

Syracuse University

SURFACE

Syracuse University Honors Program Capstone Projects Syracuse University Honors Program Capstone Projects

Spring 5-2017

Rural Retreat / Urban Myth

Celeste Pomputius
Syracuse University

Follow this and additional works at: https://surface.syr.edu/honors_capstone



Part of the [Architecture Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Pomputius, Celeste, "Rural Retreat / Urban Myth" (2017). *Syracuse University Honors Program Capstone Projects*. 1030.

https://surface.syr.edu/honors_capstone/1030

This Honors Capstone Project is brought to you for free and open access by the Syracuse University Honors Program Capstone Projects at SURFACE. It has been accepted for inclusion in Syracuse University Honors Program Capstone Projects by an authorized administrator of SURFACE. For more information, please contact surface@syr.edu.

© Celeste FitzGerald Pomputius April 9, 2017

Abstract

In his recent publication describing the evolution of the American campground, Martin Hogue explains: “this fundamental displacement—from the city to nature, from the indoors to outdoors—forms the basis of a defining experience.” Today, that displacement and distance has evolved into a disassociation between the experience of city and nature. However, the strategic pairing of architecture and policy can mend that disassociation to bridge the divide between city and nature that makes camping, or simply spending time outdoors, such a foreign concept to urban residents who have grown so accustomed to their urban setting.

This thesis proposes a destination for recreation and retreat on Plum Island, New York that references the model of the National and State Park Services and whose intended audience is primarily residents of New York City who are without the means or methods of easily seeking other experiences of nature outside the realm of city limits. The first step of this design process involves reexamining the traditional definition of “urban” to shorten the leap from the comforts of the city to the unknowns of nature. From there, the project identifies and resolves three challenges that stand between urban residents and retreat: proximity, equipment, and ownership.

Executive Summary

Urban theorist Edward Soja claims that “every square inch of the world is urbanized to some degree.” The term *urban* traditionally brings to mind crowds of people, miasmas of pollution, and canyons of buildings. This particular definition of *urban* creates a vivid divide between what is nature and what is city. The architectural thesis portion of this Capstone argues that the extreme contrast or difference between *urban* and *natural* has evolved into a disassociation between the experience of city and nature. It also proposes that the strategic pairing of architecture and policy can mend that disassociation to bridge the divide between city and nature that makes camping, or simply spending time outdoors, such a foreign concept to certain groups of urban residents who have grown accustomed to a purely urban setting. This thesis culminates in the design of a retreat destination on Plum Island, 90 miles from New York City, which is in its own right a smaller version of an urban network. The retreat includes an arrival center, individual overnight cabins, and a natural land preserve.

The project begins by revisiting the definition of *urban* proposing that urbanism is not limited to environments of industry and commerce, but can be simplified to a product of human presence. The chasm between the familiar *urban* and the mysterious *nature* then narrows as nature is distilled into a lesser degree of urbanism. Having broadened the definition of *urban*, the project then identifies and addresses three challenges that stand between urban residents and an experience in nature to inform the design of the retreat destination: proximity and access, outfitting, and personalization leading to a sense of ownership.

The first challenge, proximity and access, is addressed in the project’s site. Plum Island’s accessibility by public transportation overcomes the limiting expense of private transportation. Residents of New York City can take the train from Penn Station to the North Fork of Long Island and from there a ferry to Plum Island without having to own or have access to a private vehicle. The second challenge, that of outfitting, addresses individual needs for specialized gear depending upon what one wishes to do in nature, whether sitting on the beach or going on a kayak fishing trip around the island. The arrival center on Plum Island would house a lending library of all necessary supplies for a stay on Plum Island. Guests

could theoretically arrive with very few personal belongings and temporarily check-out all the necessities for their trip. The final challenge of personalization or ownership is addressed in both the experience of outfitting and in the design of the cabins. The cabins are a prefabricated group of interchangeable units that can be customized with the choice of adjusting the slatted surfaces that compose their structure. This customization accompanied with the process of “making camp” at the cabin are tactics for making the cabin feel more personal to each group of guests.

In addition to the architectural thesis and design project, this Capstone also includes a research paper entitled “Plot, Park, Patrimony: The Value and Meaning of Leisure and Destinations of Retreat Across Culture, Time, and Scale.” While the architectural thesis participates in an academic conversation about urban theories, a divide between city and nature, and how that divide is lessened and then translated into a design project, the Capstone paper expands upon the importance of retreat from the urban through three examples: the Russian dacha, New York City’s Central Park, and Sweden’s tradition of *allemansrätten* or “right to roam.” Each example was chosen based on a unique relationship between residents or guests and local or state lawmakers. In each case, the balance of control between user and policy-maker vary, but each is associated with a high level of recreational value. Ultimately, the research within the Capstone paper supports the significance and benefits of an urban retreat on Plum Island.

Plot, Park, Patrimony:
The Value and Meaning of Leisure and Destinations of Retreat
Across Culture, Time, and Scale

During Russia's Soviet Era, the government gifted political and cultural elites with country homes or allotments called "dachas." In 1858, Frederick Law Olmsted and Calvert Vaux revealed plans for a seven hundred and seventy-eight acre park that would blend the "publicity of the city" and the "privacy of the deep woods" into a new type of destination for the residents of Manhattan¹. Every summer, residents of Sweden leave their homes to roam the Swedish countryside without concern for whose property might be their campsite for the evening.

In his 1903 essay *The Metropolis and Mental Life*, Georg Simmel writes about the fundamental need of urbanites to seek intermittent retreat from the city. This escape being an opportunity for residents of the city to escape the carapaces or "protective organ" that they have formed over time "against the profound disruption...and discontinuities of the external milieu."² Simmel's essay reiterates the insistence of earlier social reformers that "a refuge against the soiled, bedraggled works of man's creation"³ is essentially to living well in a modern, urban society. Given the countless personalities

¹ Daniel M. Bluestone, "From Promenade to Park: The Gregarious Origins of Brooklyn's Park Movement," *American Quarterly*, Vol. 39, No. 4 (Winter, 1987): 531.

² Georg Simmel, *The Metropolis and Mental Life*, Free Press: New York, 1976, 12.

³ Daniel M. Bluestone, "From Promenade to Park: The Gregarious Origins of Brooklyn's Park Movement," *American Quarterly*, Vol. 39, No. 4 (Winter, 1987): 530.

and preferences within human society, it is expected that these places of refuge would take different form and be suited to a variety of values. Russia's dachas, New York City's Central park, and Scandinavia's *allemansrätt* are examples of this variety. Despite differences in location, scale, philosophy, and policy, these mainstays of three different cultures are examples of government's response to an essential need.

In each instance, Russia's dachas, New York City's Central Park, and Scandinavia's *allemansrätt* or "right to roam" address an intrinsic human need to periodically seek a place of retreat away from environments overwhelmed by human influence. These three, distinct cases are examples of recognition, explicit and implicit, of this fundamental human need, codified into governing practices or philosophy.

The Dacha: Between Nature and Government

The dacha is an opportunity to analyze ways in which the cities and governments attempt to reestablish a relationship between residents and nature at the scale of the individual, or family unit. The institution of the Russian dacha has evolved over time with Russian culture and mode of government to suit a variety of needs, including the need to recognize social and political status, the desire to seek recreation beyond the city, and the necessity to access and cultivate fertile land.

Evgeny Makarov, a photographer and native of St. Petersburg, starts his photo series "A Dacha State of Mind" with a contemplative description of the Russian tradition of the dacha.

The dacha is a space in-between. Neither town nor country. It goes beyond a summer dwelling. / It is a mentality, an institution - one that has been growing

since the 18th century, survived all the crises Russia has been through, and is still an essential part of Russian culture and society. / In the small universe of the dacha people enter this state of in-between: The daily struggle put on pause.⁴

Stephen Lovell, a professor and researcher of Russian history at King's College London, expands on Makarov's description of the dacha as "a space in-between"⁵ with the addition that they are "a form of settlement spatially separate from the city but in every other way—socially, culturally, economically—contiguous with it."⁶ These two descriptions introduce us to a phenomenon that is much more complex than a system of government simply assigning land to families as they see fit. As a mainstay in a society that has experienced fickle and changing politics that dictate societal norms, the tradition of dacha and dacha communities serve as a point of reference. While Russian society experiences dramatic changes over the centuries, the policies and purpose surrounding the dacha also evolves.

The tradition of the dacha began in the 18th century with Russia's tsar Peter the Great rewarding loyal members of the court with parcels of land for the construction of their own country houses. Before the era of industrialization, these allotments were a symbol of exclusivity and privilege. At this point, the residences were a feudal custom and manifestation of social status rather than an essential element of well-being.

Although this top-down distribution of property was not always the form in which the

⁴ Evgeny Makarov, "A Dacha State of Mind," Evgeny Makarov Photography, accessed Dec. 29 2017, <http://www.evgenymakarov.com>.

⁵ Evgeny Makarov, "A Dacha State of Mind," Evgeny Makarov Photography, accessed Dec. 29 2017, <http://www.evgenymakarov.com>

⁶ Stephen Lovell, "Between Arcadia and Suburbia: Dachas in Late Imperial Russia," *Slavic Review*, Vol. 61, No. 1 (Spring, 2002): 67.

Russian people acquired dacha, it did set a precedent for the state's treatment of these properties in the future.

With the rise of industry and the attending changes in the class system by the 19th century, the definition of the dacha shifted. A term used to describe the country estates of courtiers came to describe modest plots of land between fifteen hundred and two thousand square feet in size. These modest parcels of land held humble dwellings built from whatever building material could be found offhand. The dacha became a hallmark of the “many white-collar Russians [living] in crowded and insanitary conditions, and an outlet into the green belt...commonly considered essential to preserve mental and bodily well-being.”⁷ As a privatized commodity, a large portion of Russia's urban residents owned or rented these second settlements outside of the city and used them as a weekend retreat for relaxation and recreation.

The October Revolution and the beginning of Russia's tenure as a Soviet state again changed the relation of government to the dacha. This evolutionary phase of the dacha began with a change in the social value of dacha. Government upheaval, the stumbling creation of socialist councils to oversee housing and the distribution of goods, a slow recovery from economic effects of World War I, and a limited railway network unable to distribute supplies efficiently resulted in extreme food shortages throughout Russia during the first half of the 20th-century. Lack of trust in the Soviet state, periodic famine, and an uncertain future “led millions of twentieth-century Russians to value their country retreats not as places of idle repose but as a guarantee of basic subsistence.”⁸

⁷ Stephen Lovell, “The Making of the Stalin-Era Dacha,” *The Journal of Modern History*, Vol. 74, No. 2 (June 2002): 276.

⁸ Stephen Lovell, “The Making of the Stalin-Era Dacha,” *The Journal of Modern History*, Vol. 74, No. 2 (June 2002): 279.

Rather than a place of recreation and relaxation, the dacha became prime property for cultivating potatoes and produce to supplement the limited supply of groceries available in urban stores and markets. While the dachas had once “enabled an urban “middle class” to enjoy the kind of restorative rural experience that had traditionally been the prerogative of an aristocratic...elite,” they became a means of survival.⁹

The second phase of this evolution was a change in the model of dacha ownership. Although the Soviet state began efforts to socialize Russia’s housing shortly after the October Revolution in 1917, the dacha, with only seasonal occupancy and no official system of address, were of low priority to Soviet officials. The Purge of 1937 brought about a new push for housing socialization that was “mainly targeted high-density urban housing, but its strictures were extended to exurban locations too.”¹⁰ At this point, the dachas were put in the control of state corporations and trusts that no longer worked with private individuals, but rather “rented out [dachas] via trade unions, factories, and other state and party institutions at standard rates.”¹¹

Similar to the 18th-century practices of Peter the Great, the dacha tradition was once again in the hands of the government. The Soviet state controlled distribution of allotments to the working class for the sake of sustenance in a nutrient-deprived economic climate, but also used that power to set up dacha communities for distinguished writers and academics to co-opt their influence in the state’s interest. This practice expanded the Soviet definition of the dacha from an allotment allowing the opportunity to cultivate needed resources to “a place where a person could be close to the soil and

⁹ Stephen Lovell, “Between Arcadia and Suburbia: Dachas in Late Imperial Russia,” *Slavic Review*, Vol. 61, No. 1 (Spring, 2002): 70.

¹⁰ Stephen Lovell, “The Making of the Stalin-Era Dacha,” *The Journal of Modern History*, Vol. 74, No. 2 (June 2002): 280.

¹¹ *Ibid*: 271.

escape the deadening power of government institutions,”¹² albeit at the pleasure of the government.

The dacha settlements of the Soviet-era are a form of retreat specific to a socialized political system. With its sentimental history, value as a source of sustenance, and allotment by central governmental control, the dacha exhibits a conflation of ideological value and government intent that can also be seen in the creation of New York City’s Central Park.

Central Park: Between Park and Policy

New York City’s Central Park is a product of conservative reform, real estate ambitions, and political jockeying. Before Frederick Law Olmstead and Calvert Vaux even became involved in the design of what would become a park of national renown, newspapermen, real estate tycoons, and city officials appreciated the multifaceted benefits of a project that was ultimately intended for the public’s benefit. Newspaper editors and critics of society saw the park as a potential “means of escape” and “a refuge against the soiled, bedraggled works of man’s creation.”¹³ Real estate developers imagined the potential value that could be derived from properties overlooking or within short walking distance of such a marvelous amenity. City officials saw the success of such a project as a means of political advance, merit, and recognition. Intended for the use and benefit of an entire city’s residents, Central Park extended to a similar range of urban residents as the more piecemeal Russian dacha plots, but with one centralized,

¹² Stephen Lovell, “The Making of the Stalin-Era Dacha,” *The Journal of Modern History*, Vol. 74, No. 2 (June 2002): 261.

¹³ Daniel M. Bluestone, “From Promenade to Park: The Gregarious Origins of Brooklyn’s Park Movement,” *American Quarterly*, Vol. 39, No. 4 (Winter, 1987): 530.

communal space given to the public at once in perpetuity, instead of as individual properties under varying degrees of government control.

The persistent letters and editorials of the *New York Evening Post* editor William Cullen Bryant and the *Horticulturist* editor Andrew Jackson Downing were vital in pressing New York City's mayor to pursue the design of a public park for the residents of the city. Previously, Battery Park at the southern edge of Manhattan had been the only public space resembling what would today be considered a park and a few open spaces such as Washington Square were scattered throughout the then developed portions of the city. Downing found New York City's few public spaces lacking and claimed out of frustration that "what are called parks in New York, are not even apologies for the thing; they are only squares, or paddocks."¹⁴ With such insistent badgering, the civil leaders and politicians of New York City eventually took Bryant and Downing's opinions to heart and committed to the construction of a new park.

Convinced of such a park's success by social critics like Bryant and Downing, policy-makers moved forward quickly with state-mandated acts ensuring the right to eminent domain and with the purchase of land. The city commission in charge of Central Park's development, backed by the popular opinion of the wealthy and socially adept, moved forward unscrupulously with the acquisition of land. Support for the project was so great, that few of the so-called "reformists" advocating for the project spoke out about social slights such as the disbandment of Seneca Village a settlement located within the boundaries of today's park with about two thousand residents. Social reformer Hal Guernsey protested the park's motivations as being "a scheme to enhance the value of

¹⁴ Morrison H. Heckscher, "Creating Central Park," *The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin*, New Series, Vol. 65, No. 3, Creating Central Park (Winter, 2008): 12.

uptown land, and create a splendid center for fashionable life, without regard to...the happiness of the multitude upon [whom] the expenses will fall,"¹⁵ but such protests were outnumbered. Seneca Village a community comprised primarily of black and Irish residents, mid-nineteenth-century society's undesirables, was forgotten, and Central Park's creators pressed on with an idealized vision for improved urban life.

Following failed attempts within the park commission to monopolize the park's development and the resulting competition seeking more inclusion of design talent, Olmstead and Vaux took charge of the design of Central Park in 1858. Olmstead approached the project with the intention of blending the "publicity of the city" and the "privacy of the deep woods" into "another ideal altogether, that of pastoral rural life."¹⁶ Despite framing Central Park as nostalgically "pastoral" and "rural,"¹⁷ Olmstead intended that the city and park be closely linked. "The processional character of the park," its meandering walks through stands of trees and around pastures, "brought visitors to and from scenes of the city"¹⁸ as part of a regular "process of recuperation from the stresses and strains of urban life."¹⁹

Central Park was a place of retreat intended for multiple classes and forms of recreation. Olmstead preferred designing landscapes for the passive recreation such as the promenade of society elite, which was as much about enjoying the scenery as about being seen, however, he did grudgingly also incorporate playing fields for popular active

¹⁵ Douglas Martin, "A Village Dies, A Park Is Born," *The New York Times* (New York, NY), January 31, 1997.

¹⁶ Daniel M. Bluestone, "From Promenade to Park: The Gregarious Origins of Brooklyn's Park Movement," *American Quarterly*, Vol. 39, No. 4 (Winter, 1987): 531.

¹⁷ *Ibid*: 531.

¹⁸ Daniel M. Bluestone, "From Promenade to Park: The Gregarious Origins of Brooklyn's Park Movement," *American Quarterly*, Vol. 39, No. 4 (Winter, 1987): 543.

¹⁹ David Schuyler, "Parks in Urban America," *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of American History*, Nov 2015.

recreations of the time such as baseball. Thanks to this inclusivity, multiple publications of the time described Central Park, and parks designed later on following its likeness, as having “socially harmonizing influences.”²⁰ Over the course of its design, Central Park expanded upon the original intent of its construction as a “means of escape” and “a refuge against the soiled, bedraggled works of man’s creation,”²¹ and became a shared social space that brought together an otherwise stratified class system.

Similar to the dachas of Russia, Central Park was intended as a destination of retreat. With the meritable influences of politics and society, over time the park grew to be associated with a more varied set of uses, and assumed additional value. Today, Central Park is home to many of New York City’s cultural institutions such as the Metropolitan Museum and summer theater at Belvedere Castle. It is used on a daily basis as a place of recreation and relaxation by New York’s businesspeople, families, and nannies. In information gathered by CNN, Central Park was one of the “Most Instagrammed Locations of 2016” after only the global composite of Disney’s Amusement Parks.²² The early legal initiatives to create a public park for the residents of a city have expanded to include a national, if not global audience.

Allemansrättenn: Between Wandering and Law

Of the three instances of retreat destinations influenced by state policy in this exploration, Sweden’s allemansrättenn or “the everyman’s right” is the most difficult to describe as having a particular evolution, or series of influences. This is in part because

²⁰ Daniel M. Bluestone, “From Promenade to Park: The Gregarious Origins of Brooklyn’s Park Movement.” *American Quarterly*, Vol. 39, No. 4 (Winter, 1987): 537.

²¹ *Ibid*: 530.

²² Maureen O’Hare, “Favorite Instagram Destinations For 2016,” *CNN*, (New York, NY), Dec 1 2016. Web. Accessed January 7 2017.

the right “developed by custom [was found] unnecessary to codify.”²³ Allemansrätten has long been respected as a tradition that gives all residents and visitors of Sweden the right to walk, hike, cycle, or otherwise roam the countryside regardless of whether the land is public or private. While New York City’s public officials had to take special action to set aside land for public use, in Sweden “the right emerged as an ethical obligation on the part of the landowner – to allow access –and the visitor – to not disturb the landowner’s privacy or damage his land.”²⁴

There are only a few limitations when taking advantage of this “freedom” or “right to roam.” Landowners are required to “give the public access to the open country land, for walking or even picnicking; any barriers to access must be removed.”²⁵ Visitors walking or cycling across or spending the night on the property must leave their surroundings as they were found, ask the owner for permission to build a campfire, and remain a discrete distance from dwellings, and fenced areas on the property.

Allemansrätten has operated for generations on the very simple rule of “Don’t disturb, don’t destroy.” The U.S. National Parks’ slogan, “Take nothing but memories, leave nothing but footprints,” comes to mind, but the Swedish tradition has a much longer history and has taken root without any of the necessary government acts and mandates that set National Park land aside for protection. Similar versions of this rule are accepted across Scandinavia and much of the United Kingdom. Mutual respect between landowners, hikers, and nature makes allemansrätten, and similar such traditions, a

²³ Jerry L. Anderson, "Comparative Perspectives on Property Rights: The Right to Exclude." *Journal of Legal Education* 56, no. 4 (2006): 548.

²⁴ *Ibid*: 548.

²⁵ *Ibid*: 547.

feasible, nationwide method of fostering the tenuous relationship between city and country or urban and rural.

In the present era of globalization, Sweden and other countries that respect the “right to roam” have experienced a slow increase in landowners from abroad who do not necessarily agree with the all-inclusive mindset championing “every person’s right to cross the lands of another and even camp there temporarily.”²⁶ Despite the tradition’s longstanding history, challenges concerning the associated rights of owners have only recently begun. Perhaps symbolizing a slowly growing fear of losing the traditional “right to roam,” neighboring Norway’s government formalized the rights of *allemansrätten* with the passage of the Outdoor Recreation Act in 1957. Britain legislated the similar Countryside Rights of Way Act in 2000 that declared “private land that contains mountains, moorland, heath, or downland to be ‘open country,’ on which the public is now free to walk.”²⁷

The freedom afforded by such a tradition is evident in the folklore of the region. The stories of farmers and woodsmen’s encounters with trolls and mythic creatures in the woods lend wonder and sense of adventure to rambling across the country’s undeveloped land without concern of ownership. *Allemansrätten* is a historic tradition adopted without modification by a progressive social system of governance. Its trust in the better nature of people is reminiscent of the “socially harmonizing influences”²⁸ of New York City’s Central Park, while its time-honored acceptance amongst Swedes brings to mind Russians’ nostalgia for summers at the dacha.

²⁶ Jerry L. Anderson, “Comparative Perspectives on Property Rights: The Right to Exclude.” *Journal of Legal Education* 56, no. 4 (2006): 548.

²⁷ *Ibid*: 546-547.

²⁸ Daniel M. Bluestone, “From Promenade to Park: The Gregarious Origins of Brooklyn’s Park Movement.” *American Quarterly*, Vol. 39, No. 4 (Winter, 1987): 537.

Evolution, Interwoven Disciplines, and Relevance

Having examined the themes of state-backed means of recreation and retreat across various scales, elements of each can be recognized in the others. The changing meaning of the Russian dacha, citywide interest in the design and construction of Central Park, and national pride inspired by the right to roam Sweden are themes that are evident in each case.

The evolution of the dacha exposes the natural change over time that may be obvious in a city project like Central Park, but in a national tradition such as *Allemansrätten* otherwise subtly escapes notice. Over the course of its history, Central Park grew from “a rather static and formal conception of the social relations which ought to govern the American populace”²⁹ to a dynamic mecca of diverse visitation, culture, and recreation. Just as changes in Russia’s political system influenced the dacha system of ownership, changes in Central Park’s management altered what the park offered to its citizens. With the founding of the Central Park Conservancy in 1980, the park experienced immediate necessary improvement and sustained maintenance.

In the case of *Allemansrätten*, change occurs so slowly that everyday or regular use makes the gradual changes nearly imperceptible without close reflection. The ongoing transition of the “right to roam” from tradition to law in multiple Northern European countries has been evidence of a growing need to protect a long-standing

²⁹ Geoffrey Blodgett, “Frederick Law Olmstead: Landscape Architecture as Conservative Reform.” *The Journal of American History*, Vol. 62, No. 4 (March 1976): 879.

practice. One would hope that a tradition that is so entrenched in custom and seen as an “ethical obligation”³⁰ would be safe from extinction.

Citywide support of Central Park is evidence of the universal necessity for destinations of retreat. A wide range of New Yorkers and eventually tourists from around the globe take advantage of Central Park every day. The park has grown to accommodate little league teams and concertgoers as well as Olmstead’s more preferred spectators of scenery. Aligned with this sense of community and inclusivity, allemansrättens existence is a legacy of national support and pride. This freedom has shaped the fairytale and lore of Swedish history and a present day “feeling of community, of common interest in the land that comes from shared access.”³¹ This same sense of community is evident in the clusters of dachas a few hours drive from Moscow and St. Petersburg. Now that the tradition of the dacha has grown from “the Soviet-era ideal place for dutiful toil to a retreat for the sheer fun of it,”³² neighbors are brought together “who, although they inhabited the same city, might otherwise belong to different worlds.”³³

Despite differences in scale, culture, and geographic setting, comparison of the Russian dacha, New York City’s Central Park, and Sweden’s allemansrättens, reveals a universal necessity within the creation of public parks and other destinations of retreat that is more complex and essential to human nature than industrial-era social reformers could express. Over the course of the dacha’s mixed history of use and government control, the simple, country dwelling has sustained significance and gained sentiment in

³⁰ Jerry L. Anderson, "Comparative Perspectives on Property Rights: The Right to Exclude." *Journal of Legal Education* 56, no. 4 (2006): 548.

³¹ *Ibid*: 549.

³² Cathy Newman, "Russian Summer." July 2012. *Ngm.nationalgeographic.com*.

³³ Stephen Lovell, “Between Arcadia and Suburbia: Dachas in Late Imperial Russia.” *Slavic Review*, Vol. 61, No. 1 (Spring, 2002): 87.

Russian tradition. Central Park has become a landmark encapsulating the character of all of New York City. The time-honored tradition of allemansrätten has survived over generations as heritage of Sweden and other Scandinavian nations. These examples of retreat are not simply a “refuge against the soiled, bedraggled works of man’s creation,”³⁴ but evolving constructs of social significance responsive to the varied needs of their users and occupants.

³⁴ Daniel M. Bluestone, “From Promenade to Park: The Gregarious Origins of Brooklyn’s Park Movement,” *American Quarterly*, Vol. 39, No. 4 (Winter, 1987): 530.

Works Cited

- Anderson, Jerry L. "Comparative Perspectives on Property Rights: The Right to Exclude." *Journal of Legal Education* 56, no. 4 (2006): 539-50. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/42893993>.
- Blodgett, Geoffrey. "Frederick Law Olmstead: Landscape Architecture as Conservative Reform." *The Journal of American History*, Vol. 62, No. 4 (March 1976), pp. 869-889. Accessed January 4 2017. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1903842>.
- Bluestone, Daniel M. "From Promenade to Park: The Gregarious Origins of Brooklyn's Park Movement." *American Quarterly*, Vol. 39, No. 4 (Winter, 1987), pp. 529-550. Accessed January 4 2017. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2713123>.
- Heckscher, Morrison H. "Creating Central Park." *The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin*, New Series, Vol. 65, No. 3, Creating Central Park (Winter, 2008), pp. 1-3, 5-74. Accessed January 4 2017. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25434142>.
- Ilgunas, Ken. "This is Our Country. Let's Walk It." *The New York Times*. April 23, 2016. Web. Accessed January 4 2017
- Lovell, Stephen. "Between Arcadia and Suburbia: Dachas in Late Imperial Russia." *Slavic Review*, Vol. 61, No. 1 (Spring, 2002), pp. 66-87. Accessed January 4 2017. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2696983>.
- Lovell, Stephen. "The Making of the Stalin-Era Dacha." *The Journal of Modern History*, Vol. 74, No. 2 (June 2002), pp. 253-288. Accessed January 4 2017. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/343408>.
- Makarov, Evgeny. "A Dacha State of Mind." *Evgenymakarov.com*. Web. Accessed December 29 2016.
- Martin, Douglas. "A Village Dies, A Park Is Born." *The New York Times* (New York, NY), January 31, 1997. Web. Accessed January 3 2017.
- Newman, Cathy. "Russian Summer." July 2012. *Ngm.nationalgeographic.com*. Accessed December 29 2016. <http://ngm.nationalgeographic.com/2012/07/russian-summer/newman-text>.

O'Hare, Maureen. "Favorite Instagram Destinations For 2016." *CNN* (New York, NY), Dec 1 2016. Web. Accessed January 7 2017.

Simmel, Georg. *The Metropolis and Mental Life*. Free Press: New York, 1976.

Schuyler, David. "Parks in Urban America." *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of American History*. Nov 2015. Accessed January 2 2017. DOI: 10.1093/acrefore/9780199329175.013.58

Swedish Environmental Protection Agency. *Allemansrätten: Right of Public Access*. June 17 2015. Web. Accessed January 4 2017.

Van Gilder Cooke, Sonia. "Bon Voyage!: Why Europe's Vacation-Loving Ways May Make Economic Sense". *Time* (New York, NY), March 9 2012. Web. Accessed March 26 2017.