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6 Context

Context has not drifted far from its Latin root, contextere, "to weave together, interweave, join together, compose," meanings whose spirit is retained in vernacular terms such as "spinning yarns," "weaving lies," and "fabricating tales." Context contains the word text, which stems from texere, "to weave." Like textile weavings, texts are coherent, detachable, importable items with careers of appearance in different contexts. We tend to think of the text as the fixed component and of contexts as the variable settings into which the text can be placed. The relationship between context and text is far more complex than such a nested model suggests, however. To say that something has been "taken out of context" is in fact to say that a prior context has been usurped by a later one (Young 1985:119). What is of interest in contextual analysis is not simply the mechanics of inserting old texts into new situations but the strategic ways in which performances weave together contexts of all sorts, including the contexts for folklore and ethnography.

Frames, Frameworks, and the Making of Meaning

At close range, context is a frame of reference created in order to constitute and interpret an object of attention. Viewed more broadly, contexts model the master frameworks that relate nature and society. Implicit here is the concept of framing, which Erving Goffman developed into a powerful tool for exploring the interrelations of alternative domains and everyday life. As adapted by folklorists, this concept draws on Goffman's synthesis of Gregory Bateson's theory of metacommunication and Alfred Schutz's phenomenological sociology (Goffman 1974:2-8). The basic metaphor is that of a picture on a wall. The frame around the picture distinguishes the picture from its surroundings, invoking a different set of interpretive rules for what is inside the frame. Deploying this metaphor, analysts have looked at how expressive forms are first set apart from and then related to the flow of ordinary events.

A performance begins with an act of framing that separates it from the surrounding flow of events, opening onto a conjured imaginary realm. Frames can take the form of physical boundaries, like the curtains on a stage or the covers of a mystery novel. Or frames can be conceptual in nature, enclosing a performance, for instance, by identifying it as a fairy tale ("Once upon a time") or a game of make-believe ("Let's pretend"). Performers construct performance by shifting attention back and forth between the frame and the imaginary world enclosed within it. I once watched in fascination as my six-year-old daughter and two of her friends conjured and inhabited an imaginary animal hospital, framing it as an alternative realm through repeated use of the word "pretend." "Pretend you're my two puppies," said my daughter to her friends. "Ruff! Ruff! Ruff!" responded one puppy. "Pretend I'm the animal doctor now to help you guys because you're sick," my daughter said. "Pretend you carry me out of this corner because it was dangerous to me," replied the other, who then draped herself across a chair, wearing goggles. "Pretend your eyes didn't work," said the vet, hammering on the goggles with a felt mallet.

Noticing me, the puppy undergoing treatment said, "Would you please go away?"

"Why?" I asked.

"Because it will feel more like a real game," she explained.

As I rose to leave, the other child offered, "You can watch us, but don't let us see you."

"You can go in the other room and sneak and spy," supplied my daughter. But the first child held her ground. "Just go away completely," she insisted.

Note that there are two objects of attention here: an imagined alternate domain [the animal hospital] and a frame that marks the alternate domain as "make-believe"—"a game," as one little girl said. Together these resemble the two events that Mikhail Bakhtin has identified as making up the novel: "We have before us two events: the event that is narrated in the work and the event of narration itself [we ourselves participate in the latter as listeners or readers]; these events take place in different times [which are marked by different durations as well] and in different places, but at the same time these two events are indissolubly united in a single
but complex event that we might call the work in the totality of all its events" [Bakhtin 1981:233]. This principle of “double-grounding” [Bauman 1986:112] works for any object of interpretation, whether the object is a novel, a folktale, an artifact, or a game of make-believe.

The children's “game” pivots between the immediate situation of three youngsters playing a game in one child's bedroom (the “event of narration”) and the alternate time and space of the animal hospital (the “narrated event”). Through a series of repeated utterances (“Pretend...”), the three children mark off the boundaries of an imaginary world, transforming themselves and their surroundings into puppies in an animal hospital being treated by an animal doctor. The production in its entirety is sustained by a shifting of attention from the imaginary to its framing devices and back. Set off from the ordinary flow of events, the imaginary ground is in the game is held open by the command “pretend.” Its occupants are six-year-olds become puppies and an animal doctor. My attention to their game as a detached observer impeded the children's absorption in their imaginary, however. They addressed this crisis of attention by shifting their focus to the game and negotiating the conditions under which spectatorship might be acceptable.

One might be tempted to see the game (the event of narration) as the context for the animal hospital (the narrated event), but in fact the narrated event itself can be viewed as providing a remote context for the specific occasion of interpretation that occurs in each event of narration [Young 1985]. In other words, the relationship between a text and its context is more complex and dynamic than scholars once believed. There is, as Goodwin and Duranti write, an “intricate and subtle relationship between the interpretive frames we use in everyday life... and the implicit power relations that each frame implies, exploits, and, at the same time, helps reproduce” [Goodwin and Duranti 1992:31]. Of special interest to our analysis here is the relationship between the event of narration (in this case, the game) and the domain it anchors (the animal hospital). The remote context of the animal hospital playfully models what Goffman termed a “primary framework” [1974], a widely accepted conceptual apparatus for relating nature to society. Here a time of healing unfolds in the space of the animal hospital, where a licensed practitioner acts upon the body. 2

When we frame social processes and structures of power and authority through game and narrative, we hold them at a distance for inspection. This framing is essential for making the meanings that situate us in a social world that is already the effect of primary frameworks. Schutz argues that meaning is available to the reflective glance alone, a glance that can be cast only on experiences framed and set in the past. We cannot reflect on the flow of events in which we are absorbed [1970:63]. The capacity to shift our attention from absorption in a conjured world (the animal hospital) to abstract reflection on how we produce that world (the game) is central to our ability to frame experience and thus imbue it with meaning. This ability to shift between states of consciousness enables us not only to frame our imaginaries (“Pretend...”) but to map our imaginaries onto nature and society.

Context, then, is a means of relating an alternative domain to the occasion of its conjuring, whether through performance, exhibition, or written or verbal analysis. How does this concept of context align with distinctions folklorists make among kinds of context? Dan Ben-Amos, for example, describes two types of context: contexts of situation and contexts of culture. The context of situation is “the narrowest, most direct context for speaking folklore.” The context of culture, on the other hand, constitutes “the broadest contextual circle which embraces all other possible contexts,” including “the reference to, and the representation of, the shared knowledge of speakers, their conventions of conduct, belief systems, language metaphors and speech genres, their historical awareness and ethical and judicial principles” [Ben-Amos 1993:215-16].

Situating “context of situation” within “context of culture” has been a key practice of contextualism. 3 This practice is evident in the emerging arena of heritage tourism, where folklorists work explicitly to develop “cultural context” for interpreting local history and lifeways to the public. For instance, the Pennsylvania State Heritage Park Program defines “cultural context” as “a body of information drawing on ethnographic and historical sources about a region’s settlement patterns, social organization, and folklore. A cultural context will provide information about the daily patterns of activity experienced by people of different social groups at particular periods of time, covering such elements as occupational, domestic, religious, and social life; sense of place, and attitudes toward, and interaction with the built and natural environment” [Commonwealth of Pennsylvania 1991]. While admitting to the practical necessity of such definitions, many scholars acknowledge a risk in first reifying “culture” and then obscuring its status as a bounded entity imagined and defined by the ethnographer [Marcus 1989]. The problem occurs when we begin to operate in what Victor Turner calls the indicative mode [1981]. Here the subjunctive “pretend” drops out of view and “culture” is reified into a whole that exists apart from domains such as science (within which ethnographers have historically operated), technology, politics, economics, and other spheres of endeavor that powerfully...
shape a hegemonic order. What disappears from our awareness is the fabricated nature of the frameworks separating these domains—and with it, the possibility of alternatives.

Everyday speech is saturated with interpretive frames that mediate our understandings of nature and society. Such interpretive frames contextualize the situations in which we find ourselves, enabling us to hold the world of daily life at a distance for inspection and evaluation. We may invoke a sports or game metaphor to cast an inchoate situation in terms of an organizing totality set in an alternative time. A person who promises more than he delivers may be said to be “all windup and no pitch”; someone who cheats may be said to be “touching the ball in the rough”; a dupe may “swallow the bait—hook, line, and sinker”; an arbitrator may “finesse” a deal. As my daughter and her friends enchanted their surroundings, transforming themselves into puppies, a chair into an operating table, goggle into the sign of disease, we fleetingly use proverbs to map remote contexts onto immediate situations. Motorists making a long journey may disagree on whether to take the time to patch a tire or simply rely on the spare to get them more quickly to their destination. “A stitch in time saves nine,” declares the traveler who prefers to patch the tire. “But we’ve got to make hay while the sun shines,” counters the impatient companion. The two proverbial expressions conjure competing narrative contexts for the situation they gloss, even as the situation contextualizes the proverbs. Here each saying appeals to a remote context, with the goal of placing an object of attention within a larger narrative whole. Invoking the remote context is a way of enchanting the world, if only for a moment.

We might see such speech acts as efforts to recover a larger context, to place events within a stock sequence that justifies our actions here and now. The repeated recourse to such artful expressions helps constitute reality and its premises, ensuring that dominant imaginaries maintain their hold on the world, shaping society and culture. Proverbs create meaning not so much by setting a present experience in the past as by placing it within an alternate temporal and narrative framework that implies a given outcome.

Situating spaces and players within forms of time, stock temporal sequences, such narrative frameworks render an inchoate world coherent. Bakhtin used the term “chronotope”—time-space—to describe the conjunction of forms of time with particular spaces (1981). Forms of time—those predictable sequences such as biography, the career, the calendar year, the journey, or the daily round—are associated with certain spaces (places of birth and burial, the sites of morning and evening rituals, seasonal activities). In literature, particular forms of time unfold in specific settings; quest narratives or picaresque novels, for example, take place on the road. In the life of a nation such as the United States—a “collective individual” (Handler 1988)—time takes its shape from the notion of progress, a sequence of economic and individual development, of continual advancement away from primitive conditions toward more civilized ones. The “path of progress” metaphor represents this sequence as a journey through space. This powerful narrative structure rationalizes the disparity between rural poverty and urban wealth as a natural relationship between cities, those “developed” centers of progress, and the “developing” hinterlands on the margins.

The American narrative of progress provides a remote context for a wide variety of texts and performances that work the way proverbs do, bringing remote contexts to bear on the here and now. The national media, for instance, appeal to the narrative of progress in accounts of Appalachia as an enclave of poverty in a land of plenty, a destitute region in dire need of outside assistance—from industry, the government, and a host of charitable groups. David Whisnant has identified an “allegory of loss and rescue” as the primary legitimizing narrative for missionary work in the mountains—one that, by failing to address the underlying causes of poverty, helps to sustain the status quo (1989).

How do the contexts of culture that folklorists, heritage workers, and other ethnographers create relate to this master framework of progress? Do they simply replicate it, through allegories of loss and rescue, or do they hold the framework out for critical inspection?

Folklore emerged as both discipline and disciplinary object in tandem with the Enlightenment's project of supplanting traditional authority by the authority of enlightened reason (Bauman 1992b). As Max Horkheimer and Theodor Adorno argue (1972 [1944]), the hegemonic order sustained by Enlightenment principles relies on a process of disenchantment that strips the world of traditional meanings. Through the mathematical, absolute modes of measure that displace mimetic, relational modes, the world is then reenchanted as the embodiment of Enlightenment categories. Having "extinguished any trace of its own self-consciousness," as Horkheimer and Adorno put it, the Enlightenment frustrates the effort to discern and critique the context of culture—a context made up of (and by) the Enlightenment and its disenchantment-based practices of domination.

Contextualism emerged over the course of the twentieth century alongside a growing awareness of the Enlightenment's process of mastering parts of the world by isolating them and recontextualizing them ac-
cording to a logic of classification. Viewed in terms of this history, contextualism in folklore could be seen as a practice of reenchanting a panoply of texts, artifacts, and practices. Along with this effect comes the practice of folklore as the retrieval of the meanings people create, through performance, in response to the Enlightenment and its particular ways of modernizing the world and its Others.

The concept of culture itself is a legacy of the Enlightenment's separation of modernity's cultural aspect from its economic aspect (which Marshall Berman characterizes as a split between modernism and modernization). Raymond Williams and other cultural critics have observed that in tandem with the Enlightenment's reconfiguration of knowledge and the Industrial Revolution's literal displacement of people, romantic structure of feeling came into vogue, "the assertion of nature against industry and of poetry against trade, the isolation of humanity and community into the idea of culture" (R. Williams 1973:79).

What was left over after science carved up the world became the domain of antiquarians, forerunners of folklorists who dealt initially with a special kind of part—such fragments of vanishing culture as ballads, folktales, and superstitions. Over the past century such fragments have repeatedly been lifted out of originary "contexts" and recontextualized within imaginaries that pit culture against commerce and the coherence of preindustrial lifeways against the fragmentation of modernity. Appalachia, for example, has long provided fodder for one American imaginary as a locus of preindustrial culture (Batteau 1990). Though such imaginaries have flexed with the times, their continuing role has been to mark the eternal and the immutable under chronic conditions of upheaval (Harvey 1989:18).

**Contextualism in Folklore Studies:**

**From Evoking Atmosphere to Launching Critique**

As the Enlightenment placed the production of knowledge and wealth within an unfolding story of nations on the path of progress, it spatialized progress itself. The Enlightenment's master narratives created a disciplinary "field," populated by peasants or other "Others," for the collection and documentation of folklore, conferring significance on the rescue of cultural fragments as part of a continuing struggle against the fragmentation, ephemerality, and chaotic flux endemic to capitalism. Underlying the nineteenth-century collection of texts was the premise that cultural fragments were windows onto earlier stages of civilization. In keeping with the narrative of evolutionary anthropology, for instance, the Bureau of American Ethnology documented Indian culture as "a window onto the savage phase of a people's evolution" (Brady 1988:40).

"Context," a twentieth-century insight, has several aspects that we can distinguish in general terms as modernist and postmodernist. In what might be seen as an early modernist manifesto for contextualist studies, Bronislaw Malinowski complained about the anthropological practice of detaching cultural expressions from their originating milieus (a practice, we might note, that assisted the Enlightenment's disenchantment of the world): "The stories live in native life and not on paper, and when a scholar darts them down without being able to evoke the atmosphere in which they flourish he has given us but a mutilated bit of reality" (1946 [1923]: 104; cited in Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1975:215 and in Bascom 1965 [1954]). In its modernist aspect, contextualism supplanted the evolutionary narrative with "a relativist apparatus in which all frames and concepts could be seen as 'culture bound' and dependent on 'context' and 'perspective'" (Stewart 1996:25).

"Atmosphere" notwithstanding, in the decades that followed, culture remained "an object of analysis that was whole, bounded, and discrete" (Stewart 1996:25). The value of building knowledge through the collection of ethnographic data went unquestioned. The practice was still one of detachment from the time-space of the ethnographic encounter and insertion into the time-space of civilization on the path of progress. During the New Deal, folklorists working for the Federal Writers Project (FWP) of the Works Progress Administration (WPA) rejected the model of folklore as a window onto the past, conceiving it rather as mirror of the present. As Jerrold Hirsch points out, whereas antimodernists such as John Lomax had seen diversity and change as antithetical to "real" American folklore, modernists like Benjamin Botkin saw folklore as a means of developing American identity by linking it with cultural diversity (Hirsch 1988:54). Thus Federal Writers Project state guidebooks allowed Americans riding in their automobiles to become connoisseurs of cultural pluralism, one of America's definitive features (Hirsch 1988:53). The guides offered middle-class tourist-readers a transcendent view of picturesque poverty and American folk culture. As Hirsch argues, "The FWP was unable to face the issue of whether the revitalized American culture they hoped for could be created without changes in social and economic arrangements" (1988:52).

A more postmodern contextualism emerged in a climate of increasing discomfort with the transcendent narratives legitimizing such efforts as those of the FWP and other culture workers. Writing of the disjunctures between the historical creation of museum displays and the contem-
temporary reception of them, Robert Cantwell argues that “the impulse to contextualize suggests that the force of the display no longer resides in a kind of admiration for the deeds and powers that brought the specimen or artifact into the museum—an admiration that implies a willingness to tolerate an overt assertion of class distinction” (1993:63).

The 1960s and 1970s, exploding with “rage against humanism and the Enlightenment legacy” (Harvey 1989), challenged such overt assertions of class. Various disciplines—from philosophy and linguistics to architecture and urban planning—mounted efforts to situate meanings locally and historically, to draw inspiration from the vernacular, to de-center the Enlightenment’s fixed point of view (Harvey 1989). In folklore Richard Dorson noted the emergence of a “contextual movement” distinguished by its “insistence that the folklore concept apply not to a text but to an event in time in which a tradition is performed or communicated. Hence the whole performance or communicative act must be recorded” (1972:45–46).

In its postmodernist aspect, contextualism retains the emphasis on the situated and contingent and dwells on how texts and objects are deployed to create meaning. Here folklore is neither culture’s residue nor its reflection. Rather, folklore, like any other cultural production, powerfully constitutes reality. In this vein, Bauman distinguishes between “outside in” and “inside out” approaches to the study of performance. The “outside in” approach constructs “a kind of contextual surround for the folklore forms and texts under examination.” The inside-out approach, by contrast, uses “the text itself as a point of departure,” “allowing it to index dimensions of context as the narrator himself forges links of contextualization to give shape and meaning to his expression” (1992a:142). In effect, the text becomes a tool, pivoting between the remote and immediate contexts it ties together.

This inside-out perspective radically recasts folklore’s relationship to culture as constitutive and productive. We deploy folklore in the production of alternative domains that effect outcomes in everyday life. From classic examples of such scholarship: A woman in Canada uses a parable to model and defuse a volatile family situation (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1975). Conversationists in Devon, England, produce and co-inhabit their locale through a series of stories (Young 1987). Elders in New Mexico constitute “las platicas de los viejitos de antes,” the talk of the elders of bygone days, as a domain by speaking it (Briggs 1988). Fox hunters in southern New Jersey engender a world of the chase and arrange society and history around it (Hufford 1992). In each instance, people shape society through performances of folklore. An individual performing a par-

able clarifies the course a man should take to restore harmonious relations with his family. Friends telling stories in conversation order themselves into tellers and hearers of stories that bear on their social standing. The genres performed by New Mexican elders—proverbs, legends, scriptural allusions, hymns, prayers, and jests—powerfully produce the context within which their younger audiences form their social identities. Chasing foxes and telling stories about fox chases, working-class men in New Jersey continually create and re-create a society uniquely grounded in Pine Barrens history and spaces.

Thinking of folklore as constitutive, we render suspect the ideal of “decontaminated critique” (Stewart 1996)—an ideal that upholds a fiction of the scientist as detached, unbiased observer. Yet close examination of how people produce meaning through performance in particular situations makes it clear that the ethnographic event is a cultural production in its own right. As coproducers of ethnographic knowledge, ethnographers not only help to shape the content and structure of the ethnographic event (Haring 1972, Hymes 1975) but contribute stories to imaginaries under construction (Young 1987, Briggs 1988), becoming both subjects and objects in the production of local imaginaries (Stewart 1996).

Contextualism offers a way of relating folklore and folklore scholarship—as aspects of modernity—to continuing processes of modernization. As the twenty-first century begins, social contexts are implicated in the shifting times and spaces of capitalism lurching from one “crisis of overaccumulation” to another (Harvey 1989). The forms folklorists study are outcroppings not of vanished civilizations but of what John Dorst terms “the vast and pervasive cultural formation of advanced consumer capitalism” (1999:9). Poised on the cusp of the declining nation-state and the rising global economic order, scholars are turning their attention to how folklore produces locality as a context impinged on by the contexts of region, nation, and globe (Appadurai 1996). Context itself has become an object of study.

**Enclosures, Scientific Enclaves, and the Soul of the Nation-State**

What is the relationship between situated cultural productions conjured in everyday life and larger domains such as “Art,” “Science,” “America,” and “Appalachia,” imaginaries naturalized as if they were independent givens existing in the world “out there”? Like six-year-old girls conjuring a make-believe animal hospital, we use language to conjure reality, inscribing it onto our surroundings. A crucial difference between fictive
and nonfictive domains resides in the conjurers' inclination to expose their shaping hand ("Pretend...!") or to conceal it, imputing the way things are to nature or the market or some other power beyond anyone's control. Removing the markers of human agency, we lose sight of the possibility of alternatives.

The children's imaginary animal hospital grants a peek at a realm in which science is authoritative, magically vested with the power to improve on an imperfect creation. But when the children conjure their domain, their use of the word "pretend" reminds us that this is one possibility among many. Somewhat analogously, we conjure the domains of scientific knowledge through a continual process of enclosure. Through acts that "replace real space and time with classificatory, tabular spaces" [Stewart 1996:71], we create science's physical and conceptual clearings. Enclosure supplies an apt metaphor for the decontextualization against which contextualists rebelled. The metaphor of enclosure keeps in view the link between decontextualized cultural fragments and the "relentless displacement" that Dan Rose says gives rise to the global marketplace's "pure product." Chronic displacement of traditions, beliefs, values, and natural objects is accomplished through language that "endlessly reconfigures the planetary landscape and reunifies the human species within a highly differentiated frame of frames that lies concealed from us and, alternately, openly defies us to understand it" [Rose 1991:112]. Revealing the "frame of frames" that relentlessly transforms and encloses the world is one challenge for contextualism and for public folklore.

We produce and distribute knowledge and wealth through a similar process of enclosure, which Cantwell terms "the parent of Culture" [1993]. Harvey divides this process of decontextualizing and recontextualizing into three stages: de-territorialization, a stripping away of prior significance, and re-territorialization [1989:264]. In the early stages of industrial capitalism and the Enlightenment, a still-ongoing process of enclosure began whose object was the commons—the "commons" of shared knowledge as well as shared land (R. Williams 1973, Cantwell 1993). The anthropologist Keith Thomas has shown, for instance, how an enclosed system of scientific discourse was erected in the eighteenth century through the systematic assessment of common knowledge [Thomas 1983]. Botanists canvassed popular knowledge about plants and reordered it using the Latin terminology that indexed its new context. Linnaeus reinscribed with Latin names plants whose common names indexed local histories, personages, seasonal rounds, and healing practices. He thereby incorporated the plants into an international domain of knowledge. What the Latin names in fact indexed was the communi-
Text-centered collections of folklore helped construct the nation-state as a powerful imaginary, which in turn formed the remote context for building knowledge through scientific collections. “It is our firm belief,” wrote Jakob and Wilhelm Grimm in the introduction to their collection of German legends, “that nothing is as edifying or as likely to bring more joy than the products of the Fatherland.” As plants renamed in Latin stood guard outside a domain in which scientific reason preempted traditional authority, artifacts and tales inscribed as products of the Fatherland helped tether emerging nations to bounded territories.

While advancing techniques of scientific measurement made it possible to assess and redistribute natural resources and to relocate populations deemed “in the way,” folklore scholarship and public folklore productions may inadvertently play a key role in constituting and stabilizing relations between, national centers and marginal spaces.

Of interest here is the relationship between productions that conjure the nation (or any seat of power and authority) and the “other” spaces that define what it is not, productions that conjure, for instance, America on the one hand and Appalachia on the other. As anthropologists helped to build empire by producing knowledge about exotic peoples, folklorists helped build nation-states by locating disappearing culture among the “backward” populations of the interior. This work helped to constitute a “soul” for nations emerging as collective individuals on the world scene (Handler 1988). Displaying this soul could be a way for nations to demonstrate their true nationhood, insofar as having what Cantwell terms an “ethnolic plenum” indicates cultural wealth (Handler 1988, Cantwell 1993).

In the globalizing society of the late twentieth century, transnational corporations are becoming more powerful than nation-states. David Harvey links this changing socioeconomic context with an emerging “regime of flexible accumulation.” He argues that this regime consists of “new systems of production and marketing, characterized by more flexible labour processes and markets, of geographic mobility and rapid shifts in consumption practices” (Harvey 1989:124). Since 1973 this flexible accumulation has supplanted the Fordism (with its totalizing, paternalistic social vision) that was firmly implanted during the New Deal. The upheavals of global restructuring send us scurrying to find new holdfasts in the academy and the public sector. With the nation-state in decline, what is our frame of reference? How does the ideological labor of inventing heritage and situating it in a “cultural context” relate to the system of flexible accumulation? If this is the context in which “heritage” makes sense, how shall we reimagine folklore and ethnography?

**Public Culture, Heritage, and the Critical Void**

As “folklore” appeared in tandem with the rise of the nation-state, “heritage” seems to mark pathways of globalization (Abrams 1994, Corner and Harvey 1991). In the context of the decline of the nation-state and the rise of the transnational corporation (being brought about by such instruments as multinational trade agreements), heritage proliferates. “Heritage discourse,” writes James Abrams, “is formulated during and after periods of significant social transformation, and it functions as an act of cultural redefinition and repair. Migration, economic dislocation, and a sense of generational discontinuity are a few stimuli that provoke intense feelings of loss, absence, and yearning, conditions that heritage projects attempt to assuage by recovering memories and traditions presumed emblematic of a group’s desired continuity” (1994:25).

Corner and Harvey elucidate the tight fit between heritage and enterprise. Mediating the shift between old and new orders, heritage seems to be a way of simultaneously keeping local identity from being swallowed up by corporate investment while offering that investment a distinctive place to locate its operations (Corner and Harvey 1991). But heritage can be as readily staged from the political right as from the left. On the one hand, the unreflective celebration of a heritage of nineteenth-century entrepreneurship can provide a remote context for a new round of exploitation. But on the other, critically staged social history could anchor a critique of socially irresponsible free-market enterprise (Corner and Harvey 1991:41).

Relating this to context, we face the question of how structures of power are replicated through the interpretive frames of public culture, including art and heritage. To deal with this issue we have to move beyond the notion “context of culture” to explore the meaning of structural similarities among domains that are considered cultural (heritage, art, folk art) and domains that are not (economics, science).

**America and a Heritage of Fine Art**

In his study of the Brandywine River Museum in Chadd’s Ford, Pennsylvania, John Dorst finds that Wyeth art, three generations of which are displayed there, is contextualized by a narrative of transcendence that ratifies dynastic wealth and the authority of “anonymous, portable expertise.” This transcendent narrative, related from an omniscient perspective, looks down from above and is not attached to any specific locale. It ignores the roots of Wyeth art in historical, localized conditions and an-
Appalachia and a Heritage of Folk Art

Robert Cantwell argues that modern enclaves of heritage were anticipated by landscape gardens created around the ruins of English common life in the wake of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Like those landscape gardens, our modern equivalents—national parks, deep suburbs, heritage corridors, and golf courses, to name a few—embody the thinking that pits "nature against industry... poetry against trade," and collapses "humanity and community into the idea of culture" [R. Williams 1973:79]. Parks and heritage sites in Appalachia offer a breathtaking view of the continuing tradition of landscape gardens in the context of modernization.

Appalachia as a place out of time has been produced and reproduced, invested with material reality, for more than a century by the national media, economic and environmental policy, and scholarly and industrial practice [Battale 1990, Whisnant 1989]. This Appalachia, which Dorson once termed "folklore's natural habitat" (1964:163), is conjured as such a space through myriad interpretive acts. Each one—a film, a joke, a ballad collection, a newspaper article, an exhibit, an outdoor museum—like Bakhtin's narrative, is doubly grounded. In tourist productions, this double grounding opens Appalachia to outsiders and insiders alike as a domain of preindustrial culture, a rite "performed to social differentiation" [McCannell 1989 (1976)]—distinguishing, that is, between tourist and "native." Appalachia, in effect, provides spaces to which urbanites may symbolically "return" to redeem the fragmentation of modern life, while realizing themselves to be modern, in contrast to "natives" [Kostlin 1997].

Conjured in tourist destinations throughout the region, Appalachia occupies a time and space "other" to America. A 1989 newsletter issued by the National Park Service at the New River Gorge National River in southern West Virginia offers an exemplary "interpretive frame":

By 1900 the folk culture typical of the Appalachians was submerged under an enormous transition to the exploitation and transportation of coal. Handicrafts were replaced by cheap manufactured products from stores or mail order houses; live music was replaced by phonograph records and eventually radio... Popular American traditions of the industrial age were a pervasive force which eroded the traditional culture rapidly... As tourism grows and people earn an income from restoring the older customs, there will be more opportunity for visitors to experience them through fairs, festivals, and craft shops. [National Park Service 1989:1]

Here, in the modern landscape garden of the National Scenic River, is a nineteenth-century artifact—an antimodernist view of folk culture...
threatened by commerce and industry. Ironically, this view is framed within a narrative of development (“As tourism grows”) commercializing aesthetic production. Here tourism is the inevitable next stage for America’s deindustrialized spaces. Imagining two populations, “visitors” and “[local] people,” this text distinguishes and relates these populations around a tourism in which people at leisure will consume the heritage produced by Appalachian workers. Heritage thus pivots between preindustrial and modern contexts. The interpretive text distinguishes Appalachia from America, designating Appalachia as an inappropriate site for “popular American traditions,” hence constituting Appalachia as an “other” space—which is essential for setting up the contrast on which the rites of tourism depend [McCannell 1989 [1976]]. The economic system that tainted mountain culture [with “cheap manufactured products,” “phonograph records,” and “radio”] will now help to restore it by creating a demand for the “older customs.”

The context for crafts in this text is the development of tourism, which the text anchors in the New River Gorge National River. Though the narrative of the scenic river contains the trope of the rescue of nature from industry, it is nonetheless a narrative of development that lays out an inevitable economic progression from extractive industry to heritage tourism. In a remarkable example of historical flattening, vernacular culture produced under the reign of the coal industry is discounted. Here is a denial not only of the chaotic exploitation and literal fragmentation of the mountains in surrounding counties but also of the way in which vernacular practices come to terms with it.

The site’s interpretive plan frames the New River Gorge as “a microcosm of the industrial revolution,” a framework that lifts the locale from the particulars of its history in order to make it a point of entry into a generalized narrative of economic growth and decline. As historian Ken Sullivan argues in New River Gorge, a video, “In the New River Gorge you can find within close confines . . . a lot of history that in other parts of Appalachia occupied a lot more space both geographically and in time. So New River makes a nice case history in industrialization: how it happens, how it stops” (Panorama International Productions 1996). Rather than critique free-market enterprise, the complementary texts of interpretive plan and video naturalize it.

At risk under conditions of advanced consumer capitalism is the critical function of art. “Esthetic production,” writes McCannell, “which in an earlier time might have provided a critique of capitalism, has become fully integrated with commodity production. This integration disrupts the dialectic of surface and depth on which we could once depend for alteration of social and economic relations from within” [1989 [1976]:ix-x]. Similarly, Dorst sees in postmodern idioms like “vignette” and “vener”—depthless surfaces with indeterminate frames—a capacity to dodge or stymie critique [1989].

The mirroring provided by the Brandywine River Museum and the New River Gorge National River does not, like the interpretive frames examined earlier, hold the world of everyday life out for critical inspection. Like the one-way mirrors typical of postmodern architecture, it confounds efforts to see what is behind the reflection. Behind the images of the industrial revolution and the replication of preindustrial culture, the regime of flexible accumulation and the logic legitimating dislocation remain hidden. It is the context of interpretation that conjures up or tears asunder the domains of economy and culture. Evoking flexible accumulation as a context, heritage sites can foster critical thinking about the processes underlying the proliferation of heritage and its concomitant experience of exile. In the vernacular discourses folklorists study, and particularly in the discourse of those who find themselves excluded, we find the recovery of context through critique.

Of interest here are the scholarly efforts of folklorists and others to recover context by recovering the perspectives of the disenfranchised, exiled, or otherwise displaced. Just down the road from the Wyeth gallery in Chadd’s Ford, for example, is the Christian C. Sanderson Museum, where an eclectic collection of everyday memorabilia from a common man’s life has been labeled and placed on display. Here one finds everything from matches used for lighting candles on a sixtieth-birthday cake to pieces of a raincoat worn at the 1957 presidential inauguration, arranged according to a logic alien to the nearby tourist displays. Dorst views the Sanderson artifacts as an implicit critique of Chadd’s Ford’s postmodern modes of cultural production. Kathleen Stewart locates critique in the speech acts of those living in “doubly-occupied places”—spaces that, like central Appalachia, have long been colonized and controlled from without (1996). There speech ways that place speakers “within the entire historical dynamics of their society” constitute “graphic theoretical models” (Stewart 1988:238, 86). Likewise Charles Briggs writes that “the creative capacity of tradition to provide a critical perspective on changing experience . . . frequently stands as a central asset of communities that have been stripped of their natural resources and of control over their own destinies” (1988:375).

Briggs’s grounding of critical perspective in tradition has implications for public folklore, especially for public folklore practiced in “doubly-occupied” or “othered” spaces such as Appalachia and many of the early
ethnographic settings. Othered spaces have been produced and reproduced through a variety of hegemonic narratives and productions, from ethnography to the WPA's American Guide series to heritage corridors. Responses to "othering" shaped from within such spaces suggest ways of opening up the landscape gardens that aid and abet the process of containing and controlling cultural difference.

Jockeying for position in the spaces onto which the dominant conception of Appalachia is mapped are countless local constructs from within, designated as "here" or "the mountains" or "Coal River" and the like. "The mountains" is a social imaginary anchored in contested space. Locally, "the mountains" has functioned for centuries as an informal commons, where surrounding communities have for generations exercised fructuous rights; nationally and officially, the mountains are owned by absentee corporations acting in accordance with the national narrative of fueling (with coal and timber) the nation on a path of progress while battling poverty in the hinterlands.

This condition of "double occupancy" (Stewart 1996) gives rise to a kind of double-voiced discourse that Stewart terms "backtalking" (1990). Double-voicing is a special order of framing, in which a prior utterance is contained in a response that cannibalizes it (Bakhtin 1981). Two voices, the informal and the formal, are locked in a struggle over meaning, and the informal triumphs. This backtalking is grounded in a style of speaking ridelled with quoted speech. Quotation, which always entails framing, is an efficient means of holding out experience for critical inspection. Framing one's speech in the past implies the presence of interlocutors. It has the effect of populating and democratizing an imaginary.

Backtalking thoroughly permeates discourse on southern West Virginia's Big Coal River, the New River's next-door watershed, where I conduct fieldwork. On Coal River, anecdotes and parodic sayings humorously recast the dominant narrative of progress and development (an official context of culture) as a narrative of undevelopment, displacement, and exile (an unofficial, subversive context of culture). Consider the "lie" offered by Danny Williams to an audience including his neighbor, John Flynn (a journalist and forest activist), Lowell Dodge (coordinator of a scientific study of the Central Appalachian forest), myself (a federal employee assessing the cultural implications of forest species decline), and Gregory, Danny's brother, on whom the lie was told.

JF: Tell me a good story, Danny.
DW: What do you want to hear? A lie?
JF: No, I want to hear a good Danny Williams story. A fairly clean story.

DW: I told you about the Volkswagen. [pauses] I'll tell you one. Me and Gregory.

GW: Now he's gonna tell a lie.

DW: and that son of mine was out ginsenging in the mountains, and we set down to rest, we were sitting there. And Gregory got hurt. He got his hand cut off and they sewed it back. And we were settin' there restin'. [To GW] Now don't get mad at me!

GW: He's gonna tell a lie.

DW: and Gregory was settin' there restin', and we looked, and here come a man walkin' round the side of the hill. It was Jesus. And he walked up to us, we was settin' there restin', he looked at DJ, he said, he said, "DJ," he said, "Do you believe?"


He [the Lord] said, "Is there anything bothers you?"

DJ said, "Yes," said, "My arm bothers me a lot."

The Lord reached down, he touched his arm, He said, "Well you're healed." And DJ twisted that arm around, up and down, [DW flexes his arm] said, "I believe," he said, "That arm ain't never felt that good."

He looked over at me, he said, "Do you believe?" I said, "Well," I said, "I'm like DJ. Sometimes I do, and," I said, "Sometimes I don't." I said, "I don't know."

He said, "Well, you got anything that bothers you?" I said, "My legs bother me," I said, "They hurt all the time." He reached over and he touched my legs, and he said, "They're healed." They quit hurtin', I got movin' them around [DW flexes his legs] settin' there.

He looked at Gregory. Looked at Gregory, said, "Gregory," said "You believe?"

He said, "Hold it right there, Lord," said, "Don't come no closer." Said, "I'm on compensation!" [Laughing] He didn't want healed.

[Laughter]

GW: Told you he was gonna tell a big'n, now didn't I?

[Laughter]

DW: Said, "Hold it right there, Lord, don't come no closer. I'm on compensation."

GW: [with chagrin] Shee-it.

JF: Greg, do you think this forest is in trouble?

GW: Ah, "sometimes it is, sometimes it ain't."

[Laughter]

This transcript illustrates many of the points I've made here about framing and the creation of context—context that replicates structures of power and authority—through performance. DW's "lie" is an interpretive frame that opens up a domain (an aborted time of healing in the space of the mountains) relating Appalachia to America in the presence of two federal employees. In addition to me, Lowell Dodge also worked at the
time as general counsel for the Government Accounting Office.) The story models the process of the informal attacking the formal (Douglas 1968). Danny uses reported speech to establish a pattern that is reversed through the punch line. The punch line of reported speech ("Don't come no closer, I'm on compensation") dramatizes the inversion of the American narrative of development in an othered space conceived, owing to its dependence on federal programs, as one that "could never grow up." As a critique, this inversion repudiates (in the form of a "lie") the hegemonic Kantian ideal of the autonomous and complete individual.

The punch line shows that a taken-for-granted master framework ("progress"), linking the ideal of the individual as a completed, autonomous being with economic development, does not apply to this part of the world. The punch line effectively shatters an official "context" of culture (and economy). The laughter this punch line elicits registers the satisfaction that comes with fragmenting a felt enclosure which excludes a local real (Stewart 1996:128).

In the conversational realm, the narrated world becomes a resource for creating meaning, which, as we have seen, leaks across the borders of disjunct domains (Douglas 1968:13). Here the narrated world is superimposed upon the narrative event through the replication of a trick. Gregory's trick on the Lord in the narrated world is paralleled in the narrative event—the context of situation—by Danny's use of the story to victimize Gregory with words. Gregory then replicates the pattern with a verbal trick on John Flynn ("Sometimes it is, sometimes it ain't"). These tricks are played through the establishing of worlds within boundaries that temporarily redefine social relations. Gregory's quotation calls attention to the context of situation (the event of narration) for which the story (the narrated event) now serves as a context.

Gregory's trick maps the social arrangement of the narrated world onto the ordinary world of the conversation, modeling the way in which remote contexts are used to structure society and nature. This structure replicates power relations constituted in other hegemonic narratives. In his essay on the foundation of settlement schools in the mountains, David Whisnant examines the "allegory of loss and rescue" presiding over the establishment of those schools (1989). The same structure underlies the master narrative in which environmentalists seek, through a process of conversion, to heal ecosystems fallen from grace.

Meaning leaks through other boundaries as well: the narrative's troubled human limbs recall the diseased tree limbs snapping off and injuring woodcutters that were mentioned earlier in the conversation. Where laborers are treated as appendages of a shifting system that incorporates them not as persons but as "hands," it is significant, too, that the lie makes the fragment of the hand the site on which power relations are played out (Foucault 1984:159). In the othered space where few jobs are available, disability is what makes it possible to remain. If compensation is for being "cut off," as they say, from work, integrity is what's at issue in the lie. The body's transformation into a commodity betokens a loss of integrity at multiple levels. Labeling this as a "lie" calls attention to the fictitious underpinnings of the dominant order, and subversively raises the specter of alternatives. Kathleen Stewart argues that the logic of putting back together "what is always falling apart" deeply informs the cultural practice in the doubly occupied space of the southern West Virginia coalfields (1988). On the Big Coal River, mountaintop removal—carefully rendered invisible from the New River Gorge—has recently displaced communities and closed off large portions of "the mountains." People rummage through ruins on the brink of enclosure for fragments to suture into new contexts for fathoming the experience of exile. A chapel is dismantled and divided among community members. Rosebushes and grape arbors are transplanted from the site of a future coal refuse impoundment to other hollows. One man built a log cabin out of the oak timbers that for sixty years spanned the river at the evacuated place of Edwight, a once populous coal town. "A lot of trucks have driven over this house," he quipped when he took me to see it. He built the chimney by reassembling the rocks from the homestead of a founding settler at the head of a hollow now behind locked gates. And he filled the cabin with artifacts from places now emptied of people. After the fashion of the memory quilt, each artifact recalls a particular person or event or place or kind of activity: the fiddle played by his grandfather; the drawknife an uncle used to make hickory chairs; the elaborately tooled leather hunting pouch made by another grandfather, a skilled craftsman. "Now they shot him in the back for making moonshine," he commented, evaluating America's reception of that mode of craftsmanship. Ascending the slope behind the cabin are patches of ramps (wild plants somewhat like onions) and ginseng, started from plants in the hollows now closed off.

A narrative of undevelopment and displacement serves as the context for this cabin and its contents. In contrast to the New River narrative, told from the rescuer's perspective, the narrative of the oak-timber cabin unfolds from a perspective of exile (Stewart 1988). Like Danny's lie, the cabin dismantles hegemonic time to expose an othered space where time flows in reverse. Interpreting the log cabin, its maker implicitly refutes the testimony given by scientists (Dorson's "anonymous, portable expertise" [1989:5]) working for coal companies and accepted by the state.
that “there are no historic artifacts” in the region. As “graphic theoretical models,” to think with (Stewart 1996:80), the lie and the cabin illuminate clashes in forms of time. In the discourse of national progress, industrial time is a time of “growth.” But growth is a form of time suppressed throughout the othered spaces of the central Appalachian region.

“This place could never grow up,” said a man, attributing this condition to the fact that most of the land is owned by land companies that will lease but will not sell (90 percent of the land on the Appalachian plateau). Where a place can’t grow up, neither can its inhabitants. Biographical time on Coal River includes a period of outmigration that precludes “growing up around here.” Shorty Bongalis summarized this time in a parodic saying: “They taught the three R’s here in the school for a long time: Reading, ’riting, and the Road to Akron.” In that period, people traveled “hillbilly highways” northward to find work. “Now they go south to North Carolina.” Here past, present, and future are linked in a saying that highlights exile as collective time in another space.

The parodic saying here recasts the Enlightenment formula for developing the autonomous, educated individual. Like proverbs that map their own contexts, the parodic saying remaps its context while revoking the original map. The domain conjured by “Reading, ’riting, and ’Rithmetic” is the context evoked and cannibalized by the parody. The parody is recontextualized in this conversation to illuminate a new spatial orientation—facing south instead of north—in what is not a new time, Appalachian time, in other words, flows counter to American time.

During the 1980s, the economic regime of flexible accumulation implanted itself on Coal River through practices of union busting, downsizing, subcontracting, evacuation, and temporary employment. In the 1990s, when schools were being closed, the commons enclosed, and the valleys vacated, to be filled with rubble and “reclaimed” as wildlife refuges and tourist resorts, a new three R’s was coined: “Remove, Remove, Reclaim.” This saying, spoken by survivors in a place in the process of emptying out, depicts the evolution of an aphorism that was once a transcendent formula for self-development (Reading, ’Riting, and ’Rithmetic), then was modified to address the contingencies attendant on industrial colonization (Reading, ’Riting, and the Road to Akron), and has now come to fully expose the relentless transformation of a post-Fordist territory by transnational corporations. It compresses a century of domination into three words.

Context is a historically contingent framework that we generate, shape, contest, and critique through our cultural productions. Contextualism’s strong suit is its capacity to illuminate the framing conventions that allow or disallow shared—and sometimes socially disparate—meanings in public discourse. Ways of speaking that articulate the boundaries between local and hegemonic frameworks suggest modes of representation as well. James Abrams imagines such a mode: “If the concept of heritage is to be reimagined as a shifting terrain of debate intersected by a variety of voices in dialogue about the past, we need to position ourselves on the borders between cultures where these voices can be heard” (1994:34).

Fashioning our alternative domains at the borders both in public and in the academy, we constantly reimagine the context for the objects of our attention. In this shifting terrain, our own frameworks become modulating hybrids, like the vernacular forms of backtalk that so artfully illuminate political abuses of time (Fabian 1983). As folklore’s history shows full well, celebrating community arts forms and aesthetic values can become a way of enhancing the “ethnoscopic plenum” (Cantwell 1993), but it can also be a way of enhancing local resistance, of modeling the competition among imaginaries anchored in the same material world and holding it out for critical inspection.

“Shifting” is key here. As Jerrold Hirsch observes, the New Deal folklorists’ radical celebrations of democracy and diversity “became in a more conservative time a shibboleth easily repeated, while realities of discrimination and inequality were not confronted” (1988:63). In the emerging world of flexible accumulation, cultural representation has become a high-wire act. Do our representations, brimming as they are with quotation, grounded as they are in shared time, open up an alternative domain for engagement, or do they assist hegemonic practices of containment and exclusion? Like backtalk, each production we stage bears the possibility of revealing “the frame of frames that lie concealed from us” (Rose 1991:121) and of transforming that framework, if only to keep it visible and thereby negotiable.

Notes
1. In the 1970s and early 1980s a debate known as the “text/context controversy” arose over the primacy traditionally assigned to texts over their contexts (Young 1985:113). As Katherine Young observes, “formalists” tended to concentrate on the relationship between stories and the events they are about, while performance theorists (i.e., contextualists) began to look at events that stories are about as remote contexts for the storytelling occasion itself. It also was becoming clear that “some of the content of the story comes not from the events it is about but from the occasion on which it is told.” The text, Young points out, happens to be that aspect of the storytelling event
that lends itself to transcription; paring away tracings of social interaction in the transcript, we arrive at what appears to be a fixed text. But even these fixed texts "display contextual influences in changes formalisms grapple with as versions and variants, which have the peculiar virtue of lodging contextual considerations inside texts" [Young 1985:119).

2. It is within such historically contingent frameworks that children form identities, as Fernandez theorizes, by "taking the animal other." Imitating animals, children symbolically reproduce frameworks for constituting and relating nature and society, holding these frameworks out for investigation [Fernandez 1986:32-33].

3. For instance, symmetry and asymmetry in folk art, or tenets of hound breeding, have been linked with egalitarian and hierarchical social structures (Pocius, Hufford), while genres of children's folklore have been linked with cognitive and social development (Sutton-Smith, McDowell, Fernandez).

4. For related definitions and discussion, see Staab 1994.

5. The problem with context of culture relates to an insight of Marshall Berman's. Berman queries a split between modernism—as the social and cultural side of modernity—and modernization, the economic and historical process underlying modernity. Both sides are driven by narratives of development—whether of self or on the one hand or economy on the other.

6. Linnaeus incorporated the names of many biological explorers into his Latin binomials. Consider, for instance, the Asiatic dayflower, which has three petals, two of which are fully developed and one that is poorly developed. Linnaeus named its genus Commelina after the three Commelina brothers, two of whom were distinguished botanists, and one of whom died young without making a significant contribution to science. Thus the Latin name anchored the history of botanical discovery in a physical world stripped of associations with local places, people, seasons, and uses encoded in vernacular names [Runkel and Bull 1987 [1799]:201].

7. The scientific creation of fragments exemplifies the practices of enclosure involved in the production of knowledge. The symbolic violence of replacing history with classification was not lost on Wilhelm Heinrich Riehl, a folklorist in mid-nineteenth-century Germany, who compared the collectors and classifiers of isolated narratives to specimen hunters "who set out with a tin can to . . . gather superficial folk antiquities . . . in order to place them, properly pressed, dried and classified, into a Germanic herbarium . . . who try to catch unknown folk song specimens, in order to pin them in categories, well spread out, in a collection" [cited in Linke 1990:125].

8. Washington Post journalist Richard Harrington keeps this view open in a 1997 article about Alan Lomax: "Over the course of seven decades, Lomax, writer, folklorist, ethnomusicologist—has single-mindedly pursued the notion that folk culture can be a picture window onto the soul of a nation, but that unless someone opens the blinds, elemental truths and ancient histories will disappear and die in the darkness" [1997:G4].

9. Specifically the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade [GATT], the North American Free Trade Agreement [NAFTA], and the European common market and currency.

10. With respect to riddles, Alan Dundes points out that "the structure of the context (social situation) . . . is paralleled by the structure of the text used in that context" [1980:25].

11. In the same vein, K. Stewart notes that those exercising this same creative capacity to "retain and continuously redeem conventional cultural discourses . . . are on the one hand romanticized as those who can (still) speak and on the other hand coldly judged and dismissed because they speak 'incorrectly' and 'inefficiently'" [1988:228]. Edward Said provides a rationale for the emergence of critique out of the experience of exclusion. "Only to those who are excluded from the social nexus," he writes, "comes the idea of raising a question about the limits of human nature because they need a human that includes them" [1984].

12. "Laminator verbs" [such as say, tell, call, dream, and name] "frame enclaves as a different order of event from the events around them and mark one boundary of the events so named" [Young 1985:226; see also Goffman 1974:305].

13. In Appalachia over the past century, independence has given way to dependence, systematically codified through government policy [Salstrom 1994].

14. For examples of frameworks that could underpin public presentation with critique, see Dorst's analysis of the competing narrative constructions of Devil's Tower, produced by Native Americans and the National Park Service [Dorst 1999]; Michael Ann Williams's portrayal of Great Smoky Mountains Folklife [M. Williams 1996], and Joseph Sciorra's work on the Casitas of New York City, structures for which City Lore has advocated [Sciorra 1996].
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