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A project designed for the University of Manchester’s “School-University Partnerships Initiative” and Secondary Schools in Greater Manchester for 2014, with the support of the school’s teaching staff in the Humanities (Geography and History)
Immediate Purpose:

to provide programme in culture and ecology that complements the aims of Geography Stage 3.

Owen, A et al. 2009. GCSE Geography for WJECA

Wider aims of “human geography” and/or “historical ecology” relating to the course
Wider aims of “human geography” (or “historical ecology” relating to the course include to:

1. Explore case studies of how different cultures have related to their surroundings
2. Comparing ecological histories of different times and places;
3. Examine how what we can learn about adaptive strategies in different times and places can be used today to develop new solutions to social and ecological problems.
Key components

Presentations on how different cultures have related to their surroundings – with a focus on topics covered in the course.

Student projects on relationships between culture, technology and society, which will be presented in a seminar and posters

A half day workshop to explore how we can use what we learn about adaptive strategies in different times and places today to develop new solutions to social and ecological problems
Presentations on how different cultures have related to their surroundings focus on topics covered in the course:

A the physical world

land, water
climate change
rapid environmental change – plate margins, volcanic zones, etc

B culture and globalisation

settlement and mobility
population
globalisation processes, predecessors and diverse current forms and impacts
development (mapping interfaces) cultural, social and life quality challenges and possibilities
(cf Owen 2009).
The workshop brings together other aspects of the programme to explore the question:

**How we can use what we learn about adaptive strategies in different times and places today to develop new solutions to social and ecological problems?**
Introduction – dynamic relationships between nature and culture

Some challenges:
Ideas that nature and culture are altogether separate
Ideas that past experiences are not important today
Ideas that local contexts are not important for understanding wider processes
New views based on concerns about:

Climate change and sustainable development

Relationships between ecological and social problems

Widening participation in policy processes
Climate change –
cultural response and social change
– examples from the Upper Palaeolithic

- **Diversification**: to counteract scarcity of one resource through recourse to others.
- **Mobility**: to even out spatial discrepancies in resource availability.
- **Storage**: to even out temporal discrepancies in resources availability by 'saving it for later'.
- **Exchange**: to balance temporal, special and social variability in resources availability.
exchange

red shell necklaces

Trobiand Islands

New Guinea

white shell armbands
diversification
mobility
storage
Climate change – cultural response and social change – examples from the upper paleolithic
Upper Paleolithic (52,000 – 12,000 years ago – ‘BP’): A period of

climate change from the last Glacial Maximum to the rise in temperatures that began 12,000 years ago.

change in human life ways and societies between around 35,000 and 10,000 years ago, which gave rise to many aspects of cultures today.

cultural innovations – especially in arts expressing experiences of relationships between people and their surroundings.
Upper palaeolithic glaciers and art sites
Cave formation processes

(relating to the topic of change in the physical world)

- for example, stalagmites and stalagtites
There is also much evidence of portable art
Researchers have focused much attention on questions about the roles of the arts and exchange relationships in changes that took place in cultural adaptations to climate change.
Cosquer Cave
Cosquer Cave
Chauvet-Pont-d'Arc Grotte
Further study by French archaeologist Jean Clottes has revealed much about the site, though the dating has been the matter of some dispute.

The cave contains the oldest known cave paintings, based on radiocarbon dating of "black from drawings, from torch marks and from the floors", according to Jean Clottes.

Clottes concludes that the "dates fall into two groups, one centred around 27,000-26,000 BP and the other around 32,000-30,000 BP." As of 1999, the dates of 31 samples from the cave had been reported.
The Chauvet Cave is situated above the valley created by the Ardèche River.

It is very large and the condition of the artworks found is extraordinary.

Based on radiocarbon dating, the cave appears to have been occupied by humans during two Upper Palaeolithic periods (Aurignacian and Gravettian tools have been found).

The later occupation is also evidenced by child's footprints, the charred remains of ancient hearths and carbon smoke stains from torches that lit the caves.
The soft, clay-like floor of the cave retains the paw prints of cave bears along with large, rounded, depressions that are believed to be the "nests" where the bears slept. Fossilized bones are abundant and include the skulls of cave bears and the horned skull of an ibex.

Hundreds of animal paintings have been catalogued, depicting at least 13 different species, including some rarely or never found in other ice age paintings.

Much Paleolithic art centres on hunted animals - i.e. horses, cattle, reindeer, etc. -

Chauvet Cave are covered with predatory animals: lions, panthers, bears, owls, and hyenas. There are also remarkable portraits of rhinoceros.

Throughout the material surfaces (ground) play crucial roles.
As with much cave art, there are no paintings of complete human figures, although there is one possible partial "Venus" figure, a figure that may be part human – part bison, as well as diverse hand prints and other marks that may be considered as such.

Abstract markings—lines and dots—are found throughout the cave.

This combination of subjects has led a number of researchers to argue that these images may have had ritual, shamanic, or magical roles.
Summary of cultural response and social change – examples from the upper paleolithic
Current usefulness
Concluding suggestions - about common themes
Seeing and Believing – Printing Images of “Marvelous Facts and Miraculous Evidence” in Early Modern Europe
stephanie.koerner(at)manchester.ac.uk
The publication of Mary Douglas’ book, *Purity and Danger* (1966) marked a turning point in the developments we have been considering.

Amongst other things, it drew attention the importance of the roles that images of the body have played in the expression not only of social and cosmological ideals, but also of threats to these.

In Douglas, beliefs about what is pure and what is polluting (and the practices they motivate) are embedded in cultural values and cosmology.

This pattern is not restricted to any particular ‘type’ of society – it can be found at the heart of the dynamics of modern science, technology and society.
According to contributors to “monster studies,” Cohen (1996) and Mittmann (2013), monsters have frequently possessed one or more of the following attributes, including:

- bodies with cultural structures and compositions
- capacities to escape – this is sometimes known only later when people discover a re-appearance
- roles as harbingers or portents of crises
- dwelling at boundaries between fundamental differences
- policing borders of the possible
- inspiring fear as well as desire – the forbidden can attract
- acting as agents on thresholds of becoming (Cohen 1996: 5-21)
Concluding suggestions - about insights of hitherto eclipsed aspects of the histories of art and science
Perhaps, rethinking patterns of continuity and change in practices of “copying” images by hand in order to “hand them on” rather than “publish” them, and in practices motivated by understandings “image production as culture”

can contribute to alternatives to models that

“distinguish sharply between a modern participatory culture that was incapable of opening up a psychic distance from the chronologically distant past,

and a modern culture that constituted itself precisely by creating just that distance the would reinforce the metaphor of the Renaissance as a threshold between Middle ages and modernity” (Wood 2008: 83).