



Search forums

Display replies in nested form

Move this discussion to ...

< Previous (Photo Analysis)

**Photo Analysis**

by Joe Escobar - Monday, January 28, 2013, 8:52 AM

To post, you will click the "reply" link MY post. If you want to reply to a specific comment made by another student, click the "reply" link located on that student's specific post.

IMPORTANT - SUBJECT LINES

As in Forums 1 & 2, put something descriptive in the subject line of your post. Other students wanting to talk about the same topic can click the "reply" button to your post, thus helping organize this discussion.

Sum of ratings: -

Edit | Delete | Reply

**Misguided Sources**

by Whitney Stevens - Wednesday, January 30, 2013, 11:00 AM

In both cases, of the confused identity and the moved body, a perfect example of false sources is illustrated. I found it very interesting that people would be morally ok with labeling photos with false captions or the photographers giving false information about their photo. Especially in events of war, which remains a very sensitive subject. I still think we can discover the historical truth about this time period, although we must take in the information, with an objective view. These photos perfectly demonstrate the detail needed to really grasp an accurate account of history.

When I put myself in the scene as the photographer, I really can't grasp the thought of moving a body just to improve the photo. This seems ethically wrong and disturbing. That said, the case of the moved body is worse than the case of the confused identity, because they moved a dead man and added "props" that didn't belong to the man. However, I don't believe there is a way to determine if it's worse to change what is written/print or worse to mislead in images, either way it's misleading and not a valuable source.

Whitney

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Re: Misguided Sources

by Ryan Lundberg - Wednesday, January 30, 2013, 12:29 PM

Whitney,

I agree that manipulating both images and print can be extremely misleading and it's hard to determine which is worse. Maybe I've seen too many episodes of CSI, but I think it might be possible to get a little more truth out of a photograph than the written word. Even though Gardner misidentified the subjects of some of his photos, William Frassanito was able to analyze the raw evidence in the picture and identify the soldiers as belonging to the Union 3rd Corps. So, maybe with forensic analysis, the truth of an image can be discerned even if it's been described incorrectly. However, I'm sure that's getting harder and harder with better image manipulation technology. Either way, I also agree with you when you say that once you find out a source is not accurate, it's difficult to treat it as valuable.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Re: Misguided Sources

by Whitney Stevens - Sunday, February 3, 2013, 6:19 PM

Hi Ryan,

Yes, in the case of CSI and other forensics it's a great source, but with anything people can change the setting, people exc before taking the photos. After reading your reply I see your point on the photos being a bit more accurate, it's definitely harder to make photos misleading than words. The only real conclusion I can grasp, is that one source isn't reliable enough to make a claim.

Whitney

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Re: Misguided Sources

by Stephanie Sheets - Sunday, February 3, 2013, 8:52 PM

Ryan,

From my point of view, you brought up one of the most significant issues at hand. In the case of the confused identity, I consider the photo to be a

primary source and the print reporting to be the secondary source. It seems apparent that the photographer intentionally took the photograph from multiple angles to make it seem like he had seen more scenes of victory and defeat, but he probably didn't actually change the scenes, only the story. Because we can take his account as a second-hand source, but the photos as a first hand source, we can piece together the truth ourselves (as described on page 3 of "The Case of Confused Identity").

When the pictures have been arranged and manipulated as described in The Case of The Moved Body, we have no truly valid source to use at all to form an understanding of the true events. I agree with both you and Whitney that once a source has been deemed incredible, it's so hard to even consider the photos as evidence of historical events.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Perspectives

by Ryan Lundberg - Wednesday, January 30, 2013, 12:12 PM

I think the case of the moved body is a more egregious manipulation of information than the case of confused identity. Because in a way, both pictures involve confused identity. The rebel sharpshooter probably wasn't a sniper at all, but was labeled as such by Gardner. The confused identity seemed to be mainly a different perspective. So, in both cases, the subjects have been misidentified, but with the moved body, a dead soldier has been used as a prop.

While I think it's morally offensive to use a human being who died in battle as a prop to personally profit, I'm not sure if it's more of an affront than the fact that the soldier was killed in the first place. Also, some of the battlefield descriptions in McPherson's book are gruesome. Hogs eating dead or wounded soldiers, etc. It's possible that the photographers using this soldier as a prop at least kept the scavengers at bay for awhile.

In summary, to me the moved body seems to be a greater manipulation of information because it involved staging a scene versus taking a picture from a different angle and mislabeling it.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Re: Perspectives

by Colby Finnerty - Wednesday, January 30, 2013, 1:58 PM

I agree with you. Moving a fallen soldier to improve the dramatic effect and increase sells is atrocious. Although, using false information to increase sells is still shameful, I don't find it nearly as bad.

As we get further along in this course it amazes me on how quick I was to

assume that the information provided by our so called "historians" was accurate. Every week we have discussed topics that arnt as true as they appear. It really makes me wonder, how many more disturted topics there are in the civil war.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Perspectives

by Stephanie Sheets - Sunday, February 3, 2013, 11:19 PM

Colby-

I think we have a certain sensitivity at the idea of treating a soldier's remains with anything less than the utmost respect because of the times in which we live. Now, the idea of a mass grave or pile of amputated limbs is unimaginable, but then it was more the norm that we realize, so moving a body here or there to get the shot may not have been as horrifying as we consider it to be now.

Also, I too have been completely awakened to the idea that so many sources considered trustworthy by mainstream media may not be. I really had a hard time swallowing the fact that a PBS series may not have been accurate. I am a great lover of NOVA and really all things PBS. The Civil War series is right up my alley, and considering critically the reviews and implications of the mistakes and intentional "liberties" taken during its production has been quite the learning experience.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

3

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Perspectives

by Julie Skinner - Wednesday, January 30, 2013, 8:01 PM

Ryan-

I agree with your perspective that the more egregious manipulation is the case of the moved body. This seems like such a horrible manipulation. Not only is it disrespectful to the man that died, but also to his family and all those that were misled by what they saw. This is fraud in its most vivid form. The fact that someone profited from this is disgusting to me.

This class has already made me realize that we must investigate thoroughly all the information that is presented to us. This makes me mad in a way. It calls into question all the history that I have learned in the past. I feel robbed by the fact that I have to relearn everything and that I have to question all of the photographs and all of the written accounts of this war. How do we know what is the truth and what has been manipulated by someone in the past?

Thanks for sharing your perspective!

Julie

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

3

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Photo Deception

by Ian MacDonald - Wednesday, January 30, 2013, 9:07 PM

I was quite surprised to find out that some of these old war photographs were manipulated in their own way, especially the case of the confused identity. I had previously seen both those photographs of the dead soldiers lying on the battlefield and always thought that they were two entirely different photos. So it was interesting to examine them more closely and discover that they are most likely the same photo taken at different positions. I would have to say that the case of the moved body was the more egregious case for me. In terms of trying to get the “historical truth”, it makes it more difficult to find out how something (or in this case, someone) ended up where they did if it is unclear where they originally were. That isn’t to say that it is impossible to find any accurate truth about the subject, but it does make it harder to find out for sure who the subject is and where the first fell.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Pictures worth a thousand words

by Brendan MacDonald - Wednesday, January 30, 2013, 9:16 PM

Well I will start off by saying that I think it is naturally easier to believe what is seen in pictures than something in writing; especially war images which portray the brutality and devastating nature of battle; not that reading cannot instill just as powerful a feeling that an image can, but there is something seeing an image of an actual event with your own eye’s that can’t be gained as easily from reading about it.

I believe one can discover the historical truth about the time period without relying on photographs. As the *Civil War Photographs* web page states, the main intent of pictures is to communicate a certain thought or emotion. Obtaining historical facts and information can be done in ways other than viewing images although I would agree that given the fact that people often don’t question the authenticity of older pictures, it could be quite discouraging to learn that they were altered in some way.

Given what I have said, I would have to choose the second “case” as the more egregious of the two. The fact that the fallen soldier’s body was taken out of the place where he drew his final breath and placed in another spot to create a “scene”, seems to be the most unethical to me. I can understand what kind of feeling the photographer was attempting to instill into the viewer although it does seem morally wrong to use a soldier’s dead body as a prop.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Pictures worth a thousand words

by Ryan Lundberg - Thursday, January 31, 2013, 7:08 PM

Brendan,

I agree with you that it seems more natural to trust an image as authoritative when compared to text. I'm not sure why that is though. Maybe an image seems more objective. Like it couldn't be manipulated and edited the way the written word can be. But, as we saw with these photos, different angles, or changing the way the subjects are seen, or mislabeling the subjects can create a much different impression of the image itself. I wonder if it's always been that way, or it's just because most of us are a product of the MTV generation. Unending amounts of 3D movies and videogames. That said though, I wonder if subconsciously, people trust speech the most. I think I saw a study somewhere that said people who had lost a sense, sight/hearing, were more likely to commit suicide if they lost their hearing. The reason for that was because people felt disconnected from the world if they couldn't personally speak with other people versus just seeing them. So, even though it seems like on the surface we're a strongly visual culture or species, maybe deep down, we trust words more. Maybe that's why Morgan Freeman gets so many jobs narrating movies, and commercials, including some parts of this documentary. His authoritative voice and delivery might lend a little credibility to an otherwise dry text.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Pictures worth a thousand words

by Whitney Stevens - Sunday, February 3, 2013, 6:43 PM

Hello!

I wasn't aware about the higher suicide in people who lost their hearing and how important it is for us to communicate. I know personally it's important I communicate but I always thought communicating and seeing were equally important. I recently found a site this year during campaigns that lists the errors said in speech, such as the debates on this years campaign. I thought it was amazing on how many errors the president and Romney had said- I'd practically thought it was illegal to "lie" during a speech. Granted they may of just been off a little on statistics for some of them. So I can understand show people are more likely to believe speech

Anyways, back to the photographs I'm amazed at the lack of ethics with the photographers although after reading your post where you pointed out the setting of the war with animals eating dead bodies and such. And the movie talks about wagons of men, I suppose the photographers sensitivity to the bodies declined.

Whitney

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Historic Photojournalism

by Meleah Drews - Wednesday, January 30, 2013, 10:02 PM

I don't know why I was so surprised to find out that the historical photos had been altered and/or the information manipulated in some way. Perhaps I thought that the lack of integrity shown in media today was a newer development, not something that dates back to the 19th century.

In looking at, and reading the various stories associated with both of the images, "confused identity" and "moved body" I am most upset by the second. The fact that the photographer moved the dead soldiers body to a different location, positioned a gun around him in order to make the scene to fit the story he wanted to tell is detestable to me. The soldier simply became a prop at that point.

I know that in war the dead are not always treated with respect. According to Wikipedia, Sullivan Ballou's "corpse was exhumed, decapitated, and desecrated by Confederate soldiers." While I find this also horrid, I had imagined a photojournalist to operate with more professionalism and respect for the dead.

If Ken Burns was aware of the controversy about the photos and still chose to use them, that troubles me. I think it perpetuates the myth that the photographer created.

works cited:

www.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sullivan_Ballou

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Historic Photojournalism

by Julie Skinner - Saturday, February 2, 2013, 7:07 PM

Meleah-

I can't say I was surprised by misrepresentation in the media as early as the 19th century, but nonetheless, it disgusted me too. The thought that someone would actually move a dead body in order to perpetuate a story is unimaginable.

I understand why you found it troubling that Ken Burns would use the pictures if he was aware of the controversy, but if he didn't use a picture that was surrounded by some controversy, it may have significantly reduced the pool he had to choose from. Maybe he should have included a disclaimer to alert the viewer to the possible inaccuracy so as not to perpetuate the lie, thus increasing the educational value of the video.

Julie

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Historic Photojournalism

by Meleah Drews - Sunday, February 3, 2013, 1:38 PM

Julie,

I think that as long as the photos remain a part of the library of congress, they will remain available for use in future texts and documentaries. Last night I was watching a different documentary about Abe Lincoln and the Civil War called *America: The Birth of Freedom*, produced by Dan Dalton in 2011. In the documentary I recognized both photos. Again there was no mention or disclaimer about the controversy of the photos.

So, should the Library of Congress remove controversial photos from their archives? I don't believe so. Perhaps with the inclusion of these photos in documentaries, we get a more complete view of not only the devastation that took place on the battle field, but of the corruption and profiteering that followed in its wake.

works cited:

America: The Birth of Freedom. Abe Lincoln Vol 2. Dan Dalton Productions 2011.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Historic Photojournalism

by Julie Skinner - Sunday, February 3, 2013, 10:11 PM

Maleah-

I agree with you that the Library of Congress should not remove these pictures from their archives. All of the photographs from this time have value, even if they are used to explain misdeeds that occurred.

Thank you for your mention of the other series, I am interested in watching it too.

Julie

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



manipulating photographs

by Windy Ficcadenti - Wednesday, January 30, 2013, 10:35 PM

Of the two cases we read about I found The Case of the Confused Identity less egregious than The Case of the Moved Body. I still found it morally and ethically wrong for the photographer to use the same image, but at different perspective points; so it seemed like an entirely different photograph just so it could be captioned saying two different, basically contradicting things. It is misleading and manipulating, but I did think that The Case of the Moved Body was far more deplorable than the confused identity one. Knowing a photo of a dead soldier was posed and had added props to enhance the dramatic effect seems nefarious. If such a thing was practiced in today's time and it had gotten out to the public there would be well, a huge stink made about it. Possibly even could be considered criminal. If one of your loved ones body were disrespected in such a way, just so they could be a tool to manipulate a situation, how would you feel?

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Re: manipulating photographs

by Kirk Nikas - Wednesday, January 30, 2013, 11:50 PM

I would feel terrible. I agree with everything you say, although my post expressed the opposite scenario as being the more deplorable of the two. I think both situations were all together wrong to have done. Isn't it awful Ken Burns' would use these photographs in his film though such a stigma surrounds them both? It isn't like he was going to mention their background as an aspect of his film, using such photos is almost as bad as creating such photos, since it promotes the use of said material.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Dishonoring the Dead

by Kirk Nikas - Wednesday, January 30, 2013, 11:53 PM

The photographs in question represent two aspects of poor assertion of truth, both visual and contextual lies. In both photographs the bodies had been distorted and malpresented. I think the worst of the two situations is the first, the situation in where the bodies photographed are referred to as Union soldiers in one story (federals ((Field of Gettysburg))), and Confederate (rebels((A Harvest of Death))) in the next. Both situations deal with defacing and dishonoring the dead, a terrible thing for anyone to do, but I find it most disgusting in the stories where the identity of the bodies were purposefully misrepresented by Alexander Gardner as a means to convey storyline. There is no reason to dishonor the dead, and doing it for personal gain or to create conflict on one side or another makes the deed seem all the more

disgusting.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Dishonoring the Dead

by Meleah Drews - Sunday, February 3, 2013, 2:36 PM

Looking at the website for Gardner's Photographic Sketch Book of the War, and realizing that the book includes 1,118 images of the Civil War, it makes me wonder just how many of these were altered in some way. We are just focusing on two photos, but many more could have been manipulated or had a false storyline created to fit the image.

It sounds like the competition between Alexander Gardner and Mathew Brady to obtain and sell war images got in the way of their professional and ethical judgement. For instance, after Gettysburg, Gardner arrived at the battlefield 2 days after the fighting, photographing haunting images of dead soldiers, while Brady arriving a week later had a more knowledgeable guide to help document strategic sites.

Perhaps these types of situations and competition between the two war photojournalists is what prompted Gardner to embellish the stories of the fallen soldiers. For me the value of the photos comes in looking at them without reading the accompanying story. The effect is the same. I can use my own mind to imagine the fallen men were someone's son, brother, father, or husband, and that those they left behind were grieving.

works cited:

memory.loc.gov/ammem/awphtml/cwpcam/cwcam1b.html

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Confused Identity

by Julie Skinner - Friday, February 1, 2013, 11:34 AM

Alexander Gardner was quite the dynamic writer. In "Harvest of Death", he points out the horrors of war, the poverty of the Confederate Army, "The Rebels represented in the photograph are without shoes. These were always removed from the feet of the dead on account of the pressing need of the survivors." As if he is trying to make his reader feel empathy for the Confederate soldiers apparently pictured in the photo. But then he changes tactics and blames them for their condition and ultimate death. "... they paid with life the price of their treason, and when the wicked strife was finished, found nameless graves, far from home and kindred." (Gardner, text for plate 36) Gardner then uses the same scene, from a different angle, to explain the death of General Reynolds. He notes that this time the

men in the picture are Union Soldiers and with their cause being the just one, they are portrayed much differently. "The faces of all were pale, as though cut in marble, and as the wind swept across the battle-field it waved the hair, and gave the bodies such an appearance of life that a spectator could hardly help thinking they were about to rise to continue the fight." (Gardner, text for plate 37) Both accounts are intended to produce strong Union sentiment in the reader. Gardner deftly manipulates his accounts of these photographs to achieve a desired effect, to sell his sketchbook.

I think what we need to remember when viewing historical photos is what was the photographer's purpose for taking them. In this case, Gardner's purpose was to make money. We too often want to believe that the purpose was in order to accurately capture history for all time. They were trying to make a living off of the horror of war and therefore not above taking whatever creative license they felt necessary in order to do so. This is not an independent event. It has been happening forever. That is why these images are so powerful. They evoke strong emotions in the viewer making them susceptible to manipulation.

I don't know if it is possible to answer the question which is worse, changing written word or pictures. They both are morally wrong in my opinion. Manipulating pictures may be more successful in achieving a desired result. People tend to have more faith in something they can see, something they can study with their own eyes and formulate their own opinion of what happened by what they notice in a photograph. It is much easier to dismiss the written word as someone else's opinion if there is not any accompanying visual proof.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Confused Identity



by Stephanie Sheets - Sunday, February 3, 2013, 9:01 PM

Julie,

You touched on an interesting subject. I think we all understand that in today's media culture, all news is slanted to meet the "wants" of its audience and for financial gain. When we consider news sources like Fox News, CNN, or NPR, I think we have developed different levels of trust based on our individual opinions of their ethical reporting standards.

I agree that as modern learners, it is hard to discern between "old" documents and "historical" documents. Will future generations consider tabloid photos to be our true accounts of history? It is interesting to consider whether the motivations of the photographer/reporter affect the legitimacy of the work. I would say that since any reporter is paid for their work, they could all be swayed to report the most lucrative story. I am beginning to consider how ethical standards have evolved along with technologically advanced fact-checking and media coverage.

I stand convinced (with what appears to be the general consensus of this group) that moving the body and placing props to manipulate pictures was more heinous of the two immoral acts. I think the old saying "a picture is worth a thousand words" applies here. A manipulated photo just about equals a thousand manipulated stories to me.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Re: Confused Identity

by Kirk Nikas - Sunday, February 3, 2013, 9:15 PM

Stephanie,

In response to you frst paragraph's statement on Alexander gardener trying to create empathy for the soldiers, I believe he was, with those words, attempting to defame the soldiers of the Confederate army.

-Kirk

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Re: Confused Identity

by Julie Skinner - Sunday, February 3, 2013, 10:12 PM

Kirk-

That would have been my paragraph, and I see what you are saying, but it is also what I was saying. He starts out soft and then turns it around and blames them for their own conditions. That is the point I was trying to make. Thank you for your input.

Julie

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Re: Confused Identity

by Stephanie Sheets - Sunday, February 3, 2013, 11:14 PM

Julie- I can definitely see the point you're making here. The fact that he changes his position to gain the approval of his audience, editors, or whatever he was seeking seems to be evident. Just as he changed the positions in the photo, he changes his positions on the issues in his writing.

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

Sum of ratings:1 (1)



What can we discover from the photographs?

by Windy Ficcadenti - Sunday, February 3, 2013, 1:41 PM

Can we discover the historical truth about the civil war era when some of the things we rely on, such as the photographs in question, have been altered? Well, that is a good question and one that is worth thinking about. I don't think we can get the full complete historical truth when we are shown misleading images; it changes our comprehension/perspective of entire elements that was going on, though in discovering the truth behind the photographs it gives us a different look into other aspects of the war. We are forced to think of the possible motives behind such a despicable act, we can analyze whether or not these images did what the photographer intended, and what sort of impact that had on the overall feelings of the population. In a way the Photographs shines a different light on this time period.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Devil's Advocate

by Ryan Lundberg - Sunday, February 3, 2013, 2:34 PM

There seems to be a strong consensus that what Alexander Gardner did, mislabeling subjects or moving bodies to obtain better photographs and narratives was unforgivably wrong. Disgusting, deplorable, etc. While I certainly agree that his actions were not perfectly honorable, or purely motivated, I think that what he did was much more beneficial than harmful.

Nowadays, it definitely would be deplorable to do what Gardner did, but the conditions in which he was working during that time were much different than they are now. At numerous points, in both the documentary and McPherson's book, it's pointed out that there was a shocking lack of care and thought given to the well being of the soldiers involved in the fighting. There was no good system set up for taking care of wounded soldiers, let alone honoring the dead. At one point it's stated that soldiers would break rank to take their wounded friends to safety because they knew no one else would. The soldiers that died on the battlefield were left to rot; picked apart and eaten by hogs and other scavengers. Curiosity seekers would rob the dead of their belongings for souvenirs. Also, someone else pointed out regarding Sullivan Ballou, the combatants on both sides purposely desecrated the graves of the dead. In light of all the horrors committed upon the living and the dead, I think moving a body and taking a picture is about the least dishonorable thing that could have been done.

What about profit though? Yes, Gardner profited off of his work. How about the war profiteers that made a fortune off of manufacturing weapons? Minie balls, rifles, artillery, bayonets. All of these inventions were designed to slaughter human beings. Or even worse, the companies that cut corners and sent soldiers off to war with

substandard, cheap equipment. McPherson shows that the uniforms many soldiers had to wear, practically disintegrated and actually gave rise to the term shoddy. How many millions, billions, were made directly off of the deaths of soldiers? Not indirectly, as in the case of Gardner.

My main point is that in spite of the minor sins that Gardner committed, they were nothing compared to the greater horrors committed during the Civil War, and overall, his actions had a much more positive effect on society. The photos that Gardner took ended up showing the public, for the first time in history, the horrific, end result of war. Yes, some of the subjects were incorrectly identified, and yes, some of the bodies were moved, but all of those soldiers had died in battle.

Public opinion can have a powerful effect on the outcome of war. At one point in episode three, a fleeing soldier said he kept turning around as he ran because he didn't want to die of a shameful wound in the back. At another point in the documentary, a soldier says they advanced into withering fire, "cracking skulls like eggs," not for love of country or freedom, but because they did not want to be shamed. At the beginning of the war, both sides thought the war would be glorious. Unfathomable casualty numbers, and in part, photographic exhibits like Gardner's showed the general public, many people who would never be directly involved in the war, what the cost of that war was. Future generations and administrations would learn to control public opinion and not even allow the caskets of the dead to be photographed for fear of negatively impacting the outcome of a war.

I think what Gardner did in showing the general public photographic evidence of the effects of war for the first time in history far outweighed whatever transgressions he might have committed in taking, and presenting those photos.

<http://opinionator.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/09/24/the-dead-of-antietam/>

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Devil's Advocate  

by Julie Skinner - Sunday, February 3, 2013, 10:03 PM

Ryan-

I would agree that public opinion was a huge factor in the civil war. I too found the part of the video about the fleeing soldier turning around so as not to be shot in the back extremely telling of the times. He wasn't as worried about being killed as he was about how he was killed and what it would say about his character if he was shot in the back. Still does that excuse the doctored photographs? I don't know. I think we must acknowledge that this was a different time, and as you say, the photographer is attempting to make a living, but no matter the time or public opinion I don't think it excusable to knowingly mislead the public especially about something so sensitive.

Julie

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Devil's Advocate



by Windy Ficcadenti - Sunday, February 3, 2013, 11:20 PM

Ryan,

I like some of the points you have brought up, but I'm not so sure if what Alexander Gardner did was more beneficial than harmful. Yes, it was a different time and there were what could be considered way more atrocious acts happening, but does it make it any better or worse to compare one bad deed to another? I don't think it does. In that way of thinking it is almost like a kid stealing something and then defending themselves by saying, well, so and so across the street stole something bigger. If people only ever lived their lives not by any moral code, but just by trying not to be quite as bad as their fellow man then I would say we all would be in more trouble. I liked how you pointed out that the photos Gardner took "ended up showing the public, for the first time in history, the horrific, end result of war." Many people of the time would have never had a clear understanding of what exactly was happening if not for photojournalism, as a lot of people were unable to even read. Though I think what Gardner may have done was mislead the public, since a number of people looked to photographs as a sort of way to get information. And was it photographic evidence of effects of the war that he showed the general public, or was it his skewed version of it?

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

3

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply

[< Previous \(Photo Analysis\)](#)

You are logged in as Joe Escobar (Logout)

 Moodle Docs for this page

