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Editors’ Introduction

Editors’ Introduction

In this fifth edition of *Aegis*, Otterbein students have continued the tradition of submitting an array of topics that span the humanities discipline. You will find in this issue essays covering subjects such as femininity, music, literature, history, and the environment.

This issue is introduced among political turmoil, both domestic and international. The past eight years have seen a controversial war, downfalls of high-profile dictators, and political scandal. This edition exposes Otterbein readers to equally important issues that are sometimes left out of the media spotlight.

This year, Americans will be choosing their leader for the next four years. As citizens of this nation, we need to focus on everything going on, rather than the shortcomings of a particular leader or what the evening news tells us is important—like the personal business of pop stars.

Just as this issue contains an essay on feminism, the 2008 election will provide an interesting national commentary on women’s role in society and how much it has changed over the past 50 years. This is but one of the topics in this issue that pertains, in a way, to current affairs. Other papers that tie into recent headlines include the papers on beauty pageants and *Beowulf* for example. Tara Conner, Miss USA 2006, made headlines when Trump revealed that, for the first time, a crown holder would attend rehab. This event brought about much speculation and conversation about beauty pageants and their role in society. The *Beowulf* movie (Zemeckis 2007) modernized and introduced a famous epic poem to a nation increasingly obsessed with one-hit wonders and fading celebrities.

We have selected essays that are truly thought provoking and that could possibly relate to issues and events taking place in the world today. In so doing, we have created an issue that answers some questions but also poses many more. It is suitable for readers seeking to read for pleasure and leisure and also for readers looking for analysis and connections.

This edition’s humanities interview features Dr. Robert Miklitsch, the author of the pop culture book *Roll Over Adorno*. The interview discusses studying pop culture academically, and the roles that it plays in today’s society. Miklitsch believes that pop culture can be studied and analyzed to provide the public with meaning and insight into our country and where it is headed. We discuss *The Sopranos*, Britney Spears, and various music artists and movie stars.

The essays and interview within this edition prove that seemingly innocuous occurrences actually have a deeper meaning. The humanities provide individuals the opportunity to relate disparate subjects and events to create a lens through which to view society and world events. Be it political upheaval, social injustice, or environmental concerns, the humanities have a way of investigating and exposing the underbelly of each.

We, the editors of the 2008 issue of *Aegis*, hope the Otterbein community enjoys this year’s selection. Whether you agree with the views expressed or not, you are sure to find something that catches your fancy or familiarizes you with a different point of view.

Meghan Johnson
Zachary Hopper
An Interview with Dr. Robert Miklitsch

● ● ● Meghan Johnson and Zachary Hopper

What popular culture event sparked your interest in pursuing the subject academically?

What got me into thinking about popular culture? That’s a good question. I think I’ve been doing pop culture a long time. I don’t have a very simple answer for that. I’ve always been in English departments and the dominant subject is literature. I think like anybody, or most people, I watch a lot of TV and listen to music and go to movies, and I guess I became interested in teaching that material, and I eventually wanted to write on it. I don’t remember the first text I wrote on popular culture. My first book’s on Madonna, and Madonna was such a phenomenon in the ‘80s. That was definitely one of the beginning points for me, one of the places where I started. And I think it was partly too because Madonna was such an ubiquitous figure in not only America but global culture. I also genuinely liked her music. And I think to write about popular culture you have to have some kind of investment in it. You really can’t write about it unless you like some of it or a lot of it.

There are a lot of topics in this book (Roll Over Adorno). What specific event or person inspired you to write this particular book?

This book is actually a collection. I always wanted to write about popular music. There’s amazing literature on popular music. So I think at some point I just started reading and I decided I could write on it. So I decided that would be my entrée. That’s how those particular essays started.

In the films, I’ve been teaching and watching films for a long time. I think the case of the Tarintino films (Jackie Brown), there was a ton of stuff written about him in the ‘90s. Oddly enough, the film they didn’t write about because they wrote so much about Reservoir Dogs and Pulp Fiction, was Jackie Brown. I really like Jackie Brown. A lot of people didn’t like it—they were disappointed. I thought, I’ll write about this because I like it and it’s not written about as much as the other films.

The Sopranos—that was a no brainer for me. For me, it’s easily one of the best TV shows that I’ve ever seen and I’ve been watching television for a long time. And as I wrote about in the book, I grew up around the corner from a mafia don. So I had an intimate relationship, I hung out with mafia kids where I grew up and delivered the paper to a mafia don. The FBI basically one weekend set up a roadblock and arrested him for racketeering. For me, my relationship to the mafia was that they were a part of my neighborhood and the kids I grew up and friends with my parents, but they never talked about. You knew they were a part of the mafia, you knew but you never said anything. First of all it was just bad taste, bad manners. And if nothing else you were just afraid because you thought you could get hurt somehow. And like most people, I watched the Godfather films, but the Sopranos for me was just extraordinary television. Maybe even more so than music, there is something that I felt I had a real investment because I knew that culture, not Italian culture, but Mafia culture, so I thought I could write about that.

And Melrose Place, most people don’t know this, but there is a lot of literature on soap
opera. Sometimes to me you write about stuff and teach things to learn about something. I wrote because I wanted to learn something about soap opera and television studies. People don’t realize there’s an enormous volume of work on television studies. So how do you write about television? That was a way to teach myself.

Where did you grow up?

I grew up in western NY, Niagara Falls and Buffalo historically speaking have been pretty “mobbed up.” There’s a long history of mob involvement. The major Mafia Don I wrote about in the book was one of the 10 major dons. He had one of the longest reigns, about 50 years I think. He had an ailment, or so they said, but they never really got him although they arrested him for racketeering. His lawyer got him off and he ended up dying a natural death. He was a very long “lived” mafia don. We all knew about this and we read about it and I’d see him. He was a perfectly nice old man, but he was also a mafia don. So I had seen both sides. So I was aware of that doubleness that’s in the Sopranos that’s very wonderful—the opposition and conflict.

On the Sopranos series finale…

I liked the finale. I was also surprised by it. People were disappointed that Tony didn’t die, that he didn’t get “whacked.” I liked the ending. I like the fact that Tony survived, and he wasn’t punished yet. I thought it was very appropriate and suspenseful. It’s typical of a soap opera, it continues. There wasn’t some grand punctuation. It stopped like a heart beat. One thing you got from that last episode is the dread you must live with as a mafia don. At any moment you could get whacked and you have to live with that. It’s a very existential show, super existential. I really liked the last episode, and I definitely disagree with the people that hated it. David Chase said that he would never wrap it up and put a pretty little bow on it, and he didn’t.

The trend in society, even if you turn on the 10 o’clock news, there’s 10 minutes devoted to pop culture and celebrities. What do you think about that, do you think it’s a good thing for the media to focus on that, or do you think it’s just necessary for them to get the ratings?

I’m afraid I’m going to sound like a hypocrite, because like most people, I’m a media junkie. I watch Access Hollywood every night. So I’m a real junkie for pop culture, I really am and I admit it. I’m appalled by it too, though. I mean, we’re fighting a war, for God’s sake. Sometimes you forget we’re at war, because all you can ever hear about is Britney and her marital problems, or drug problems. I do think it is a problem that it’s covered by news organizations. I’m pretty old fashioned when it’s covered by news. I think there’s too much of entertainment news. If it’s a show meant to cover that, and only that (like Access), but if it’s on evening news (like CBS), then that’s a problem.

So for me, it’s less of a problem, it’s part of my life, it has its place and it’s like a guilty pleasure. But I think it’s become too prevalent. Like the whole thing with Anna Nicole Smith—Britney can at least be considered a sort of artist. But in Smith’s case, I don’t know what she contributed to the culture, so why there’s so much about her, I don’t know. Spears, at least for a moment, was an interesting cultural force, and maybe she’ll be able to come back and make some interesting music.

But again, what the problem is, they’re not talking about her “art,” her music. They’re
talking about her personal life. Which ultimately is not important compared to California fires, the war, local elections, or the presidential campaign, which is heating up.

There’s a book, *Everything Bad is Good For You*, by Stephen Johnson, in which the author’s main argument is that those sort of things help make our culture smarter—that we have to make sense of a complex web of relations. What would you say to that argument? Where do you stand on his stance?

I have to read that book, but I do agree with part of it. There is some cognitive value to culture. On the other hand, it’s not clear how Spears and Smith are really helping you intellectually or emotionally. I guess for me I would say, like the Greeks, everything in moderation. It’s a good thing to be in touch with your culture—the best of the culture and the worst of the culture. But I do mean more the “art,” the music, TV, and movies. That’s what people will remember.

Popular culture texts tell you about the culture. They tell you what the culture is thinking, its anxieties, its pressure points. But again, Britney’s personal life doesn’t say that much about the culture. I want to see less focus on celebrities’ lives. If the focus is on the actual art, that is almost always valuable.

Are you able to enjoy something for what it is, and turn of the academic side of your brain, or do you find yourself constantly analyzing?

Yes I can. That’s why I think, oddly enough, I’m a good critic. I can completely surrender to a text. T.S. Elliot once said in one of my favorite essays that the first step is to surrender. I think the first thing to do is just enjoy it. In my class, I barely set a film up, I just say we’re watching [insert film], and we’ll analyze it after the fact. It may not be the best way to teach some films, but I’m more interested in them experiencing it as much as possible in a classroom. I watch movies and TV for pleasure first. There’s always some part of me that’s probably doing some sort of analysis, though you’d be amazed in some ways how innocent and naïve of a spectator I really am. I’m a pretty basic spectator. I’m very open in art, and I don’t tend to judge or think about things too much, I just watch it. If it’s a song, I listen to it, if it’s a movie, I watch it, if it’s a book, I read it.

Interestingly enough, I started off in literature, and I find that’s the one medium where I’m more critical. I can go really low in other mediums (movies and music) but I find it hard to go low in literature. That lever in my brain is harder to click off. I like to read pop literature, but it’s a lot easier for me to watch a bad movie than it is for me to read a bad book. There’s something about literature that I have a high art disposition for. I have HBO and watch virtually every movie. I’ll watch Hilary Duff movies, *The Perfect Man*, and that’s a bad movie, but I’ll watch it. I listen to everything. I tell my students, and they don’t believe me. I’m an indiscriminate consumer. I don’t really say, “That’s trash, and I won’t engage it.” I’ll try it out, it’s like an appetizer—I’ll try a little taste of it. I like to judge for myself.

I was talking about the Adam Sandler movie, *Chuck and Larry*, and I found myself starting to judge it, guessing that it was homophobic, but I stopped myself. Because the truth is, I haven’t seen the movie, and I shouldn’t judge it before I’ve seen it. To be honest, I probably won’t like it; I’m not a fan of Adam Sandler movies. I have my pet peeves and prejudices too; I really don’t think Adam Sandler is a very interesting actor or filmmaker. There are moments when I can sound like a high art critic, where I have conventional tastes. And there are mo-
ments when I won’t want to watch some popular culture event because I think it’s probably not that interesting ahead of time—I’m human.

In regard to historical, influential figures that get absorbed by pop culture and kind of lose their original meaning, do you think that’s a good thing?

There’s a difference between pop culture and commodity culture. “Baby Einstein” products—Einstein is a very unique example, because I don’t think most people, including myself, understand the theory of relativity. So what do they really know about him? I just heard on the news, that there have been terrible racist correlations between brain size and racial intelligence and there’s proof that Einstein’s brain size was smaller than normal—so much for that argument, huh? But most people don’t know much about him. They just have that image of him in their head, the frizzy hair. So Einstein himself is actually a cipher. What we have is his image, E=MC2 and that’s about it. So the question would be then, what does he really represent? Intellectual genius or a man of science? It’s almost like a myth. In that essence, he’s almost a superhero, a brilliant superhero—something we’ll never be.

This is a great thing to quiz your friends on: name three of the most famous Western artist? Picasso would probably be one, Michealangelo, VanGough, Raphael, or DiVinci. A classic example would be Rembrandt, people may say they recognize the name, he is art with a capital “A”, but they wouldn’t be able to point out a painting—but this is a mythology again, the same as “Baby Einstein.” You buy “Baby Einstein” so that your baby will be as smart as Einstein. It’s just an ad, a type of short hand. It may not mean so much literally, but figuratively it says a lot about the role of commodity culture, the importance of names and figures, and that’s fascinating.

You have recognized the importance of popular culture and its reflection on society, but do you think it’s influential to the point some people think it is? For example, are video games and music responsible for the violence in society?

I just had a student who argued that the first volume of Sin City produced real world violence. I am not up, as an academic, on the recent literature on the relationship between media violence and the real world, but I have to say I tend to stand by academic freedom. I think artists should be able to portray violence the way they wish to portray it. I think art has to “earn” its violence, though. Frankly, I’m bothered by issues of censorship. I don’t think that a movie or a song can directly produce violence; I don’t think that logic is true. It’s never a one to one thing. Sure there are disturbed people in society, and maybe they can’t distinguish fantasy from reality. But that’s the exception, and you can’t censor people because of exceptional cases. The average person can distinguish between reality and fantasy.

What is your must-watch TV show?

I watch a lot of junk TV, I’m a multi-tasker—The TV is always on. The two shows I really like now are Mad Men on AMC, a wonderfully made and evocative, spellbinding TV show and the second is Tell Me You Love Me on HBO, it can be quite controversial because of its graphic nudity and some people would say it’s even pornographic. But it can be quite intimate and it’s very powerful and disturbing. It feels like real time and it’s more challenging to watch. You get to know these people and their issues, and everyone who has been in a relationship has these issues and you have to face them through watching this TV show.
What bands or music are you really into right now?

It’s very difficult to keep up with contemporary music as you get older—especially right now because it’s easier to produce and distribute with today’s technology. I’m interested in learning what people are listening to, but for me, I’m listening to stuff from the ‘40s, like Doris Day with Tommy Dorsey. She started out as a vocalist and she was in Hitchcock films, and she’s just really interesting to me as an artist. My choices are really quite odd. I used to keep up with music by watching MTV, but they don’t play much music anymore. I might not ever right on contemporary music again because there’s so much of it; it’s almost like a full-time job. There are so many genres that it’s hard to make generalizations. I find it bewildering.

Music is, in some ways, the most intimate art form. It’s almost like the atmosphere in which you move. Music, to some people, is 24/7. It’s all pervasive in a way and that’s why I’m fascinated by music in youth culture, it’s almost like the air you breathe. It’s almost less important what people are listening to, than the technology or how they are listening to it. When I talk to students, they are listening to all sorts of things; it’s hard to generalize what they’re listening to. The differences in their music choices are less interesting than the fact that they’re listening to it all the time.

Do you have a favorite celebrity that you find most interesting?

Who am I fascinated by? The problem is, the celebrities that you hear about you get tired of (e.g., Paris Hilton, Britney Spears, Lindsay Lohan, Nicole Richie). There are artists that I like. For example, Viggo Mortenson, I really admire him. He’s not a celebrity, he hates celebrity culture. He’s a committed artist and painter, a fine actor and he takes real chances in his acting. And frankly, I’ll say this, he’s a sexy guy, I said this to my girlfriend after seeing Eastern Promises. That’s an example of someone who’s in fact, not a real “celebrity.” He’s an interesting artist and a good actor, and to me, that’s good celebrity culture, whatever that means.

What would you say is the most recent movie that would be categorized as “film noir?”

Eastern Promises, definitely. I think it’s the best. It’s gotten very good reviews. A History of Violence is very good as well.

Do your views keep you from liking or admiring certain people?

Yes, absolutely. I was so bothered by Tom Cruise’s Scientology and discourse on pregnant women, or post-partum women, that I can’t even watch him anymore. He made a movie with Michael Mann, Collateral, and I would not watch it because I did not want to watch Tom Cruise. As an actor, you want people to be able to see you in a role. You need to be a blank slate. With Tom Cruise, that’s impossible. It’s going to take a while for me to forget about some of the things that he’s said, which were quite offensive (in regard to medication/pharma-ceuticals).

In regard to pop courses and degrees, do you see that being a huge influence in higher education with more people majoring in it and using it in their careers?

It depends how well done it is. I mean, if it’s analytical and critical, I think it’s useful. Ultimately, people aren’t using their time looking at Picasso paintings or watching PBS documentaries on World War II. What a lot of people are doing is watching popular music,
listening to popular music, and watching their favorite TV shows. I think it’s important that people have some critical skills to not so much dissect the show but to at least be aware that there may be problematic messages or issues that need to be talked about with their children or amongst themselves. It’s better than absorbing it completely uncritically.

I mean, it’s important to have classes about high art and how to construe it. But today, I think it’s more important than ever to be skilled in terms of popular culture—about what the messages are, what the ideology is, what you’re absorbing. The only problem would be when people aren’t being analytical or critical. But that’s what college is about; you’re supposed to do that stuff.

People aren’t getting enough analysis and criticism out of college. You need to bring these questions into the classroom. For example, to bring a canonical example from five years ago, let’s bring Eminem into the classroom and talk about it. Is this racist? Is this sexist? Is this homophobic? That’s interesting, bringing Eminem into the classroom, why not? That would be more useful than bringing Beethoven into the classroom, although, to be fair, you should be doing that, too.

I try to be really honest about something—if I don’t know anything about something, I admit it. I try not to judge, but I do it occasionally, but I stop myself. A quick story—when I was young, Elvis came to my town in Niagara Falls. I wrote a scathing review even though I didn’t go to the concert. I think it had something to do with my sister liking him. They actually printed it, but it was ridiculous. And of course, now I like Elvis. But I remember this, and that’s really bad, so my thing is to not judge people.

So, when you’re in college, I think it’s fair to bring something like Eminem into the classroom. Have a discussion. There are a lot of people that just denounce things that they don’t know anything about. That opinion, I think, is pretty worthless. Any opinion that is based on that little knowledge is useless and pretty bad. Not to be too harsh, but I find it appalling on the part of any academic to denounce a subject on which they know nothing.
Little girls often dream of one day becoming Miss America. They practice “the wave” in hope of one day taking the runway by storm with a large bouquet of roses in the other arm and a large diamond studded tiara atop their hair that has been sprayed with at least three bottles of hair spray. Just how did America reach this obsession of female beauty? The emergence of beauty pageants in popular American culture has played a vital role in defining the ideal form of beauty. What started as part of the attractions at local festivals and carnivals gradually grew into a national phenomenon. From 1880 to 1921, beauty pageants moved from the local level to the national level, causing society to evaluate women on their physical appearance instead of their domestic abilities.

Historians have debated the impact the emergence of beauty pageants have had on society. Lois Banner is among the most famous of historians, for her opinion that as beauty contests became part of American culture, certain expectations were created pertaining to gender roles and physical appearance for women because of society’s obsession with physical appearance. Scholar, Kimberly Hamlin, in contrast, argues that the contests are about power and not beauty. Women who voluntarily submitted their bodies to be critiqued are accepting role of bearers, dominated by men’s opinion instead of striving for a self-actualizing role. Historian, Angela Latham, agrees with Hamlin but also argues that despite sacrifices made by women in the early 20th century for suffrage to become independent, woman lost ground in the quest of independence because beauty contests “enslaved” women in the control of men through the scrutiny of their bodies. All three historians agree beauty pageants marked an important change in the way that society viewed beauty and its importance.

The first official physical beauty contest was the Miss United States Pageant in 1880, however, there was not enough interest to be continued the following year. Instead, early contests mostly consisted of judging paintings or photographs of young women instead of physical bodies. In 1882, Bunnell’s Museum in New York held what it called a modern beauty contest. Fifty-five portraits of women were on display and both male and female visitors had the opportunity to vote for which one they thought was the most beautiful. Banner argues in her book American Beauty that these displays also were important for immigrant men and women because it was a type of acculturation; it was a way for them to discover what was considered beauty in the U.S. The first place winner received $100, but awards were also given to “the finest eyes, something for the one with the finest figure, something for the least beautiful—will reward victors and vanquished.” Artwork was not being judged for how well it was done. Instead, the emphasis was on the physical characteristics of the women as though they were real people.

Beauty contests progressed from paintings to actual photographs of woman by the turn of the century. In 1901, Life magazine held a photographic beauty contest in which subscribers could choose the most beautiful from twenty different women. The pictures were taken from the neck up, and only three of the women were head on, the rest were taken from the
side view (or profile). Only the face was shown to prohibit judgment on the rest of the shape of her body. It is also interesting to note that none of the women are smiling in their profiles. Instead the majority of them have their eyes closed. They looked either stern or shy. Women were not supposed to be very outgoing, letting the men speak for them, which is reflective in the pictures Life chose to run and consistent with Latham and Hamlin’s opinions. The women look as though they are from the upper classes of society and appear stiff and unfriendly. As a result, the selection implies that to be wealthy is to be beautiful.

Life received thousands upon thousands of ballots. The winner received over three thousand votes. She had light colored hair and very fair skin. The majority of the top ten, including the winner, wore dresses that had a low neckline opposed to very conservatively dressed women with high necklines. Women with darker hair did not receive as many votes. Thus, the American idea of beauty was a woman with fair complexion, light or blonde hair color, and a reserved personality.

Pageants emerged after photographic contests. The pageants were a grass root effort, taking place at local festivals and carnivals while establishing the coveted title of Beauty Queen. Instead of being an independent contest, the event was run as part of the attractions of the festival. The 1900 Easter Festival in New York held multiple beauty contests, in which, once again, voting was open to the public and the winner on each particular night was the woman with the most votes. Mrs. Donald McLean earned first runner up but still enjoyed the experience. In an interview with The New York Times she explained, “she has taken part in all sorts and kinds of things before in her life, but this is her first experience in a beauty contest, and she thinks it is delightful.” It is also important to note that McLean was a significant regent in the Daughters of the Revolution New York City chapter. She was a prominent figure in society, who was also married, meaning it was acceptable for women to be put on center stage of the public eye instead of being cast in the shadow of her husband as they had been before the turn of the century. Banner argued, “public festivals reinforced the centrality of physical beauty in women’s lives and made beauty a matter of competition and elitism and not of democratic cooperation among women.” McLean’s success can be seen as an example of class privilege in pageants.

With the introduction of pageants as part of festivals and carnivals quickly came the independent beauty contest. The beauty pageants themselves, in a way, became festivals, complete with extravagant parades and crowds. In the Life beauty contest, none of the girls were smiling and had either a shy or stern look in its place. However, Daly’s beauty contest, in which contestants were competing for the title of Miss Knickerbocker, encouraged the very opposite. The girls were to “strut up and down as it’s done on Broadway” and then try to smile just as the type of New York femininity is supposed to smile.” Women were encouraged to show their true personality. The article in which the advertisement for this contest appeared is specifically claiming that personality is connected to what it means to be a woman through femininity. Daly’s is claiming Miss Knickerbocker will be “the New York girl” demonstrating that based upon her looks a woman should have physical beauty according to a panel of judges. However, this does not take in to account their inner beauty.

The overwhelming majority of beauty pageants were solely for women, as they remain today. However, one rare example of a beauty pageant held in Madison Square Garden was instead labeled a Physical Culture Show. Instead of being a normal contest, participants, both men and women, were judged in their underwear on their body proportions by a panel of
artists, sculptors, physicians, and athletes. “All of the bowlegged men and hollow chested women who sought the chance to exhibit themselves, were shown to a lower door, leading toward the benches in Madison Square.” This type of contest was even more harsh than traditional beauty contests because the contestants were in their undergarments and were literally shown the door if their body did not fit the standards of a few select individuals. One well known Swedish actress was furious she was invited to participate, claiming: “I am a lady even if I do wear fleshings in a comic opera. I am physically the superior of the whole bunch, and so is every girl in our show. I would not have hesitated to appear in opera costume, but not in this way.” This actress raises a very valid argument for the time on two levels. The first is that she claims that she is a lady, and unlike the previously discussed beauty contest, the women participating in this particular contest are not from the upper class. Also, the fact that a woman who acts in the same attire for her profession would not even put her body on display in such a manner proves that this contest went against specific moral standards.

The popularity of beauty contests was created by the more liberal, younger generations who were more likely to violate moral standards set by their more conservative elders. This is evident in the failure of The Ladies Home Journal photographic contest in 1911. The contest was design to recognize the ten most beautiful girls in five regions across America. Each young woman had to be between seventeen and thirty years old. If she was a minor, she had to have her parent’s written permission to submit her photo. None of the names of the top fifty girls would be printed in the magazine when the results were announced. The most beautiful in the five regions would win a trip to New York to have a life size sketch done by renowned artist Charles Dana Gibson and those sketches would be printed with the girl’s name if she and her parents approved. At the end of the contest, the photographs would not be returned but would be destroyed to protect their privacy.

Despite the strict guidelines put in place to protect the identity of the thousands of girls that submitted their photos, parents still objected to the use of their daughters’ images and them being shown to millions of readers across the nation. As a result, three months after the contest was posted, The Ladies Home Journal canceled the series and returned each of the photographs to the contestants. When considering the magnitude of photographs that were received, it clearly demonstrated the amount of opposition presented in order to cancel the contest. Parents were trying to protect the innocence and identities of their daughters. There was still a strong resentment about women displaying the bodies for the amusement of the public. It did not matter if the photos were published anonymously, the fact still remained that these young women were vulnerable to the judgment of everyone who read the magazine.

Even though the contest was canceled, The Ladies Home Journal’s Loveliest Girls in America contest demonstrated a new level of beauty contest. Beauty queens no longer represented the local communities they were from but were winners of entire regions of the country. A more successful example of this is a pageant put on by the Chattanooga News that expanded over four states and was split up into seventeen districts. The expansion of beauty pageants to a more regional level proved that the contests were becoming more and more accepted in society. Some of the women that participated received as many as two million votes.

The parents of the young women who participated in The Ladies Home Journal would have been horrified at the amount of personal information that was given in an article describing the seventeen winners and their trip to New York. Not only were the names of the
The shift from the local to regional level demonstrates that these women are not just receiving their title and then going back to a normal lifestyle the next day. They are starting to have a “reign” in which they are constantly in the public eye for extended periods of time. For some girls, the end of their reign brought hard times. Blanche Glover should have had the world at her doorstep, but despite her success in beauty contests she was at the end of her rope. At only twenty years old, she came to New York after winning a beauty contest in Cleveland, Ohio to become a famous actress. However, she was unable to use her beauty to make it big and tried to commit suicide rather than pay the mounting bills she was accumulating. When her body was found, she was not identified as a struggling actress, but a beauty contest winner. It gave her a distinct title that set her apart from others in her profession, showing that she should have a step above the rest because of her looks, yet was still struggling—proving beauty did not always lead to happiness.

The success of the beauty contest in America raised the question of how beautiful women of the United States were compared to women in other parts of the globe. One French writer specifically claimed that American beauties were “Amazon” in looks. The writer’s description of masculine qualities in American women can be attributed to the women’s rights movement that was taking place at the same time. Women were on the verge of getting the right to vote and becoming independent from their husbands and fathers. The writer also claims: “Americans are ridiculous and insupportable, with their independent airs dominating even the male with their physical forces. Thus they lose charm. One never sees a really beautiful woman or dreams of her as happiness.” In essence the writer is claiming that women should be known for their beauty instead of their own ideas because they would be taking on masculine roles. This ideology promoted contests because it encouraged women to embrace their femininity.

Beauty contests were becoming more and more socially accepted by the late 1910s and 1920s. President Woodrow Wilson indicated this when he requested “A Dream of Fair Women,” a film about winners of a beauty contest to be part of his private collection. President Wilson, like the French writer previously mentioned, also did not find a woman’s independence attractive, something evident when he blocked an amendment to allow women to have suffrage. Yet ironically, beauty pageants were a way for women to be recognized independently from their husbands. Their sashes told the public their identity and were originally worn by their sister suffragists. However, beauty contests did not challenge a man’s opinion of how a woman should function mentally. Instead it questioned the perception of what beauty was in America. This question would soon be answered.

All of the photographic contests, festivals, and regional pageants led up to one event that would forever change the ways that pageants would be carried out and thought of in society. In 1921, the first Miss America pageant was held in Atlantic City. The two day pageant drew contestants from all over the country in hopes of winning the $5,000 mermaid trophy. Instead of being named the Miss America Pageant, the event was called the Atlantic City Autumn Beauty Contest. Thousands of spectators from all over the country came to watch the contest. This was an event that was unlike any other event of its time simply because those thousands of people were there to watch women. When large crowds came to events like this, it was usually to watch a male activity. Pageants were officially part of the American entertainment industry. The concentration was on how well women could compete against each
other. However, many of these spectators came to watch what was to become the most famous component of all pageants, the bathing suit section, a delight to the male spectators.

Just as with the Physical Culture Show, women were being judged specifically by the way their bodies were shaped in the bathing suit contest. A censor ban had to be lifted in order for the women to be able to compete in tight fitting one piece bathing suits and show their bare knees. The controversy surrounding what was appropriate for women to wear, and, in this case, not to wear, was brought out in full force. One critic went as far to say, “I don’t believe the real beauties enter beauty contests. They must be too modest.” The contestants paraded down the street in their suits before 250,000 spectators. The moral issue of young women being judged specifically on their physical appearance by thousands of strangers remained the key issue surrounding the pageant.

The act of women paying more attention to their looks than their homes was the specific reason that House Representative Herrick, who was a Republican from Oklahoma, introduced a bill to ban all newspaper beauty contests on the eve of the Miss America pageant in 1921. Any editor who would try to hold a contest would have to serve time in jail. This view was shared by many others. In an article entitled “The Vulgarest Thing in America,” one writer claims that these contests “lack wholesomeness” because they do not require any specific skill, claiming youth should instead devote their time to activities that develop character, courage, and skill. The issue of these women being judged on their physical looks instead of their personality was once again on center stage. Despite Herrick’s proposal, the Congressional record shows that the bill was only introduced but never debated or voted on.

Judges of the pageants were looking for very specific characteristics when they scored the contestants. The perfect queen had to have long hair and a small stature. She needed to look as though she would be able and willing to carry out the domestic duties of the house, including motherhood. They did not want anyone who looked like a flapper, professional, and, most importantly, a suffragist. It was undesirable for women to project a dominate confident personality associated with masculinity. The second Miss America, Mary Katherine Campbell, was described in this way by The New York Times: “Her complexion is a most delicate type of peaches and cream. She has a small straight nose, eyes not very large and of a soft brown, with rather straight brown eyebrows of the same warm tint as her naturally curling hair.” The reader gets a very clear descriptive image of Campbell and what was defined as American beauty.

Beauty contests have played a vital role in American popular culture for over one hundred years. They have evolved from portraits painted by artists in a local museum to real women competing all over the nation for the title of most beautiful woman in the country. Women went from being cast in the shadows of their fathers and husbands to being in the American spotlight. The road was not always easy. Contests were canceled by parents’ fears of their daughters being exposed to millions of strangers. Moral conservatives tried to put a national ban on contests because they felt it was making women lose focus on their traditional domestic tasks. But at the bottom of all problems was the idea that women were being judged for their physical appearance. They were being judged on an activity that required no skill and were putting their bodies on display to complete strangers. Despite beauty pageants’ many opponents, pageants survived. At first glance, beauty contests may seem extremely superficial and demeaning to women, but they gave women a new sense of independence during a time when the roles of women were dramatically changing.
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“What have we women to do with these matters?”: Women and Femininity in Pre-Revolutionary America, 1763-1775

Megan Hatfield

In November of 1769, Mrs. Henry Barnes wrote in a letter to Elizabeth Murray Smith Inman, “…When the deluded multitude finds they have been led astray by false maxims they may Possibly turn upon them with their own weapons…This is my Private opinion, but how I came to give it is a Mistry, for Politicks is a puddle I never choose to dabble in.” Barnes was not the only woman in the British American colonies surprised to find herself publicly expressing a political opinion in 1769. Since 1763, women in the colonies had become politicized through their role in pre-revolutionary activities and moved away from such traditional definitions of femininity as the colonial goodwife, whom God had created as an obedient and faithful helpmate to her husband, the deputy husband and the pretty gentlewoman. By the mid-1760s, women’s participation in consumer boycotts, their home production of manufactured goods, and their involvement in other gestures of political defiance against Great Britain brought them surely and swiftly into the world of politics.

This paper examines how and why such a shift in women’s identities was possible by investigating the responses and justifications made by men and women to validate women’s involvement in political activity. In other words, it asks: how did men and women react to women’s changing role and were they able to conceptualize this role in a way that did not too radically challenge their understanding of femininity? Using a collection of primary and secondary sources, this essay begins with a discussion of the Consumer Revolution and how this brought women into the political conversation. It then examines men’s reactions to women’s politicization showing that men accepted women acting politically because it was necessary and done within the confines of domesticity. And finally, it explores women’s reactions and argues that three factors convinced them that this political behavior did not compromise their femininity: they were acting within the confines of domesticity, they received encouragement from men affirming the compatibility of political behavior and femininity, and they were able to use religion in ways to support their behavior. Throughout the paper, I argue that far from being a radical departure from traditional conceptions of femininity, the men and women of pre-revolutionary America adjusted their understanding of femininity in ways that they understood to be temporary and necessary if their efforts against Great Britain were to be successful; they did not intend for this to remain a long term change in women’s roles but rather it was purely a temporary expedient in difficult political times.

During the eighteenth century, the American colonies experienced what historians have termed the Consumer Revolution in which the colonies became dependent on the importation of manufactured goods from Great Britain for their social and economic livelihood. This process had several consequences that laid the foundation for women’s politicization.
in the mid-1760s. The shift from a production to a consumption-oriented economy transformed the social and cultural character of colonial America, and it resulted in strengthened ties to Great Britain. It was as if the material goods they consumed allowed them to recreate British society in their homes which in effect, deepened their love for their parent country. Additionally, the Consumer Revolution reached people from all classes and regions, and although the impact of it differed according to class and location, it still united the colonies through providing a common culture. For example, one English traveler noted on his journey through sparsely populated regions of America that “in very many of the habitations we found elegance as well as comfort,” and in a later letter he noted that “the quick importation of fashions from the mother country is really astonishing. I am almost inclined to believe that a new fashion is adopted earlier by the polished and affluent American than by many opulent persons in the great metropolis.” His letters clearly reveal that British culture was present throughout all parts of the colonies.

As the influx of British manufactures changed the social character of colonial America, women’s place within that society also changed. Women had previously assumed the role of production within the household; however, the Consumer Revolution freed urban elite women at least from their production responsibilities. In response to the wide variety of consumer goods, these women now focused on the refinement of their homes and families helping to change their definition of femininity. The qualities stressed by the goodwife ideology, industriousness and frugality, were replaced with the ideal of what some historians have called the “pretty gentlewoman” whose qualities were “delicacy, refinement, and attention to fashion.” It is important to note that even though this was an ideal primarily attainable by the urban elite, it had appeal for women across all classes who when possible, tried to live the lifestyle dictated by that standard. Overall, the consumer world that developed in the mid-eighteenth century was one that greatly changed colonial society and women’s role in it as their attention shifted from production to consumption.

The shifts caused by the Consumer Revolution paved the way for women’s involvement in politics. When the British imposed the Stamp Act on the American colonies in 1765, the colonists voiced their discontent by boycotting British imports. In order for the boycott to be effective, all colonists had to participate in it; consequently, women were vital to its success since they had become the principal consumers in the market. For women, ordinary behaviors like buying a dress became charged with a political meaning since that purchase either supported or undercut colonial political goals. Thus, women were inadvertently politicized as they were forced to make political decisions through their typical consumer behaviors and not by a deliberate effort to involve themselves in politics. Equally significant, women were asked to not only stop consuming British imports, but also to increase or resume home production to compensate for the shortage of goods. In short, women were politicized through their roles as consumers and producers.

Contrary to what one might expect, most men supported, if reluctantly, the political role that women assumed. While traditional gender conventions held that politics was a business only for men and women were restricted solely to the realm of the household, men’s reactions show that they were able to accept this breach of gender roles because it was necessary and done within the confines of domesticity. Because of the way these factors worked together, it is clear that they understood women’s involvement in politics to be a temporary side effect of their imperial political troubles.
These attitudes are primarily evident in the way men publicly tried to convince their own sex that women’s involvement in politics was acceptable. In a 1767 Pennsylvania Chronicle article, a man using the pseudonym “Oeconomicus” wrote in reference to the role played by women, “for we all know how much it is in their power to retrench superfluous expences, and by their care and activity in the management of domestic concerns, to second and assist their husbands….Indeed their alliance in an understanding of this nature, is of very great importance, that I can hardly think it practicable without them.” “Oeconomicus” pacified any potential concerns by showing that women’s support was essential because of the duties of their domestic role as consumers. Notably, he described that women would “second and assist their husbands” thereby assuring men that the traditional power hierarchy would remain unchanged. Moreover, in the context of the whole article his description of the ladies’ alliance as reaching “an understanding of this nature” implies a sense that men were granting women temporary permission to behave in such ways until the colonies’ financial affairs were in order.

An essay written by Christopher Gadsden in 1769 also demonstrates the sentiment that involving women was necessary and legitimate because of their domestic responsibilities. The essay listed numerous obstacles preventing South Carolina from effectively boycotting the Townshend Acts. Among those reasons, Gadsden emphasized, “what many say and think is the greatest difficulty of all we have to encounter, that is, to persuade our wives to give us their assistance, without which ‘tis impossible to succeed.” Obviously, he quite plainly recognized the necessity of women’s cooperation. Furthermore, his use of the words “persuade” and the italicized “greatest difficulty” show how Gadsden and many others felt it would be a struggle to mobilize women and obtain their cooperation for the boycott. To address that issue, he then urged men to gain women’s support by appealing to domesticity. His reasoning for employing that tactic was as follows:

for where is that hard hearted mother or wife to be found, when properly warned, that every farthing she lays out, even unavoidably and unnecessarily, for herself and family, in European goods, tends only to increase a power, that is, at that very time, distressing herself, her family, her dearest friends and relations, in the most essential and tender manner, and doing all it can to reduce them to the lowest infamy and disgrace.

This line of reasoning makes it apparent that in rejecting the harmful European goods women were only doing their proper duty as mothers and wives. While this may have had the dual effect of convincing women it was acceptable to behave politically, it certainly functioned to show men that their masculinity was not threatened because Gadsden appealed to men in a way that left it clear that the traditional power hierarchy would remain intact. For instance, according to Gadsden, women’s political awareness would be achieved only because her husband “informed” or “persuaded” her that it was her domestic responsibility, thus, it was in their power to control and manipulate how women were brought into the political realm. This concept was also buttressed by the sense that women were to blame for the colonies’ political troubles. Gadsden makes women seem like clueless culprits who brought about the colonies’ dependency on British manufactures and if they, as society’s chief consumers, continued those patterns they would be to blame for the colonies’ disgrace. In this case, by casting women as the weak link, men are elevated to a position of superiority as they are the ones left to fix the problem which women created.

Gadsden was not the only man to blame women for the colonies’ dependency and subsequent political problems. For instance, in a 1769 article in the Boston Evening Post
designed to promote home production, one man wrote that throughout history women had determined the fates of men with their spinning wheels and “had the Ladies, in every age since, ruled in this laudable way, perhaps some nations would be in a far better state than they now are.” This man overtly laid blame on the “ladies” for the present political situation because they failed to work diligently at their spinning wheels. Similarly, in a speech delivered by William Tennent III in 1774 on the subject of tea, he warned women that their “trivial Pleasure,” the “darling Tea-Dish Ceremony,” if continued would “be paid for by the Blood of your Sons.” Not only does his description of tea drinking as “trivial” and “darling” appear condescending and patronizing, but also his warning to women implies that they were to blame for the escalating situation with Great Britain due to their attachment to tea. In these examples blaming women, the men made it seem more legitimate that they needed to bring women into the political conversation because that was the only way to control and change their deleterious habits. Additionally, it helped sustain their sense of superiority over women and assure their sex that gender roles were not threatened, just temporarily adjusted to meet their political necessities.

The point that men legitimized women’s involvement because it was allotted to them within the confines of domesticity is further strengthened when examining the controversy surrounding the Edenton Ladies’ Agreement in 1774. While there were other agreements or petitions that ladies entered into, the Edenton petition’s wording caused dissension among men. The contentious part of the document reads, “it is a duty which we owe, not only to our near and dear connections, who have concurred in them, but to ourselves…we therefore accordingly subscribe this paper as a witness of our fixed intention and solemn determination to do so.” This became controversial because women noted that while they owed a duty to their family connections (i.e., children and husbands), they also owed a duty to themselves, which they were determined to follow. Thus, it signaled a sense of female autonomy that stepped outside the lines of what men deemed to be appropriate behavior. To contrast, women of Boston also entered into a non-consumption agreement, but unlike the Edenton ladies, their behavior was exalted. In part, perhaps this was due to the uniqueness of women’s circumstances in Boston and the town’s reputation as a radical leader against Great Britain, so women were allowed greater flexibility to act politically without risking societal norms. Yet surely this was also due to the particular wording of the Boston agreement. The language of their agreement shows that the women felt obliged to do this because of their domestic duties. For example, it states: “and as we find we are reproached for not being so ready as could be desired, to lend our Assistance, we think it our Duty perfectly to concur with the true Friends of Liberty…This Agreement we cheerfully come into, as we believe the very distressed Situation of our Country requires it.” These words indicate that the women were complying because they felt it was a requirement, rather than out of a separate political will such as the Edenton ladies seemed to possess.

Indeed, the Edenton Ladies’ Agreement left them open to criticism especially from British observers who attacked their femininity. One form of criticism came from a British cartoonist who drew a satire of the event. The satirist depicted how the ladies of Edenton, or America more generally, were stepping outside of their proper role. Essentially, the image of a promiscuous woman, an unattended child, a mischievous slave, and the overall chaos of the room invokes a sense that nothing less than the total breakdown of traditional and functional society was, or would be, the result of women asserting that type of political behavior.
same way, Englishman Arthur Iredell wrote to his brother from London commenting at length on the Edenton Agreement. He joked derisively that the women were an important threat: “whilst we [men] so unhappily formed by Nature. The more we strive to conquer them, the more are Conquered! The Edenton Ladies conscious, I suppose, of this Superiority, on their Side, by former Experience are willing, I imagine to crush us into Atoms, by their Omnipotency.” Iredell’s sarcastic words concerning the strength, power, and significance of the Edenton ladies’ actions imply that their behavior was unmistakably masculine, so much so that he did not take their actions seriously. Although both the Edenton Satire and Iredell were British, and thus likely to have certain political biases and motives, their reactions of questioning the femininity of the Edenton Ladies still show that men were uncomfortable with women acting as political persons outside of their domestic role, and they would respond by characterizing such women as masculine to deter the anomalous behavior. On the whole, the various public responses of men to women’s political involvement commonly show that men saw women as consumers who momentarily had to assume a political role due to the necessities of a tumultuous time; they never sought long term change in traditional conceptions of femininity and gender roles, only a short term adjustment.

Like their male counterparts, women responded to the call to revolutionary political action in varying ways. Reluctant Women who responded reluctantly or adopted a negative attitude towards their new political role did so because they felt it was outside the bounds of femininity. With few exceptions, politics had traditionally been a topic that women were not to publicly participate in or discuss; therefore, they did not see the new role as conducive to femininity. Simply put, these women thought that politics were for men. This is evident in some of the responses of reluctant women. For example, Charity Clarke wrote to her male cousin, Joseph, in England that although she had taken up the patriot cause and increased her home production, she feared that her discussion of politics would destroy “the idea you should have of female softness in me.” Clarke continued to be active in her discussion of politics, but she was well aware that it was not traditional feminine behavior. In a letter to The Pennsylvania Magazine in 1775, a woman under the name “Arabella” exemplifies the sentiment that women saw the political role the boycotts made them assume as unfeminine and unrelated to women. She claims that at first she was supportive of the boycotts, but “it is an old story now, and it is really very troublesome” because “we [ladies] are in great danger of suffering for want.” Moreover, she writes “What have we women to do with these matters?...I like patriotism very well: But why should we be refused the essaries and comforts of life such as tea, gause, lace, and a thousand little et cetera’s…” “Arabella” did not think that women should be denied the luxuries like tea and lace that femininity had been inextricably linked to. Also, she made it clear that, in her opinion, women had nothing to do with politics so they should not have to be further inconvenienced by the boycotts.

Despite the reluctance of some, the majority of women supported the political roles that society asked them to take. The first of the three key factors convincing them to do so was that, like men, women did not feel threatened that femininity was risked because they were politicized in the context of domesticity. Thus, poems and articles stressed that women were only asked to be conscious of the political decisions and their consequences that they were already making in their every day life. For example, the Virginia Gazette in September 1774 published an article “To the Ladies of Pennsylvania.” The article asks ladies to “cooperate” with their husbands and fathers by “withstanding luxury of every kind” to “above all…ban-
ish India Tea from your tables, and in its stead, substitute some of those aromatic herbs with which our fruitful soil abounds.” The author of this article makes it clear that their husbands and fathers did not seek a high degree of women’s activism in politics, just cooperation in making the right consumer choices for the well being of their country. Similarly, the point that women are just asked to make wise decisions is evident in the following excerpt from the poem, “The female Patriots:”

The use of the Taxables, let us forebear,
(Then Merchants import til yr. Stores are all full
May the Buyers be few & yr. Traffick be dull.)
Stand firmly resolved & bid Grenville to see
That rather than Freedom, we’ll part with our Tea

Both the author of “To the Ladies of Pennsylvania” and the author of “The female Patriots,” published their work anonymously, but it is clear that they wanted to portray themselves as women. This shows that as women they recognized that they were to participate in the political discussion through traditionally female ways in controlling their consumer choices. Also, it shows that they understood the need to present the role in those domestic terms to their fellow women in order to make them more likely to support the patriotic cause.

Furthermore, in a letter addressing the gentlemen of her city, “Sophia Thifty” acknowledged that women belonged in the political conversation because of their domestic role. She wrote that women as mothers and wives understood that their consumer choices would help or destroy their country, therefore they “would not hesitate a Moment about resigning every Thing inconsistent with the general welfare; on the contrary, we will sacrifice, cheerfully sacrifice…” The rest of her letter continued to defend women not as mindless consumers with petty attachments to luxury items, but as wives and mothers who shared a love for their country with their male partners. In short, her letter demonstrates that women received the message that this political problem was their concern because of their domestic role, and that she felt comfortable publicly expressing her opinion, though under a pseudonym, on such political subjects precisely because they were in fact domestic concerns.

Second, women were convinced that femininity was not risked because men made it clear that they adjusted their perception of femininity or female attractiveness to suit the necessities of the time. For example, in an article published in the Boston Gazette, “The Farmer” wrote: “Tell the fair Ladies, how much more amiable they will appear in decent plain dresses made in their own country, than in gaudy, butterfly, vain, fantastick, and expensive dresses brought from Europe.” This shows that men wanted women to know that their idea of female beauty was no longer the “gaudy” dresses from Europe, but instead, beauty was packaged in plain, homespun dresses. This same idea is conveyed in an “Address to the Ladies” published in the Virginia Gazette. The poem tells ladies to give up luxuries like tea and fancy clothing and the final lines of the poem tell ladies “These do without fear, and to all you’ll appear./ Fair, charming, true, lovely, and clever; /Though times remain darkish, young men may be sparkish./ And love you much stronger than ever.” Although the sex of the author is not indicated, it still shows women that men will love them more if they change their consumer habits and appearance to support the political cause of the colonies. They wanted women to understand that the qualities they found attractive in women were no longer the fancy dresses
from Europe but rather, they preferred women who dressed plainly, drank local teas, and rejected the luxury. In short, men made it clear that femininity was no longer defined by the qualities introduced by consumerism. They rejected the “pretty gentlewoman” and preferred the plain look that characterized the “goodwife” who had preceded her.

Third, women were able to use religion in two important ways to justify their role in politics: through the discussion of the word “virtue” and through the general link that was established between religion and politics. Foremost, religion surfaced as a justification through the discussion of the word “virtue” and the qualities of those who attained it. During the Consumer Revolution, Protestant ministers fought against the growing consumer society in sermons and in moral stories published in newspapers. They claimed that luxury was a vice, and condemned the society that embraced it. The ministers even claimed that consuming women were a threat to male authority, however, their efforts were to no avail. Regardless of the minister’s complaints and advice, the colonists continued to increase consumption because as Dr. Alexander Hamilton described it, “making such a sacrifice was not necessary for their salvation.”

By the 1760s, however, the Protestant rhetoric of vice and virtue with respect to consumer habits resonated with colonists. Pre-Revolutionary society found such arguments about vice and virtue quite useful and effective as they adopted an understanding of virtue that was founded on the principles of self-restraint and self-denial in the face of consumer temptations. Now, the same sermons and pamphlets circulated by Protestants could serve to reinforce the colonies’ political cause. For instance, sermons like “The Prodigal Daughter” and “Hamet: or Insufficiency of Luxury to the Attainment of Happiness” preach against material luxuries, vanity and extravagant lifestyles describing virtuous women, women whom God welcomes into heaven, as industrious and frugal. Although these sermons typically did not take up politics directly, they likely indirectly supported the colonial cause because they reinforced the point that extravagance was a vice and frugality was a virtue from the perspective of the Church and God.

It is clear that these religious messages resonated with colonists in the linkages that men and women made between religion, virtue, and their political goals that were intentionally directed to women. In a letter published in The Pennsylvania Magazine, a woman detailed the reasons why women should take up spinning for the patriotic cause. Among those reasons, she touched on the principles of virtue as described by King Solomon. She quoted, “A virtuous woman— her price is above rubies. She seeketh wool and flax and worketh diligently with her hands…. In the next paragraph, she asked ladies to “submit to a degree of self-denial for the good of the suffering fellow-creatures...to shun those vanities and vices, that idleness and luxury may provoke.” She wanted her readers to understand that Christianity deemed it virtuous to spin, and that they should deny themselves the pleasure that the vices of luxury brought. More importantly, she did this for a political reason. She made it clear from the very start of her letter that spinning was what women could do to help the patriotic cause, and the rest of the letter explained why they should do it in terms of being virtuous through self-denial of luxury.

That lone example, however telling it may be, is not enough evidence to illustrate that women generally were aware of the link between virtue and political choice. To bolster this point, it is necessary to examine the encouragement men gave women in the matter. For example, in a 1764 letter published in the Boston Gazette, one man wrote that luxury was
an evil that caused their indebtedness to Great Britain, and that “Industry and Frugality are Virtues which have been buried out of Sight: ‘tis Time, High Time, to revive them.” Later, he implores women to “assiduously apply themselves” to instill in their children the “Principles of Virtue and Oeconomy.” Likewise, in 1769, another man wrote in a *Boston Evening Post* article designed to encourage women to increase home production that the women of James-Town should be commended for their earnest in “promoting frugality, industry, and all other virtues.” Both of these examples show that the male colonists deliberately connected virtue to the principles of industry and frugality in an attempt to gain women’s support for their political cause. Significantly, these were not the only two men to speak of virtue with such motives; it seems to have been a frequent theme in articles on the subject. Given this pattern and the fact that these stories were published in newspapers throughout the colonies, it is likely that women were receiving some type of exposure for understanding virtue in consumer terms.

One implication of understanding virtue in such a way is that it could have made it acceptable for women to behave politically because it linked politics, consumer goods, virtue and femininity together. Since women were understood to be virtuous by nature, virtue was automatically part of the definition of femininity. And since politics became intertwined with consumer goods and virtue was attained by rejecting the correct consumer goods (British manufactures), then virtue and femininity, as the two were linked, were connected to political involvement. Thus, it stands to reason that women, who strove to be virtuous, would find this as a rationalization for why femininity was not risked and political behavior was acceptable; they were just trying to be virtuous as always, only now virtue was accomplished through political choices.

Beyond the specific connotations of virtue, there emerged a more general link between religion and politics that convinced women that their femininity was not risked by political behavior. The fusing of religion and politics is most evident in the spinning meetings that women held as public and social events in which a number of women in the community would gather and spend hours of the day spinning cloth. It is important to note the limits of this discussion. Historians have found that spinning matches were a northern, urban phenomenon, adopted by middling and upper class women. With this in mind, the impact of spinning matches in linking religion and politics is only relevant to women who fit into that group, but those limits do not mean that the area does not warrant investigation. Spinning meetings were understood to be a religious activity before they were symbolized as the quintessence of female patriotic support. For example, historian Laurel Thatcher Ulrich notes that of the forty-six spinning matches she documented between 1768 and 1770 only six of those were unmistakably held for the patriotic reasons, while thirty-one of those were held at ministers’ houses. Usually, the bees held at ministers’ houses were like charity events where women would spin for the benefit of a member of their church. Therefore, this comparison shows that spinning was done chiefly for religious purposes, not political.

Whether the spinning meetings were intended to be political or not, it did not stop outside observers from interpreting the events as patriotic. Newspaper articles praised women for their enthusiastic support as evident by the spinning matches. For example, one man wrote, “…the industry and frugality, of American Ladies, must exalt their character in the eyes of the World, and serve to show how greatly they are contributing to bring about the Sal-
ulation of a whole Continent." Publicizing women’s spinning matches as a great demonstration of their love for their country was intended to encourage other women to increase their own cloth production. While spinning took on a political meaning to outside observers, the women who participated in spinning meetings could have been doing both a religious and/or patriotic service to their society. Given the significance of religion in women’s lives, the tie between religion and politics through the traditionally female domestic manufacturing of cloth could have served to justify why the majority of women were not threatened that femininity was risked by the entrance of politics into their lives. Overall, spinning meetings combined with the definition of virtue in consumer terms made religion a key factor that allowed women to enter the political conversation since religion itself had become intertwined with elements of politics.

In sum, despite the reluctance voiced by a few, men accepted women’s politicization because women were critical to the success of their boycott efforts and it was done within the confines of domesticity, and women were convinced to act politically and to support the colonial cause because their participation was restricted to their domestic duties, men made it clear that their perception of femininity was no longer defined by the qualities introduced by consumerism, and certain aspects of religion became intertwined with politics. As a result, women in pre-Revolutionary times found that politics was inescapable. Due to the nature of the resistance which colonists chose, women were forced to make political decisions in their everyday lives as society’s primary consumers. Even in religion, women found that the politics of non-consumption and patriotism had been adopted. Although both men and women generally understood the acceptability of such behavior to be only for a short time, they could not control the effects that politicization would have on women. Women took pride in their contributions to the boycott efforts as is evident in Anna Green Winslow’s declaration in a diary entry in 1772 that “I am (as we say) a daughter of liberty I chuse to wear as much of our own manufactory as pocible.” Predictably, the pride that women felt for their participation in and contribution to the pre-revolutionary activities would not make it easy for them to return to their traditional, non-political role. What no one expected when they allowed women to take a temporary role in politics was that there was a long, hard war in their future that would carry on the process of politicization that was started by the consumer boycotts. After the experiences of war in their homeland, women could not just go back to being the “goodwives” or “pretty gentlewomen” that they were before the war. Like Winslow, women had become politicized and proud, and needed a place in the post-Revolutionary world.
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Reduce! Reuse! Recycle!

Whitney Prose

Reduce! Reuse! Recycle! Every student born after the environmental turmoil of the 1970s knows this creed by heart. Unfortunately, the education to go with these aspects tends to be lopsided and only recycling is focused upon. This is reflective not only in the current “Green Slogans” such as Recycling Makes Cents but also in the large amount of recycling programs versus reducing or reusing organizations. Some organizations, such as the Californian government (1989; 1994), recognize that Reduce, Reuse, Recycle is a hierarchy and reducing is the most important—but this idea is generally glossed over when taught to the general public (§40051 and §40196). This paper attempts to analyze and discuss, without prejudice, the actual value or lack thereof of recycling. Due to the large amount of materials that can be “recycled” and the fact even the term “recycling” is disputable, this paper will concentrate on just two materials: aluminum and paper.

What is recycling? According to the American Environmental Protection Agency, (1997)—hereafter abbreviated as the EPA—“[a] material is ‘recycled’ if it is used, reused, or reclaimed” (CFR 261.2(c)(7)). Therefore, anything taken out of the main waste stream, anything not going to the public waste landfill, is considered ‘recycled.’ The food one eats, the jar one reuses to hold pennies, the hazardous waste shipped to be incinerated “recycled” because it has been used, reused, or reclaimed. Something “reclaimed” is either broken down into something usable, or “recharged” into a valuable use (261.2(c)(4)). The EPA (1997) uses batteries as their example: the lead in batteries can be taken out and is instantly usable either for more batteries, or another use. Typically, this is the part of recycling that is taught to the public. What is not taught as often is the various ways a material can be used that is also considered recycling. The EPA (1997) defines reusing as taking a material that could be considered waste and using it for another purpose—such as coal companies who gather their fly-ash byproduct of burning coal and reuse it to stabilize their sludge from the same process of burning coal (Conesville personal interview 2007). But, a material isn’t recycled if it is removed from the waste stream, processed, and makes a new item but leaves behind unusable portions—the EPA (1997) gives the example of recovering metals from a machine but having a bunch of plastic, rubber and other non-recyclable items left behind during the process (CFR 261.2(c)(5)(i)). Additionally, if the item recycled replaces a commercially available item it is not considered “recycled” by the EPA’s definition because the company could have bought the material (CFR 261.2(c)(5)(ii)). The EPA (1997) cites using old picking brine as a sludge stabilizer in a waste water treatment plant as an example of not recycling. The reason it is considered not recycled is because the brine was heading to the waste water treatment plant anyways, and the brine was made by making pickles—not as a result of treating waste water. Additionally, when coal plants sell or give their fly ash to cement companies it is not considered recycling because the fly ash was made as a by product of coal—not cement making—and the cement company could buy different materials than fly ash to use in the making of their cement. Obviously, the public’s idea on what is recycling and the official government’s idea varies.
Why Recycle? A Passaic County official (2004) writes: “Unfortunately, the economics of recycling are not as simple or as predictable as we might like them to be. In most cases, programs are lucky if they break even on their recycling operations” (Economics of Recycling). Why is there this dire imperative to recycle, if recycling rarely, if ever, “makes cents?” According to John Tierney of the New York Times (1996), recycling as a moral imperative—instead of an economic boon—can be pinpointed on the 1987 event of the sea barge Mobro 4000 (Recycling…Is Garbage). Before this time, a sort of liaise faire recycling system was in place. If something was economically profitable and feasible to reuse, reduce, or recycle, companies did so to make a better profit.

In 1987, the Mobro 4000 left its dock in Long Island loaded with 3,100 tons of garbage (Katz 2002, p. 22). Mobro traveled up and down the coast, even to Belize, over the course of weeks but no one wanted Mobro to dump its waste in their landfills (p. 22). This event was heavily covered in the media and Americans “became obsessed with personally handling their own waste” (Tierney 1996). So, J. Winston Porter, the assistant administrator of the 1988 EPA, and his engineers looked at the current waste being produced, and how much was currently being recycled (10%) and decided that approximately 25% should be recycled within five years. The public responded astoundingly and recycling has become the huge.

Eco-conscious people are not the only citizens concerned with promoting and performing recycling. Recycling is seen as part of a more holistic ideology of “Stewardship” in many religions. Pope John Paul II spoke, “Care for the environment is not an option. In the Christian perspective, it forms an integral part of our personal life and of life in society. Not to care for the environment is to ignore the Creator’s plan for all of creation and results in an alienation of the human person” (2003). In Buddhism, The First Precept reads “Aware of the suffering caused by the destruction of life, I undertake to cultivate compassion and learn ways to protect the lives of people, animals, plants, and minerals. I am determined not to kill, not to let others kill, and not to condone any act of killing in the world, in my thinking, and in my way of life” (Trans. by Thich Nhat Hanh 1993). Together, these two religions illustrate that caring for the earth is more than just a “good thing to do,” instead, it is a method of worship and reverence: it is a way of living beyond oneself.

Additionally, besides saving landfill space, promoting eco-awareness, and a way of worship, recycling is seen as a method of creating markets and jobs. On a tour of Rumpke Recycling Facility located in Columbus Ohio, the author noticed at least five workers were needed for each stage of recycling separation; additionally, overseers, vehicle drivers, a public relations specialist, and other office workers were needed in the small five-county operation. If recycling were not present, these workers would be out of jobs. Additionally, according to Rich Simon of Rumpke, recycling creates viable markets because recycled goods are purchased at bare-minimum prices per ton (personal interview 2007).

He notes that resources are saved because the recycled paper is shipped in sea-containers heading to China. These containers used to return empty to China after bringing goods to America, but now they are utilized to carry paper overseas and no additional energy is wasted because the containers were headed to China anyways.

Promoters of recycling note recycling is all about saving the environment from degradation—but as illustrated above, clearly recycling has many more benefits and facets. Alone, the education recycling provides to children and adults is widely considered invaluable.
Recycling is Bogus. Many people believe they are helping the environment by recycling, but people may in fact be ruining their economy—which is a part of the human environment. According to John Tierny, quoting William Franklin of Keep America Beautiful—a non-profit environmental group—recycling can actually “add 15 percent to the costs of waste disposal—and more if communities get too ambitious” (2007). As a result of the public’s increased awareness of an impending too-much-trash problem, solutions were quickly implemented without much economic planning. J. Winston Porter was an assistant administrator for the EPA in 1988 and part of their group who made the Waste Hierarchy (after recycling came composting & waste-to-energy incinerators and finally landfills) and five-year waste management plan for America. Porter recounts that he and his group felt pressure from the public to make an official government law mandating recycling, even though they personally felt that doing so would overstep the boundaries of the government. But the recycling craze had settled in, and some cities and states enacted their own regulations—some, such as Rhode Island, mandated that 70% of all waste produced had to be recycled. Additionally, it turns out that there was no shortage of landfills for the Mobro and Americans in general—just a shortage of localized cheap dumping space due to new environmental regulations mandating safer landfills.

But by the time it was realized that incinerators were “disastrously expensive” and recycling programs tend to always lose money, the government had already instated mandates that parks had to buy recycled materials (such as benches made of recycled plastic) and the people had become dedicated to faithfully recycling goods. Economically, recycling everything makes no sense.

Additionally, recycling might be harming the very environment people wish to protect. Take for consideration all of the energy used to collect the recyclables, sort them, wash them, and reuse them: this environmental concern caused the Environmental Defense Fund specialist Richard Denison to calculate ecological impacts of recycling. He summarized, “The net result of recycling is lower energy consumption and lower released of air and water pollutants.” Denison added there are much more efficient ways to receive the same energy-saving results and much more economically friendly.

With all of this conflicting information entering the public common knowledge, it is no wonder people are at odds and confused over whether or not recycling is even a portion of what some environmentalist would have the public believe. Therefore, the below paragraphs examine just two of many materials available for recycling and discusses their pros and cons both environmentally, and economically. But, as John Tierney notes, “even ardent environmentalist give up...[c]ost-benefit analyses for individual products” because it is just “so confusing” (1996).

Paper & Cardboard Recycling

How it is done: Paper is broken into grade such as office paper, newsprint, and cardboard. Each of these has their own uses and viability as a recyclable material. Paper mills buy certain types of recycled paper to meet the type of requirements their end product requires. The paper mill then puts the paper in a vat full of chemicals and water to turn the paper into a pulp (TAPPI 2001). The chemicals alone cannot do the job, therefore, the wet paper is also chopped and heated to turn the solids into cellulose—organic fiber. This pulp is still full of
“impure” items such as, plastic, glue and tape. So the pulp must be strained to retrieve out the impurities. Nevertheless, items like staples still fit through the screens. Therefore, the pulp is spun quickly in tubes to cause differenation of the materials. Anything heavy, such as metal staples, collect on the outside by centrifugal force and are collected out of the pulp. The pulp is now clean, but it is a dark murky color unsuitable for paper. Two different de-inking processes typically occur to a pulp before a mill can use it and they employ both halves of Henry’s Law. First the pulp is drenched with water to remove the loose ink and any remaining large impure partials. Secondly, a chemical surfactant is added to the pulp to cause the ink and impurities to release from the paper. These are brought out of solution by bubbling the pulp with air. Now the paper is beat to cause the fibers to expand to their full potential, and to break up any clusters. Additionally, not all of the ink will have been removed at this point. Therefore, the pulp is soaked in various chemicals to remove the colored inks, and also bleached with hydrogen peroxide, chlorine dioxide, or oxygen to make it white. A mill can now make paper from this pulp, but because the fibers are now quite weak, often the pulp is mixed with virgin fibers to make it stronger. The pulp is mixed until it is 99.5% water and then it is spread out into new paper sheets. This flat mixture travels through a series of presses and heaters to turn the pulp into paper. This paper is then rolled and in general turned into its final consumer product.

Environmental Impact: According to Tierney, “[r]ecycling newsprint actually creates more water pollution than making new paper: for each ton of recycled newsprint that’s produced, and extra 5,000 gallons of waste water are discharged” versus virgin pulp newspaper (1996). Whereas virgin paper is made from trees harvested, transported, chopped into pulp and turned into paper. John Tierney adds that timber companies sell their no-longer high-demand tree farms to developers, and the land is turned into housing developments instead of natural forests. According to The Leading Technical Association for the Worldwide Pulp, Paper and Converting Industry, approximately 35,000 tons of dry sludge is made for every 100,000 tons of dry recycled paper. And, “Wood fibers can only be recycled five to seven times before they become too short and brittle to be made into new paper” (TAPPI 2001). Unlike virgin paper, recycled paper (if it is made into anything other than the lowest end paper-towels) must be thoroughly cleaned before it is useable. TAPPI notes that magazines contain clay on the pages to make them shiny, glue to hold the pages together, ink for all the full-page pictures and text, and “many other materials” such as perfume samples and different shades of glossiness. All of these must be worked and reworked out of the paper before it is reusable as pulp. On the reverse side, paper sent to the landfill does not decompose and comprises the majority of residential waste (Michaels 2007). Although the issue is complicated and there is constant on-going research, it appears that most current paper recycling is in fact detrimental to the environment.

Economic Impact: Christine McCoy, the Director of Environment Programs for the Rural Community Assistance Programs of Washington DC shares an article interview from two of her past paper-company employers, “When all is said and done, recycled fiber to the machine can be more expensive per ton than virgin. Many people start with the assumption that this cannot be, but it can be so” (2002). This is because of all of the additional steps needed to make recycled paper useable. But, economically, the market for recycled paper is growing (McCoy 2002). TAPPI notes new areas for recycled paper use such as “egg cartons and fruit trays... fuel, ceiling and wall insulation, paint filler, and roofing. Nearly 100,000
tons of shredded paper is used each year for animal bedding. Even cat litter can be made from recovered paper. According to Rich Simon of Rumpke Recyclers in Columbus Ohio, paper mills in China are buying paper from Rumpke at a price that allows them to not only cover the cost of gathering the recyclable paper, but also make a small profit. Simon noted this is unusual in the paper market, and is “only because China’s environmental laws and labor laws, coupled with their growth, is so different than [the USA]’s” (2007). Paper mills are regulated in America by environmental legislation such as the Clean Air Act and the Clean Water Act. Ma Jun, the Chinese director of nongovernmental Institute of Public & Environmental Affairs, admits that “the implementation power of environmental laws and regulations in China is very weak” (Jianqiang 2006). The lack of strong environmental laws means that the companies can continue to produce paper made from low-grade paper Americans have sent for recycling. The company does not need to worry about cleaning up the environment after they have produced all the waste sludge and water, all they do need to worry about is making a profit. In China it can be generally assumed that the labor laws do not demand the federal $5.85 US dollars an hour wage. The Chinese companies use the paper they make in packaging which they use to house items they then sell back to the US (Simon 2007). The Chinese ships used to return from America empty of their cargo and essentially waste the fuel on the return trip; but now after delivering the American’s imports, the Chinese load their ships with recycled paper to feed their mills and their need of more packaging. Therefore, except in cases of “nice paper” (AKA not brown or basic), paper recycling makes economic sense to both the Americans and the Chinese.

Aluminum Can Recycling

**How it is done:** Aluminum—mainly in the form of cans—is used world wide and recycled in many places. The cans are taken to gathering locations—just like paper—and then compacted into heavy bales. These are then sold to aluminum manufacturers. The manufacturers take the bales and shred them and compact them once again (Aluminum Association). The aluminum is burnt to remove the advertising paint on the outside, and the remainders of the food/drink on the inside. The aluminum is then mixed with virgin aluminum made of mined bauxite. Aluminum is the third most abundant material on earth—only behind silicon and oxygen—but it also is very reactive and doesn’t occur in a metallic state naturally (MII) Therefore, the rock bauxite is mined and refined to remove its high aluminum oxide content. According to the EPA, the typical can has about 40% recycled aluminum in it, and it would have more if more cans were recycled (2006). The mixed “potato chip-sized” aluminum is then fed into a furnace and turned into molten aluminum. The molten metal is poured to make 25 foot long ingots of aluminum. These can way 3,000 pounds and are unwieldy to work with; therefore the last stage is to press the ingots into sheets as needed for the industries receiving the metal. These sheets can be as thick as 20 feet or as thin as a human hair. Once the sheet is made, it is rolled for convenience and shipped to a can company who stamps cans and lids from the sheets, and then ships the cans to a bottling company. In all, a can may be recycled, collected, melted, pressed, re-made, filled and back on the shelf in 60 days (Aluminum Association; EPA 2006). This is one of the quickest turnovers of any material.

**Environmental Impact:** British Thermal Units, a measurement of energy, is one way used to measure the impact of aluminum cans. Approximately 229 BTUs are needed to
make one aluminum can from virgin bauxite versus just the 8 BTUs needed to produce a can from recycled aluminum (EPA 2006). This is about a 95% difference in the favor of savings. When bauxite is brought to an aluminum refinery, it must be specialty refined into a material called alumina, then the “alumina and electricity are combined in a cell with a molten electrolyte called cryolite. Direct current electricity is passed from a consumable carbon anode into the cryolite, splitting the aluminum oxide into molten aluminum metal and carbon dioxide. This process of removing the aluminum from its oxide state and transforming it into a metallic state is what uses so much energy. To date, there is no other proven way to remove aluminum to a useable form. But, as more aluminum is available already refined and viable through recycling, and through better electrometallurgical technologies, the energy needed to produce one pound of aluminum has dropped 12 kilowatt hours to 7 (Aluminum Association 2004). Environmentally, aluminum recycling is one of the prime ways to reduce energy consumption. Recycling aluminum is environmentally viable from an energy stand-point.

**Economic Impact:** Aluminum is a big money business. According to the Aluminum Association, “In 2000, 100.8 billion aluminum cans were produced in the United States, and 62.6 billion of those were recycled, for which the industry paid $1.2 billion [US Dollars to recycling facilities]” (2006). This is because of the huge difference in the amount of energy needed to produce a can from virgin material versus that of a recycled material.

Right now, most recovered aluminum is used in cans—but many consumers prefer plastic bottles (EPA 2006). Consumers drive the market, and therefore the demand for aluminum may decrease and make aluminum recycling no longer such a lucrative business. On the reverse side, the demand for lightweight cars is on the rise. As more consumers desire cars which have high gas mileage ratings, more and more companies will invest making their cars from less steel and more aluminum because aluminum is three times lighter than water. According to the North Carolina DENR, “The average aluminum content per passenger car increased from 191 pounds in 1991 to 252 pounds in 1996” (2006).

Additionally, can recycling is what has allowed recycling in general to flourish. If it were not for the stable profit from aluminum, other potentially money-losing items such as paper recycling would not be able to be offered all the time. It would be offered only when the market was profitable to recycle. According to the Aluminum Association, approximately 30,000 jobs have been created by aluminum recycling in this country alone (2006). Because of jobs, the money saved, and its potential, recycling aluminum is economically profitable.

**The Recycling Reasons:** Many would prefer to believe that every bit of recycling helps the environment. Unfortunately, this is not the case. *Not all recycling is environmentally friendly.* Believing recycling is the ultimate waste solution is what lets the average US citizen continue their consumptive lives and helps the citizen avoid making uncomfortable self-sacrifices. Originally, recycling was taught as the last method before reducing and reusing. But both of these methods of waste reduction require the self-sacrifices of not buying, and making do with that is bought. Reducing and reusing do not allow a consumption based lifestyle, and demand life-style changes. Recycling requires minor life-style changes and does not impact consumption. Why is recycling so heavily promoted if it isn’t always environmentally friendly? It’s profitable. Although many recycling companies break even or make only marginal profits on collected materials; they receive much more in public support, free advertising, and increased customer numbers. The ability to say your company or product is “green” is a way to state that it’s okay to purchase and consume your product without guilt. Addition-
ally, recycling companies are aware that the market for recycled goods is not only growing world-wide; but also that the US government will continue to force agencies to buy recycled goods. As more companies and citizens desire to be green the domestic markets for recycled materials will continue to flourish. Recycling *everything* is partially so well promoted *because* it is economically profitable.

But Americans don’t have to rely solely on recycling to solve our waste management woes. Reducing and reusing are also tools in the waste-management kit: They are just not heavily promoted. Reusing works better than recycling environmentally and at times is economically beneficial (in the form of thrift stores, antique shops, etc.) Reducing works better than both recycling and reusing because it stops waste at its source. One cannot reuse or recycle something they do not purchase in the first place. Environmentally, reducing is best; but economically it is the worst choice. A consumer-based culture cannot thrive with frugal citizens. It is economic and not environmental reasons that keep reducing and reusing in the shadows of American minds.

In the end, recycling is an extremely complex activity. It not only involves the emotional and spiritual psyche of humans, but also involves their ideologies, economy, and social standing. Someone arguing *against* paper recycling appears heretical in our society. This is evidence of how well versed the public is in the idea recycling everything is environmentally sound. Furthermore someone arguing for metal recycling and against paper recycling is unheard of and avoided: that’s beginning to sound too complicated. The American appeal of dyadic thought cannot be applied to environmental issues. No environmental issue is as simple as yes or no, right or wrong. Environmentally, recycling is a bandage. For some cuts it works great, and for others, it is useless. Just as we use discretion in when to apply a bandage, we should discretion in when to use recycling.
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Kenny and Wee on the Necessity of ‘Liberty of Indifference’ in Descartes’ Theory of Judgment

● ● ● Larsa Ramsini

§ 1. The Problem

On a first reading of Descartes’ Fourth Meditation, it seems quite evident that he believes it is not a requirement of human free will that we be able to choose one option over another, since, as he explains in the meditation and elaborates on in a letter he writes in 1640, “our mind is of such a nature that it cannot fail to assent to what is clearly understood” (Kenny, CSMK 147). But Cecilia Wee reads what Descartes requires for free will much differently, and as a result, her view also differs from the position Anthony Kenny advocates. Kenny argues that Descartes believes, even though our free will often does entail liberty of indifference, this type of freedom is not necessary, and that free will sometimes consists only in liberty of spontaneity, “and that is all that is essential to it” (147). Wee contends that along with liberty of spontaneity, Descartes also requires that liberty of indifference, in the sense of being able to choose one option over another, be a necessary requirement for human freedom. In this essay I will explain how Kenny and Wee come to their conclusions by focusing on what Descartes claims in the Meditations, the Replies to the Objections, the Principles, and various letters, and then show that it is as a result of these different interpretations that they are not able to come to an agreement about one rather informative letter written by Descartes to Jesuit Denis Mesland in 1645, concerning how the freedom of one’s will depends on the perspective we take to the time the judgment is made.

§ 2. The Need for Free Will

Descartes discusses the notion of free will in order to solve the so-called problem of evil. In the Meditations on First Philosophy, Descartes puts forward his arguments for the existence of a non-deceiving God, the distinction between the body and the soul, and the existence of the external world. The Fourth Meditation, “Concerning the True and the False,” follows his proof of God’s existence, where he shows that we are able to trust our clear and distinct ideas. Descartes’ version of the problem of evil, however, still exists. If God is omnipotent and non-deceiving, why does He allow us to make mistakes (since falling into error constitutes sin for Descartes)? It is here where Descartes explains his theory of judgment and error, and as a result, conveys his beliefs for the requirements of human free will in order to take the responsibility of our mistakes off of God’s shoulders, and therefore solve the problem of evil.

Descartes believes that the judgments we make depend on both the intellect and the
“free choice of the will” (“Meditation” 43). It is the intellect that perceives and the will that makes a judgment concerning the truth or falsity of that information. Since the will has a wider scope than the intellect, it is able to make judgments concerning things for which it does not have adequate knowledge. For Descartes, the only time a valid judgment can be made is when the individual has a clear and distinct idea of all the information related to the specific claim in question. We fall into error when our will makes a hasty judgment while at the same time lacking sufficient information to make the judgment valid. Instead of judging the truth of something of which we do not have a clear and distinct idea, in this situation, Descartes believes we should refrain from deciding one way or another. The big question between Kenny and Wee is, however, how much freedom an individual is allocated with respect to the judgments of the will in the presence of a clear and distinct perception. In order to see where Kenny and Wee conflict, it is necessary to first explain the different notions of free will that they bring to Descartes’ own theory.

§ 3. Liberty of Indifference and Liberty of Spontaneity

Two different conceptions of freedom that have been prevalent throughout the history of philosophy are liberty of indifference and liberty of spontaneity. Advocates of liberty of indifference claim that “we are free in doing something if and only if it is in our power not to do it,” while liberty of spontaneity invokes the idea that “we are free in doing something if and only if we do it because we want to do it” (Kenny 146). Liberty of spontaneity is sometimes referred to as “Soft Determinism” or “Compatibilism,” because people who hold strong to this belief claim that the idea that human beings are determined and that all our actions our causally determined by some other event which precedes it, is compatible with the claim that at least some human actions are free. In order to maintain both of these claims, freedom is defined as simply being able to do what one wants (even if what one wants is determined by previous circumstances). The problem in the Fourth Meditation involves which of these two views Descartes advocates, and it revolves around his conception of “willing.” Descartes defines willing as

merely a matter of being able to do or not do the same thing, that is, of being able to affirm or deny, to pursue or to shun; or better still, the will consists solely in the fact that when something is proposed to us by our intellect either to affirm or deny, to pursue or to shun, we are moved in such a way that we sense that we are determined to it by no external force (“Meditation” 43).

The first definition of “being able to do or not do the same thing” seems to advocate liberty of indifference, while the second definition of being “determined to it by no external force” appears to support liberty of spontaneity. The question now is which view is Descartes advocating, or could he possibly be advocating both? Wee believes that various writings of Descartes’ clearly show that he supports the first as well as the second, while Kenny maintains the view that he only advocates the latter.
3.1. Clarification of Liberty of Indifference in Descartes

Kenny first clarifies a distinction between two different ways of understanding liberty of indifference. Descartes states that,

In order to be free I need not be capable of being moved in each direction; on the contrary, the more I am inclined toward one direction—either because I clearly understand that there is in it an aspect of the good and the true, or because God has thus disposed the inner recesses of my thought—the more freely do I choose that direction. Nor indeed does divine grace or natural knowledge ever diminish one’s freedom; rather, they increase and strengthen it. However, the indifference that I experience when there is no reason moving me more in one direction than another is the lowest grade of freedom ("Meditation" 43).

This passage seems to outright deny that liberty of indifference is essential to freedom, if this freedom is thought of as the ability to choose one side over another. But Kenny argues that what Descartes means here by liberty of indifference is a state the person is in, rather than a power that he has. Indifference as it relates to a power one has corresponds with an ability to choose one of two options. When someone is in a state of indifference, he has no reasons to judge one way over another; but this does not have anything to do with the question of which options this person is actually able to choose. Descartes also writes in another letter to Mesland in 1645 that "'[i]ndifference' in this context seems to me strictly to mean that state of the will when it is not impelled one way rather than another by any perception of truth or goodness. This is the sense in which I took it when I said that the lowest grade of freedom is that by which we determine ourselves to things to which we are indifferent" (Kaufman, CSMK 245).

There is also support for this type of indifference regarding the state of an individual in Descartes’ Objections and his Replies. Descartes notes in the Replies to the Objections that "indifference does not belong to the essence of human freedom, since not only are we free when ignorance of what is right makes us indifferent, but we are also free—indeed at our freest—when a clear perception impels us to pursue some object" (135). He argues in the Objections that an individual is more free the less indifferent with respect to knowledge he is: "as for man, since he finds that the nature of all goodness and truth is already determined by God, and his will cannot tend towards anything else, it is evident that he will embrace what is good and true all the more willingly, and hence more freely, in proportion as he sees it more clearly" (135). There is no question as to whether Descartes requires indifference in the sense of having a balance of reasons for human free will; but we do not know whether he considers the "ability to do otherwise" as necessary to free will, since, in the Fourth Meditation, the indifference to which he refers has simply to do with indifference with regards to a state the person is in and not whether he is able to do otherwise. Since the indifference outlined above is the state of indifference, we can say nothing thus far about what Descartes claims about the power of indifference, the type of indifference for which Wee argues. Is liberty of spontaneity the only option left for Descartes, or can he still argue that an individual needs to have the ability to go
against a clear and distinct idea? For Descartes, does a person, when confronted with a thought so incredibly and unmistakably true, need to maintain the power to deny this idea?

It seems that if we continue to go by what he puts forward in the *Principles*, which is that “the minds of all of us have been so molded by nature that whenever we perceive something clearly, we spontaneously give our assent to it and are quite unable to doubt its truth,” the answer would be no (174). But even though our will may be drawn toward the good by clear and distinct perceptions, Wee still holds that “the will is not necessitated by clear and distinct perceptions” (395). To support this, she cites a letter to Mesland written in 1645 in which Descartes claims that it is “‘always open to the agent to hold back from pursuing a clearly known good’” (CSMK 245). This statement along with the text from the *Principles*, seem to produce a blatant contradiction: the first seems to allow us the ability to deny the truth of a clear and distinct idea, while the latter claims that we are “unable” to avoid the truth of an idea of this sort. But as will be shown shortly, these two statements can be reconciled by Wee’s interpretation of another part of this same letter to Mesland. First, however, let us introduce the controversial statements made by Descartes that cause Kenny and Wee to hold such differing views on his theory of freedom.

§ 4. Irreconcilable Problems with Descartes’ Theory?

I will now explain Kenny’s interpretation of Descartes using various texts and show how Wee understands these extracts much differently. Kenny cites several places where, in his view, Descartes makes it very clear that it is not a requirement that a person be able to do otherwise in order to make a free choice. In contemplating his discovery of the cogito, Descartes notes, “I could not help judging that what I understood so clearly was true; not that I was concerned into making this judgment because of some external force, but because a great light in my intellect gave way to a great inclination in my will, and the less indifferent I was, the more spontaneously and freely did I believe it” (“Meditation” 43). This inability to judge otherwise constitutes the lack of liberty of indifference, which in cases of clear and distinct ideas, is not in the picture, according to Kenny. Wee does not think this interpretation can be reconciled with other statements made by Descartes in the *Principles*, such as the following:

It is a supreme perfection in man that he acts voluntarily, that is, freely; this makes him in a special way the author of his actions and desiring of praise for what he does. We do not praise automatons for accurately producing all the movements they were designed to perform, because the production of these movements occurs necessarily. It is the designer who is praised for constructing such carefully-made devices; for in constructing them he acted not out of necessity but freely. By the same principle, when we embrace the truth, our doing so voluntarily is much more to our credit than would be the case if we could not do otherwise (172).

Wee reads this as a requirement that people be able to “do otherwise” in order to be free. Kenny, however, does not think this refutes his claim that liberty of indifference is unnecessary because, as shown above, this type of freedom only exists for a short amount of time.
when we are gathering all the relevant information to make the judgment. We are able to do otherwise up until the point when we have a clear and distinct idea; but once that point comes, the will is no longer able to do otherwise and must submit to the truth of the clear and distinct perception. According to Kenny, liberty of indifference “does not extend to things which are certain and examined: because there were some things which even to a Cartesian doubter were beyond doubt” (150). Since Descartes has already proven the existence of God and knows that he cannot be mistaken concerning the truth of his clear and distinct ideas, Kenny believes that one is not able to doubt these truths while they are unmistakably demonstrated in front of him.

Kenny moves to the Second Objections where Descartes states that “the will of a thinking substance is impelled—voluntarily and freely, since that is of the essence of the will, but none the less infallibly—towards a good clearly known to it” (CSM II 117). This means, on Kenny’s interpretation, that no matter what the will does, when it is in the presence of a clear and distinct idea, it wants to, has to, and will go towards the truth of that idea, and yet will do so freely because it is what the will truly wants to do. In a letter to Mesland in 1644, Descartes writes:

If we see very clearly that a thing is good for us, it is very difficult—and on my view, impossible, as long as one continues in the same thought—to stop the course of our desire [to pursue it]. But the nature of the soul is such that it hardly attends for more than a moment to a single thing; hence, as soon as our attention turns from the reasons which show us that the thing is good for us we can call up some other reason to make us doubt it, and so suspend our judgment, and even form a contrary judgment (Kenny, CSMK 233-234).

This passage shows that it is only by turning away from the clear and distinct idea that one is really able to do otherwise. As long as a person focuses clearly on the idea presented, there is no way for the will to judge to the contrary. This reasoning is extremely important to Kenny’s interpretation of Descartes because as long as a person is confronted with a clear and distinct idea, he will have no choice but to submit to the truth of that perception. Kenny argues that it is possible to “turn away” from a clearly perceived truth only after the will has already judged and the individual wishes to change his mind. He does not believe that a time period in-between the perception of a clear and distinct idea and the judgment of a will exists that will enable someone to freely deny the truth of the idea in front of him. Wee disagrees, arguing that “there is always a temporal gap—no matter how brief—between the clear and distinct perception of a truth/good, and the will’s affirmation/pursuit of that truth/good” (396). She argues that Descartes believes “while one is focused on perceiving a clearly known good, the will is inevitably drawn towards (pursuit of) that good. The will is also free in being drawn towards that good insofar as the agent has (in principle) within herself the resources for stopping herself from pursuing that good” (397). Wee accepts that the individual must turn one’s “attention away from the clear and distinct perception to some other thought” in order to deny it, but she believes this can be done before ever making any judgment (398).

We have seen how Kenny and Wee come to two very different conclusions, and we
shall now look at the 1645 letter to Mesland to see how, as a result of having interpreted Descartes in different ways in his other writings, Kenny and Wee again see Descartes as advocating two opposing positions regarding the relationship of liberty of indifference and the time a judgment is made.

§ 5. The Letter to Mesland

One of Descartes’ most important writings to consider is his letter to Mesland of February 9th, 1645. It in this letter where he discusses how the freedom of the will is related to the time the will judges. He discusses the two senses of indifference that have already been introduced: the first being a “state of the will when it is not impelled one way rather than another by any perception of truth or goodness,” and the second being “a positive faculty of determining oneself to one or other of two contraries” (Kenny, CSMK 244-246). He claims that indifference in the second sense, a positive faculty, not only exists in situations where an individual maintains indifference in the first sense (a balance of reasons), but “also with respect to all other actions” (Kenny, CSMK 244-246). This means that we maintain the liberty of indifference of being able to do otherwise when we do have a clear and distinct idea, as well as the times when we do not. This is because “when a very evident reason moves us in one direction, although, morally speaking, we can hardly move in the contrary direction, absolutely we can” (Kenny, CSMK 244-246). In order to determine what Descartes means by “morally” and “absolutely,” one can look to the Principles and see where he explains the distinction between the two:

Some things are considered as morally certain, that is, as having sufficient certainty for application to ordinary life even though they may be uncertain in relation to the absolute power of God...absolute certainty arises when we believe that it is wholly impossible that something should be otherwise than we judge it to be (210-211).

So, according to Descartes, it is highly unlikely in practical situations to turn away from a clearly perceived good; but if someone tries hard enough, it is not absolutely impossible to do so. The option remains open for the will to choose the worst of two choices. For Descartes, “it is always open to us to hold back from pursuing a clearly known good, or from admitting a clearly perceived truth, provided we consider it a good thing to demonstrate the freedom of our will by so doing” (Kenny, CSMK 244-246). But the question remains, what does he exactly mean by “always?” Does this mean before and during the time a will judges the truth of a clear and distinct idea, or only at one of these points? Descartes spends the rest of letter responding to this precise question.

5.1. The Will, Considered Before and After Judgments

Descartes explains that we can consider the freedom of the will before the will judges, and after the will judges. When we consider our freedom during the time the will is making its decision, it “does not entail any indifference either in the first or second sense; because what is done cannot remain undone once it is being done” (Kenny, CSMK 244-246).
So, once the will is in the process of making the decision to affirm or deny the clear and distinct idea, we are not free to go the other way because our will has already made its decision. Both Kenny and Wee agree on this interpretation, and neither claims that once the will has decided, it is able to change its decision while it is in the process of judging the truth or falsity of the clear and distinct idea.

5.2. Kenny’s Opinion

The problem arises when we consider what the will is capable of before it judges. Descartes holds that this time “entails indifference in the second sense [positive faculty] but not in the first [balance of reasons]” (Kenny, CSMK 244-246). So, when we have a clear and distinct idea of a truth or good, and we see the reasons that point clearly toward that good, our will is still able to choose whether or not to admit to the truth of that idea. This is where Kenny and Wee have different interpretations of what Descartes is saying. Kenny believes that in this instance, Descartes is referring to a time when a person has a clear and distinct idea, and the will has already judged the truth of this idea. This is because Kenny thinks that a person has no choice but to admit to the truth of such an idea instantaneously, so it wouldn’t even be possible for there to be a time when an individual is presented with a clear and distinct idea and the will has yet to judge. According to Kenny, Descartes’ conception of will is that it is of such a nature that at the moment an idea like this presents itself, the will has no choice but to submit to the truth of it. He claims that when Descartes says “that it is always open to us to hold back from pursuing a clearly known good, or from admitting a clearly perceived truth, he need not mean that we can do this at the very moment of perceiving the good and the true. Rather, we must distract our attention” (Kenny 157). Kenny maintains that the choice Descartes says the will has in this instance refers to the choice to eventually change the first judgment of the will (which was inevitably admitting the truth) to a “perverse,” or wrong, second judgment, but only after having turned one’s attention away from the clear and distinct idea that always binds the will to succumb to the truth. He believes this reading of the letter to be consistent with Descartes’ other writings, in particular the letter written to Mesland in 1644 (already cited), where Descartes claims that the attention of the will needs to be turned away from the idea so that it no longer continues “in the same thought” (Wee, CSMK 233-234).

5.3. Wee’s Opinion

This differs greatly from Wee’s reading. She does not explicitly state her interpretation of this text in her argument, but given that she advocates the “ability to do otherwise” as a necessity for Descartes’ notion of freedom, this reading is the only one that seems consistent with her claims. She believes that when describing the freedom of the will before the will judges, this judgment is the first judgment it will be making about the clear and distinct idea that it is perceiving at that exact moment. For Wee, there does exist a time in-between the perception of a clear and distinct idea and the initial judgment of the will concerning that idea. This interpretation of the wording in the letter is consistent with her entire argument that it is always possible for the will to deny the truth of a clear idea the very first time it judges. She argues that one does not “have to continue in the same thought— it is possible to shift our focus to some other thought;” and she believes this is possible before the will judges the clear
and distinct idea, while Kenny believes it possible only after the first unavoidable judgment of the will (397). Wee admits that this “window of opportunity” does not exist for long, and that “the will will be constrained by a clear and distinct perception if it does not act quickly,” but the fact that it does exist, no matter for how brief a period of time, is enough for her to say that Descartes requires of freedom that the individual “be able to do otherwise” (398).

§ 6. Conclusion

This letter, therefore, does clear up any confusion about the freedom of the will during the time it makes its judgment, but leaves open to interpretation whether or not Descartes thinks it is possible to deny the truth of a clear and distinct perception when first presented with it. Though Kenny clearly denies it, he does in some way accept that Descartes believes a person is always able “to do otherwise,” but in a very weak sense. This ability only consists in being able to change one’s mind about a previous judgment of a clear and distinct idea. The will is not so restrained in Kenny’s view that once it perceives a truth it is never able to go back on it; but it takes some time to get rid of the clearness of what’s presented before a perverse judgment can be made. Both Wee and Kenny’s arguments are very convincing on their own, but so far, it does not appear that all of Descartes’ statements regarding the will have been reconciled with each other in such a way that gives the reader a clear understanding of how much control we actually have in our judgments of clear and distinct ideas, assuming that these judgments really belong to the will in the first place. But if it really is the will that ultimately makes the judgment, most of us still hope that we can have access to the kind of knowledge that Descartes’ clear and distinct ideas provide, while also maintaining our freedom to do otherwise along the way. This is why it is important to discern what Descartes says on the subject, and, if he denies liberty of indifference, whether we agree with him or not.
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“Athens - an anti-Nazi demonstration - hundreds of thousands of people chanting a slogan which reproduces itself like a gigantic rhythm. Then combat with the enemy. The rhythm bursts into an enormous chaos of sharp sounds; the whistling of bullets; the crackling of machine guns. The sounds begin to disperse. Slowly silence falls back on the town.” (Matossian, p. 58)

These are the words Iannis Xenakis used to describe his vivid aural memory realized in the 1954 composition *Metastasis*, his first major orchestral work. The epiphany he experienced during this episode centered not on individual sounds, but of the collective sound of opposed forces en masse and how this sound linearly transformed. It was the symmetry of the sound of chaos.

Immediately praised and denounced at its debut, the piece, which would serve as a kind of overture to all of his later output, was undeniably unique and jarring to a public rapt with neo-classicism and serialism. It was programmatic, but in inspiration only; its mathematical probability-based musical language was so new that it seemed to defy standard thematic and harmonic analysis in favor of pure visceral effect. Its bold exploitation of timbres and near total lack of tonality or categorical rhythm ushered in a new school of thought in composition. The seeming chaos was actually a careful experiment in chance, signaling the birth of a new musical style Xenakis termed “Stochastic Music,” or more simply, the music of probabilities.

Composed for an orchestra of 65 players, *Metastasis* is written entirely divisi, making a virtual soloist out of each musician. Its form and technique were so unique to players at the time there was reportedly quite a bit of arguing about its validity among the musicians at its first rehearsal in 1954 (Varga 1996, p. 35). But there was no denying the originality therein, and anything more than a surface level analysis showed tremendous thought and manipulation of the musical medium towards Xenakis’ innovative ends.

Romanian born, Xenakis spent most of his young life in Greece at a boys school for wealthy foreigners. His accent often caused him to be the focus of ridicule, re-enforcing his already isolated nature. Although his mother had a musical background, other pursuits had always taken precedence for him. The library was his main sanctuary, a place where he spent hours absorbing book after book, focusing mainly on the ancient Greek masters. Even though his academic record was anything but stellar, his personal research was voracious. “Here Xenakis began to erect the intellectual scaffolding upon which he would build a lifetime’s work of research and creative expression” (Matossian, p. 14).

The stability of government in Greece was tenuous at best, as numerous regimes rose and fell with regularity. World War II brought a string of occupations, from the Italians, to the Germans, and finally as the war ended, the British. It was just before the Italian invasion in 1940 that Xenakis traveled to Athens to enroll in the Polytechnic Institute. His education was sporadic there over the next 7 years as the school was closed and reopened throughout the occupation, even being used as a wartime prison at one point (Matossian, p.17-27).
When class was in session, the school served as a staging ground and recruitment center for the national liberation front, the EAM. Xenakis became active with this and other resistance groups after the Germans took over occupation from the Italians in 1941, a year which saw the worst famine and neglect throughout the seven years of occupation. At first these groups, largely backed by the Communists, staged only non-violent rallies and demonstrations demanding fair ration of bread and oil for Greek citizens. However, as circumstances became increasingly dire, so did their methods. By the time of the siege of Athens in December of 1944, they had effectively become armed militias (Varga, p. 16-18). Xenakis’ account of the moment that inspired *Metastasis* most likely occurred during this period of time.

In December of 1945, Xenakis experienced a close brush with death as a mortar exploded near him, killing a young girl and nearly fatally wounding him and another. He recuperated in a hospital, permanently scarred and losing his left eye. At the same time, the leaders of the resistance movement for which he had fought and nearly died were capitulating. The terms of surrender seemed a brutal betrayal to their very own members. Xenakis and those that fought for the liberation of Greece were now fugitives and subject to death or deportation to work camps (Harley 2004, p. 2).

After his release from the hospital in March of 1945, Xenakis remained in Greece to finish his studies, finally graduating with an engineering degree in the summer of 1946. The political environment had drastically changed, and his continued presence in Greece put him at grave personal risk. He was constantly avoiding arrest or worse and did in fact spend some time in jail. That he had stayed so long after the disarmament of the resistance movement was a testament to his devotion to country and principle. But the climate had become dangerous, and his father helped him flee to Paris in 1947. He would never see Greece again.

*Metastasis Begins*

*Metastasis* opens quietly at an imperceptible 1/4 time signature, with a slow crescendo on a unison G natural throughout the 46 strings. It is effectively the only moment of stability and traditional harmony in the entire piece until its final note 333 bars later. Xenakis initiates a massive divisi crescendo in bar 2, by which each instrument commences a glissando at a different temporal point and varying degrees of pitch shift towards an individual ending pitch in bar 34. These pitches together create a chord constructed of A, B, C, D, E, F, and G. No instrument doubles another, and the effect is one of a pure transition, evolution and expansion. The only pseudo-rhythmic indicator is the nearly random accent of a wood block at varying dynamic levels. This section is perhaps the clearest example of Xenakis’ primary aim in the piece. “I was interested in if it was possible to get from one place to another without breaking the continuity.” (Varga 1996, p. 73) With each part individualized and its point of departure and pitch-change trajectory unique, Xenakis had achieved a seamless transition from unity to chaos. But it was only the beginning.

Once every glissando has reached its quite atonal destination at m. 34, Xenakis punctuates the dissonance with several pizzicato accents, a brief silence then a tremolo mass of all 12 chromatic pitches at once throughout the instruments at a dynamic of triple forte. This sound mass is repeated several times as the sonic palette is further extended through the entrance of the brass instruments; trombones, then trumpets, and finally horns. The mass seems
to surge and breath, with sudden breaks in the cacophony as the plodding glissandos of the trombones in their lower register persist and more seemingly random occurrences of pizzicato appear, enhancing and expanding the mêlée’ of sound. The section is concludes with one final mass glissando coming to rest in m. 101 on what might be described as a quartal chord, based on fourths, E-D#-G#-A.

**Paris – Architecture and Music**

Once in Paris, Xenakis landed a position with the influential architect Le Corbussier. In his studio, like the other young employees, Xenakis was given a great deal of freedom in working on his assigned tasks. Xenakis shared with his employer an admiration of ancient Greek architecture, and took an interest in the secrets of the Golden Section. Defined as “the division of a line such that the smaller part is to the greater as the greater is to the whole,” Le Corbussier had measured the ratio repeatedly in the architectural masterworks of Greece and Egypt (Matossian, p. 40-41). Mavericks of scientific and philosophical thought of the time had explored the theory further, finding the same ratio occurring throughout nature and even in the human form. Using this unit as a sort of standard scale in his designs, Le Corbussier sought to make his structures a reflection of the natural trends occurring around them. Xenakis excelled under his tutelage, becoming more confident as his innovations were appreciated and adopted by Le Corbussier.

His inquisitiveness about the interdependence of the arts and sciences also increased, and he began to perform crude experiments, applying his new architectural and mathematical ideas to musical works he would compose in his leisure time. Most of the works centered on ways of updating and incorporating Greek folk music into a new kind of expression. He searched for a proper teacher to guide him, but many of the perspective teachers shunned his approach, discounting his pieces immediately upon finding parallel fifths, octaves, and other taboos of standard tonal music.

He cycled through a number of teachers in the Paris area, generally only lasting a few lessons until he began to disagree with the limitations of the methods they imposed on him. It was not until he met neo-serialist Oliver Messiaen that he found a mentor to provide him with the proper combination of guidance, encouragement, and freedom. Messiaen’s approach was nearly entirely hands off, and he embraced and encouraged Xenakis’ naïveté’ as a portal to greatness.

From Messiaen, Xenakis learned ways of approaching serialism and tone rows that were far less constrictive and manufactured. Rhythmic analysis also figured prominently into his education, as Messiaen shared what he learned from the pentameter of ancient Greek poems. Xenakis admired his teacher’s expansion of serialist parameters to include not just pitch categories but also duration, intensity, and attack (Harley, p. 4). Throughout their time together, Xenakis was always encouraged to take what he could from the master, but to work alone on his compositions so as to not sully his own creativity and chance for true innovation.

A key influential factor, which must also be mentioned, was a prevalent general disgust among many young European composers for the contemporary revival of baroque and classical styles of composition. All had lived through the ravages of World War II and many were now displaced with painful memories of violence and destruction. The once revered art music of Haydn, Bach, and Mozart did not speak to these composers’ experiences.
was no parallel to be found for this generation of composers between the trite diatonicism and mechanical forms of the old masters and the devastation of World War II.

If music were to embody human experience, it needed an entirely new vocabulary. Serialism had been the prominent trend in this direction for some time, imposing ordered rows where every one of the twelve pitches must be sounded before a pitch is repeated. The sound was indeed a clear departure from previous compositional techniques and indicative of overall movements in art and architecture to “purify against tradition” (Dufallo, 179). Xenakis found it interesting but felt it was just a reworking of the old rules of composition, thereby sustaining the very constraints composers were attempting to transcend.

…in indeterminism, you find “probabilities,” probabilistic logic, which deals with “masses” that I used, or with “rare events.” As a result of the impasse in serial music, as well as other causes, I originated, in 1954, a music constructed from the principle of indeterminism… (Duffalo, 179)

“Then combat with the enemy” – B and C section analysis

The B section of the piece, beginning in bar 104, is a stark contrast to the preceding section. The sound mass halts, and three violins and three cellos begin a ten tone series partitioned between the instruments (Harley, p. 10). The row is altered and modulated according to Xenakis’ own methods, not abiding by the strict rules of serialism, which he found constrictive and unnatural. The composition is somewhat like a bell choir, as the individual notes of the melodic lines are split between instruments. They overlap and change timbre through glissandos and tremolo.

Also of interest in this section is Xenakis’ use of three simultaneous time signatures, 4/16, 3/8, and 5/16. Coordinated with synchronized bar lines, three simultaneous subdivisions of the beat occur. This creates a feeling of motion but no real signposts for identification of a standard rhythm or sense of beat one.

As the orchestration expands, so do the events of probability, like the massive protest that inspired the work. The ten tone row and opposing meters persist through bar 201, as the percussion along with pizzacato and con legno strings begin to provide a hint of rhythm in their repetitive statements. This is perhaps reminiscent of the marching feet or weaponry of the opposing factions closing in.

Measure 202 begins the C section, the piece’s most dense exploration of probability in sonic events and has all the character of a massive armed confrontation. The brass instruments continuously and separately punctuate the chaos with single notes of varying dynamics and degrees of attack, making use of flutter tonguing and mutes for a variety of timbre. The snare drum and wood block seem to take on the role of machine gun fire near and distant. The strings continue their chaotic assemblage of glissando, pizzicato, and con legno phrases, personifying the mélange of voices in anger, horror, confusion and mortal pain. Throughout all this divisi composition, it is impossible to find any tonality or rhythmic pattern to grasp onto for a traditional orientation. It is indeed a sonic chaos never achieved before in music, the meticulously planned sound of simultaneous chance events in large numbers.

One of Xenakis’ main innovations evident here is the use of what he called “brushes.” Found throughout the C section in varying groupings of instruments, one such example
is bars 267-269. Six of the second violins and six of the violas simultaneously begin a unison E natural which Xenakis describes as a temporary center of gravity. Then, by way of short, non-simultaneous divisi glissandos, the unison expands outwards. From A sharp above the original E natural in the second violins, to B natural below it in the violas, all twelve chromatic pitches are stated. Like a brush being touched to canvas and then fanned out, a mass of all twelve tones extends from one starting pitch. (Varga, p. 73)

“Slowly, silence falls back on the town”

For his final section, Xenakis employs a near mirror image of the very first mass glissando of the piece. Again, all strings divisi play all 12 tones simultaneously and smoothly transition back to one note. The piece ends one half step higher than it began, on a G sharp. A final vigorous triple forte tremolo of the G sharp decrescendos away to nothingness as the piece comes to a close.

*Metastasis* was debuted in 1955 at a new music festival in Donaueschingen. It was immediately controversial, creating fans and detractors in equal numbers. Serialist Antoine Golea, speaking for a conference at the festival, referred to the piece as a “scandal” because it was “crammed with glissandos” and “devoid of any interest” (Varga, p. 34-35). The festival organizer disagreed, saying, “It is an atomic music. It is a fascinating music” (Matossian, p.65). Xenakis was immediately swarmed by autograph-seekers and adoring young music fans.

Interestingly, the architectural and music careers of Xenakis had a very tangible convergence a few years later. Still working with Le Corbussier, he directed the design of the Philips Pavilion at the Brussels World’s Fair of 1958. He used as his initial sketch something he had already designed years earlier: the mass glissandos of *Metastasis’s* opening segment. By using the glissandos as the ruled lines of the structure, he connected them with ever-sloping, smoothly-transitioning walls to create this decidedly non-traditional building (Xenakis, p. 10).

Xenakis exhaustively explains the theories and mathematical equations underlying *Metastasis* in his 1971 book *Formalized Music*. Here, he lays out the main themes of applying probabilities to musical composition:

1. We can control continuous transformations of large sets of granular and/or continuous sounds.
2. A transformation may be explosive when deviations from the mean suddenly become exceptional.
3. We can likewise confront highly improbable events with average events.
4. Very rarified sonic atmospheres may be fashioned and controlled by the use of formulae...” (Xenakis, p. 16)

The type of thought underpinning Xenakis’ theories had been around for many years in different fields. But it was his interpolation of so many disparate disciplines that afforded him a unique and wider perspective on the arts and sciences, much like a man standing on a mountain top has a greater view of all the action in the town below than one standing on a specific street in the town. Likewise, Xenakis approached the composition of *Metastasis* as
a true Renaissance man. He synthesized all of his knowledge and experiences to create a new musical idiom that sounded entirely fresh and unpredictable while following natural rules rather than man-made. No longer bowing to the microsystems of tonality and serialism, he managed to compose following only universal laws of probability.
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Leading up to and during the Holocaust the Vatican knew about the Nazis’ intentions and later their acts of atrocities against the Jewish people. What did the Vatican think of all this going on within their continent? The reign of Pope Pius XI was waning in the 1930’s. He took a far stronger moral stance against the rise of Nazism up until his death in February 1939. His successor, Pope Pius XII on the other hand, undermined the decisions that Pius XI made and found himself aligned with the Nazi party. In the mid-1930’s the Catholic Church had a far stronger stance against National Socialism and Fascism. What caused the change of view in 1939? Pope Pius XII caused the Church to stray from its moral values during the time of the Holocaust in favor of forging a stronger diplomacy throughout the world.

Pope Pius XI was the Pope during the rise of National Socialism in the 1930’s. He took a strong stance against the party, as well as the Fascist regime in Italy that sympathized with the Nazi party. In 1938, some events took place which indicated his confrontational attitude toward fascist racism. First, in the spring of 1938 the Nazi’s seized Austria which was known as the Anschluss. In this, Cardinal Theodore Innitzer rang the bells of the church and flew a Nazi flag for the return of Hitler to his hometown of Vienna. Following this display, Pius XI directly reprimanded Innitzer, “which was communicated in detail through diplomatic channels to the United States so that world government would know where the Vatican stood regarding Hitler’s Germany.”

Later that year the Fascist leader of Italy Benito Mussolini adorned the Nazi flag in the streets for a visit from Hitler. On account of this, Pius XI left the city, refusing to meet with the two leaders as is customary during a head of state visit.

In September, 1938 Pius XI told a crowd of Belgium Catholics that they were all children of Abraham and that spiritually they were all Semites referencing the commonality between Judaism and Christianity. Pius XI’s claims were motivated by a desire to create a bridge between the two faiths and show how ignorant it is to be anti-Semitic. Ernst Ludwig Ehrlich, a Jewish leader believed that if that ideal had taken root in the Christian tradition predating the Holocaust, “it may have been prevented or diminished in its fury.”

November, 1938 was when the famous Kristallnacht took place. Following this atrocity Pius XI remained silent even though in the months prior he had spoken out vehemently against such actions. The reason for his silence is a matter of debate, but Phayer believes it could be in part due to Pius’s waning health and Eugenio Parcelli. There is some credence in this speculation. Parcelli, who would soon take over the post of Pope, could have foreseen his succession in the wake of Pius XI’s deteriorating health and may not have wanted to upset these governments. Parcelli was more of a bureaucratic-minded person as opposed to the moralistic Pius XI.

While serving under Pope Pius XI, Eugenio Parcelli was the Vatican Secretary of State which afforded him, “responsibility for foreign policy and state relations throughout the world during a period when Pius XI was plagued by illness and entrusting more and more on his favorite cardinal.” This also allowed him to create many Concordats
with the Nazi regime. The purpose of a Concordat dates back to medieval times and was intended to “safeguard the rights of the church in a foreign country.”5 The reason Parcelli was more indifferent towards National Socialism was due to his larger fear of Atheistic Communism in Russia which had already declared a war on Orthodox Catholicism. In this movement, the Bolshevik party executed a widespread murderous persecution on the members of the Church which begun in 1917.

As early as 1940 Pope Pius XII was already under scrutiny for the way he handled these issues differently than Pius XI. Some believed his bureaucracy to be self-serving rather than what was best for the Church and his duty’s as the liaison between Jesus Christ and the Church. Francis Osborne, the English minister to the Vatican, was even quoted in making a comparison between Pius XI and Pius XII saying, “The Holy Father appears to be...adopting an ostrich-like policy toward [the Germans invading Poland and terrorizing the people]...the great moral authority enjoyed by the Papacy throughout the world under Pius XI has today been notably diminished.”7

Pius XII made sure in his appointments that none of his work done as Secretary of State would be undone. Because of this he appointed Eugenio Orsenigo, a pro-Nazi, anti-Semitic fascist, as his nuncio in Berlin. Orsenigo urged German bishops to join the Nazi party. One Bishop later complained after joining the Nazi party that the nuncio had tricked him into thinking that he spoke for the Vatican.

During the war itself, the Vatican was one of the first to find out about the Holocaust.8 The information regarding the extent of the Vatican’s knowledge of the Holocaust is subject to scrutiny. One document written in February 1942 spoke of Nuncio Orsenigo wanting to move the Catholic priests in Auschwitz to Dachau. “The reason behind this request may have been that the Nuncio had certain information...concerning the difference between a ‘concentration camp’ (Dachau) and an ‘extermination camp’ (Auschwitz).”9 To further confirm some of the chatter heard by the Vatican on the issue of concentration camps, the Jewish Agency, the World Jewish Congress and the Swiss Israelite community sent Pius XII a letter regarding the state of Jews in Central and Eastern Europe.10 It would take a compilation of information to lead anyone to the conclusion of the genocide of the Jews. All the information accumulating in the Vatican could have lead to such a compilation. They chose instead to give no publicity to the issue which, according to Phayer, “had mortal consequences because the public at large, including Jews, found it difficult to accept the evidence about the final solution and did so only with considerable delay.”11

Other reports from various persons from within the Church also gave notice the atrocities which were occurring within Europe. In 1942 the Holy See’s chargé d’affaires in Bratislava, Giuseppe Burzio said that the Jews being deported were essentially being sentenced to death. Soon thereafter, the nuncio in Budapest Angelo Rotta said much the same thing about the Jewish circles deported within Slovakia.12 These reports could not go unnoticed by the Pope yet he was not quick in any action in support of the Jewish peoples within these areas. On August 7, 1941, Marshal Petain asked Leon Berard his Ambassador to the Holy See to find out what the Vatican thought about the Vichy Government passing the legislature that would Aryanize, “Jewish enterprises and the control of all funds belonging to the Jews.”13

It would seem that Pius XII is generally portrayed as being a Nazi sympathizer and anti-Semite due to his being involved with the Nazi regime. As mentioned earlier though he
had reasons for doing this, albeit personal reasons. In contrast to what John Cornwall surmised about Pius XII, Phayer contends that the reign of Pius XII was not in direct opposition to the Jews. In some instances he was “mindful of the Jewish predicament.” At other times and under different circumstances though, he did not intervene. This paints a completely different picture of Pius XII than one could imagine with the evidence given.

Pius XII was generally in a state of unrest due to his fear of Rome and the Vatican being bombed by either side in the war. It seems that he put himself and the Church in a neutral position to keep from being an enemy to either side. This has its diplomatic strengths, but as Pope his actions should be more based on the Christian moral stance and faith as opposed to diplomacy. Under the duress that the political situation within Europe put him under, some could empathize with Pius XII. In times of crisis leaders have the choice to hold to their position or to join with what appears to be the newest party in power to rank themselves within the regime. This could possibly have been his motivation as to why he was aligning himself—and through him, the Church—with the Nazi party.

One instance of this occurred June 28, 1940. A telegram was sent by the Cardinal Secretary of State on behalf of Pius XII to the Fuhrer and Reich Chancellor. In this he called for a meeting between himself and the governments of Germany, Britain, and Italy in hopes of bringing a, “cessation of the conflict.” In this, the Pope’s demarche was motivated to restore peace. Though, if Britain had agreed to sign this peace treaty Germany’s command of Continental Europe would be in full order. According to Friedlander, “It is possible that Pius XII glimpsed this danger, but decided nevertheless to support the efforts of the Germans on account of what seemed to him an even graver danger: an expansion of the Soviet Union into Europe.” Following the demarche in his July 19th Reichstag address, Hitler made peace proposals with Britain. Two days later Lord Halifax replied by saying that Britain will not accept the proposals and will continue the fight until he was certain that the liberty of Britain was assured.

In October, 1943 the deportation of Rome’s Jews began. The argument can be made that Pius XII did no directly assist the Nazi’s during this deportation. But by his silence he was basically helping the German’s out. According to Settimia Spizzichino who was the only Roman-Jewish woman to survive the deportation in Auschwitz, “Pius XII could have warned us…We might have escaped from Rome…He was an anti-Semitic Pope, a pro-German…He didn’t take a single risk.” His mind was not on the suffering of the Jews during the deportation as evidenced on October 19 when a diocesan bishop informed him of the Jews pleading for water from the cattle cars. He was given an update of the condition of the train as it progressed but never made an action. His mind was further engrossed in his fear of Communist takeover in the absence of police protection. This came on the very day that the Jews were en route to the death camps. On October 28, 1943, a report came to Berlin that the Pope would make no pronouncement against the deportation of the Roman Jews. The Pope did not want to injure any relation between the Vatican and Germany.

Pope Pius XII did however make some effort to assist the Jews in Rome before the deportation began. October 1, 1943, an elderly Jewish couple was being hidden within an abbey. The sisters of the abbey did not want to take in the husband due to the fact that he was a male. Upon hearing this, Pius XII told them to allow the husband as well. Soon after this incident, the Jews of Rome foresaw the inevitable danger that lay amidst them and begun leaving the city or looking for assistance from the religious community. During this time, “the barriers
of canonical cloister were lifted, thus allowing men to enter the convents of women religious and also permitting women to enter the cloisters of male religious.”18 It was soon after this that the SS officers went house to house to round up the Jews that the Pope began his silence in favor of the German actions. This raid brought out about a thousand of Rome’s Jews who were then put on the train and deported to the death camps.

The Vatican played a pivotal role during the period leading up to, and during the Holocaust. Pope Pius XII took the church in a radically different domain than Pius XI before him. By undermining all Pius XI’s authoritative decisions during the 1930’s, Pius XII caused disillusionment among the Church. Under such conditions as he was faced one cannot necessarily blame his being afraid. But given the evidence that he did not whole-heartedly act on behalf of the Church, or as his role as mediator of Christ, it has been made obvious that he should have handled the situation differently. It would be naïve and fallacious to claim that he was truly against the Jews though. He made many efforts to assist them especially when it came to the Jews within Rome itself. However, when it came down to the decision of helping them by arguing the actions of the Nazis’, he fell short of the mark. If Pius XII had stepped forward at any point during the War, either to first warn the Jews of the impending danger on the horizon, or to defend them against the inevitable death they faced at the hands of the German’s, history very well could have been thwarted and we may be talking about Pius XII as a liberator instead of a stain on the history of the Church and humanity alike.
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The Genocide of the Herero Set the Tone for the Holocaust

Gabrielle Gagnon

Colonization of Africa by European powers began during the 19th century. The scramble for Africa led European countries to claim territories in Africa. After taking control the governments would dominate and commit genocide against the indigenous populations. At that time, Germany took control of German South West Africa (now Namibia) economically, legally, as well as military. The Herero resented the control by Germany, which resulted in a revolt. Because of the revolt, the Germans committed genocide against the Herero from 1904 until 1907. The genocide was illegal under the treaties and conventional laws of the time. The Herero became the first ethnic group subjected to genocide during the 20th century. This genocide set the tone for the Holocaust.

Several phases led to the genocide of the Herero. German South West Africa was acquired in 1884 during the scramble for Africa. In 1894, the territory started to develop rapidly and German troops know as the Schutztruppe (which is translated as protection troops) were sent to pacify the region. The indigenous Namibians needed to be pacified to enable settlers to develop the region as they saw suitable. German protection treaties stripped the Herero of their traditional power and resources leading to resentment. Judicial discrimination and racial segregation became commonplace. As a result, on January 12, 1904, the Herero, under Samuel Maharero, attacked settlers to regain their land and rights. The revolt led to a war between the Germans and Herero. As fighting continued with no end in sight German General Lothar von Trotha was put in charge upon which he initiated an annihilation policy. Von Trotha defeated the Herero in the Battle of Waterberg afterwards driving survivors including women and children into the desert where most died of thirst and starvation. Survivors were rounded up and incarcerated in concentration camps where the German government continued the genocide using a varying combination of malnutrition, inadequate medical care, overwork, unsanitary conditions, and violence that led to the indigenous pollutions destruction. When the Germans arrived the Herero numbered 80,000, after the genocide in 1907, only 15,000 remained alive.

Resentment towards Germans was due to the appalling treatment of Herero women, general physical abuse, economic pressure, and legal inequality under colonial law. First, Herero women were raped frequently. The imbalance in female and male settlers led to numerous rapes of indigenous women. The practice was so common that settlers had names for it: Verkafferung, or going native, and Schmutzwirtschaft, or dirty trade. Second, the Herero were subject to abuse by settlers. Indigenous Namibian employees could be beaten legally under the authority of the Väterliche Züchtungsrecht or paternal right of correction. Third, economic pressures centered on the competition for cattle and land. The notion of unclaimed land in Africa provided the framework for genocide by suggesting that indigenous people were less worthy of land ownership and less human. Fourth, indigenous Namibians were subjugated to Germans introducing foreign laws and taxation. These abuses led the Herero to attack settlers because it was perceived as threatening their way of life.
Racism played a major role in the genocide. German settler community sought to emphasize their racial superiority. Racist tendencies were widespread in the colony. Germans believed that the Herero were nothing better than baboons that deserved to exist only if it benefited them. As a result, the Germans took away their land to ensure that it was utilized to its full potential. Many Germans supported the total annihilation of the Herero. However, not everyone felt this way. The community socially ostracized settlers who refused to ill-treat the indigenous Namibians. In every aspect of their lives the Herero and Germans were seen as different, this belief allowed ideologies and popular attitudes to build on the psychological, physical, and cultural differences. This mentality allowed injustice, violence, rape, and murder to occur and eventually genocide. Thus, ideological racism provided the setting to annihilate the Herero who revolted against them.

Violence was spurred by racist ideology. The law protected the Germans over the Herero. Rarely were settlers punished legally for beating or causing the death of their laborers. There are numerous reports of women and men being beaten to death by employers and sometimes police. However, the law rarely intervened. Germans believed they could punish their laborers as they pleased, a practice euphemistically called “paternal chastisement.” Racist ideology allowed the “inferior” Herero to be treated violently by the “superior” settlers.

Violence, racism, and resentment led to the revolt under the leadership of Chief Samuel Maharero killed which around 120 Germans mostly male civilian and some soldiers. After the attack, soldiers began suppressing the violence. Many settlers wanted revenge for the deaths. According to one report, settlers were “thirsting for blood of the Herero.” Soldiers were unable to defeat the unconventional battle tactics of the Herero. The guerilla tactics did not fit German tactical frameworks, which led to frustration thus many of the troops fighting felt that traditional military codes of conduct did not apply. Because of the ongoing war, the German Kaiser appointed General von Trotha as the military commander.

Lothar von Trotha was well known for the brutal suppression of the indigenous resistance during the boxer rebellion. In June of 1904, von Trotha arrived after the war had been raging for five months. German troops did not know how to fight the guerilla tactics. However, von Trotha had experience in fighting guerilla tactics. Upon arrival, the general immediately started planning the Herero annihilation. In a letter to the governor Leutwein, von Trotha stated “his Majesty the Emperor only said that he expected me to crush the rebellion by fair means or foul and to inform him later of the causes that had provoked the uprising.” Von Trotha devised a deadly plan to quell the uprising, which did not discriminate between soldiers and civilians, or men, women, and children. This plan was similar to ones used by the Nazis against Jews.

The battle was only the beginning of von Trotha’s plan to end the war and annihilate the Herero by any means necessary. On August 11, 1904, at the Battle of Waterburg under the generals orders, soldiers encircled the Herero on three sides leaving the only escape route the Omaheke Desert. The general knew that if the indigenous Namibians escaped into the waterless desert it would lead to their destruction. During the two-day battle the German reigned superior. Because of the onslaught the Herero fled into the desert as von Trotha predicted. Since the Herero could not escape, many died of thirst and starvation.

On October 2, 1904, General von Trotha issued his Vernichtungsbefehl or extermination order against the Herero nation.

I, the Great General of the German soldiers, address this letter to the Herero people...
The Herero people will have to leave this country. Otherwise I shall force them to do so by means of guns. Within the German boundaries, every Herero, whether found armed or unarmed, with or without cattle, will be shot. I shall no longer accept any more women or children. I shall drive them back to their people-otherwise I shall order shots to be fired at them. These are my words to the Herero people.

This clearly depicts that von Trotha planned to annihilate the Herero. Troops discarded traditional military code of conduct. Women and children were killed indiscriminately. Similarly, the Nazis attacked Jews regardless of gender, age, or military status. According to a witness, “After the battle all men, women, and children who fell into German hands, wounded or otherwise, were mercilessly put to death. Then the Germans set off in pursuit of the rest, and all those found on the wayside and in the sandveld were shot down and bayoneted to death.”

Following the battle, a military cordon was maintained for over one year to ensure that they could not return to their homelands. The desert killed thousands while concentrations camps finished the job. By 1905, the population was 16,000, mostly ill and weak children, women and old people. In Germany, the atrocities led to a public outcry. The emperor rescinded the extermination order two months later. However, rescinding the order did not stop the extermination. The remaining Herero were merely interned into concentration camps were most of the remaining population died. Von Trotha’s achievements in Africa gained him a medal of honor from the Kaiser.

Konzentrationslagern or concentration camps were part of von Trotha’s original plan to destroy the Herero. The British were the first nation to establish the concentration camps during Boer War (1899 – 1902). However, the Germans made the camps into a structure that led to systematic deaths. Concentration camps structure and management would later be copied and used against Jews in Germany. By the end of the Battle of Waterberg, camps had already been prepared. The German army set up five camps around the colony. Throughout the colony, the defeated Herero were imprisoned. Men who surrendered were interned many died of smallpox, typhus, tuberculosis as well as exhaustion and malnutrition from the extensive labor. However, three-fourths of the prisoners were women and children.

Camps conditions were horrendous as forced labor and little food led to numerous deaths. These conditions led to high mortality rates. Prisoners had to work hard despite their dire physical and mental condition. Women and children as young as five were ill-treated and made to work. While settlers witnessed the atrocities, nothing was done to stop it. On witness, Mr. Percival Griffith, stated “Heavy loads of sand and cement have to be carried by the women and children, who are nothing but skin and bones.” Despite the heavy loads, the Herero had to work or they would be beaten. Furthermore, Mr. Percival Griffith witnessed that

The loads of sand and cement are out of all proportion to their strength. I have often seen women and children dropping down...when they fall, they are sjamboked [whipped] by the soldier in charge of the gang with his full force. Until they get up. Across the face was the favorite place for sjamboking and I have often seen the blood flowing down the faces of the women and children and from their bodies, from the cuts of their weapon...

Indigenous Namibians were not only subjected to beatings and physical labor. In the camps, prisoners worked under grueling conditions and were subjected to medical experiments. These medical experiments took place to advance science. Those who tried to escape were killed immediately without mercy. The working conditions without adequate food and medical experiments were also used on Jews with the same deadly results.
The Germans especially treated women poorly while they were interned. Special camps were set up so that German troops could relieve their needs on Herero women. As the men died in their thousands the women were forced into sexual slavery against their will. Within these conditions, women had to make difficult decisions. According to Doctor Otto Bongard women cannot be expected to produce healthy offspring. This is especially true of mothers who were young girls when they suffered the trials and tribulations of the sanveld. Add to this that many women are sterile because of venereal disease and that the Herero decided to cut down on procreation through abortion lest children be born while they were held in bondage.

Thus, as with any genocide the Herero women were the ones who carried the brunt of the pain and suffering. Furthermore, most of the deaths were women, children, and the elderly.

By late 1907, the annihilation of the Herero had been successful. The indigenous Namibians not killed in the battle or in the desert were placed into concentration camps where they died. Their land was transferred to settlers with long-term loans subsidized by the government. Following the war, only 15,000 of the 80,000 Herero were alive.

The German government has continually argued that their actions during the war were not illegal when they were committed in 1904. Recently government officials have stated that the action during the war were for the purpose of annihilating the Herero. Ms. Wieczorek-Zeul, Germany’s Development Aid Minister, has stated publicly “we accept our historical and moral responsibilities and the quilt incurred by the Germans at that time.” Germany’s actions at that time do not fall under Article II of the 1948 Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide which defined genocide as ‘acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group.’ These acts include killing members of the group, causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group, deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part, imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group, and forcibly transferring children of the group to another group. However, at that time there were international laws against some forms of genocide, such as wars of annihilation, and ill treatment of prisoners, which were embedded in treaty and customary law by the late nineteenth century.

Germany’s annihilation against the Herero was illegal under the Berlin West Africa Conference and the Hague Convention. The Berlin West Africa Conference of 1884-1885 was the first legal precedent, which set guidelines for European nations that colonized Africa. These guidelines including preserving indigenous tribes, suppressing slavery and slave trade, as well as religious freedoms. Article VI decrees that all powers exercising sovereign rights in Africa have ‘to watch over the preservation of the native tribes, and to care for the improvement of the conditions of their moral and material well-being, and to help in suppressing slavery, and especially the slave trade.’ Furthermore, it bans the annihilation of Africans by the signatories. Consequently, Germany one of the signers was bound by the guidelines of the treaty to preserve and prevent annihilation of the Herero under their rule. The Hague convention ratified in 1900 established the Laws and Customs of War on Land, which codified the laws of war and regulating the treatment of prisoners. The treaty stated that ‘it is especially prohibited to kill or wound treacherously individuals belonging to hostile nation or army.’
be honorably treated.' Prisoners had to be humanely treated and taken care of including being given food, shelter, and clothing. Germans signature on the treaty obliged them to protect and take care of the Herero. However, Germany failed to do so. They treated both what they considered the ‘soldiers’ as well as the women and children poorly. Germans imprisoned and killed all who survived the battle. While the Herero did not sign the treaty, they were protected under it. The convention was perceived as the international law at the time. As a result, the Germans should have protected the Herero. International law and treaties signed by the German government banned wars of annihilation and the ill treatment of prisoners. Therefore, the German government is responsible for their actions. The same laws and conventions, which made the genocide of the Herero illegal, also made the holocaust illegal. However, because the actions by the Germans against the Herero was not punished the Germans repeated the actions against the Jews.

The Herero genocide set the precedent for the Holocaust. A Namibian foundation has sued three German companies in court for allegedly making money off Herero slave labor. Court papers stated that the genocide foreshadowed with chilling precision the irredeemable horror of the European Holocaust only decades later, the defendants and imperial Germany formed a German commercial enterprise which cold-bloodedly employed explicitly-sanctioned extermination, the destruction of tribal culture and social organization, concentration camps, forced labor, medical experimentation and the exploitation of women and children in order to advance their common financial interests.

Some historians draw a direct lineage between the extermination of the Herero by the German government to the holocaust sponsored by the Nazis. Colonial policies, including the acquisition of Lebensraum, treatment of the Herero as subhuman, and legally institutionalized racism were communicated to and borrowed by the Nazis. While these three aspects are important, the annihilation policy and concentration camps had the biggest impact on Nazi Germany.

The notion of the acquisition of Lebensraum was used by Hitler based on the Herero genocide to expand German territory. Settlement and expansion in German South West Africa was based on the desire to obtain Lebensraum or ‘living space’. Germans viewed the Herero as uncivilized and subhuman thus unable to use land appropriately. As a result, the settlers rationalized taking Herero land because of inherent German superiority and material necessity. Germans put the theories into practice by violent means in Africa setting the precedent for Nazis to later seize and settle Eastern Europe. Hitler believed that Germans had the right to take territory and destroying the inhabitants because of their racial superiority. After acquiring the territory, Nazis followed the colonial model by brutally subordinating indigenous resources for their purposes. Just as the indigenous Namibians were beaten, starved, and worked to death for the benefit of the German nation so were all who were deemed subhuman by the Nazis. However, Hitler added an extra aspect those unable to work were exterminated in Nazi death camps as part of the final solution.

The treatment of colonized as subhuman was also used by Hitler. Colonists first implemented a Weltanschauung, which ensured that superior Germans ruled over subhumans. Violence was acceptable because Germans were superior and needed to show the Herero their place. The violence was so common that people stopped being shocked and became numb. This led to more violence and feelings of racial superiority. Colonial literature transferred violence and racist concepts to Germany, eroding their resistance to brutality thereby providing
ideas and methods that the Nazis later expanded upon. The atmosphere was ripe in Germany for genocide to occur. The physical mistreatment of Herero coupled with inequality before the law set dangerous precedent for later genocide.

Legally institutionalized racism was communicated to and borrowed by the Nazis. In Africa, there was a law that banned interracial marriage or cohabitation with the loss of suffrage. The debate about these laws took place in the colonies but also in the German government and public debate. Thus, the ideas were already in place before Hitler came to power. Similar laws were implemented by the Nazis making it illegal for Jews and Aryans to marry or have sex. In the colony and Nazi Germany, lawmakers transformed racism into legal discrimination removing an important barrier to the most severe form of racial intolerance: genocide.

The annihilation policy and concentration camps had the biggest impact on the Nazis. Germans settlers implemented a policy of Vernichtung or annihilation. Germany might have been making a statement about threats to the German nation. The genocide against the Herero could have been conducted to demonstrate to other European states Germany's military power and intolerance to threats to the nation. After the rebellion, the native population was proclaimed enemies of the German nation. Because the entire population was viewed as enemies, it allowed all regardless of gender and age to be killed. The war of annihilation against the Herero population set the tone for the Nazis. However, the Nazis used the Vernichtungskrieg as a military doctrine to pursue victory through the complete annihilation of enemy populations.

Concentration camps set the tone for the genocide against the Jews, Roma, homosexuals, and disabled. Mass murder of the Herero was a departure from military tradition, which corroded their morality and set precedents for even more extreme behavior by Hitler's Wehrmacht in Eastern Europe. The Nazis, like von Trotha's troops, killed men, women, and children indiscriminately with the result of acquiring territory. After taking the land enemies were put into concentration camps. Von Trotha's camps were blurred together under the term Konzentrationslager, which was coined at the time, yet they were divided into labor camps and death camps. The Herero alive after the battle and dessert were subjected to malnutrition, inadequate housing, and forced labor leading to numerous deaths. In Nazi Germany, those too old, young, or unhealthy to work went straight to the death camps. People that could work were often worked to death. In both cases, German authorities knew what was taking place.

Germans who played a role in the Herero Genocide planted the seed or had a part in the Holocaust. Many prominent Nazis had direct connections to colonial Namibia. Heinrichs Göring served as Reichskommissar. His son, Hermann Göring, was in command of the Luftwaffe in Nazi Germany. Franz Ritter von Epp was a soldier who led soldiers into battle and participated in the genocide. Additionally he passed the act that granted Hitler dictatorial powers and set up the Nazi regime in Bavaria. While governor of Bavaria, he presided over the construction of Dachau and virtually all the Jews and Roma were murdered. Others included, Rudolf Hess, Gregor Strasser, Walther Schultze, Ernst Röhm, and Eugen Fisher.

The first and second hand Nazi connections in Africa as well as the literature and debate about the Herero genocide had a tremendous impact on the Nazis. These beliefs and attitudes set the tone that enabled the Nazis to carry out the Holocaust, which killed 10 million including Jews, Roma, Homosexuals, and the disabled.
I will leave the reader with one last thought. The Herero genocide and the Holocaust were explicitly authorized by the German state. Furthermore, at the time the genocide fell under treaties and conventional laws. Because the law did little to stop the Herero genocide it set the precedent for the Holocaust. Because of the Holocaust, the U.N. Genocide Convention was enacted. Since the enactment of the convention, numerous genocides have transpired despite the laws. As not to have to take action, recently genocides are termed ethnic cleansing or crimes against humanity. The international community needs to look at past precedent and current genocides to see what can be done to enforce the laws to stop genocide and punish perpetrators. While genocide is part of human nature if the laws are enforced it might stop genocide, ethnic cleansing, and crimes against humanity, whatever they are called from taking place.

Spurred by resentment towards German control the rebellion led to the war of annihilation against the Herero from 1904 to 1907. This annihilation was the first genocide of the 20th century. At the time, there were laws and treaties preventing annihilation of people. However, these laws did little to prevent the genocide, as do the laws now under the U.N. Genocide Convention. What occurred in the colonies set the precedent for the holocaust in Germany.
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The psychiatrist Elisabeth Kübler-Ross first introduced the idea of five stages of grief to the world in 1969 with the publication of her book, *On Death and Dying* (“Elisabeth Kübler-Ross”). This revolutionary theory has allowed many literary researchers and biographers, such as Claire Tomalin, to take a closer look at the subjects of their study. For example, as Tomalin explores in her most recent book, a biography on Thomas Hardy, depression and grief are often difficult to pinpoint and explain, especially in one’s own life. Hardy, according to Tomalin, struggled intensely with depression, telling a friend in a letter, “As to despondency I have known the very depths of it—you would be quite shocked if I were to tell you how many weeks and months in bygone years I have gone to bed wishing never to see daylight again” (209). Although Hardy wrote hundreds of poems spanning his lifetime, five poems are representative of Hardy’s experience with the five stages of grief. Each of these poems illustrates a specific stage, including denial, depression, anger, bargaining, and acceptance. Even though Hardy does not claim to be the speaker in these poems, they are obviously autobiographical. Hardy’s life and poetry testify to his extended period of grief in which he not only realized his disillusionment with love, but also his estrangement from the world.

Thomas Hardy’s poem, “Her Dilemma,” provides a portal into the earlier years of his life, the slow decaying of innocence, and the beginning of his struggle with denial. Born in June of 1840, Thomas Hardy led a rather quiet life in his youth and younger years. Troubled by illness and weakness, Hardy did not attend school until age eight. However, his illnesses did not prevent him from waking early every morning for the better part of his youth to read classics such as the Renaissance poets and Homer. When Hardy turned fifteen, he began to apprentice as an architect in his hometown. The steady work allowed Hardy to write without worrying constantly about financial stability. Working at several architectural firms, Hardy eventually ended up in Dorchester, where in 1870, he first met Emma Gifford (Black 1). This time period sets the mood for the first poem that reveals his five stages of grief—“Her Dilemma.” This poem presents Hardy’s struggle with the first stage of denial, in which he refuses the restrictions of love and its boundaries in general. Little is actually recorded of Hardy’s love life during the period previous to Emma, which presents the question of why Hardy is even in denial at this stage of his life in the first place? Claire Tomalin offers an explanation, using the time period in which Hardy lived in London as the reason. Hardy stayed in London from 1862 to 1867, enriching him with the most highly influential intellectual years of his life. According to Tomalin, “Hardy fell more in love with poetry than with any of the girls he met in London and gave more attention to it” (73). It seems Tomalin’s argument rings true—perhaps the culture romanced Hardy more than any women of London could.

Hardy’s “Her Dilemma” certainly offers disillusionment with the common accepted notions of love—which mirrors the heavy influence of an ahead-of-its time London culture. During the years of youth, especially during Hardy’s era, there was an extreme amount of pressure to find a mate and to have a family. This pressure ignited the first step in Hardy’s
personal journey through the five stages of grief—denial. At the age of 26, Hardy completely
denies this widely held belief with his poem “Her Dilemma.” Although many contexts and
circumstances are embedded in this poem, he makes his position clear on the concept of ar-
ranged marriages and “true love.”

Writing the poem from the woman’s viewpoint is Hardy’s first step in denying the
popular notions of marriage and relationships. Not many male poets of Hardy’s time ever
presented the female side of things, which gives the poem an interesting twist. The female is
presented with an ultimatum from the male, an accurate reflection on society during Hardy’s
time. The female speaker, feeling that she has done the right thing saving the man’s life by
lying and saying she does love him, realizes that her innocence will be her end. Although she
explains, “Twas worth her soul to be a moment kind” with confidence, she soon realizes that
she no longer wants to live in a world “where Nature such dilemmas could devise” (HD 12,
16; 11). Hardy’s point is clear—for many youth, particularly women, love is an ultimatum in
which there is truly no choice. Young women especially must be married, and often times into
relationships arranged by their parents. At this point in his life, Hardy’s introduction to the
sophisticated London society made him question the importance of forced love and marriage.
This question of love leads him to ponder an even deeper question of disillusionment with
society and a world “where Nature such dilemmas could devise” (HD 16; 11). Although at
this point Hardy had not been formally in a relationship or had met Emma, his thoughts and
poetry, especially “Her Dilemma,” illuminate his struggle with denial and also predicted his
predicaments to follow.

Written in 1898, Thomas Hardy’s poem, “Neutral Tones,” provides evidence of
the second step in Hardy’s grief: depression. Hardy married Emma Gifford in 1874, and the
beginning years of their marriage were fairly happy and peaceful. Eventually, many com-
lications arose during their marriage, including Hardy’s constant lust for other women and
Emma’s claiming to be an integral part of Hardy’s work; as Tomalin explains, “[she] became
one of those wives who regards her husband’s work as ‘our work’ and refers to it in that way
in public” (179). Hardy’s growing popularity added to the strife, along with frequent travel-
ing that left plenty of time for Emma to wonder. However, it is incredibly hard to pinpoint the
true cause of their strife, as Tomalin illustrates, “…the shifting feelings in a marriage, and in
a family, are as complex and unpredictable as cloud formations” (183) . After 25 years, mar-
rriage became Hardy’s ominous cloud of depression and “Neutral Tones” transfused his emo-
tions to paper. He begins the poem with “We stood by a pond that winter day,” which leads the
reader to understand the speaker, Hardy, is addressing the poem to his lover (NT 1; 3). Instead
of the eyes of his lover looking at him longingly, they are “eyes that rove” and do not even
focus on him, but rather the troubles and struggles of the past that are too hard to let fade (NT
5; 3). At this point in the poem, Hardy’s depression is concretely related to the estrangement
of his relationship with Emma. Images such as “ash” and “gray” leave the reader feeling en-
veloped in a sense of impenetrable darkness. Odd word pairs point out the estrangement even
more with their surprising twists, such as “love deceives” and “riddles solved” (NT 3). There
is a sense that their relationship should be stable, but somehow it is not. As Hardy explains,
“The smile on your mouth was the deadest thing/ Alive enough to have strength to die” (NT 9-
10; 3). This imagery of death and odd word pairings of smiles and death further intensify the
depressed mood of the poem. Similar to those affected by depression, Hardy’s speaker does
nothing to change the situation. He merely accepts the circumstances and his disillusionment
as the end of the road, declaring, “Since then, keen lessons that love deceives,/ And wrings with wrong, have shaped to me” (NT 13-14; 3). Hardy’s “Neutral Tones” makes it obvious to the reader that he has given up the fight against disenchantment from his previous stage of denial. He no longer questions the world, as originally seen in “Her Dilemma.” Slowly, with the presence of Emma and the downfall of their marriage, Hardy fell into the stage of depression and remained there for many years to come.

Hardy did not fade into his third stage of grief until the year of 1909, when his poem “Shut Out that Moon” clearly illustrates the anger that had overtaken him. The anger that developed over the years of his marriage was not directed towards Emma nor meant to harm her at all. At this point in his life, Hardy realized the world was not what he had dreamt it would be those earlier years in London when he wrote “Her Dilemma.” His poem, “Shut Out that Moon,” displays a revolutionary change in thought for Hardy. It is opened immediately with harsh commands to close the casement and shut the blinds so as to “shut out that stealing moon” (SOM 2; 4). He personifies the moon, exclaiming that “she wears too much the guise she wore/ Before our lutes were strewn” and she had actually tricked him as youth when he was still innocent (SOM 3-4; 4). He is irritated with the beautiful night, the glowing constellations of Lad’s Chair and Orion, and mostly with the bough of midnight scents. These scents, Hardy explains, “…Wake the same sweet sentiments/ They breathed to you and me/ When living seemed a laugh, and love/ All it was said to be” (SOM 15-18; 4). He acknowledges the hopefulness of his youth, in which he had wished the world to be perfect. However, Hardy does not want to recall the content times of his life because of the current hardships. The line break after love serves to help the reader pause and understand that the next line is full of importance—love and life did not turn out the way it was said to be. In fact, Hardy explains, life was too easy in the beginning and too difficult in the end, “Too fragrant was Life’s early bloom/ Too tart the fruit it brought!” (SOM 23-24; 4). Although Hardy is angry and upset about the decaying of his marriage to Emma, it is obvious that he learned a much more important lesson through his struggle with love. Hardy ultimately, through his estranged marriage, realized the world is unfair, unkind, and ruthless, thus causing him to fall into that third stage of grief: anger.

After the building up of tensions for more than forty years, Hardy was extremely disheartened by the death of his wife Emma and wrote “The Voice,” which illustrates his fourth stage of grief: bargaining. After thirty-eight years of marriage, Emma passed away of heart failure and gallstones in 1912 (Tomalin 311). Written in 1912 shortly after Emma’s death in a collection named “Poems of 1912-13” focusing mostly on her, “The Voice” echoes Hardy’s intense regret and often-delusional requests for Emma to return. In this collection of poems, William Morgan argues that he obviously struggles with remembering his past joys in a positive way because of the more recent dilemmas and predicaments that face him (227). This struggle is evident in the vague and abstract word choices and arrangements that Hardy chooses. For instance, when referring to the woman he misses, he instead refers to the wife he had lost even before she had actually died, “Saying that now you are not as you were/ When you had changed from the one who was all to me” (TV 2-3; 6). This strange arrangement of words illuminates Hardy’s struggle with losing Emma before she had even died of illness, as well as his difficulty in accepting past joys in such a complicated present, as Morgan suggests. When Morgan examines the aesthetics of Hardy’s “Poems of 1912-13,” he discovers crucial questions embedded in each of the poems, such as, “How can the tormented present be recon-
ailed with the joys of the distant past or the estrangements of the more recent past?” (Morgan 227). Emma’s death obviously left an intense emptiness in Hardy’s life, which is especially noticeable in “The Voice.” His constant questioning of Emma, who is dead by this time, is never fulfilled by a response from her. Hardy is bargaining with Emma, acknowledging that he should have made amends with her while she was still living and he still had the chance. Hardy realizes he must live with this mistake for the rest of his life, “Thus I; faltering forward,/ Leaves around me falling,/ Wind oozing thin through the thorn from norward,/ And the woman calling” (TV 13-16; 6). Emma’s memory becomes a ghost that will serve as a constant reminder of what could have been done to save his marriage. Ultimately, she does not haunt Hardy because she is dead, but because he lost her before her physical being was gone.

Many critics disagree over the hidden meanings of Hardy’s “The Voice.” Seiwoong Oh’s critical evaluation of the poem argues that the poem functions mostly to represent the speaker’s bargaining with the ghost of his lover. Oh begins her argument by considering the claim of Maire A. Quinn who believes that Hardy’s referrals to “air blue gown” and “apparition” is concrete evidence that the subject of the poem is the actual dead woman’s phantom. Oh disagrees with Quinn, however, stating that the language used by Hardy seems more likely to be the “speaker’s request to the voice,” or Hardy’s bargaining (154). Oh continues to explain how this assumption can be proven true by the fact that the more the speaker becomes excited by the illusion of the dead woman, the more he asks her to appear in front of him. For instance, when the speaker truly feels that the dead woman’s presence is near, he comes back to his senses and wonders “Or is it only the breeze?” (154). The way in which the dead woman is addressed, first off as “woman,” or in third person, secondly in second person, and lastly back in third person, further proves Oh’s point. Hardy’s poem is more of an explanation of the speaker’s cycle of illusions rather than concrete evidence of an apparition or the dead woman’s ghost. With “The Voice,” Hardy admits that he is bargaining with the ghost of Emma to take away his pain.

However, Hardy’s empty requests quickly stifled his bargaining for Emma’s return and he wrote “The Photography” to offer his acceptance of the events of his life. He had finally reached his fifth and last stage of grief. After more than forty years of denial, depression, anger, and bargaining, Hardy finally found acceptance of the life that he was given. Five years following Emma’s tragic death, Hardy wrote “The Photograph” to explain the beginning of his difficult journey towards acceptance of all that had occurred in his life. His poem “The Photograph” begins with haunting imagery of flames creeping up a photograph as it “gnawed at the delicate bosom’s defenseless round” (TP 5; 7). It can be easily assumed that the photograph belongs to Emma because Hardy burns it thinking that his emotion has dried up. However, Hardy realizes “the spectacle was one that I could not bear,/ To my deep and sad surprise” (TP 7-8; 7). As hardy sobs, it is obvious that the memory of Emma still haunts him and that he will never quite be able to forget her. After the flame had completely devoured the picture and had “eaten her breasts, and mouth, and hair,” Hardy felt that the deed had been done and that he was finally able to let go of her (TP 10; 7). Although Emma had been dead for almost five years at this point, Hardy exclaimed, “But I felt as if I had put her to death that night!…” (TP 20; 7). He had at last found it in himself to accept Emma’s death and finally let her free, thus, in essence, finally allowing her to pass away from his imagination, dreams, and daily thoughts. However, this temporary confidence is mingled with suspicions of whether or not Emma is truly dead in his heart, “Yet—yet—if on earth alive/ Did she feel a smart, and
with vague strange anguish and strive?” (TP 23-24; 7). As a result, it is clear to the reader that he has not fully accepted her death, and perhaps, he never will. Hardy ends the poem with a heart-breaking image of Emma shaking her head at him from heaven, knowing that he will never fully accept the fate of their marriage and her untimely death. Although Hardy has not completed the final stage of grief entirely at this point, it is still a huge accomplishment for Hardy to have been ready to begin to accept all of the twists and turns of his life, after life had handed him so many troubles.

Hardy’s poetry serves as articulate reflections of the stages of grief he endured during his lifetime, ultimately illuminating his estrangement from love and the world in general. Even though the stages of grief do not always occur in order, individuals often undergo them on their own personal level. Hardy’s poetry proves this long endurance of loss, pain, and grief that spanned more than forty years of his lifetime. As Meghan O’Rourke states eloquently, “Thomas Hardy is not a poet likely to come to mind during the first flush of romance: his best love poems concern his stricken remorse at the death of his first wife.” However, as she later describes, “What makes these poems remarkable…is the precise nature of that regret” (O’Rourke). Almost all of Hardy’s poetry, as O’Rourke agrees, is an articulate documentation of the regret and grief that he suffered. Each individual poem, as witnessed here, provides a small glimpse into a fleeting moment of Hardy’s life in which the reader is allowed entrance into his world of disillusionment. Holding nothing back, Hardy declares his estrangement from the world through this poetry. The brutal honesty, dark imagery, and arrangement of words in this collection of Hardy poems accurately echoes what history cannot. Ultimately, Hardy’s struggle with grief was a life-long struggle with what all of humanity endures—the world will never be what we expect it to be.
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Saint Manuel the Unhappy, Deceiver

Zachary Hopper

Miguel de Unamuno’s short story “Saint Manuel the Good, Martyr” is the tale of one man’s recognition that there is no transcendent meaning in the world, and his struggle to cope with this realization. The man, Don Manuel, is ironically a parish priest in the village of Valverde de Lucerna. The people of this humble town love him, and word of the “real live saint, of flesh and bone” quickly spreads to other towns (Unamuno 2). Despite his saintly image, Angela Carballino suspects that a conflict is occurring within the holy man. Through time spent with Don Manuel, Angela begins to suspect that he does not believe in an afterlife, and this fact is confirmed when her brother Lazaro confides in her the secrets that Don Manuel entrusted to him. So it appears that we are in a quandary. How can this man of god, who makes the town “reek of holiness,” possibly not believe in Heaven or Hell (Unamuno 1)? Furthermore, if Don Manuel does not believe in God or an afterlife, then why does he preach these things to the villagers? In this paper, I will show how Don Manuel acknowledges the lack of transcendent meaning in the world and I will also explain his response to this recognition—becoming the tragic hero—and how this response is detrimental not only to himself, but to the entire village as well.

The first confrontation Don Manuel has with this lack of meaning can be seen when he convinces Perote, the former boyfriend of Rabona’s daughter, to marry her and accept her child as his own. Angela remembers their conversation:

“Look, give this poor little one a father, for he only has the one in heaven…”
“But Don Manuel, I’m not the guilty one!”
“Who knows, my son, who knows….! And especially because it’s not a question of guilt” (Unamuno 2).

This dialogue represents the internal conflict going on within Don Manuel. The first and last lines represent the side of Don Manuel that thinks he should keep his revelation to himself, while the second line represents the side of Don Manuel that wants to speak out, that does not know why he must feign belief in an afterlife. With this in mind, the conversation would read:

“Look, give these poor villagers a Father, because they will only have one if there is a heaven.”
“But I am not to blame for the lack of an afterlife!”
“Who knows if you are to blame? Besides, it is not a question of your guilt.”

The final line is what convinces Don Manuel, just as it did Perote, to obey the command of the first line—which, in Don Manuel’s case, is to spread the word of God despite his disbelief. This clash with the lack of transcendent meaning in the world is the reason why Don Manuel preaches even though he is a nonbeliever; he feels compelled to give the villagers hope of an afterlife, to give meaning to their lives. It is for this reason that Don Manuel is a tragic hero. If he were to preach that there is no afterlife, the villagers would believe him, and then he would
be responsible for taking heaven from them. So we see that Don Manuel is not responsible for his own lack of heaven, but he is responsible for his followers’ heaven, or lack thereof. Don Manuel must confront this lack of meaning in other instances throughout “Saint Manuel the Good, Martyr,” but it can be seen best in his assistance to the doctor.

Don Manuel’s second major confrontation with the lack of meaning in the world occurs when he accompanies the doctor on his rounds. Don Manuel is especially interested in child rearing and pregnancies, and Angela remembers that, “he thought it one of the greatest blasphemies that of ‘from the cradle straight to heaven’ and the other one ‘little angels in heaven.’” (Unamuno 4). Don Manuel is offended by sayings like these because there is no heaven. Children do not automatically go to heaven upon death; in fact, they do not go anywhere. Don Manuel can be compared to Ivan Karamazov, who is also “profoundly moved by the death of children” and does not believe that the world has transcendent meaning (Unamuno 4). Don Manuel believes that there is no meaning in the world because there is no afterlife, and therefore children do not automatically go to heaven upon death. The fact that innocent children are not permitted an afterlife adds credence to Don Manuel’s belief that there is no meaning in the world. Ivan, on the other hand, believes that since children are made to suffer, there can be no God, and therefore no transcendent meaning in the world. We see this when Ivan says,

Can you understand why a little creature, who can’t even understand what’s done to her, should beat her little aching heart with her tiny fist in the dark and cold, and weep her meek unresentful tears to dear, kind God to protect her? (Dostoevsky 12).

When he encounters suffering children, Don Manuel comes face to face with the lack of transcendent meaning in the world. The question left unanswered is how he responds to the grim prospect of a meaningless world.

After recognizing the lack of transcendent meaning in the world, Don Manuel reacts in two ways: he avoids thinking about it and he becomes the tragic hero by continuing to preach that the world has meaning. The first response is easy to understand; let’s face it, a meaningless world is downright depressing. Free choice loses some of its appeal if our choices do not mean anything, and without an afterlife to console and reward us, we have nothing to look forward to. So I can see why Don Manuel “fled from idle thinking” and led a life that was “active and not contemplative” (Unamuno 4). However, keeping busy to avoid idle thinking is only one way that Don Manuel responds to the lack of transcendent meaning in the world.

Don Manuel’s second course of action is to assume the role of Kierkegaard’s tragic hero. After recognizing the lack of transcendent meaning in the world, Don Manuel realizes that he cannot possibly share this secret with the simple villagers. They believe him to be a saint—it could even be said that they worship him—and they try to live according to what he tells them. We see their devotion to him when Angela remembers that “everyone went to mass, even if they only went to hear and see him at the altar” (Unamuno 3). Don Manuel’s reputation has even spread to other villages, as Angela remembers her friend at the religious school say “How lucky you are my friend, being able to live near a saint like that, a real live saint, of flesh and bone, and be able to kiss his hand!” (Unamuno 1-2). So if Don Manuel told the villagers that there is no transcendent meaning in the world, then they would believe him
without question. Don Manuel becomes a tragic hero when he decides to keep his realization to himself so as not to ruin the villagers’ meaningful lives. Not only does he place the villagers before himself—“I must live for my people, die for my people”—but he does so at his own cost (Unamuno 5). The priest is suffering on the inside because his world has no meaning, but he must feign belief in an afterlife in order to give his people hope and meaning. Don Manuel’s frustration and despair can be seen when he screams during his sermon, “My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?” (Unamuno 3). By sacrificing his happiness, and condemning himself to a life of internal conflict, Don Manuel succeeds in giving the villagers meaning in their lives, and in this respect he is a tragic hero. But is his decision to withhold the truth from his people just? Who is Don Manuel to decide what is best for another man, let alone an entire village?

The problem with Don Manuel’s response to the recognition that there is no transcendent meaning in the world is that he limits the practical freedom of the villagers. By not being straightforward with his people, Don Manuel is shielding them from a point of view which would change how they live their lives. If the villagers believed that the world was without meaning, they would stop going to church and living their lives according to religious values. Maybe the villagers would strive to be educated instead of striving to be closer to God, thereby improving the economic situation of their village. Or maybe without meaning in the world, the townsfolk would simply refuse to get out of bed every day and they would spend their lives on a mattress. Regardless of what becomes of them, the villagers would be choosing how they live their lives. Under the influence of Don Manuel, the villagers are free to think whatever they want (ontological freedom), but they are not free to do whatever they please (practical freedom). They will be ostracized if they do not adhere to the religion of the ‘herd’, which is the mass of people who follow Don Manuel; they are required to follow a set of rules concerning everything from how to worship to how to dress. Angela remembers that on New Years day, when people would visit Don Manuel, he “wanted everyone to come dressed in a new shirt, and if someone did not have one, he himself gave them a present of one” (Unamuno 2). Don Manuel believes that he knows what is best for the people, but by not giving the villagers a choice in what to believe, he is curtailing their practical freedom.

I have shown that Don Manuel confronts the lack of transcendent meaning in the world in his conversation with Perote and through his fondness for children. After this realization, Don Manuel attempts to ignore the issue by keeping himself busy, but this only produces internal conflict within himself, and he soon becomes consumed by an issue that is “something terrible, something intolerable, something mortal” (Unamuno 9). With the exception of Angela and Lazaro, Don Manuel keeps his doubts to himself for the reason that “the simple people could not live with it” (Unamuno 9). However, in choosing not to present the villagers with his revelation, Don Manuel limits their practical freedom. The town “believes unwittingly, out of habit, out of tradition,” and what is necessary, according to Lazaro, is “not to wake them up” (Unamuno 9). Although Don Manuel’s decision to become the tragic hero is made with good intentions, he ends up doing harm to the villagers by limiting their practical freedom. Don Manuel deceives his people by preaching something that is untrue, and in so doing he affects how they will live their lives. When he is on his deathbed does Don Manuel realizes the damage he has done, as he says “Forgive the harm that I might have done you unwittingly and without knowing it” (Unamuno 17). Whether we consider Don Manuel’s tragic act good or bad depends on how much we value freedom. Would you rather be happy and living in a
Mary Shelley’s *Frankenstein* subverts the social order of nineteenth century British society in two ways: it accuses society of being patriarchal and emphasizes the importance of a female self, and it criticizes single parenting and unorthodox child-rearing techniques. Shelley challenges the status quo not because of the sensitive topics she addresses, but because she does so as a woman. For a man to debate these topics is nothing out of the ordinary, but a woman’s viewpoint is rarely heard. In *Frankenstein*, Shelley gives voice to the voiceless; she speaks against the male-oriented society and does so in the tradition of her mother, Mary Wollstonecraft. Her critique on how children are raised goes against the social norms of her time, which emphasize that women be the primary caretakers of children, and as Barbara Johnson notes in her essay “My Monster/My Self,” the result is that “human infants are cared for almost exclusively by women” (Johnson 241). By challenging society’s views of women and its stance on nurturing children, Mary Shelley’s *Frankenstein* breaks the mold of the typical novel, becoming part attack on parents and part feminist manifesto.

In their essay “Mary Shelley’s Monstrous Eve,” Sandra M. Gilbert and Susan Gubar note that, “Though it has been disguised, buried, or miniaturized, femaleness—the gender definition of mothers and daughters, orphans and beggars, monsters and false creators—is at the heart of this apparently masculine book [*Frankenstein*]” (Gilbert and Gubar 232). This is a bold claim to make, considering that *Frankenstein*’s three main characters—Walton, Victor, and the Monster—are men. These males are portrayed as being rational, strong, educated, and goal-oriented. The women in the novel, on the other hand, are irrational, emotional, weak, and have no future plans (besides marrying, having children, and serving a man, of course). Elizabeth, the female with the largest role in the story, rarely leaves her home and certainly never strays out of town. Her role is to wait for Victor until he comes home to marry her; only then, under the supervision of her husband, will she be able to leave her town. We see from the language she uses in a letter to Victor both her role at home and her hopes for the future: “return to us,” “the growth of our dear children,” “my trifling occupations take up my time and amuse me,” (Shelley 57-58, chap. 6). She then hints at marriage by relating to Victor news of recently wed couples. From this letter we can see that Elizabeth’s life is confined to menial tasks, caretaking, and waiting for marriage, which will lead to children, more caretaking, and more trivial tasks. With these things in mind, how can Gilbert and Gubar claim that *Frankenstein* is about femaleness?

Notice that Gilbert and Gubar state that the story is about *femaleness*, not female characters. This femaleness is apparent when Victor removes himself from society in order to create the Monster, which can be seen as his offspring. Gilbert and Gubar argue that, “His [Victor’s] “pregnancy” and childbirth are obviously manifested by the existence of the paradoxically huge being who emerges from his “workshop of filthy creation,”” filthy meaning obscenely sexual in this context (Gilbert and Gubar 232-233). Shelley uses specific words to illustrate Victor’s “pregnancy”: “incredible labor and fatigue,” “painful labour,” “emaciated
with confinement,” “a passing trance,” “oppressed by a slow fever,” “nervous to a painful
degree,” “exercise and amusement would drive away incipient disease,” “ Winter, spring, and
summer passed away” (Shelley 47-50, chap. 4). After the monster has been “born,” Victor
appears to suffer from postpartum depression, as he spurns his “offspring” and becomes increas-
ingly nervous and moody. Victor symbolizes women in that he “gives birth” to a creature that
grows up only to cause him trouble, just as women give birth to men who grow up to oppress
them. Shelley included this femaleness for a reason: not only does it show what women go
through before and after childbirth, but it gives them power that has been denied by man in
other facets of life—the power of creation.

When the Monster begins telling Victor his story, he is really relating the tale of what
it means to be a woman. He grows up in the same manner as women in the nineteenth century,
“isolated and ignorant, rather than insulated or innocent” (Gilbert and Gubar 236). Gilbert
and Gubar argue that, “the monster’s narrative is a philosophical meditation on what it means
to be born without a “soul” or a history, as well as an exploration of what it feels like to be a
“filthy mass that move[s] and talk[s],” a thing, an other, a creature of the second sex” (Gilbert
and Gubar 235). In Shelley’s time, women were considered to be “other,” a deviation from the
“normal” male sex, similar yet inferior to men; Simone de Beauvoir addresses this issue in her
best known work, The Second Sex, in which she argues that women are defined as outsiders
or as “other” and deserve to be treated equally. The Monster, too, wants equal treatment, as
we can see from his constant attempts to make peace with man: “I would bestow every benefit
upon him with tears of gratitude at his acceptance. But that cannot be; the human senses are
insurmountable barriers to our union” (Shelley 129, chap. 17). As this quote shows, the Mon-
ster has realized that he will never be equal to man. Moreover, he has come to see himself as
a monster because men have treated him that way. If we look at his life before his first contact
with man, we see no trace of this idea. Gilbert and Gubar relate the Monster’s situation to that
of women when they say, “Women have seen themselves (because they have been seen) as
monstrous, vile, degraded creatures, second-comers, and emblems of filthy materiality” (Gil-
bert and Gubar 239). The importance of establishing a self and breaking free of patriarchal
views is exemplified in the monster, but what does Shelley have to say about Victor’s parent-
ing, or lack thereof, of his creation?

Frankenstein is an attack on parenting techniques, as it emphasizes what hap-
pens when a child is neglected or raised by only one parent. Barbara Johnson notes that the
“spectacular scientific discovery of the secrets of animation produces a terrifyingly vengeful
creature who attributes his evil impulses to his inability to find or become a parent” (Johnson
246). When Victor “gives birth” to the Monster, he is immediately disgusted and horrified by
its appearance. He says, “I beheld the wretch—the miserable monster whom I had created
[...] no mortal could support the horror of that countenance. A mummy again endued with
animation could not be so hideous as that wretch” (Shelley 52, chap. 5). Johnson maintains
that Victor’s hatred towards his “child” is a sign of postpartum depression, a “representation
of maternal rejection of a newborn infant” (Johnson 246). This concept is a fairly recent one,
and by implying that Victor as “mother” of the Monster can loathe and reject his child, Shel-
ley defies the established views on parenting of nineteenth century British society. If there
were a second parent in the scene to nurture the Monster until Victor could be persuaded to
accept it, then the Monster would not have strayed down the path of evil. Shelley emphasizes
this point by contrasting the Monster with Victor, who is the son of two loving parents. As
Johnson notes, Shelley shows that “in the existing state of things there is something inherently monstrous about the prevailing parental arrangements” (Johnson 242). By presenting the asymmetrical parenting techniques popular during her time as flawed, and by contrasting them with a successful two parent system, Shelley is advocating a parenting system in which both sexes are equally involved in the upbringing of their children.

I have shown that Mary Shelley undermines the dominant culture and values of nineteenth century British society by accusing it of being misogynistic and by criticizing how it raises its young. Shelley shows the stereotypical views of men and women—that men are superior to women; that women are weak and irrational while men are strong and level-headed—through her characters. As Gilbert and Gubar note, Shelley inserts femaleness into *Frankenstein* to show that women have the power to give life and a man’s attempt to do so will only end in catastrophe. Through the Monster’s narrative, Shelley expresses the need for women to define a self, rather than be defined by men. The concept of the “other” is important in *Frankenstein*, and Shelley hints that to do away with “othering” would be beneficial to both man and woman. As the daughter of feminist philosopher and author of *A Vindication of the Rights of Women* Mary Wollstonecraft, it is no surprise that Shelley borrows some of her mother’s ideas in *Frankenstein*. Not only does Shelley question the established patriarchy, but she also challenges traditional beliefs concerning child-rearing techniques and decries neglectful parents. She uses the Monster to show what happens when a child does not receive the proper nurturing it requires, and Victor is her example of a bad parent; his rejection of the Monster becomes the source of both of their problems, and in the end of the novel Victor and the Monster “become indistinguishable as they pursue each other across the frozen polar wastes” (Johnson 242). This shows that a single parent system is detrimental to both parent and child, as well as emphasizes the fact that children need to be nurtured rather than repudiated. *Frankenstein* encourages us challenge the status quo, to question the established values and culture of our society, and what better place to start than in our own homes?

**Works Cited**


Beowulf and Gawain: Different Stories, Similar Endings

Zachary Hopper

Although six centuries separate Beowulf from Sir Gawain and the Green Knight, the endings to these alliterative poems are not unlike. While the poems themselves are unique, telling different tales and sharing few common themes or philosophies, the resolutions are quite similar. In both poems, the hero embarks upon a journey culminating in a final confrontation and victory (in one form or another) for the hero and those he serves. Gawain and Beowulf themselves represent traits valued by their respective cultures, many of which are identical. However, many readers fail to notice these likenesses and instead focus on the more apparent differences between the poems, such as the final challenge and outcome of the hero or the obvious cultural differences. I maintain that, while the resolutions of Beowulf and Gawain are seemingly dissimilar, they actually share many things in common.

The contrast most evident in the resolutions of Beowulf and Gawain is the outcome of the hero. In Beowulf, a dragon has been terrorizing Geatish lands and Beowulf battles it to protect his people. This is his most challenging fight yet, as the text makes clear: “No quarter was claimed; no quarter given… So for the first time fortune was failing / the mighty man in the midst of a struggle… the blade he brandished / had failed in the fray thought forged from iron” (Beowulf lines 2254-2280). Additionally, the fact that Beowulf, a solitary fighter in the past, needs assistance from Wiglaf, and dies in spite of this help, tell us that this is the most brutal and difficult battle that Beowulf has ever fought. Gawain’s conflict, while every bit as serious as Beowulf’s, is much less intense. The beheading game is more refined than Beowulf’s harsh battle with the dragon, so much so that it even has rules and expectations for both Gawain and the Green Knight. We see how civilized this contest is when the Green Knight delivers his blow to Gawain’s neck: “Lightly his weapon he lifted, and let it down neatly / with the bent horn of the blade towards the neck that was bare; / though he hewed with a hammer-swing, he hurt him no more / than to snick him on one side and sever the skin” (Gawain lines 2310-2313). The Green Knight means no harm to Gawain, as the real game is the exchange of winnings between Gawain and Bercilak. The main difference between Beowulf’s and Gawain’s battles is the high intensity of one and the cordial atmosphere of the other. However, if one pays attention to them, the similarities between the two fights abound.

The battles in the resolutions of Beowulf and Gawain share three things in common: victory (of some sort) for the hero, service to others, and a journey leading up to a final challenge. Beowulf’s journey begins when he embarks upon a voyage to “offer Hrothgar, with honest heart, / the means to make an end to this menace [i.e. Grendel]” (Beowulf lines 244-245). Beowulf’s desire to help others is the motivating force behind his three major battles, and culminates in his defeat of the dragon at the cost of his own life; he says, “…still in old age I would see out strife / and gain glory guarding my fold” (Beowulf lines 2213-2214). Gawain, too, is motivated by helping others, and accepts the Green Knight’s challenge on behalf of King Arthur. He says,
“...I find it unfitting, as in fact it is held, / when a challenge in your chamber makes choices so exalted, / though you yourself be desirous to accept it [the Green Knight’s challenge] in person, / while many bold many about you on bench are seated...since this affair is so foolish that it nowise befits you, / and I have requested it first, accord it then to me! (Gawain lines 348-351).

In order to serve Arthur, Gawain decapitates the Green Knight and, according to the rules of the game, begins his journey in one year and one day’s time. Like Beowulf, Gawain travels a great deal and faces many challenges, such as resisting the temptations of Bercilak’s wife or playing the exchange of winnings game. In the end, Gawain is shamed because he did not give up the green girdle, thereby losing the game, so he wears it around his neck as a reminder of his weakness. But when he returns to King Arthur’s court to tell of his journey, the lords and ladies of the court make a law stating that, “…every knight of the Brotherhood, a baldric should have, / a band of bright green obliquely about him, / and this for love of that knight [Gawain] as a livery should wear” (Gawain lines 2518-2520). Although Gawain falters in his knighthood by accepting the girdle from Bercilak’s wife, he earns the respect of the Green Knight and of the people of Arthur’s court for fulfilling his knightly duty of service to his lord. This duty is part of Gawain’s knightly code, and it is but one of the values that he shares with Beowulf.

One of the most overlooked connections between Beowulf and Gawain is the strict code of values followed by the heroes. Beowulf’s warrior culture values qualities such as courage and loyalty. These values are especially important in the face of defeat, because victory does not guarantee superiority; how one conducts battle is more important than winning. Therefore, warriors can and should boast of their deeds in battle, which not only prove their worth but also help to build their name. Beowulf demonstrates this when he arrives at Hrothgar’s court and says,

“They [Geatish earls and elders] have seen me / return bloody from binding five brutish giants, / a family of foes destroyed in our strife; / and under the surf I have slain sea-monsters, / nightmarish nixies noxious to Geats. / Hardship I had, but our harms were avenged, / our enemies mastered” (Beowulf lines 372-378).

Not only does he prove that he is capable of defeating Grendel, but he also achieves glory through performing heroic deeds. Gawain follows a code as well, although his varies slightly. As a knight, he is bound by duty to serve his lord, King Arthur. The Knights of the Round Table can be compared to Beowulf and his men serving Hrothgar. Kinship bonds are present in both cultures, but Gawain’s culture focuses more on the individual. It regards loyalty and courage highly, as Beowulf’s does, but it values additional qualities in knights, such as generosity, fellowship, chastity, chivalry, and piety. Gawain is the embodiment of these five characteristics, and he is described as “gold refined, / devoid of every vice and with virtues adorned” (Gawain lines 633-634). Although Gawain possesses characteristics not found in Beowulf’s culture, and vice versa, it is apparent that they share some of the same qualities, and that their values are not as different as they first appear.

I have shown that the resolutions of Beowulf and Sir Gawain and the Green Knight appear to be radically different, but are actually quite similar. Both Beowulf and Gawain are
motivated by others and ultimately achieve victory against their enemies. They share many of the same traits, and one can see that their dissimilarity is only surface deep. Most readers miss the similarities between these two heroes, and instead focus on their obvious discrepancies. How the poems end, both in terms of character traits and plot outcome, are not unlike one another, and for those that cannot see their likeness, perhaps a more critical reading is necessary.
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“I had reached Nobrow, ground zero, the exact midpoint at which culture and marketing converged.” Such is the prose of “Nobrow”, an analysis of American culture by John Seabrook. In his work Seabrook, a staff writer at The New Yorker, examines marketing-the Buzz-and the ways it has affected his life and the American culture as a whole. According to Seabrook, American culture was once defined in terms of High and Lowbrow. Things considered Highbrow were unique and expensive; for the American elite. Lowbrow was for the general population; cheap, mass-produced, and commercial. However, as Seabrook sees it, such distinctions are terms of the past. Today there is only Nobrow; where marketing and pop-culture have merged to create the American culture we know so well.

In order to prove his thesis, that American culture is purely Nobrow, Seabrook divided his work into three areas of study. In the first portion of “Nobrow”, Seabrook discusses his relationship with his father (and his father’s handmade suits). This section presents American culture how it once was; where there was a meaningful distinction between Highbrow and Lowbrow. “Nobrow” also focuses on the celebrities and media sources that have done so much to create a cultureless America. As a writer with The New Yorker, Seabrook had access to the gods of pop-culture. MTV, George Lucas and David Geffen (etc.) were examined and interviewed to illustrate their connections and substantial contributions to the Nobrow phenomenon. The final illustration of American Nobrow was the transformation of The New Yorker from Highbrow literature into what it is today; another Nobrow pop-organ like Vogue and Seventeen. Using these sources and invaluable experiences, Seabrook created a revealing look at American culture; or lack thereof.

“Nobrow” is a sadly revealing look at the commercialization of American culture. I hadn’t really thought much about this culture (I never figured we had one), but Seabrook proves that we at least have a burgeoning culture of pop.

As a member of The New Yorker writing staff, Seabrook was given access to many celebrities and intriguing cultural events. The biggest draw of the work, besides its overall lesson, is the large amount of celebrity-oriented information and revealing facts Seabrook provides. I learned that Ben Kweller was touted as the next Kurt Cobain (Ben Kweller!), but was unfortunately overshadowed by Hanson. I also found out that the SKG (as in Dreamworks SKG) is an acronym for Spielberg (Steven), Katzenberg (Jeff) and Geffen (David, of Geffen Records fame). And my thoughts on George Lucas, who was interviewed in the shadows of the Skywalker Ranch’s basement, were confirmed. Lucas noted that he focused on editing and light, rather than plot and characters, in his filmmaking ventures (this becomes apparent when one views Star Wars: Episode II).

Such factoids aside, I enjoyed “Nobrow”. It was written in an easy to read journalistic yet casual style, and his research was quite compelling. Upon completion, I’m convinced that the Nobrow pop-culture of America is our culture; and, unfortunately, the world around me doesn’t suggest a cultural shift any time soon. I would definitely recommend this work.
A Thousand Splendid Suns written by Khaled Hosseini is about a woman’s journey of finding herself while growing up in Kabul, Afghanistan. It is about her life journey from growing up as a child to becoming a prisoner in her own life.

Mariam grew up being the shame of her father, the result of infidelity. She lived with her mother in a one room Kolba on the outskirts of Kabul. She was a child who desperately wanted to know her father and her other brothers and sisters but was not allowed to as her father was the wealthiest man in Kabul; and a scandal of infidelity would ruin his reputation. As Mariam grew older she became bolder. She ventured off to Kabul by herself to see her father and meet her siblings but this venture killed her mother, not just emotionally but physically as well.

When Mariam’s mother died she was fifteen years old and went to live with her father regardless of his reputation. She was able to live with him for a few weeks before he and his three wives arranged her marriage to a thirty-six year old shoe maker. This was the beginning of Mariam’s life as she becomes a prisoner of it being abused emotionally and physically by her husband.

While starting her new life Mariam experiences many more devastating losses but also gains a new friendship with her neighbors’ daughter, Laila, as she too experiences the most horrid loss of her parents to the war of the Wahdat faction and the Jihad. These losses from the war set the tone of the story as many more lives are lost and the Taliban gains control.

Throughout the book, Hosseini was able to vividly describe the emotions that the characters experienced. He describes the life they had to live in a small village to the wars they had to live through and the strict changes the Taliban enforced. As a reader Hosseini makes it feel like he/she is experiencing it for themselves. A Thousand Splendid Suns was a powerful tale of heroism through a dark time of the lives of two brave women and it really makes one understand what it must be like to live in a third world country experiencing war and constantly fearing for ones life.
In *Blindness*, José Saramago probes deep into the realm of human nature, creating a novel that both celebrates and condemns humanity. Set in an unnamed city, *Blindness* is the story of an epidemic of “white blindness” that swiftly spreads across the country, sowing seeds of chaos and turmoil with each person struck down. The novel focuses on the first people to be infected—a man and his wife, a little boy, (ironically) an optometrist and his wife, and several other people brought together by chance—and their struggle to survive. As the blindness spreads, the government confines the blind and infected to an asylum in an effort to contain the disease. While society on the outside is rapidly deteriorating, the society of the blind has already hit rock bottom. In the asylum, Saramago presents us with a frightening glimpse of the Hobbesian state of nature: armed gangs rape women, hoard food rations, and kill with wanton disregard; frightened, trigger-happy soldiers guarding the asylum execute any blind person that gets too close; filthy living conditions mirror the state of the internees’ morals, and soon it becomes a fight just to retain one’s dignity. But when the soldiers become blind as well, the internees are able to join the outside world, or what is left of it. Led by the doctor’s wife, who has miraculously retained her sight throughout their ordeal, the group ventures forth in search of food and shelter. Immune to the white blindness, animals have begun to reclaim parts of the city, with packs of feral dogs preying on the infected citizens. Fortunately, the group crosses paths with a good-tempered dog that provides protection and companionship. Through the eyes of the doctor’s wife and discussions with other people, they learn that food is scarce and that people are being driven further away from the city in search of something to eat. The doctor’s wife manages to find a storeroom with food and supplies that went unnoticed by the blind, but caring for the others has begun to take its toll on her, resulting in periods of deep contemplation and a mental breakdown. As they come to rely on one another in order to survive, they eventually begin to restore a sense of normalcy to their hectic lives. Just when people start to adapt to a sightless life, the white blindness suddenly comes to an end, restoring not only vision, but also law and order.

*Blindness* is an exploration of the human condition, of both the best and the worst sides of humanity. Saramago shows how much we depend on one another, especially in times of need, while at the same time detailing the dichotomy between the individual and society as a whole. Among current authors, he is a pioneer both in terms of subject matter—one of his most famous novels, *The Stone Raft*, involves the Iberian Peninsula breaking away from Europe and sailing about the Atlantic Ocean—and in terms of style. Saramago’s writing style may be a bit intimidating to people looking for an easy read. In *Blindness*, he avoids using proper nouns, and rarely uses periods. Instead, he prefers to string sentences together with commas, oftentimes resulting in sentences lasting a full page. One of the most difficult things to adapt to in *Blindness* is Saramago’s refusal to use quotation marks to signify dialogue;
when the speaker changes, the first letter of the new speaker’s dialogue is capitalized. At times I found myself frustrated by this technique, but it served to demonstrate—on a small scale—what the characters felt when their vision was stripped from them. His novel is both a tribute to the endurance of the human spirit and a prophetic vision of a world without order. While it may be a challenge to adjust to Saramago’s distinctive style, *Blindness* is definitely worth the effort.

Lubrano’s mission in this book is to expose the myth that the United States is “classless.” This country is known for its freedoms and endless possibilities, or what is commonly called the “American dream.” Lubrano argues, however, that class issues exist and they limit or confine individuals depending on which class they are born into. To do so, Lubrano chronicles his own experiences growing up as a young Italian-American male in Brooklyn, NY and the struggles he encountered when he attends college and leaves his working class roots for a life in the middle class. He supports his own experiences with input from working-class studies scholars and anecdotal evidence he received from 100 interviews over a nine-month period with other “straddlers.” Lubrano defines a straddler as those who “were born into blue-collar families and then, [like him], moved into the strange new territory of the middle class. “They are the first in their families to have graduated from college. As such, they straddle two worlds, many of them not feeling at home in the either, living in a kind of American Limbo” (2).

Lubrano feels that studying and examining social classes is beneficial to people, “By ignoring class distinctions, people may be overlooking important parts of themselves and failing to understand who they really are” (5). It can be difficult for Straddlers because they were “trained” in one world, but need to survive and function in another. Those raised in a blue-collar family have different life tools and ways in which they interact with family and friends, but when they receive their college education and begin learning the ins and outs of middle-class life, they may encounter emotional conflicts. Lubrano summarizes it best when he says that Straddlers and their families are related by blood but separated by class (7). This statement, coming first-hand from a first generation college grad from a blue-collar family does wonders to prove that, in fact, class does exist in the United States and can cause rifts between not only different classes, but members within the same family as well.

In an effort to further illustrate the differences between white- and blue-collar families, Lubrano addresses the issue of communication—“the number of words spoken in a white-collar household in a day is, on average, three times greater than the number spoken in a blue-collar home (especially the talk between parents and kids)” (9-10). Basically, Lubrano summarizes that in blue-collar homes, the parents come home from a hard day of laborious work and expect children to be seen and not heard. On the other hand, in white-collar homes, parents converse with their children and encourage them to voice their opinions and emotions. This major difference is what attributes to the courage and “belongingness” children of white-collar families carry into their college experience and white-collar jobs (9). Along with this “belongingness,” Lubrano also addresses the fact that we “begin in different places” and the differing journeys that white-collar and blue-collar children make “makes all the difference in how one ultimately views the world” (11). Also, those from middle-class families
may have a “jump start” in that they come “equipped with helium balloons to raise them to a higher stratosphere where things just come to you” (19). This statement proves that Lubrano, when speaking of white-collar families, is not talking about the average middle-class family. With the class boundaries becoming increasingly disparate in the United States, most families classified as middle class probably realize that their “helium balloon” is non-existent.

Another interesting aspect of the book is Lubrano’s account of his experiences right here in Columbus, Ohio. He got a job at a now non-existent daily paper in the city in 1980 and when he told his parents what he was going to be doing and where, his father asked, “Ohio? Where the hell is Ohio?” He goes on to illustrate his opinion of Ohio’s ambiguity and blandness when he gives the following description:

The quiet yuppie preserves of Columbus (an Ohio cabdriver described the place as mashed potatoes without salt or gravy) couldn’t compare to the tumult of my old town [Brooklyn, New York]. The genuineness of the people charmed me. And the pizza and bagels were real, too. Once in Columbus, I’d asked a diner waitress for an untoasted bagel. She brought a plate with a frozen Lender’s round-bread-thing on it. (108)

His experience in Ohio revealed another difference between white- and blue-collar individuals. He made frequent trips home to visit his family, and his friends in Ohio would be amazed by this, saying, “I don’t see my family as much as you do yours,” and his relatives lived within 20 miles. Lubrano attributed this difference to the fact that “middle-class kids are groomed to fly away, and they do. The working class likes to keep its young close to home. Those who drive 600 miles west are the odd ones” (108). This stereotype makes a huge assumption about family bonds between the classes. It’s hard to believe that, across the board, white-collar families do not have a family bond and an innate need to visit and keep in touch, while blue-collar families do.

With the obvious flaws in this book (the journalistic “research” style does not offer concrete numbers or diagnoses), Lubrano approaches a sensitive and complex issue in a reader-friendly and engaging way. The topic, or argument, presented is an interesting and thought provoking one. It forces individuals to consider the stereotypes they themselves may hold about different economic classes based upon the job they hold, the amount of money they take in per year, or education. This book definitely lends to discussion, but it may not always be positive—one individuals may feel intimidated or defensive depending on the experiences they bring to the table in relationship to the book’s subject matter. Despite the level of truthfulness the book has in its revelation that class issues do exist in this country, the deep generalizations and stereotypes it provides for certain classes may be a little too overwhelming for some people, especially those who are preparing to face, or may already be facing, an already intimidating transition into college life. But it’s also important to realize that these stereotypes are just that, generalizations, and that having a “white collar” or a “blue collar” does not define one’s life or destine them to certain family, life, or career scripts.

Laura Muellner

Humanity has been struggling to understand how the brain works for centuries. Dr. Oliver Sacks has contributed to the study of the brain through his analysis of his patients, many of whom have neurological or psychological anomalies. His most recent publication, *Musicophilia: Tales of Music and the Brain*, focuses on a variety of aural problems and their possible causes. He approaches serious problems and strange symptoms with compassion, making the reader sympathize with and understand people who have lived very different lives than themselves, with experiences that the reader has never had.

In the first section of *Musicophilia*, Dr. Sacks focuses on normal people, rather than musicians, who hear and appreciate music in unusual ways. He tells the story of a doctor who, after being struck by lightning, develops an insatiable desire to listen to and play piano, though he had previously not enjoyed classical music. Other patients have musical hallucinations; tunes play spontaneously in their heads, both familiar and completely new, that they have little to no control over. This can be very crippling for music lovers, as it destroys their ability to appreciate live music. While Dr. Sacks includes stories of musicians who experience these problems, he speaks of them in the same terms as non-musicians, emphasizing the similarities rather than the differences between the groups.

In contrast to the opening section, Dr. Sacks spends the second segment of the book speaking of what differentiates both musicians and the extremely amusical from the general public. Dr. Sacks examines the possible reasons for perfect pitch, noting that the phenomenon is much more common among people whose languages rely on pitch for meaning. He also describes a musician who, after an accident, loses her conception of harmony. She could still hear individual melodic lines, but she was unable to understand the combination of sounds without retraining her ear. Many of the patients in this section are Dr. Sacks’s personal friends rather than patients, giving his analyses a different, more intimate feeling than in other sections.

Since much of Dr. Sacks’s background deals with abnormal psychology, he includes a description of how music interacts with other psychological disorders. Musical therapy is a growing industry, and the third part gives many examples of how effective it can be. Tourette’s patients can learn to control their spastic motions through jazz drum improvisation. The spasms that Tourette’s patients experience can actually inspire new rhythmic motives, which entire solos can be based around. Such creative outbursts allow them to embrace themselves and their disease in a way that would not otherwise be possible. Aphasia, which affects the ability to understand language, can be treated through song. Patients can be taught words through songs, occasionally regaining language independent of the tunes they originally relearned them through. These applications are addressed in addition to the much more common therapy for motion problems.

In the final part of the book, Dr. Sacks discusses how music can shape people’s identities. Brain imaging has shown how people’s strengths can come from weaknesses; when one
temporal lobe has damage, the other takes over some of its functions. In one rare, congenital disorder known as Williams Syndrome, children’s entire world is based around music. They are born with a very low IQ, but their social IQ is very high; they can interact on a normal basis and have in-depth conversations with others. One of the main symptoms of Williams Syndrome is an extreme love of music. They bond through the act of performing and listening to music in a way that most other people cannot understand. Their lives are based around the enjoyment of music, usually in a nonprofessional format, only to a much greater degree than normal music lovers. He concludes the book with a description of dementia and music, demonstrating how music can provide structure and memories for those whom society assumes have no remaining connection to reality.

Dr. Sacks describes a variety of symptoms and syndromes that relate to music, exposing readers to problems that they never knew existed. Throughout, however, he maintains a sympathetic viewpoint, so that rather than feeling alienated, readers identify with the patients. *Musicophilia* is appropriate for both seasoned musicians as well as laymen; Dr. Sacks reveals aspects of the psyche that are applicable to those from all walks of life, from those who have common problems like hearing loss to those with rare, relatively unknown problems like Williams Syndrome. His research has answered many questions, but raised a great deal more. Hopefully his work will inspire more research into this area of the brain.
Abby Reschke

“I only did my duty – if you can save somebody’s life, it’s your duty to try.” (315)

This was the simple and essential thought-process of Jan and Antonina Zabinski during WWII. Together and with the help of 70,000 – 90,000 other Warsaw citizens, they saved the lives of thousands of escaping Jews.

Jan and Antonina Zabinski were the proud owners and founders of the Warsaw zoo. Throughout their lives they worked hard to preserve the lives of many animals including the prized Przywalski horses, lynxes, bison, and their zoo even harbored the birth of the twelfth elephant born in captivity. However, it is their preserving of the human species that they are most noted for.

Having worked with animals their entire lives, many of them being raised or nursed back to health within their own home, Jan and Antonina had a special connection with animals. “At a moment’s notice, she can lose her Homo Sapiens nature and transform herself into a panther, badger, or muskrat!” (235) Having this innate ability allowed Jan and Antonina to ‘transform’ themselves and think like the German Nazi’s during WWII.

With their ability to think like the Nazi’s, Jan and Antonina were able to sense what would tip them off and how to remain on their good side. As a result, during WWII they saved roughly 300 lives through their affiliation with the Underground Peasant Movement. They didn’t risk their lives just because they felt it was their duty to save escaping Jews, but also because Jan felt a “moral indebtedness” to them. (111)

After several bombs fell on their zoo, many animals escaped, and those remaining whom the Nazi’s deemed dangerous were shot point blank. This left their zoo mostly uninhabited, and with Jan and Antonina being very clever and creative, they realized that they would be able to house escaping Jews in the now empty cages. Every arriving escapee had an animal name and every animal remaining in the zoo had a human name, making it not only confusing to normal houseguests, but even more confusing to any Nazi over hearing a conversation. “The Zabinski’s home was Noah’s Ark, with so many people and animals hidden there.” (310)

Jan knew that he needed to keep his zoo so he could remain a part of the underground and he knew that the only way to do this was to show the Nazi’s that his property had use for them. So Jan used some land and created a park where off duty Nazi’s could wander, relax, and reminisce about their homeland. Much of their remaining land was used for various temporary functions such as raising pigs for Nazi consumption and even raising foxes for fur. With the Nazi’s constantly on their property Antonina and Jan along with all of their guests (legal and illegal) knew they had to be on their toes at all times. The phrase of ‘keep your friends close and your enemies closer’ worked wonders for them. “Knowing the German mentality, they would never expect any kind of Underground activity in a setting so
exposed to public view.” (113)

Antonina and Jan battled throughout the entire war to find new and creative ways to help save more Jews and to keep themselves and their many illegal actions undiscovered. They even battled being separated several times not knowing if the other remained alive and well.

_The Zookeeper’s Wife_ tells a true, documented, and heavily researched tale of two heroes during WWII. It is captivating, candid, and intensely emotional. Jan and Antonina unselfishly dedicated five years of their lives to save “people stripped of everything but their lives.” (266) Rescuers of this war, like Jan and Antonina, although they “held solemn principles worth dying for, they didn’t regard themselves as heroic.” (315) Simply stated, they “did it because it was the right thing to do.” (315)
In *The World Without Us*, Alan Weisman describes a world without humans. Weisman descriptively creates an imaginative world which few can even begin to contemplate. He asks the reader to envision the Earth without us. How long would it take for the world to return to a pure pre-human state? What would happen to the animals currently on the verge of extinction? What would happen to all the plastic—how long does it even take to decompose? Would big cities like New York City ever fall?

Weisman begins his work mentioning the few remaining places on earth that have been void of humanity and therefore pose as an example of what the world would be like without humans. The half-million acre forest of Puszca, Poland is Europe’s last remaining old-growth wilderness. Trees tower over 150 feet tall and there is over 50 cubic yards of decomposing trunks covering the ground in every acre. Weisman described the wilderness, “To enter it is to realize that most of us were bred to a pale copy of what nature intended” (12).

Next Weisman discusses what would happen to our housing. Even the most durable and built to last would fall. He states,

“If you’re a homeowner, you already knew it was only a matter of time for yours, but you’ve resisted admitting it, even as erosion callously attacked, starting with your savings. Back when they told you what your house would cost, nobody mentioned what you’d also be paying so that nature wouldn’t repossess it long before the bank” (15).

The first stage of the attack would be by either mold, termites or worst of all—water. Within 500 years there wouldn’t much left of your house.

New York City is one of the largest and most massive cities in the world. Besides Central Park, New York city is practically a city of concrete, asphalt and steel. Once it had a picturesque landscape full of hills and streams. Obviously there are no running brooks through the city today. Weisman states, “In a city that buried its rivers, rain still falls. It has to go somewhere.” This would ultimately be the city’s demise as the subways and streets would be flooding within 24 hours without humans there to control water pressure and regulate generators and pumps. With water filling the ‘belly’ of New York City, it wouldn’t take long for pavement to crumble and buildings to collapse from the ground up.

The most intriguing chapter by far was that on plastic. Little is known about plastic’s decomposing properties. Much of the plastic produced doesn’t even make it to landfills and instead finds its way to the ocean to eventually sink to the unknown depths below. The most common form of plastic pollution is nurdles—the raw materials of plastic production which are used to melt down into practically anything. These nurdles are found on beaches across
the world today. The amount of plastic in the ocean is increasing at an alarming place. Plastic as been found in some places in the ocean to be 10 meters deep below the surface. Plastic beads are very common today in such items as face creams and also for use to scour paint from boats and aircrafts. According to Weisman, “They’re selling plastic meant to go right down the drain, into the sewers, into the rivers, right into the ocean. Bite-size pieces of plastic to be swallowed by little sea creatures” (117).

The most fascinating discussion concerning plastic was about the North Pacific Gyre. The North Pacific Gyre is a 1,000 mile stretch between Japan and the United States. Due to the circular ocean currents in this area, the ocean is a giant whirlpool. All things that flow down rivers to the sea end up in one of six gyre’s in the ocean. It is calculated that over 3 million tons of plastic is currently floating in this giant whirlpool. This figure only represents visible plastic on the ocean’s surface.

Weisman answers so many questions in his masterpiece, *The World Without Us*. What would the world be like without farms? Which animals would survive or die off? What—if anything—would be left for those arriving after our demise to remember us by? Weisman also offers the readers a solution. *The World Without Us* concludes by listing overpopulation as the number one reason for the woes and problems of the world today. Weisman states, “Worldwide, every four days human population rises by 1 million” (271). By 2050 there are projected to be close to 9 billion people. His solution is to limit every human female on earth to bear no more than one child. By 2150 this would take the population back to a sustainable level of approximately 1.6 billion.

*The World Without Us* is by far one of the most captivating books of 2007. It forces the reader to face reality and also the consequences of their actions. It enables the reader to see what is important in the long run. *The World Without Us* is a great read for anyone curious about the world and interested in keeping humanity alive at leave for a couple more millennia.
Will Ferrall was born on a farm in Gilders, Mississippi, and attended school there until moving to Ohio with his family in 1994. The new homestead, Hilliard, was good to Will as he attended various levels of schooling necessary for college. Following good-gradedom and graduation from high school, Will went to Otterbein College and is currently of junior standing. You might even be reading this in a room containing Will Ferrall. Ponder. Will enjoys playing drum-set and listening to music (ex: Arcade Fire). He likes grilled cheese sandwiches as much as the next guy.

Ashley Fox is a Senior at Otterbein College with a major in Psychology and spends a lot of her time conducting research for her psychology professor Dr. Shpancer. She is currently planning to travel to Africa for her SYE class and hopes this is only the beginning of her traveling endeavors. Next year she is planning to attend grad school to pursue childhood psychology. Ashley wants to thank her family, friends and her fiancé Jerry for being very understanding and supportive during this stressful and exciting time of her life.

Gabrielle Gagnon is a senior political science major with minors in religion and history. On campus she is a resident assistant and enjoys line dancing, soccer, archery, hunting, and horseback riding. In the future, she will be commissioning as a 2nd lieutenant into the Air Force on June 15. She will be stationed at Eglin Air Force Base in Florida as a Security Forces officer. She would like to extend a special thanks to Professor Cooper for all his encouragement with her paper. This paper helped to further develop her understanding of the atrocities committed by the Germans during the holocaust and where the idea for the concentration and work camps originated. She would also like to thank her parents for being supportive with her many endeavors as well as her college career and future plans.

Megan Hatfield graduated from Otterbein in Spring 2007 with a B.A. in history. Though taking this year off from serious work and studies, Megan plans to attend the University of Miami next fall to earn a Ph. D. in early American history. Right now, she spends her days contemplating whether she is more excited about all the history that she will be studying or the fact that it will be done in a warm, “winter” free climate. She would like to deeply thank Dr Sarah Fatherly, Dr. Amy Johnson and Dr. Louis Rose for their support and advice throughout the arduous application process. Without them, she fears that graduate school would have been a dream of the past and serving bacon and eggs would have remained the sum total of her life’s experience.
Zachary Hopper, like most children, was born. Immediately afterwards, he realized that his life’s goal was to be a marine biologist. Unfortunately, young Zachary failed his scuba diving test and almost drowned in the process. Insert empathy here. After much meditation and introspection, our hero realized that this tragic event could be transformed into a positive experience. And so Zachary began to spread awareness of the potentially fatal effects of drowning, and strongly advocated the use of water wings, both at land and at sea (just to be safe). Actually, he became a double major in literary studies and creative writing, with a minor in philosophy, at Otterbein College. He plans to use his poetic license for the good of mankind, and swears that his powers of the pen will be used to fight evildoers. He does not like Wilhelm Gottfried Leibniz. Zachary hopes to become an English professor and a grumpy old man someday.

Meghan Johnson is a senior English major at Otterbein College, with minors in public relations and speech communications. After graduating this June, she hopes to continue her career in the publishing and editing field. This July, Meghan will be getting married in Mexico and returning back to the United States and working. While her experience at Otterbein was a pleasant and rewarding one, at this time she has no future plans for formal education. She would like to thank her parents and her fiancé for pretending to like her during the stresses that come along with senior year.

Whitney Prose is an English creative writing major minoring in environmental studies and Japanese. Her hometown is Kilbourne, Ohio and some of her interests include manga and anime, ethnobotany, activism in community service, reading, writing, and tea. In the future, she hopes to work with an environmental for-profit and non-profits as a communication link between specialists and the general public. God willing, she would love to attend graduate school, too, for more environmental studies and language education.

Larsa Ramsini is a junior majoring in mathematics, philosophy, and French, and will be applying to law schools in the fall. On campus she is a member of Sports Pals and the AEGIS editorial board. Larsa would like to thank Dr Mills for getting frustrated with her in trying to work things out when she first started this paper, and Jason Craig for saying after having read it, “So, what is your thesis?”

Abby Reschke is a senior majoring in business administration and minor- ing in both the fine arts and German. She will be graduating this spring and plans on moving to Seattle, Washington to pursue her entrepreneurial goals. Her interests include painting and photography, playing tennis, traveling, going to concerts, and reading (especially about WWII). She would like to thank her family (parents especially) for giving her the opportunity to go to such a great school and supporting her through rough patches, and her friends for all the support they’ve given her and the great memories they have created.
Jennifer Scarbrough is a senior at Otterbein with a double major in Spanish and business with a concentration in international business. Jennifer will be graduating in June of 2008. She would like continue her education for two more years at Otterbein to earn a Masters in business administration. Jennifer is looking forward to her trip to Europe this summer with her mom, grandma, and sister as it will be a nice treat after four years of hard work. She would like to thank her family for all their support and guidance as she wouldn’t be where she is today without them.

Stacie Walulik is a junior majoring in English Education/Integrative Language Arts (with a literature focus). She will graduate in June 2009 and would like to become either a teacher or an editor. She loves spending time with her fiancé, friends, and Tau Delta sisters, as well as reading, discovering poetry, cooking, swimming, watching Scrubs and Arrested Development, The Beatles (and music in general), and being outside. She is an assistant recruitment, scholarship chair, and one of the choristers for Tau Delta Sorority. She would like to thank Dr. Daugherty for her help editing, Patti Rothermic for helping her research and find sources, and, of course, her family.
In this edition...

A New Type of Queen: The Emergence of Beauty Pageants in America, 1880-1921

“What have we women to do with these matters?”: Women and Femininity in Pre-Revolutionary America, 1763-1775

Reduce! Reuse! Recycle!

Kenny and Wee on the Necessity of ‘Liberty of Indifference’ in Descartes’ Theory of Judgment

Metastasis

Pope Pius XII: His Role with the Vatican in WWII

The Genocide of the Herero Set the Tone for the Holocaust

Exploring Thomas Hardy’s Grief Through His Poetry

Saint Manuel the Unhappy, Deceiver

Frankenstein: Gothic Novel, Feminist Manifesto, and Guide to Parenting

Beowulf and Gawain: Different Stories, Similar Endings

...and more