



HST 209: American History: Civil War W17 (Escobar 31664)

Home ► Winter 2017 ► HST 209 W17 (Escobar 31664) ► Week 4 - 1862 - Forever Free ► Week 4 Forum ► Civil War Photography


Search forums

Week 4 Forum

Civil War Photography

[• Subscribe](#)[◀ Civil War Photography](#)[Move](#)[Pin](#)

Civil War Photography

by Joe Escobar - Saturday, January 28, 2017, 9:22 PM

This thread is for discussions on the Civil War Photography topic.

To make your POSTS, click the reply link in this, MY post. To reply to another student's post, be sure to click the reply link within in THEIR post.

IMPORTANT - SUBJECT LINES

BE SURE to use an informative subject line for your post that focuses on the questions you are addressing. Do NOT simply leave it RE: Civil War Photography

Sum of ratings: -

[Permalink](#) | [Edit](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Let's play pretend history!

by Nicholas Esser - Tuesday, January 31, 2017, 9:47 PM

When it comes to most egregious, I would have to base it on morality and find more fault in *The case of the moved body*. In my opinion, Gardener showed great disrespect to the fallen soldier moving his body for a more desirable angle. Historically, however, the claims of the resting place of General Reynolds is perhaps more damaging.

Armed with this knowledge, I can make sense of these as works of fiction to shock and awe the audience, but without this context the greater audience won't. Maybe what the audience doesn't know won't hurt them in the case of the photographs, but you must not completely change or alter history around for a good story.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: Let's play pretend history!

by Stanley Cates - Thursday, February 2, 2017, 12:40 PM

In general I agree with your statement that we shouldn't try to alter history. However, I feel compelled to point out that what Gardener did was not altering history; what Gardner did was altering current events. Certainly ethics violation abound here, but the devil is in the details. I think that opens up another interesting avenue though. If we see what Gardner did as immoral then what do we think future generations will glean from of our own photographic manipulation, which is arguably superior to what Gardner had available.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: Let's play pretend history!

by Nicholas Esser - Friday, February 3, 2017, 5:46 PM

I think that knowingly documenting an incorrect location of where a general fell in battle is altering history, as current events at the time, immediately enters history as they are recorded. Though the actual location of the general Reynolds' death was accurately documented, it's not hard to assume some of the population were only aware of Gardener's history, an eerily similar conversation we have been having on Ken Burns telling of history. I do not, however, feel that in the grand scheme of the Civil War this picture is as damaging compared to some of the controversy we have discovered outside of this week's forum.

Your point about future generations, and how they interpret the history we are actively leaving behind for them is an absolutely terrifying idea. In a time in society when it's hard to know the truth while living in it, I cannot imagine the

work historians hundreds of years from now have in store for them!

Sum of ratings:2 (1) Permalink | Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Let's play pretend history!

by Stanley Cates - Friday, February 3, 2017, 9:56 PM

Your statement about things immediately entering history once they're recorded got me wondering where the actual boundary between current events and history is; so I went looking for it. The short answer is that there is no hard and fast definition. However, I found this one from Professor Paul Fouracre, University of Manchester, in an article at historyextra.com to be rather compelling: "History ends and current affairs begin at the point at which consequence is unknowable, documents are unavailable and at which moment reaction rather than memory informs oral testimony." Still a fuzzy line with varied width, but I thought it was interesting and worth sharing.

You also said: " In a time in society when it's hard to know the truth while living in it, I cannot imagine the work historians hundreds of years from now have in store for them!" Seems to me that an individual in the 19th century would not have been mistaken to make the same comment. We live in a time when humans are more connected than they ever have been before and we still hardly have any idea what's actually going on most of the time. It's difficult for me to imagine how they ever kept facts straight in the 19th century; with or without people like Gardner messing up the works.

Sum of ratings:3 (1) Permalink | Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Morality in History

by Zachary Embree - Sunday, February 5, 2017, 11:21 PM

I have noticed that there is trend in this discussion to base many of the objections on what happened in this photo series comes from a moral position. Mainly that moving or altering the position of a dead soldier is disrespectful. In the defense of the photographer I think he was trying to do the opposite of that. By moving the body he was creating a narrative that showcased the horrors of fighting a war like the one that claimed this man's life. In a sense he was trying to turn a seemingly meaningless death into a reason to avoid continuing a conflict that was creating just that.

Sum of ratings:2 (1) Permalink | Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Morality in History

by Bailey Tillotson - Sunday, February 5, 2017, 11:40 PM

I was thinking the same thing, that morally yes it was wrong to move the body like he did; however, he was trying to tell a story or have a meaning in doing so. I would say that morality is a constant issue in our country, especially considering our country was predominantly Christian at first. Personally I wouldn't have moved someones lifeless body for the sake of a photo, relying on the event itself or would try to find another scene.

Sum of ratings:1 (1) [Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Portraying vs Manufacturing drama

by Stanley Cates - Wednesday, February 1, 2017, 6:13 PM

As for the first question; I find myself far more repulsed, and perhaps slightly angry, with the moved body case. If I were to speculate, I would propose that in the first case (confused identity) Gardner may have written his passages first and then gone to find his pictures; I think the use of the same scene at different angles could be explained by the cumbersome nature of the contemporary photography equipment. Maybe a few edits to his words were necessary afterward in order to drive home the pathos of the war to his audience; perhaps misguided, but I can see where he was coming from; not unlike how Burns attempted to deliver pathos with the Ballou letter. However, in the case of the moved body the story is completely manufactured, as is evident by Frassanito's analysis, and I can only assume that the motive was to be dramatic and shocking, and I'd not be surprised if there was a financial influence as well; not unlike today's film industry.

As for which form of manipulation is worse I am genuinely torn and welcome some swaying input.

Sum of ratings:3 (1) [Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Re: Portraying vs Manufacturing drama

by Timothy Lucas - Sunday, February 5, 2017, 10:42 AM

I agree with giving the Gardner matter a bit of a pass, as I would think it is pretty standard for a reporter to look for a side of a story that they want to tell. One would probably not have to look far to find a setting that fits the narrative you want in these

battlefields. But even in that case you have a duty to get the details right and owe it to the fallen to get their story as close as you can to accurate.

Altering evidence, in this case, dragging a fallen soldier to a more picturesque location is sickening no matter what the context. If there is any good from this, it is that once people have looked into it a more complete and detailed truth gets told.

Sum of ratings:1 (1) [Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Re: Portraying vs Manufacturing drama

by Stanley Cates - Sunday, February 5, 2017, 6:22 PM

Just so we're clear I was absolutely not giving Gardner a pass. I was offering an explanation, not an excuse. If it was a cumbersome equipment issue then Gardner is guilty of professional negligence and I'm ill prepared to forgive him on the grounds that he's passionate about his work.

Sum of ratings:1 (1) [Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Re: Portraying vs Manufacturing drama

by Randall Broome - Sunday, February 5, 2017, 5:44 PM

I agree with you that Gardner could have just had an issue with equipment. Maybe he just made a mistake in the fact that he took the pictures and later when he developed them he could have thought it was maybe a different picture. Considering he couldn't have seen the pictures right away, like today, this is a stretch but a possibility. Or maybe it was just manipulation of evidence. However, moving the body of a soldier just for the purpose of a picture is one of the worst things you can do. It's a disgrace. I'm sure the scene was dramatic enough, with all the bodies and blood everywhere, so I don't understand doing this. It's similar in today's media, manipulating the news to make a more dramatic story. I think it is annoying because it's not always the honest thing to do.

Sum of ratings:1 (1) [Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Re: Portraying vs Manufacturing drama

by Stanley Cates - Sunday, February 5, 2017, 6:23 PM

I like your mixed up exposures hypothesis; I hadn't thought of that.

Sum of ratings:0 (1) [Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



the problem with photos

by Jordan Okoniewski - Wednesday, February 1, 2017, 7:15 PM

It is hard to say what is worse from a historical account - the manipulation of objects for photography, or the changing of ideas in written history. In both you run into the same problem, which is essentially deceit that very well could change the perceptions of history. We can all think of notorious examples, such as Holocaust denial, or Texas high school textbooks devoting less coverage to slavery and the Jim Crow period, but it can be problematic on lesser matters too. I think the problem with photographs being manipulated is that we often expect it less. It's true that with photoshop today, we can very easily manipulate images, but I'll admit that I don't often suspect things to have been photoshopped unless they are kind of inflammatory or extreme in nature. And on the other side of that, WHENEVER I see a particularly outlandish photo, I always just assume off the back that it's been photoshopped, even if it turns out to be true. It seems like the people who photoshop images and try to pass them off as news stories tend to do it with a rather transparent and inflammatory agenda, and they're not particularly known for their subtleties. That is why images, like these we just learned about, are so problematic. They're almost too innocent in they're scope for us to suspect them these days. I think this is the main risk of manipulating photos - where as we often suspect primary sources of written history to have a degree of bias ("history is written by the victors"), we tend to expect historic photos to be more objective.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: the problem with photos

by Jordan Okoniewski - Wednesday, February 1, 2017, 8:04 PM

On the other side of this, we also have to ask ourselves at what point the manipulation does irreparable damage to the subject at hand. For instance- the flag raising at Iwo Jima

One has to ask one's self though, at what point does this manipulation really become problematic. For instance, as probably a lot of you know, the famous image of the flag raising on Mt Suribachi in Iwo Jima was the second flag raising of the day, and shot well after the Mountain had been taken. Is it problematic that many Americans thought (and continue to think) that it was the first flag raising of the day? However, its still an incredibly powerful image that has been used pretty efficiently for the US military, and I would argue has helped a lot of people justify some of the more unsavory things they had to do in the war.

I'd argue that there are levels to this, and they're not easily definable. If I had to say which case is more reprehensible, I think I would have to side with the case of mistaken identity, mostly because these are people who were killed by the Confederate soldiers they're being identified as. If I had a choice between my body being moved and photographed after I died, or my body being photographed and circulated with a caption essentially saying "this guy was down with slavery"... I'd definitely opt to be dragged on the blanket

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



Re: the problem with photos

by Nicholas Esser - Friday, February 3, 2017, 6:16 PM

Perfect example with the iconic Iwo Jima flag raising! The way I look at, if I were a historian, I would only be upset if I found out that picture was actually taken on Guadalcanal or Wake Island. Comparing the two Iwo Jima photographs, I can understand wanting a re-shoot to add to what was an extreme turning point of the war in the Pacific. I'm only okay with this (and I'd like to press the term, just okay with) if; the story behind the photograph remains the same, it is accurate, and it does not disrespect the fallen whom made it possible. In my opinion, Gardener struck out in all three categories.

The altered photo of General Grant would be a great example of a picture that, I feel, doesn't mean a lot historically.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: the problem with photos

by Jared Lake - Friday, February 3, 2017, 9:06 PM

I loved your somewhat relaxed stance on "at what point is this a problem" I think it takes a somewhat realistic approach to the altering of history. Knowing that nobody is perfect, and small lies often turn to big ones. I liked the comparison to the flag raising, as I didn't actually know that. However, i feel it is important that history is transparent, so that we may learn from our mistakes.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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

Re: the problem with photos



by Jordan Okoniewski - Sunday, February 5, 2017, 10:37 PM

I agree that this is a very slippery slope; it's pretty similar to a real life test of the butterfly effect. I don't think it's ever a good thing when it happens, though some examples are more egregious than others. I think context and intent often plays a role in determining just how bad it is. I was constantly reminded while doing this exercise of how post mortem photography was incredibly trendy at the time. For those unfamiliar- people would basically pose for photographs with their dead friends and relatives. It's incredibly creepy, but kind of normalized for me the concept of people dragging around dead bodies to different parts of the battlefield to get other photos. I'm NOT defending the practice, but at least to me it seemed not out of the ordinary in everyday life back then.

here's a link in case anyone felt like they were going to sleep too well tonight <http://www.bbc.com/news/uk-england-36389581>

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: the problem with photos

by Stanley Cates - Thursday, February 2, 2017, 1:00 PM

First of all, at the risk of being seen as intemperate, I just have to say that I've always taken issue with the phrase: "History is written by the victors". There are just too many documents from the losing sides of wars throughout the ages for that to be credible; indeed, I'm sure even the textbook we're reading for this course was partially composed in reference to confederate documents. Anyway, I'll digress on that tangent no more.

I appreciate what you said about expecting the manipulation of photographs less than bias in written works. When I read that I realized that this is what I was thinking but I just couldn't quite put my finger on the articulation. You pointed out that you're much more likely to suspect a modern "outlandish" photograph than a historical photograph to be manipulated; as do I. I'm curious though, do you supposed this bias of ours stems from presentism and seeing our technology as superior to theirs and therefor being more suspicious of its implications; or do you think it is based more in the romanticizing of the past and not wanting to readily accept that someone would alter the historical record so eagerly?

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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

**Re: the problem with photos**

by Aimee Chow - Sunday, February 5, 2017, 4:10 PM

I agree with you. I don't focus on a photograph if it's photo shopped or not. I agree that we expect it less, so seeing a tampered photo over altered written history personally doesn't have a strong impact on me. Before reading your post, I believed that changing ideas in written history is worse. However, I could see how manipulating objects in photographs is more damaging. Like you mentioned, people often use photos as a primary source to refer back to history and find it useful as a visual aid. If more photographs are tampered with, more incorrect information could get out there.

Sum of ratings:1 (1) [Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**This was Expected**

by Zachary Embree - Wednesday, February 1, 2017, 7:43 PM

In the nation sundering conflict that the civil war turned into it does not surprise me that people would be looking to the new media, photographs, to reach the emotions of the populace. I can only imagine how the unprecedented cost in both men and materials would pressure members of the press into tapping the emotional roller coaster the country was going through. This was a new type of war reporting that finally brought the reality of the battlefield into the civilian home and opened a new way for a reporter to speak to a national audience. Each one forming their own narrative for the brutal images they captured, and with no real regulatory body I always imagined some would modify shots to enhance their story. A rifle placed into the hands of a shot teenager turns a random casualty into a stirring last stand for the folks back home, much like the dead "sniper" in the article.

A camera will only show what is presented but nothing says those images are immune to tampering. "Although the camera lens views the world impartially, the photographer constantly judges..."(Library of Congress). This quote captures my point very well, even though the camera is impartial the man behind it will have his own judgements and bias that effect how he takes each shot. It is up to us as the view to use various sources like the Library of Congress's website to create an informed opinion of each image.

Sum of ratings:3 (1) [Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Re: This was Expected**

by Jared Lake - Thursday, February 2, 2017, 9:45 PM

Your point in how the media swayed opinions, and likely made voters, soldiers, and mothers feel a certin way is very valid. I enjoyed that you touched on that because I definatly forgot to. I also find your point on how the camera only shows what is in

front of it and not the entire story. That is very relivent even in todays culture and I appreciate that you made that point!

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Contrasting Information

by Aimee Chow - Wednesday, February 1, 2017, 8:52 PM

Personally, I find Confused Identity the most egregious. Seeing the two photographs in comparison really opened my eyes to perspective. It's crazy how the two photos were the same shot of the same subject, just a different point of view. The one thing I noticed about the two narratives was the word choices. *A Harvest of Death* used "harsher" phrases such as "frantic efforts", "nameless graves", and even "savage wantonness of fiends". In contrast, *Field Where General Reynolds Fell. Battle-Field of Gettysburg* appeared more calm using phrases such as "falling lifeless". I personally got a more calming tone while reading this excerpt. I think it's ironic considering that this photograph physically appears darker than *Incidents of the War. A Harvest of Death*.

I believe even though some information might be altered due to different sources being tampered with, we can discover some historical truth to an extent. We can gather a general idea of what the piece of history is even though there could be some false information. The second part of the question is worded a little strange, but, I would say that changing what is written is worse. When a word is slightly changed, it could mean something totally different.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



Re: Contrasting Information

by Stanley Cates - Thursday, February 2, 2017, 1:13 PM

That's interesting that you found the picture intended to be more sinister to be less dark. I honestly didn't really find that many differences as far as the emotion of the scene in the two photographs; perhaps because I didn't have time to assess them before I learned that they were in fact the same scene. The difference in language that you describe is partially what led me to the conclusion that Gardner might have written his passages first and taken his pictures second. I'm tempted to call it blatant propaganda and a crude attempt to dehumanize the confederacy.

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

Sum of ratings:2 (1)



Re: Contrasting Information

by Zachary Embree - Sunday, February 5, 2017, 11:10 PM

I like your approach to finding the truth of what happened even when faced with possible false information. Gathering an overview of the whole situation from what information you have and be willing to change that based on new information. On another of your points your example of a word change making a situation look entirely different also in a way applies to visual media. Much like a changed word a change in the perspective when taking the a photo can seemingly change what it is representing. In that way both text and photography can be very alike.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Altered

by Bailey Tillotson - Wednesday, February 1, 2017, 11:47 PM

Yes I do think we can still learn about this time period even when photographs or data is altered. Even if something is completely changed, it's changed by the person's viewpoint or message they wished to convey at the time. Media is a big part of today's society, and certain things are altered for certain viewers to sway opinions or feelings. A hundred years from now people can see both sides of President Trump's presidency, people love and hate him. Either way people can get a sense for who he was and the impact he had on the nation in the end. History is about facts, so it's a shame when things are altered and take away from the true meaning or event; however, I still think we can learn from everything we see and read, whether it's about the time, event, author/photographer or the viewers it reached.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: Altered

by Aimee Chow - Sunday, February 5, 2017, 3:48 PM

I am on the same page as you. I think we can still learn if history is altered, as long as we get the concept of the facts. It's crazy that what we're going through right now will be in history books. About Trump's presidency, media will truly influence what will be taught in classes in the future. But yes, I agree that we can still learn from altered history.

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

Sum of ratings:1 (1)



Re: Civil War Photography-Altered photos, Past midnight, sorry!

by Jared Lake - Thursday, February 2, 2017, 1:49 AM

I find the idea of 19th centry altered photos to be somewhat interesting. In a comparison to modern day altered photos. I feel that modern day photoshop is used to spread lies and false media; yet i feel that if a photo was modified back in the 19th centry it was mostly for entertainment and somewhat of a joke to them. I dont feel strongly that they wanted to spread false history and I dont feel that it compares to modern day pranksters. I feel that the idea of spreading false history was more of a concern before the internet. I feel like we as a society dont nessicarily care as much now because of the vast amounts of infromation we store and can access quickly.

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

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



Re: Civil War Photography-Altered photos, Past midnight, sorry!

by Stanley Cates - Thursday, February 2, 2017, 1:34 PM

You said:"I feel that modern day photoshop is used to spread lies and false media; yet i feel that if a photo was modified back in the 19th centry it was mostly for entertainment and somewhat of a joke to them".

I'm interested to know why you feel that way. What is different about now versus then that leads to your conclusion that what Gardner did was a "joke"?

You said: "I dont feel strongly that they wanted to spread false history and I dont feel that it compares to modern day pranksters".

But is it "false history" if it just happened a few days ago? Isn't that just fake news? Don't we still have the problem of fake news today? Isn't it in fact a popular subject lately?

You said: "I feel that the idea of spreading false history was more of a concern before the internet. I feel like we as a society dont nessicarily care as much now because of the vast amounts of infromation we store and can access quickly".

But doesn't the internet actually make it easier to spread false history? I can publish any written content that I desire on the internet and no one is going to step in, in any serious capacity, to correct my misinformation. For crying out loud there's an entire movement on the internet that pins Hillary Clinton as the head of a child sex ring run out of a DC

pizza shop and people took it so seriously that a man stormed in with a rifle and fired in the general direction of employees; but spreading false information, and by extension false history, isn't a concern on the internet?

<http://www.nydailynews.com/news/politics/pizzagate-clinton-conspiracy-theory-led-dc-shooting-article-1.2899371>

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



Re: Civil War Photography-Altered photos, Past midnight, sorry!

by Jared Lake - Friday, February 3, 2017, 9:09 PM

I only meant that there is a lot more false media going around in modern days due to how easy it is.

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

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



Manipulative Motives

by Timothy Lucas - Friday, February 3, 2017, 11:57 AM

The manipulation of evidence is something we should be concerned about, and we should always try to understand the intentions of those who present us with information. This is especially true after we have learned that what we see and hear may not only be slightly less than accurate, but also designed to influence in a certain way. I granted a little bit of a pass on the Ballou letter last week because at this point the letter has become more than what it was when it was created, and many have given it a life of its own that provides a way for people outside of that time to attempt to understand how a soldier felt about his duty and his family.

Intentional manipulation of a photograph however is a higher level of deception that should not be so easily forgiven. It is a collective human experience that oral and written stories get passed down, each time changing a little with the speaker or with whom ever gets to rewrite or interpret the text. Photographs are relatively new medium that in this scenario attempt to convey the brutality and senselessness of battle. While they achieve the goal of being gruesome their place in history is tarnished because of either poor research at the time, or a desire to tell a story that does not fit the visual. For me *The Case of the Moved Body* becomes the most offensive as stated here, "...After taking pictures of the dead soldier...the two photographers noticed the picturesque Sharpshooter's Den...and moved the corpse to this rocky niche and photographed him again." This analysis by Frassanito points out several inconsistencies that betray the memory of what really happened, possibly with a profit motive stemming from getting that good shot.

One thing I like about history is the idea that I am giving voice to those who believed in something and acted, fought or even died in a moment that invariably affected my life and reality. The least I can do is attempt to understand why and give proper voice to those passed and hope a better understanding will come out of what is learned and the enlightened will either do better or not repeat the mistakes. This cannot be done properly when our tools are corrupted and manipulation takes precedent over an honest analysis and retelling of a story.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



Re: Civil War Photography

by Randall Broome - Saturday, February 4, 2017, 5:33 PM

I think it is terrible either way to alter images or alter the text for the image. In either situation the viewer is not getting the whole truth and this can be a bad thing. I think moving the body by Gardener was definitely worse. Disrupting a corpse of a dead soldier just to get a good photo is such a dishonorable thing to do. I think just photographing the realism and what actually happened would have been dramatic enough. This day and age we definitely need to question everything because of all the technology and photoshop. I had no idea that they did something similar back then. It was definitely an eye opener to read those studies.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: Civil War Photography

by Zachary Embree - Sunday, February 5, 2017, 10:30 PM

In the interest of understanding the mindset behind why the photographer would move a body, I think we need to put ourselves in the mind of a man during that time period. After looking through the background materials provided for this article I think that whatever he did came from more than just stirring up drama. This was a man who had been following a devastating conflict and feels a need to make some kind of impact on the public back home. Moving a body to bring into focus the negative side of the war might have met a lot less to man who had been seeing bodies carted off the field for hours.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: Civil War Photography

by Jared Lake - Friday, February 17, 2017, 7:30 PM

I agree that dishonoring a fallen soldier is utterly disrespectful. But in my own studies I have learned that media wins wars more than soldiers do. While our brave men and women are out there protecting our freedom, the media can either help them or hurt them dramatically. I feel that back in the civil war era, in order to have a shot at winning the war, the alteration of key text and placement was entirely necessary.

Sum of ratings: -

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



Changing What is Written vs. Imagery

by Bailey Tillotson - Sunday, February 5, 2017, 10:08 PM

I wouldn't say that there is a difference, simply because everyone learns better if different ways. Personally I learn visually, which has helped me immensely in sports. However, if I had to choose one I would say written or revealed print would be a little more impactful when it came to history. Types of imagery have been around for a long time as well, but written work is what is spread around the world so much more. Then again, images can say a lot without words. I took another history class where we were given an image to write up on. At first I was confused about what to do, and wrote up purely on what I saw and assumed of the context. Soon after, I realized that we were to look up the historical document and get the title and history behind it. I found that my views were changed on some pictures after I learned the name of it. Sometimes I preferred what I had assumed of the picture, I was left to have more imagination and freedom of thought. But when text was involved I was limited specifically what it was titled and the background/meaning of it. In the end, I feel text is solidifying, and has the majority of facts when it comes to history. I would say images rely on emotion more, and try to tell a story with that one image. While text is more of a factual based method of history. At my conclusion, I find it hard to decide which is more impactful when changed.

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

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



Different Mediums

by Zachary Embree - Sunday, February 5, 2017, 10:40 PM

When the information made for public consumption is altered what media that information is in means no difference in my view. Putting one type of media over the other would in a way indicate that it has a greater ability to impact the public. That is an idea I find often repeated by some but not one I agree with. With the proper creator any media can effect the public as well as any other. For example a brutal description of the seemingly endless warfare tearing across the country can paint a picture in the public mind as harsh as the photos in this collection.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: Different Mediums

by Jared Lake - Friday, February 17, 2017, 7:28 PM

While I agree with your points on how the media can paint a nasty picture, I believe that as a modern society we can be coming away from that. I'm not entirely sure if your post was meant to be past or present tense, but I think that today at least we are in a world of such open and free information that almost everything soon becomes transparent.

Sum of ratings: -

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



The Truth of the War

by Zachary Embree - Sunday, February 5, 2017, 11:00 PM

In any society effected by political and emotional pressures some of the recollections will have a degree of bias. It is times like this I refer to some choice advise given to me by one of my earliest history teachers, it is very important to not only analysis the information but gather a variety of sources. When somebody does the former it involves taking a critical look at the information taking into account the circumstances under which it has been taken and kept. An example of this was demonstrated in the article with observations like this, "The type of weapon seen in these photographs was not used by sharpshooters" (Frassanito). Here a historian used his knowledge of the subject and looked for inconsistencies in the photo.

The second method, using a variety of sources is something that we are using in this course. To learn about what really happened we look at historians that use a variety of sources and critical reasoning to fill in the gaps to get an overview of the conflict. In addition we have the exact of accounts of those that were caught in the fighting for each side, willingly or not. This way we as the audience and students can find our own inconsistencies and meanings behind what we learn.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Confused Identity or Moved Body, which is more egregious?

by Bailey Tillotson - Sunday, February 5, 2017, 11:52 PM

I would say that Confused Identity was more upsetting and egregious for me. I'm not happy with a fallen soldier's body being moved for the sake of a photo, but I can see

why he did it- doesn't make it okay, but still. Moving a body or viewpoint for an image doesn't change what happened, it would just make you feel slightly different about the event/act. When it comes to historical accuracy and facts, Confused Identity would be more of an issue for me. Moving a body for images is a morality issue, when not being accurate of where someone died is something that would impact the reliability of the information we are given. In the end I would rather see the raw true facts no matter what or where.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: Civil War Photography-Altering history

by Jared Lake - Friday, February 17, 2017, 7:25 PM

I feel that the very idea of altering history is so faught against, but it is also unavoidable. No matter what we do or how hard we fight against it, theres really no way to avoid the eventual distortion of even our own stories. Although I believe we cant deny the inevitable, I feel that we should delay it as long as humanly possible. The problem comes in the form of not being able to know what from history could be true and what from history could be entirely made up. I think it seems easy to think about what might be totally false until the point where you start looking at different photos and documents. Without a total and complete set of historical facts and an official archive, its nearly impossible to tell the difference.

Sum of ratings: -

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

◀ [Civil War Photography](#)

[Moodle Docs for this page](#)

[Accessibility at Lane](#)

You are logged in as Joe Escobar (Log out)

HST 209 W17 (Escobar 31664)

