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From the President

Thank You

The Spring Torch Magazine will be the final issue edited by Dr. Reed Taylor. Five years ago, after an anniversary meeting of the Buffalo Torch Club, past IATC President Anne Sterling and I went to Reed’s home for a glass of sherry and to reflect on the Torch issues of the day. Aware that the current Torch editor, Patrick Deans, had planned to retire, Anne popped the question: “Reed, would you consider being the next editor of Torch Magazine?” After some deliberation, Reed agreed to be the editor for five years, and during that time he has more than met our expectations. He has reduced the cost of publication, increased the number of articles published in each edition and, most importantly, has worked closely with our authors to make each edition of the Torch Magazine as perfect as it can be.

A retired high school English teacher with a BA in American Studies from Yale and an MA and PhD in the same field from Emory, he has filled all the leadership positions in his Buffalo Torch Club as well as serving as Region 1 Director and as International President. I salute my friend Reed Taylor and, on behalf of the entire Torch family, thank him for being a Torch leader.

We will miss Reed, but we welcome Dr. P. Scott Stanfield as our new editor starting with the Fall 2013 issue. Scott is a professor of English at the Nebraska Wesleyan University with a specialty in English and Irish literature. He comes from a Torch family. His father, Paul, was an International IATC President and Scott was a former IATC Regional Director, a member of the Editorial Advisory Committee, and is a current member of the Lincoln, Nebraska Torch Club. Scott and Reed have been working closely together to assure a smooth transition. I know that Scott will follow in Reed’s footsteps and continue to make Torch an outstanding publication. I recently enjoyed receiving Scott’s commitment to the editorship over breakfast in Lincoln, Nebraska.

Torch is also losing the services of Edith Warring, our long-time compositor. Edith has provided excellent copy and layout support for both Patrick Deans and Reed Taylor, but is now moving from Virginia to be close to her family. In preparing Torch for the printer, she has given the magazine a professional appearance. Torch will miss you Edith.

—Charles E. Carlson, President IATC, esccec@gmail.com
Cornelius Van Dyck: The Missionary Who Inspired the Arabic Literary Renaissance

The onetime Syrian Protestant College continues a proud heritage in the Arab world as the American University of Beirut.

By Arthur Goldschmidt
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We hear a lot these days about the shortcomings of America’s Middle East policies and the widespread resentment of many Middle Easterners—Muslims especially—against the U.S. government. Nevertheless, respected Middle Eastern institutions founded and developed by Americans help to offset these negative perceptions. Among these, the greatest monument to American “soft diplomacy” and largest contributor to the reservoir of good feeling toward the United States is the American University of Beirut, commonly known as AUB. This paper tells about one of its pioneer teachers, an American better known by the Arabs than by his fellow countrymen.

Early Days of American University in Beirut

Beirut’s American University, what we know as AUB, started as the Syrian Protestant College, founded by Presbyterian missionaries in 1866, when Beirut was a Mediterranean port city of thirty thousand people under the Ottoman Empire. It was meant to be the capstone institution for a constellation of mission schools founded in various towns and villages of Syria, an Ottoman province embracing the current Republic of Syria, parts of today’s Lebanon and northern Israel, and a piece of Turkey. The first Protestant missionaries arrived about 1820 with the burning desire to win the hearts and minds of Muslims—and possibly also Jews—to Christ in the land where he had lived, taught, and died. Although it soon dawned on them that few (if any) Muslims or Jews wanted to become Christians, they did find villages nestled in the Lebanon Mountains whose inhabitants were already Christian, typically either Greek Orthodox or members of Maronite or Uniate Roman Catholic groups. Though the latter were unlikely to turn to Protestantism, some Orthodox Christians were deeply alienated from their own church due to the cultural divide between the Arab priests and their Greek bishops or the ignorance of their clergy. One village priest is said to have long disguised his illiteracy by memorizing one page of the Bible and by chanting from that page every time he conducted a service. A couple of teen-aged boys decided to play a trick on the prelate, breaking into the church one night and turning the pages of the Bible to the beginning of another book. The next Sunday, the priest began chanting: “And God said…. and God said….” Then he stopped for a minute, looked around,
and shouted: “Some jackass has been messing with God’s holy word!” As you can imagine, some laymen were turned off by the backwardness of their church and converted to Catholicism (becoming Uniates). Others were prime targets for conversion to Protestantism, especially because the early American missionaries provided schools that offered at least rudimentary instruction in the three Rs, taught originally in Arabic, and only much later in English. The Syrian Protestant College and other missionary schools did much to reinvigorate Arabic as a language for writing about literature, history, and the natural sciences, in addition to religion and law, giving rise to the so-called “Arabic Literary Renaissance.”

Among the older buildings on the AUB campus is Van Dyck Hall, built around 1930 with money from the Rockefeller Foundation, named for the most gifted and honored of all of the pioneer teachers of the Syrian Protestant College, Cornelius van Alan Van Dyck.1 Descended from one of the early Dutch families that colonized the Hudson Valley, Van Dyck was the son of a country doctor in Kinderhook, New York, born in August 1818. He earned his MD degree from Jefferson Medical College in 1839, just before he turned twenty-one, and was immediately sent by the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions to Beirut as a lay medical missionary. The record offers little to explain why such a young person who knew no Arabic and was a Dutch Reformed Christian would agree to go to Syria and work among Presbyterian and Congregationalist missionaries. We do know from Van Dyck’s “Reminiscences” quoted in an online article about the Arabic Bible that he was mainly self-educated due to his father’s financial reverses, that he collected a herbarium of the local plants of Columbia County, and that he lectured on chemistry to a girls’ school when he was eighteen.

**Medical Missionary—From the Hudson Valley to Beirut**

In his reminiscences Van Dyck describes his harrowing voyage from Boston to Izmir (then called Smyrna) in January and February 1840, with no proper accommodation for passengers, vile smells resulting from coffee having been spilled in the hold on a previous voyage and not cleaned up, and no protection from the winter winds. Luckily, Cornelius had an overcoat and a buffalo robe; many of the other passengers, mainly missionaries, had even less. They were met in Smyrna by settled missionaries, rested, and a month later took an Austrian steamer to Beirut, detained for two weeks in quarantine in the city where the missionaries were to found the Syrian Protestant College a quarter-century later. He was taken in by a missionary family and began to learn Arabic.

Two local Arabs had an immense influence on the young doctor’s life: Butros Bustani, who had recently converted from the Maronite sect to Protestantism (at great risk to his own life), became his closest friend for forty years; and Ibrahim Nasif al-Yaziji, a poet and later a leader of the Arabic literary renaissance, became his first teacher. These personal ties to two of the most honored men of Arabic letters, combined with his own gift at picking up languages, launched Cornelius Van Dyck on the linguistic side of his career. Another contributing factor to his immersion in Arabic culture was his marriage in December 1842 to Julia Abbott, daughter of the British consul in Beirut whose widow later married the Reverend Dr. William Thomson, Van Dyck’s guide on a tour of northern Syria soon after his arrival.

In June 1843 Van Dyck, Thomson, and Bustani moved to the mountain village of Abeih, founding the Abeih Academy, which awarded Syria’s first high school diplomas. During his four years there, he translated from English into Arabic or composed textbooks on geography, algebra, geometry, logarithms, plane and spherical trigonometry, navigation, and natural philosophy (today’s general science). He later revised these books, which remained standard works in the Arabic language for many years. His geography of Asia Minor and Syria (including what are now Israel and Lebanon) is a thesaurus of graphic description and includes quotations in poetry and prose from the writings of classical Arab geographers and travelers. Modern Arabs admire it and often quote from it. Van Dyck’s missionary colleagues ordained him as a minister in 1846.

In 1847 Van Dyck joined a
committee headed by Protestant missionary Eli Smith to prepare a new translation of the Bible into Arabic, moving with his father-in-law from Abeih to the port city of Sidon. He had originally hoped to do more preaching, but he soon got caught up in the work of translation. When Dr. Smith died in 1857, Van Dyck completed the work, which was praised by his contemporaries as almost devoid of errors, though modern Arab scholar Abdel Latif Tibawi has criticized Van Dyck’s “Brutistanti Arabic” in an earlier article Van Dyck wrote for the *Journal of the American Oriental Society* in 1849.2

Van Dyck went to New York in 1865 to supervise the task of electrotyping the whole Arabic Bible. This was a new invention at the time, one that would save the cost of resetting the type each time the Arabic text was printed. During his two years there he taught Hebrew at Union Theological Seminary, which offered him a professorship. He declined, saying “I have left my heart in Syria and thither I must return.” He did so in September 1867 to take charge of the mission’s press and its weekly journal, *al-Nashra*, one of Syria’s earliest periodicals. Predictably, he also accepted a professorship of pathology at the brand new Syrian Protestant College, which pointedly chose to teach exclusively in Arabic in order to attract more students.3 During his fifteen years there he published large volumes in Arabic on pathology, astronomy, and chemistry. He founded Beirut’s first astronomical observatory and supplied much of its equipment.4 His students in the School of Medicine included Shibli Shumayyil (the pioneer Egyptian science writer), Ya’qub Sarruf and Faris Nimr (the founders of the scientific monthly *al-Muqtataf* and also the Cairo daily, *al-Muqattam*), and their rival editor at another scientific magazine, *al-Hilal*, a Syrian named Jurji Zaydan. The latter subsequently praised his famous teacher, Dr. Van Dyck, as one always friendly to the Arab people, and “most prominent in debates,” who used to preach, practice medicine, and teach, and [yet] he received the same salary as his colleagues. He was of a generous nature and a man of many good deeds, all of which were performed with kindness and humanity. …He used to teach pathology and chemistry in the College; then Dr. [Edwin R.] Lewis took over chemistry instruction. Students loved Van Dyck and used to sing his fine qualities, kindness, and consideration. The people thought that Van Dyck was the founder of the College. Some used to call it Van Dyck College. He never said that, but his fame overshadowed that of his colleagues.5

The Darwin controversy almost destroyed the Syrian Protestant College, but one must keep in mind that Darwin’s theory of evolution by natural selection was and is a red flag to evangelical Christians, who feel that it lowers humanity to the level of mere animals. The College was founded to propagate Christian principles.

Surviving Darwinian Controversy

Although the Syrian Protestant College gloriied in what Van Dyck had done, his liberal ideas and especially his attachment to Edwin Lewis led to a rift when the latter gave the commencement speech in 1882. Speaking on “Knowledge, Science, and Wisdom,” Dr. Lewis noted the methods by which science seeks to find the causes of events and praised the geological studies of Sir Charles Lyell and the biological writings of Charles Darwin. He thus placed himself in direct confrontation with the Governors of the College and its president, Daniel Bliss, who believed that its mission was to teach the principles of Biblical Christianity and not the dangerous doctrines of Charles Darwin. Dr. Lewis was obliged to resign. Almost half the faculty, including Cornelius Van Dyck and his son William, followed suit. The Van Dycks offered to go on teaching their students, many of whom also dropped out of the College, at their home. Cornelius went to work in the Greek Orthodox Hospital of Beirut. He never again taught at S.P.C.6

The Darwin controversy almost destroyed the Syrian Protestant College, but one must keep in mind that Darwin’s theory of evolution by natural selection was and is a red flag to evangelical Christians, who feel that it lowers humanity to the level of mere animals. The College was founded to propagate Christian principles. Note, though, that the Arabic scientific monthly *al-Muqtataf*, edited and written by S.P.C. graduates Sarruf and Nimr, had already published articles in praise of Darwin, who had died early in 1882, and that other issues, such as Dr. Lewis’s serving wine at a public
function, also offended the Board of Governors and indeed President Bliss. The Board insisted, following the Darwin controversy, that all faculty members sign a Statement of [Christian] Principles. The outcome, however, was for instructors to serve for shorter periods of time, to move away from Biblical fundamentalism, and to prepare their students for a wider scientific community by teaching in English. Arabic ceased to be the language of the S.P.C. medical school in 1883, four years after the liberal arts division had made the same change.

After his resignation, Van Dyck published eight science textbooks and a book called Kitab irwa al-zama min mahasin al-qubbah al-zarqa (“ Beauties of the Starry Heavens ”). His final work was an Arabic translation of Ben Hur, which was published after his death on the press of al-Muqtataf in Cairo. Ya’qub Sarruf, the editor of that monthly magazine, wrote that the doctor never claimed sole credit for his Arabic translation of the Bible, even when Dom Pedro, the Emperor of Brazil, complimented him on his accomplishment. Scorning flattery, when a delegation of learned scholars from Damascus praised him in grandiloquent Arabic and asked Van Dyck, “ What gifts and talents must a man have to attain such learning as yours? ” he curtly replied, “ The humblest may attain to it by industry. He who strives wins. ”

Van Dyck ’ s Rich Reputation

On the fiftieth anniversary of his arrival in Beirut, Syrians and Americans joined in celebrating his jubilee year in 1890. The celebrants included the Greek Orthodox patriarch of Antioch, a representative of the American Bible Society, the Curators of the hospital where he had worked, the Syrian Evangelical Society, the Greek Bishop of Beirut, the alumni and undergraduates of the Syrian Protestant College, the Syrian Young Women’s Society, the YMCA, and the missionaries in Beirut. The Syrians gave a purse containing 500 pounds. The American missionaries gave him a Gothic walnut case containing all 26 of his Arabic publications, elegantly bound. The managers of the Greek Hospital gave him a silver coffee set. Two years later, he received an honorary L.H.D. degree from the University of Edinburgh. Cornelius Van Dyck died in Beirut on November 13, 1895. At his request, no word of eulogy was uttered at his funeral, much to the chagrin of some twenty poets who had composed long Arabic poems for the occasion. One of his pupils later gathered forty-seven elegiac poems that were published by an Arabic publishing house. His gravestone in Beirut reads

Cornelius Van Alan Van Dyck
Born in Kinderhook, August 13, 1818
Died in Beirut, November 13, 1895
After laboring 55 years among the sons of the Arabic language

Among Van Dyck ’ s disciples were the founders of the two oldest Arabic scientific journals, al-Muqtataf and al-Hilal, both founded in Beirut and published for many years in Cairo (the latter survives). He is one of the few Americans recognized by Arab scholars for pioneering the renaissance of Arabic literature, and he is appropriately honored by inclusion in the standard Arabic biographical dictionaries.

Notes
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Whither Our Youth?

A lifelong pediatrician offers some insights into the complexities of adolescence.

By Peter B. McMain
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The Challenge of Child-Rearing

Having children—nurturing, rearing, and educating them—is the fulfillment of a biologic imperative. For most, parenting brings a sense of satisfaction, joy, and love; but it can also create times of considerable angst. Such frustration typically emerges during infancy, at the time of school entry, and during adolescence—the last a particularly vexatious and puzzling time. Happily for most families, adolescence is a temporary rebellious phase, following which a child settles into a stable lifestyle. For some families, however, it is a period when a child is in serious conflict with parents and with society in general. Like the parents in such cases, I too have puzzled over difficult adolescent behavior during my practice as a pediatrician for more than fifty years. Through a review of genetic, psychological, educational, and societal factors, this paper will suggest possible causes of adolescent conflict as well as strategies for its prevention.

The word adolescence is derived from the Latin ‘adolescere,’ meaning to grow up. For most purposes it is regarded as the period between twelve and nineteen years of age, a stage of emerging sexuality, increased sense of personal identity, and improved ability to handle and create generalizations. Adolescence can be regarded as both a physical reality and a state of mind. A snapshot of today’s youth, as presented by national statistics and the media, does much to fuel our angst. The high school dropout rate, teenage pregnancy, suicide, and drug abuse have increased. Some 46 percent of all high school seniors have had sexual intercourse and 14 percent have had four partners or more. The larger fourteen to twenty-four-year-old age group accounts for half of new cases of sexually transmitted disease.¹ According to the World Health Organization, in some African countries 60 percent of new HIV infections occur in teenagers.²

Anxiety and insecurity have increased among adolescents. Some young people stop talking, becoming emotionally avoidant to protect themselves from pain. They evince an affect lacking in authentic emotion. Nothing matters; cool is the in thing and aggression is cool. In its worst form there is a sense of meaninglessness, indifference, and lack of direction, with deterioration to nihilism. This state of mind is not confined to Western society. In Japan, the word hikikomori is used to describe a type of withdrawn youth who avoids social interaction and relies on digital communication.³ The word hunzi denotes dropouts from the consumer society who grow long hair, get tattoos, and smoke marijuana.

Literary Views

Adolescent rebellion is not a new social phenomenon. Consider the following statement: “Our youth loves luxury, has bad manners, disregards authority and has no respect for age; our today’s children are tyrants; they do not get up when an elderly man enters the room; they talk back to their parents; they are just very bad.” This criticism is attributed to Socrates (470-399 BCE).⁴ Or what about the following: “I have no longer any hope for the future of our country if today’s youth ever become the leaders of tomorrow because this youth is reckless, unbearable—just terrible.” This criticism is attributed to Hesiod (c. 720 BCE).⁴ Or what about the following: “I have no longer any hope for the future of our country if today’s youth ever become the leaders of tomorrow because this youth is reckless, unbearable—just terrible.” Hesiod (c. 720 BCE) was no less a critical reviewer of youth than is any exasperated parent of 2012.⁵ In As You Like It, Shakespeare described the seven ages of man but unfortunately made no reference to adolescence. Perhaps like others, he too found them
puzzling.

Jean-Jacques Rousseau saw the child as an innocent, a noble savage with intuitive perceptions of the eternal spoiled by urban society. For Victorian novelists such as Charles Dickens and George Eliot, the child was the victim of social pressures in a society obsessed with the idea of progress. William Golding’s novel Lord of the Flies portrayed the belief that good and evil are inherent in man. Mark Twain’s Huckleberry Finn is clearly an abused child. Jerome Salinger’s 1957 novel The Catcher in the Rye described the initiation of the main character Holden into the viciousness of adult society, a portrayal disturbing enough to adults to cause the book to be banned from some schools.

Genetic Factors

Teenage dissidence may be a passing phase for many, but it has raised important underlying issues. Certainly the great evolutionary forces of Darwinian natural selection continue to be operative. The deep primitive levels of the nervous system are thought to be kept in check, albeit imperfectly, by more recently acquired levels of the nervous system. The mechanistic workings of biologic development can be differentiated from human volition. Evolution selects among genes but not societies. The science of genetics has expanded greatly since Mendel experimented with peas. His “abstractions” were the forerunners of DNA and the mapping of the human genome, hopes ran high that the modern science of genetics would provide the answer. Richard Dawkins, however, reminds us that “it is a fallacy to suppose that genetically inherited traits are fixed and unmodifiable.”6 While our genes instruct us, we are not compelled to obey them all of our lives.

Science is just beginning to explore the role of epigenes. They do not reside in DNA but are able to modify gene expression. For example, the methylation of cystine can turn a gene off. Early development of the mammalian egg is now known to be controlled by maternal DNA. It is also now clear that some traits can be conveyed from parent to child through cultural interactions rather than genetic influences. Indeed, the word ‘meme’ has been coined to categorize such cultural transfer. No genome scan or demographic checklist will reveal all. Happily, the Nazi pseudoscience about race and the Marxist pseudoscience about the malleability of human nature have been assigned to the dust bin of history.

Psychological Forces

Parents frequently refer to “the terrible teens” as a time when their patience is often pushed to the limit. They tend to draw solace, by reminding themselves that what they are witnessing is simply a transient developmental stage. Rephrasing this in the terminology of Jean Piaget, one could say that the child is in the stage of formal operations during which there is disequilibrium followed by equilibration of accommodation and assimilation processes. But has this clarified the problem? Behavioral psychologists, pediatricians and educators tend to think in terms of developmental stages. No doubt these descriptive stages have some utility, but they have limitations and sometimes can be misleading. A recent study published by the American Academy of Pediatrics concluded, “No categorization of developmental stages has been able to describe accurately what parents have been observing for centuries.”

Unlike Piaget, Sigmund Freud didn’t study many children directly. Freud can be credited for the concept of the id, ego, and suppression of thoughts into the subconscious. According to his psychodynamic theory, suppressed thoughts can resurface in later years and result in impaired social functioning and neurosis. Of more recent interest is the work of Hungarian analysts Nicolas Abraham and Maria Torok, who draw attention to the psychological phenomenon of trans-generational haunting, the process whereby the suppressed thoughts of parents are passed to the subconscious of their children like secrets.

Educational Issues

The acquisition of motor abilities, language, and social skills that begin in the home is the start of formal schooling at about four years. School is a vehicle which transports children from age four to adult society, with stops en route for maintenance and tests of competence. Only a minority of students, like Alexander the Great, have had the benefit of individual tuition by someone like Aristotle. Some attend private schools, but since the seventeenth century most have relied on publicly-funded educational systems. How and what children should be taught has been the subject of heated debate for ages. Not all students learn at the same rate, and ideally the focus should be on matching educational resources and learning opportunities to student readiness. Schooling poses the risk that the diversity and originality of our youth might be reduced to a Platonic essentialism for statistical analysis. All too frequently, the student experiences a set of political and philosophical forces for which school becomes the battleground. Some critics, like Louis Althusser, regard school as an
ideological state apparatus designed to regulate behavior, reduce dissidence, and generate a labor force.8

In Western society, some educators may think that besides imparting factual knowledge, they teach creativity, problem solving, teamwork, and global awareness. However, teaching creativity is unfortunately a myth. The child is a creative entity whose self-expression the school is supposed to facilitate. A case has even been made by Sir Ken Robinson that schools stifle creativity.9 Standardized exams do not test character; all they offer is statistical aggregates and averages. A common observation is that success at school does not necessarily equate with success in the world at large. Indeed does not necessarily equate with observation is that success at school aggregates and averages. A common scholastic success is often the result of cumulative advantage—the so called “Matthew Effect.”10 One has to wonder what the effect of cumulative disadvantage might be.

It is important to recognize that failure is an essential component of learning. While some students are written off as school failures, they can still make a success of their lives in non-academic pursuits. One can find notable examples of students who were poor or disappointing, but who later made great contribution to science, the arts, and society. Winston Churchill couldn’t enter university because of difficulty with languages. Carl Jung was poor in mathematics. Thomas Edison was disturbed because he was always at the bottom of the class. Galileo was refused a doctorate at Pisa. Albert Einstein was refused admission to the Zurich Polytechnic. Auguste Rodin failed to get into the School of Fine Arts three times. Bill Gates was a university dropout. Roger Penrose, emeritus professor at Oxford’s Mathematical Institute, had to repeat a class at eight years because he was slow at math. Napoleon Bonaparte, W.B. Yeats, Henry Ford, G.B. Shaw, and Harvey Cushing had difficulty with spelling. Oscar Wilde and G.K. Chesterton were unusually clumsy.

**Social Stress**

Parents and teachers realize the importance of play and pretense in child development, providing insight into the workings of the world. The child learns about the actual through discovering the difference between pretense and actual, a learning experience that extends into the teen years. At this age of discovery, teenagers mirror what they see and question previous assumptions. All too frequently the result is internal as well as overt conflict. The clash of adolescent and parental values is perceived as a generation gap, giving rise to the question of what kind of world the youth of today see.

Clearly, the modern world is one of rapid change, inevitably accompanied by emotional stress. In the space of a few centuries, communication has advanced from an oral tradition to the printed word and telecommunication. If one were to choose an icon for the twentieth century it would be the atom, but for the twenty-first century it has to be the Internet. It is reported that by the time today’s children reach the age of seventy, they will have spent ten years watching television. Between the ages of 8 and 18, children spend more than seven and a half hours a day on such digital activity as television, the Internet, social media, texting, movies, music, and video games. Media have also become more interactive than ten years ago. While having a great potential for good, the media currently add to children’s alcohol and drug abuse, early sexual activity, aggression, obesity, and poor school performance.11 Teen magazines contain 48 percent more beer ads, 20 percent more hard liquor ads, and 93 percent more sweet alcohol ads than do magazines for adults. Exposure to violent video games may desensitize the viewer to real life violence. One wonders whether the announcement in December 2010 that the video game “World of Warcraft” set a world record with twelve million subscribers was good news.12

The rise of industrialization, compulsory education, and the two-income family have diminished contact between child and parents. Current lifestyle only augments the trend. Fifty per cent of all first marriages in the U.S. end in divorce and one million children per annum are affected by it.13 Divorce sets off a tangle of social pathology. Nowadays, it is fairly easy for a teenager to slip into a parallel universe with only minimal overlap with the rest of the family. Indeed, many children today are more connected to their peer group than to their parents. About one million children in North America are receiving antipsychotic medications, and the parallel increase in dispensed stimulants is alarming.

**Remediation**

Those of us who work with children recognize their great powers of adaptability and resilience. We also know that they are hungry for something to hold onto and want answers to troubling questions. Although some are filled with a sense of emptiness, others are effective, self-reliant, resourceful, loving, and altruistic. The nature v. nurture debate is over. Both are important. The social milieu shapes attitudes and behaviors in children and is easier to change, beginning in the home. The late scholar and Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan, in a letter to President L. Johnson wrote, “…the richest inheritance any child have is
a stable loving disciplined family life, and affection they need.” Children need protection from the nullifying effects of exposure to poverty, ill health, violence, alcohol, drugs, divorce, and verbal, physical, and sexual abuse. Since children imitate what adults do to gain their approval and affection, they need protection from the evils of modern life as reflected by the media.

As early as the twelfth century, Moses Maimonides stressed the importance of habit in the formation of ethical and altruistic behavior. This theme was also taken up by William James, a founding American psychologist, who regarded habit as, “The enormous fly wheel of society.” This does not mean putting our youth in uniforms and regimenting them. The excesses of the Red Guard and Hitler Youth should provide sufficient deterrence. Rather, the focus has to be on fostering love of learning, wisdom, hope, optimism, and friendship. A shining example of how these basic concepts should be used is to be seen in Venezuela, where the el sistema program has provided 350,000 children with a musical education. Many of them are disadvantaged children from the barrios. The dropout rate is 7 percent compared with the national average of 25 percent.

Knowledge, without an accompanying sense of decency, can be very dangerous. Traditional religions and philosophies have been weakened. The threat of punishment from above has lost force. Today’s youth have a great need for moral exemplars and role models. For the troubled teenager it is crucial to have a teacher or some other responsible adult with whom they can discuss their difficulties. The first job of a teacher is to establish a trusting, honest relationship with a pupil. We live in a culture of vast sub-literacy. If properly used, our electronic media—a modern equivalent of the tower of Babel—could do much to improve teenagers’ social skills by requiring them to collaborate, to share, to practice collective problem solving, to become sensitive to people’s needs, and to develop a sense of community.

Quo vaditis iuventutes noster?

The question hangs suspended, still begging an answer. For me to make a forecast would be presumptuous and at best inaccurate. Adults tend to assume that today’s youth will think like them and have the same access to information. However, they will differ from us in many ways. There is an old saying that the future is hidden from us by a veil which is held by the angel of mercy. Maybe so! Nevertheless, when I look critically at some scruffy, sullen, rude, uncooperative teenager, I take comfort in the thought that this individual might have great potential to improve human society. Of this much we can be sure: The direction taken by today’s youth will depend largely on the type of society adults create and the leadership provided them.

Notes

5. Ibid.
Plagiarism in Eighteenth Century America: Was Thomas Jefferson the Author of the Declaration of Independence?

The emergence of a new political polarity played a key role in redefining Jefferson’s iconic status.

By Roger Wilson

About the Author

Roger Wilson earned an AB from Newberry College in South Carolina in 1966, an MA in speech and drama from Miami of Ohio in 1968, and an MS in Library Science from Florida State in 1973. After two years coordinating library services at Camp Community College in Franklin, VA, and three more as Director of Learning Resources at Roanoke’s Virginia Western Community College, he taught public speaking, acting, and related courses until his retirement in 2010. From 1978 to 1990, he served as the Artistic Director for Virginia Western’s theatre program. Since a biography of Benjamin Franklin ignited his passion for the Revolutionary War in 2001, Roger has read hundreds of books about this era. In 2006 he sought out the Roanoke Torch Club as an organization where he could put into practice effective public speaking skills that he has taught to thousands of students. From 2007-2009 he served as local club president.

Presented to the Roanoke Valley Torch Club on May 3, 2011.

A person claiming today to be the author of “It was the best of times, it was the worst of times” would clearly be guilty of plagiarism. On the other hand, few would make the same charge against Thomas Jefferson for writing these words:

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Nevertheless, as this paper will show, when Jefferson arranged to have carved on his tombstone that he was the “Author of The Declaration of American Independence,”’ he too was guilty of plagiarism. The issues of “authorship” and “plagiarism” carried different connotations in Jefferson’s eighteenth century culture from their meanings even a half-century later.

An Eclectic Drafting Process

Current historians agree that Jefferson combined his ideas with those of others in laying out the first draft of this declaration. In her recent study of this central American document, Pauline Maier stated, “I dissent from any suggestion that…the full story of the Declaration can be told apart from that of the Independence it declared and the process that led to it.” Therefore, before addressing Jefferson’s role in the famous document’s origination, this paper will begin by discussing the process that led to its creation. The first thing to understand is the nature of the 2nd Continental Congress, the entity that declared the independence of all thirteen colonies from Great Britain. The 2nd Continental Congress began its first session on May 10, 1775. For fifteen months, Congress debated whether to declare independence or seek reconciliation.

During this time Congress had few rules. Each colony could have unlimited delegates, but each delegation only had one vote. Within any delegation, a majority determined how that delegation would vote. If there was a tie, then that delegation abstained.

Committees continued to work when Congress was not in session, meeting several times to discuss pertinent issues, having a member draft a resolution to present to Congress for debate and an ultimate vote. Congress liked to resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole.
Commitees continued to work when Congress was not in session, meeting several times to discuss pertinent issues, having a member draft a resolution to present to Congress for debate and an ultimate vote. Congress liked to resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole. Then the same delegates who had been debating in a congressional session continued debating in a committee. All the while, no minutes were kept, encouraging delegates to speak more openly. Any votes taken in a committee were unofficial, allowing delegates to vote the way they really wanted. All could see how the official vote might turn out and whom to convince to change his mind.

**Thomas Paine as Catalyst**

For over nine months, Congress was unable to decide whether they should declare independence. Then on January 6, 1776, Thomas Paine published his best-selling pamphlet, _Common Sense_, stating why America should declare independence in response to the tyranny of the British monarchy.3 Greatly influenced by this pamphlet, citizens began urging their congressmen to declare independence. Now instead of Congress leading citizens, citizens were leading Congress! But the vote for independence was still almost half a year away. Or was it? On May 10 the 2nd Continental Congress adopted a resolution bearing this preface, authored by John Adams:

> [F]or the…defense of their lives, liberties, and properties, against the hostile invasions…of their enemies; …resolved…[that] the United Colonies…adopt such government as shall…best conduct to the happiness and safety of their constituents.4

As Adams biographer David McCullough points out, this preface “all but declared the colonies immediately independent.”5 According to historian Joseph Ellis, Adams believed he had written the real declaration of independence.6

On May 14, Jefferson arrived in Philadelphia. He brought with him from Virginia’s constitution, some of which wound up in his draft of the _Declaration of Independence_. Meanwhile some colonies began sending new instructions to their delegations. They were telling them to vote for independence—if some other delegation were to propose it. Virginia stepped up to the plate on June 7 when Richard Henry Lee submitted this proposal from the Virginia state government:

> That these United Colonies are, and of right ought to be, free and independent States, that they are absolved from all allegiance to the British Crown, and that all political connection between them and the State of Great Britain is…totally dissolved.7

For two days Congress, meeting as a Committee of the Whole, debated Lee’s resolution. Meanwhile couriers from some colonies arrived with resolutions supporting independence. On June 11, Congress appointed another committee, with five members—John Adams, Franklin, Jefferson, Robert Livingston, and Roger Sherman—which became known as the Committee of Five. Congress postponed further consideration of Lee’s resolution until July 1. If at that time Congress voted to declare independence, the Committee of Five would already have a resolution to propose.

The Committee of Five met several times. They read various state resolutions, decided which proposals to include, and how to organize the results. Specifically, these men agreed on the outline of their committee report and on who would write it. Jefferson suggested Adams, who refused saying that in his constant arguments for Independence he had made himself obnoxious, and that any draft he wrote would be subjected to severe criticism. Adams also believed that Jefferson was the better writer. Jefferson was thus chosen to write the first draft of the document, which he completed in seventeen days, between June 11 and June 28. Jefferson first showed his draft to Adams, who made a few changes. He then showed it to Franklin, who also made changes. It is believed that Livingston and Sherman made no changes. According to historian Michael Beran, on June 28 Jefferson presented the Committee of Five’s draft to Congress. It was read aloud to the delegates—and then laid aside to await further consideration.8

**Variations on a Theme**

What Jefferson had drafted was not original, and he knew it. He wrote James Madison, “I did not consider it as any part of my charge to invent new ideas altogether, and to offer no sentiment which had ever been expressed before.”9 According to Maier, the Committee of Five’s draft

…restated what virtually all Americans—patriot and Loyalist alike—thought and said in other words and in other places. And that was exactly what the Declaration was meant to do. It was, according to Jefferson, ‘to be an expression of the American mind…’10

Most ideas expressed in the _Declaration_ came from specific sources. Historians typically mention at least three writers who had influenced Jefferson, though no two historians’ lists are identical. The one writer who does appear on every list is John Locke, who wrote that in a natural state, everyone has freedom of actions and has the power to preserve his property, life, and
liberty. This natural state is one of equality, in which all are free, equal and independent, and no one without his consent can be under the political power of another. When a number of such individuals decide to form a government, a majority may choose someone to have certain powers, providing that this person use that power for the good of all. If he abuses his power instead, he is a tyrant and, if a tyrant commits a long chain of abuses, the people have a right to replace him with a new leader or new form of government. Jefferson also wrote that “the highest perfection of intellectual nature lies in a... pursuit of happiness.”

By 1776, all Americans had learned Locke’s ideas from newspapers, pamphlets, and schoolbooks—ideas Maier notes were conventional among all Americans, some also found in other patriotic writings. For example, the idea that government had a duty “to provide for the security, the quiet and happy enjoyment of life, liberty and property” appeared in James Otis’s Rights of the British Colonies, written in 1764. Similarly, on June 12 in Williamsburg, Jefferson’s friend George Mason penned the words “That all Men are by Nature equally free and independent, and have certain inherent Rights...among which are the Enjoyment of Life and Liberty, with the Means of Acquiring and possessing Property, and pursuing and obtaining Happiness and Safety.” It was published as part of Mason’s Virginia Declaration of Rights in a Philadelphia newspaper during the time Jefferson was working on his draft.

**Author as Rewrite Editor**

Do these citations prove that Jefferson was guilty of plagiarism? No, for in late eighteenth-century America the concept of an author did not include that he be an original writer. What was valued was that he could take the ideas of other authors and rewrite them more effectively. That became the view of what Jefferson had done—that he had expressed familiar ideas better than anyone else had. But did Jefferson actually write these ideas the way they appear in the Declaration of Independence? Here is text that sounds like a less-polished version of our familiar Declaration text:

> We hold these truths to be sacred and undeniable, that all men are created equal and independent, that from that equal creation they derive rights inherent & inalienable, among which are the preservation of life, & liberty, & the pursuit of happiness.

These are in fact the words of Jefferson, submitted as part of his final draft for Adams and Franklin to consider. Only after their contributions did this sentence closely match the words that the world cherishes today. But others were still to tweak it.

On July 1, Congress resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to debate Lee’s resolution. In a nonbinding vote nine supported independence. South Carolina and Pennsylvania opposed the motion, Delaware’s two delegates present out of three split on the issue and abstained, and New York’s delegation abstained because they were under instructions to support reconciliation. Agreeing that any vote for independence had to be unanimous, the delegates postponed the official vote a day. July 2 brought an entirely new result. South Carolina simply changed its vote, possibly because British war ships were reported off the coast of Charleston. The return of Delaware’s third delegate, Caesar Rodney, a general in his colony’s militia who had been summoned back from putting down a loyalist uprising at home, brought the delegation a tie-breaking vote for independence. Within the Pennsylvania delegation, the vote on July 1 had been 5 to 2 against independence. But on July 2, two pro-reconciliation delegates were absent, presumably unable to bring themselves to vote for independence, but unwilling to stand in the way of the inevitable. That still left Pennsylvania with a 3 to 2 majority against independence, but after Franklin talked one of them into changing his vote, the Pennsylvania delegation voted for independence 3 to 2. New York again abstained, clinging to hope for reconciliation.

Thus it was that on July 2, 1776, the 2nd Continental Congress voted for independence by a vote of 12 to 0. It was unanimous—among those delegations who had voted. On July 3, Congress as the Committee of the Whole began their analysis of the Committee of Five’s draft. They went over it line by line, word by word. They made many changes. Sometimes they changed wording. They tweaked the document’s most famous sentence until it finally became the most revered statement in the English language. Sometimes the Committee added words. In the concluding paragraph they added two references to God—“the supreme judge of the world” and “divine providence”. Sometimes they overhauled entire paragraphs. They eliminated almost half of the Committee of Five’s concluding paragraph—which declared independence—and inserted at least as much material from Lee’s earlier resolution for independence. Many times they cut. In all, the Committee of the Whole eliminated about one quarter of the Committee of Five’s draft!
of the Whole finished their revisions. They evolved back into a session of Congress, which unanimously approved (with New York abstaining) their heavily-edited version of The Declaration of Independence and directed that several hundred copies be printed overnight and distributed. This printed document was entitled A Declaration by the Representatives of the United States of America—in General Congress Assembled and was dated July 4. It bore only two names—both printed—John Hancock and Secretary of Congress Charles Thomson. Copies were sent to the various states and to the Continental Army, eventually reaching European courts. Throughout the group-editing process, Jefferson remained silent—and marked the changes on his own copy of the draft. He became more and more miserable. He thought Congress had mutilated the draft, and wanted nothing to do with it.

Joseph Ellis points out that Jefferson “…went out of his way to disavow responsibility for the version of the Declaration passed by Congress.” He made at least five copies of the Committee of Five’s draft and mailed them to several friends along with copies of the Congressionally-approved version. He wanted his friends to judge for themselves which they thought was better. These were hardly the actions of a man who wanted to be known as the author of the official Declaration of Independence. Through the 1780s, on July 4th Americans celebrated the fact of independence, not the Declaration itself. As late as 1790—fourteen years after the vote for independence—the Declaration of Independence was all but forgotten, including Jefferson’s role in its creation. And that was the way Jefferson wanted it—forgotten. Most historians agree that the changes made by Congress significantly improved the document. “In the end,” wrote Maier, the efforts of… the Congress itself, sitting as the Committee of the Whole, made it into a distinguished document by an act of group editing that has to be one of the great marvels of history.

Today, along with revering the Declaration of Independence, most Americans believe that Jefferson authored it. This belief had its origins in the birth of America’s two-party system in the 1790s, when the Federalist and the Republican political parties emerged. A major difference between them was that the Federalists wanted closer ties to Britain and fewer ties to France. The Republicans wanted the opposite. The Federalists wanted to downplay the Declaration of Independence, embarrassed by its attacks on the British people and their king. Meanwhile the Republicans began to celebrate the Declaration as a “deathless instrument” written by the immortal Thomas Jefferson—who just happened to be the leader of the Republican Party. The Federalists poh-pohed the Republican notion that Jefferson was the author. They emphasized the roles of the Committee of Five and of the 2nd Continental Congress in creating the document, referring to Jefferson as a scribe who borrowed from Lee and stole from Locke.

Jefferson’s Late Venture into Plagiarism

The Federalists went on to oppose the War of 1812 against Great Britain. After Andrew Jackson’s overwhelming victory at the Battle of New Orleans, the Federalist Party faded and died. While Jefferson was still alive two new major political parties came into being, the Whigs and the Jacksonian Democrats. Both these parties claimed descent from Jefferson’s Republican Party, and both now hallowed the Declaration of Independence and Jefferson’s role as its author, the view which persists to this day, which presumably prompted Jefferson to have carved on his tombstone that he was the “Author of the Declaration of American Independence.”

By the early 1800s, the concept of an author had come to be seen as a person who had written something original, like three works written and published in America in Jefferson’s time—Cooper’s novel The Spy and the poems A visit from Saint Nicholas by Moore and The Star-Spangled Banner by Key. By now, educated Americans knew that when someone claimed to be an author, he meant he had written a specific original work by himself. Although Jefferson knew he wasn’t the Declaration’s author as that term had come to be defined, he had come to believe the political hype of his own political party. Thus when he planned to claim on his tombstone that he was the author of the famous document, he was guilty of plagiarism.

It is sad that Jefferson—one of our greatest founding fathers—tried to make more of his truly significant contributions to the Declaration of Independence than those contributions warranted. Someone had to write that first draft, and that someone was Thomas Jefferson. Without Jefferson, the world would never have been inspired by these memorable lines—as revised by Adams, Franklin, and the Congressional Committee of the Whole:

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life,
liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.
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On May 22, 2011, during a keynote address to a conference of the Christians for Middle East Peace in Washington, DC, Israeli Christian Archbishop Elias Chacour declared that if you take the side of the Israelis that is good. They need all the help they can get. They need friends. If you take the side of the Palestinians, that is good. You will be on the right side. But it does no good for you to sympathize with Palestinians if it means that you hate the Jewish people as a result. We do not need any more divisions or enemies; we have too many already. Whether one hopefully seeks a “way forward” or pessimistically a “way out,” the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is not easy to understand, let alone resolve. This essay will indicate how the historic roots and evolving political geography of the region have sharpened cultural differences and expanded the so-called “Catastrophe” of the UN partition of 1947 into the present climate of violence that affects young and old alike. We Americans have been given only part of the story of life there. I found that what I learned in Schools of Christian Mission led by United Methodist Women and what I gleaned from attending the Middle East Interfaith Peace Witness are true. Both Israelis and Palestinians are hurting and both live in fear. For over sixty years, U.S. media have focused primarily on the Israeli perspective. My commitment to peace guides this paper’s thread of argument in the direction of reconciliation.

Historical Antecedents of Conflict

A personal visit in the Fall of 2010 to the small village of Ibilin in Galilee revealed Archbishop Chacour’s impressive transformation of this town into a model of relationships between Muslims, Christians, and Jews. That achievement had a significant personal history. Elias Chacour was eight years old in 1948 when Zionist soldiers came to his Galilean Melkite Christian village of Ba’ram seeking a place to sleep. The villagers slept on the roofs and let the soldiers stay in their homes, recognizing that the soldiers had lost their homes and families in Europe’s terrible Holocaust. Elias’ family prepared a large feast for the soldiers, who ate heartily. However, unlike the Jewish neighbors who were very friendly and frequently chatted over coffee, the soldiers were rude, brusque and unkind, brandishing their trigger-ready guns and frightening the children as they made their way to school or during mealtime. When Elias’ brother asked why the soldiers carried guns his father responded, “Our Jewish brothers have been exiles in foreign lands. They were hunted and tormented—even by Christians. They have lived in poverty and sadness. They have been made to fear; and sometimes when people are afraid, they feel they have to carry guns. Their souls are weak because they have lost peace within.” Still the children were afraid the soldiers would harm them. Their father always let them know that no matter what others do, “we do not use violence ever.”

After a week, the soldiers told the people of Ba’ram that for security reasons they needed to lock their homes and give the keys to them. They were told to travel light and were assured that they would be able to return in two weeks. They had to leave in a hurry and camp out in the open. After being out in the cold and rain for over two weeks, some men went back up the hill to Ba’ram only to find the first homes they encountered ransacked, with broken doors. Then they met soldiers who evicted them at gunpoint.

Husbands, wives, and children were often separated. Many were killed. After a great deal of suffering and hardship, Elias’ family eventually managed to get reunited. After three years, his father and three brothers were able to get back to the homes...
special work passes in order to enter what had been their property so they could work for a settler with Father Chacour’s beloved fig trees. He bore with patience the indignity of having his special worker’s pass scrutinized by soldiers several times each week before he could set foot on the land. The attitude of Chacour’s father was, “If someone hurts you, you can curse him. But this would be useless. Instead, you have to ask the Lord to bless the man who makes himself your enemy. And do you know what will happen? The Lord will bless you with inner peace—and perhaps your enemy will turn from his wickedness. If not, the Lord will deal with him.” Such was the heritage of hate and fear spawned by the Partition of 1947.

For hundreds of years prior to 1948, Jews, Christians, and Muslims had lived together in harmony; but the situation changed with the impact of Zionism, a secular ideology that began in the 1890s and grew out of the persecution of Jews in Europe. Realizing they could never gain freedom and respect in Europe, they sought to build a nation elsewhere. One leader, Theodor Herzl, an agnostic, German-speaking Jew, wrote a book on the Jewish State. Zionism was not based on the Biblical concept of the promised land, but rather on the creation of a Jewish country. Many Jews countered that Judaism is a religion, not a nationality.2 That religion speaks of hospitality, of caring for the alien in your midst, of welcoming the stranger as Abraham welcomed visitors to his tent with a feast. The prophets reprimand the people for oppressing others. Micah informs us, “What does the Lord require of you, but to do justice, and to love kindness, and to walk humbly with your God?”3 The people are to be a light to the nations.

When I was a teenager and Israel was coming into being, my family thought this was a good thing; the Jews would have a place to live. Jews were fleeing Europe and many nations, including the U.S., did not want so many refugees coming to their land. It seemed good that they could have their own place to live. Some Christians said that this was the fulfilling of prophecy and that the second coming of Christ could be speeded up by helping Jews return to Israel. Often Christians will tell Arab Christians that they should leave their homeland and move to another Arab nation to make room for Jews. This runs counter to what I read in the New Testament. Paul says “There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for all of you are all one in Christ Jesus. And if all of you be Christ’s, then all of you are Abraham’s seed, and heirs according to the promise.”4 “The gospel is for all people regardless of race, gender, or status!

Noah Baum, a Jewish storyteller in Washington DC writes, “When the great Rabbi Hillel was asked by a Gentile to explain the entirety of the Torah while standing on one foot, he said: “What is hateful to you, do not do to your fellow. The rest is just commentary. Now go and learn.” This advice is not consistent with the beliefs of those who even today so passionately want to rid all the holy land of Palestinians, ignoring the fact that Jews, Christians, and Muslims all originated among Semitic people. Most likely Christians in Palestine have more Semitic blood than many of the Jews from Europe, Russia, and the U.S. for in diaspora they have intermarried with others. In the early 1940s, most Palestinians spoke Arabic. Most were Muslim, about 15% [down to 2% today] were Christian—mainly Greek Orthodox—and 5% were Jews. The indigenous Jews, deeply religious, opposed this Zionism whose goal was to replace the Palestinian people who had lived on the land for centuries with immigrant Jews. A slogan for Israel was “a land without a people for a people without a land.”5

**The Catastrophe**

The devastation following the UN Partition Plan in 1947 is known by Arabs as The Catastrophe (Al-Nakba in Arabic). Four hundred to five hundred Palestinian villages and towns had residents driven out or were leveled by bulldozers. An Israeli Army reserve officer who fought in 1948 gives us a glimpse into what happened as quoted by Alex Awad, “As uncontrolled panic spread through all Arab Quarters, the Israelis brought up jeeps with loudspeakers which broadcast recorded ‘horror sounds.’ These included shrieks, wails, and anguished moans of Arab women, the wail of sirens and the clang of fire alarm bells, interrupted by a sepulchral voice calling out in Arabic: ‘Save your souls all ye faithful: the Jews are using poison gas and atomic weapons. Run for your lives in the name of Allah.’”6 Many people were slaughtered. A twelve-year-old during the massacre of Deir Yassin was hiding with his family when the door was “blasted open and they were taken outside in time to witness a man being shot: ‘When one of his daughters screamed, they shot her too. They then called my brother Mahmoud and shot him in our presence, and when my mother screamed and bent over my brother (she was carrying my little sister Khadora who was still being breast fed), they shot my mother too.’”7

About 750,000 refugees fled, usually on foot, to such neighboring countries as Lebanon, Jordan, and Syria. It was a difficult, treacherous journey, and some too weak to make it died on the way. They had lost everything—home, land, possessions—and often were separated from family or had family who were killed. Now 60 years later they with their descendants number nearly five million in refugee camps in these neighboring countries as well as camps in the West Bank and Gaza. A refugee camp I visited in Bethlehem was very crowded and depended a great deal on the UN for survival. I suspect that Gaza is even more crowded!8 Imagine an area 5 miles by 25 miles with a population of 1.5 million and only 0.3 of a million who are not refugees! Conditions in these camps
are often very deplorable. Someone visiting one in Lebanon said that it was more decrepit than any big city ghetto they had seen. A UN Resolution stated that Palestinians should be able to return to their home; and if they don’t wish to return, they should be compensated for their property. This will probably not happen in spite of Israeli promises to the UN. In the 1967 Six Day War, Israel took the Golan Heights from Syria; the Sinai Peninsula and Gaza from Egypt; and East Jerusalem and the West Bank from Jordan. This was a war that increased the number of refugees; but it also made life for Palestinians more difficult.

Political Geography
Peninsular Israel is about the same size as the state of New Jersey, less than one-fifth the size of Pennsylvania. It has borders with the Mediterranean Sea, Egypt, Jordan, Syria, and Lebanon. The West Bank is smaller than the state of Delaware, a state which extends 35 miles E-W at its widest; its maximum N-S extension is 96 miles. The Gaza strip is 5 miles wide and 25 miles long. The West Bank is so named because it extends from the west bank of the Jordan River to Jerusalem.

Under its regime of occupation after 1967, Israel controlled all sources of water, natural resources, the borders and all passage of people and goods, and took responsibility for all infrastructure and services such as trash and roads. Israel gave short shrift to these responsibilities, however; in 1973 in a meeting with Winston Churchill, Likud Party founder Ariel Sharon declared, “We’ll make a pastrami sandwich of [the Palestinians]. We’ll insert a strip of Jewish settlement, right across the West Bank so that in 25 years’ time, neither the United Nations, nor the United States, nobody, will be able to tear it apart.” And in 1998 Sharon, now Minister of National Infrastructure, encouraged the development of settlements that created what critics called a Swiss cheese map of the West Bank, saying, “Everybody has to move; run and grab as many hilltops as they can to enlarge the settlements, because everything we take now will stay ours. Everything we don’t grab will go to them.” This was quite a reversal from his advocacy of coexistence a decade earlier, in 1989, when he was Minister for Trade and Industry: “I begin with the basic conviction that Jews and Arabs can live together. I have repeated that at every opportunity, not for journalists and not for popular consumption, but because I have never believed differently or thought differently, from my childhood on... I know that we are both inhabitants of the land, and although the state is Jewish, that does not mean that Arabs should not be full citizens in every sense of the word.”

Violence Faced by Palestinians Under Occupation Today
The history and geography of Israel tell only part of the story. As Alex Awad points out, Israel is systematically carrying out a plan to rid the land of Palestinians through ten strategies of interference with normal life:

1. Humiliation and liquidation of the Palestinian leadership
2. Economic warfare directed at the water supply, closing many wells and diverting 80% of West Bank water to Israel (the average Arab gets 80 liters of water per day, some of which must be purchased, whereas the average Israeli uses 350)
3. Virtual incarceration of the Palestinian population through curfews that limit businesses and employment, as well as sieges and widespread travel restrictions
4. Attacks on emergency medical personnel, services, and hospitals
5. Interruption of education, with schools fired upon—some destroyed and others taken over by the military
6. Construction of a 400-mile-long, thirty-foot-high wall inside the West Bank, often dividing property, separating homes from olive orchards
7. Confiscation of Palestinian land to build settlements, the wall, and even bypass roads easing travel between Israeli settlements
8. Restraint of, and assault on, journalists
9. Arrests and routine detention of Palestinians
10. Rejection of applications for permits required to travel from town to town within the West Bank via some 120 permanent and hundreds more non-permanent checkpoints.

Jean Zaru, clerk of Ramallah Friends Meeting, can no longer go to Jerusalem for visits, worship, or medical treatment. If she wishes to travel outside the country or needs a hospital, she must cross the King Hussein Bridge into Jordan. She writes, “To do that requires military permits, paying expensive fees, and being thoroughly checked—our papers, our identity cards and our passports, our bodies—often without any respect for our human dignity.” They also check their shoes and their belongings piece by piece. Under normal circumstances, Zaru could reach the Hussein Bridge in less than an hour; however it takes five or six hours because she must use secondary roads instead of the bypass roads provided for the exclusive use of Israeli settlers. These back roads have many checkpoints, detours, and road blocks. It takes another thirteen hours or more to cross the bridge—as long as a flight from Amman to New York City. For this reason, her mother had to move to Jordan for the last years of her life so she could receive medical care as needed.

Rev. Mitri Raheb, pastor of Christmas Lutheran Church in Bethlehem, describes the Israeli military invasion of the little town of Jesus’ birth in April 2002. They came from five different directions with military tanks, armored vehicles, Apache helicopters, automatic machine guns firing .50-caliber bullets in series. Raheb’s parsonage and church received a lot of damage and destruction. Neighbors were
killed. A twenty-four-hour curfew was placed over Bethlehem for nearly four months in 2002, preventing anyone from leaving home to go to work, school, or clinic at any time, seven days a week. Occasionally the curfew was lifted for a short time so one could go for food. Most towns throughout Palestine were invaded that year. Rev. Raheb offsets this grim situation with the report of a peaceful evening candlelight march where 2500 Christians and Muslims carried a banner with the message, “The Light of Right, Not the Power of Might.”16

Violence in At-Tuwani

Today, both Israelis and Palestinians live in fear of injury or death. The media employ favorable or pejorative terms depending on which faction is favored; when Palestinians throw stones or kill others via a suicide bomber, it is called terrorism and violence; yet when Israelis use machine guns and bombs, it is called law and order and security. About ten times as many Palestinians die through violence as Israelis. In October 2010, I visited the small Palestinian village of At-Tuwani southeast of Hebron in the southern West Bank, in Area C, under Israeli military and civilian control.17 Israeli authorities have refused to provide electricity and running water to the village, despite the fact that the Israeli settlement of Ma’on, less than a kilometer away, has access to these utilities. In addition, the Israeli government refuses to grant building permission to Palestinians in At-Tuwani and surrounding villages. Consequently, Palestinians frequently face the threat of demolition on their houses, mosques, schools, clinics, and wells. In contrast, Ma’on and Havat Ma’on and other settlements and outposts in the area continue to expand, despite regulations. But it is Israeli violence that makes life unbearable in At-Tuwani.

There are two men in the village from the Christian Peacemakers Team (CPT)18 who help the people with the challenges they face. Children from neighboring villages face danger daily when walking to and from school. The shortest route passes an illegal settlement, Ma’on. Children fearing harm from the settlers were escorted by two Christian Peacemakers. The first day went fine; the second day they were attacked; the Peacemakers were both injured; the children ran and thus escaped injury. The issue went to court and the Peacemakers were no longer permitted to accompany the children; the military was to provide daily escort for them. However, the CPT frequently had to call the military because several days the military were late both at the beginning of the school day and/or at the end of the day.

Even with the military escort, children have been victims of violence over the past seven years. When settlers have become violent, the children have not been immediately protected. Those settlers who used violence against the children en route to or from school have not been indicted in spite of the presence of military and Israeli police. Also the Ma’on settlement has been allowed to expand. When the settlers constructed a gate along the road in 2008, that became the de facto end of the military escort, despite the fact that children were harassed and attacked by settlers beyond that point. Soldiers would not go beyond that point even though they could see armed settlers. They claimed it is a private gate even though they pass it whenever they want to go to Palestinian villages beyond it. This gate not only makes the path more dangerous to go to school, it also makes access to medical services and the direct route to the nearby city of Yatta more difficult.

The violence extends to teens and adults as well. When two Israeli soldiers attacked a sixteen-year-old Palestinian youth 150 yards from his home in Hebron in 2009, he did not resort to violence in response. They made sexual comments about him and his mother and beat him with their hands and rifle butts. When they blindfolded him, cuffed his hands and hit him some more, he wasn’t sure if they were soldiers or settlers. An Israeli officer saw the boy’s father filming the abuse; he removed the blindfold and handcuffs and warned, “If you say anything to internationals or police, I will kill you.” According to the Christian Peacemaker Teams’ newsletter, “The youth volunteers for the Israeli human rights group B’tselem and has taken nonviolence training.”

Reflecting on the incident, he remarked, ‘The soldiers tried to make me angry and violent. But I was so quiet. I was so strong. If we stay in the way of peace, I think we will soon have our freedom.’”19

On March 19, 2011, Mahmoud Ibarhim Ali Awad, a resident of Tuba, was traveling by donkey to Yatta for a medical appointment when he was stabbed by a settler from Havat Ma’on. A resident of At-Tuwani saw the attack and ran towards the settler who retreated to the settlement. Awad was taken to the hospital in Hebron where he is recovering from stab wounds to his head, arm, and chest. A week later on March 26, At-Tuwani villagers tried to set up a small tent on village land near the illegal outpost as they held a peaceful vigil to protest the stabbing. They were prevented from setting up the tent by a declaration that this is a closed military zone. Despite the danger, village women and children occupied the area for several hours.20 In 2009, CPT reported that “over recent years, At-Tuwani has received increased media attention due to its residents’ genuine commitment to nonviolent resistance. Palestinians in At-Tuwani and the surrounding villages have successfully used nonviolence to reclaim their land and freedom of movement and to highlight the violence they experience under the Israeli occupation.”21 In spite of some successes, children still need to be escorted to and from school, villagers get attacked, water delivered in a tank truck has to be paid for, and land is taken from them. Still, even today, they continue to use non-violence to seek their rights.
Hope for Reconciliation

At the conference in Washington DC at the end of May 2010, we learned that the Arab people are fed up with violence and killing and are encouraged by the Arab Spring and the progress being made in surrounding Arab nations. Even Hamas, the group of Palestinians known for violence, are turning to using non-violent means to seek justice. The most important thing the Palestinians seek is justice, whereas the people of Israel, feeling insecure, regard security as the highest priority; thus the strong military, soldiers ever present, and numerous checkpoints. Israel’s strong military force is a constant presence. Palestinians respond with homemade weapons and suicide bombs. Israel receives financial and military aid from other countries, particularly the U.S., which gave Israel in 2011 “at least $8.2 million per day in military aid and $0 in military aid to the Palestinians.”

This past year has been a difficult one for both Palestinians and Israelis who are working to end the occupation and resolve the conflict using nonviolent means. Hopefully 2013 will bring us closer to compassion and understanding.

What can we do to help bring justice to the holy land? First of all, we can become more educated about what really goes on for both Israelis and Palestinians. When we visit the Holy Land, we can make a point of visiting both Israelis and Palestinians and thus more clearly discern continuing need for economic and diplomatic pressure in the Middle East. As our attitudes change and we influence other people, improvements will evolve. All people need to learn the importance of respect and understanding which can come through dialogue with each other and the building of relationships. The greatest need above all is to have hope that reconciliation between Jews and Palestinians can take place. As long as they are strangers to each other, that will not happen. No matter how rough the way, hope is so important. If people know and understand each other, if they show respect and recognize the dignity of each individual, then they will seek what is right for all and will not see one group of people as an inferior race. Then justice will emerge and there will be peace in the holy land.

This past year has been a difficult one for both Palestinians and Israelis who are working to end the occupation and resolve the conflict using nonviolent means. Hopefully 2013 will bring us closer to compassion and understanding.

Notes

2. Alex Awad, Palestinian Memories: The Story of a Palestinian Mother and Her People (Jerusalem: Bethlehem Bible College, 2008), 96.
5. Although usually assumed to be a Zionist slogan, the phrase was in fact coined by a Christian Restorationist clergyman in 1843 and continued to be used for almost a century. Because they did not consider the Arab inhabitants of Palestine a coherent national group, “a people”, Christian Restorationists argued that the “land of Israel” should be given to the Jewish people. Today a young person with a Jewish parent can have a free trip to Israel and have a great experience as did our granddaughter.

6. Published in Marine Corps Gazette, June 1964. Quoted by Alex Awad, Palestinian Memories, 115.
7. Ibid, 144.
8. Lancaster County Pennsylvania is 6.75 times larger than the Gaza strip.
10. Cited at http://piag.quaker.org/InfoMapsLatest.jpg [accessed February 8, 2013]. This source provides a current map of the “Swiss cheese” pattern of Palestinian fragments and the “illegal Israeli settlements” interspersed throughout the West Bank area that had been a solid region until 1967.
12. Alex Awad, Through the Eyes of the Victims: The Story of the Arab-Israeli Conflict (Jerusalem: Bethlehem Bible College, 2001), 196. The headings and many ideas are from Awad. The author has added some details.
13. The terms “Arab” and “Palestinian” may be used interchangeably.
14. Buying a home in a settlement is inexpensive, and living there is comfortable. Ardie, a settler from Chicago, compared his life in the settlement to living in a gated community. The settlements have many unsold homes; one settlement has 47% unsold; another 97% unsold. Often they leave lights on to make a home look occupied.
15. Jean Zaru, Occupied with Nonviolence, A Palestinian Woman Speaks (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2008), 10.
18. For information on CPT teams see http://www.cpt.org/ [accessed
propelled grenades (RPGs). Though usually smuggled across the Egyptian border into the Gaza Strip and to a lesser extent Jordanian border into the West Bank, various small arms are believed to be produced in the Palestinian territories. On August 14, 2008, the Popular Resistance Committee showed off the Nasser-4 missile, an upgraded version of the existing Nasser-3. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Palestinian_domestic_weapons_production][accessed February 9, 2013].

24. U.S. has never provided Palestinians with military aid (although we have provided Palestinians with aid for policing their own people as well as with humanitarian and development assistance). See graph at [http://www.ifamericansknew.org/][accessed February 9, 2013].
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The People of the Park: The Human Cost of Creating the Shenandoah National Park

The innocence of the dispossessed still casts a shadow on one of nature’s marvels.
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The establishment of Yellowstone as the first U.S. national park in 1872 inaugurated a uniquely American concept—that of a nation preserving land for public use and enjoyment. As other national parks followed, the National Park Service was formed in 1916 to administer and manage the parks, now fifty-eight in number. Unlike the western national parks, which were basically government-owned wilderness, the Shenandoah National Park land was home to nearly 500 Virginia families, many of whom had lived there for generations. As we enjoy the “re-creational” and “recreational” benefits of the park, as President Franklin Roosevelt said at the dedication on July 3, 1936, and as we reap the economic benefits, we need to remember the human cost of the project. This paper is intended as a memorial to the contributions and sacrifices of the people of the park—certainly its boosters and backers, but also the 2,500 mountain people who had made their homes in the park land.

Beauty of the Shenandoah Park

Many visitors have enjoyed the magnificent overlooks, misty blue mountains, sparkling waterfalls, 100 species of trees, 200 species of birds, 1100 flowering plants, myriad mammals, amphibians, reptiles, fish, and insects, and guest lodging and dining facilities of this national treasure. The scenic Skyline Drive crowns the ridge of the park’s mountains, and a portion of the Appalachian Trail runs nearly the entire seventy-mile length of the park. Initially the Shenandoah National Park was promoted by a number of enthusiasts, including Presidents Calvin Coolidge, Herbert Hoover (who built his own fishing retreat in the park), and Franklin Roosevelt; by Governor and later Senator Harry Byrd; by William Carson and Ferdinand Zerkel, businessmen who were valley residents; and by George Freeman Pollock, the flamboyant owner of the Skyland resort in the park land. An important consideration of the Skyline Drive and the park was their proximity to muggy, buggy Washington, DC, then ninety miles away, now closer thanks to modern roads.

In 1926, President Coolidge authorized 521,000 acres for the park, and the Virginia Assembly approved a State Commission to begin a tract by tract survey of the proposed property and a census of the landowners, asking numbers, name, and age of property dwellers, their level of education, and their livelihoods. It should be emphasized that absolutely no one had any idea how many people lived in the park land, much less what they owned.

Costs and Complications

As costs and complications mounted, the acreage was slashed from 521,000 to a minimal 180,000 acres. With later acquisitions, the park, now in its eighty-first year, contains about 200,000 acres. The original plan was for the state of Virginia to condemn the land, hope that some property would be donated, and buy the rest at Depression prices ranging from $1 to $50 per acre. The acreage was reduced to get rid of higher priced agricultural and forest land, creating a long skinny park with a sawtooth border. Fortunately, some of the cheapest land included the best scenery. The situation at the time was a perfect economic storm. The chestnut blight in the 1920s killed the trees responsible for the livelihood of many parkland residents. Then came the stock market crash, bank failures, and the Great Depression, which hurt tourism as well as business. Finally a terrible drought in 1930 devastated area farms. The Virginia Public Park Condemnation Act, passed in 1928, was halted for two years by a lawsuit contesting its constitutionality. The only progress came from drought relief funds, which began construction of the Skyline Drive in 1931. Running 105 miles along the crest of the...
mountains, at first it was a parkway without a park. The Skyline Drive was built by professional contractors with heavy equipment, but onerous hand labor was provided by local residents and boys in Roosevelt’s Civilian Conservation Corps, set up shortly after his inauguration in March 1933, who cleared brush, smoothed slopes, grew and planted trees and shrubs, and built walls, guardrails, drainage ditches, and buildings.

When the Skyline Drive was first proposed, residents were receptive because the park area had few public roads, only the present U.S. Routes 211 and 33 and the Gordonsville Pike at Fishers Gap; the hills and hollows were accessible only by horseback or foot. Locals welcomed the jobs afforded by the “Scenic,” until they realized that access to the new road would be limited and that some farms were cut up by its right of way. Anxious residents of the park land were assured by Governor Byrd, Skyland resort owner George Pollock, Hoover’s Interior Secretary Roy Lyman Wilbur, and others that they would not be forced to move unless they were directly in the path of development. A number of residents, mainly the better educated and more prosperous, voluntarily sold their land to the state of Virginia.

**Removal of the Valley’s Diverse Population by “Blanket Condemnation”**

Although later press releases portray the mountain people as being uniformly the same Appalachian type, park historian Darwin Lambert disagrees: “The 1300-plus families caught in the ‘blanket condemnation’ [in 1929] represented just about the whole gamut of Virginia life.”

Most of the park residents were of English descent, some German, Scottish, Scotch-Irish, Welsh, French Huguenot, and a smattering of others. A few residents had owned slaves, and there were several African-American communities near the park land, but no African-Americans were involved in the removal. Virginia historian John Wayland says of the region, “There is no other part of Virginia, possibly no section of any other state, in which can be found so great a variety of races and religions as in the Shenandoah Valley.”

Most mountain people were dependent for their living on the marvelous chestnut tree, which provided building materials, firewood for heat, cooking, and laundry, bark to face buildings and tan leather, and nuts to eat or sell. Most families had cash incomes of less than $150 per year, raising everything they needed except salt, coffee, sugar, flour, and tobacco.

A very few of the park land residents were college educated. Lawyer John Alexander, known as “Alexander the Great,” owned the largest tract in the condemned land, some 24,000 acres. At the time of the condemnation, he was residing in the state penitentiary because of his penchant for felonious forgeries. Lewis Willis, educated at the University of Virginia (whose wife Ida was a graduate of Smith College) organized a Landowners’ Protective Association in 1929 and waged an unsuccessful fight against the government for his entire life, writing letters to the President and the Interior Secretary protesting the condemnation. “We are unwilling,” he wrote Hoover, “to part with our homes to help a small portion of our population to get their hands into tourists’ pockets.”

Robert Via, another wealthy farmer and businessman, took a suit against the condemnation legislation to the U.S. Supreme Court, charging that park boosters had falsely claimed that the land was pristine wilderness (actually it had been inhabited for centuries) and asserting that Virginia could not condemn land just to give it away. The Supreme Court dismissed his appeal and sent him back to the state courts, where he anticipated a losing battle. Indeed, the issue of grounds for condemnation of land by eminent domain and what constitutes “public good” is still controversial.

**The People of the Park**

So who were the 5,000 people living on the park land when the Shenandoah National Park was formed? In early documents, park residents were characterized as lawless and dangerous, if mentioned at all. In the challenges of acquiring land and creating a park, the people who lived there were not a concern. No one knew how many there were or what they were like until authorities began successive surveys in 1926. Actually any head count is suspect as the mountain people moved their few possessions easily from one dwelling to another and in and out of the park land. Regarding the numerous surveys, one mountain resident expressed her frustration: “I’ve just answered so many questions for so many people. Don’t you people that write down never show each other what they have wrote down?”

In 1931 Miriam Sizer began a survey of the residents’ literacy, health, and lifestyles. A University of Virginia graduate student who spent two years living among the mountain people and teaching their children at a school provided by Skyland proprietor George Pollock, Sizer was not trained as a sociologist. Her survey of 132 park families concluded that 38% were illiterate and only 13% exceeded the fifth grade level of literacy. With few roads, fewer schools, and a subsistence farming livelihood, education was understandably not a priority for the mountain people, who did take advantage of such schools as existed. Some residents homeschooled their children, and others moved to the lowlands where schools were available. Concerning the health of the mountain people, the 1932 census rated 80% as being in good health, except for dental problems, the rest fair or poor. After all, their lifestyle afforded fresh air, clean water, ample exercise, and an adequate diet, although they were fond of tobacco—even the children. With the exception of a few physicians visiting the Skyland resort, there were no doctors in the park. In emergencies of childbirth or serious illness or injury, doctors were summoned from the lowlands, traveling on horseback. People relied on mountain women experienced as midwives, as well as on considerable use of folk remedies and patent medicines.

A local 1931 census to facilitate resettling the park residents found 465 families living in the parkland, a number having already left. Less than half owned
the land where they resided, the larger tracts belonging to people who lived elsewhere but had farms, orchards, and grazing lands within the park boundary. Many residents were tenants who used buildings and land in return for looking after the absentee owners' property and stock. Share-cropping was not usual, but time-honored custom allowed squatters of many years who had improved property to file for ownership, leading to confusion later when the state or park service attempted to buy their land.

The range of prosperity is evidenced by the dwellings of the park people. The typical home was 3.9 rooms for a family of 5.1 people, but some had as many as nine rooms on two or three floors. Like most rural American homes at the time, they lacked electricity, plumbing, and indoor bathrooms. The typical resident cultivated less than five acres of rocky mountain land, perhaps with the help of a horse or mule. A characteristic home would be made of logs with a small garden plot protected by a picket fence, perhaps an orchard, chickens, a hog or two, and a cow. Many homes were attractively landscaped with flowering plants. Historian and archivist Katrina Powell states that from 1928-1935, “park promoters began a campaign to assuage local opposition [to the park] by representing mountain residents as in need of the services to be provided them once they were removed from the park”? The Farm Security Administration hired a New York photographer to document the effects of the Great Depression and show the deplorable condition of the mountain folk. C. Arthur Rothstein’s photographs of the people and their homes were at once accurate and sympathetic, similar to the Appalachian photographs of Dorothea Lange and Walker Evans.

Negative Stereotypes in Hollow Folk

In 1933, University of Chicago-trained psychologist Mandel Sherman and Thomas Henry, a Washington D.C. journalist, published Hollow Folk, a book based on a two-year study begun in 1929 by a staff of psychologists, a nutritionist, a psychiatrist, and sociologists. Aided by Miriam Sizer’s fieldwork, Hollow Folk studied four hollows (mountain communities) and a town in the vicinity of Old Rag Mountain. Using fictional names, the study concentrated on the poorest of the five, called Corbin Hollow (actually Colvin Hollow), which it described as “almost completely cut off from the current of American life” and “not of the twentieth century.” Despite her apparent concern for the mountain residents, Sizer was condescending, patronizing, and ultimately came to be resented and rejected by them. Nevertheless, her recommendations were the basis for action taken by authorities to resettle the mountain families.

Hollow Folk was widely read and devoured by the media. Newspapers in Washington and Baltimore described the mountain people as “a community of perennial and penniless squalor...[where] sisters and brothers have intermarried.” Skyland owner George Pollock, who stood to profit by the establishment of the park, emphasized the inadequacy and neediness of the people, portraying himself as their employer and savior. Actually the residents provided essential services to Skyland as laborers, maids, waiters, and cooks as well as local color which he exploited for his city guests. Pollock assured the park folk that it was to their advantage to move elsewhere and that Uncle Sam would provide for them well. Historian Darwin Lambert, who lived with a park family for several years while working as a botanist in the park, warns of inaccurate and persisting Appalachian stereotypes portraying the mountain folk as uniformly isolated, poor, illiterate, uncivilized, dirty, and barefoot, sometimes hostile and dangerous, but entertaining if not riled. We know them as the Yokums of Al Capp’s “L’il Abner” and the characters of The Beverley Hillbillies, Green Acres, and Hee Haw. Authorities consistently portrayed the mountain people as helpless, deprived, and in desperate need of rescue. Residents were shrewd enough to take clothing, food, money, and tobacco from Skyland guests and to sell them wildflowers, berries, nuts, and handmade split oak baskets, but no one was actually listening to them despite the repetitious surveys. Artifacts uncovered by archaeologist Audrey Horning show that mountain families were not as isolated and deprived as depicted, possessing watches, Haviland porcelain, phonograph records, contemporary toys, and other items available from mail order catalogs. The most egregious instance of paternalism was the case of a sickly and underweight 20-month-old boy, who was taken from his Corbin Hollow parents, Sam and Annie Corbin, in 1931 by authorities promising to nurse him back to health and return him. Instead, he was given out for adoption to a childless couple elsewhere in Virginia.

In 1934 when the park passed to federal ownership with 465 families in residence, 295 were classified by the Resettlement Agency as prospects for one of seven “homestead” communities near the park. The Virginia Department of Welfare would resettle an additional 104 families in bad health or financial need for minimal rent with an option to buy. Ultimately 40 names were placed on a lifetime list (administered by Interior Secretary Harold Ickes) of individuals selected on the basis of age, infirmity, and worthiness, who were allowed to remain in their homes rent-free for life. By 1937, 172 families had moved into homesteads, which cost them $5 for 1938, after which house and land could be purchased at appraised value with a 40-year mortgage. Due to bureaucratic delays, some homesteads were not ready when promised. Because they had little cash and were unused to mortgages, some families lost their homes a second time. Families who remained in the park after 1934 were those who did not own land or lacked the means to move. Between 1929 when the condemnation act became law and 1938 when the last park family moved to a
homestead, residents struggled to live, no longer allowed to hunt, plant and cultivate crops, cut live wood, or make whiskey or apple brandy. The last post office, gas station, and store had been closed, sealing their isolation.

Polite Resident Requests

In letters they wrote to authorities, the people of the park deferentially asked the government that had taken their homes for various permissions, clarification of rules, and materials such as buildings, firewood, apples, fencing, roofing, and windows. Three hundred of these letters written 1934-1938 are stored in the NPS archives in Luray, half of which have been published in Answer at Once, edited by Katrina Powell. Some typed but most neatly written in pencil on ruled school tablets with phonetic spelling and non-standard syntax, the letters speak eloquently of the needs and feelings of dispossessed residents, expressing understandable confusion about who was in charge and what the rules were as authority changed from the state to the NPS. Interior Secretary Ickes and NPS Director James Lassiter answered their letters, but they regarded the residents as impediments to their job of establishing and managing a national park. For several reasons, the mountain people showed remarkably little resistance. They did not understand that they must leave until they received a letter in 1934 from then NPS Director Arno Cammerer. All official notices had been posted or mailed to land owners, not to residents, and the authorities themselves were confused, one granting a permission, another denying it. Park residents did not know their options and were not politically organized.

Katrina Powell’s collection of letters documents the feelings of residents in their own words: John T. Nicholson, a minister known for crafting split oak baskets, wrote: “My dear friend Mr. Lassiter…if there is anything that you can do or say that will help to prolong our stay here, please do so… You will be blessed by the Lord.” Lula Haney addressed her letter directly to President Roosevelt, saying her son had signed up for a homestead, but the family’s home was scheduled for demolition before the application could be processed. “I always loved my ‘mountain home,’” she wrote, “and never wanted to sell it, but as you know how it all happened, guess it is gone now… I know there is some other ‘authority’ perhaps I should have asked, but I did not know to whom to go, so in humble simplicity I come to you for directions and information. May I hear from you at an early date. May God bless and keep you as one who leads our ‘nation.’ Fraternally yours, Lula A. Haney.”

Richard Nicholson wrote to Senator Harry Byrd in 1945, “A number of mountain people have asked me to write and ask you if it would do any good or be a chance whatever of the people getting their land back… on the grounds that the mountain people was badly misled when they sold their land for a park believing they could stay there and not be forced to move. Almost every man or woman who moved from the park would sign such a petition. There is those who live in various homestead locations and 9 out of 10 would rather go back to their old home in the mountains. Because they were born and reared in the mountains and they will never be satisfied otherwise.”

Apparently descendants of the dispossessed park residents are still resentful about the displacement and the negative way their families have been portrayed. In 1992, a group they formed called Children of Shenandoah managed to produce a revised exhibit and a new film, The Gift, at the Harry F. Byrd Visitor’s Center, both of which emphasize the contributions and sacrifices of the park people. Another group with the same aims is the Blue Ridge Committee for Shenandoah National Park Relations. Both petition for better access and maintenance of family graveyards in the park, access to the archives (presently closed to the public for lack of a full-time archivist and necessary security), and greater recognition of the contributions of their families’ history and culture.

As we proudly enjoy the facilities and economic benefits of our magnificent wilderness, we need to remember the mountain people whose homes were sacrificed to create the Shenandoah National Park.

Notes

3. Quoted in Lambert, 23.
5. Ibid., 34.
8. Ibid.
13. Ibid., 159.
Broken Symmetries in Nature, Art, and Science

A “beautiful theory” may not necessarily be useful.
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Introduction

We find symmetries everywhere in nature, art, science, and in daily life.1 Like Platonic ideas, they are part of our thought process, helping us to establish order in our world and guiding us in understanding and controlling it. Closely related to symmetry is the experience of beauty and truth. The more we think we understand a law of nature, the more beautiful we find it, even to the extent of calling it a “basic” or “divine” truth. As much as we perceive beauty and truth in symmetry, our understanding is constantly challenged by breaks in symmetry. As the physicist Lee Smolin says in The Trouble with Physics:

physicists may have to tone down their expectations about finding that elusive “Theory of Everything.”

“Many modern theorists believe instinctively that the fundamental theory must be the most symmetric possible law. Should we trust this instinct or should we listen to the lesson of history, which tells us that nature becomes less rather than more symmetric the closer we look?” Experience has taught us that the demands of progress and evolution even require symmetries to be broken by natural causes, or by our own actions, or just spontaneously. Perfect symmetries frequently strike us as boring, because they often result in stalemates.

Therefore, our attitude toward symmetry is best described as “ambivalent.” We cherish it as an expression of beauty and truth, but we also destroy it, because it impedes further development and progress. This presentation will elaborate on our love-hate relationship with symmetry and on our changing concept of beauty and truth. Let’s first look at some simple examples in nature.3

Broken Symmetries in Nature

A wasp nest has several geometric symmetries: six-fold rotational, bilateral, and translational. It also has non-geometric symmetries like invariance against a permutation of cells. Of course, that’s true only for the ideal hexagonal lattice; the cells in a real wasp nest are all slightly different and thus distinguishable from one another. It shows, once again, that we normally don’t talk about the object we see but about the Platonic idea we derive from it.

Depending mainly on the ocean currents and the wind for moving around, many jellyfish have circular symmetry, since they have no need to distinguish between forward and backward or between left and right. They can’t have spherical symmetry, since sunlight is coming from above, and gravity is acting from below. Slightly higher developed animals like sea stars cannot afford to be circularly symmetric anymore, because they must use legs (or arms) to crawl around on a solid surface. Sand dollars are an interesting transition between the two. They can burrow or slowly creep through sandy or muddy sediments by means of spines on their undersides, but the design of a five-fold star on their backs looks like an indication that they “want” to get rid of their circular symmetry and also develop five legs as a more efficient way of locomotion.

Animals ranking at the top of the development hierarchy, including man, have only retained their bilateral or mirror symmetry. This particular remnant from our long chain of evolution usually comes to mind when the word “symmetry” is mentioned, but its scientific meaning is much more general as we will discuss later.
Renaissance artists like Leonardo da Vinci (“Vitruvian Man,” 1487) and Cesare Cesariano (“Homo Ad Circulum,” 1521) nevertheless attempted to ascribe circular symmetry to humans in order to set them apart from other mammals, even though this view has no biological significance.

**Broken Symmetries in Art**

Early representations of human figures show perfect bilateral symmetry like the Egyptian Queen Hatshepsut (1450 BC). She seems to sit on her throne for all eternity as the embodiment of stability and regularity. Later statues break this symmetry to varying degrees. Numerous Kouroi (young men, probably representing the god Apollo) from the Greek archaic period (sixth century BC) do not appear as immobile as the Egyptian Queen. They all put their left foot forward as if they want to advance, thereby breaking an otherwise perfect bilateral symmetry.

A hundred years later, Polykleitos created the classical Greek style of human statues: naked athletes that break their bilateral symmetry more strongly by their dynamic postures (e.g., Spear Bearer, Olympic Champion). Medieval religious art also broke bilateral symmetry by clearly distinguishing between “right” and “left” as “good” and “evil,” respectively. Typical examples can be seen on the tympana of Notre Dame in Paris and the gothic Cathedral in Freiburg, Germany, illustrating the “Last Judgment.” The “good folks” are assembled at God’s right and go to heaven, whereas the “bad guys” at God’s left go to hell—plain and simple and perfectly understandable even for illiterate people. Some western languages still use the words “right” and “left” not only to indicate a direction but also to distinguish “good” or “correct” from “evil” or “sinister” (from the Latin word sinistra = left).

**Broken Symmetries in Daily Life**

Hats and hair styles are frequently used to break an undesired bilateral symmetry. For a long time, people were wearing their hats or caps slightly tilted, but nowadays some boys turn their baseball caps all the way to the side to express their strong aversion against looking too symmetric and straight. Most people prefer to have their hair parted on one side of the head rather than in the middle, and ladies sometimes break their bilateral facial symmetry by a “beauty mark” on one cheek to add mystique to their appearance. Notice that, in this case, a deviation from symmetry is considered “beautiful.” Idential marks on either cheek would no longer qualify as “beauty” marks. Similarly, the Princess of Eboli, an interesting historical character at the court of Philip II of Spain, wore a sexy eye patch like a piece of jewelry. She had lost her right eye in a fencing practice, but she turned it to her advantage, because it helped her attract attention and gain political influence. Schiller’s drama “Don Carlos” and Verdi’s opera “Don Carlo” made her immortal.

Modern life would be unthinkable without semiconductors. Many of these devices owe their existence to the “doping” of an electrical insulator with a chosen impurity, thus breaking the perfect symmetry of their crystal lattices.

Functionality in architecture also requires symmetries to be broken. One of the most basic dwellings is an igloo, whose circular symmetry offers a minimum surface area for a given volume, important in a harsh climate. However, the occupants must be able to get in and out, so the symmetry must be broken to accommodate an entrance way. Buildings in the traditional Georgian architecture and the “Maisons Québécoises” in French Canada are bilaterally symmetric, but the modern requirement of an attached garage inevitably also breaks this symmetry. A famous symbol for the stalemate caused by perfect bilateral symmetry is Buridan’s Ass, the donkey who stands exactly midway between two bales of hay but starves to death because it can’t decide on which side to start feeding. Cut spending or raise taxes is one familiar example of such a stalemate. Perfect symmetry is usually associated with law and order, security, formality, equilibrium, harmony, and thinking, whereas asymmetry stands for liberty and freedom, adventure, casualness, change, dissonance, and feeling. Most people’s comfort zone lies somewhere in between: We want law and order, and we value rational thinking, but we also like liberty and freedom, and we cherish our feelings. Symmetry and asymmetry appear to be juxtaposed in the sense of Friedrich Nietzsche’s Apollonian-Dionysian dichotomy.

**Broken Symmetries in Science**

Symmetry has found its most general form of expression in the mathematical discipline of group theory, which is part of higher algebra. It can be simply defined as any operation that leaves an object unchanged or, as scientists call it, “invariant.” The object may be a geometrical figure, but it can also be a law of nature, a force, or even space-time itself. Physics offers two celebrated examples of symmetry-breaking, one that was settled fifty-five years ago, and one that is still the subject of ongoing research and debate. It was taken for granted until 1956 that natural laws do not distinguish between left and right. A movie or a television show, viewed through a mirror, would not appear unusual, except for cultural artifacts like letters and numbers. Lee’s and Yang’s discovery in 1956 that “parity,” a representation of bilateral or mirror symmetry, is not conserved by the weak nuclear force controlling radioactive decay has changed that...
view. No other force in nature is known to break bilateral symmetry.

The following year, C.S. Wu at Columbia University conducted a classic experiment in order to demonstrate the non-conservation of parity by the weak nuclear force. The experimental setup was bilaterally symmetric with respect to a plane perpendicular to a magnetic coil containing axially aligned radioactive Cobalt nuclei. The breaking of bilateral symmetry was effectively demonstrated by different intensities of electron emission from both ends of the coil. This solved the “Ozma” problem of communicating our understanding of “left” and “right” to a hypothetical alien civilization using a fundamental law of nature. The right-handed double helix of the human DNA molecule or the asymmetric position of internal organs like the heart cannot be used for this purpose, because they are only incidental results of evolution on earth. They are not necessitated by natural laws and may not occur elsewhere in the universe. The same applies to optically active materials like glucose or fructose that rotate the plane of linearly polarized light to the right or left, respectively.

Unifying all forces of nature into a “Theory of Everything” (TOE) is an unfulfilled and probably impossible dream of physics. “To unify” in this case means to uncover a symmetry that was supposedly lost in the course of cosmic evolution. As the universe expanded and cooled, different forces allegedly “froze out”—more and more symmetries were broken. The complete reverse process from the present all the way back to the big bang cannot be simulated in the laboratory because of ever-increasing requirements for size and energy. During the late 1960s, Steven Weinberg and Abdus Salam developed a theory for the unification of the electromagnetic and weak nuclear forces that was verified in 1983/1984 at the European Nuclear Research Center (CERN) near Geneva. It required a proton collision energy of a few hundred giga (= billion \(10^9\)) electron volts (GeV) to create the predicted force carriers (W and Z bosons). From 1998 to 2008, the Large Hadron Collider (LHC), with a circumference of seventeen miles, was built at CERN and is now the largest particle accelerator in the world. Its maximum proton collision energy will reach 14 tera (= trillion \(10^{12}\)) electron volts (TeV) in 2014. According to the standard model of cosmology, this corresponds to an average cosmic temperature of \(10^{17}\) degrees Kelvin at 10^{-14} seconds after the big bang, as compared to the present 2.725 degrees Kelvin of the cosmic microwave background radiation. However, verifying any Grand Unification Theory (GUT) for the strong and electroweak nuclear forces would require the gigantic energy of a trillion TeV, well beyond the reach of any conceivable particle accelerator.

A “Theory of Everything” that also includes gravity would be even less amenable to terrestrial experimentation. Does it make sense and is it worth the cost to build more powerful particle accelerators? The U.S. Congress answered that question in 1993, when it stopped funding the construction of the Superconducting Supercollider (SSC) near Dallas, Texas, which was designed for a maximum proton collision energy of 40 TeV. Likewise, the Tevatron at Fermilab near Chicago, the largest existing American particle accelerator with a maximum of 2 TeV, was shut down permanently on September 30, 2011. Particles with significantly higher energies are found only at very low intensities in cosmic rays and in the very early universe itself, both of which have become the laboratories of last resort for high-energy physics.

**Symmetry versus Beauty and Truth**

With experimental verification hard to come by, cosmologists and elementary particle physicists resort more and more to such formal criteria for “truth” as “simplicity” and “mathematical beauty.” Maxwell’s theory of electromagnetism and Einstein’s theory of gravitation, both elegant and successful, have undoubtedly reinforced that belief. The British mathematician Ian Stewart wrote a history of symmetry entitled Why Beauty is Truth, yet he already conceded in the preface that “none of us can say why beauty is truth and truth beauty.” Why then did he write a book with this title? Steven Weinberg makes a similar statement: “I will not try to define beauty, any more than I would try to define love or fear. You do not define these things; you know them when you feel them.” By contrast, the German mathematician Hermann Weyl in his famous Princeton lectures discussed beauty as being “bound up” with symmetry, but he stopped short of identifying it with “truth.” Galileo’s assertion in The Assayer (1623) that nature’s grand book is written in mathematical language does not mean that the beauty of this language is a reflection of beauty in the physical world.

Maybe our concept of beauty simply results from the happy experience of understanding a natural phenomenon. The history of science is full of such “Eureka” events. Once we think we understand a law, we are inclined to call it “beautiful,” but as our understanding of the world changes, so do our criteria for beauty. Before discovering the three laws of planetary motion, Johannes Kepler described in his Mysterium Cosmographicum (1600) a model of the solar system based on a nested arrangement of the...
five regular Platonic solids. He thought he had deciphered “God’s geometrical plan of the universe,” but nowadays we look at it as nothing more than numerology or playing with numbers without relevance to the physical world. Other once “beautiful” theories have also fallen by the wayside after they served their purpose and were replaced by more realistic models. Today, Aristotle’s geocentric cosmology with its geometry of concentric spheres is just a historic curiosity, and Rutherford’s planetary atomic model with its elliptical electronic orbits has survived only as an atomic energy logo. Reality turned out to be not nearly as pretty and simple as the models suggested. There is no reason to believe that our present sense of beauty will fare any better. Considering modern theories of high-energy physics with their ever-increasing particle zoo and unexplained masses, it must be suspected that the physical truth is even messier (or uglier) than contemporary thinking suggests.15

Notes
1. From the Greek word *symmetria*, proportion, harmony.
3. Many more examples in nature, art, and science are discussed in Hermann Weyl’s illustrated Princeton lectures *Symmetry*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1952). The science part is no longer up to date, because the breaking of mirror symmetry in radioactive decay was only discovered later. See notes 8 and 9.
5. Modern reproductions based on Roman marble copies.
6. The British maintain that driving on the right side is driving on the “wrong” side, and driving on the left side is driving on the “right” side.
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Introduction

When the Pilgrims arrived, our American landscape was one vast natural area, to be conquered by axes and plows to stave off starvation. With the conquest of land deep in the American psyche, we have heard exhortations of “go west young man,” seen land rushes, gold rushes, and homesteading. Today, this contest is done with bulldozers and pavement at an ever-increasing pace. For example, from 1982 to 1997, the U.S. population grew by 17 percent while urbanized land grew by 47 percent. Between 1992 and 1997, the U.S. paved over more than 6 million acres of farmland, an area roughly the size of Maryland. Although America seems crowded now, the Pew Research Center predicts the population will rise from its present 300 million to 438 million in 2050, assuming current trends continue. This projected population growth will spur new subdivisions, commercial development, and further loss of rural farmlands, western ranches, and eastern forests.

Despite this anticipated growth and resulting development, urban sprawl is still not going to take over the entire continent. Developed land is only 6.2 percent of the total land area of the United States, though much of the undeveloped land is far from where people live and not desirable for habitation. People live in cities located on or near the best land, leading to the sense of crowding from development. In reaction to the sprawling growth, an ever-growing community of individuals and organizations committed to land preservation has arisen. As this paper tells the story of urban growth in the United States, it highlights the work and tools of America’s preservationists.

History of Land Consumption

Our current American landscape evolved as a result of improvements in farm productivity, the invention of the automobile, and related political decisions about transportation infrastructure. In the 1800s, thinkers like the English economist Thomas Malthus hypothesized that famine and disease would limit populations. Until about 1830, they were largely correct, when the U.S. population was only about 10 million. In the 1850s, the mechanical reaper became common, increasing farm productivity just as the railroads enabled widespread distribution to distant markets. With its new food supply, the American population shook off the Malthusian constraints of a limited food supply and increased rapidly, quadrupling from 1830 to 1870, and then tripling from 40 million in 1870 to over 120 million by 1930. As the population shifted from rural to urban, the new cities were densely populated places limited in geographic size only by their reliance on horses for transportation. With Henry Ford’s Model T, affordable for “the great multitude,” individual transportation helped to expand cities into lower-density suburbs in the large land areas outside the cities. In the 1920s, the federal and state governments spent staggering amounts on new roads, motorizing police forces, installing stoplights, and laying sewer lines to new low population density suburbs before the new homes were sold. Chicago alone spent $340 million (approximately $4.5 billion in 2012 dollars) between 1910 and 1940 on roads. In 1925, federal road spending topped $1 billion ($13.5 billion in 2012 dollars). It was the beginning of a process that changed American life and the American landscape.

Although urban and inter-urban streetcars transported people to the suburbs where the lines’ owners were engaged in real estate development, that development was limited to land adjacent to the car tracks. Policy makers, favoring the auto, provided little support to streetcars, while the auto companies conspired to eliminate them. For example, General Motors waged a systematic campaign to put streetcar lines out of business and replace them with buses, which it conveniently supplied. A bus could go anywhere there was road. The blanks in suburbia began to fill in as streetcars were edged out. In the 1930s, the government also turned its back on rail, a financial loser despite its social good. The loss of the rail lines insured that highways would be the primary mode of American transportation. Even during the Great Depression, highway building continued while all other sectors of the economy, including housing, were grinding to a halt. Between 1933 and 1940, the federal government spent $4 billion ($73.5 billion in 2012 dollars) on roads and streets as a way to put people to work.

In the immediate post-WWII era, policy makers were looking to reward returning GIs and appease rural southern farmers who migrated to cities after being replaced by mechanical pickers and tractors. Because of America’s huge productivity advantage over other nations
at the end of the war, the country could easily afford their demands for new and better housing, and Congress passed two key pieces of housing legislation, the FHA and VA backed mortgage. William Levitt, widely considered the father of modern suburbia, seized the opportunity by creating Levittown, New York, one of the first suburban developments of thousands of mass-produced nearly identical houses. Developers followed the Levittown template in cities across the United States. The auto-centric American culture of Mom, Dad, and family in their suburban home was well established.

The Interstate Highway program, approved by Congress in 1956, brought a new boom to the American economy while devouring land at an unprecedented scope. Once-long commutes became short, stimulating further suburbanization. Although recession factors and the high gasoline prices of the “oil shock” of 1974 slowed the suburbanization process nearly to a halt, the situation eased during President Reagan’s first term when the oil cartel fell apart, mortgage interest rates declined, government debt accumulated, and the building process began anew. Suburbanization and land development accelerated until the recession in 2008-2009 applied its economic brakes.

Other seemingly unrelated government policies have encouraged suburban development. For example, with 9 percent of electricity lost in transmission lines, service costs more per customer in less densely populated areas. Yet all residential customers pay the same price per unit of power regardless of the true cost. In effect, residents in high-density areas subsidize low-density suburban development. Similar arguments are made for water and natural gas distribution, sewers, and roads. The end result of these policies has been to encourage suburban development regardless of its true cost.

American Interest in Land Preservation

During this period of urbanization and suburbanization of America, the notion of land preservation began to blossom, signaled by the creation of parks. By the 1920s, America couldn’t get enough of parks like those created by Theodore Roosevelt a decade before. Tales of awe-inspiring national parks like the Great Smokies, Everglades, Yellowstone, and Yosemite captivated the public, and some states became involved in setting aside wild land. For instance, Adirondack Park, a 6-million-acre patchwork of state and private land holdings in upstate New York, was developed as the single largest park in America outside of Alaska. The urban park movement, established in the 1860s with New York’s Central Park, demonstrated an incredible concept: the taxes generated from increased values of surrounding land were greater than the cost of the park itself. Central Park generated $5.4 million ($139.6 million in 2012 dollars) annually from increased real estate taxes. The park itself cost $14 million ($362 million in 2012 dollars). Payback occurred in three years. Today, New York City has 38,185 acres of parkland equaling 19.6% of the city land area in parkland. City after city followed the lead of New York in establishing urban parks. By the 1950s, however, the enthusiasm for parks began to wane. People had large yards that seemed like little green parks. Why pay a mortgage and taxes and then pay additional taxes to fund parks when you already had one in your backyard?

Early Voices Influencing the Land Preservation Movement

In 1854, Henry David Thoreau wrote eloquently of his immersion in nature at Walden Pond, where he isolated himself from society to gain a more objective view of it through simple living and self-sufficiency. A half-century later, Theodore Roosevelt championed the national park system, advocating conservation so long as it provided utility for the public. Benton MacKay, a forester who created the Appalachian Trail and co-founded the Wilderness Society, wrote two books criticizing urban sprawl and promoting land preservation for recreation and the now well-accepted concept of a watershed. In 1949, Aldo Leopold, a professor at the University of Wisconsin, outlined his efforts to restore eighty acres of Wisconsin barren land in his Sand County Almanac, which sold over a million copies and had a profound impact on the environmental and conservation movement. Rachael Carson became a leading voice for the environment with her 1962 book Silent Spring, which spurred a nationwide ban on such pesticides as DDT. Such awareness of environmental issues has influenced the American land preservation movement.

Research on the Human Benefits of Land Preservation

Today, the concept of land preservation has extended beyond parkland to preserving productive farmland and natural areas even though held in private hands and not accessible to the public. A new wave of research findings demonstrates the importance of open space to human beings:

- People with low incomes who are exposed to natural environments are healthier.4
- Senior citizens in Tokyo who lived close to walkable green streets lived longer by five years than those who did not.5
- Students at Michigan high schools with views of trees and greenery out their windows scored better on standardized tests, graduating and attending college at higher rates than students without such views.6
- Post-surgical patients in Pennsylvania in rooms with views of green recovered faster and needed less pain medication than those with windows looking at a brick wall.7

These studies make intuitive sense. People aspire to a cottage on the water or a cabin in the woods. The open space creates a pleasurable “get away” and a sense of well-being. This wave of research findings and demands from the general public have elevated the importance of the issue of protecting and conserving land among today’s public policy makers and private individuals.

Public and Societal Benefits of Land Preservation

Keeping land in an undeveloped state has many benefits, such as the economic gains of fewer public services and greater revenue from tourism—a $90 billion
industry where 50,000 birders visited Port Clinton in a single week. By protecting water quality, land conservation in Ohio not only produced clean water for 11 million people, but also made western Lake Erie one of the most productive fisheries in the world, drawing hundreds of thousands of sport fishermen to the area annually. Isolating wild land conserves wildlife habitat and protects against invasive species, acting as a buffer to developed areas. Agriculture benefits from the preservation of land for farms and ranches, promoting national security by protecting America’s food production. Other benefits include the pleasant character of rural communities and the use of carbon sinks to deter climate change.

**Current Land Preservation Efforts**

Our government is the largest single conservation landholder. The U.S. Forest Service administers 193 million acres of forests and grasslands, an area equivalent to the size of Texas. The National Park system encompasses 84.4 million acres in 58 national parks. In addition to such well-known programs, the federal government also administers the Land and Water Conservation Fund, which enables federal agencies to acquire key properties from willing landowners to protect our national parks, forests, and wildlife refuges. In total, the federal government owns between 600 and 700 million acres.

Congress established several conservation programs in the 2008 farm bill. The United States Department of Agriculture, through the National Resources Conservation Service, reimburses for 50% of the cost of purchased conservation easements for certain farm and ranchland protection, grasslands reserves, healthy forests, and wetlands reserves. Other landscape initiatives such as the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative, Everglades Initiative, and Bay Delta Initiative are included in the bill.

The federal government also encourages land preservation through the tax code, permitting a deductible contribution for a voluntary and perpetual conservation easement donation that establishes activities prohibited or permitted on the property and benefits the public with significant conservation values such as open space wildlife habitat, and scenic property not necessarily open to public access. The easement contract between the landowner and a qualified donee (public-supported charity or governmental agency) is enforceable against any current or future owner of the land and revokes development rights forever, at the same time giving the donee organization the right to restrict the property to uses promoting conservation. Conservation easements are useful for farm families holding highly appreciated land and having few liquid assets to pay estate taxes. Easements lower the value of the land and the resulting estate taxes, thereby preventing the need to sell the family farm to pay estate taxes.

Land trusts of various sizes are the donee organizations most commonly receiving conservation easements. The biggest is the Nature Conservancy, which had revenues of $1.4 billion in 2008. Worldwide, it protects 16 million acres. The American Farmland Trust has saved over 3,000,000 acres of farmland. The Trust for Public Land, founded in 1972, provides legal and monetary assistance for conservation land acquisitions. It brokers land deals, leverages funding sources, conducts feasibility studies, analyzes funding options, and does election analysis, all free of charge. The Black Swamp Conservancy protects over 12,000 acres in Northwest Ohio. The land trust movement started in the 1960s; the Nature Conservancy recorded its first conservation easement on six acres in 1961. In 1982, 400 land trusts were operating in the United States with combined budgets of only a few million dollars. By 2006, that number had grown to 1,700 (or an average of 34 in each state) with a combined budget of over 400 million dollars. Combined, land trusts have over 6,000 professional staff and 90,000 volunteers working to protect over 37 million acres. Other national not-for-profit organizations are deeply involved in land preservation.

**Present and Future Land Preservation Issues**

The growing use of public funds for land preservation creates private and public institutions that face several issues:

- What land should be preserved and for what purposes?
- What level of private and public resources should be made available for purchasing conservation easements?
- How should priorities be set to protect critical and sensitive areas with limited private and public funds to achieve best results?

Some say that tax policy, normally used to raise revenue and reflect social values, is an inappropriate tool to encourage conservation easements. If conservation of private land is a worthwhile goal and reflects the values of our society, is it appropriate to give private landowners tax benefits to further those objectives? Congress was aware of this criticism when writing the law, requiring a significant public benefit and conservation outcome in conservation easements. Another argument against using tax policy to encourage conservation easements is the lack of public access to easement land. In fact, landowners are providing a benefit to the
public by keeping land in open space for scenic vistas and in retaining working land for uses such as farming and ranching. Some are concerned that conservation easements lower property taxes, which, in turn, diminishes local revenue. While land subject to conservation easements often have lower property tax values, the criticism looks only at the revenue side of the budget equation. Undeveloped lands demand fewer public services than other land uses.

The perpetuity requirement is another commonly-heard criticism of conservation easements. While an easement does take land-use prerogatives away from future landowners, it is no different from building on the land. Either way, whether developed or conserved, the land is devoted to use beyond the current generation. If conservation were limited to a specific number of years, land speculation would be encouraged at a public cost in the form of tax benefits. Landowners would keep their land undeveloped until a temporary easement expires and market value of the land increased, at which time the landowner would sell. To keep the land undeveloped, the public would have to pay on multiple occasions to acquire the same conservation benefit from a landowner. Special zoning for land preservation is controversial. First, it requires the private sector to bear the cost. Second, special zoning is not permanent protection. Elected officials can change the zoning rules or their successors can change them.

There is no one-size-fits-all approach to land preservation. The general public prefers guided or managed growth to maintain agricultural and ecological land integrity for future generations. Each community has unique goals, challenges, and collective knowledge to guide private and public actions in crafting effective land-use management and policy. Successful programs have flexibility and local knowledge as their most salient features.

Summary

Urban sprawl threatens the nation’s most productive farmland. Once land is developed, productive topsoil is effectively lost forever. From its early days in the late 1800s and early 1900s, the land preservation movement in America has continued to grow. Today, citizens are recognizing the importance of open land in their lives. In the past, Congress has responded by establishing programs and potential tax savings for individual conservation efforts. At this writing, tax benefits and land preservation funds available under the extension of the 2008 Farm bill face an uncertain future. The number of organizations involved in land preservation has grown exponentially in response to the demand for land preservation. The currently popular green, local food, and sustainability movements sometimes conflict with American-style economic development. Land preservation will likely be a major issue for many years to come.

Notes

2. Ibid.
10. Ibid. Conservation Bonds by Region:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>% of Approval on the Ballot</th>
<th>Funds Raised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>$14.7b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New England</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Atlantic</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>$45.6b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Red Triangles in the Queen City

Nineteenth-century American nativism haunts today’s debates over immigration.
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Anti-Catholicism was an element of Cincinnati life, at least since the organization of the first Roman Catholic Church in 1819. With the arrival of large numbers of German and Irish immigrants in the 1840s and 1850s, the final link in the dualistic doctrine of nativism, opposition to both Catholics and foreigners, was welded in place. But by July of 1855, the following letter to the editor of the Cincinnati Enquirer deplored the continual scenes of bloody fights, houses and grog-shops are numerous, and “most degraded [area] in the city. Its dance-houses and grog-shops are numerous, and liquor sales on Sundays, “incendiary” fires in the German section of the city, “intemperate” Irish behavior, and conditions in “Gas Alley.” The Columbian newspaper called the Sixth Ward’s “Gas Alley” the “most degraded [area] in the city. Its dance-houses and grog-shops are numerous, and are the continual scenes of bloody fights, rows, and not infrequently murders.”

Nonetheless, the Democratic mayoral candidate, D. T. Snelbaker, endorsed by the Cincinnati Enquirer, won a close victory over Taylor and two other candidates.

But the election did not end the controversy. The visit of the Papal Nuncio to the United States, Gaetano Bedini, to Cincinnati’s Catholic Archbishop Purcell in December 1853 enraged native-born Americans and Protestant Germans, many of whom had read Maria Monk’s best-selling bogus memoir of rape and murder in a Montreal nunnery. Catholicism’s opponents found more ammunition in the 1850 census confirmed nativist fears. It revealed that immigrants comprised more than 50 percent of Cincinnati’s population. Germans comprised one-third of the total and lived north of the Miami-Erie Canal, which came to be known as “Over-the-Rhine.” The Irish occupied “Gas Alley,” a squalid area near the Ohio River. Most German and Irish newcomers were Roman Catholics escapiing from either crop failures in Ireland or political turmoil in the German homeland.

Friction between the native-born and the growing immigrant throngs escalated, especially with the approaching 1853 mayoral election in which the main issue was school funding. Catholics opposed a common public school system funded by the citywide property tax. They demanded a share of the taxes for operating Catholic private schools. The Protestant majority protested this violation of church and state. They supported the candidacy of James D. “Pap” Taylor, editor of the Daily Times, who labeled the Democrats the “Pope’s Party.” Incidents between the rival groups increased, fanned by intertemperate Cincinnati newspapers. These presses condemned the Jesuits, the Pope’s temporal power, gambling and liquor sales on Sundays, “incendiary” fires in the German section of the city, “intemperate” Irish behavior, and conditions in “Gas Alley.”

Eventually, other issues dominated the next eight years in the Queen City. Manifest destiny captured headlines with the Mexican War and the Oregon conflict with Great Britain. Both the Wilmot Proviso and the Compromise of 1850 rekindled the slavery controversy in the territories. Finally, the city’s remarkable economic prosperity diverted attention from most urban problems. By 1860, Cincinnati’s population exceeded 160,000, the sixth largest city in the country, and the center of the salt pork industry which led to the nickname, Porkopolis. But nativism did not disappear.
harangues of intolerant preachers and newspaper editors. Bedini was vilified as the “Bloody Butcher of Ugo Bassi” for his alleged role in having the priest flayed alive and killed for betraying the Papal States, whereas Bassi was actually tried by an Austrian court martial and executed for service in Garibaldi’s army. On Christmas Day, 1853, the so-called “Freeman’s Society” marched four abreast with up to 1200 participants to Archbishop Purcell’s residence where he was entertaining Bedini, Lieutenant Williams S. Rosecrans (later a Union Civil War general), and the Catholic Telegraph’s editor. Signs reading “Down with Bedini,” “No Priests, No Kings, No Popery,” and “Down with the Raven Butcher” were accompanied by a makeshift gallows and an effigy of Bedini. As they reached Ninth Street, the marchers encountered a hundred policemen. What happened next is conjecture. Officer George Carr later testified that several shots were fired by the marchers. Chief of Police Lukens testified at the inquiry that he “heard a pistol shot,” but could not determine who fired the weapon. The chief, admitting he was “considerably excited,” directed his officers to advance on the crowd, provoking a riot. By midnight sixty-three marchers were arrested and the “Weinachtsch Riot” ended, but not before fifteen police officers and rioters received minor injuries, four or five suffered serious wounds, and rioter Charles Eggerling was killed.

Two leading Whig newspapers, as well as Pap Taylor’s Daily Times, called the episode a police riot. The Daily Gazette blamed “the police in resorting to violence…and should be held responsible for the death of Charles Eggerling.” Taylor editorialized “the rioters were the police,” But the Democratic Cincinnati Enquirer observed “that nearly every man who was arrested, was found to be armed, exhibits in a great degree that they were prepared either for the offensive or defensive” roles. The paper commended the police for “checking and quelling such disorderly outbreaks.” Local journals truly mirrored the divisive forces controlling the emotions, words, and deeds of most Cincinnatians. The trial of the “Weinachtsch Sixty-Three” was conducted amid an atmosphere of tension and acrimony. Queen City Prosecutor Dickson asked the court to dismiss all charges, since they were based on the false assumption that the crowd planned to injure Bedini. Also, the police could identify only four of those jailed, and even then, they could not prove “murderous intent.” Judge Spooner concurred and the prisoners were released.

Nevertheless, intense emotions persisted, exploited by the newly formed Know Nothing Party. The rapid development of this “mysterious, invisible, inscrutable, subterranean, never-seen order of beings called Know Nothings” made almost daily headlines in all Cincinnati newspapers during the summer of 1854. Thomas C. Ware, President of the State Council of the American (or Know Nothing) Party of Ohio, laid down the party’s planks for the 1854 statewide congressional elections: 1) a naturalization period of twenty-one years for immigrants; 2) no interference by the Catholic Church in America’s system of government; and 3) opposition to the extension of slavery. Ware concluded that his party “is now the sheet-anchor” of the country’s hopes. In the election, the fusion forces of Know Nothings, Whigs, Anti-Nebraska Democrats, and Free Soil Democrats won in all of Ohio’s twenty-one congressional districts. Know Nothingism, as the cementing agent of the fusionists, seemed to be in control. However, the inclusion of an anti-slavery plank indicated that nativism was not the only issue facing voters. As early as April 1854, Pap Taylor’s Daily Times endorsed the Know Nothings, calling on subscribers to combat “the insidious wiles and approaches of the ‘Pope’s Party’.” The Cincinnati Enquirer editor, James J. Farran, replied that Taylor’s fiery editorials “encourage a fierce, intolerant and dangerous spirit, which resorts to the incendiary’s torch and the ruffian’s bludgeon to attain its end.” The two editors entered the contest for mayor in the spring 1855 election, and invective flew. Seizing upon the fact that Taylor’s parents had emigrated to the United States from Ireland, Farran printed a series of cartoons by Frazer and Denis lampooning the incongruity of Taylor’s Irish heritage and his ultra nativism. Another cartoon depicted Taylor addressing a crowd on a keg labeled “New Rot Gut.” The caption read: “The Inauguration—The Old Ass Proclaimed a Mare at Last—Jemmy O’Taylor Making a Speech Upon and From His Native Platform.” Passions ran high as Know Nothing rowdies killed two persons in a hospital and stabbed an Irishman to death. Then, shortly before the election, two German factions, former Whigs, announced their support for Farran, the Democrat. They agreed with the politically moderate editor of the Cincinnati Daily Commercial, M. D. Potter, who withheld support for Taylor who, he said, lacked “honesty” and “capacity.” “We know him to be mendacious, tricky, malignant, and undignified.” Cincinnati nativists regarded the betrayal of the German factions as final proof that immigrants did not deserve the vote. The maneuver “increased immensely the anti-foreign feeling among the natives.”

Election Day, April 2, 1855, dawned and the morning Columbian predicted a “remarkably quiet and orderly” election. But the night before, the city streets were cluttered with red paper triangles—a signal for Know Nothings to prepare for action. If the red triangles were a symbolic threat, the arrival of three hundred Kentucky hoodlums, brought in by the city’s Know Nothing Councils, was more dangerous. With widespread rumors of ballot stuffing in the German Eleventh Ward, a mob of Cincinnati and Kentucky Know Nothings overpowered polling officials, seized the ballot boxes, and destroyed 1,300 ballots. Fighting escalated when an estimated 3000 to 6000 persons attacked each other with “stones, clubs, dray-pins, knives and pistols.” The nativists won the battle, capturing a German ceremonial cannon which they hauled to the Irish Thirteenth Ward, firing rocks and boulders from it to clear the streets. In the Irish Fourth Ward, other nativists seized control of the polls and demanded proof of citizenship from all voters. Meanwhile, the Enquirer’s office was surrounded, stones were hurled through windows, and the building became a potential target for the ex-German cannon.

The next day, nativists destroyed the Twelfth Ward’s ballots, and that evening Germans barricaded the bridges “Over-the-Rhine.” According to historian William Baughin, “The whole city took on the aspect of one of the European capitals in the throes of revolution, as well-disciplined German military units—armed to the teeth—patrolled the barricades and formed an interesting contrast to the unruly mob gathered on the other side.” At ten o’clock, four hundred torch-bearing nativists, shouting “Hurrah for Pap Taylor,” stormed the barricades. The “Rhinelanders” replied
by firing fifty rounds of rifle shot. Two nativists fell mortally wounded and the rest retreated in confusion.23 Although several minor skirmishes took place on the third day, the mob’s enthusiasm waned, and by evening the riot seemed to be over. Heavy rains fell on April 5, termed by the Commercial an act of God: “a beneficent visitation more efficient than a thousand special policemen.”

The three-day riot was over. Many city neighborhoods lay in smoldering ruins. At least three persons died and scores sustained wounds, but exact figures were never determined. Police were unable to cope with the riots about which Mayor Snelbaker concluded: “I never saw such an utter disregard of human life.”24 Barricading bridges into the German quarter prevented the riots from becoming one of the most destructive episodes in American history. James Harper, editor of the pro-Know Nothing Gallipolis Journal, wrote that the riots were “the beginning of the end. The foreigners have been very insolent for years past in that city, and the Americans [Know Nothings] are showing a determination to curb them—-they are determined no power shall be vested in foreigners only upon purely American principles, and we believe they are right.”25 The Cincinnati riots displayed the power of political nativism. Meanwhile, the riot’s original cause, the mayoral election, was still an issue. Destroyed ballots in the Eleventh and Twelfth Wards were the keys. Without the normal Democratic majority from those wards, Taylor would win. However, the Board of Elections certified approximate figures from those wards based on polling officials’ estimates. Farran was declared the winner over Taylor, with 52.6% of the total vote.

Although Know Nothingism continued as a political threat, its potency was weakened. In the 1855 Ohio governor’s contest, the American (Know Nothing) candidate garnered 27% of the vote in Cincinnati’s Hamilton County. Two years later, the party’s candidate got 10%. It was the last major political contest for Queen City nativists. Their rapid decline was due to several factors. First, the rioters’ violence shocked more moderate party members. Second, the political expediency of according German Protestants in their ranks destroyed the nativist fabric. Third, the ineptness and intolerance of the Pap Taylor campaign drove ex-Whigs to desert. Finally, the Know Nothing party could not survive the reigniting of the sectional controversy, for the 1854 passage of the Kansas-Nebraska Act permitted slavery’s extension into those territories.

American historians generally organize the 1830-1860 era in American history around such themes as the westward movement, manifest destiny, Jacksonian democracy, the transportation revolution, humanitarian crusades, or the slavery issue and the looming Civil War. Rarely depicted as a powerful historical force, the thread of continuity inherent in nativism is an equally strong thread in the fabric of American society. The nineteenth century editor of the New York Tribune, Horace Greeley, observed that the Know Nothing party “would seem as devoid of the elements of permanence as an anti-Cholera or anti-Potato rot party would be.”26 He was mistaken. Although the party died, its bigoted goal lived on. Antebellum nativism in Cincinnati demonstrated a force bedeveling the American nation that the impending crisis over slavery only postponed. The ignorance, prejudice, and violence associated with nativism were a malignancy that reappeared in the 1880s, fostered by the secretive anti-Catholic American Protective Association. Nativism would resurface in the vigorous Ku Klux Klan movement of the 1920s which attacked the movement. Those who believe in the cyclical theory of history are too well aware of nativism’s potency.
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Reflections

Knowledge is proud that he has learned so much; Wisdom is humble that he knows no more.
—William Cowper, “The Task” (1785)