going to be a bank or a deli'" (Sisario, 2008). This attitude, that in its crude form of imitation John Varvatos has preserved a rich history,

[Seemed] to be the consensus among the musicians on Thursday [at the grand opening]. 'I'd rather see this than a Dunkin' Donuts or a Starbucks,' said Jesse Malin of D Generation. Clem Burke of Blondie added: 'It's better than if it was a Starbucks or a bank. This keeps some of the spirit of the place alive' (Ibid).

This model of incorporation and ostensible preservation of the past as cultural capital for new development, exemplified by the story of CBGB, is increasingly popular in New York City, pervading consumer taste and transforming the urban landscape.

It takes the form of a four-facaded *Urban Outfitters* intended to evoke at once "a hat store, a hardware store, a neighborhood bar and a bodega;" a trendy restaurant going by the playful moniker "DBGB" whose decor—bleak concrete and piles of copper pots—is intended to evoke the old restaurant supply stores of the Bowery; a pseudo-speakeasy located behind a steel door in the back of a seemingly old-fashioned barber shop; a frozen yogurt shop moving into the space of a long-standing record store and using vinyl records as an interior design motif (Troianovski, 2010; Marco, 2010, "About DBGB," n.d.; "About Blind Barber," n.d.; Campbell, 2013). It takes the form of the upscale Italian *Carbone* opening in the space occupied for nearly one hundred years by *Rocco's*, a traditional Italian-American restaurant, superimposing their own logo on top of *Rocco's* old tattered neon signage, and ensuring, according to Jeff Gordinier's *New York Times* review (2013), that

Just about every element — the menu, the music, the uniforms, the décor and even the servers' banter with customers — will be engineered to conjure up the feeling of a lively night downtown, circa 1958.

These establishments, amongst an inexhaustible and ever-growing series of others, all share in their purported commitment to the past a common undercurrent of fixation on the "authentic." Carefully cultivating their image in the aesthetic of the past, they cast themselves as purveyors of that coveted and elusive good, *authenticity*. This phenomenon has been aptly dubbed *authentrification* by some critics—most notably in a growing blog subculture that documents the changing face of the city.¹ *Authentrification* is the familiar story of gentrification obfuscated, infused with elements of apparent "authenticity." As local news blog *Bowery Boogie* elucidates, it is, "a new descriptor coined to explain the phenomenon of gentrification demolishing the old, then marking it with a gravestone tribute. Or, in other words, kill the real deal then pay

1. For primary examples of these blogs, see *Jeremiah's Vanishing New York*, *EV Grieve*, *Bowery Boogie*, *The Lo-Down*, *The Local East Village*, or *Lost New York*.

homage” (Elie, 2011; Symonds, 2011). *Authentified* developments veil destruction as preservation, simulating the experience of the “old” and “authentic” after the truly “old” and “authentic” disappear. As such, they are proper Baudrillardian *simulacra*, encouraging us to experience “real,” “authentic” history in an emotionally prescribed and prepackaged form, when the history is no longer *really* there (Baudrillard, 1988).

The preordained emotional reaction to history that *authentification* produces through its aesthetics of the past is closely aligned with notions of artistic *kitsch* (from the German “*verkitschen*,” meaning to cheapen) (Oxford English Dictionary, “Kitsch,” n.d.). Marita Sturken perspicaciously calls this relationship the “tourism of history.” As she explains,

The tourism of history in American culture is fueled in many ways by...kitsch as a prepackaged and sentimental response, which directly relates to its political meaning. This kind of kitsch is meant to produce predetermined and conscribed emotional responses, to encourage pathos, and sympathy, not anger and outrage...Even when a kitsch object might be used by some-one in a non-kitsch way, as a means to recognize loss, it can rarely be an incitement to historical reflection or political engagement (2007, p. 26)

As such, an *authentified* development utilizes, “easy formulas and predictable emotional registers which form a kind of escapism” (p. 23) into a simplified, palatable version of history in which we believe ourselves to be merely honoring and keeping the spirit of the past alive. It *kitschifies* memory, “[curtaining] off the abject” in a way that prevents us from engaging meaningfully with those memories (p. 26). When we are presented with the *kitsch* of an *authentified* development, we avert our sight away from the elephant in the room; namely, that these developments themselves, *qua* developments, are instrumental in the disappearance of the “authentic” urban places that they are purporting to honor in their

crude aping of the “old” aesthetic. They are therefore, “not innocent,” but merely, “sell the idea of innocence” (p. 27). Kitsch, *authentified* development as such is a mechanism in the larger system of gentrification in cities, allowing us to believe that there is *actually* some kind of qualitative difference between it and the more common recipients of derision, such as banks and Starbucks. They naturalize the social processes of development that alter neighborhoods, offering a manufactured, quasi-authentic charade as the best thing available in light of some putatively inevitable, disinterested, and organic economic force.

REFERENCES

Baudrillard, Jean and Mark Poster, *Selected Writings*. Stanford, CA: Stanford UP, 1988. Print.

Campbell, Marc. "Bleecker Bob's Is Closing: Legendary Record Store To Be Replaced By Frozen Yogurt Chain Store." *Dangerous Minds*. March 7, 2013. Accessed December 10, 2013, http://dangerousminds.net/comments_bleecker_bobs_is_closingLegendary_record_store_to_be_replaced_by.

Elie. "Lower East Side 'Authentrification' Explained." *Bowery Boogie Blog*. October 4, 2011. Accessed December 10, 2013. <http://www.boweryboogie.com/2011/10/lower-east-side-authentrification-explained/>.

Gordinier, Jeff. "A New Italian Spot? You've Been There Before." *New York Times*. March 4, 2013. Accessed December 10, 2013. http://www.nytimes.com/2013/03/06/dining/carbone-in-greenwich-village-is-an-italian-place-youve-seen-before.html?ref=nyregion&_r=1&.

Hell, Richard. "Rock n Roll High School." *New York Times*. October 14, 2006. Accessed December 10, 2013. http://www.nytimes.com/2006/10/14/opinion/14rhell.html?_r=0

Marco, Meg. "New 'Ironic' Urban Outfitters Store Parodies The Mom & Pop Shops Killed By Its Ilk." *Consumerist*. June 21, 2010. Accessed December 10, 2013. <http://consumerist.com/2010/06/21/new-ironic-urban-outfitters-store-parodies-the-mom-pop-shops-killed-by-its-ilk/>.

Moss, Jeremiah. "Varvatos: Birthplace of Punk." *Jeremiah's Vanishing New York Blog*. April 18, 2008. Accessed December 10, 2013. http://vanishingnewyork.blogspot.com/2008/04/varvatos-birthplace-of-punk_18.html.

Oxford English Dictionary, 2nd ed., s.v. "kitsch."

Sisario, Ben. "CBGB Brings Down the Curtain With Nostalgia and One Last Night of Rock." *New York Times*. October 16, 2006. Accessed December 10, 2013. <http://www.nytimes.com/2006/10/16/arts/music/16cbgb.html?adxnnl=1&pagewanted=all&adxnnlx=1386277231-jrBh0Z5f3pRjQx+uFrcARw>.

Sisario, Ben. "This Ain't No Nightclub (at Least Not Anymore)." *New York Times*. April 19, 2008. Accessed December 10, 2013. http://www.nytimes.com/2008/04/19/arts/music/19varv.html?_r=1&

Sturken, Marita. *Tourists of History: Memory, Kitsch, and Consumerism from Oklahoma City to Ground Zero*. Durham: Duke UP, 2007. Print.

Symonds, Alexandria. "In Which We Mark Graves Like Birthplaces." *This Recording*. October 3, 2011. Accessed December 10, 2013. <http://thisrecording.com/today/2011/10/3/in-which-we-mark-graves-like-birthplaces.html>.

Troianovski, Anton. "Urban Outfitters' Chic Storefronts." *Wall Street Journal*. June 21, 2010. Accessed December 10, 2013. <http://online.wsj.com/news/articles/SB10001424052748704050804575318933235710228>.

"About Blind Barber." Blind Barber. Accessed December 10, 2013. <http://blindbarber.com/about>.

"About DBGB." DBGB. Accessed December 10, 2013. <http://www.dbgb.com/nyc/about>.

"About John Varvatos," John Varvatos, accessed December 10, 2013, <http://www.johnvarvatos.com>.

UNESCO Approved:

The Politics of Cultural
Heritage and Antiquity

BY CAROLYN BALK

In 1972, the first United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) World Heritage Convention changed the politics of cultural heritage forever by creating a reference in order to determine what cultural forms, monuments, and objects are worth preserving for the future. UNESCO creates standards, often derived from Western forms of thought, for designating cultural objects and sites around the world in the name of tangible heritage. Yet these standards are temporalized in a particular manner, giving disproportionate value to “untouched” or “ancient sites,” and in doing so promote the visual aesthetics of history as being completely unattached to modernity. World Heritage sites are preserved in the past as a means of asserting their discontinuity with the present—creating separated gems of culture. Indeed, UNESCO World Heritage sites emerge as more problematic, notably in developing countries, than positive due to their museumification and faulty temporal designation. Via case studies in Hampi, India, Java, Indonesia, and Siem Reap, Cambodia, I prove that UNESCO’s hegemonic regulations have adverse effects on Global South communities because of the little attention paid to the contemporary implications of designating heritage.

AREAS OF INTEREST:

Post-Colonialism, Human Rights, International
Politics, Historic Preservation

In 1972, the first United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) World Heritage Convention changed the politics of cultural heritage forever by serving “as a reference for what is worth preserving for future generations” (Schmitt, 2009, p. 104). There are two forms of cultural heritage, tangible and intangible, with tangible comprising the celebrated UNESCO World Heritage sites. UNESCO creates standards for designating cultural objects and sites around the world. These standards are temporalized in a way that gives disproportionate value to “untouched” or “ancient sites,” and in doing so promote the visual aesthetics of history as something completely unattached to modernity. World Heritage sites are preserved in the past as a means of asserting their discontinuity with the present—creating separated gems of culture. Despite their preservational efforts, UNESCO World Heritage sites perhaps emerge as

more problematic than positive due to their museumification and faulty temporal designation of historical sites. This is particularly salient in developing countries. UNESCO often constructs World Heritage sites as intrinsically antique, aesthetically pleasing, and societally detached without paying attention to contemporary implications or interactions with surrounding communities.

While UNESCO certification has become a way for developing countries to assert their prominence in the world, it often proves detrimental to the wellbeing of local populations. In the cases of Hampi, Borobudur, and Angkor Wat, UNESCO monuments’ importance supersedes the community’s welfare (see Images 1 and 2). Although UNESCO has good intentions in recognizing “unique and irreplaceable” aspects of human heritage, who has the right to decide these qualities, and who should ensure the sites’ management are very contentious issues (Peterson, 1981, p. 36). In the hopes of designating “cultural heritage” sites around the world, UNESCO creates an unfeasible standard of authentic and valid heritage.

UNESCO was created in 1945 after World War II along with the United Nations (UNESCO website). UNESCO’s goal at its conception was to promote “solidarity, peace, and equality through...the free exchange of ideas and knowledge,” guided by the sentiment that the lack of these qualities was at the root of war (Nielson, 2011, p. 274). UNESCO good-willingly promoted global culture and knowledge-sharing to perpetuate peace (Huxley, 1946, p. 14). The organization’s original foundation document, “UNESCO: Its Purpose and Its Philosophy,” mentions that all cultures should receive equal attention, yet are not worth the same; however, who is determining this “worth” remains unclear (Huxley, 1946, p. 42). While the rhetoric echoed throughout the document centers on preventing war (however applicable at the time), extreme unity among nations can be considered homogenizing or hegemonic today. Indeed, much of UNESCO’s rhetoric is simple and idealistic in way that might fail to acknowledge the complexity of the issues surrounding its work (Nielson, 2011, p.

284).

The World Heritage Convention in 1972 set the groundwork for creating a list of UNESCO World Heritage sites, made official in 1978 (UNESCO website). Today, there is a broad range of 962 cultural, natural, and “mixed” UNESCO World Heritage sites, as well as multiple sites in the midst of being evaluated or on the “List of World Heritage in Danger” (UNESCO website). The overwhelming majority of UNESCO World Heritage sites are from before the Industrial Revolution, and nowhere in the original World Heritage Convention are the terms “industry” or “technology” referenced (Cleere, 2000, p. 31). Sixty percent of World Heritage sites are found in developing nations, although Italy and Spain have the greatest number of sites, respectively (Timothy & Nyaupane, 2009, p. 6; UNESCO website). In other words, there is an expansive array of cultural heritage sites, yet most of them are relics and do not incorporate industrial sites—the places integral to modern-day livelihoods. Typical historic sites include “The Historical Complex of Split” in Croatia or “Ancient Thebes with its Necropolis” in Egypt, while more recently constructed sites include Australia’s “Sydney Opera House” and “Auschwitz Birkenau” Concentration Camp in Poland. There are only 23 sites that can be considered “industrial;” however, these also include ancient industrial sites, such as the old Bolivian Spanish-colonial mining town of Potosí (Cleere, 2000, p. 33). In general, cultural sites and monuments over two hundred years old dominate the UNESCO World Heritage list, creating a narrative of antiquity without modernity.

UNESCO World Heritage status offers various benefits for the 157 countries that have designated sites. Indeed, “seen from a political and bureaucratic vantage point, UNESCO promotes culture as a road towards a better world” (Nielsen, 2011, p. 278). World Heritage site status, regardless of the country, guarantees a commitment to longevity and archeological wellbeing, as well as ensuring funds for site restoration and maintenance. For developing countries, UNESCO status makes them “visible” to

the world, giving them a place to be recognized on the global cultural and economic map (Timothy & Nyaupane, 2009, p. 11). World Heritage sites and “cultural tradition [secure] society and [provide] a sense of cherished local pride.” They bolster national identity and patriotism as the edges of tradition become increasingly distorted by modernity (Baig, 2003). Indeed, as UNESCO workers Frances Albernaz and Francesco Bandarin and academic Jyoti Hosagrahar state,

UNESCO has long been aware of the potential of World Heritage sites as powerful incentives to economic growth, not only as direct sources of employment and revenues for communities, but also as indirect generators of spin off incoming from sales in crafts, music, and other cultural products (2011, p. 18).

UNESCO has paved the way for change in multiple communities surrounding the World Heritage sites, spurring infrastructural improvements catering to tourism and local economic growth.

HERITAGE: FROZEN

Amidst UNESCO’s seemingly positive facets, however, World Heritage status can have many harmful effects on the sites’ surrounding communities, whose well-being is often overlooked in favor of maintaining and preserving the heritage site. The least powerful stakeholders are ignored in pursuit of gaining the UNESCO “award,” and consequently, there are “few attempts to engage locals in [these] procedures” (Henderson, 2009, p. 81).

Even the very use of the word “heritage,” which connotes that there is a “fragment of the past that needs to be conserved and preserved for the present, and indeed the future” (Fontein, 2000, p. 17), appears to be problematic. The word “heritage,”

linked with the word “inheritance,” signifies some sort of “legacy,” “passed down from previous generations” (Howard, 2003, p. 6). Labeling something as a “heritage” site, and thus strictly historical even if still commonly used, distances the site from its surrounding area. But, if we define “culture” as “[lacking] clear spatial and temporal boundaries,” then the idea of a “cultural heritage site” is essentially oxymoronic (Brown, 1998, p. 197). Culture is not a rigid concept, although classical anthropologists such as Margaret Mead explain culture as discrete, bounded wholes, comprising traditions that are uniquely their own (Clifford, 1988, p. 230). Although UNESCO does not define “culture” in a concrete manner, the organization does state that “cultural diversity” occurs concurrently with the “maturing of society” and “building a democratic society.” These are particularly Western notions of culture and development (Nielsen, 2011, p. 278-279). By mapping a World Heritage site in the past, there is hence a “risk of transforming what are still vigorous cultures into fossilized relics.” (Brown, 1998, p. 214).

UNESCO recognizes, labels, and brands World Heritage sites as “frozen” in the past, making them static in the present (Fontein, 2000, p. 67). These sites, with few exceptions, do not incorporate modern culture and are supposed to be representative of “human history” (“UNESCO” website). Although World Heritage site criteria list “living civilization,” in practice the sites are framed as isolated from modernity—save tourist conveniences like in Hampi and Borobudur. The ideas behind UNESCO are that “heritage is fragile and often unwittingly destroyed or lost in the rush to modernize and globalize,” and therefore, must be safeguarded (Albernaz, Bandarin, & Hosagrahar, 2011, p. 19). This view of heritage eliminates the potential for hybridization between old and new traditions and ways of life, something for which historian and anthropologist James Clifford advocates (1988, p. 251). Although the past should never be forgotten, tradition in fact lies first and foremost in “[living] for today” (Clifford, 1988, p. 251). This implies, for instance, that it would still be “traditional” if

the Maasai indigenous group in Kenya performing at the Mayers Ranch used cell phones or spoke English with the tourists who come piling in off their tour busses (Bruner & Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, 1994). Indeed, “unalterable tradition is an illusion, change itself *is* a tradition.” This represents a powerful refutation of UNESCO’s policy of demarcating history and modernity (Cotter, 2012). UNESCO sites are essentially decontextualized from the present and stand as solitary relics of the past, only incorporated for developmental purposes of the region (such as tourism) and national identity reification. The past becomes idealized— a separate entity from the present, even if the monument or site at hand is still presently used.

HAMPI, INDIA - ALIVE AND WELL

In Hampi, India, naming the Hampi Temple a UNESCO site meant the destruction of the community surrounding the still-functioning temple. The two thousand-plus temples in Hampi attract numerous tourists, pilgrims, and local worshippers from surrounding communities in Karnataka province each year to honor the birthplace of the Hindu monkey god Hanuman (Chamberlain, 2012). The site gained UNESCO World Heritage site status in 1986, and was put on the “List of World Heritage in Danger” from 1999 to 2006 (“UNESCO” website). In July of 2011, however, the Indian government—without warning—bulldozed the numerous households that lined the pathway leading up to the temple (Image 3). Nominally, the Indian government has offered the families 130,000 rupees and “a small plot of land about 4km away to build a new home, but the money has yet to materialize” (Chamberlain, 2012). There is now a new Walt Disney-like walkway being built to develop the tourist industry and make the site more equipped to accommodate large groups. Certain parts of modernity are eschewed, such as the houses, hawkers peddling cigarettes, and small businesses selling *Lays Chips* impersonations

and cell phones, while other parts are incorporated, such as the new walkway and the resident elephant inside the temple that tourists pay a pittance to be blessed by.

The fact that Indian politicians reject that Hampi is a living temple in daily use prompts the question: “Are these [living] traits going to be abandoned for the sake of purity, or are they going to be included in [the sites’] copyrights” (Brown, 1998, p. 214)? The Hampi temples, in UNESCO’s eyes, crave an historical appearance—the same as they were in the fourteenth century—yet include modern conveniences such as the new walkway, nice tourist restaurants, and Western toilets located around the central temple. Even though capitalizing on culture is a common path to economic development for many nations, according to many critics it is not the most ethically correct path (Henderson, 2009, p. 84). Hampi conservationist Suresh Varadaraj proclaims that “we [the Indian site conservationists] cannot bring back the people from the 15th century, so instead we are going to preserve [the temple]” and that the people living around the temple “were encroaching” (Chamberlain, 2012). He states patriotically that “everyone should have an interest in our [Indian] heritage,” and that, naturally, those living around the temple must already have known that they were infringing and moved (Ibid). In a country where residents are not even given valid markers of citizenship without documented property ownership (another justification the government offered to bulldoze their homes), “encroaching on land” around a temple integral to their daily lives is a given. Forcibly removing impoverished residents from their homes further subordinates an already marginalized community.

In response to the Indian government’s measures, UNESCO stated that the bulldozing incident manipulated their organizational intentions (Ibid). Although UNESCO claims that “living civilization” monuments or sites can gain World Heritage status, this does not manifest in practice (“UNESCO” website). UNESCO functions instead to make sites into objects that are separate from the living society around them, upholding their “master-

piece” status rather than taking into account the natural evolution of culture.

YOGYAKARTA, INDONESIA - A BUDDHIST JEWEL

Twenty-three miles outside of Yogyakarta, Java, Indonesia on a vast green lawn, replete with walkways and designated photo-op sites, sits the beautiful Buddhist temple Borobudur (Image 4). Buddhists comprise only one percent of the population of Indonesia, which is the largest Muslim country in the world. The temple, built in the eighth and ninth centuries, consists of ten layers, representing the steps to Nirvana, with numerous stone reliefs leading to the large stupa at the top. Named an official World Heritage Site in 1991, UNESCO assisted in Borobudur’s restoration starting in 1973. They utilized the same materials used in the original construction, with some additional materials and techniques to ensure the site’s durability (“UNESCO” website). Before UNESCO helped restore the temple, much of Borobudur was in shambles from multiple failed restoration projects and looting. The temple was also built in a fertile valley with volcanic ash making the soil incredibly nutrient rich over time, meaning that when UNESCO arrived in the 1970s, there were multiple prosperous rice farms surrounding the temple. In order to protect the temple, and later make it conducive tourism, the farms were demolished. Two years after UNESCO completed the temple restoration in 1985, nine terrorist bombings damaged the temple’s upper terrace (Pinault, 2003, p. 16). Although often shelved as Islamic-fundamentalist inspired bombings, many say, including tour guides at the temple, that a secondary reason for the bombings was that many Muslim Javanese rice farmers’ livelihoods were ruined for a Buddhist, and thus “pagan,” monument (p. 17). This is not to say that Islam should trump Buddhism;

even the Indonesian government legally recognizes both religions equally. Nevertheless, rice farming is a quintessential and integral part of Indonesian life, and as the site aged it naturally changed from a solely Buddhist pilgrimage temple to a temple surrounded by rice farms. (Whitehouse, 2003). For the sake of cultural heritage “protection,” these farmers were forced to leave their homes and livelihoods around Borobudur.

Borobudur has created a sort of obsession among Western conservationists, from Dutch colonizers to, most recently, Germany, who pledged \$130,000 to Borobudur’s continuing restoration in 2012 (Jakarta Post, 2012). The site is orderly and stunningly beautiful, creating an archetypal, aesthetically pleasing monument. Borobudur is like a Buddhist theme park, complete with walkways wide enough for jovial elephant rides, open-air souvenir shops next to the parking lot, and of course: the picture-perfect stupa. Because there are so few Buddhists in Indonesia today, Borobudur becomes even more intuitive a site for UNESCO protection. It is ironic, however, that the rice paddies were removed, as all over Asia rice farming and the terraced paddies have created old romantic imagery among Westerners. As elite Mexican artist and writer Miguel Covarrubias noted about Bali, one of Java’s neighboring islands, during his 1937 visit:

The most striking element...is the ever present rice field... the receding...terraces, like flights of gigantic stairs, cover the hills and spread over the slopes and plains. [With water] they are like mosaics of mirrors that reflect the clouds. Later they are sprinkled with the dainty blades of the newly planted rice in the all-over pattern of chartreuse on a ground on brown ooze. This thickens eventually into a tender yellow-green carpet which turns to a rich gold ochre as the grain ripens... (p. 71-72)

Alas, Borobudur’s stupa, “[architecturally] [illustrating] a significant stage in human history,” supersedes the rice farming, or “traditional human settlement” (“UNESCO” website). The

Philippines, nonetheless, contains the UNESCO designated “Rice Terraces of the Philippine Cordilleras” site, which dates back two thousand years. Functioning rice paddies, and the farmers who worked them, were removed from Borobudur’s landscape not only for restoration, but also to make the site more conducive to showcasing the stupa and temple to visitors. For a World Heritage site to be successful there must be an animated “synergy” between the living community and World Heritage site rather than for the latter to solely depend on capitalizing on the worldly prominence that comes with being part of UNESCO (Baig, 2003; Timothy & Nyaupane, 2009, p. 11). The rice paddies and farming practices aspects of Borobudur’s landscape are aesthetically appealing yet not deemed worthy enough to save along with the temple itself.

SIEM REAP, CAMBODIA - A CASE OF KHMER IDENTITY

French colonists in Cambodia “discovered” and began excavating the Angkor Wat Archeological Complex in 1861 (Image 5). This included taking artifacts for French and European museums, instigating a looting trend that continues today. Although when the French first “discovered” Angkor, “a labyrinth of monumental structures entangled with tree roots and lichen,” they claimed it was “lost, even dead,” this is simply not true (Winter, 2005, p. 53). There were and are multiple local villages peppered throughout the archeological park (Image 6). The French portrayed Angkor as abandoned and wild to promote the romantic mythology of loss and rediscovery (Winter, 2005, p. 53). This mythology perpetuates today, in tourism and even in Cambodia’s political rhetoric (Ibid). Even after Cambodian independence from France, France still took an active role in Angkor Wat’s and its surrounding temples’ maintenance until approximately 1972, when the political situation was too unsafe to continue.

In 1992, Angkor Wat was named a UNESCO World Heritage site, but not without the help of multiple other governments, namely Japan and France (Di Giovane, 2009). Attention to the archeological site was needed, given the mass amount of looting occurring since the Khmer Rouge era, and before with the institutionalized looting of the French. The Declaration of Tokyo, written in 1993, expressed “the urgent need for international assistance to prevent the Angkor monuments from further decay and destruction” (p. 335). Cambodia was not heavily involved in formulating the Angkor development project, and because of this lack of involvement, “understanding Angkor as a form of ‘living heritage’ remains neglected” within the current management framework (Winter, 2009, p. 50).

According to Miriam P. Stark and P. Bion Griffin, “Nowhere is this linkage between nationalism and heritage management more evident than in Cambodia.” Angkor Wat is “a vehicle of agency” to help Cambodians understand their identity, and even appears on the Khmer flag (Ibid). Nonetheless, Angkor tourism is centered on “high price tourism,” as well as the overall high “quality of the [tourist] experience” (p. 55). Cambodia’s APSARA Association, a subsidiary of UNESCO in control of Angkor Wat maintenance, bars locals from living around the complex, as they have done for years, and actively forbids building more housing around the temples. As Cambodia continues to reconstruct its society after the Khmer Rouge, living heritage can be used as a vital contributor “to the ongoing constitution of national, cultural, and ethnic identities,” but not when international bodies promote otherwise (p. 64). Many Cambodians disagree with Angkor Wat’s development as a modern tourism site, but do not have a forum to voice their opinion. Khmer heritage has been marketed to be something beyond the Cambodians themselves—something for other peoples’ consumption. Nonetheless, according to UNESCO, all of the cultures and sites in the world are for an international body to appreciate. Whose “heritage” is it?

A WESTERN TASTE

Ofentimes, a cultural site is not given UNESCO status if it is not aesthetically pleasing or if it conflicts with Western visions of heritage. In order to gain a place on the World Heritage List, a cultural site must be “a masterpiece of human creative genius” or have “exceptional...beauty and aesthetic importance” (“UNESCO” website). Ironically, the term “masterpiece” is often used for fine art or sculpture meant to be gazed at, not an interactive archeological site. These criteria are assessed at UNESCO’s center in Paris, France—creating a systemic bias that judges from a Western perspective. Indeed, the aesthetics of culture implicitly presupposes a (invariably, Western) framework of evaluation that has the taste and distinction to accurately judge. Further, many of those who evaluate a site’s criteria are diplomats and not experts, and thus might create unfair standards of heritage without taking into account their bias of defining what constitutes cultural heritage. According to Henry Cleere, within UNESCO,

Culture manifests itself principally in the form of archeological sites and monuments from classical Greece and Rome, European architecture from the later Middle Ages to neo-classicism, and the art and architecture of the Indian subcontinent and imperial China (2000, p. 32-33).

This does include the Hampi temples in southern India; however, Cleere notes the Taj Mahal palace as India’s primary archeological site. Anthropologist Michael Brown suggests that there is an “aesthetic delight” for artifacts that society catalogues, from museums to UNESCO, the latter which “[codifies] knowledge” (1998, p. 200, 203). This aesthetic designation then distorts our view of what the past and present are, because, ideally, according to Clifford “everything that’s new is old with us” or synthesized together (1988, p. 251). Places in non-Western societies may have significant cultural or spiritual significance, but because they do not appear as grandiose as St. Mark’s cathedral in Venice might, for example, they are often overlooked (Cleere, 2000, p. 32). Cer-

tain canals and railway tracks are and were vital to human development in industry and trade; however, only the romanticized and more “beautiful” sites such as “von Ghega’s magnificent Semmeringbahn in Austria and the narrow-gauge Darjeeling Himalayan Railway in India” are recognized (p. 34). Definitions of beauty and aesthetic ideologies differ among nations and culture, and because UNESCO is a European-based organization, there is Western bias in defining what constitutes a “masterpiece.” UNESCO surfaces as a “bureaucratic” force clouded with fixed aesthetic ideologies (Nielsen, 2011, p. 281).

Many argue that UNESCO promotes Western cultural hegemony and domination in the locating, choosing, and guarding of World Heritage sites. According to UNESCO, “cultural diversity [referring to global World Heritage sites] cannot be confined,” although the list of ten criteria for a World Heritage site confines monuments to standards of Western culture (Nielsen, 2011, p. 280; “UNESCO” website). “Evidently Western notions of heritage do not have a place in the non-Western world;” however, this has not kept UNESCO and other Western “cultural” organizations from intervening (Byrne, 2008, p. 231). Expectations of “continuity and essence have long been built into...Western ideas of culture,” encompassing what is judged worthy of UNESCO status (Clifford, 1988, p. 233). The “real” or “authentic,” manifested through continuity, is part of the cultural collection of Western thought. The invention of “new” traditional landmarks due to globalization generally does not receive the same amount of attention from UNESCO as “pure” historical sites might. UNESCO is a judging body, concerned with “cataloguing, archiving, and legislating” heritage’s future, which can institute a hierarchy of archeological and cultural importance (Baig, 2003). Indeed, it is hard “to ignore the tyranny of the Western world system” and its intellectual dominance (Sahlins, 1999, p. v).

HERITAGE IN DANGER

Not only does UNESCO have a list of World Heritage sites, but it also has a “List of World Heritage in Danger.” When a heritage site is too exploited, touched, discovered, or in Margaret Mead’s mindset, “badly missionized,” it then becomes in danger of misrepresenting cultural heritage as the “very characteristics for which a property was inscribed on the World Heritage List [are threatened]” (Clifford, 1988, p. 231; “UNESCO” website). This creates a cycle of unsustainability and volatility of UNESCO status, particularly in developing countries. All but three sites currently filed on the “List of World Heritage in Danger” are in developing nations, with problems listed such as “urbanization” and “unchecked tourist development” that incessantly plague developing nations (“UNESCO” website; Timothy & Nyaupane, 2009, p. 6). Indeed, multiple sites have already been stripped of their World Heritage site status (p. 11). Reasons for this range from “tourism pressures” (tourism being an implication of World Heritage site designation in the first place), and “illegal timbering” or “illegal mining” of natural resources, which are often supplied to more developed nations—the countries with great sway in UNESCO labeling (Ibid). The “List of World Heritage in Danger” configures UNESCO in a paternalistic manner, giving the Western-based organization full capability to remove the World Heritage site title—akin to a father grounding his child or taking away his/her privileges.

World Heritage status keeps Hampi, Borobudur, and other sites pristine and untouched jewels set in the past, but this also constructs a difficult dichotomy to maintain. Cultural heritage is supposed to weave a strong national identity and sense of belonging into a nation, although in some cases it can leave citizens displaced, helpless, and angry (Albernaz, Bandarin, & Hosagrahar 2011, p. 20). Livelihoods are compromised and irreversibly altered for the sake of heritage monuments. Yet, ironically, in order for “cultural heritage [to be] vibrant,” the “living environment” must be healthy at the same time (Baig, 2003). The past becomes a sort

of “prize,” and “culture has become a battleground for recognition” (Fontein, 2000, p. 16; Nielsen 2011, p. 288). Indeed, there is a need for a consistent “sense of place” to determine authenticity, even if the site itself has been modified beyond recognition. A prime example of this is the “Brú na Bóinne Complex” in Newgrange, Ireland (Smith & Waterton, 2009, p. 83; “UNESCO” website). UNESCO produces heritage fragments of past civilizations and intends to have these golden beads of culture strung around the globe, sustained in the same way they were during their most glorious point in antiquity.

If “all the world’s a stage,” as Shakespeare once said, then UNESCO World Heritage sites emerge as “playhouses of diversity,” platforms for re-presenting “imagined dramas” and settings (Di Giovine, 2009, p. 275). Alas, under UNESCO’s reign and the dominant discourse of World Heritage, only “the ‘right’ kind of culture is epitomized” (Nielsen, 2011, p. 279). UNESCO has the power to mold what will be remembered about ancient cultures in the future, and in doing so, eschews contemporary cultures today. UNESCO essentially removes the heritage’s agency from the local people and spreads it globally. Most World Heritage sites, especially in developing nations, maintain an aesthetically pleasing antiquity detached from present day influences, creating a skewed view of global cultural heritage, often harming local communities in the process.

SUPPLEMENTAL IMAGES

All of the following images have been photographed by the author.

IMAGE 1 **HAMPI, INDIA**



IMAGE 2 **BOROBUDUR, INDONESIA**



IMAGE 3 **HAMPI BAZAAR DESTRUCTION**



IMAGE 4
**VERDANT FIELDS, PATHWAYS,
AND VOLCANOES SURROUNDING BOROBUDUR**



IMAGE 5
**TA PROHM TEMPLE AT ANGKOR, MADE PARTIALLY FAMOUS BY
ANGELINA JOLIE IN THE FILM TOMB RAIDER. THE TREE ROOTS
STILL ENVELOP THE TEMPLES, MAKING IT EASY TO PERPETUATE
THE MYTH OF DISCOVERY.**



IMAGE 6

A CHILD AT HER HOUSE IN THE ANGKOR WAT COMPLEX JUST OFF THE MAIN TOURIST ROUTE, BUT STILL UNDER APSARA CONTROL.



REFERENCES

Albernaz, Frances Sailer; Bandarin, Francesco, & Hosagrahar, Jyoti. Why Development Needs Culture. *Journal of Cultural Heritage* 1(1). (2011): 15-25.

Baig, Amita. "Managing Cultural Significance," *Seminar* (530). (2003).

Bruner, Edward M. & Kirshenblatt-Gimblett. Maasai on the Lawn: Tourist Realism in East Africa. *Cultural Anthropology* 9(4). (1994): 435-470.

Brown, Michael. Can Culture be Copyrighted? *Current Anthropology* 39(2). (1998): 193-222.

Byrne, Denis. "Western Hegemony in Archaeological Heritage Management." in Fairclough, Graham; Harrison, Rodney; Jameson Jr., John H. & Schofield, John (eds.) *The Heritage Reader*. New York, New York: Routledge Press, 2008.

Chamberlain, Gethin. "India's Hampi heritage site families face eviction from historic ruins." *The Guardian*. (2012, May 26). Online. Retrieved from <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2012/may/27/hampi-india-heritage-temples-eviction>.

Cleere, Henry. The World Heritage Convention as a Medium for Promoting the Industrial Heritage. *The Journal of the Society for Industrial Archeology* 26(2). (2000): 31-42.

Clifford, James. *The Predicament of Culture: Twentieth-Century Ethnography, Literature, and Art*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1988.

Conklin, Beth. Body Paint, Feathers, and VCRs: Aesthetics and

Authenticity in Amazonian Activism. *American Ethnologist* (24)4. (1997): 711-737.

Covarrubias, Miguel. *Island of Bali*. North Ryde, Australia: Alfred K. Knopf Inc., 1986 (first edition: 1937).

Cotter, Holland. "Finding Art as Real as Life Itself." *New York Times*. (2012, Apr. 16). Online. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/04/17/arts/design/in-mali-finding-art-as-authentic-as-life-itself.html?pagewanted=all>.

Di Giovine, Michel A. *The Heritage-scape: UNESCO, World Heritage, and Tourism*. New York, New York: Lexington Books, 2009.

Fontein, Joost. *UNESCO, Heritage and Africa: an Anthropological Critique of World Heritage*. Report Paper. 2003.

Henderson, Joan C. "Heritage Tourism in Southeast Asia" in Nyaupane, Gyan P. & Timothy, Dallen J. (eds.) *Cultural Heritage and Tourism in the Developing World*. New York, New York: Routledge Press, 2009.

Howard, Peter. *Heritage Management, Interpretation, and Identity*. New York, New York: Continuum, 2003.

Huxley, Julian. "UNESCO: its Purpose and its Philosophy." *Preparatory Commission of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization*. (1946). Retrieved from <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0006/000681/068197eo.pdf>.

"Germany Supports Safeguarding of Borobudur." *The Jakarta*

Post. (2012, Jun. 12). Retrieved from <http://www.thejakartaglobe.com/news/germany-supports-safeguarding-of-borobudur/523717>.

Larson, Gary. "Watch out! The Anthropologists are Coming!" (1984). Retrieved from <http://anthropology.net/2007/09/14/watch-out-the-anthropologists-are-coming/anthropologists-anthropologists/>.

Nielson, Bjarke. UNESCO and the 'right' kind of culture: Bureaucratic production and articulation. *Critique of Anthropology* 31(4). (2011): 273-292.

Nyaupane, Gyan P. & Timothy, Dallen J. (eds.) *Cultural Heritage and Tourism in the Developing World*. New York, New York: Routledge Press, 2009.

Peterson, Jeannie. Preserving the World's Wonders: The Second in a Series of Synopses on UNESCO's World Heritage Sites. *Ambio* 10(1). (1981): 36-38.

Pinault, David. Indonesia's Buddhist Heritage. *America* (189)17. (2003): 16-18.

Randolph, Eric. "Official Zeal Ruins Life for Residents of Hampi Heritage Site." *The National Newspaper*. (2011, Nov. 23). Online. Retrieved from <http://www.thenational.ae/news/world/south-asia/official-zeal-ruins-life-for-residents-of-hampi-heritage-site>.

Sahlins, Marshall. What is Anthropological Enlightenment? Some lessons of the Twentieth Century. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 28. (1999): i-xxiii.

Schmitt, Thomas. Global Cultural Governance, Decision-Making Concerning World Heritage between Politics and Science. *Erd-*

kunde 63(2). (2009): 103-121.

Smith, Laurajane & Waterton, Emma. *Heritage, Communities, and Archaeology*. London, United Kingdom: Gerald Duckworth & Co. Ltd., 2009.

UNESCO Website. (2012). Retrieved from <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/>.

Whitehouse, David. "World's 'oldest' rice found." BBC Online. (2003, Oct. 21) Retrieved from <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/science/nature/3207552.stm>.

Winter, Tim. "Landscape, Memory, and Heritage: New Year Celebrations at Angkor, Cambodia." in Harrison, David and Michael Hitchcock, eds. *The Politics of World Heritage*. Tanawanda, New York: Channel View Publications, 2005.

Environmental Photography Its Background of Tension

BY JAKE MADOFF

This paper discusses how one may come to understand the background (history) of tension in an environmental photograph. By tension, I refer to the interminable relationship between the natural and the unnatural. In discussing the natural and unnatural, this paper outlines key definitions and notions from various philosophical and scientific literatures. Once these are cleanly demarcated, it explains where the tension arises. Ultimately, this paper argues that the said tension arises in industrial processes which negatively alter our climate (thereby altering nature). I then delve into why photography is the sole medium on which I am focusing. Using John Berger's thoughts on photographs as objective and specific environmental photographs symbolizing either the natural or unnatural, this paper will explicate how words may be utilized to comprehend the history of and reveal the tension within each photograph.

AREAS OF INTEREST:
Environmental Studies, Photography,
Aesthetics, Ethics

plication. To reiterate, photographs cannot alone reveal the deep tension between the two entities because words have an integral role in this synergy. Therefore, when photographs are combined with words, it makes for a more efficacious and powerful tool that, if applied to humanity's psychological framework, will yield understanding, connectedness and, ultimately, environmental improvement.

NATURAL AND UNNATURAL

Before explicating the historical backgrounds of photographs, it is important to delineate what is defined as natural and unnatural. The Oxford English Dictionary defines “natural” as, “existing in or caused by nature; not made or caused by humankind” (“Natural,” n.d.). “Unnatural,” conversely, is defined as “contrary to nature: not existing in nature, artificial” (“Unnatural,” n.d.). Philosophers, too, offered thoughts on this relationship; Elliott Sober, in “Philosophical Problems for Environmentalism,” discusses the idea of the natural: “If we (humans) are part of nature, then everything we do is part of nature, and is natural in that primary sense, [but] when we domesticate organisms and bring them into a state of dependence on us... [one may] call this unnatural” (Sober p. 180). In addition to “domestication,” human activities have generated enough of an impact to shift the “natural geological epoch.” According to Will Steffen in “The Anthropocene: Are Humans Now Overwhelming the Great Forces of Nature?” this epoch, called the Holocene, has been shifted to the Anthropocene (an epoch in which anthropogenic change has influenced Earth’s systems to such a degree that they are “unnatural”). Steffen states that this “departure” is caused by “anthropogenic emissions of CO₂,” which he argues may change the “natural behavior of climate for the next 50,000 years” (2007, p. 614-615). The work of Sober and Steffen reveal aspects of this tension. The tension essentially develops when humans intervene with the natural, changing its composition and functioning in a

INTRODUCTION

Every photograph has a background. This kind of background can be understood not only as a physical background, but also as a historical lineage— one that encompasses origins, conditions, and experiences. A photograph serves as a portal, one which captures an instant in time. However, while the photograph itself acts as an objective and evidential window by which to view, and later understand, history, language functions to elucidate this background. Words may reveal the interminable tension between the natural and unnatural. Tension here refers to the frictional interaction between the human activity and the concept of the natural (the parameters of what constitutes natural and unnatural and how photographs have a part in revealing this tension will be outlined in great detail below). Once one enters the portal of a photograph, understanding grows through written ex-

way that makes the natural unnatural — that is, drastically dissimilar to how it was before humans existed.

Indeed, human activity has, in its tremendous scope, influenced nearly every organism and system. However, for the sake of expedience, we will generally only consider plants, trees, lakes, oceans, geological features, deserts, insects, reptiles, mammals, fish, birds, (any species on the phylogenetic tree besides the *Homo sapiens* clade), to be natural/of nature. Moreover, we will say that contemporary humans and their creations are unnatural—creations being anything made predominantly with the human hand or things substantially influenced by man (Vining, 2008, p. 7-8).

WHY PHOTOGRAPHY?

This paper examines environmental landscape photography on the grounds that it functions by its very nature as something evidential. John Berger's "Appearances" touches upon this objectivity of photographs and their unique ability to provide sound evidence. In the work, Berger provides a photograph of a man and a horse. He states that this photo "offers irrefutable evidence that this man, this horse and this bridle existed. Yet it tells us nothing of the significance of their existence" (1972, p. 86). In other words, photography may be used as evidence for a feature's existence. Moreover, he says that photographs "quote from...appearances;" and, as such, they "cannot lie" (p. 96-97). However, Berger then addresses the point at which photographs become obsolete, saying, "Meaning is discovered in what connects, and cannot exist without development. Without a story, without an unfolding, there is no meaning" (p. 89). That is to say, photographs cannot show the historical background of a certain space. The "unfolding" which is a necessary condition for "meaning" is where the utility of words arises. Words enable us to find and comprehend the history presented in a photograph. Various scholarly works of science and philosophy will aid us in our search and understanding of this background of tension.

FIRST PHOTOGRAPH

Let us look through our first window, the top photograph by Gary Braasch image, which was taken in 1985 (figure 2). This photograph captures a majestic and powerful mountain. Here, Mount Hood in Oregon is covered in snow and ice—its peak and slopes generously drizzled. This photograph offers irrefutable proof that this mountain experienced snowfall. That is, the altitude and "cryospheric aspects" of this mountain translate to heavy snowfall; thus, as a result of natural climatic systems, this geological mass *naturally* looks this way (Le Treut, 2007, p. 110). Let this mountain symbolize that which is pre-industry, not touched or misshapen by the human hand.

SECOND PHOTOGRAPH

Let us enter another portal— a photograph of epitomizing industrial production (Landsman, n.d., figure 3). Here, we see the iconic and domineering smokestacks releasing clouds of toxins into the atmosphere. This results in a setting inundated with photochemical smog and gaseous pollutants: carbon dioxide, methane, hydrocarbons, and sulfur dioxide (Le Treut, 2007, p. 100-119). There are also vehicles— the ubiquitous symbols of industry—in the foreground, and a web of telephone poles, draping a metal apparatus above the earth. Upon further observation, this photograph contains an interesting contrast: on each side, natural life is present, albeit slowly failing. Let this industrial power plant symbolize that which catalyzes the transformation process of the natural to the unnatural: human exploitation of natural resources, domestication of mammalian species, and various other activities that radically alter the climate (p. 115-116).

THIRD PHOTOGRAPH

Once industrial mechanisms finish, post-production emerges and develops. This stage yields unnatural products. These products, once natural resources, become chemically altered via “combustion” and refining processes (p. 97). The end result is an unnatural product. For example, natural resources such as limestone, iron ores, and sedimentary rock, become steel and cement. As an illustration of this, figure 1 provides an image of Manhattan (Hawkes, 2013). This photograph epitomizes the end result of industry mechanisms. While it may be perceived merely as a feat of human labor and intelligence, every colossal tower took many years and many resources to construct. This steel and cement jungle was produced using the products of the Earth. That is, the birth and creation of such an artificial landscape necessarily entails the death and destruction of Earth’s natural landscapes. Here, we begin to see the interminable tension between the two entities and the proof of it that is evident in environmental photographs.

This space could not have always appeared so stiff and grey; nature once resided on this island. Before humans occupied this area, photosynthetic organisms flourished in abundance; the terrain was dynamic and brilliantly green. However, that era of natural vigor is over; the manmade now dominates; there are highways, sidewalks, bridges, skyscrapers, vehicles, and the sundry other objects that are the marks of a human presence. Whether these things are impositions on an otherwise sovereign nature, or if they themselves exist within the order of the natural, is a question of grave ethical importance.

FOURTH PHOTOGRAPH

To explicate this question more thoroughly, we must address the ultimate result of the industrial process. That is, after all the stages of production are carried out, where does

this leave our environment? The bottom portion of figure 2 may serve as an answer to the latter question. The photograph shows Mount Hood in 2002, during the same time of day (Braasch, 2002, fig. 1). There is a stark contrast with the earlier photo. The mountain is now somewhat arid; its snow is spotty; its rock face is exposed; its peak no longer has snow and ice. These human-caused alterations to the environment epitomize the tension between the natural and unnatural. Again, let this paradigm symbolize all the externalities of human production: receding glacial ice, coral reef bleaching, deforestation, loss of biodiversity, increased frequency of tropical cyclones, rising sea levels, air pollution, eutrophication, habitat displacement, desertification (Le Treut, 2007, p. 100-116).

To understand why these changes occur, we must look at the “International Panel on Climate Change AR-4” report, by Herve Le Treut, et al (2007). Le Treut asserts the primary catalyst for nearly all aberrant climate occurrences is greenhouse gases. Greenhouse gases absorb and trap heat in the atmosphere through a process called the greenhouse effect (p. 116). He states that, currently, “human activities...are greatly intensifying the natural greenhouse effect, causing global climate change” (Ibid). “Solar irradiance and the atmospheric energy budget” may also cause the greenhouse effect to be homeostatic or augmented (p. 96). As one may conclude, the composition of these atmospheric components influences climate variables in the biome and, ultimately, determine “feedback mechanisms” (p. 97). These mechanisms refer to such processes as the ice-albedo negative feedback loop, El Niño and La Nina, desertification, deforestation, and ecosystem productivity. These mechanisms are drastically altered by human activity, directly resulting in the aforementioned environmental issues (p. 105).

The concept and question of naturalness in this process is explored in Steffen’s work. As stated earlier, human activities have pushed our biological fabric to a new “geological epoch.” Scientists theorize that this new “human driven” system “has left Earth’s natural...interglacial state” to one termed the Anthro-

cene (Steffen, 2007, p. 614). Steffen asserts that “preindustrial societies did modify coastal and terrestrial ecosystems, but did not have the social and economic organisation...to dominate the great forces of Nature” (p. 615). He continues to suggest that “their impacts remained well within the bounds of the natural variability of the environment” (Ibid).

The tension is clear. We alter the systems of nature to a state of unnaturalness. Nature seeks to flourish and operate in “matters” of naturalness (Sober, 2000, p. 188). That is, nature has its own collective interests (e.g. to photosynthesize and thereby create energy for functioning). Sober purports that “a thing is right when it preserves the integrity and stability of the biotic community...[and] is wrong when it tends otherwise” (p. 186). It is a fact that we are imposing ourselves on nature, putting stress on and damaging its constitution. Because we act using our own human-centric decision matrix, we carry out this imposition with little reservation; our decisions are not deliberated comprehensively. In other words, we do not seem to account for the “intrinsic value” in the natural process, but rather put a great deal of weight on instrumental and use value (p.184).

How do we better our decision process? That is, what kind of attitude would yield actions that are not detrimental to nature? To answer this question, we must explore what is often called “conservation psychology.” Joanne Vining, in “The Distinction between Humans and Nature: Human Perceptions of Connectedness to Nature and Elements of the Natural and Unnatural,” discusses this concept in detail and provides findings from her survey. The survey asked, “Do you consider yourself as a part of or separate from nature? Explain” (Vining, 2008, p. 3). Vining found that “even though the large majority of our participants considered themselves as part of nature, their general perception of natural environments excluded any humans or human involvement while their general perceptions of unnatural environments included mostly human-made entities” (p. 8). The finding, as such, is “conflicting” and implies “cognitive dissonance” (p.10). This

psychological disagreement may be the reason we interact poorly with the environment. Thus, Vining proposes a solution—she says, “studies show the level of connectedness an individual feels towards an environment will affect their level of concern for, and decisions towards, that environment” (Ibid).

CONCLUSION

By effectively demarcating the “natural” and “unnatural” we can shed light on, and ultimately remove, the dissonance in our conceptions of them. Photographs such as the ones examined above, in addition to providing tangible proof of environmental change, can also forge a greater sense of “connectedness” that is necessary if we are to reassess our environmental decision matrix. Unlike science and philosophy, which may be intellectually valuable, photographs evoke another response altogether—they interact with our emotions. If scientific facts fail to motivate us to act with environmental tact, intense feelings of emotion may. Emotions tend to be a powerful influence, operating and compensating in realms where factual comprehension may be weak. When strong feelings are channeled towards a goal, the goal may be reached more effectively. Therefore, when we combine these two mediums of comprehension, we create an efficacious and powerful tool, one which yields connectedness, reverence and, perhaps, environmental improvement.

PHOTOGRAPHS

Bloomberg (fig. 1):



http://www.theguardian.com/world/picture/2013/aug/08/eyewitness-manhattan-new-york#_

Braasch (fig. 2):



http://news.bbc.co.uk/nol/shared/spl/hi/picture_gallery/05/sci_nat_how_the_world_is_changing/img/5.jpg

Landsman (fig. 3):



<http://www.naturalhealth365.com/images/toxic-air.jpg>

REFERENCES

Berger, John. "Appearances." *Ways of Seeing*. London: British Broadcasting, 1972. Print.

Bloomberg, Daniel A. *New York City From Above*. 2010. Photograph. Herman Yung's Collection. 19 July 2010. Web. 29 Aug. 2013.

Braasch, Gary. *In Pictures: How the World Is Changing*. 2010. Photograph. Figure 5. British Broadcasting Corporation. Web. 28 Aug. 2013.

Landsman, Jonathan. *Chemical Toxins in the Air*. 2012. Photograph. *Solutions for Toxic Indoor Air Pollution*. Natural Health 365. 11 Jan. 2012. Web. 29 Aug. 2013.

Le Treut, Herve, Et al. "Historical Overview of Climate Change." *The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007. Print.

"Natural." *Merriam-Webster.com*. Merriam-Webster, 2011. Web. 15 April 2013.

"Nature." *Merriam-Webster.com*. Merriam-Webster, 2011. Web. 15 April 2013.

Sample, Ian. "Human Activity Is Driving Earth's 'sixth Great Extinction Event'." *The Guardian*. Guardian News and Media Limited and Its Affiliated Companies, 28 July 2009. Web. 29 Aug. 2013.

Sober, Elliot. "The Preservation of Species." Ed. Bryan Norton. *The Value of Biological Diversity* 7 (1986): 179-180. Princeton University Press, 2000. Web. 15 Apr. 2013.

Steffen, Will, Paul J. Crutzen, and John R. McNeill. "The Anthropocene: Are Humans Now Overwhelming the Great Forces of Nature?" *Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences*. 36.8 (n.d.): 614-21. *Ambio*. Dec. 2007. Web. 15 Apr. 2013.

"Unnatural." *Merriam-Webster.com*. Merriam-Webster, 2011. Web. 15 April 2013.

Vining, Joanne, Melinda S. Merrick, and Emily A. Price. "The Distinction between Humans and Nature: Human Perceptions of

Connectedness to Nature and Elements of the Natural and Unnatural." *Human Ecology Review* 15.1 (2008): 1-9. *Society for Human Ecology*. Web. 29 Aug. 2013.

THANKS

The Editorial Staff of the Gallatin Research Journal would like to thank the following people, without whom this would not have been possible:

Dean Susanne Wofford
Associate Dean Linda Wheeler Reiss
Professor Chinnie Ding
Former Editor-in-Chief Will Notini
Carolyn Concepcion
Gisela Humphreys

The founders of the Gallatin Research Journal:
Jareka Dellenbaugh-Dempsey, Marc Dones, and
Sarah Zapiler



The Gallatin Research Journal (GRJ) is a student-run publication devoted to showcasing the excellence achieved by Gallatin students in the arena of academic non-fiction. It is our goal at the GRJ to strengthen the connections between individuals and ideas in Gallatin by affording students the opportunity to have their work published in a single platform. The GRJ thus establishes itself as a periodical that embraces the structure of Gallatin's individualized curriculum and provides an exemplary representation of interdisciplinary study in general.

In doing so, the GRJ urges students to pursue and explore their own academic work outside of the classroom, thereby bringing their own personalized sets of questions and ideas to the research process. We dedicate ourselves to acting as a supplement to the classroom experience by extending the impact of study and fostering communication between the myriad approaches offered by the research and the writing of the Gallatin community.

NYU**GALLATIN**

SCHOOL OF INDIVIDUALIZED STUDY