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Editor’s Note

“The greater danger for most of us is not that our aim is too high
and we miss it, but that it is too low and we reach it.”
—Michelangelo Buonarroti

The Core Curriculum gives its students an amazing opportunity to study works from great thinkers. The brilliance of the works sets high standards that invite students to become great thinkers themselves. The eternal motion of each concept we explore gives it relevance to our contemporary lives while preserving it in history for all time. Works from the Humanities, Natural Sciences, and Social Sciences unite to enhance, cultivate, and fulfill the academic pursuits of Core students.

This volume of The Journal of the Core Curriculum catches a glimpse of the inspired poetry, prose, and art produced both by students and by faculty. This year, we received some of the most profound, provocative, meaningful, and insightful pieces in the history of the Journal.

I must personally acknowledge the work of our editorial staff because without their invaluable effort and input, we would have missed the mark. Zachary Bos, an excellent mentor for all things Core, receives my utmost gratitude and respect.

Prof. Tabatabai’s wisdom, support, and constant inspiration encouraged the Journal staff to reach our full potential. We produced a better publication than we would have otherwise, because we aimed for the highest possible success. In every line, and every detail, this volume of The Journal of the Core Curriculum reflects the beauty and complexity of the Core community.

Danielle Naellen
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The Four O’Clock Café

Daniel Hudon

The Four O’Clock Café was only open at one time: 4 o’clock. Right on the dot of the hour, the blind flapped up, the clouded window slid aside yielding glimpses through a curtain of the dark, red-lit interior and two anonymous hands distributed coffee in tiny espresso cups to all those who stood in line. Word went around quickly that a new café had opened—at the summit—and it immediately became popular.

The fact that the “4 oh,” as it came to be called, had only a pair of beaten up picnic tables to sit on was part of its charm. Operated out of a small trailer, it was like a kiosk that you might find—or hoped to find—at a rest stop on some old scenic coastal highway. Latecomers drove up in a rush, dimming their headlights and slowing down before turning off the road. Already the customers stood around the picnic tables, chatted with each other about where they were working, stretched, and looked about as if they were seeing the place for the first time.

Despite the darkness, there were three views: down, across and up. Looking down you saw the vast ocean of clouds that lapped up against the mountain. If it was clear you could discern the lights at Kona on the west side or Hilo on the eastern coast. Across, you saw the barren moonscape-summit of the volcano with its odd white observatory domes standing here and there, each of them open, collecting their distant light. At sunrise or sunset, looking past the summit and the domes, across to the other horizon, you could see the shadow of the mountain on the sky, a triangular blue silhouette momentarily suspended. Up, if you weren’t too tired to crane your neck, the night was peppered with stars. Often it was windy and you didn’t bother with the view—you just
huddled up against the trailer.

Because the “4 oh” was on top of Mauna Kea, on the big island of Hawaii, the site of the darkest, clearest skies on Earth, the customers were always the same—astronomers. They came from everywhere: Hawaii, the mainland, Canada, France, Britain, Japan, Mexico, Chile, Holland, Germany, Spain; grad students, postdocs, research associates, collaborators, full-fledged, tenured professors. They arrived jetlagged and unacclimatized for two or four night runs, some for a few weeks. Whoever they were and wherever they came from, at 4am they only wanted one thing: coffee.

A simple handwritten sign in the window, barely illuminated by the red light, advertised the offerings. She (the anonymous hands could only belong to a woman) served espresso for two bucks each and that was it. Friday nights she made chocolate chip cookies and sold them for a dollar. In one night she probably made forty or fifty dollars. Clustered in twos and threes, everyone agreed, when they got around to discussing it—after confirming whether the seeing was sub-arcsecond or not—that she couldn’t have been doing it for the money. Naturally, you wondered who she was too. She served with such confidence and gusto that you thought no problem was beyond her, and despite the obscuring curtain and the anonymous hands, when you got up to the window you were tempted to confess to her your confusions about the mysteries of the universe as if she were a Delphic oracle. You imagined different scenarios: her matter-of-fact replies, as if these problems were mere distractions getting in the way of the real secrets, or her wise, Rilkean silence, reminding you to love the questions themselves. The consensus was that she was one of the cooks from the lodge down at 8,000 feet and she came up to the summit either because she was an insomniac or simply out of the goodness of her heart. But no one ever saw the trailer down in the parking lot at breakfast. Next time, for the hell of it, you will try to make her laugh.

Under the blazing stars, in the wind, at 13,600 feet—the highest point in the Pacific, in the darkness, above the clouds, it is strange to have coffee—espresso—under such circumstances. But now, in the middle of the night, is when the lack of oxygen starts getting to you and the caffeine helps. You sip it slowly, wondering if this is the highest altitude café in the world. You imagine opening up a tiny tea hut at Everest
Base Camp, halfway around the world, for sherpas and because-it’s-there mountain climbers.

It’s easy to imagine these things. A speck of dust lights up as a shooting star and streaks across the sky. You hear the hum of a dome swiveling around to a new position. You think of all the light raining down on the mountain and this tiny fraction that’s scooped up by these dozen telescopes tonight. Star forming regions, pulsating stars, distant solar systems, remnants of exploded stars, newborn galaxies at the edge of the observable universe. Snapshots of fireworks seen from afar. Though it’s the wind, you imagine it’s the starlight that’s deafening.

Just as you think you should have another shot, you see the woman’s hands put a tray out and the window clicks closed. One by one the empty cups collect on the tray and you watch everyone trickle back to their domes. On your way back in you take one last look up; two more hours ’till dawn. ✽
One afternoon during a brief halt in my most recent voyage, I was in a town on the north coast of France passing my idle time on a bench while reading from a small book of poetry. A young woman rushed out of a store and, looking for a place to sit, approached the bench on which I was resting. Before we'd even had a chance to exchange salutations—for I was so engaged in my reading—she peered over my shoulder for a moment and then asked, “What book is that you’re reading?”

“This is a book of Romantic poetry. The poem I’m reading now is by Wordsworth. It’s called ‘We Are Seven.’ I’ve read it over ten times if my memory serves me correctly, yet on every reading I remain surprised by the seeming contentment of the poor young girl that the poet describes. It just seems to me that such a child would be the sorriest little creature in the world and yet she has this easy dignity that puzzles me. You are a fairly young girl yourself, perhaps you could help me understand how an innocent girl views her situation. I’ll read it to you. Please feel at liberty to share any insights you have with me.”

I was prepared to begin reading, but the moment was stolen by a young man of the servant class exiting from a noisy tavern, singing, “Voglio far un gentiluomo, e non voglio più servir.” He soon took notice of the pretty young girl sitting beside me. After a brief exchange of introductions, the man—Leporello—complimented Mrs. Lydia Wickham—so the woman beside me was named—by calling her “bella donna” when she was by no means a lady. I asked Leporello to stay as I read the poem aloud and, if he would, share his thoughts as Lydia was invited to share hers. I then proceeded to read the poem, giving different voices to the narrator and the “little cottage Girl.”
I put down the book and then asked, “So now, what do you make of this poor girl? I think that I must feel sorry for her, having no brothers or sisters to play with and left to grow up with only her mother in their small cottage. What’s more, being in a profession that forces me to travel, this brings to mind the loss I feel every time I make a new voyage and must leave my loving wife and all our dear children. But still, I may return to see my family once my ship has returned and before the next one has left. For this poor child, this is not the case. So how can it be that such a simple child is as stoic as a Houyhnhnm?”

“She is a simple child indeed!” exclaimed Lydia. “Only the simplest child in England could be so foolish. The author tries so hard to correct the girl’s mistake, but she doesn’t understand that he is trying to help her see that she doesn’t have seven siblings anymore. I’ve got four sisters, all older than me, and you wouldn’t see me forgetting how many of them I’ve got. What a silly, stupid girl! I was never so dim-witted as she is, insisting I’m right to an adult who knows better. When I was that young I knew when to listen to my elders. I was always very mature—and tall.”

I grimaced, not knowing up until then that I was socializing with a true Yahoo. Still I tried to get her to understand the poem a little more and so said, “Think about that line, ‘Two of us in a church-yard lie’. She is saying two of us. She genuinely feels that her dead brother and sister are still among her siblings, even closer than the ones that are still living. Look! She mentions just once the two gone to Conway and the two gone to sea...”

“Oh the sea! How I long to go to the sea once more. Love is in the air at the sea. That’s where I found my very own handsome soldier, my dear Wickham,” Lydia interjected, finishing with a sigh.

By now I had grown annoyed with this fool, but I remained civil, saying, “Alright, that’s kind of you to share, but you’re missing the point I am trying to make. She has living brothers and sisters who are all gone away, but she has more to say about the brother and sister who have passed away. I know what it’s like to have your loved ones separated from you by the sea; when that’s the case it seems like they aren’t even there anymore. Sometimes they appear as distorted images before you, but you can never see them as they really are, far off, occupying the home, awaiting your return. I just can’t comprehend how such a girl
can stand being so isolated. I've struggled with it myself, but I'm a
grown man. How does such a little thing get by like that?" I turned to
Leporello, who by then was three sheets to the wind but was nonetheless preferable to the meanness of Lydia.

"You're right to question this girl's behavior. From what I've seen of
death, the graveyard is a frightening place, but this innocent child
seems comfortable there. I would be afraid were I in her position, but
that is because I am haunted by the memory of my last master and his hideous death. Ever since he died, I have wandered in search of a new
lord, drinking to forget the memory though drinking itself reminds me
of that fearful night and my master's command: 'Versa il vino!' He paid
nothing but disrespect to the memory of a dead man and for it he paid
with his life. I think this girl does well to remember her brother and sis-
ter, even if they are long dead."

I wished for Leporello to continue, but his speech had led him into a
disturbed state of mind and I felt it best to give him some time to com-
pose himself. His observation made it apparent to me that the girl was
right to say that she is one of seven, but I still wished to explore how
such wisdom could come from such a seemingly innocent child. Lydia
had been quiet a while but then felt it was her turn to speak. "I can
remember what it was like to be a girl living at home, and I must tell
you that it is no fun at all. The only time I ever had fun as a girl was
when someone threw a ball, but this girl is too young to be concerned
with anything of such importance as a ball. She's leading a plain, boring
life, and I can see why she would play everyday in the church-yard if there are no sisters there for her to play with. If that was me stuck
with nothing to do but knitting and sewing in the churchyard, I would
hope to be away with my other sisters at sea."

I tried to make the best of what Lydia had to say and then addressed Leporello, "What do you make of that? If you were in this
girl's place, what would you hope for?"

"I cannot be sure what I would hope for, sir. I know very little of
women and cannot understand what it is they want, though my master
could see into the heart of any girl. Mrs. Wickham may be right to say
that this girl should want to be with the living portion of her family, but
she is probably too young and innocent to have an idea of what she is
missing in being the only child left. Her whole world is that cottage and
that church-yard. She is young to have to know so well the pain of death, but she is too young to grasp the meaning of her own mortality. Whoever it is that insists on telling her that her siblings no longer exist must not have an understanding of what it is to be an impressionable child. Young girls never have any idea of the dangers they are exposed to, even when they are old enough to put themselves in harm’s way. I think this girl is smart to remember the dead when others would forget—to their discredit—but she is still innocent and ought to be protected from the harsh realities of a cruel life. The speaker in this poem is wrong to try to disturb her pleasant ignorance of how frightening life can be."

“You’re right, Leporello, to say that the speaker is wrong to push the girl to say that she is only one of five, not seven,” I said while looking back at the poem. “Wordsworth brings it up in the first stanza of the poem. It’s written right here: ‘A simple child . . . what should it know of death?’ If the speaker means to say that such a child shouldn’t have to know of death, why does he insist on reminding her that they are not just lying in the church-yard, but dead? It’s true that death is a reality for all of us, and that there is nowhere one can go without witnessing
death, but there’s no cause for telling a young girl to think of her brother and sister as being dead and gone when she is happy in her view of the situation. She may not have her family complete and at home with her, but she shouldn’t be made to feel alone.”

I looked at Lydia and she looked much sadder. I asked her what was the matter and she replied, “I haven’t seen my own family in what feels like forever. I might as well be dead to them the way things are now. I talk about them as if we’ve always been together, but it’s been too long since I’ve been home. I’ll be alright, I haven’t lost them for good. I had better go though,” she said as she left to join some ladies gossiping further down the road.

Leporello was as shocked as I was at her abrupt exit, but we both understood that women are easily swept up in their emotions. “Perhaps she became scared at the idea of her own isolation,” he suggested. “To be alone does not bother me anymore. I only wish that I could forget that death is always standing over our shoulders, preparing to cast us to our doom. I can never forget that image of death from my master’s house. I doubt that any child could be as content as this girl is to play among the shadow of her siblings’ graves, but it is true that we are obligated to meet the demands of the circumstances we are given in life.”

I found Leporello’s explanation of the girl helpful and so invited him to come explore more mysteries of poetry with me. We agreed that when we returned to England he would work as my servant. We left the town and headed for my ship, for I longed to be back at sea. *

WORKS CONSULTED
The Repercussions of Secularization
Courtney Futryk

“If once in America the question of religious toleration was raised in defense of nonbelievers who dissented from religious orthodoxy, today it is raised by believers who feel excluded from a predominantly secular public world.” - Alan Wolfe

The media is overrun with stories of nonbelievers battling to eliminate public displays of faith. From debates over the removal of God from the Pledge of Allegiance to the removal of the Ten Commandments from court rooms, religion has become almost taboo in public. Families no longer bow their heads in prayer in restaurants, and individuals refrain from speaking about faith outside of the privacy of their own homes. Americans may wonder if this modern secularization was what the Founding Fathers intended when they called for the separation of church and state. As social scientists, Alexis De Tocqueville, Karl Marx, and Max Weber all express strong views on the merit and demerit of the presence of religion in society. In response to Wolfe’s statement, Tocqueville and Weber, although from very different perspectives, both foresee the problematic nature of secularization and consider it a challenge to Americans to uphold their moral character in the absence of religion. Marx on the other hand, would advocate the dissolution of religion and therefore fully support secularization as a consequence of the realization of scientific communism.

In Democracy in America, Alexis de Tocqueville takes notice of the powerful role of religion in the New World. Following a trip to analyze American prison reform, Tocqueville returned to France with an incredible insight into the nature and spirit of American culture and politics (Kessler xviii). However, what he considers most noteworthy is the ubiq-
ility of religion in the New World: “upon my arrival in the United States, it was the religious aspect of the country that first struck me” (Tocqueville 136). He introduces the concepts of mores at the very onset of his discussion regarding the “equality of conditions” (1), stating that equality of conditions “extends its influence far beyond political mores and laws, and that its empire extends over civil society as well as government: it creates opinions, gives rise to sentiments, inspires customs, and modifies everything that it does not produce” (1). Tocqueville proceeds to articulate the relationship of equality and mores to religion. He claims that religion “governs moral habits” (132), and the translator further clarifies this intrinsic relationship by defining mores as “moral habits” (Kessler 1). Therefore, equality of conditions influences democratic mores, and mores encompass religion.

In this roundabout manner, Tocqueville illustrates the power religion holds in a democratic society. To support this idea of the relationship between religion and mores, Tocqueville looks to the nature of family values in America. He observes that, because of religion, “America is undoubtedly the country in the world where the marriage bond is the most respected and where they have conceived the highest and most just idea of conjugal happiness” (132). He notes a sharp contrast in the way domestic values are brought into the public space, observing that, “whereas the European seeks to escape his domestic distress by disturbing the society, the American draws from his home the love of order, which he then brings to the affair of the State” (133). Though these comments attest that religion and the moral habits of Americans are closely intertwined, the positive religious trajectory seen in early nineteenth-century America has been disrupted by a modern trend toward secularization.

Americans are plagued by disorder, restlessness of heart, and the instability of desires that Tocqueville argues would be mitigated by the family values accompanying religion (133). Today divorce rates reside at a historical high of approximately sixty percent. Marriage is not only precarious, but is also delayed; many Americans wait until their late twenties or thirties before settling down to begin a family. According to Tocqueville, family ties and domestic values impart order into the lives of Americans and this stability resonates throughout society (133). By tolerating a decline in the institution most responsible for
propagating moral values, the society undermines its own stability.

Judging from his hypothesis relating social mores and religion, and his commentary on religion's influence on families, it is reasonable to conclude that Tocqueville would argue that the withdrawal of religion from the public sphere has shaken the moral foundation of contemporary America. The secularized citizens of the United States must find an answer to Tocqueville's discerning question: "How will society avoid perishing if, while the political bond is loosened, the moral bond is not tightened? And what can be done with a people that is master of itself, if it is not subject to God?" (136). The consequences that secularization could potentially have on democracy is frightening, but Tocqueville's own hope for the position of religion and the development of a secular society is rather complex.

After his clear explanation of mores and religion, he goes on to question the very power of religion that he illustrated previously. Tocqueville argues that, "to the degree that a nation assumes a democratic social state, and societies are seen to incline toward a republic, it becomes more and more dangerous to link religion to authority" (139). He has established the correlation of mores and religion, but the extent of the power religion holds within society becomes important. The separation of church and state is a significant conception in Tocqueville's portrayal of democracy: "we have seen religions linked intimately to earthly governments, dominate souls by terror and by faith at the same time; but when a religion contracts such an alliance, I do not fear to say it, it acts as a man might act: it sacrifices the future with a view to the present, and by obtaining a power which is not its due, it puts its legitimate power at risk" (138). When religion becomes too involved in the political operations of society, Tocqueville anticipates abuses of power and public opposition. Although Tocqueville understands the connection between the relationship of mores and religion, he is aware of the potential for exploitation.

Weber's concern was the American variety of Protestantism while Tocqueville focuses his attention on Catholics, whom he argues "form the most republican and most democratic class that exists in the United States" (129). More importantly, he insists that Catholicism is "the most favorable to the equality of conditions" because all Catholics are equal human beings in the eyes of God (129-130). Tocqueville also
O dolce stella, quali e quante gemme
mi dimostraro che nostra giustizia
effetto sia del ciel che tu ingemme

O gentle star, what—and how many—gems
made plain to me that justice here on earth
depends upon the heaven you engem!

—Dante's *Paradiso* 18.115
highlights the poverty that plagues most Catholics, and the power of the clergy in the political realm. He criticizes Protestantism for its propensity towards independence, the very trait that Catholic clergy and poverty prevent Catholics from possessing (130). Modern readers are likely to feel a tension between Tocqueville’s emphasis on Catholicism and modern secularization. If Catholicism promotes the equality of conditions, in its absence, can the equality of conditions, the basis of democracy, still survive? This is the question modernity faces. The influence Catholicism holds in modern society is waning. In the light of recent Church scandals of priest molestation and clergy attempts to conceal these abuses, many churchgoers find their faith tested. Catholic Church attendance rates have declined, and the number of individuals who identify themselves as Catholics has dwindled. It remains to be seen whether a secular society can impart the same values that religion secures.

Weber places a similarly strong premium on moral character that derives from religious beliefs: his focus, however, looks past mores to economics. He attributes the rise of capitalism to the “elimination of the Catholic Church’s domination over the believer’s life in its entirety, but also the substitution of one form of control by another” (Weber 4). The substitution of control he refers to is the replacement of Catholicism with Protestantism; a switch that was brought about by the Protestant Reformation. This turn to Protestantism sparks a greater emphasis on certain economic forces that were not previously stressed within Catholicism. Weber underscores this point when he writes about the religious reformers: “the salvation of the soul stood at the center of their lives and deeds—and that alone. Their ethical goals and the practical effects of their teachings were all anchored in the salvation theme and must be seen entirely as the consequences of purely religious motives” (48). Protestants took on an economic role that was previously unparalleled in the society, and they brought about the rise of modern capitalism. It is here that Weber senses a departure from the Protestant movement and potential danger in society’s actualization of that ethic.

As he makes his observations, Weber rarely interjects with his own personal judgments. This objective disposition is demonstrated when he writes, “it should be directly stated that studies such as this one are in
no way concerned with the attempt to evaluate the substantive ideas of the Reformation, by reference to either social-political or religious vantage points" (48). His standard lack of criticism or commendation provides a challenge in elucidating his likely stance on secularization. When Weber does make a rare evaluation, he highlights his concern at the possible implications of the outcome of certain social phenomena. Careful readers acknowledge that Weber judges the absence or distortion of religion in American society to be gravely dangerous.

Weber feels strongly about the potential threat of a lack of religious presence because he departs from his typical objective position. When capitalism is no longer grounded in the Protestant worldview in which it was born, it becomes excessively accumulative and materialistic. In a specific example, Weber notes the repercussions; "here again, and in full conformity with the developmental pattern we have repeatedly observed, as the religious roots of an idea died out a utilitarian tone then surreptitiously shoved itself under the idea and carried it further" (120-1). This unhinging of the necessary link between capitalism and Protestantism that secularization brings about has a serious effect on the underlying goals and hearts of Americans. Weber further claims that "The Puritan wanted to be a person with a vocational calling; today we are forced to be" (123). Religion supplies the meaning behind the economic principles of capitalism but, in the absence of religion, Americans become constrained to their economic duties. Consequently, capitalism is free to reign over the desires of men without the guiding values religion affords.

Weber's fears concerning the absence of religion possess a certain truth in modern society. The disappearance of religion from the public realm makes maintaining a moral character an insurmountable challenge. In modernity, most individuals are ruled by the extent of their greed. Americans have gradually become a people controlled by wealth, luxuries, and materialism. They no longer see careers as necessary in and of themselves but instead, United States citizens focus on securing jobs that will guarantee them the most wealth or highest status symbol. The inequalities that arise from the spirit of capitalism and its departure from religion are remarkable. A large and widening gap between the rich and the poor is characteristic of the economic classes.

To determine Weber's probable solution to this unfortunate situation, a
general sense of the value Weber places on capitalism would have to be observed. Due to the lack of such “value-judgments,” it is unclear whether Weber supports the spirit of capitalism or the system of capitalism as he observes it in operation (124). However, he maintains that the merits of capitalism diminish with the disappearance of the Protestant ethic. If capitalism is to prove successful, it must uphold the religious principles upon which it is founded. Unfortunately, in America’s secular society, this union has dissolved, and Nietzsche’s disheartening diagnosis that Weber refers to is accurate. Americans have become “narrow specialists without mind, pleasure-seekers without heart; in its conceit, this nothingness imagines it has climbed to a level of humanity never before attained” (124).

Weber and Tocqueville are aligned in their response to secularization. Readers, however, discover a far different message in the writing of Karl Marx. The very dangers that Tocqueville and Weber would observe from a movement toward secularization, Marx advocates as a necessary step towards achieving communism. The strengths Tocqueville and Weber attribute to religion, such as a sense of family values and ruling principles are opposed by Marx. Unlike the nature of democracy and capitalism that Tocqueville and Weber characterize, communism is not about morality. Communism is a classless and stateless society that unites self-interests for a common interest and, in doing so, establishes human freedom. Within a communistic society, social constructions such as family, religion, organizations, and class distinctions are abolished because individuals cease to be plagued by the alienation these establishments create. The absence of religion should occur prior to the institution of communism, and Marx argues that secularization is vital for the most natural and desirable human state of communism.

Marx examines religion because “first, religion, and second, politics arouse predominant interest in contemporary Germany” (Marx 14). He insists religion and politics must be addressed to “have an effect on our contemporaries and specifically on our German contemporaries” (13). To Marx, religion is a means to reach his audience. This is a significant distinction from Tocqueville and Weber. For them, religion is a necessary establishment in society. Religion is not a vehicle to engage an audience, but a crucial force within society. .

Marx characterizes religion as “the catalogue of the theoretical
struggles of mankind” and the political state as “the catalogue of its practical struggles” (14). By definition, religion is an impractical and conceptual articulation of the social facts. For Marx, the political state is the accurate representation of the “social struggles, needs, and truths” (14). He demonstrates that, “the more man puts into God, the less he retains in himself” (72). The presence of religion establishes distance between human beings and reality. Furthermore, he attributes religion to the alienation of mankind: “religion the spontaneous activity of the human imagination, of the human brain and the human heart, operates independently of the individual—that is, operates on him as an alien...it is the loss of his self” (74). This negative depiction of religion clearly reflects Marx’s attitude towards its existence. He states that position when he writes, “since the real existence of man and nature has become practical, sensuous and perceptible—since man has become for man as the being of nature, and nature for man as the being of man—the question about an alien being, about a being above nature and man—a question which implies the admission of the inessentiality of nature and of man—has become impossible in practice” (92). Marx argues that religion asks individuals to deny their essence as man and nature. In America, this departure from the worldly is problematic within a society that holds such importance in materialism.

Marx advocates the abolition of religion within the state. He braves to say that within the ultimate goal of communism, even atheism has no place in society. “Atheism, as the denial of this inessentiality, has no longer any meaning, for Atheism is a negation of God, and postulates the existence of man through this negation” (92). Beliefs in any form, specifically religion, must be absent in scientific communism. Although this is an important piece of communist design, Marx might take issue with the fact that modern secularization comes prior to a violent revolution or the withering away of the state and private ownership. Dissolution of religion must occur along the journey towards the establishment of communism, and it would reflect that society is a step closer to the ultimate goal. Marx would probably feel that America is similarly located in the capitalist historical stage that it was during his time. Class distinctions abound in modern America, and American citizens confront alienation of unprecedented strength, alienation from their
labor as well as from their sense of self-worth because of the abundance of social constructions. Therefore, modern secularization is not a proper realization of scientific communism.

Coming from such distinct traditions and viewpoints, it is remarkable that a reader can hypothesize that Tocqueville, Weber, and Marx share an objection to a modern movement, the secularization of religion. This stands as a negative reflection of the direction in which American society is moving. The stability that religion offers in an ever-changing, often troubled existence is not something Americans should seek to produce. Instead of the thriving, prosperous, and principled depiction of American life that Tocqueville and Weber present, in the absolute absence of religion, the United States may begin to resemble that daunting, uniform, and controlled society that Marx envisions.
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Analects of Core:  
First Year

“Of him who knew the most of all men know; who made the journey;  
heartbroken; reconciled; who knew the way things were before the  
Flood, the secret things, the mystery; who went to the end of the earth,  
and over; who returned and wrote the story on a tablet of stone.”  
-Gilgamesh

“But the man skilled in all ways of contending, / satisfied by the great  
bow’s look and heft, / like a musician, like a harper, when / with quiet  
hand upon his instrument / he draws between his thumb and forefinger  
/ a sweet new string upon a peg: so effortlessly / Odysseus in one  
motion strung the bow. / Then slid his right hand down the cord and  
plucked it, / so the taut gut vibrating hummed and sang / a swallow’s  
note.”  
-Homer, The Odyssey

“I tell you that to let no day pass without discussing goodness and all  
the other subjects about which you hear me talking and examining both  
myself and others is really the very best thing that a man can do, and  
that life without this sort of examination is not worth living.”  
-Socrates, The Apology

“Study seems to be the only activity which is loved for its own sake. For  
while we derive a greater or smaller advantage from practical pursuits  
beyond the action itself, from study we derive nothing beyond the activ-  
ity of studying.”  
-Aristotle, Nichomachean Ethics
“My work is not a piece of writing designed to meet the taste of an immediate public, but was done to last forever.”

-Thucydides, *History of the Peloponnesian War*

“A gentleman who is widely versed in letters and at the same time knows how to submit his learning to the restraints of ritual is not likely, I think, to go far wrong.”

-Confucius, *Analects*

“So sever the ignorant doubt in your heart with the sword of self-knowledge, Arjuna! Observe your discipline! Arise!”

-Krishna to Arjuna, *The Bhagavad-Gita*

“Since the Sage does not contend
No one can contend with the Sage.”

-Lao-Tzu, *Tao Te Ching*

“Is it for you
To lay the stones for Carthage’s high walls . . .
Oblivious of your own world, your own kingdom!”

-Mercury to Aeneas, *The Aeneid*

“Zebras have the unpleasant habit of biting a person and not letting go. They are also virtually impossible to lasso with a rope...because of their unfailing ability to watch the rope noose fly toward them, and then to duck their head out of the way.”

-Jared Diamond, *Guns, Germs, and Steel*

“Remember that the contest is now and the Olympic games are now and you cannot put things off any more and that your progress is made or destroyed by a single day and a single action”

-Epictetus, *The Encheiridion*

“Await no further word or sign from me: / your will is free, erect, and whole; to act / against that will would be to err- / therefore I crown and miter you over yourself.”

-Virgil to Dante, *Purgatorio*
How does a baby, governed primarily by a set of reflex-like responses, develop the capacity for symbolic thought? How, in other words, does one acquire language? For centuries, students of human behavior have sought an answer to this fundamental question. Although countless theories have been promulgated, a consensus has yet to be reached, in fact the controversy over the origins of language remains a source of heated exchange.

At the heart of this controversy is the debate over the respective roles that nature and nurture play in the formation of high-level thinking. To what extent is language development based on genes, and to what extent is it based on culture? In recent years, two opposing camps have emerged: the “discontinuity” and the “continuity” theories (Greenspan and Shanker 191-2).

According to the discontinuity theory, language evolved rapidly during the Pleistocene Era as a result of a “monster” genetic mutation. This “Big Bang Hypothesis,” made famous by MIT linguist Noam Chomsky, puts forward the proposition that language acquisition is a biological phenomenon. Such a “language gene” would have been naturally selected, given its cognitive, social and communicative advantages (192). In Chomsky’s model, therefore, the environment plays a limited role, in that it simply turns on or off certain “regulatory” genes (18).

The continuity theory, on the other hand, places more emphasis upon the importance of one’s environment. According to this theory language evolved slowly over millions of years in response to ongoing environmental changes. Hence, for continuity theorists, the human capacity for language is regarded as an end-product which emerges only after a long and gradual process of symbol formation (192).
At present, the discontinuity theory is by far more popular (2). In fact, in his “New York Times” bestseller The Blank Slate, MIT psychologist Steven Pinker explicates Chomsky’s views on language’s origins (Pinker 2002, 36-9). Like Chomsky, Pinker believes that rules for language acquisition are embodied in the neural circuitry of the brain. He relies heavily upon his view to bolster his own thesis—that the mind is not a “blank slate.” As a result, Pinker devotes only minimal time to the environment’s role in symbol formation. On the contrary, he takes as his model a genetically-based conception of language development, and thus, maintains that, “people know how to talk in more or less the sense that spiders know how to spin webs. Language is part of our biological birthright, it is not something that parents teach their children” (Pinker 1994, 6). Pinker leaves no doubt as to his stance in the language controversy.

Despite its current acceptance, the Chomskian model has several opponents, notably Dr. Stanley Greenspan, a child psychiatrist and psychoanalyst, and Dr. Stuart Shanker, a psychologist and philosopher. These two men recently published a book that directly challenges both Chomsky and Pinker’s theory of language acquisition. Entitled The First Idea: How Symbols, Language, and Intelligence Evolved from Our Primate Ancestors to Modern Humans, this book explicates a new theory of how language is acquired, based on genetic codes, but rather on critical social and emotional relationships during a child’s development.

By stressing the crucial role that emotions play in the language development, Greenspan and Shanker hope to settle the nature vs. nurture debate over language development. One of their aims, therefore, is to reconcile the theory of the biological evolution of the human mind with the impact of culture on mental functioning. For, as they maintain, “Nature and nurture are constantly influencing on another” (Greenspan and Shanker 3-4). The First Idea moves beyond the nature-nurture controversy by offering a testament to the importance of emotions on the origins of language. With this bold book, Greenspan and Shanker hope that the continuity theory will gain the respect that it rightfully deserves.

Greenspan and Shanker present rich evidence to support their hypothesis, specifically that the critical step in symbol formation is not
a “genetic leap,” but rather a learned capacity. As primatologist Dr. Sue Savage-Rumbaugh avows, “Old nations of genetic determinism are replaced with testable hypotheses that place emotional development at the heart of language” (Savage-Rumbaugh). Her telling description is right on the mark as Greenspan and Shanker, in The First Idea, draws upon data from not only their own research with human infants and non human primates, but also from neurological studies the fossil records.

In his work as a physician, Greenspan has treated countless children suffering from developmental and emotional disorders, in addition to children of normal development. He is arguably the world’s foremost authority on clinical work with infants. By testing out various intervention strategies with the special needs children under his care, Greenspan has gained invaluable insight into the processes underpinning language acquisition (Greenspan and Shanker 13-14).

Shanker’s direct clinical experience with children is equally impressive. Like Greenspan, Shanker is a leading figure in child-language studies. Moreover, he is at the forefront of ape-language research. His work with nonhuman primates has made possible a comparison of the language of human infants with that of apes (13-14).

Greenspan and Shanker are both credible scholars and practitioners whose new theory on language should be taken seriously. Moreover, unlike Chomsky’s “Big Bang” hypothesis, which Greenspan describes as little more than an “evolutionary myth” (188), their account of the origins of language comes equipped with an array of supporting evidence. Hence, by refusing to fall victim to the cardinal sin in evolutionary theory of “Just-So” reasoning (188), Greenspan and Shanker have paved the way for such diverse disciplines as developmental psychology and philosophy to expand in radical new directions.

In order to fully grasp the significance of their findings, a brief account of the Chomskian model will be presented, followed by a more in depth explanation of the Greenspan/Shankerian model. In so doing, the discontinuity theory will be seen as deficient in its assessment of symbol formation. The continuity theory, on the other hand, will reveal itself to be a far more convincing depiction of the origins of language. With the support of Greenspan and Shanker’s research, it will demonstrate how caregiver-infant interactions play a crucial role in language
acquisition.

According to Chomsky’s biological theory of language development, children acquire grammar automatically as the result of information encoded in each one’s respective “language gene.” As earlier explained, this gene is said to have arisen fortuitously in response to a “monster” genetic mutation that was passed on to each new generation through natural selection. Hence, in Chomsky’s model, language acquisition is regarded as a maturational process (209)—namely, one in which a child’s development is guided by genes and unfolds in a fixed sequence. As Chomsky maintains, “In fundamental respects we do not really learn language; rather, grammar grows in the mind” (Chomsky 1980, 134). Chomsky and other discontinuity theorists believe language to be largely determined by internal factors. In their view, the environment serves primarily to activate these factors, and nothing more.

Chomsky’s “Big Bang” hypothesis bears the influence of the famous argument known as the “poverty of the stimulus” (Greenspan and Shanker 210). This argument postures that the acquisition of language is impossible without inherent knowledge of the particular forms that grammar can take. A child that is not endowed at birth with a set of “super-rules” cannot in this theory learn language.

Chomsky uses this “poverty of the stimulus” argument to explain how children are able to carry out complex conversations at the seemingly young age of three. He says, “They are not acquiring dozens or hundreds of rules; they are just setting a few mental switches” (Pinker 1994, 18). When “turned on,” these switches activate the “language gene”. As enumerated by Pinker in his book *The Language of Instinct*, Chomsky’s generativist stance is guided by the principle that language acquisition is a spontaneous process—hence, formal instruction and conscious effort are not necessary (18).

In his *Syntactic Structures*, Chomsky expands upon the “poverty of the stimulus” argument by introducing what he call “syntactic universals” (Chomsky 1957, ). Chomsky proposes that every human language obeys a finite set of rules governing sentence construction. These rules are known as “context-free phrase-structure grammar.” For instance, nouns can only appear within particular frames of a given sentence for the latter to be considered well-formed. However, the sentence itself
need not make sense. For example, Chomsky offers that following: “Colorless green ideas sleep furiously” (Greenspan and Shanker 225). This sentence does not make sense, yet speakers will still recognize it as being well-formed. On the contrary, the sentence “Furiously sleep ideas green colorless” is neither logical nor well-formed.

Although “context-free phrase-structure grammar” is described by Chomsky as the tool for generating human languages, it is only a tool. In order to actually construct a given language, these “syntactic universals” must be supplemented by “transformational grammar” (Chomsky, 1957,) or rules on phrase structures that are used to later a sentence’s meaning. For instance, with the help of “transformational grammar,” assertions can be made into questions, and active sentences into passive ones. With these two grammars at one’s disposal, an individual is capable of producing sentences of unlimited linguistic diversity, despite the latter’s being governed by finite rules.

Chomsky’s theory of “syntactic universals” was a challenge to the formerly held assumption that language is infinitely variable. In his model, the language learned is more of a machine than a creative being. In fact, as Chomsky maintains, “Someone learning language is in exactly the same position as the linguist” (Greenspan and Shanker 227). That is, the language learner must draw upon fixed “super rules” (“context-free phase-structure grammar”) in order to acquire the myriad of “surface rules” (“transformational grammar”) of his natural grammar. In much the same way, a linguist draws upon morphemes (the smallest units of meaning in language) to predict their distributional regularities in sentence construction (227). Hence, according to Chomsky, both language learner and linguist take part in an analytical process when formulating a grammar.

Chomsky’s theory on language acquisition represents the amalgamation of two major advances taking place in the 1950s: artificial intelligence and genetic determinism (228). From the AI revolution, Chomsky borrowed the notion that a child’s brain is endowed with a basic language-reception program at birth. The “atomic units” of this simple program are then built-up to facilitate higher-order cognitive processes, such as the grammar of one’s natural language. This so-called post-computational mechanistic view presented a new model of the cognitive unconscious, comprising heuristic algorithms embodied in
the physical structure of the brain. Using these algorithms, early AI scientists believed that the hidden operations of the mind could be uncovered (100-1).

From genetic determinism, Chomsky borrowed the idea that genes contain the “blueprint” for this basic language program’s assemblage. Heavily influenced by eighteenth-century Deist thought, modern genetic determinists portray Nature as a “watchmaker” who designed the human brain (the computer hardware) as well as the finely-tuned human genome (the software). As such, they regard the human capacity for higher-reflective though as innate (98-100).

The Chomskian model of language development is a mechanistic one. In particular, neither his “Big Bang hypothesis” nor his theory of “syntactic universals” allow for the possibility that emotions play a role in a child’s acquisition of language. Hence, just as the ancient Greek philosophers viewed human behavior as governed by two opposing forces, emotions and reason (100), Chomsky and other discontinuity theorists continue to discuss a child’s emotional and linguistic development as if they were separate processes. In fact, one of Chomsky’s linguistic maxims is that, “Meaning must be completely separated from grammar” (225). Clearly, the Chomskian model places most of its emphasis upon nature and little upon nurture.

In response to Chomsky’s model of language acquisition, Greenspan and Shanker argue: “There is no algorithm, computer program, or scientifically validated biological mechanism to explain complex symbolic and reflective thinking” (101). Thus, the question of how a child develops language will not, in their opinion, be solved by the advancement of modern technology. Nor will it be solved by taking a purely biological approach.

On the contrary, Greenspan and Shanker believe the answer to lie in caregiver-infant interactions. These early nurturing practices are essential to language acquisition. Like Chomsky, they agree that basic biological capacities are a “necessary” condition for a child learning to construct symbols. However, these capacities, in and of themselves, are deemed insufficient. The “sufficient” condition is a series of learning steps that involve emotional signaling (4). In the Greenspan/Shankerian model, these tools for linguistic development must be learned anew by each generation.
With this new theory of language acquisition, Greenspan and Shanker hope to prove wrong the Chomskian model. In fact, they make this goal transparent: “We will show, contrary to the views of Chomsky and Pinker on the genetic origins of language, that language and cognition are embedded in the emotional processes that, in our hypothesis, led to symbols” (7). Before presenting their new model, however, Greenspan and Shanker begin by explaining how they came to this striking conclusion.

First and foremost, Greenspan and Shanker were awakened to the importance of emotions on higher-level cognitive processes from years of clinical research with children. For example, their studies on children from multi-risk families provided them with a telling indicator that severe environmental deprivation has a negative impact on language development. In these studies, risk factors such as mental illness and family dysfunction, both of which significantly undermine caregiver-infant interactions, were associated with a number of language and cognitive setbacks in children. In fact, families with four or more risk factors were twenty times more likely to have children exhibiting marginal IQ scores and language delays by the age of four (21-2).

Recent studies on child care reveal similar trends. One study, in particular, found that low-quality daycare, long hours in full-time daycare, and a mother’s returning to work before her baby reaches nine months of age were all linked to compromises in language and cognitive functioning (21). These studies, along with those of Greenspan and Shanker, reveal the importance of emotional engagement between caregiver and infant.

Having discovered a link between early problems in emotional interaction and language difficulties in children, Greenspan and Shanker implemented intervention programs with the multi-risk families under their watch. Through therapeutic experiences, the children of these families made significant advances in their linguistic and overall cognitive capacities. In fact, higher-quality childcare, including emotional sensitive caregiving, has also been associated with earlier language development (21).

Greenspan’s extensive work with autistic children confirms these findings. Autistic children, like those of the multi-risk families that Greenspan studied, have problems with interpersonal communication.
However, their respective environments are not the issue; rather it is their own biology that interfere with language acquisition. Such processing difference make learning especially difficult for them.

However, when Greenspan constructed special learning programs that dealt with these processing differences, many of the autistic children were, in fact, able to learn. For example, in one of Greenspan’s studies the autistic children were unable to link nouns with verbs (214-215). While standing in front of a door, they would say “Door, door, door” or “Open, open, open . . .” while indicating their desire to go outside. Yet, none of them could say, “Open the door.” Greenspan hypothesized that in order for these children to link noun and verb, they needed to connect their emotions with the action they wanted to perform. Hence, to promote back-and-forth interaction, Greenspan blocked their passage to the door. At first, the children simply pushed him away. However, he persisted, and they, in return began to make purposeful gestures, as if to say, “Go away! I want to open that door.” Once these children replaced their formerly repetitive gestures with purposeful and emotionally laden ones, they were more intentional. Moreover, emotions were available to guide their behavior.

Eventually, the autistic children in Greenspan’s study started using nouns and verbs properly. They would say such things as, “Go away!,” “Mommy, go!” and “Daddy, stop!” Within months, they were forming meaningful sentences. A subgroup of these children even learned to become empathetic, creative, and reflective, all because of extra practice with meaningful emotional interactions. Thus, Greenspan demonstrated that, despite their biological challenges, some autistic children are capable of improving their language and social skills (SR).

In addition to their own studies on children, Greenspan and Shanker drew upon those of such primatologists as Sue Savage-Rumbaugh and Harry Harlow on nonhuman primates. Rumbaugh, who began working with bonobos in the 1980’s, has discovered that nonhuman primates are capable of acquiring language skills when emotionally engaged. Her early language research on the chimpanzees Sherman and Austin serves as a case in point. In these studies, Rumbaugh’s primary objective was to expand the chimpanzees’ communicative abilities. At first, she tried a behavioral modification program, but the chimps made little progress. After years of limited success, Rumbaugh abandoned this
program in favor of another that employed lexigrams in the chimps’ daily activities. Incredibly, with the help of these lexigrams, Sherman and Austin began acquiring symbolic skills. In fact, the longer they were able to take part in co-regulated affective gesturing, the more advanced receptivity became. Hence, just as Greenspan’s therapeutic work with children was instrumental in improving the latter’s linguistic skills, Rumbaugh’s work with Sherman and Austin revealed the importance of emotional engagement on language acquisition.

Harry Harlow’s infamous experiments with rhesus macaque monkeys displayed a similar set of results (Harlow 573-685). In these experiments, Harlow sought to disprove the then-commonly-held notion that attachment is based primarily on nutritive rewards that an infant loves the milk and therefore loves the mother. To test out the validity of this so-called drive reduction theory, Harlow took a group of baby rhesus monkeys away from their mothers shortly after birth. He then proceeded to place them in cages that each contained two surrogate mothers—the first, a metal, milk-bearing one; the second, a cloth one that could not feed. By graphing the mean amount of time that these monkeys spent nursing versus cuddling, Harlow hoped to uncover the true source of their attachment—mother or milk. After only several days, the rhesus monkeys transferred their attachment from real mother to cloth surrogate. As Harlow’s results confirmed, the majority of their time was spent cuddling. In fact, the babies only approached the milk-bearing surrogate when hungry. Even then, they would immediately rush back to the cloth surrogate mother after getting their fill. This disparity in favor of cuddling was, in Harlow’s words, “so great as to suggest that the primary function of nursing . . . is that of enduring frequent and intimate contact of the infant with the mother” (573-685). Hence, Harlow concluded that “contact comfort” is an essential component of love.

Harlow’s next step was to remove the cloth surrogates from a select number of cages. In so doing, he broke the rhesus monkeys into two groups—those with both wire, milk bearing surrogate and cloth surrogate at their disposal, and those with only the former to offer them companionship. A comparison of these two groups over time was expected to reveal the relative importance of “contact comfort” on the baby rhesus monkeys’ development. After several months of research, Harlow announced his findings—the babies with access to only the wire.
mother showed signs of stunted growth and communicational deficits, whereas the babies in the cage with both mothers were significantly healthier. In both cases, the babies had been properly fed and cleaned. Therefore, Harlow could logically infer that emotional contact with a caregiver is essential to proper growth and development.

Along with these studies on nonhuman primates, current neurological research also contributes to the model of language acquisition that Greenspan and Shanker would eventually propose. For example, Nobel prize winning neuroscientist Erik Kandel recently demonstrated the importance of emotional experiences in the creation of long-term memories (Greenspan and Shanker 275). As his work reveals, such experiences affect human regulator genes. The latter, in turn, control neuronal connections in the brain. Hence, emotions are once again found to be essential for cognitive functioning.

In another neurological study, PET scans on adult musicians showed that their brains have more neuronal connections in the area controlling hand movements (275). Undoubtedly, years of practice on their instruments were responsible for such changes in brain structure. PET scans
have also shown that emotionally meaningful experiences stimulate many areas of the brain in concert, whereas impersonal cognitive tasks stimulate fewer areas. The evidence from both of these studies indicates that “enriched” experience is causal in the creation of more neuronal connections in an individual’s brain.

Synthesizing evidence from their studies with human infants with data from the non-human primate research of Sue Savage-Rumbaugh and Harry Harlow, Greenspan and Shankar have been able to ground their theory of language acquisition in firm neuroscience. Each of these areas of study indicates the relationship of emotion and experience on higher-level cognitive processes. With an array of supporting evidence at their disposal, Greenspan and Shanker were at last prepared to answer the fundamental question: how does a baby, governed primarily by a set of reflex-like responses, develop the capacity for symbolic thought? In other words, “what was the first idea” (37).

Greenspan and Shanker propose that, “the first idea is the emergence of the capacity to invest a freestanding image with emotional meaning to make it into a meaningful multi-sensory, affective image” (37). In the Greenspan/Shanker model, therefore, human beings begin to recognize symbols only when the images they perceive become emotionally significant to them. In order for this to happen, co-regulated emotional interaction with other human beings is necessary. Greenspan and Shanker attribute the unique character of the human mind to formative cultural practices that guide caregiver-infant interaction in the early years of an infant’s development.

Having put forth their hypothesis, Greenspan and Shanker proceed to describe the two-step process by which an image comes to be imbued with emotional meaning. In the first stage, an infant perceives only “multi-sensory” images—that is, his mind registers only those things that can be seen, heard, and/or touched (26). However, these images are not yet emotionally meaningful. On the contrary, very young babies react to such images with a set of reflex-like responses. At this stage in their development, therefore, perceptions are closely tied to action.

As a case in point, Greenspan and Shanker explain what frequently happens when a young infant perceives his mother (a multi-sensory image). First, the sight of “mother” causes the infant to experience
hunger (an emotion). Almost instantaneously, he begins to cry (the action), so as to deal with that physical need. In other words, the infant moves from perception to action in three steps: he perceives something, he experiences an emotion, and this emotion triggers an action (26). Hence, there is little delay on his part in carrying out the action.

Such fixed-action patterns are visible in many other species across the animal kingdom. A trout, for instance, perceives a fly (a multi-sensory image) and immediately attacks (the action). Like a human infant, the trout’s perception triggers action (26). However, whereas the trout is primarily confined to a set of reflex-like responses for the remainder of its life, a human infant progresses beyond stage one with the help of caregiver-infant interactions. These nurturing interactions afford the infant the opportunity to separate perception from action, thus enabling him to enter stage two.

An infant’s entrance into the second stage is described by Greenspan and Shanker as a “momentous developmental step. In this stage, the infant’s emotions do not automatically lead to fixed actions, as was previously the case. Rather, these emotions come to be increasingly transformed into interactive signals, which serve to convey the infant’s intent toward action. Thus, the three-step pattern that formerly characterized the infant’s move from perception to action becomes as follows: the infant perceives something, he experiences an emotion, this emotion is transformed into an interactive signal (27).

An infant who is angry, for example, may grimace (the interactive signal) so as to convey his intent to bite (27). If the caregiver responds before the baby has actually bitten anything, then the baby is likely to respond, in turn, with another intent. If, for instance, the caregiver responds to the baby’s grimace with a soothing look of “what’s the matter?” and then offers to pick him up, the baby is likely to soften his grimace, replacing it with a look of expectation (another interactive signal). Like the grimace, the baby’s look of expectation conveys an intent—this time, however, the baby wants to be cuddled.

Such back-and-forth preverbal interaction, which Greenspan and Shanker refer to as “circles of communication,” is responsible for an infant’s eventual ability to perceive “freestanding images”—multi-sensory images that are separated from action (27). In the Greenspan/Shanker model, these images provide the missing link in
understand language acquisition in human beings. For, as Greenspan and Shanker explain, such freestanding images develop into internal symbols over time which, in their turn, develop into speech.

The image of “mother,” for example, comes to be associated not only with milk and crying but also with other emotional experiences, such as playing, being comforted, and so forth. Hence, “mother” becomes a symbol that stands for a complex web of emotions, ranging anywhere from love and devotion to annoyance and frustration. As such, she is perceived as more than just a “multi-sensory” or “freestanding” image—instead, she becomes a “multi-sensory, affective image” invested with emotional meaning (33).

In the Greenspan/Shanker model, even impersonal objects must be invested with emotion before they can become meaningful symbols ((25). Take, for example, an apple which, as Greenspan and Shanker explain, is more than just a red, shiny object: it is also something given to your teacher with pride or to throw at your brother in anger. Similarly, number concepts are understood based on how an individual feels when in possession of “a lot” or “a little” of something. To a four-year old, for instance, “a lot” is more than you want, whereas “a little” is less than you expect.

Once a child forms meaningful internal symbols, communication is said to become enjoyable for its own sake. In other words, Greenspan and Shanker believe that these caregiver-infant interactions enable human beings to experience feelings of closeness without direct contact. In their words, “Holding, touching and proximal smelling, and other forms of direct contact . . . can now be partially satisfied through distal communication across space” (38). Thus, communication through gestures begins to serve one’s basic need for intimacy and nurturance.

Co-regulated affective interaction between infant and caregiver is responsible for not only the infant’s ability to create internal symbols but also for the development of his motor capacities. In fact, these nurturing interactions are described by Greenspan and Shanker as the, “vehicles through which increasingly complex vocalizations, facial expressions, affect intonations, postural changes, and problem-solving actions. All are critical factors in an infant’s eventual development of language. Thus, along with symbol formation and communication for its own sake, such motor skills provide the foundation for language and
speech. As Greenspan and Shanker illustrate, “Biology and experience work together” (39).

With all of the necessary factors for language in place, an infant of 18 months or older begins to put these internal symbols into words. The infant’s refined motor capacities—particularly his tongue and oral skills—enable him to express these symbols aloud. Moreover, his newfound enjoyment of communication for its own sake compels him to do so. In fact, Greenspan and Shanker have found that the more emotionally charged their social interactions, the more motivated children become to master language (196).

Even after an infant learns to put his thoughts and feelings into words, such nurturing interactions continue to guide the development of his language skills. Grammar development, for instance, appears to be made possible by the so-called “circles of communication” that routinely take place between caregiver and infant (196-7). These back-and-forth emotional interactions fuel the infant’s planning and sequencing abilities. Thus, they play a fundamental role in an infant’s ability to properly align nouns and verbs.

Likewise, the “linguistic creativity” that Chomsky accounts for in mechanistic terms arises via emotional signaling (196-7). As Greenspan and Shanker explain, this continuous flow of back-and-forth signaling provides a constant source of new affects. In turn, these affects stimulate the next sequence of ideas or words. Preverbal gestural problem solving, therefore, accounts for an infant’s ability to use words creatively.

In the Greenspan/Shanker model, caregiver-infant interactions are essential to language development. Through such nurturing experiences, infants learn to break the pre-wired cycle of perception to action. In doing so, they are left with “free-standing images”. As explained, these images eventually become internal symbols, which then develop into works. Hence, back-and-forth signaling is found to be necessary for an infant learning to construct symbols. Basic biological capacities alone, devoid of the input from culture, are deemed insufficient for the attainment of language.

With their novel theory on the origins of language, Greenspan and Shanker offer insight into the importance of emotional interactions on linguistic processes. Their research has convincingly demonstrated that
both nature and nurture play a crucial role in an infant’s development of language. Thus, the Chomskian model is concluded to be deficient as a result of its silence on the effects of early nurturing practices on language acquisition. Yet, because Chomsky’s model continues to prevail, Greenspan and Shanker wonder if, “Perhaps there is comfort in assuming that biology, rather than families, communities, and culture is responsible for and protects our higher mental abilities” (9)? If so, then we will be satisfied, as Greenspan and Shanker say, to live in ignorance. However, if we can overcome the Chomskian habit of deferring to genetics and biology, then the Greenspan/Shanker cultural model will most certainly provide us with the first step towards a reconciliation of nature and nurture.
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Hindering the Division of Labor
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In The Wealth of Nations, Adam Smith discusses the concepts of value, trade, and division of labor. Smith asserts that labor creates value and that commodities should be sold in a decentralized free market. People intrinsically have “the propensity to truck, barter, and exchange one thing for another” because they continually need to satisfy their desires (Smith 25). The division of labor enables workers to specialize in a certain field of work, allowing the entire production of a commodity to be more efficient. This idea of the division of labor can be applied to the international division of labor, in which countries specialize in producing certain goods. Just as the division of labor has its limitations, there is also a limitation to the international division of labor. This limitation came about when the United Fruit Company became a monopoly in Latin America.

The introduction of the division of labor in any company produces three important results. First, each worker becomes more dexterous in his line of work through repetition and can, therefore, work more efficiently. For instance, a person assigned to make nails all day might have produced a few hundred in the beginning, but eventually his output increases as he becomes better at his job. Secondly, the division of labor saves time because each person is responsible only for one specific task as opposed to many. One no longer needs to run from one end of the workplace to the other in order to complete the entire project; instead, he can remain focused on his task. Finally, because each worker performs the same task repeatedly, he eventually devises plans to ease his job, such as simple machinery. Collectively, these three factors increase production of goods, which can then be sold in a market (17-20). However, this specialization causes people to be more
dependent on each other in order to gain wealth. Without one worker in the production line, the commodity may not be completed and thus it cannot be sold for profit.

The concept of the division of labor that Smith introduced in the late 1700s is now referred to as the “detailed division of labor” or the “division of labor in manufactures” (Caporaso 13). This idea of distributing labor can be applied to other fields of the division of labor. The most primitive trade originated when one person wanted something that another person could provide. Eventually, trade increased among more people and then extended to towns. Naturally, this phenomenon did not end domestically. Over time, as travel became less difficult, countries began to trade commodities, and these interactions slowly created the international division of labor (187).

In the international division of labor, nations or regions specialize in exporting certain goods in the world market (188). As noted previously, the division of labor allows for more productivity, and thus each country produces more of their commodity through specialization. As long as there is a market available, countries can export all of their goods, and they benefit from the profits. However, the exporting country becomes more dependant on the rest of the world market’s participants to purchase the good. A problem arises when the size of the market shrinks because a smaller market limits the potential gains from trade.

In the modern market, when people desire a commodity, they can usually acquire it as long as they have enough money to purchase it. For instance, in the case of an ordinary banana, one simply goes to the local supermarket and buys one for less than a dollar. Little does the consumer realize that his pleasure in buying a banana is a result of the international division of labor. When the countries are able to specialize in producing certain commodities, they can become the dominant exporter for that good in the world market. Thus, the international division of labor allows people to enjoy goods that their own country cannot always provide.

In the Western Hemisphere, the largest banana producing regions are Central America, the Caribbean, and South America, respectively (Moberg 5). The climate in these tropical regions is suitable for growing this fruit, and therefore, these regions are considered to be “natu-
producers of this crop. Though these areas are dominant producers of this fruit, the United Fruit Company, a US firm, exploited the market on this product by establishing itself as a monopolistic multinational firm. The separate nations should have produced these goods and exported them in the world market on their own, but the United Fruit Company stole this opportunity for increased trade. Instead, this monopolistic multinational corporation placed these countries under its strict supervision, and ultimately prohibited the existence of the true international division of labor.

Until the late 1800s, the market for bananas was highly decentralized because there was no single power that controlled or dominated international trade. Voluntary trade occurred in the free world market as private US and European firms purchased bananas from local growers in the Western Hemisphere, Africa, and Asia (Raynolds 25). By the early 1900s, these companies realized the enormous profits that could be gained from exporting bananas. In order to utilize this advantage, they began to build their own private banana plantations where they could produce more cheaply than buying from independent domestic growers. In 1899 two American banana firms, the Boston Fruit Company and Minor Keith's company merged to establish the United Fruit Company, which became the strongest monopolistic force in the Western Hemisphere (Moberg10).

The United States became an economic hegemony in Latin America during the 1900s, which meant that it had a dominant influence over economic activity across the continent. In the 1800s, the dominant colonial powers such as Great Britain and France consistently traded with the countries in the Western Hemisphere. Once tensions of a European war arose, these two countries along with others significantly decreased their trade with Latin America in order to concentrate on the war effort. The United States quickly recognized the opportunity to replace Great Britain and France as an economic power in Latin America and they did so by seizing control of the banana market (Keylor 201). When the United Fruit Company established itself in the region, the countries could sell bananas in the world market only through the assistance of the company. Furthermore, in addition to dominating the economic sphere in the region, the United Fruit Company was able to influence politics because the countries relied
heavily on profits from banana production (Raynolds 26).

Though bananas can be found in Africa and Asia as well, the United Fruit Company decided to establish itself in the Latin American, Central American and Caribbean regions due to proximity. Because bananas spoil relatively quickly and travel by ship was slow, the shortest distance meant that more unspoiled bananas could be imported. Thus, the United Fruit Company decided to invest its capital in the Western Hemisphere (Soluri 53).

According to Smith, the value of a good is determined by the amount of labor invested in its production (Smith 47). Because bananas cannot be grown efficiently in the United States, the value of the banana is entirely related to the amount of labor required to import it into the country. The first import of bananas in the US occurred in New York in 1804, and by the 1850s small firms were importing bananas from the Latin American region (Soluri 51). Initially, importing bananas was an arduous task for the following reasons: first, the firm must buy the fruit from local growers, then ship them to the United States without spoiling, and finally, they must travel within the country to domestic stores (Moberg 10-11). Therefore, the quantity of bananas was limited, and this good was considered a luxury. People recognized the difficulty in importing this exotic and tropical fruit. Therefore, the scarcity of bananas caused their value to increase.

As technology advanced, firms were able to store bananas for longer periods of time. Cooling devices on ships and railcars emerged, which enabled increased storage time. Additionally, the expansion of railroads within the United States allowed firms to sell more bananas to domestic produce stores (Soluri 53-54). Furthermore, scientists were able to overcome the problem of the Panama Disease, which was a soil fungus that infected bananas. They were able to breed a type of banana that was resistant to the disease (67-68).

Because a lower percentage of bananas spoiled, a higher percentage of the fruit made it to American markets. As the cost of importing decreased, a larger quantity of bananas could be imported. According to the basic economic principles of supply and demand, this increase in supply caused the price of the banana to decrease. Eventually, banana prices dropped. As more consumers gained access to this tropical fruit, the popularity for bananas began to increase.
because of one main reason: people believed that a diet rich in fruits was more nutritious than a traditional diet of grains. While the apple was, then, the main fruit available, the banana emerged as a substitute, because it contained more nutritional value than the apple (54-55). More people wanted bananas, and companies could now respond to this demand. The banana that was once a luxury item was transformed into an ordinary commodity. Additionally, because the total supply of bananas increased overall, the total value of imports also increased. In 1871, the US imported less than $250,000 worth of bananas, but by 1901, this value soared to 6.5 million (49).

Although it is clear that Latin American countries had the potential to produce a surplus of bananas that they could export to other countries in the world market, the means of production was highly debatable. At the inception of the banana trade, small US companies bought bananas from local growers. However, as demand in the United States increased for bananas, companies had no choice but to respond to consumers. Instead of relying on private sellers, companies such as the United Fruit Company began to build their own banana plantations in these regions. All of the workers were locals, but this multinational organization controlled all levels of production. This was the only way to guarantee a steady supply of bananas to the United States (Bucheli 81-82).

By 1910, the United Fruit Company secured itself as a monopoly trade in the Western Hemisphere as it drove all domestic and foreign competition (Moberg 146). The company paid local producers higher prices for bananas than other foreign companies, which eventually drove those firms out of business. Once foreign competition was eliminated, the United Fruit Company proceeded to extradite independent local banana growers (149). By 1930, the Company owned twenty times the land that it actually needed for production. It feared that the Panama Disease might thwart plant growth, and therefore it needed more land for cultivation (150). Acquiring this land forced small local growers out of business while making the United Fruit Company the largest multinational corporation in the region.

As the United Fruit Company forged a monopoly and began to control all levels of production, it vertically integrated these regions into the United States’ economy. Banana production no longer appeared as
a task done by the region, but was considered an extension of the American economy. Although domestic people worked on the plantation, an American company owned and operated the plantations (Bucheli 80). Controlling all stages of production “required substantial investments in infrastructure in Latin America and the Caribbean, including: plantations, hospitals, roads, canals, docks, telegraph lines, railways, and ships” (80). When the United Fruit Company controlled all of the stages of production, it basically forced Latin America to be dependant on foreign capital. It was the United States’ money that maintained the infrastructure, not the money of the country where the plantation existed. If an American multinational corporation controlled everything in this region, then Latin America could no longer be thought of as the producer of bananas. If the plantations were not controlled by the people of that country, there would be a disruption in the international division of labor.

As the United Fruit Company dominated Latin America, it forced Latin American countries to become dependent on the corporation. The company owned about one fourth of one percent of all agricultural land in 1955 (May 123). Therefore, local agricultural workers often worked for the United Fruit Company because they had no other alternative. Because the company was successful, it was able to pay higher wages than a domestic producer could (124), and the workers benefited from increased wages. However, the total revenue earned did not return to the host country since the United Fruit Company belonged to the United States. For example, on average, the local governments received only about 6.5 percent of the total revenue. Percentages ranged from one-fifth of one percent in Colombia to 19 percent in Costa Rica (124). If the host countries owned banana plantations, they could have earned more revenue for their country.

When the United Fruit Company vertically integrated Latin America into the American economy, it also forced the region to be dependant on United States capital. Maintenance and further innovations came from the company itself, and funding originated from America as well. The countries relied on the US market to buy these bananas from the United Fruit Company, which could become a problem if the company no longer felt it needed a particular plantation because the costs of production becomes too high. For example, the colony of British
Honduras “constituted no more than 3 percent of the United Fruit’s total banana imports to the United States” (Moberg 151). If the company decided to shutdown its plantation there, the government of British Honduras could take control of it. However, it probably would not earn profits since it could not compete with the United Fruit Company. Thus, the host countries are at the mercy of the company to drive its economy.

When the United Fruit Company accumulated more land for banana production, it inevitably hindered the production of other crops that could be traded in the world market. Data shows that in 1955, the production of cacao in Costa Rica was significantly below banana production (May 144). Had the Company not monopolized in this region, Costa Rica could have specialized in cacao production and sold it in the world market, which would have integrated it into the international division of labor. Additionally, other products such as timber, rubber and sugar were limited in production because of the company’s existence (145). The United Fruit Company did not foster the production of other crops, but instead forced the economy to depend on banana production for revenue.

Though the United Fruit Company hindered the international division of labor, its presence in Latin America increased economic development and improved social welfare. The company helped the region economically because it was able to transform heavily forested terrain into arable land for banana cultivation and production. Additionally, the company introduced better roads, railways, and communication systems. Socially, the United Fruit Company created jobs for workers in undeveloped areas. Furthermore, it recognized the needs of its workers, and therefore provided housing, education, recreation, and places of worship (183).

According to Adam Smith the implementation of the division of labor increases productivity via specialization. As the divisions become smaller, the tasks became easier. Therefore, workers are more easily replaceable and can be compensated with a lower wage. On an international scale, countries have unique commodities that can be traded in the world market. Ideally, the country itself should be the producer of the good which would allow it to fully gain the benefits of trade. When foreign firms such as the United Fruit Company produce these
goods on behalf of the host country, they impede the economic success of the country.

Although the United Fruit Company was an economic hegemony in the 1900s, by 1956 its monopolistic power slowly declined, as it only controlled 40 percent of its original share in the world market for bananas. Competition increased as other companies were able to increase productivity, which resulted in over 160 competitors today (245). The existence of multinational corporations in today’s world does not necessarily indicate hindrance to the international division of labor, but monopolistic multinational corporations do. Numerous multinational corporations have less power to control all the means of production than a single multinational corporation, and therefore not hurt the host country as severely.

In the end, the United Fruit Company hindered the international division of labor because it monopolized banana production in Latin America. Commodities are sometimes linked to specific regions, and no outside corporation should have the ability to produce on the behalf of that nation. In the case of the United States and Latin America, the United Fruit Company should have continued to buy bananas from the independent producers and allowed them to develop larger, more efficient plantations. This analysis of the United Fruit Company demonstrates one major problem in the international division of labor: should multinational firms manufacture goods in other countries when the country itself should be the producer? It is often argued that because the nations in the Latin American region are not fully economically developed, they cannot produce goods efficiently. Therefore, more industrialized countries such as the United States apply their manufacturing techniques in order to foster efficiency. According to Adam Smith, once someone is given a specific task to perform, he naturally will become better at it through repetition. Similarly, when Latin American countries were given the “job” to produce bananas, they too over time would have become more efficient, with or without the help of another country. Instead, the United Fruit Company quickened the rate of efficiency, but it resulted in the dependency of Latin American countries on the United States.

The United Fruit Company’s interference in the international division of labor raises an important question for today’s world. What is the
future of the multitude of multinational organizations that currently exist? One solution is to limit the number of multinational organizations in the region or regulate the percentage of total revenue that is returned to the host country. Another possibility is to allow the host country to have total control of the multinational corporation. The answer to this question may be crucial in order to secure the international division of labor.
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from *Camus: Carnets*

GEORGE KALOGERIS

5.

*Halfway between poverty and the sun*

is how you described growing up in Algiers,
dirt-poor as the glistening dunes of the beach at Sablettes
where you learned to swim in a school of dolphins—
until dusk, when the *jeune filles* slithered away,
though your legs were still tangled in the seaweed's hair.

The Grecian urn before the age of images,
when the daughter of Dibutades, the potter, traced
the dusky line of a young man's shadow on a blank wall.
Silhouette for the first clay vase fired by Eros.
We lose track of the light, the body's hymnal.
The silent mouths of those who forgive themselves.
24.

The cypress trees tapering like silvery vapors.
Candles of the Sahel. Faint odors of rosemary,
wormwood, and scorched stone. Breathing as you lie
flat on your stomach, one feels the solar plexus
is slowly being crushed, though the body seems to reject
this longing to swim away in the ripple of light.

No, Baudelaire. Not only the recent tears
dried in dawn wind, but also the sheen of the tree-snail
dragging his house on his back, like a gypsy caravan.
When my children visit they leave their fingerprints
on the mirror’s surface. Their touching reflection is real.
My transience is not — until I polish the récit.
The Raven, the Nightingale, and the Albatross

DYGO TOSA

In dark Hades did some shades black
Form a curious dialogue of three:
The first a Raven, death creature of Poe,
The second a Nightingale, of Keats's ode,
And last an Albatross, broad-wingèd, of Byron's sea.

The Raven begins speaking, as it croaks its inhuman voice mimicking
The thoughts of its dark and somber master of yore:
"Like Charon who keeps his ferry, I shall be master of us three airy
Spirits who fuse poesy with analysis like no birds before.
These words are dying, dying as images in the mind's store—
Wanting to be written yet never has memory failed so much more."

The author "continued for about three hours" in profound inspiration, during which time he was to compose six to seven pages of dialogue in verse; if such a humanities paper could be written with skill it would indeed be to the amazement of author and reader both (Coleridge UVA). On approaching his computer, and taking up the keys, he eagerly began the task of mimicking each poet in verse while maintaining the serious tone of a scholar, and the first two stanzas above as well as the scattered rhymes below are "here preserved" (Coleridge UVA). At that moment the electrical connection to the computer was cut off. Upon restoration of power an hour later, the author returned to find "to his no small surprise and mortification" that his work had vanished into digital oblivion (Coleridge UVA). The Muses have no deadlines, which allowed Coleridge the leisure to reassemble some of what he wrote, but the author pressed for time had to begin anew, without the verse or brilliant analysis he had before. Alas!
RAVEN
Well, here we are at “Night’s Plutonian shore,” and now that the
“silence was broken,” it would please this “ominous bird” to know what
has brought you feathered creatures to my door (Hunter 218-220).

ALBATROSS
Good evening, dark Raven, / Form friends, and shall we discuss—/
Why look’st thou so?—With a cross-bow / A mariner shot this Albatross
(Coleridge UVA).

NIGHTINGALE
Now there’s a man with good aim. Some man mistook me for a quail
and shot his friend behind me.‡ Though “the dull brain perplexes and
retards” in asking how I look at all like a quail (Ricks 403).

RAVEN
Now you, “light-winged Dryad,” what brings you down to these for-
saken depths? (403) Haven’t the Muses protected you from the gloom
of the underworld? What do you cry “weep weep weep weep”? (Blake
13) As I quoth Shakespeare: “Nor shall Death brag thou wand’rest in
his shade, / When in eternal lines to time thou grow’st” (Hunter 18).

NIGHTINGALE
Grim Raven, have you forgotten the sonnet’s last line: “So long lives
this, and this gives life to thee”—just so I only live while mortal men
drink the “blushful Hippocrene” (Hunter 18, Ricks 403). It is in poetry
that I take flight; with the disenchantment of modernity my wings are
broken.

ALBATROSS
So do tell us what curse of time / Has made us, figures of poets, to
be decreed, / Doomed to fall into this underworld—/ How it is so that
Poetry has died!§

NIGHTINGALE
I shall tell, my feathered companions, of what has changed in this
world that commits me as a “little black thing among the snow: / Crying
weep, weep, in notes of woe” (Blake 34).

ALBATROSS
Do they believe “they have done” you no injury, / When we can’t
hear your dance and song? (34) / Have the views of men changed so
that / Truths and beauties are now all wrong?
“Heard melodies are sweet, but those unheard / Are sweeter,” and
now “no birds sing” (Ricks 402, 401). I have come to hide in this dark
place to make men “through a long absence” feel along their hearts
my “unremembered pleasure” (344).

As I perch on this “bust of Pallas” (Hunter 218), and recall loving the
classics, there was inscribed on a Grecian urn—

Ah, “half-naked, loving, natural, and Greek!” (Byron II, CXCIV)

Ahem, the words “Beauty is truth, truth beauty” (Ricks 403). As life
and death persist through all human ages, so I thought of both beauty
and truth—eternal yet present in every moment in separate form.7

Come now, Nightingale; you use the monstrous term “modernity” and
have yet to explain anything.

Then “A flowery tale more sweetly than our rhyme” shall attempt to
explain my plight in time (905).

You hold us with your glittery eye / We cannot choose but hear
(Coleridge UVA).

One evening whilst flying over a village in La Mancha, I spied a
large bonfire. Approaching closer, my “viewless wings of Poesy” drew
flames and I was burned; for I saw that the housekeeper was not turn-
ing the leaves of trees to ashes but rather the leaves of books (Ricks
403).

Oh how countless romances burned with fire!

I should “shed tears myself!” (Cervantes, Chap. VII)

The Spanish countryside infected by such strange ideas—“The sleep
of reason produces monsters,” and in the name of the martial religion’s
romantic fancies fade (Goya, 1797-1798).

Another day, as I flew late morning over English land, I happened to
pass a conversation of some “country neighborhood” (Austen 42). The women went along ranting about daughters and marriage &c until one of them exclaimed, “I wonder who first discovered the efficacy of poetry in driving away love” (44).

ALBATROSS
   Blasphemous! Poetry is the “food of love!” (44)

NIGHTINGALE
   It is true, I feed upon such morsels, “Roots of relish sweet, / And honey wild, and manna dew” (Ricks 899).

RAVEN
   Such foolish aristocrats that treat poetry below them.

NIGHTINGALE
   Even in France a Parisian Lady scorned amorous verses some mischievous poet offered up.

ALBATROSS
   “La belle dame sans merci!” (900) Oh ho, but I remember—what grotesque orgy of dogs then followed!

RAVEN
   “Beware! Beware!” of digressions here (448). Yet it is a sad state seen all across the European continent, women scorning poetry. If only that Italian playboy Don Giovanni—wait, here he comes.

NIGHTINGALE
   Weep, weep.

DON GIOVANNI
   “Hear that? Some pretty lady abandoned by her sweetheart. Poor thing! We must try to comfort her.” (da Ponte I.7)

RAVEN
   Don Giovanni, the lady you search for is merely a bird—a feathery winged one if you must ask—and we three are holding council on the death of poetry.

DON GIOVANNI
   “The whole thing is quite bizarre,” but “provided that she wears a skirt . . .” (da Ponte II.18, 19) [Imaginative gesturing.]

ALBATROSS
   Have you not changed your life! “Alas no doom can match your crimes!” (II.25) [Dantean flames erupt from unseen openings, the ground shakes, and the Earth swallows up DON GIOVANNI.]
NIGHTINGALE

“Heavens above! How incredible!” (da Ponte II.25)

RAVEN

I must agree. But consider, there’s a dying art: opera. If opera had a bird it would fall into the endangered species list; yet it struggles on. Oh Nightingale, you surely kid us when you visit this dark place. Poetry still flourishes—“thou were not born for death, immortal Bird! / No hungry generations tread thee down; / The voice I hear this passing night was heard / In ancient days by emperor and clown” (Ricks 404).

NIGHTINGALE

Yes, “With many recognitions dim and faint, / And somewhat of a sad perplexity, / The picture of the mind revives again:” back to the epic ages when entertainment was a minstrel “whom God made lord of song, heart easing” (Ricks 345, Homer 126).

ALBATROSS

“But to resume—" did not “Juan learn his alpha beta better / From Haidée’s glance than any graven letter?” (Byron). What place do these Romantic Poets hold if our Nightingale’s cries remain scorned? Modernity demands reality, no longer “dreaming dreams no mortal ever dared to dream before,” but on money, material and marriages—oh the thought! (Hunter 218). Literally it is on concrete foundations that skyscrapers are built, on concrete images that novels thrive. Besides, in the Nightingale’s Romantic poetry “Bold lover, never, never canst thou kiss” (Ricks 402).

NIGHTINGALE

“Yet, do not grieve; / She cannot fade, though thou hast not thy bliss, / For ever wilt thou love, and she be fair” (Keats 402).

RAVEN

But “No where / Lives a woman true and fair” (Donne).

ALBATROSS

So “I loathe, detest, / Abhor, condemn, abjure the mortal made / Of such quicksilver clay” (Byron). “But to return: that which Men call inconstancy is nothing more / Than admiration due” (Byron). And “Tis the perception of the Beautiful, / A fine extension of the faculties, / Platonic, universal, wonderful, / Drawn from the stars, and filtered through the skies, / Without which Life would be extremely dull.” (Byron)
NIGHTINGALE
And thus “‘Beauty is truth, truth beauty’—that is all / Ye know on earth, and all ye need to know” (Ricks 403). I daresay that we haven’t gotten too far from where we started.

RAVEN
But neither does the West Wind, from “Autumn’s being” to “summer dreams,” for “If Winter comes, can Spring be far behind?” (Ricks 390) The cycle of worldly inspiration comes around, as Nature is always reborn. Nightingale, you shall stay here nevermore! Poetry gives us “Melodies round honey-dropping flowers, / Footless and wild, / Like birds of Paradise, / Nor pause, nor perch, hovering on untamed wing” (Coleridge UVA). Come now, Nightingale, alight on these “happy, happy boughs!” (Ricks 402)

NIGHTINGALE
Ah “more happy love! more happy, happy love!” (Ricks 402)

[\text{Nightingale flies away.}]\]

ALBATROSS
Like an ancient mariner finding his way home, poetry brings us back to where the heart flows. “Let us have Wine and Woman, Mirth and Laughter, / Sermons and soda-water the day after” (Byron). Although “if one sole lady pleased for ever, / How pleasant for the heart, as well as liver” (Byron). What we love changes over our lives, for we are drawn to the beautiful—to women, to pleasures, to different kinds of poetry. Let Romantic poetry fall one day—it will return. “Au revoir! Au revoir!” (Ricks 404)

RAVEN
The Nightingale’s “plaintive anthem fades . . . Fled is that music” (Keats 905). The Albatross, “No voice does [the bird] impart”—so did it depart, as a “lovely light”\textsuperscript{12} (Coleridge UVA). And let this be “word our sign of parting” (Hunter 220). No reasoning allows poetry to justify itself, no logic allows inconstancy to rule our hearts—can we ever prove poetry to be true?

...\]

Yet “Nothing beside remains” (Ricks 389). *
ENDNOTES

1. Grothe at <http://www.chiasmus.com/whatischiasmus.shtml> points out that “In Xanadu did Kubla Khan” is listed in Collier’s Encyclopedia as example of chiasmus, where the sound of ‘Xan’ mirrors ‘khan’ and ‘du’ mirrors ‘ku’.

2. A lovely use of a rising tricolon, although different from Coelridge’s stanza scheme.

3. The Albatross is from Coleridge’s “Mariner,” but Byron fits the meter better.

4. Often the true story isn’t the interesting one.

5. Quoth Professor Ricks: “A bird in the hand is worth two in the Bush Administration.”

6. In the difficulty of this work, or pure laziness, the author has taken certain liberties with Coleridge’s verse form, in this case with slant rhyme.

7. The author once wrote a paper on English love poetry that considered how the force of love, wanting eternity, is yet captured in a moment by the poet.

8. My high school history teacher described seventeenth-century Inquisitors and Jesuits as “Catholic storm troopers.”

9. If I had a copy of Rabelais with me, I would have cited some passage here.

10. “Novels” taken more abstractly too, as “new literature.”

11. The line that would have followed here, but which was omitted in the tenth draft: “RAVEN: Albatross, you barely have any words of your own!”

12. As strange as it was for the cursed Mariner to be the only survivor (perhaps not unlike Cain), it becomes problematic in terms of character integrity when the Albatross’ departure is resolved by a Christian ascent in this story. Far from being akin to Jesus, the Albatross is rather goofy.

WORKS CONSULTED


Hey, Dionysus

BRIAN JORGENSEN

Prelude to a performance of Aristophanes’ Frogs
(Almost ragtime)

Hey, Dionysus, pull on your yellow dress
Hey, Dionysus, pull on your yellow dress
Sling your gunbelt low, just like the Code of the West
Nylon stockings, and a Wyatt Earp vest

Hey, Dionysus, the world is falling down
Hey, Dionysus, the world is falling down
Can’t you feel U.S. America shimmy around
And all the good poets gone under the ground

Going down, going down, knocking on Hades’ door
Going down knocking, knocking on Hades’ door
Find some man, take me back where I was before
Read “Song of Myself,” hear those bombers roar

Across Dead Lake, the old man made me row
Across Dead Lake, the old man made me row
Trying to pull the oar, trying to sing yo-ho
Heard those frogs booming so loud and low

“Bre-ke-ke-ke-kex, co-ax, co-ax
“That’s our tune, more hoppin’ than the hippest sax
“Put some plop in your shop, let the good vibes wax
“Bre-ke-ke-ke-kex, co-ax, co-ax”

“Bre-ke-ke-ke-kex, co-ax, co-ax”
Trying to get across before my sphincter cracks
Trying to stay steady, trying to face the facts
“Bre-ke-ke-ke-kex, co-ax, co-ax”
“Studying the words on our documents and plaques
“Feeling good about my ‘hood in the great galax
“Slurp that deconstruction, hey, logos yaks
“Bre-ke-ke-ke-kex, co-ax, co-ax”

“Gonna bomb the east till the women all wear slacks
“Democracy bulletins pinned with red thumbtacks
“Keep the glad rags coming on my shelves and racks
“Bre-ke-ke-ke-kex, co-ax, co-ax”

“When God rains down, we sing in the deeps so black
“He loves us for the dapples on our backs”
Gonna cross this swamp, belching with the other hacks
“Bre-ke-ke-ke-kex, co-ax, co-ax”

Hey, Dionysus, the poets reject your pleas
Walt Whitman says, “They’d just call me old geeze”
Emily Dickinson softly says, “No, Please”
“Hiccup, I’ll go,” says Aristophanes
“I’ve a weakness for those weird democracies”

Fireworks, flashlights, glow sticks, sparklers
Speed this poet through the wine-blest darkness
To our language’s light where freedom rings
Saying many serious and many funny things

Hey, Dionysus, spike that BU punch
Sprinkle some strange on the cookies we’re gonna munch
I can see your actors, they’re a pretty ragged bunch
I guess that’s the best we can do, in the budget crunch

We’re the Fish Worship Band, wishing you a night of fun
You could buy our great CD, if we had one
Translated unexpurgated by Dean Henderson
Frogs, Professor Nelson, bring it on!
A Night At the Opera: Mozart’s Don Giovanni

HOLLY HUGHES

The recent production of Mozart’s Don Giovanni at the Boston University Theatre was an enjoyable and well-executed portrayal of the timeless opera. As performed by members of the BU Opera Institute and the Chamber Orchestra, the classic Mozart recitatives and arias sounded wonderful in the small, intimate setting. Every detail of the production, from the sets and costumes to the staging and performances, accentuated one of the opera’s strongest themes: the issue of class separation and the characters’ struggle to cross social boundaries. This motif is echoed strongly in the opera’s music, so it was fitting that BU’s production highlighted the significance of social class in Don Giovanni.

The central role of Don Giovanni is based on the classic character of Don Juan, who had previously appeared in several literary works. Though fictional, the womanizing libertine has had a significant presence in the world of literature, and he has been the subject of pieces by such luminaries as Moliere, Byron and Shaw. Though there are some small differences among the many depictions of Don Juan, his basic characteristics remain the same: he is an immoral, heartless man who is obsessed with the pursuit and conquest of women. This is documented in the comical aria “Madamina,” which is performed by Don Giovanni’s long-suffering servant, Leporello. In the aria, Leporello catalogues Don Giovanni’s long list of sexual triumphs, including women of all ages, sizes, appearances and social classes. It appears that Don Giovanni, though himself a nobleman, cares little of the differences between peasants and nobility when it comes to women.

Yet, his own nobility is a vital facet of his character, for he uses it to his advantage in his seductions, particularly that of the peasant girl
Zerlina. To Zerlina, like many others before her, Don Giovanni’s wealth and status are part of his allure. The complications presented by class differences in the plot of Don Giovanni are complemented by Mozart’s beautiful score, which employs rich, grand chords for the noble characters and simple, pleasant melodies for the pastoral scenes involving Zerlina and her fiancé, the young peasant Masetto.

Don Giovanni’s privileged status affects not only his dealings with women, but also with his fellow male characters. As J. W. Smeed says in his study of the Don Juan character, “he will change his tune from one moment to the next, treating his social equals with politeness and a superficial gallantry, while browbeating or patronizing those from the humbler classes” (Smeed 24). It is true that Don Giovanni addresses Leporello and Masetto in rather plain, condescending tones which differ greatly from the courteousness he uses around Don Ottavio and Donna Anna. This contrast shows that, although Don Giovanni may seem blind to class in his dealings with women, he is actually aware of the power he holds as a member of the nobility.

The first and most noticeable way in which the BU Opera Institute addressed the class issues of Don Giovanni was through the production’s sets, designed by Tesshi Nakagawa. The entire opera was staged upon a set featuring several staircases of various sizes, which rotated to suggest different locations. The staircases were used effectively to suggest Don Giovanni’s elevated status, for he would frequently hide or observe events from the highest platforms, then gradually descend to the level of the woman he was trying to seduce. For example, when Donna Elvira, who is of a slightly lower class than Don Giovanni, makes her entrance, he watches her from many steps above as she sings. He then joins her on the ground in an attempt to charm her. Only then does he notice her identity.

This staging works in perfect accordance with Mozart’s musical themes. Don Giovanni does not have a strong signature melody, as some of the other characters do; instead, he adapts the tune of whomever he is trying to corrupt or manipulate. Therein lies the key to his seduction routine. He cleverly moves between melodies and classes in order to bring himself closer to the woman of his choice, such as when he adapts Leporello’s simple persona and peasant clothing in order to bewitch Donna Elvira’s maid. The staircase sets were an impressive way
of depicting this feature of Don Giovanni's personality.

This differences and conflicts between the classes were also emphasized through the costumes, which were designed by Nicole Moody. The noble characters of Don Giovanni, Donna Anna, Don Ottavio and Donna Elvira were dressed in rich colors such as blue, green and red. In addition, their costumes were frequently trimmed in gold or fur, suggesting great wealth and prosperity. The peasant ensemble was clothed in simple brown and white outfits. Zerlina and Masetto's costumes were trimmed in turquoise, and they wore white wreaths of flowers during their opening scene, suggesting the simplicity and pureness of their lives when compared with the corruption of the upper class.

Perhaps the most compelling clash of the upper and lower classes in Mozart's opera is found in the seduction of Zerlina, in which the young peasant girl finds herself intrigued with the dashing, aristocratic Don Giovanni. Although Zerlina seems innocent, there is no doubt that she reciprocates Don Giovanni's interest. As Joseph Kerman states in his analysis of the opera, "Zerlina acknowledges Giovanni right away by singing his tune . . . Despite her show of tremulousness, she is fully in control" (Miller 111). In this production, Valerie Arboit played Zerlina as a flirtatious and willing partner for Don Giovanni. He seduced her by physically caressing her and singing intimately in her ear, which she seemed to enjoy before reluctantly pulling away at the thought of Masetto's reaction.

Zerlina's interest in Don Giovanni is due not only to a physical attrac-
tion to the handsome stranger, but also to his well-versed flattery and his obvious high status. He promises her a life of privilege in his handsome country house, and the ideas of riches and grandeur may be just as attractive to Zerlina as Don Giovanni himself. In his essay on the opera, Nino Pirrotta points out that “the fine cavalier tempts her by . . . speaking so smoothly and putting so much sweetness into his ardent invitations” (Pirrotta 156). The fineries that Giovanni suggests are foreign to Zerlina, and it is natural that she might be intrigued by his smooth, eloquent words.

In her own way, Zerlina is as skilled at the art of manipulation as Don Giovanni is, for she persuades Masetto to forgive her through two beautiful and seductive arias. Yet as Liane Curtis points out, “Giovanni uses his power, status, wealth and charm to seduce according to his own impulses . . . Zerlina uses her seductive power because that is the only power she has” (Curtis). Both characters have adapted to their positions on the social ladder. Don Giovanni exploits his status to get what he wants, while Zerlina seduces Masetto because, as a member of the lower class, she has no other resource at her disposal.

The performances of the singers further accentuated the class differences, particularly between Don Giovanni and Masetto. In the title role, Matthew Moore’s smooth voice and swaggering physicality seemed infused with confidence, as if Don Giovanni was fully aware of the appeal found in his good looks, wealth and status. In contrast, Rob Woodin played Masetto as a rather bland, plain young man with none of Giovanni’s fire and passion. This contrast was apparent in one of the more comical scenes in the production, when Don Giovanni tried to urge the fearful Masetto to jump over a river in the center of the stage. Masetto was hesitant, took several minutes to build up his courage, and required much encouragement from Don Giovanni in order to leap across the river.

As demonstrated in this scene, it appeared as if both characters were aware of their contrasting positions in life and acted accordingly: Giovanni with the brashness and self-assuredness that comes with money and power, and Masetto confined within the doubts and limits of his low class. This difference is why Masetto lets Leporello lead him away from Don Giovanni and Zerlina, even though he is aware of the nobleman’s plan to seduce Zerlina. Masetto is a simple peasant who is
powerless against the bold, undaunted Don Giovanni.

While some of the central relationships in the opera cross social lines, such as Don Giovanni and Leporello, the romance of Donna Anna and Don Ottavio is an example of a refined, elegant love between two members of the nobility. Pirrotta describes the encounter between these two characters in the opera's final scene: “Don Ottavio, as befits his noble rank . . . turns to Donna Anna to insist in his best singing style on an immediate wedding. And with just as much tenderness . . . she asks him to wait ‘another year’ and they join in a tender duet” (Pirrotta 152-153). The love they share is sincere, but extremely formal and proper, as opposed to the playful, teasing romance of the pastoral characters, Zerlina and Masetto.

The gap dividing the peasants and the nobility was made evident near the end of this production when Donna Anna, Don Ottavio and Donna Elvira entered Don Giovanni’s ball in disguise. The choreography by Judith Chaffee made a clear distinction between the classes. Don Giovanni joined Zerlina and the other peasants in a carefree, somewhat silly dance while the three masked figures remained straight-laced and dignified while dancing. Even in their masks they could not fully disguise themselves amongst the lower class, for these affluent characters do not share Don Giovanni’s desire to immerse himself in peasant life, nor his skill at adapting to different situations.

WORKS CONSULTED
Recognized early in his career as a great painter, Francisco José De Goya y Lucientes was appointed Pintor del Rey (Painter to the King) in 1786 and by 1799 was promoted to First Court Painter. In this capacity Goya produced portraits of the royal family such as *The Family of Charles IV* (1800). While Goya’s earlier court paintings, such as *The Parasol* (1777), epitomize the idealization of classical beauty popular during the Neoclassical movement, the artist makes no attempt to promulgate the image of a beautiful or perfect royal family in *The Family of Charles IV*. While it is clear that Goya depicted the royal family in a natural light, it is not certain whether Goya intended the portrait as a critique of the monarchy. In light of the relationship between the patron and the painter, and in the growing popularity of naturalism, Goya’s portrait was not so much a critique but as a symbolic representation of the organization of the monarchy amidst political instability and a homage to the art of painting.

The primary argument for interpreting “The Family of Charles IV” as a social criticism and caricature of the royal family is the unflattering representation that the monarchy was somehow duped into accepting the piece, as they did not object to it upon its completion. Traditionally the royalty was depicted with a systematic reverence equal to symbolism and the importance of façade; the old would often be painted young and attractive and malformations or imperfections would be altered according to the desires of the patron. Though Goya did not make drastic adjustments in his physical representation of the royal family, he did not represent them grotesquely; as the pretty, young Infanta Doña María Isabella is juxtaposed with her naturalistically
aged mother, something of the Queen’s former beauty is revealed, especially in her large eyes. Furthermore, in his representation of Doña Maria Luisa (to the right, holding her infant son), Goya had an opportunity to ridicule the royal family, as she suffered from a spinal defect, instead, Goya depicts her standing rigidly upright, displaying his humanity and respect for the family. Like Doña Maria Luisa, the figure of the king’s sister, Doña Maria Josefa, has long been referenced in Goya’s ridicule of the monarchy; however, historical records reveal that the aging woman suffered from the effects of Lupus, which Goya painted naturalistically, neither hiding nor emphasizing her illness. While Goya did not gloss over the imperfections of the monarchy, there seems to be little basis for the assertion that in depicting the monarchy naturalistically Goya mocked his patrons. The relationship between the painter and the patron seems to render the likelihood of mockery nearly obsolete. As Edward Olszweski writes “That they were duped by Goya seems as impossible to accept as the belief that Goya wanted to mock and deceive them, for their portraits derived from numerous approved sketches” (Olszweski 177). Thus, while Goya did not idealize the royal family, he also did not mock them, and indeed there is no historical reference to the portrait as mockery in the artist’s time (175-178).

While “The Family of Charles IV” is not a caricature of Spain’s royal family, it clearly does aim to represent the organization of the monarchy during an era of turmoil and instability, primarily through the positioning of the subjects. Though the royal family seems to stand casually in front of a mirror, as Goya paints their reflection, upon further inspection it is clear that the artist constructed the portrait with a tight structural order in mind. The Queen is clearly the central figure in the image, though she is properly painted to the right of the King, as both the faceless figure and Maria Luisa glance at her. The King’s stance indicates his advance toward the center, to be met by Ferdinand (on the left) and followed by the future Duke of Parma (on the far right), which clearly draws the dynastic succession. Furthermore, the King’s brothers and sisters fade into the background; both their positions and their status fixed. The hierarchy of scale used in depicting the King’s sons also emphasizes their importance and their place in the line of succession; the twelve year old Infante Don Carlos stands behind the
future Ferdinand VII, eclipsed by his older brother yet still ready to step forward and claim the throne should the need arise. Just as the relationship between fathers and sons reflects their place in the state, so too does the King’s relationships with his daughters, as they are physically distant, reflecting their “function as barter” in dynastic marriages (179). All are subservient to the rights of kinship, a concession made only for the emotional needs of the youngest child, placed between his parents.

Goya’s emphasis on the royal lineage seems excessive, as he represents thirteen figures spanning three generations of the dynastic line, yet in his work, Goya also addresses the delicate state of the monarchy. Quite noticeably, the group lacks a common focus, some looking out towards the viewer while others gaze at each other, adding a sense of animation to the portrait, while also creating a sense of uncertainty and disorder. Furthermore, in the somewhat uncomfortable stances of the family members Goya seems to allude to their impending exit, an uneasiness in the regency permeating the painting. Thus, it seems that in the uncertainty of focus and casual demeanor of his subjects, Goya underscores the uneasy state of the monarchy during an era of turmoil.
Further displaying the fragility of the monarchy is the faceless figure to the left of the Queen. Though this figure is thought to represent the bride of the future King Ferdinand VII, the woman had not yet been chosen, thus, a face could not be painted. This uncertainty of lineage is poignantly depicted by Goya as the faceless figure could easily have been omitted, and the decision to include this indication of fragility only emphasizes the artist’s symbolic structure. Thus, in his deliberate choice of subjects and their positioning Goya sheds light onto the insecurity of a fragile monarchy, though he does so subtly and without a sense of ridicule or caricature (Licht 127).

While the representation of both the structure of the monarchy and its fragility is central to Goya’s “The Family of Charles IV,” by drawing inspiration from earlier works such as Diego Velázquez’s “Las Meninas,” the artist celebrates the art of painting. The reference to “Las Meninas” is clear, in both the subject matter and its representation. Like Velázquez, Goya places himself in the image and alludes to a mirror in the space of the viewer that the subjects seem to gaze into. The Infanta and her servants represented in “Las Meninas” are animated, with a great sense of movement and interaction that indicates an unposed nature paralleling that of “The Family of Charles IV.” Furthermore, Goya incorporates the idea of a painting within a painting, by including two large pieces in the background, much like Velásquez’s visual references to the work of Rubens in “Las Meninas.” It is important to note that like Goya, Velásquez held the illustrious position of court painter, a position he revered and in which he sought to garner respect. Thus, in his hearkening back to a great predecessor, Goya recognizes the distinction of the tradition of courtly portraiture from which his work springs.

Perhaps the most important parallel between “Las Meninas” and “The Family of Charles IV” is the placement of the artist in the scene. Though Goya paints himself hidden in the background (almost completely enveloped by the dark tones of his chiaroscuro), he remains visible, a necessary reference to the importance and dignity of his profession. Further celebrating the artistic ability of his work, Goya uses elaborate detail to articulate the clothing of the royal family. Unlike the clothing in other work such as “The Parasol,” in “The Family of Charles the IV” the artist carefully details the fine brocading and
embroidery of the royal wardrobe. While the effect of the richly detailed clothing partially serves to demonstrate the wealth and elegance of the ruling class, the careful execution displays the skill of the artist, a tactic used by Velásquez (Kleiner 592, 662).

While Goya avoided neoclassical idealization in his depiction of "The Family of Charles IV", there seems to be little true basis for the assertion that the artist ridiculed the monarchy in portraying them naturalistically. Perhaps the desire to see Goya as a critical painter, especially given his later work, has clouded the true nature of the monarchical painting. Though Goya subtly demonstrated the fragility of the monarchy and the importance of the line of succession in the careful placement of each subject and in the uneasy nature of their gathering, he made no attempt to ridicule the family, depicting them as they were, even making adjustments to improve upon their actual features (as in the straightened back of Doña María Luisa). Furthermore, in his visual references to the work of an earlier court painter, Diego Velásquez, and in the exquisite detail of his own work, Goya celebrates not only the art of painting, but also the professional painter. Thus, though Goya's work is void of a harsh social criticism, the artist consciously included references to the state of the monarchy and to his own position in the court (artistic liberties which are still surprising given the strict nature of royal commissions).

WORKS CONSULTED
Austen’s Intertwining of the Personal and the Literary

SHIRLEY FIELD

By Jane Austen’s time, England was a place in which marriages based on love had been more or less encouraged for several centuries. However, despite this popular idea of romance, love was most definitely not the only factor in the selection of a spouse. Among the higher classes in particular, women had to keep in mind numerous financial and class qualifications before they could allow themselves to properly marry. These ideas played (or should have played) a large part in the thoughts and actions of the characters in Jane Austen's novel, *Pride and Prejudice*.

The financial standing of a potential spouse was of particular significance to the five Bennet daughters because of the entail of their father’s estate. Thanks to Mr. Bennet’s lack of a male heir, after his death his estate would be left to his nearest male relation, Mr. Collins and leave Mrs. Bennet and her daughters homeless and poor. Mrs. Bennet, despite being “a woman of mean understanding, little information, and uncertain temper” (Austen 7), was justifiably preoccupied with marrying off her daughters. Had they a brother, he at least would have retained the estate and would have been obligated to provide for his sisters, should they remain unmarried (a fate met by Jane Austen’s brother, Edward, who provided a home for his widowed mother and two unmarried sisters (Teachman 15) and one avoided with some relief by the brothers of Charlotte Lucas after her marriage to Mr. Collins (Austen 112). Therefore, a man’s economic status was of the utmost importance, so the reader is made aware of the finances of prospective husbands (and, of course, the Bennet family). The reader is well aware of the worth of not only the Bingleys and Darcys, whose incomes are bandied about with startling specificity, but of Wickham,
Mr. Collins, Colonel Fitzwilliam, and Colonel Forster. Being a silly woman, Mrs. Bennet is not particularly picky about the status of the man her daughter marries—something a more sensible woman would worry about. Her sister, Mrs. Gardiner, is an excellent example of such a sensible woman. Upon observing the affection between Elizabeth and Wickham, a man of great charm but of no particular worth, she warns her, do not involve yourself, or endeavour to involve him in an affection which the want of fortune would make so very imprudent. I have nothing to say against him; he is a most interesting young man; and if he had the fortune he ought to have, I should think you could not do better. But as it is—you must not let your fancy run away with you. You have sense, and we all expect you to use it” (128).

For people like Elizabeth and Wickham, marriage was not only a romantic endeavor, but a serious financial one as well. At this stage, both Elizabeth and Wickham retain their “sense” as Wickham breaks off the flirtation with Elizabeth, whose father would not be able to provide him with an adequate dowry, to pursue the rich heiress, Mary King, and Elizabeth accepts this development with good grace, well aware that “handsome young men must have something to live on, as well as the plain” (133). Again, economic and romantic concerns go hand in hand. Charlotte Lucas, Elizabeth’s close friend, provides the most extreme example of a woman sensible to her financial future.
Well aware of her limited marital options (unmarried at 27, she was
dangerously close to never marrying at all), she chooses to marry Mr.
Collins, who is, by Jane's account, "a conceited, pompous, narrow-minded,
silly man" (121). She explains herself logically to a dismayed Jane:
"I am not romantic, you know. I never was. I ask only a comfortable
home; and considering Mr. Collins's character, connections, and situation
in life, I am convinced that my chance of happiness with him is as fair
as most people can boast on entering the marriage state" (114-115).
Though she does not love her husband, she is adept at ignoring him and
pleased with his estate, so her ending is not a completely dreary one.

Still, the importance of financial and social security can be exag-
gerated. A woman was not necessarily expected to marry a man she
despised solely for the sake of security. Despite Mrs. Bennet's extreme
reaction to her daughter's rejection of Mr. Collins and Mr. Darcy's
angry shock at her rejection of his initial proposal, Elizabeth's actions
were considered acceptable, though startling and unusual. And Mr.
Bennet would not have shown such worry over her engagement to Mr.
Darcy had he not been concerned with his daughter's emotional well-
being. He certainly would not have asked her, "But will he make you
happy?" (319). Love is a factor in the selection of a spouse. But it must
not just be any kind of love—this must be mature, sensible love that can
endure. And in Pride and Prejudice, mature, sensible women don't fall in
love with men who can't support them. Lydia, the immature, silly daugh-
ter, does just that with Wickham. And it is this episode which shows just
how much a marriage could be like a business transaction in those
times, especially for a girl under 21 like Lydia who, not only cannot be
legally married without parental consent in England, thanks to the
Marriage Act of 1753 (Macfarlane 127), but, thanks to her poor
choice in men, had to be "settled" in order for him to marry her.
Settlements and dowries had long been a custom in England and nego-
tiations were known to occasionally drag out for interminable periods
of time as the spouses-to-be and their fathers haggled over the
amounts they would give to the happy couple. (Rise 75). However, with
Lydia, the negotiations went quickly since her family's reputation was at
stake and Mr. Darcy was helping them along. Despite her initial hap-
piness and passionate adoration of Wickham, Lydia, the senseless
daughter, does not have a happy ending. She winds up in a marriage
Field

devoid of love, without even the comfort of financial stability that was enjoyed by Mrs. Collins and kept her happy. It is the sensible girls of *Pride and Prejudice* who truly get their happy endings. Jane and Elizabeth are prudent and wait for promises of financial security as well as love. Jane does not flirt outrageously with officers of low worth like Lydia, and Elizabeth never seriously entertains thoughts of marrying one who could not provide for her. These girls receive their romantic, and most significantly, economic happiness.

In this way, Jane Austen’s *Pride and Prejudice* can be seen as an economically sensible fairy tale. The silly girl with no thoughts of her future receives her disappointing ending. The logical girl who marries a well-off dolt receives a somewhat satisfactory ending. But it is the patient, sensible girls who win their princes with large estates and incomes. *Pride and Prejudice* reminds us that marriage was not only about romance: it was an important financial decision as well.

---

**Works Consulted**


Eternity

Robyn Fialkow

Sat by the ivory window sill
Gazing into the black abyss
With nothing but the darkness
And the vast voids to fill.

Then as though 'twere Heaven's desire
Appeared a gift of brilliant shine
An offering delivered by the Divine—
Sapphire specks set afire.

Glinting and gleaming from above
Calling to Earth by their glow cast
Whispering stories of time past
Tales of squandered life and love.

What beauty in their beaming faces!
But lo, what still and silent sorrow
Fixed eternally with no tomorrow—
An infinite unfading stasis.

Sat by the ivory window sill
With nothing left to mourn but
Day's remnants ragged and torn
By Night's merciless chill.
“Y ou cannot go,” she said. I watched in silence as my moth- 
er abruptly turned away from me with the basket. Her 
face was veiled in black, as if she were in mourning. She 
hesitated at the threshold and turned to face me. Her eyes were filled 
with tears. The redness of her face, overwrought with emotion, con-
trasted absurdly with the dark emptiness of her attire and with that 
which was similarly filling her heart. It made me think of blood—of 
blood and babies. I could see the flowing blood of newborn babes, 
that blood of my own flesh pulsing beneath his living pink exterior. To 
consider the fragile sphere of new life which was nearing its obliteration 
by rampaging death brought tears to my eyes and I wept, bound 
to the ground upon which I stood. I could not remove my gaze (Music is 
heard: “Moonlight Sonata”).

“You cannot go,” she repeated and, with that, the door shut.

I stood motionless in front of the dimming fire. My shadow cast itself 
upon the door. What could I do? The wife of Manahath had seen my 
brother and had told of him. Her own son had been torn from her arms 
in the past day. When I paused to heed the silence, I could still hear 
echoes of her wails. Dust from the ground had crowned her brow as she 
stomped and sank to the earth, crying out in despair. She, of all the 
women, had seen. No other male child would live while hers did not. 
Where are you, O God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob? Can you 
not, creator of all small and great that breathe amongst the fields and 
marshes, stop Pharaoh from destroying your people? Have you no fear 
of man? What creator despises his creation so immensely that he 
watches in silence while his own perish (“River Lullaby”)?

No. I would not obey my mother. The hour was just before daybreak.
The very thought of sunshine about to burst upon this dark, endless night was detestable to me. I felt the air press heavily against my skin through the window. The darkness seeped into my pores. Even my shadow seemed to shift in the breeze that stirs; perhaps it was my eyes. I had remained awake since before sunrise the previous morning. The day had begun just as all others had. Chores seemed to have endured for longer than usual throughout the morning. At dusk, my mother emptied the breadbasket into a clean cloth and spread bitumen and pitch along the outside of the papyrus. No one had spoken of what she was about to do. And yet all knew that something terrible was to happen. The hour of deliverance but, most likely, the hour of death, had already come, sucked away hope and replaced it with despair. All the hours of the day and night had merged into one—all except for the hour in which the baby was to depart from us forever. He was gone. But I would follow (“Deliver Us”).

I, too, fear God. Yet I love my brother. If we are all to pass from this earth on some day, is it sin to disobey Pharaoh, to interfere with God’s master plan? But what if it is in God’s plan for me to somehow bring back my baby brother? What would I do if I find him among the reeds in the darkness, wailing in fear and trembling? I did not know. All I knew was that I have heard the cries of my kin and they afflicted my being with a pain not unlike that of the sores of the flesh (“Deliver Us”).

I gathered my cloak around me and covered my face. A prayer and song for the dead passed through my mind. I instinctively reached up to cover my ears, to block out the terrible noise. In the instant when my body met my shadow at the door, silence fell. I was alone. Or perhaps I was not? Would God come with his daughter? I uttered a prayer to the Lord. I could feel nothing. No angel had descended from the skies to come to my aid. The first flicker of light shined through the window. I started in surprise; I pulled the door open sharply (“Through Heaven’s Eyes”).

As I stepped outside, I noticed that the air had changed. My feet quickly became coated with dew. I treaded the ground lightly. Greenery blurred around me in the dim light. Foliage crinkled and soon I found myself running as I neared the reeds by the river. At the bank, I struggled to see the tiny boat of my baby brother. My heart pounded like a dozen chariots as I realized that I could never find him like
ElShourbagy

this. How was one to discern the black of his basket from the black of the Nile? He could be far down the river by now—or caught in a tangle of brush. I needed to move somewhere—but I did not know where. I had to find him before someone comes. I glanced around frantically and searched for cover. I heard the sound of bells faintly in the distance. Women. Laughter. I froze (“All I ever Wanted”).

The Pharaoh’s daughter had come to wash with her attendants! Unable to move, rooted in place, I watched as she—brown and glorious, but dressed in a simple white robe—stepped into the water. A breeze stirred the foliage, carrying the scent of fragrant oil to me. I paused and closed my eyelids for a moment, savoring the air that had just stifled me. I must have fallen asleep for a moment, for when I opened my eyes, Pharaoh’s daughter seemed to have finished washing and was now combing her long, dark and shiny hair—like a sheet of fine stone—while singing a beautiful melody. Suddenly, her voice ceased. I followed her gaze. Could it be? She had seen something. Still holding her comb, she quietly crept towards the source of her interest. Was I imagining a baby’s wail bursting forth? Pharaoh’s daughter bent at the waist and peered beneath the leaves close to the banks of the river. She had heard it cry out too! I moved closer, still covered by the dimness of the early morning sky. She looked up, as if to question the Gods about the reason for this strange presence at her feet. Her attendants were resting away from the water. Pharaoh’s daughter hesitated, as if about to call them but then changed her mind and reached towards a dark, wet mass, bringing it towards her cautiously (“Red Sea”).

Pharaoh’s daughter unwrapped the baby. Then understanding washed over her. It was a Hebrew child. I could not read the expression on her face. Would she put him back in the water? Would she throw him out of the basket—fling him into the water as her father had decreed (“Goodbye Brother”)?

I could not believe my eyes. She covered him and rocked him gently. Her attendants gathered beside her and admired the boy. One said, “What beautiful brown skin!” Another wondered why someone would place such a fine Egyptian child in the water.

“Will you keep him?” a third attendant asked. Pharaoh’s daughter seemed entranced by this baby. I moved closer—I wanted to hear what
she would say or do.

“Yes,” she answered.

My eyes were fixed on Pharaoh’s daughter’s profile. I stumbled and fell and cried out. The women turned. My heart thundered within me I removed my cloak. Silence fell upon us. I lowered my eyes. Then I raised them to meet Pharaoh’s daughter’s gaze. The moment seemed to last forever. Her eyes were deep brown.

“Are you hurt?” she finally said. I shook my head. “Then go and wash,” she said, her gaze never leaving my face. Somehow, though we never mentioned the baby, I believe she knew that I was there because of it. I washed my cloak, which had become filthy from the run to the river. As I turned to leave, a genderless voice called out to me.

“Miriam!” I turned to look behind me, where the Pharaoh’s daughter was. None of her attendants were facing me. “Miriam!” The voice called most insistently this time and I stopped with my back to the river, “Ask of Pharaoh’s daughter if you may call a nurse for the child.” A rush of images flew before my eyes and settled on the image of my mother looking at me so intently before she left with my brother.

“Daughter of Pharaoh, shall I go and call a nurse from the Hebrew women for you that she may nurse the child for you?” I spoke quietly.

“Go forth,” she whispered (“All I Ever Wanted,” then “Humanity”).

So I ran home. My mother was kneading dough but she left immediately once I had told her what happened. She wept and ran after me, to the river (“The Burning Bush”).

Home. My brother—he was coming home. As Pharaoh’s daughter had heard that miniscule wail, cry for help, so too had God heard the prayer of his daughter. Nachitah v’chasd’cha am zu gaalta. “In your love, You lead the people You redeemed” (“When you Believe”). ✪
Our Ingenious Hidalgo

ALEX RAIKE

IMAGINE v. 1: To form a mental image of, to represent to oneself in imagination, to picture to oneself (something not present to the senses). 6: To form an idea or notion with regard to something not known with certainty; to think, suppose, fancy, 'take into one's head'; often implying a vague notion not founded on exact observation or reasoning. (Oxford English Dictionary)

Cervantes' creation of Don Quixote can be seen as a form of criticism connected with yet distinct from the conventions of knight-errantry literature. The term "burlesque," while partially approached by the presence of humor within the text, does not apply directly to Cervantes' novel when measured against previous accounts of chivalry. The text is primarily concerned with Don Quixote's activities which, while dependent upon the influence of other works of knight-errantry, are wholly devoid of the general tendencies of the characters found in the tales upon which Cervantes draws. The stories in the text come from Quixote's re-enactment of episodes within such novels: Cervantes does not pretend that our ingenious hidalgo is actually a legitimate participant in such behaviour, rather Quixote's "knight-errantry" takes place only within his own mind. Since the original books of chivalry do not feature characters who imitate other books, it is impossible to categorize Don Quixote as a true burlesque, insofar as the narrative style and primary themes deal with characters and situations in an innovative creative framework that has no precedent.

The mindset of the reader, when undertaking any work of fiction, is used to receiving characters whose self-conception corresponds to
reality. Specific to the case in point, the knights of Arthurian legend possess an accurate understanding of both their particular situation and the role that they play in relation to this. By contrast, the gentleman from La Mancha is an individual (Alonso Quixano) who imagines himself to be an alternative fictitious character (that of Don Quixote), distinct and separate from his real identity. Where the activities of true knights are accepted as legitimate from the account that is provided by their respective authors, Quixote’s follies are of an entirely different nature: he is caught between a supposed “real” world (as preserved by Sancho Panza’s as well as the speaker’s own commentary), and his own world of imagination, which has been taken from chivalric stories of the past. In this respect, Don Quixote is an entirely unique endeavor, combining elements of particular scenes from books of knight-errantry only when they occur inside the mind of the protagonist.

Cervantes is able to effectively and seamlessly preserve this conceptual duality by painting the original “author” of the story as an historian of sorts. “That Cide Mahamate Benengeli was a careful and meticulous historian, something that’s obvious enough for he refused to pass in silence over the happenings related so far” (125). As Greenberg observes in The New Criterion, Don Quixote is a “book about books” (NB: not a “book about chivalry”); it is through the portrayal of a protagonist driven mad by the reading of fiction that Cervantes is separates the actual and the imaginary. The recurring conflict between Quixote’s reality and the real world is at the core of the text’s allure. This convention, upon which the effectiveness of the narrative hinges, is successful only insofar as these equally fictitious realms are kept separate and distinct in the mind of the reader. Early on in Part I, Cervantes describes the procession of the two friars from St. Benedict with their coach carrying a Basque lady to Seville. This event is interpreted by Don Quixote as follows:

Either I am much mistaken or this will be the most famous adventure ever witnessed; for those black figures over there must be and no doubt are enchanters abducting a princess in that coach.

(67)

To no avail, Sancho attempts to restore his master to his senses. “This’ll
be worse than the windmills . . . look here, sir, those there are Benedictine friars, and the coach must just be taking some travelers on their way" (67). As Sancho confirms the narrator’s account, the reader is provided with insight into the nature of Quixote’s perspective. Without further hesitation, our ingenious hidalgo “rode forward . . . and, when he thought they were near enough to hear him, he cried: ‘Diabolical and monstrous wretches, release this very moment the noble princesses . . . or prepare to be killed” (67). The reader enters into Don Quixote’s imagination, even if he or she knows perfectly well that it captures a false recognition that does not agree with the external reality of the situation.

As Don Quixote remains a real character within the imagination of the reader and a fictitious character in his own mind, the character that Cervantes describes remains conceptually on par with the protagonists of preceding chivalric stories. Only Quixote’s imaginings cause the reader to simultaneously entertain the fact that our ingenious hidalgo believes himself to be once further removed from his true identity. It is in this respect that Don Quixote’s character is presented as a spectacle necessarily both real and fictitious. When Quixote travels to the inn that, unfortunately for him, he mistakes for a castle, the reader must view the inherent absurdity, much in the same way that Sancho does, while imagining Quixote’s perspective at the same time. The reader also recognizes that the subsequent behavior of our ingenious hidalgo corresponds to precisely what he is imagining at every given instance. It is in this way that Quixote stands on his own as a unique character—separate from those knights-errant of Cervantes’ epoch, while, in his own mind, often stumbling into a twice removed world of fiction. As a point of reference, any comparison between Odysseus and Aeneas would rest upon the similarities and differences of each character as presented by Homer and Virgil respectively. The conclusions drawn from such a treatment would illustrate important distinctions between the two, but on the whole would find many points of association between each epic hero. The character of Don Quixote, on the other hand, is similar to knights-errant only insofar as his actual behavior (that which both Sancho and the reader can clearly see) remains comparable. Since the typical adventures of our ingenious hidalgo find Don Quixote fundamentally mistaken as to the reality of his surroundings, a
comparison of this type is impossible based on the character that the reader is presented with (e.g. Quixote's "helmet" is merely the wash basin of a barber). It would be a mistake to group Don Quixote's attempted adventures as worthy of the category of "knight-errantry." The only instances of "true" chivalry occur within Don Quixote's own imagination: a characteristic wholly absent from the stories that Cervantes is drawing upon.

Within the context of Don Quixote, the protagonist attempts to re-create the tales he has previously read, such stories are consequently subjected to the constraints of a physical reality that is external to his own imagination. Oddly enough, Quixote's re-creation is brought about by the same mechanism by which Cervantes, in turn, is creating him. The reader, if only subconsciously, feels solace in Don Quixote. As one observes the events within the story, the reader simultaneously imagines and re-creates the exact scene that Don Quixote himself is in the process of imagining and re-creating. In other words, the reader imagines Don Quixote (who has been supposedly imagined by Cide Hamete (who has likely been imagined by Cervantes) imagining a situation which Quixote remembers from a story that has been imagined by another author (probably by Cervantes himself). Furthermore, the imagined instances of Quixote's folly depend on a world of "reality" that is also imagined by Cervantes, employed as a means of limiting the imagination of Quixote and bringing him back into the aforesaid imagined reality. While the distinctions between all of these levels of imagination remain clearly divided in the mind of the reader, this lengthy chain of imagination raises a fundamental question as to the general conception of "truth" within this text: Are the objects in question windmills or giants? Cervantes makes it clear that the supposed giants that Quixote attacks are no more than windmills, yet both windmills and giants exist in separate fictitious worlds and depend on the same unitary capacity of imagination within the reader to be realized. In fact, the conflict between Sancho Panza's realistic comprehension of windmills and Quixote's interpretation of them as giants can only be mediated by Cervantes, who is imagining the entire scene: the characters, the windmills/giants, and the series of events that transpires. While the reader necessarily accepts Cervantes' account throughout the novel, it remains inextricably linked with Don Quixote's alternative
interpretation and the effect that this has on the imagination of the reader.

Cervantes manages to resolve the two separate realms of fiction through the recurring tendency of Sancho to play along with Quixote's madness in conjunction with Quixote's acknowledgement of the external reality of the situation at hand (usually by making excuses for his behavior when it is necessary to save face). Upon Don Quixote's initial apprehension of a dust cloud, Sancho kindly directs his attention to a second "army" consisting of sheep, as interpreted by his master. After sustaining a relatively minor wound from a pebble thrown during an encounter with a shepherd, Don Quixote is addressed by Sancho: "Didn't I tell you, Don Quixote sir, to turn back, because what you were attacking wasn't armies, it was flocks of sheep?" (143). Seeing that he and Sancho are once again by themselves and without a pending adventure, our ingenious hidalgo quickly explains how "this just shows how my enemy, that scoundrel of an enchanter, can transform things and make them disappear . . . this villain who is persecuting me, envious of the glory he saw I was about to conquer in this battle, turned the armies of enemy forces into flocks of sheep" (143). This is one of the many examples of apparent reconciliation between knight and squire through Quixote's concession of his fantasies and Panza's appeasement of his master by humoring many of his ill-advised "adventures." Cervantes' ability to distance the narrator from the world of knight-errantry allows Quixote to retain full responsibility for the figments of his own imagination: a quality that is found nowhere in preceding novels of chivalry. In turn, Cervantes is credited with the world in which Quixote exists while our ingenious hidalgo remains the sole proprietor of his fantastic habits of mock chivalry.

Like Don Quixote and Sancho Panza, the reader willingly gives his or herself over to the fiction of this story through differing degrees of imagination. The reader is constantly caught with one foot in reality and one in fiction, depending upon Don Quixote's understanding of the world as provided by Cervantes. It is in this respect that the text has abandoned the chivalry found in knight-errantry to illustrate a different form of heroism: the human imagination. As long as books and the human capacity to imagine exists, Don Quixote will continue to speak to the soul of the reader until the quill of man is forever silenced.
Through this text, the reader is reminded of the ultimate power of fiction in regards to one’s conception and understanding of the world, and that whenever one picks up a book, like Rocinante, it will take them in whichever direction it pleases.

**WORKS CONSULTED**


Stigmatization & Isolation
AIDS Infection in Minority Communities

SARA HANSHAW

Glen Loury’s *The Anatomy of Racial Inequality* and Elijah Anderson’s *Code of the Street* both focus on factors that may explain the disparities between minority and white populations. These explanations prove extremely significant in the rise of minorities affected with the HIV/AIDS virus. No evidence suggests that being a member of a minority racial group increases the likelihood of becoming infected; therefore, these data indicate an underlying social inequality. Racial stigmatization and the social isolation accompanying this stigma exacerbate the effects of infection, especially among African-Americans. These two factors, examined by Loury and Anderson, are closely related to many risk factors: poverty, low education, drug use, and most importantly, limited access to health care.

Although initially thought of as the gay, white man’s disease, HIV/AIDS infection is becoming increasingly prevalent among minority populations. Accounting for roughly 12% of the United States population in 2003, African-Americans represented 49% of the estimated AIDS diagnoses, a rate ten times higher than for whites and three times higher than for Hispanics. Because females come into contact with health care earlier and more regularly, this rate is much more apparent in this cohort. From 2000-2003, rates for black females were 19 times those of whites and five times those of Hispanics. For males, black rates were seven times higher than those for whites and three times than for Hispanics (HIV/AIDS among African-Americans). Alarmingly, 64% of blacks say that they personally know somebody living with or who has died from HIV or AIDS, compared to 42% of whites (Survey of Americans on HIV/AIDS). With disparities as large as these, blacks are definitely more likely to be infected with the disease. A closer look,
however, reveals other factors that more often affect minorities and leave them at greater risk for infection.

Poverty has become one of the leading risk factors for HIV/AIDS contraction, and relative to the population, more minorities find themselves living in poverty. Because one in four African-Americans lives below the poverty line, the association between low income and HIV/AIDS infection has become extremely relevant (Survey of Americans on HIV/AIDS). The virus hits most strongly in the highly populated inner cities or urban areas, in which many minorities live. From the CDC’s AIDS Surveillance Branch, Paul Denning responds to this factor by saying, “Because the virus is very prevalent in these communities, the chances or odds that a person’s sexual partner may be infected with HIV are increased” (Greeley). Anderson discusses the negative power of living in the inner city, more often than not in poverty: “The hard reality of the world of the street can be traced to the profound sense of alienation from mainstream society and its institutions felt by many poor inner-city black people, particularly the young” (Anderson 34). Often times when unemployed or on government supplemental programs, people find themselves unaware, unable, or simply unwilling to deal with the dangers they face in their environment.

In addition, 28% of adults infected with the virus have children, and cannot afford health care in addition to the costs of child-rearing. This is a significant problem as 67% of HIV infected parents participate in one or more government supplemental programs (Researchers Examine Access). Although people living in poverty rely on Medicaid for health care, it does not cover support services for chronic illnesses, like AIDS, or for long term care, which leaves infected people to seek care from expensive private sector care providers (Schoff and Schore). Anderson argues that this fact leaves socially isolated minorities without sufficient HIV/AIDS care. A major concern then becomes,

what it means to manage the care of people whose lives are so chaotic that health care is not their primary concern, even though they are very ill (Schoff and Schore).

Not only does poverty leave people more at risk for infection, it also leaves them without many options for care. When just getting by is a
difficult task, getting by after being infected with HIV/AIDS is almost impossible.

Another prominent risk factor of HIV/AIDS is low educational levels, which are also more apparent among minority populations. In one study, John F. Aruffo surveyed various groups about their knowledge of HIV/AIDS, using “yes,” “no,” or “don’t know” options. He found that whites scored the highest, with an average of 78% correct answers. Blacks, however, scored an average of 68% correct, and Hispanics were even lower, scoring an average of 61% correct. The Sheffe range analysis revealed a significant difference between white and black HIV/AIDS knowledge and between black and Hispanic knowledge (Aruffo). One major factor contributing to the lack of understanding in the Hispanic population is the language barrier, because many schools do not offer sexual education classes in languages other than English (Greeley). Anderson suggests that the school system itself is as hurt by its inability to provide an effective education against the negative influence of street life, as the students who suffer for the lack of that education:

Education is thus undermined because the mission of the school cannot equal the mission of the kids. To accept the school would be to give in and act white, to give up the value of the street for some other thing. And the value of that has not been sufficiently explained to the children to make them want to give up the ways of the street and take on the ideology of the school (97).

The fact of differential dropout rates for different races or ethnicities supports Anderson’s argument. Although the gap has decreased, both blacks and Hispanics are more likely to drop out of school than whites, leaving them even more isolated from the system and its points of access for health care assistance. Furthermore, this gap drastically increases when examining the rates for low-income dropouts, which are higher among all races and ethnicities. Because minorities are more likely to be in low-income situations, they also make up a larger relative percent of dropouts. While the total dropout rate for all populations was 22.1%, whites represented 13.9%, blacks 21.0%, and Hispanics 42.4% (ref: Drug Use among Racial/Ethnic Minorities).
Anderson also presents negative aspects for those who remain within the school system:

> With each passing year the school loses ground as more and more students adopt a street orientation . . . often what is out on the streets is brought into the classrooms (Anderson 94).

Therefore, youth minorities, especially those in low-income neighborhoods, are more likely to be misinformed or under-informed about many issues, including HIV/AIDS transmission, care for the disease, or even the overall dangers presented by their environment.

Although African-Americans do not use illegal drugs more often than whites, they are still more likely to obtain HIV/AIDS from intravenous drug use (IDU). Helen Fox, senior policy analyst of the National Minority AIDS Council, says that early statistics of HIV/AIDS in minority communities are misleading because people just assumed that it was a gay, white man's disease and did not even think about the risk. Therefore, early statistics are most likely higher than studies indicate. She says,

> There was no understanding of the disease or of the relationship of injecting drugs and the transmissions of the virus (Greeley).

This could explain why IDU is the second leading cause of HIV infection for African-American women and the third for African-American men (ref: HIV/AIDS among African-Americans).

Even though they do not use drugs more often, the attitudes that blacks have toward drugs and drug use are much different than those of whites. In a survey from 1999, 74% of black youths say that they associate marijuana with great danger, in contrast to 84% of white youths. Also, fewer black teens (75%) and parents (82%) saw a danger with cocaine/crack than white teens (85%) and parents (92%). Only 45% of youth blacks saw a danger with heroin, while 58% of white youths saw a danger with the same drug (ref: Drug Use among Racial/Ethnic Minorities). Once minority communities obtain less negative attitudes toward dangerous behaviors, it becomes extremely difficult for them to see how this danger affects them. According to Loury,
this is because African-Americans are stigmatized by the rest of the population and are no longer able to see better situations:

Black ghetto dwellers are a people apart, ridiculed for their cultural styles, isolated socially, experiencing an internalized sense of despair, with limited access to communal networks of mutual assistance (Loury 77).

Because of this stigma and isolation, the lack of assistance leaves minority communities to grow worse instead of better. Because attitudes are less negative towards drugs, the prevalence of drugs in these neighborhoods increases. The same survey showed that 28% of black parents thought that cocaine/crack was easily attainable for their children, where only 16% of white parents agreed. Also, in 2000, 27% of black teens thought that it was acceptable to sell drugs for money, while 17% of whites said it was acceptable (ref: Drug Use among Racial/Ethnic Minorities).

Compounding the direct risk of infection through IDU, the use of any intoxicant, including alcohol, increases the likelihood of engaging in risky behaviors while under the influence. Having sex without using a condom and having multiple partners in a period of three months are indicated as high risk behaviors (ref: Drug Use among Racial/Ethnic Minorities). A study of HIV-infected women shows that drug use also influences medical care. Drug users among the women were less likely than nonusers to take their antiretroviral medicines as prescribed, which greatly affects its potency (HIV/AIDS among African-Americans).

One of the most significant factors contributing to the disparity between minority and non-minority HIV/AIDS infections is due to the limited access of minorities to health care. As discussed above, more minorities are under the poverty line, which immediately reduces their access to health care services. Many inner city minorities do not routinely visit available medical care providers, which also reduces their chances of discovering HIV/AIDS infections (Greeley). Because there are often no distinct unique symptoms, people frequently confuse HIV/AIDS infection with the flu, and are not concerned enough to seek medical care (Emerging and Re-Emerging Infectious Diseases). Although more advanced antiretroviral therapy has decreased HIV/AIDS mor-
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tality rates in the United States overall, the reduction in mortality for minority groups has been less sharp than for whites. From 1998 to 1999, the rates for whites fell by 15% but only 3% for blacks. Both delayed medical care and limited access to quality care are cited for this difference in mortality rates (Swindells et al.).

The consequences of a disconnect from organized health service go beyond the deficit in diagnosis. The financial burden and logistical complexity of treatment is an added obstacle to effective care that is especially problematic for poor minorities. In the United States, the common treatment is an extremely expensive “cocktail” of medications—approximately $15,000 per patient, per year—administered according to a regime that is difficult to follow perfectly. With a minimum of eight pills daily, some to be taken with food and some to be taken on an empty stomach, people with hectic or non-routine schedules find it difficult to abide by the strict rules of the medication. In addition, the treatment often leads to side effects, such as nausea, diarrhea, rashes, higher cholesterol levels, and headaches. Side effects place a heavy burden on inner city workers, who depend on their jobs, and cannot miss work due to side effects of their medication without the risk of getting fired. However, as soon as the strict regimen is stopped, the virus immediately returns to its original danger level. Even missing single doses can lead to an incomplete suppression of the virus. In these lapses, a new strain can arise, resistant to current drugs. These resistant breeds will multiply extremely quickly since the medication is stifling the other types of virus, thus eliminating the viral competition. Despite the high cost and degree of sophistication, this cocktail is not an overwhelmingly successful treatment; the average time to death after diagnosis is only ten years in the United States. Without treatment, the average time to death is two years (Emerging and Re-Emerging Infectious Diseases).

Other studies show other disparities in health care treatment between minority populations and white populations. The introduction of highly-active antiretroviral therapy (HAART), was a huge advance in HIV/AIDS treatment. It has improved both the function of the immune system and survival rates for HIV patients. HAART also reduces costs for care because patients spend more time in outpatient care than in normal hospital visits. One study showed that mean cost per month in
outpatient care was $168, while in hospital care was $423. When HAART first became available, a smaller amount of people insured with State Medicaid programs or uninsured people were provided with the drug (ref: Researchers Examine Use). Early access to the drug was initially based on level of need, as in HIV/AIDS patients with the lowest CD4 counts. However,

after adjusting for need, female IDUs were 41% less likely to have early access to HAART than homosexual males, and patients with less than a high school education were half as likely to receive HAART as those who had completed college or graduate education . . . blacks were much less likely to have early access to HAART than whites (Researchers Examine Access).

This gap, though, has narrowed in more recent years (ref: Researchers Examine Use).

Along with the introduction of HAART, many experimental drugs show the same disproportional access between some groups. Both black and Hispanic HIV patients are only half as likely as non-Hispanic whites to attempt to participate in new medication trials. This reflects the lack of awareness in many minority communities of these clinical trials (ref: Black and Hispanic HIV Patients), or the lack of an effort by the research community to make these trials accessible to minority participants. One study showed that patients from minority communities exhibited more advanced stages of the disease when diagnosed. Once these patients entered care, increases in CD4 T counts and a reduction in viral loads did not differ based on minority status. This study suggests that if equally provided for, HIV/AIDS patients would not vary so extensively from race/ethnicity (Swindells et al.). This study supports Loury’s argument that people must move away from the belief that “the essential nature of the race-marked subjects precludes development” (Loury 163).

One of the most alarming aspects of health care disparity is the fact that youth populations are so negatively affected. HIV/AIDS health care for youth minority populations is important because a substantial amount of those infected with the virus are minorities. In 2003, of the 59 children younger than 13 years old diagnosed with the virus, 40 of
them were African-American. Of the 90 infants diagnosed, 62 were black (HIV/AIDS among African-Americans). Statistics also show that from the ages of 13-19, blacks and Hispanics together make up 62.3% of HIV/AIDS infected males and 83.5% of infected females. Relative to population, this number is extremely large ("HIV/AIDS and Adolescents").

The strength of younger immune systems often reduces or completely eliminates detectable symptoms of the virus. Because of this, many people are diagnosed with HIV/AIDS in their twenties, even though they contract the disease as adolescents. This most likely is connected to the fact that many minority children are not educated enough about the dangers of the problem and how to avoid them. Among sexually active young people who have not been tested for the virus, about half of them do not consider themselves at risk for infection. The fact that they do not see themselves in danger is demonstrated in a national youth survey that found that one-third of sexually active adolescents and two-thirds of young adults had sex without a condom at least once. In addition, less than half of the respondents knew “for sure” where they could go to get an HIV/AIDS test ("HIV/AIDS and Adolescents").

Even of those who know for sure that they are infected, many do not enroll in care. While a total of one-fourth of HIV infections occur in people under the age of 21, it is predicted that only 11% receive sufficient health care. One of the major causes of this alarming percentage is the fact that one in seven youth live in poverty. This number is higher for minorities at one in two. In addition to the lack of health care coverage in many instances, many adolescents, just like adults, are afraid of the stigma attached to being infected with HIV/AIDS. Embarrassment and shame are both linked to ignoring the virus in its early stages, when medication is most effective on the strong immune system of adolescents ("HIV/AIDS and Adolescents"). Since minority youths find themselves alienated from the health care system, they are not able to respond with trust to future efforts by that system to assist them. Their distrust reinforces alienation in the next generation. In this way, a cycle of inadequate care is developed.

The differences among health care between minorities and whites must have underlying causes because even individuals of similar insurance and income display disparities in care. Even though there have
been efforts to increase the amount of health providers to minority communities, they are still more likely to report little or no choice in where they go for care: 28% of Hispanics, 22% of blacks, and 15% of whites. The eradication of these disparities is "challenging in part because their causes are intertwined with a contentious history of race relations" (Health Care & 2004 Elections). Loury suggests that underlying problems of race relations will never disappear if people refuse to look at the problem as one of the entire society:

Entrenched racial disparity in developmental opportunities is an intractable, often neglected moral problem—one that gives rise to unavoidable conflicts between cherished values and challenges settled institutions about social justice (Loury 94-5).

Many people do not even acknowledge a treatment gap, let alone recognize the underlying social causes; 67% of whites and even 69% of physicians believe that blacks receive the same quality of care as whites, regardless of their race/ethnicity (Loury 94-5).

Acknowledging the problem is the first step to equality in health care, which if brought about would drastically reduce the amount of HIV/AIDS infection in minority communities. Cherylene Showell, the executive director of the Intergrroup Minority Project, AIDS Consortium and Trust, addresses this issue when she says,

In most public health practices, once you know that there is something dangerous, you let the community know. And they can take whatever measures they need to protect themselves. But with HIV people don't treat it like the flu, because it is tied to all these 'isms.'

For this reason, "HIV becomes invisible with devastating results" (Greeley).

A parallel can be drawn in the involvement of the U.S. in the AIDS crisis domestically and globally, which both point to stigmatization of black populations. The United States was unwilling to provide sufficient aid for African nations that hold the largest burden of the AIDS pandemic. Some argue that throughout the 1990s, the U.S. was merely
tired of providing foreign aid. Also, HIV/AIDS was still a crisis domest-
ically, which seemed more important. However, “through the 1990s, if
global AIDS had a face, it was an African one. The distinction would
have an enormous bearing on the U.S. response” (Behrman 65). Be-
hrman admits that there is no evidence to believe legislation has
been struck down for lack of support for black Africans with AIDS, he
argues that the fact that the majority of global AIDS cases are in
Africa did weigh heavily on the United States’ willingness to act
(Behrman 67). Furthermore, Patsy Fleming, federal AIDS Czar in 1994,
said,

At the beginning of the epidemic in the former Soviet Union
countries, I thought, well, maybe now they’ll pay attention to it,
they are white people (Behrman 68).

Domestically, this pattern can also be seen, but in reverse order.
Because by the mid-1990s AIDS rates had begun to decrease, many
people wanted to move on from the issue (Ibid. 74). In the early 1980s,
most of the reported AIDS cases were white, and it is these cases that
began to wane by the mid-1990s. However, by 1996, there were more
African-American cases than any other racial group (ref: MMWR).
When AIDS started to become a “black problem,” the country’s con-
cern declined in hopes to move on. Here again, Loury’s theory of “us
versus them” is very important:

By failing to consider how our policies, in conjunction with racial-
ly influenced patterns of social interaction, may be generating
an unfair outcome, we act in effect as though the problem here
lies with THEM and not—as is, in fact, the case—with ALL OF US
(82).

It is reasonable to conclude that an underlying social factor has pro-
duced the disparities between African-Americans and whites. It is true
that being black does not lead to a higher risk of being infected with
the HIV/AIDS virus. Nonetheless, blacks are more often inflicted with
poverty, low education levels, drug use, and limited access to health
care, which do lead to higher risks of being infected. Loury and
Anderson both agree that these differences have root causes in the institution of slavery, which created a distinct separation between blacks and whites. This “social otherness” of African-Americans persists even after the Civil Rights Movement of the 1960s. Loury explains,

both formal and informal social relations mediate the provision of nearly all the resources necessary for human development (99).

Though the U.S. has passed legislation attempting to provide equal opportunity and better conditions for black populations, it appears legislation is not enough. While 61% of African-Americans say that there is a lot of discrimination against people with AIDS, and only 42% of whites think so, it is clear that there is still work to be done (ref: Survey of Americans on HIV/AIDS). This discrimination difference is most likely associated with what Loury calls “entrenched racial disparity.” It is apparent that the stigmatization and social otherness of blacks is transferred to many aspects of life, even the contraction of a deadly disease. However, only with the elimination of stigma and social isolation will blacks be fully able to benefit from all the institutions protecting people from the HIV/AIDS virus.
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The Epic of Steevi Sweet

Joseph Sacchi

Steevi Sweet, part-rocker, part-god, returned
To his dressing room after rocking out,

After defeating easy listening
With blistering riffs and bad-ass solos.

He discarded his rocking leather pants,
And washed his hair, his long flowing locks.

He put on a silk gown of pomp and show
and cleaned his guitar, a wicked machine.

Then there arrived a beautiful siren,
Cindi Trixx, the legendary groupie.

"I have laid with many a rock star god:
Hendrix, Morrison, Garcia, and more.

Now, though, I desire your company.
None in the world can compete with your skill."

Yet Steevi knew the tales of misfortune
That befell the men whom Cindi had known.
“I admire your long list of lovers past  
But I have heard the tales of their downfall.  

You deplete the strength of rockers supreme  
Until they can no longer rock and roll.  

Your fading libido cannot be used  
To lure part-rocker, part-god into bed.”  

Cindi could not believe what she had heard.  
An upstart insulting her charm and grace?  

She cursed Steevi Sweet, part-rocker, part-god,  
And smashed his true love, his rocking guitar.  

Steevi then wept for seven days and nights.  
His guitar, his life, lay broken in pieces.  

Steevi Sweet was no longer a rocker,  
And Steevi Sweet was no longer a god.
And on that day a messenger came to the wife of Job and he said, “Your husband and my lord has died. His serving girls mourn for him and wait for your word to proceed with him to the burial shroud. Come, let us not mourn. Instead, let us celebrate his life, for he was old and full of days.” And the wife of Job did hear the wisdom in the servant’s words but could not heed them. Instead she arose, tore her robe, threw dust in the air above her head and fell on the ground and worshipped. She said, “Naked I came from my mother’s womb and naked I shall return there; the LORD gave, and the LORD has taken away. Blessed be the name of the LORD.”

In all this the wife of Job did not sin or charge God with wrongdoing in her words, although her complaint was bitter.

Now Job’s widow wished to see her husband’s three friends, Eliphaz the Temanite, Bildad the Shuhite, and Zophar the Naamathite, for she knew that they had come upon her husband when they heard of his troubles. But so many years had passed since they had incurred the wrath of the Lord when they did speak wrong of Him to Job that the widow no longer knew whether the three friends still lived on the LORD’s earth. But her hope was rekindled when she remembered Elihu, son of Barachel the Buzite, who was so young in years when God plagued the body and wealth of Job. So she sent for her most trusted servant and said, “Go forth and find me Elihu—be he at any corner of the earth, find him and bid him tell you if Eliphaz the Temanite, Bildad the Shuhite or Zophar the Naamathite are still living and bid him tell you where to find them. Here is a gift of gold and incense to offer him. Once you have learned of these three wise men, go to them if they be
alive and bid them come to the widow of Job, whose suffering is great. Take with you three pieces of money and gold rings to offer each of them in turn." After she had bid her servant go, the wife of Job returned to her chamber to mourn.

Then one of her serving woman did question her. She asked of her mistress, "Why do you seek these three men who so angered our God? Surely these are not the people you want to comfort you in this hour of need."

The wife of Job answered her servant, "Although they did anger me when they condemned my husband and spoke wrong of the Lord, I remember that I too erred in begging my husband to curse God and die. I feel that, together, these friends of my husband and I can come to celebrate the life of Job my husband, who was blameless in the eyes of the LORD."

_Elihu Receives the Servant_

When Elihu, son of Barachel the Buzite, received the servant and heard of his mistress' misfortune, he was loath to help her, knowing of her only her answer for the trials of her husband. "Did not she say to her husband 'Curse God and die'? Surely such a woman is not deserving of comfort from our Lord or from me. What could such a woman desire from me?"

And the servant of Job was afraid, for he could see that Elihu son of Barachel was a man of God and had much wealth and was now one of the greatest men in the east, but he was also driven to defend his mistress, to whom he had always been loyal.

Then the servant said, "The wife of Job, the man whom you counseled in his hour of need, has much need for comfort now. I know that the friends of Job could offer some pieces of wisdom that she, in her state of mourning, cannot see. Although God did repay the losses she and her husband suffered twofold, my mistress has always mourned the loss of her children. The separation of a mother from her children, surely, is a trial too great to forget. And now her husband, my lord, has died and she is alone in the world." And Elihu son of Barachel the Buzite saw the wisdom in the servant's word and then said, "I know that what you say is true. My God is a compassionate God and does care for the
unfortunate and so too did Job when he was alive. Job surely was blameless and upright, one who feared God and turned away from evil. Bildad the Shuhite and Zophar the Naamathite have both died. The only one of the three friends of Job who still lives on the LORD’s earth Eliphaz the Temanite.”

Then the servant went to the home of Eliphaz the Temanite and presented him with the piece of money and the ring of gold and bid him come and comfort the widow of Job whose suffering was great. Eliphaz the Temanite was loathe to help her, knowing only her answer for the trials of her husband. He said, “Did not she say to her husband, ‘Curse God and die?’ Surely such a woman is not deserving of comfort from the Lord or from me. What could such a woman desire from me?”

And the servant of Job was afraid for though Eliphaz the Temanite was not as great a man as Elihu, he was still much respected and thought to be a man of God but he was also driven to defend his mistress, to whom he had always been loyal.

Then the servant said, “The wife of Job, the man whom you counseled in his hour of need, has much need for comfort now. Go to her— I know that you could offer some pieces of wisdom that she, in her state of mourning, cannot see. Although God did repay the losses she and her husband did suffer twofold, my mistress has always mourned the loss of her children. The separation of a mother from her children, surely, is a trial too great to forget. And now her husband, my lord, has died and she is alone in the world.”

Then Eliphaz the Temanite went to Job’s widow to comfort her. When he saw her from a distance he did not recognize her, for so many years had passed since he saw her last. And he saw that her suffering was very great, as her servant had told him.

He went to the wife of Job and then sat with her in her home where she continued to mourn for her husband. And together they sat in silence for half the day, for the suffering of Job’s widow was very great.

Satan Goes to the Wife of Job

One day the heavenly beings came to present themselves before the LORD, and Satan also came among them. The LORD said to Satan, “Where have you come
from?” Satan answered the LORD, “From going to and fro on the earth and walking up and down on it.” The LORD said to Satan, “Have you considered the widow of my servant Job? There was no one like him on the earth, a blameless and upright man who feared God and turned away from evil. Job died old and full of days. Now his widow lives alone. Tell me, have you seen her? She mourns for her husband although I did repay him twofold for the fortunes I took from him and he died old and full of days. Although she has not sinned against me with her words, I believe she allows her discontent to rule her. I will stretch out my hand now to touch all that she has so she will learn to fear God.” Then Satan answered the LORD, “The widow does fear God, for she has seen Your power which has no limit. Let me discover the nature of her discontent. I did incite you against her husband, let me now show your face and your might to the widow of Job through my words. Do not stretch out your hand against her now. I will show you the true character of the widow of Job.” The LORD said to Satan, “Very well, use your words to show me the true character of the widow of Job. Only do not reveal your true self to her, only disguise yourself so she will believe you to be a servant in her household.”

Job’s Widow Speaks

Satan disguised himself as a servant of Job and went to where Eliphaz and Job’s widow sat together in her home. But he did not go to them immediately, instead concealing himself behind a door and listening to hear what the widow of Job would say.

Eliphaz had not spoke a word to her, for he saw that her suffering was great but he also saw that she did fear God and he had no words of comfort or rebuke for her. They mourned together in silence for half of the day.

After this the widow opened her mouth and cursed the day that God did stretch out His hand against all that Job her husband had.

“Let the day perish in which my children were taken from this Earth and from my sight.

And the night that said, a man, Job in the land of Uz has lost servant, land and cattle and now his body is inflicted with loathsome sores
from the sole of his foot to the crown of his head.

Nothing good could come to my husband after that day for he blocked his eyes to all the light in the world.

He saw only the darkness that surrounded him when God did turn away from us.

He blocked his heart to God’s love for him and for me.

He felt only the pain of God taking away what He had bestowed upon us.

He blocked his heart to the love I had for him and for God.

He felt only the revulsion he had for himself when his body was afflicted with sores and his breath did repel his family and, so he believed, me.

He blocked his ears to the sound of our ten children’s laughter.

He could only hear the cries of our children so long ago killed.

When I did come to him with my most beloved son, he did weep to see the resemblance between the babe in swaddling clothes that I held to my breast and the first son that I bore so many years ago.

He blocked his mouth to the taste of the food I would make for him with the most succulent meats and seasonings.

He could only taste the ash in which he sat during his hours of suffering.

He blocked his nose to the scent of the perfume that I did wear to entice him each time I was ready to bear him another child.

He could only smell the smoke that came out of the fire of God that did burn up the sheep and the servants and consumed them. Cursed be that day which brought misery to the rest of the life of Job and to me.”

Both Eliphaz and Satan Rebuke the Widow

Hearing these words of the widow of Job Satan came forth and said, “May I venture a word with you? Only I hope that you will not be offended. If I may say to you, do you not see the error in your words? Surely God is mighty and does not despise any as you say he despises you. Do not turn to anger simply because you have been tried with affliction. Job my master and your husband was humbled by God after questioning the ways of the Lord and surely you too will learn the error in your ways.”
Then Eliphaz said, “Surely I must agree with what your servant says to you. Let fear of God be your confidence and the integrity of your ways be your hope. You must put your faith above your suffering. He repaid his debt to your husband twofold because He is compassionate. In this you must put your faith. You more than all who live on Earth must know that our God is just and does not punish the righteous or reward the evil. This was shown when Job was humbled by God after he did question His ways and surely, so too will you be punished.”

The wife of Job answered Satan and Eliphaz, for her anger was stirred by their words. She said, “Eliphaz, did you learn nothing after you kindled the wrath of our God? Again you have spoken wrong of Him and of me. I did err when I told my husband to curse God and die, but He did not rebuke me or punish me because He knew that my suffering was great, like that of my husband, Job. I suffered alongside my husband and went without the comfort of my friends and without the hand of God. I have not erred when I said that no good could come to Job after God did take away our children and his health. Although God did repay him twofold, he did not return to us the children that I bore. He did not take away the memories of my husband’s pain and suffering and he did not bequeath to my husband his one request: an answer to the questions he did put forth in conversation with Him. While it is true that Job my husband was humbled before God and so too am I ever more, we could never understand why this misfortune befell us. While I was able to forget in the face of God’s bounty and in the children he placed in my womb, my husband could never forget. And so I say, let never the light shine upon the day that God closed my husband’s eyes to my suffering and to our children. Let the sun go down on the day that God did plague my husband with sores and take away our children and our wealth. God is great, compassionate and just, but His works we can never understand. You, Eliphaz, did you ever come to understand why it was you who kindled the wrath of God and not the many others who held the same beliefs and do hold fast to the belief that God punishes the wicked and rewards the righteous? Did you ever come to understand why you were wrong in that belief? Job’s integrity was sound despite all of your challenges but where was the knowledge that you lacked? Where could you have learned that God worked in such a mysterious way as He does?”
Then the wife of Job turned to Satan still disguised as a servant in her household and with kindness in her voice said, “I do not know from where you came or what understanding of the LORD you may have. I may venture a question to you in the hope that you will be honest and maintain your integrity when you make your answer: do you fully and completely understand God’s actions against us? Can you tell me the ways of the Almighty in detail and in truth?”

And Satan did open his mouth to answer ‘yes’ but stopped and began to question himself. So he remained silent. ❖

ENDNOTES
1. Or was abolished
2. Heb sons of God
3. Or the Accuser; Heb ha-satan
Two Sonnets

ZACHARY BOS

Crouched on the column marching to the sea
I hug my legs to my chest. The dark plain
Is streaked with rolling foam, breaks in the grain,
White slashes in the bark of a birch tree.
The herring gulls, having paused their campaign
Of shrieks to sleep, sleep turned into the lee,
Flocks whose nighttime terms are solitary.
Crab battalions emerge to compete
For the refuse refused by gulls: wet meals
Washed out of pipes. I wonder how it feels,
To pinch; to be clawed; scuttle on six feet;
To merge in camouflage with beach debris;
Be cold-blooded; be free from wondering;
Reign in salt puddles as a rubbish king.
‘Braking wheels repel oxygen’s attack.’
This and other thoughts as I gently feign
Fascination with stones between the tracks.
At the platform, we passengers maintain
The dignity of silence; a protest
Against shared humanity? A refrain
To remember that speaking counters rest?
Exiled to herself, a woman. Plain,
Not old, but worn, her bag clutched to her chest,
Is skirted by the disembarking crowd.
My offered helpful arm is unaddressed.
She overcomes the steps. She is not proud.
Her volume displaces air on the train
Beside me as I sleep, though it is loud.
The most basic function of language is communication, wherein the hearer receives intact the message that the speaker wishes to send. In Shakespeare’s *King Lear* and Rabelais’ *Pantagruel*, certain characters misuse language to the point where honest or clear communication is no longer possible. In both texts, a particular figure emerges to mock the individuals and societies responsible for this abuse of language. As the Fool and Panurge deconstruct language itself through their own obscenity and “folly,” they stress the importance of human beings’ most basic, natural, physical relationships, and expose the artificiality of the societies in which they live.

In the opening scene of *King Lear*, Cordelia fails her father’s test of her love because, unlike her sisters, she is unwilling to take advantage of the malleability of language, specifically of its potential to deceive. She refuses to “heave [her] heart into [her] mouth” (1.1.93), that is, to obscure her true feelings with untrue words. Only by this metaphorical separation of emotion from language (heart from mouth) can Cordelia remain honest in the face of what amounts to a request for artificiality. Lear entreats her to “mend her speech a little” (1.1.96) because he has lost sight of what love truly is, namely a natural “bond” (1.1.95) that needs no verbal adornment. Instead, he falls victim to the misconception that a statement in and of itself can constitute reality. As De Grazia stresses (385), Lear uses language as “an extension of will” (385). He orders Cordelia’s disinheritation, Kent’s banishment, and the division of the kingdom. As king, he has become used to the idea that he can make something happen simply by commanding it, and expects this to remain the case even after relinquishing the crown: “The king would speak with Cornwall. The dear father / Would with his daugh-
The juxtaposition of the words “speak” and “commands,” although they ostensibly belong to separate clauses, emphasizes the association that Lear makes between these two functions of language. Lear’s abuse of language reaches a climax in the storm scene. At this point, he has gone from ordering about his subjects to commanding nature itself: “Blow, winds, and crack your cheeks. Rage, blow!” (3.2.1). The old man “[perverts] the medium that binds men together into a medium devoted solely to his personal and subjective ends” (De Grazia 386).

Regan and Goneril are totally unlike Cordelia. Instead of speaking “nothing” (1.1.89), they make lengthy but false declarations of love, engaging in a battle of empty words. Lear’s judgment is clouded by his perversion of language as a vehicle of his own will. He never expects others to take advantage of this medium in their own turn. The problem is not an inherent deficiency in language, but rather language’s potential to misrepresent reality, capitalized upon by speakers whose own moral imperfections take shape in their abuse of language. Just by initiating the “love test,” Lear makes unrealistic demands upon his daughters. He establishes a discourse of dishonesty that only serves to increase the superficiality of his relationship to Goneril and Regan. Their false declarations of love exemplify the artificiality of courtly society. Whereas they base their relationships to their father on what they say, Cordelia bases hers on a natural “bond” (1.1.95), the real human connection between father and daughter, created in the sexual act of conception, needing no linguistic elaboration to justify its validity.

A solution to this problem of language comes in the character of the Fool. The Fool handles language unlike any of the other characters in the play. His job is to speak in riddles and rhymes (that is, nonsense or folly) for the King’s amusement. What makes his character so fascinating, however, is that, in doing just this, he is able to communicate more truthfully and effectively than the other characters, and to bring Lear to the realization of his own folly. As soon as the Fool enters the action, he begins to upset the current social hierarchy, offering to “hire” Kent (it is not his place to hire anyone), and implying, through his mocking but accurate description of the preceding action, that it is really Lear who is playing the fool: “Why, this fellow has banished two on’s daugh-
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ters, / and did the third a blessing against his will. If thou / follow him, thou must needs wear my coxcomb” (1.4.104).

A few lines later, he offers to teach Lear “a speech” (I. 4. 118). The rhyme that he proceeds to recite (I. 4. 121-130) has no immediate bearing on the situation, its general message seeming to be a recommendation of caution, frugality, and abstinence. Lear’s response upon hearing it is “This is nothing, Fool” (I. 4. 131). The word “nothing” thus characterizes the opening speeches of both the Fool and Cordelia, which do, indeed, serve a similar purpose. Just as Cordelia refuses to participate in the discourse of deceit, so the Fool, by making a speech that Lear considers to have no meaning, challenges language itself. He continues, “Can you make no use / of nothing, Nuncle?” (1.4.133-4), to which the old man answers, “Why, no, boy, Nothing can be made out of / nothing” (1.4.135-6). We can imagine that Lear becomes aware of the resemblance between this conversation and his previous exchange with Cordelia, especially if we hear him hesitate between lines 135 and 136. The Fool is intentionally beginning to deconstruct language as Lear knows it, and the king’s realization of this marks the beginning of his descent into madness. He finds himself in a frightening world where not only has his imperious language ceased to have the desired effect, but his constant companion speaks incessantly in this deranged language of folly.

A very important aspect of the Fool’s speech is its sexual imagery, exemplified in lines such as “The codpiece that will house / before the head has any, / the head and he shall lose” (2.2.27 ff.) and “she that’s a maid now, and laughs at my departure / Shall not be a maid long, unless things be cut shorter” (1.5.50-55). Vulgarity is, of course, a characteristic feature of the language of folly. More importantly, dirty language places emphasis on the basic physical needs of human beings. Seiden notes “The Fool’s sexual jokes, with the genital allusions, serve primarily to remind Lear and to show us that copulation, birth, and death are the essential, the brute facts of human existence” (Seden 202). This return to physicality goes hand in hand with the Fool’s attack upon a social construct based on individuals’ self-serving manipulation of language. The Fool, by devoting his own use of language to the base and obscene (that which is unequivocally and universally human), effectively returns language to the common domain from which,
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according to De Grazia, the misguided Lear and his two daughters initially usurped it (202).

The Fool thus comes from outside society in order to break it down. His tool for doing so is language, manipulated in the uncommon manner of folly. The society in question is based on titles and courtly formality, on the censuring of base (but essentially human) topics, such as sexuality. One is what one is called; Edgar is legitimate, Edmund a bastard, even though, as the latter points out, nature makes no distinction between the two. It is this artificial linguistic framework that corrupt individuals such as Goneril and Regan take advantage of. The Fool, however, has no personal stake in the wellbeing of this society. According to Seiden, the Fool’s lack of a personal history not only sets him apart from other characters in King Lear, but also distinguishes him from “fool” figures in other Shakespearean works, about whom the action of the play provides at least some background information (199). From this position of removal, as an outsider caught up in the conflict of King Lear’s court society, the Fool exercises his “Saturnalian power,” reducing Lear himself to the position of fool (200). Furthermore, Seiden writes, the Fool commits no groundbreaking acts, nor any real acts at all, for that matter. Rather, “his license is truly poetic license: the freedom to say what, prudentially, he ought not but must say” (201). By his frequent voicing of obscenities, he brings to the surface the graphic reality of human sexuality, which, although censored by court society for the sake of propriety, is nonetheless the very foundation of true human familial relationships.

Language is a major theme in Pantagruel as well. Like Shakespeare, Rabelais portrays language as a fallible medium usurped by corrupt social forces and misguided individuals. The Library of St. Victor, for example, contains volume upon volume of academic drivel. The ridiculous titles of the books in the library are meant, at least in part, to demonstrate the absurd intellectualization of trivial or nonsensical matters, the elevation of useless and simplistic concepts to the level of scholarly achievement, that Rabelais considers characteristic of medieval learning.

A similar criticism lies behind the episode in which Pantagruel encounters the “Limousin who murdered the French language” (Rabelais 183). The man in fact murders French and Latin at the same time, com-
bining them into a hyper-erudite code consisting mostly of Latinate roots with French grammatical endings. The Limousin seeks to employ language as a symbol of social status, and Rabelais condemns this, not only by portraying its inherent ridiculousness, but also by having Pantagruel convict the scholar of a crime against the French language itself. Kotin describes this episode as part of Rabelais' ongoing crusade against those who would shun the vernacular in favor of ornate and "obsolete" words (693-695). Of course Rabelais himself delights in obscure, learned references, as well as in the use of foreign languages (Italian on page 277, Latin frequently) and uncommon or non-vernacular words (e.g. effluvia on 276), not to mention words of his own coinage (many from Latinate roots): "monarticulating, wry-neckifying, buttocking, ballocking, and diabolicating" (278). This, however, is but evidence of his "instinctive affection" for the scholarly discourse that he so vigorously mocks (Cohen 19).

The Limousin not only murders French, but abuses language itself by "trying to imitate the Parisians' language" (Rabelais 185). He attempts to use language as a marker of social status. When Pantagruel threatens him, he reverts in terror to his native dialect: "Ho, let me alane, for Gaud's sake, and dinna hairm me!" (185). Pantagruel approves: "Now you're speaking naturally" (185). Our giant protagonist thus advocates the honest use of "natural" language over the pretensions of affected speech.

The debate between Lords Kissmyarse and Suckfizzle further illustrates the social abuse of language. Over the course of the entire exchange, nothing said by either of these two characters is comprehensible to the reader. As Rigolot notes, it is only the "referential" function of language that "loses its grip" in this passage (140). Clearly the two men are speaking French. All the function words (articles, prepositions, conjunctions, etc.) remain intact, such that the syntactic structure and logical flow (or, at least, the illusion of logic) are evident. What is missing is actual meaning. The particular words that they choose, although we may understand the majority of their definitions, have no clear referents in reality. Any random sample will illustrate this point: "There passed between the two tropics the sum of three-pence towards the zenith and halfpenny, for as much as the Rhiphean mountains had that year been most sterile in tricksters" (205). Pantagruel himself par-
Herman participates in this nonsensical exchange. As in the Library of St. Victor episode, our hero identifies himself with the object of satire, illustrating once again how Rabelais delights in the very abuse of language whose perpetrators he mocks. Here, he indicts the discourse of the Law. Rabelais satirizes the “sophistic” jargon of legal language through a hyperbolic portrayal of its impenetrability.

Like the Fool in King Lear, the character of Panurge arrives onto this scene of linguistic depravity to expose, through his own “folly,” how those around him are misusing language. In attempting to converse with Pantagruel and his companions, Panurge tries twelve different foreign languages before resorting to French, even though this is his “natural mother-tongue” (201). Like the Limousin, he rejects the natural and direct in favor of the obscure and pretentious. Is Panurge, then, as guilty as the Limousin of abusing language? Kotin argues that “If French succeeds in communicating where all other linguistic signs have failed, it is because Panurge has ceased to let his effort at establishing communication predominate” (Kotin 698). It is true, as Kotin points out, that Pantagruel recognizes Panurge’s disheveled condition before a single word is uttered (see Rabelais 197), and that Panurge’s repeated declarations that his state of distress should be self-evident only delay his receiving the necessary assistance (699). In light of this, Kotin views Panurge’s linguistic crime as different from that of the Limousin, but as a crime nonetheless. Panurge would thus be just another guilty party in the common massacre of language.

There is, however, one important aspect of Panurge’s performance that Kotin omits, namely the question of why he chooses to wait so long before finally speaking French. Pantagruel is the first to speak in their encounter, and yet Panurge chooses to respond to his French in German. All the subsequent comments made by Pantagruel and his party are in French, including their entreaties for Panurge to speak a language they know. Panurge must understand French, since he uses it in the end. The intentionality of his persistence in using foreign languages throws new light on the episode. Instead of an object of satire and a participant in the defamation of language, like the Limousin, Panurge can be seen as an active agent of mockery, a devious deconstructor of language and society. In this way he both resembles Shakespeare’s Fool and separates himself from all the other characters.
in *Pantagruel*.

An examination of Chapter 19 of Book Two, in which Panurge "confound[s] the Englishman who argue[s] by signs," sheds further light on the similarity of the roles of Panurge and the Fool (Rabelais 234). In this episode, not only does Panurge have an entire conversation without the use of spoken language, but he also uses a great many suggestive and obscene hand gestures in the course of the debate. We already know Panurge to be, like the Fool, a particularly vulgar individual, having observed this quality in him on several occasions. Among the more abrasive of these are chapter fifteen, "How Panurge Demonstrated a Very New Way of Building the Walls of Paris" (namely, out of vaginas) and Chapter seventeen, about marrying off the old women, from which a particularly memorable line reads thus: "So I had a good banquet and the best of drink prepared for them, with plenty of spices to put the old women in rut and on heat" (Rabelais 228). In the sign debate, Panurge translates his obscene language into obscene gestures. For example:

> He put the nail of his left-hand forefinger on to that of the thumb, making as it were a ring in the space between them and clenched all the fingers of his right into his fist except the forefinger [sic], which he repeatedly thrust in and drew out of the space between the two others of his before-mentioned left hand. (235)

Besides being at times vulgar, the whole exchange—and indeed any episode in which Panurge is involved—is brutally funny. Like the Fool, he uses offensive humor to breech social and linguistic propriety (whether offending the reader or another character), with particular emphasis on copulation and the central role of physicality in defining the human experience. Thaumaste comes seeking answers to those fundamental questions he considers "so difficult that human words would not be adequate to expound them to [his] satisfaction" (231). The answer Panurge gives him to these eternal questions is either nothing (because the signs are incomprehensible to the reader) or vague intimations of obscene physical acts.

In conclusion, we see that in both *King Lear* and *Pantagruel*, language
itself is not to blame for misunderstandings between individuals. Language is indeed shown to be fallible, but not inherently misleading. There is plenty of effective and straightforward communication between characters in both works. The fallibility of language only becomes a problem when immoral individuals take advantage of it for their personal gain—as in the case of Regan and Goneril—or when language is used to advertise social status, as with the Limousin. More broadly speaking, this fallibility is exposed when a focus on the artificial superstructure of society obscures the fundamentally physical and sexual nature of human relationships, and frustrates language’s natural goal of communication.

WORKS CONSULTED
The Republic in the World

HAMILTON ACKERMAN

Over the course of the most famous work of political science ever written, The Republic, Plato (through the eyes of Socrates) outlines what he envisions to be the “ideal city” or “kallipolis,” a population aligned by a strict caste system, production dominated by specialization, and a ruling class of thinkers with one great Philosopher-King (or Queen) at the top of the social pyramid. Two important points of Plato’s system include the equality of women in the workplace and the rigid censorship controlling the poetry, music, and art of the people. In the years since Plato wrote this defining text, aspects of his hypothetical regime can be seen in almost every political system that has emerged, including Adolf Hitler’s Nazi Germany, Fidel Castro’s Communist Cuba, and the present-day United States of America. This paper will examine the two points mentioned above in each of these three regimes and both compare and contrast each instance with the ideals outlined in Plato’s The Republic. Based on these real events, it will also analyze the possibility of such a city actually existing before concluding with a discussion of Plato’s motive for writing this text.

In Book V, Socrates announces that women would have equal rights and would be appropriately divided into each of the three societal classes alongside the men. While at times he doesn’t seem completely serious about this radical suggestion, at one point asking his listeners, “Do you know of anything that is practiced by human beings in which the class of men doesn’t excel that of women in all these respects?” (Bloom 133), he concludes this section appearing optimistic about the idea of mixing the sexes to utilize every person’s specialty. Plato even goes so far as to suggest that the ruler of all could in fact be a
Philosopher Queen if the rigorous process behind this assignment selected her. Years ahead of his time, Plato’s suggestion to ignore the prevalent sexual prejudice against women is visible in both Cuba and present-day America where the idea is quickly gaining social acceptance.

Just as members of Plato’s society were to specialize in the one thing that they did best, so too were the women of Hitler’s society raised with the sole purpose of producing as many healthy, happy children as possible over the course of their marriage (History Learning Site). While both Plato and Hitler would agree that specialization is the key to success, they had very different ideas of a woman’s role in society: Plato tried to maximize efficiency by allowing women to specialize in anything as long as it was their calling in life, whereas Hitler essentially cut his workforce and talent pool in half by keeping women out of work and politics and instead focusing on rearing children for the Reich. When taken in the context of Plato’s equality, it seems almost humorous that Hitler would declare men and women equal because “both sexes have their rights, their tasks, and these tasks were in the case of each equal in dignity and value, and therefore man and woman were on an equality” (History Learning Site). According to Plato, however, manipulative statements are characteristic of the tyrant, so this really shouldn’t come as a surprise. What is surprising, however, is a holiday that the Nazis celebrated, August 12”, which had been Hitler’s mother’s birthday. On this day, the prestigious Motherhood Cross was awarded to women based on how many children they had birthed: eight children earned a gold cross, six a silver cross, and four a bronze cross (History Learning Site). This metal system seems to be taken straight out of The Republic and modified for the demands of the Reich. While Hitler was on the right track with specialization, his definition of equality certainly needed some refining in order to comply with Plato’s ideals.

Looking at Cuba’s history, women were treated as the inferior sex for a long time, but Castro’s 1959 Cuban Revolution brought improvements to their lives. Before the Batista Regime was overthrown, 9.8% of Cuban women had jobs, with 70% of these women working as domestic servants. Many of the unemployed women were, like Germany’s females, encouraged to stay home, and many others worked as prosti-
tutes to make a living. To garner popular support for his movement, Castro stressed the equality of both sexes and promised to open doors for women; as claimed, the Revolution legally granted women the right to hold almost any job in the Cuban economy, but the prejudices associated with the "weaker sex" lingered (Pages). Still, in less than half a century, the female presence in the workforce has increased in staggering numbers: today, 66.1% of professionals and intermediate-level technicians are female. While this is a leap in the right direction, the Federation of Cuban Women (FMC) says "we are the majority of the economic base but a minority in power," with just under a third of leadership positions occupied by women (Pages). There is light on the horizon, however, as numbers continue to shift in favor of women; perhaps one day there will be true equality between the sexes. Compared to Germany, Cuba comes much closer to Plato's description of women in society. With women filling prominent roles in all ranks except for the upper echelons, Cuba, as Plato suggested, seems to be taking advantage of the potentials women offer society. Cuba also has one of the lowest birth rates in the world, which allows women the time and energy to pursue successful careers (Pages). Interestingly, Socrates seemed to imply in his description of the differentiation of the sexes that men are generally more able than women at each social level (Bloom 134), so perhaps a male majority would actually exist among the philosophers, just like with Cuba and its positions of leadership today.

Women's rights in the United States have evolved tremendously in the past 100 years, beginning with the 1919 proposal of the 19th Amendment to the Constitution, granting women the right to vote, continuing with pro-birth control legislation and anti-same-sex segregation laws through the middle of the century, and climaxing today in the 21st century, where women hold prominent positions in almost every legislative body, Fortune 500 company, and organization in the country (Infoplease). Based on 2004 figures from the United States Department of Labor for workers over the age of 20, women comprise 46.3% of the total workforce, with a majority in management-related occupations, service occupations, and sales and office occupations (US Department of Labor). While these figures suggest a labor meritocracy independent of sex, a hotly-contested topic among women's rights groups is wage equality, where men in the workforce over the age of
24 earn, on average, $163 dollars more per week than women do (The US Department of Labor). Feminists would be up in arms about the following thought, but if Plato was correct in asserting that men are generally more able than women, then the self-correcting, self-adjusting capitalist system of America would pay women less because they are worth less. A more reasonable explanation based on Plato is that perhaps the natural difference in abilities between men and women (Bloom 133-134) allows men to occupy higher-paid positions in today's society; departing from this idea, women could and probably will be equal to men in the United States workplace, in a few years.

On the topic of women and mothers, it is important to note an absurd aspect of Plato's city which is absent not only from these three communities but also from any regime ever, the idea of the communal family experience, whereby children are produced in mating festivals, the parents of each individual are unknown, and the children are raised together in a unit (Bloom 136). No matter what society is examined, the women would riot at the implementation of this policy. Suggestions such as this certainly cast doubt on the possibility of Plato's ideal city ever working as described; as seen with female equality in different society, parts of Plato's city are certainly feasible, but other suggestions are impossible.

Plato considered himself to be a philosopher, literally a "lover of wisdom," but he believed that freedom of expression was a dangerous thing in the hands of the masses. Over the course of Books II and III, Socrates outlines what types of expression are permissible for each class, warning especially against influential children's stories, as the soul is most malleable in youth. He makes rules to govern stories about gods, who must be represented as wholly good to avoid children growing up believing that the warring, conniving gods are their role models; gods must also refrain from changing shape in order to avoid children growing up without a sense of truth and honesty. Stories about heroes must portray death as a glorious thing, nothing like the underworld conversation between Odysseus and Achilles in The Odyssey, for instance. Heroes themselves must be honest, emotionally-sound people who can control their aggression. Songs must be composed only in the specific key and meter conducive to the training activity at hand; actors would not be allowed, because by specializing in acting, they actually
attempt to portray many different occupations and situations, thus voiding their specialization. In Book X, Socrates spends quite a bit of time denouncing painters as third-generation creators after gods and carpenters, merely imitating the truth. Finally, he regrettably decides in Book X that poets must be banned from the city, owing to the fact that their poems present only images which appeal to the bad part of the soul. All in all, little material would be available to the masses of Plato’s city.

The Nazis seemed to agree with Plato’s idea of banning anything that hurt the cause of the city, although again, Hitler and Socrates had different definitions of “harmful” in mind. The Nazi party labeled any modern art which failed to support the Nazi ideals “degenerate art” and would display it publicly for mockery (Wikipedia). As museums were stripped of their avant-garde garbage, it was replaced by Heroic Art, a type of propaganda that was meant to exemplify the German race through “racially pure, corruption-free expression” (Wikipedia). Literature and general speech also suffered heavily under Nazi occupation. The Hitler Jugend, the network of carefully controlled, fanatical youth groups, was infamous for raiding libraries and burning any books written by racially inferior authors or containing dangerous or “incorrect” ideas. When the Nazi army invaded a new territory, radios, newspapers, and publishers were immediately shut down or replaced by the unstoppable propaganda machine, responsible for promoting the atrocious actions of the Nazi party. This caused illegal press to flourish, however, as papers and newsletters were published underground by groups of activists struggling to retain their basic human rights of expression and information (Beacon for Freedom of Expression). Underground efforts will be discussed in greater detail after first discussing the censorship policies of Cuba and the United States.

According to the Cuban Constitution, “Citizens recognize freedom of speech and press conform to the needs of the state,” and “No recognized freedoms can be exercised against the constitution or the law, nor against the decision of the Cuban people to build socialism and communism.” The second excerpt seems clear enough, saying that any expression critical of communism will be appropriately censored, but the first excerpt takes a bit of a leap assuming that all citizens will
accept this condition (Beacon for Freedom of Expression). As far as most new works of art coming out of Cuba are concerned, the government follows its Constitution fairly closely: in recent years, some Communism-friendly Cuban musicians, poets, artists, and cinematographers have found success at the international level, whereas other, more anti-revolutionary artists have suffered under bans and restrictions (Columbian School of Journalism). Still, one very interesting area of Cuban censorship is past works, banned books. In a speech in 1998, Castro told the people of Cuba, “There are no banned books in Cuba, only those which we have no money to buy” (Cubafacts.com). In response to this statement, couples and families began to establish what are today called “independent libraries,” private collections of banned books made freely available for semi-discreet public consumption. The government keeps tabs on all of these libraries, with constant inspections from police officers; owners suspect their phones are tapped and their activities within the library are recorded. Some aren’t afraid, but perhaps they should be, considering past events where independent library owners have been fired from their jobs, their siblings expelled from school, and their books confiscated; their lives essentially ruined (Cubafacts.com). Still, Cuban methods of censorship seem mild when compared to Nazi methods, which are today regarded as some of the most comprehensively violent censorship ever.

When it came time to draft the Bill of Rights for the young United States of America in 1789, the first amendment gave US citizens the rights of “speech, press, religion, peaceable assembly, and to petition the government” (Wikipedia). For most artists, writers, poets, musicians, cinematographers, and almost every other type of occupation involving expression, they are essentially free to do as they please. This certainly makes America the odd country in the context of this paper. The closest the US comes to banning books is the process of “challenging,” whereby boards of education, PTA groups, and local communities argue the virtues and vices of an “offensive” book and decide to either keep or remove the book from library shelves, reading lists, etc. From an academic standpoint, it seems absurd to think that such classic works as Steinbeck’s Of Mice and Men or Twain’s The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn would find themselves under fire, yet every year titles such as these cause heated debates in many settings for their examples
of racism, offensive language, violence, homosexual undertones, sexual content, or otherwise. Still, the First Amendment protects these works, and they could never, under our current government, be completely banned from public consumption, only not recommended or immediately available to some individuals at a local level (American Library Association).

The rules of censorship in Plato’s city, Nazi Germany, and Cuba are all similar in that what hurts the people of party is removed from view and what promotes the party’s power is wisely distributed. However, in both Germany and Cuba, strong underground resistance formed almost immediately after the freedom of speech was taken away; how does Plato contend with the inevitable human thirst for taboo topics? He doesn’t have to; as far as the masses are concerned, it doesn’t exist. One of the beauties of Plato’s system is that everyone is controlled, essentially brainwashed from a young age to read, watch, and listen to only what the philosophers prescribe. Everything else ceased to exist, as far as Plato’s masses are concerned. In reality, however, it would be nearly impossible to create this system; Plato absurdly suggests that everyone except for the 10 year olds and the philosophers leave the city, another instance of an impossible necessity of his kallipolis (Bloom 220). Without anyone capable of producing goods for necessary consumption or protecting the city, this city would instantly crumble, either to an enemy or on itself. Exactly like the case of women’s equality, some aspects of Plato’s city have been utilized over the course of history, whereas others are undoubtedly impossible.

By examining only two of the many topics discussed by Socrates and friends in The Republic, a “crack” emerges in each argument—the ideas of communal family units and the city’s inauguration of ten year olds and elders. Because of these slight cracks, which are prevalent throughout the text, I believe that Plato wrote The Republic less as a blueprint for utopia and more as a city of speech, a warning to future political leaders and citizens about the dangers of trying to reach perfection: these cracks seem to mirror the cracks in human nature that would prevent a city like the ideal city from ever seeing the light of day. The real magic of the text, however, lies in the careful blend of these cracks and the plethora of legitimately genius ideas and observations Socrates makes about human nature. For this reason, The Republic is a timeless
text that, while not the answer to the question of utopia, will remain immortal in the hearts and minds of men forever. *
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Iceberg

MATTHEW KELSEY

Aer Lingus planes fly routes over Britain every day. Window seats offer a view spanning for dozens of miles beyond what we can fathom, beyond the down fabric of clouds. The Thames remains invisible. With neck pain from craning, seat 18C rests. She buys wine. Far below, cobble covers dirt. London fog and sprits of rain slide down umbrella sides, falling in circles over stone. Sidewalks are trekked, marked by busy vendors who lend a reeling buzz. Inside shops, hands paw cereal boxes and choose shampoo. They acquire maps to navigate twisted, hidden streets, to find rain-green parks. A magpie squats on a long conifer. His charcoal and cerulean checked garment is sketched by a benched artist, able to see linden trunks but not the supple roots plunging to park side diners. Couples purchase English Breakfast tea. It is July eleventh.

Half-buried bodies, minced now or burning, deposit blood in the Metro. There are screams no one above can hear. Survivors flail, clutching for anything the senses register. They buy time.
Analects of Core:
Second Year

“When the actor maketh a covenant by authority, he bindeth thereby
the author, no less than if he had made it himself, and no less subjecteth
him to all the consequences of the same.”

-Thomas Hobbes, Leviathan

“This tree is not as we are told, a tree
Of danger tasted, nor to evil unknown
Opening the way, but of divine effect
To open eyes, and make them gods who taste;
And hath been tasted such”

-John Milton, Paradise Lost

“The first person who, having enclosed a plot of land, took it into his
head to say this is mine and found people stupid enough to believe him,
was the true founder of civil society.”

-Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Second Discourse

“He replied, That I must needs be mistaken, or that I said the Thing
which was not. (for they have no Word in their Language to express
Lying or Falsehood.)”

-Jonathan Swift, Gulliver’s Travels

“We realize all the more clearly what we have to accomplish in the
present-I am speaking of a ruthless criticism of everything existing, ruth-
less in two senses: The criticism must not be afraid of its own conclusions,
nor of conflict with the powers that be.”

-Karl Marx, “For a Ruthless Criticism of Everything Existing”
“And all should cry, Beware! Beware!
His flashing eyes, his floating hair!
Weave a circle round him thrice,
And close your eyes with holy dread,
For he on honey-dew hath fed,
And drunk the milk of Paradise.”

-Samuel Taylor Coleridge, *Kubla Khan*

“Perhaps as we read the account of these remote customs there may emerge a feeling of solidarity with the endeavors and ambitions of these natives. Perhaps man’s mentality will be revealed to us, and brought near, along some lines which we never have before. Perhaps through realizing human nature in a shape very distant and foreign to us, we shall have some light shed on our own.”

-Bronislaw Malinowski, *Argonauts of the Western Pacific*

“Ah yes, we say ‘enlightenment’, forsooth!
Which of us dares to call things by their names?
Those few who had some knowledge of the truth,
Whose full heart’s rashness drove them to disclose
Their passion and their vision to the mob.”

-Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, *Faust Part I*

“The great phenomena of nature, the revolutions of the heavenly bodies, eclipses, comets, thunder, lightning, and other extraordinary meteors; the generation, the life, growth, and dissolution of plants and animals; are objects which, as they necessarily excite the wonder, so they naturally call forth the curiosity of mankind to enquire into their causes.”

-Adam Smith, *The Wealth of Nations*

“But that is the beginning of a new story, the story of the gradual renewal of a man, of his gradual regeneration, of his slow progress from one world to another, of how he learned to know a hitherto undreamed-of reality. All that might be the subject of a new tale, but our present one is ended.

-Fyodor Dostoevsky, *Crime and Punishment*
S’Cores
Favorite Selections from the Core

Wolfgang Amadé Mozart, Don Giovanni

Johann Sebastian Bach, St. Matthew Passion

Ludwig van Beethoven, Symphony No. 9 in D Minor, Op. 125 “Choral”

Igor Stravinsky, The Rite of Spring
Fairytales and First Impressions: A Conversation on *Pride and Prejudice*

Shanna Slank

*Players:* Charlotte Bronton, Mary Benignington and Scott Welter, lightly modeled after Charlotte Brontë, Mary Bennet and Sir Walter Scott.

“It is a truth, universally acknowledged, that any person inclined to think favorably of Jane Austen’s *Pride and Prejudice* must secretly be in want of romance, which anyone with any sort of practical thought, such as myself, would realize does not likely exist. And though love and romance seem formidable opponents of sound reason, it nonetheless is the commonplace of human nature to be bewitched by such fairytale, fantastical, far-reaching and far-fetched notions—or at least, this is what I gather from as much as I have read.” Across the table, Mary’s companion raised the small porcelain tea cup to her mouth so as to hide the smirk indicative of a mild amusement with Mary’s incorrigible allegiance to rationality. Fittingly, Mary remained unaware and forged on with her speech. “I should like it better if no book was ever to be filled with silly sentiments of love, but instead always with themes more useful, mainly those which pertain to philosophy and science—subjects more intellectual in intent, more reasonable in their form. I should say for books like Ms. Austen’s *Pride and Prejudice*, that I would more sooner give up my very own independence to a husband than to be ever in want of reading that book again. Think of what use those pages could have had if they had not been fully saturated with the silliness of marriage and love. Why, it was only recently that I read . . .”

“It seems that I am quite inclined to agree with you Miss Benignington,” interrupted Ms. Bronton, realizing that the end of Mary’s
speech—for which she had been a long time politely and patiently waiting—was not soon coming. “I should likely say, though, that any person inclined to think favorably of Ms. Austen’s work is in need of better taste in literature. I cannot understand the appeal of a story that, to me, very much seems so banal; her Pride and Prejudice, if I may say, is what I would call plain and predictable.” Ms. Bronton’s tone teetered towards haughty. “I have a friend who, in telling me that my own writing was too melodramatic, suggested to my consternation that I might improve by trying a style more similar to that of Ms. Austen’s. As I said to him then, I will say to you now Miss Benignington: in reading Pride and Prejudice, I found an accurate daguerreotype of a commonplace face; a carefully-fenced, highly-cultivated garden, with neat borders and delicate flowers; but no glance of a bright vivid physiognomy, no open country, no fresh air, no blue hill, no bonny beck. I should hardly like to live with her ladies and gentlemen, in their elegant but confined houses.1 Occupied solely with boorish lifestyles where concern lies with little else other than money and marriage, the story contains nothing in which any modern, intelligent reader might take an interest.”

Until now, the gentleman had sat silently through his companions’ conversation. Both the alignment of his chair to the table (tangential) and the preoccupation of his gaze by outward features of the landscape, much removed from the ladies sitting near him, gave one the impression that he was indifferent either to the conversation or to the company, though there is no reason to think it could not have been a general indifference to both. Without warning he spoke: “Forgive me, ladies, but I’m afraid I mustn’t in good conscience allow you to continue this tongue-lashing of Ms. Austen and her novel without offering at least a word or two in her defense.”

“Why, Mr. Welter,” Charlotte responded, “I shame myself for having nearly forgotten of your delightful presence at my tea. Forgive me for not being more mindful of you, my less conversationally-inclined guest.” She paused. “I must confess, I should not have thought that Pride and Prejudice could cause this sudden kindling of interest in my opinions and Miss Benignington’s.”

“Almost as surprising, I should think Ms. Bronton, as the idea that kind words from me on behalf of Ms. Austen would rouse your spirit, which I have learned and now admire, of course, as one always counted upon
to be so carefully, so coolly restrained,” Mr. Welter returned. “Without meaning your cheeks to turn cherry, I would like cautiously and respectfully to offer the following opinion to my gracious hostess and her young friend: Though it may be of some truth that there is little for us of the twenty-first century to find familiar in a society so rigidly structured by class, one ought to appreciate, at the very least, what fine insight Ms. Austen gives us into such a particular and irretrievable period of history.”

“Yes, indeed,” Mary chimed in, “it was very much a reality at that time for women to have to rely on marriage as a means of securing their livelihood. With patriarchal laws in place, they could not inherit property. As well, socially, it was considered appropriate that women be submissive and restrained. These are all facts, you know, commonly known to anyone sensible enough to read any sort of history book.”

Paying no mind to Mary’s comment, he went on, “And aside from such, Ms. Austen has a talent for describing the involvement and feelings and characters of ordinary life which is to me the most wonderful I ever met with.”

“Why Mr. Welter, I should say!” cried Ms. Bronton. “You’re being quite absurd! Anything like warmth or enthusiasm, anything energetic, poignant, heartfelt, is utterly out of place in commending these works. There isn’t anything extravagant: all such demonstrations the authoress would have met with a well-bred sneer, would have calmly scorned as outré or extravagant. She does her business of delineating the surface of the lives of genteel English people curiously well. She ruffles her reader with nothing vehement, disturbs him with nothing profound. The passions are perfectly unknown to her, though she divines the manner of the ball, the carriage, and the country house with delightful accuracy. If this is heresy, I cannot help it.”

“There is an appeal, Charlotte, in her romantic rags-to-riches story; this much you cannot deny. Her heroine Elizabeth is heart-capturing, and her handsome hero makes us all hope for the competition of such suitors.”

“What appeal is there in a love story ending happily, that happens also conveniently to excuse social and economic prosperity?”

Again, Mary interjected, benignly superfluous, “Why yes, in this sense, Ms. Austen is seen as having taken a conservative stance where
feminism is concerned, in what scholars have labeled as post-revolutionary." Though the others seemed not to care, Mary continued, "Considered against the work of other female authors, like Mary Wollstonecraft's *Vindication of the Rights of Women*, Austen in her writing seems to be taking a more traditional stance with the role of women in society. But then again, one should not forget that there were other writers like evangelical Hannah More who made Austen seem radical in comparison."

"I wish, Charlotte, that you would not be so myopic. There is a kind of femininity in Elizabeth," Mr. Welter went on, "that would render her fairytale ending different than that of any other heroine. She is active and visible, and it is marriage that submits to her will, not the other way around. She doesn't accept Mr. Collins' proposal, although that marriage would have guaranteed asecure-enough life. To Mr. Darcy's first proposal she is vehemently opposed, irrespective of his social and financial status. Can you fault Austen in finding an ideal marriage with Elizabeth and Mr. Darcy? Does Elizabeth not keep her independence of mind? Is it not that Mr. Darcy loves Elizabeth not for her beauty, but for the liveliness of her mind? There is obvious critique of the institute of marriage in the examples of Mr. and Mrs. Bennet, of Mr. Collins and Charlotte, and of Lydia and Mr. Wickham. What say you to these things, then?" Ms. Bronton's crinkled brow gave away her mind's desperate search for a response to Mr. Welter, but such effort proved futile. Mary opened her mouth, presumably about to attempt once more to impress the company with her vast storage of book-learned knowledge. Before she could do so, however, Mr. Welter started again, saying, "Ms. Austen has penned a story that enchants the heart while compelling the mind to evaluate the possible danger of first impressions and the potential reward in willingness to change one's mind. Dear Charlotte, you, much like Ms. Austen's Elizabeth, are witty and outspoken, and I am afraid perhaps a bit prejudice like her, as well. Even if you cannot bring yourself to think kindly of the novel's fairy-fancy love plots, I hope that you might at least be willing to concede Austen's discerning delineation of human nature and her persistent prominence among authors of socially aware fiction."

"My concession and my admiration is for your compelling rhetoric. But you will, I hope, not object if I remain skeptical of her claim to lit-
erary innovation. She might as well have titled her earnest work in social mobility, *Plain and Predictable, or a Tale of Beggars in Threadbare Petticoats.*

Ms. Bronton quietly thundered, “In the end, we all want a happy ending, Welter.”

Mr. Welter was lightning quick to respond. “I was most glad at the end that it was the end, dear Charlotte.”

Ms. Benignington looked on, bemused and harmless. “More tea? Yes please. And cakes!”

**Endnotes**

1. “I found . . . houses.” Charlotte Brontë, from a personal letter written to George Lewes, 12 January 1848. The text can be found at the Republic of Pemberley website, which editor Vivien Jones recommends for further reading on Jane Austen. The text also appears in Chapter 18 of Elizabeth Gaskell’s *The Life of Charlotte Brontë.* <http://www.online-literature.com/elizabeth_gaskell/charlotte_bronte/18>


4. From the introduction: “We still respond with pleasure to the rags-to-riches love story, to the happy ending which combines sexual and emotional attraction with ten thousand a year and the prospect of becoming mistress of Pemberley, a resolution which makes romantic love both the guarantee and the excuse for economic and social success.” Jane Austen, *Pride and Prejudice,* ed. Vivien Jones (Penguin Books: London, 1996), xii.

5. Ibid., xviii.
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----- Letter to George Lewes, 12 January 1848. <http://www.pemberley.com>

The SICK ROSE

O Rose, thou art sick.
The invisible worm,
That flies in the night;
In the howling storm:
Has found out thy bed
Of crimson joy:
And his dark secret love
Does thy life destroy.
tl 'Ih rop
by William Blake
translated into Klingon
by Ann Marie Dyer
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Russian Jews migrating to the United States at the dawn of the 20th century had an important choice to make. Faced with starting anew in a strange place one question loomed large for these immigrants: were they Russian, Jewish or both? The question of identity, however, is not confined to immigrant groups of the early 1900s. Muslim immigrants today face the same dilemma as their Jewish counterparts, but with one important difference. Unlike Jewish immigrants of the early 20th century, many incoming Muslims have left largely Islamic countries in order to take advantage of greater economic opportunities in America, as opposed to Russian Jews, who were forced to flee countries where they were persecuted minorities. Despite their ethnic differences, the ties between Jewish immigrants were strengthened by the widespread persecution and outright segregation they all experienced in their homelands. Conversely, many newly arrived Muslims are more inclined to identify with those of similar ethnic backgrounds, rather than with all fellow Muslims. As a result, Jews in the United States identify with their religious background first and ethnicity second, while many Muslims feel that their ethnic identity is more important than their religious identity (Mazrui 120). This tendency to identify along ethnic, and sometimes socioeconomic lines, only adds to the fragmentation that is already inherent in a religion that lacks the structure that comes with a centralized church hierarchy. In recent years, however, there has been a growing trend among middle class and professional Muslim immigrants towards a revitalization of the Islamic faith. These immigrants not only embrace their faith, but they also hope to form a universal Islamic community which includes all Muslims, regardless of their ethnic background.
Although the majority of these newly arrived Muslims owe their economic success to the greater opportunities afforded by American society, many reject what they consider to be the immoral aspects of American culture in favor of more conservative Islamic values. In particular, “Muslims among those more recently arrived from Pakistan, feel that adherence to the formalism of a daily schedule begun and ended with prayer in obedience to God is the only way to keep Islam alive” (Haddad 22). Within the last twenty years, a number of organizations and institutions have formed in order to protect the rights of Muslim Americans and ensure that future generations will continue to practice their faith in an increasingly secularized society. At the heart of this initiative are Islamic Centers, which provide religious instruction and child care services to the community as well as a growing number of Muslim private schools. While the pressure on Muslims to assimilate is no less, and in some cases more than that of immigrant groups of the past, today’s middle class and professional Muslim immigrants have an economic security that eluded previous immigrant groups, and that security allows them to resist the pressure to adopt American culture and practices.

Conversely, there are those Muslim immigrants, who for reasons of economic security reject both their Islamic and ethnic backgrounds in favor of adopting mainstream American culture. Lower class Muslim immigrants feel that they can “compensate for their insecure economic situation by mooring themselves to the dominant culture which brings them closer to the mainstream and fosters a feeling of physical and psychological security . . . over their daily lives” (Goldwasser 304). As minority groups living in communities that are often ignorant of, and sometimes outright hostile toward, the Islamic faith, these individuals have chosen to reject all foreign associations, rather than define themselves by their faith alone.

While the migration of middle class and professional individuals to the United States from Muslim countries is a modern development, Muslims migrating to the United States is not a recent phenomenon. The first of five waves of Muslim migration began around 1875 and lasted until 1912 (Haddad 14). This wave was made primarily of uneducated Arab men from rural areas who came to the United States in order to escape the economic crises that accompanied the decline of
the Ottoman Empire and European colonialism. Like their Italian counterparts, these immigrants were forced by their lack of education to take low paying jobs in America’s growing industrial sector. As a result, the majority of early Muslim communities were located in cities on the East Coast. This trend continued with the second wave of Muslim immigration from 1918 to 1922, which consisted mainly of relatives or friends of those immigrants from the first wave (14). As uneducated lower-class members of society, early Muslim immigrants tended to form close knit communities in the inner cities of the East Coast, such as the Palestinian community in Chicago in the early 20th century. However, these communities were based on ethnic rather than religious affiliation. While “immigrants in [this] period did not forget their religion entirely, other aspects of life seemed of higher priority to them” (Schmidt 111). This practice continued with the third wave of Muslim immigration from 1930 to 1938, which was also made up of relatives and friends of those in the first wave (Haddad 14).

Despite the fact that the Arab world constitutes “only slightly more than one third of the world’s Muslim population,” the first fifty years of Muslim migration to the United States was dominated by lower class Arabs (Brown 9). One reason for this phenomenon was the immigration quotas that prevented South Asian Muslims from immigrating to the United States in large numbers prior to 1965. However, the period immediately following World War II saw a significant increase in the number of Southeast Asian Muslims from India and Pakistan as well as Muslims from Eastern European countries. The increase has continued into the present day, despite the increase in non-Arab Muslim migration, Arab migration to the United States remains strong due to political upheaval in much of the Arab world. This upheaval was only compounded by the 1967 Six Day War in which a coalition of Arab forces led by Egypt under President Nasser was defeated by the Israelis.

Unlike their 19th century counterparts, Muslim immigrants “since the middle of the century have been educated professionals eager to enjoy the economic and political advantages of the United States” (Haddad 14). Newly arrived Muslims, especially those from the Arab world, were the beneficiaries of a program of secular nationalism that swept most of the Islamic world in the early part of the 20th century. Many nationalist Muslim states promoted higher education for all citi-
zens regardless of their socioeconomic status. For example, in Egypt under President Nasser's populist-authoritarian regime, “the number of students enrolled in primary education per thousand of population increased by 234 percent, and the number of students enrolled in higher education rose by 325 percent” (25). The majority of Muslim immigration in the past fifty years, therefore, can be characterized as well educated middle class professionals from a variety of countries in Europe, Southeast Asia and the Middle East.

Among the Muslim communities in the United States, Chicago is one of the best examples of the transition from isolated lower class Arab immigrant neighborhoods to an influential Muslim middle class made up of a variety of ethnic groups, including a significant number of African American converts. Some of the first Muslims to settle in Chicago came as part of the Columbian Exposition in 1893 (Schmidt 16). The majority of these early Muslim immigrants were Palestinian or Lebanese men whose goal “was to amass as much wealth as possible in the shortest time and then return to the homeland” (Husain & Vogelarr 232). Although these early immigrants continued to practice their religion, Islam was not their highest priority. Many of these individuals even made attempts to assimilate into American culture by marrying non-Muslims, and for the most part, blended into the American melting pot (232).

Due to immigration quotas, many Southeast Asian Muslims were barred from coming to the United States. As a result, Arab-Muslims constituted the majority of Muslim immigrants in the Chicago area until immigration quotas were relaxed in 1965. However after 1965, “many professional and skilled workers migrated to the United States [and] many of Chicago’s present day South Asian Muslims came during and after that period, settling in suburban neighborhoods” (Schmidt 23). Over a hundred years of Muslim migration to the Chicago area has produced a community that is both ethnically and economically diverse.

Although “ethnic affiliation within the Chicago Muslim community [is] still running strong” (59), some members of the community are actively involved in programs that focus on the universality of Islam, rather than ethnic differences among various Muslim groups. However, these programs have not entirely erased the reality of ethnic and socioeconomic-
ic differences within the Muslim community. For example, “even though African Americans are active in various immigrant mosques and organizations, Muslims of immigrant background often voice skepticism when African American Muslims independently interpret Islam according to their communal experiences and history” (28). A distinction, therefore, is made between converts to Islam and those who were born into the faith. Furthermore, the fact that Islam, like Judaism, lacks a centralized church hierarchy leaves the religion open to interpretation, only increasing the differences between various Muslim groups. As a result, two opposing groups emerge in the Chicago Muslim community. On one hand are groups located among lower class Muslims in the inner cities whose goal is not only to incorporate Muslims of all ethnic backgrounds, but also to invite non-Muslims to participate in community events and programs. On the other hand, there are groups made up primarily of middle class Muslims professionals whose institutions, such as Islamic private schools, effectively restrict their interaction with non-Muslim as well as Muslim groups whom they feel do not promote proper Islamic values. As a result, even those groups that wish to promote a more universal ideal of Islam are still affected by the debate over religious versus ethnic identity.

The struggle between religious and ethnic identity is indicative of the conflict between the immigrant generation and those who are second and third generation Muslim Americans. While many immigrants “speak in nostalgic tones about the country they left behind, their children may speak of the ethnic home of their parents with some disappointment and even resentment” (114). It is no surprise then that an organization like IMAN or the Inner-City Muslim Action Network, which promotes Islamic values as a means to keeping inner-city youth away from drugs and gangs, was created in 1994 by Muslim students at Depaul University. As an extension of the local Islamic Center which serves as both a meeting place and a community outreach program, IMAN could draw on the support of Chicago’s inner city Muslim community, providing religious instruction as well as an after school program (45-46). By promoting Islam as a religion whose values can be imitated even by non-Muslims, IMAN promotes the idea of a universal and inclusive Islam, rather than creating divisions based on ethnicity and, in the case of non-Muslims involved in the program, even religious affiliation.
However, not all Muslim groups wish to promote the inclusive message of Islam that IMAN embodies. For example, in an attempt to present “Islam as a social movement, transcending borders of ethnicity, violence and poverty for those living in the surrounding neighborhoods” (115), IMAN has held a festival for several years called “Taking it to the Streets.” Although “Taking it to the Streets” was deemed an instant success by those who participated in the ceremony, several Muslim groups, especially Arab Muslims who lived in the suburbs, declined participation in the event. The absence of these groups was not only indicative of the division among ethnic groups, but also among Muslims of differing socioeconomic status. By not participating in an event sponsored by inner-city Muslim organizations, middle class Muslims “might devalue the needs and activities of other Muslims by claiming that they did not practice Islam correctly” (59). By adopting a more universal message, the middle class Muslims of Chicago’s suburbs felt that IMAN presented a more flexible vision of Islam, which went against their core values. For example, middle class Muslims claimed that members of Chicago’s inner city Muslim community in which IMAN was based engaged in activities that went against the basic tenets of Islam, such as selling liquor and lottery tickets in their businesses and donating the profits from these unseemly activities to the local mosques (59). Given the activities of some of its members, middle class Muslims felt that the message that groups like IMAN promoted was a corruption of the Islamic values they struggled to promote through their own community programs.

Although middle class Muslim immigrants in the suburban Chicago area may make distinctions between Muslims of differing socioeconomic status, many of these same individuals overlook ethnic differences in favor of forming communities and institutions dedicated to the preservation of Islamic values. One of the most prominent examples of this movement is the establishment of several private Islamic schools in the Chicago area. These schools appeal to middle class Muslim parents who “wanted their children to learn Islamic standards and get acquainted with the normative scriptures, traditions, and language of the Qur’an” (63). Islamic private schools not only promote Islamic values, they also provide an environment in which Muslim children can learn about and practice their religion without fear of discrimination by
non-Muslim students. Furthermore, Islamic schools provide a sense of community that many parents feel is absent from American public schools.

The development of Islamic schools in the Chicago area is indicative of a “utopian hope for the future, where competing voices of doubt and hypocrisy . . . [are] to be silenced through the unification of the umma” (75), an idea that many middle class Muslims wish to promote. Parents hope that the close knit communities formed within these schools will protect their children from falling prey to American culture, which they feel would lead to a corruption of Islamic values. However, as professionals reaping the rewards of the American economy themselves, these parents understand the need for their children to receive a comprehensive education that will allow them to compete in the real world. Islamic schools in the Chicago area, therefore, are a synthesis of American educational standards and Islamic values. While Islamic schools may promote a message that transcends ethnic differences in favor of a universal form of Islam, the private nature of these schools makes it impossible for them to transcend socioeconomic differences between inner city and suburban Muslim communities.

Even though the dominant trend in Chicago’s Muslim community is one of a transition from an ethnic to a religious identity, the impetus behind this trend was sparked by those very ethnic differences. The flexibility inherent in a religion without a specialized hierarchy of authority allowed for different interpretations of Islam among different ethnic groups. While there is a “tendency to consider the Middle East both as the homeland and heartland of Dar al-Islam (the abode of Islam)” many early Muslim immigrants from the Arabian Peninsula practiced a more secularized version of Islam (Brown 10). However, the relaxation of immigration quotas after 1965 resulted in an influx of Southeast Asian Muslims, especially Pakistanis, in the Chicago area. Whereas many Arab Muslims tended to practice a less restrictive form of Islam, Pakistani Muslims tend to be stricter in their observance (Haddad 14). This emphasis on religion among Pakistani Muslim immigrants translated into a greater emphasis on religious rather than ethnic identity and has prompted the creation of institutions like the Islamic private schools. As a result, the increase in immigrant groups who are more devout in their observation of Islam has led to a greater empha-
sis on religion within the community as a whole. In addition, the increasing prominence of Islamic fundamentalist movements, such as the Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt and elsewhere in the Muslim world, has influenced the latest wave of Muslim immigrants to the United States.

While the majority of Muslim immigrants in the Chicago area voluntarily migrate to the United States in order to benefit from greater economic freedom and employment opportunities, many Sub-Saharan African Muslim immigrants come to the United States as refugees fleeing genocide or unbearable living conditions. The circumstances under which these individuals migrate to the United States influence the way in which they perceive themselves and practice their religion once they arrive on American soil. These circumstances have caused two very different reactions among foreign born African Muslims. On one hand, there are immigrants, such as working class Eritrean Muslims in Durham, North Carolina, who for reasons of economic security reject both their religious and ethnic background in favor of adopting mainstream American culture (Goldwasser 302). On the other hand, there are immigrants, such as the Sierra Leonian Muslims, who look to a greater community of Muslims from a variety of ethnic backgrounds for support while still maintaining a separate ethnic identity (D’Alisera 9).

Unlike today’s professional middle class Muslim immigrants, many Muslims from Africa come to the United States with little education or marketable skills. Their lack of education forces these immigrants to work long hours in low paying jobs. For example, Eritrean immigrants in Durham, North Carolina are often forced to work under conditions which prevent them from practicing the required prayers five times a day or to attend Friday afternoon prayers (Goldwasser 305). Their limited job skills also mean they sometimes have to take jobs that go against fundamental tenets of Islam, such as working as a bartender serving alcohol, in order to make a living. Eritrean immigrants tend to identify with mainstream American culture since the lack of economic security prevents them from observing Islamic religious practices correctly. In addition, many of these immigrants perceive their lack of success in America as directly related to their foreignness, which prevents them from getting higher paying jobs. As a result, these immigrants tend to downplay their ethnic and religious heritage in order to advance in American society. However, unlike immigrant groups of the
past, these African Muslim immigrants see their assimilation as a temporary situation. Although they may send their children to public schools and encourage them to speak English rather than their native language, these immigrants realize “a college education, which will help their children find a secure job is . . . one way to ensure the maintenance of this Muslim identity” (306). Eritrean Muslims, therefore, view their Islamic identity as an impediment to their economic security but also hope that their children can integrate that same identity into their lives as they achieve greater economic security than their parents.

The level of economic security within the Muslim community directly relates to the level of religious observation among its members. While low socioeconomic status prevents Eritrean Muslims in Durham, North Carolina from practicing their religion as they would normally, middle class and professional Muslims in the same area make an effort to integrate their religious identity into their everyday lives. For example, the more flexible schedule found in the medical and academic fields allowed many Muslim professionals to take their vacation during the month of Ramadan so that they could fast without it impeding their ability to work (308). The greater emphasis on religion, furthermore, crosses ethnic lines, with middle class Muslim immigrants from Egypt, Indonesia, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Bangladesh and Dubai all choosing to remain on the cultural margins of society in favor of promoting an Islamic lifestyle (302). While many Eritrean Muslims are forced to take jobs that conflict with their religious practice, middle class and professional Muslims in the very same community feel secure enough in their position to resist the pressure to assimilate into American culture.

In direct contrast to Eritrean Muslims in Durham, North Carolina is the Sierra Leonian Muslim community in Washington D.C. Rather than lose their Islamic heritage by migrating to the United States, “migration enables [Sierra Leonian] Muslims to reflect on the ways Islam has been understood and . . . many find themselves questioning for the first time what it means to be Muslim” (D’Alisera 11). Sierra Leonian Muslims maintain a variety of community ties based on both religious and ethnic backgrounds. One of the most important aspects of the Sierra Leonian community in Washington D.C. is its ability to “relocate themselves through expressive representations of homeland. These expres-
sions form the boundaries . . . [that] provide a means by which people recognize the identities, places, and realities that separate them from the perceived American Other" (42). However, that is not to say that these identities remain separate from one another. Rather, their recollections of their homeland and their traditional ways of practicing Islam influence the way in which they perceive the multi-ethnic Islamic community in which they live.

The rich ethnic diversity of Washington D.C. provides Sierra Leonian Muslims with a unique opportunity to experience the varied nature of Islamic practice in the United States. Like the Islamic Centers in Chicago's inner city Muslim communities, the Islamic Center in Washington D.C. acts as a meeting place for a variety of Muslims in its quest to create a more universal form of Islam. Completed in 1957, the Islamic center in Washington D.C. "represents the breadth of the Islamic world . . . [and] the congregation reflects sectarian as well as cultural and national diversity" (62). Even traditional Friday afternoon prayers at the Islamic Center give Sierra Leonian Muslims an opportunity to interact with Muslims from diverse ethnic backgrounds (58). Faced with the sheer variety of Islamic practice at the center, many Sierra Leonian Muslims have begun to reconsider more traditional indigenous forms of Islam.

While many Muslim immigrants have benefited from increased educational opportunities in their homelands, gaining a greater understanding of their faith in the process, Sierra Leonian Muslims feel that their grasp of Islam is inadequate. Given this sentiment, their limited religious knowledge is "central to why and how these Sierra Leonians continually redefine themselves as Muslims" (65). Contact with a multi-ethnic Muslim community has caused many individuals to rethink their own distinctive form of Islam and they "strive to redefine their own Muslim identity in relation to an imagined dominant 'other'" (64-5). Given what they feel is their inferior status, Muslim immigrants from Sierra Leon living in an urban center like Washington D.C. take ideas from other Muslim groups, while also making a distinction between themselves and other ethnic groups, such as the South East Asian and Arab Muslims who also gather at the Islamic Center. Rather than allow ethnicity to limit their understanding of Islam, Sierra Leoinan Muslims emphasize the importance of learning how to practice Islam correctly
regardless of ethnic differences. In her study on Sierra Leonian Muslims, D’Alisera argues that “in the case of many Sierra Leonian Muslim . . . an idealized Islam rooted in part in the metanarrative of global Islam, one that often conflicts with indigenous customs and practices ‘back home’ transcends location” (10). As with growing numbers of Muslims in Chicago, many Sierra Leonian Muslims view the tenets of Islam as universal.

Unlike immigrant groups of the past, many Muslims immigrants not only embrace their religious identity, they also openly resist societal pressures to assimilate into American culture. Three main factors contribute to the revitalization of Islam in Muslims communities across the United States. Among these factors, the increasing number of middle class Muslims migrating to the United States has had the greatest impact on the Muslim community at large. As with other ethnic and religious immigrant groups since 1965, recent Muslim migrants are unusual in the history of American immigration for the unprecedented number of professionals who are migrating to the United States in search of upper level positions in academic and professional fields. The flexibility inherent in these upper level jobs gives Muslim immigrants the freedom to practice Islam without fear of compromising their economic security. These upper class Muslim immigrants “use their socioeconomic status to preserve their Islamic heritage and thereby choose to remain on the cultural margins of society” (Goldwasser 312).

Nevertheless, greater economic security alone cannot completely account for the revitalization of Islam throughout the world. Rather, the secularization of many Muslim countries beginning in the early 20th century and reaching its peak in the fifties and sixties in conjunction with greater educational opportunities contributed to the revitalization of Islam. Increased education resulted in a greater interest in Islam, while the failure of the nation state to fulfill its promises in countries like Egypt caused many Muslims to look back to their religion for a solution to their problems. More recent Muslim immigrants, therefore, were already more devout than their earlier counterparts, while their higher socioeconomic status gave them the freedom to practice their religion. The flexible nature of Islam, with no church hierarchy, allowed immigrants to form their own universal form of Islam that transcends ethnic differences and traditions. Although Muslim immigrants, like immigrants
of the past, could choose to identify with an ethnicity rather religion, many Muslim immigrants today seek to form a community based on shared religious ideals rather than ethnic identity.

WORKS CONSULTED
A Brief Note from Budapest

March 20, 2006
Budapest

To the Core Journal -

The buildings may be crumbling in Budapest -- much reconstruction still yet to be done -- but the spirit is vibrant. The young people are energetic and here at The Birdland the jazz is sensational.

All good wishes,
J.J.
As a boy, I waited for the smile to appear in you.
Listened for echoes of the sigh I could hear in you.

You are the mirror where I have sought the beloved:
Her hyacinth tresses, a nod, a wink, a tear, in you.

In the marketplace, you can learn your future for a price.
They are merchants of fate; I see the seer in you.

What had been buried under the scripture's weight,
Its truth—without words or incense—becomes clear in you.

They who bind you on the altar of sacrifice
Hide behind masks; don't let them smell the fear in you.

As I approach the house lit by dawn's blue light,
Step by step, I lose myself, I disappear in you.
salimmo sù, el primo e io secondo,
tanto ch’i’ vidi de le cose belle
che porta ’l ciel, per un pertugio tondo.
E quindi uscimmo a riveder le stelle.

He first, I following—until I saw,
through a round opening, some of those things
of beauty Heaven bears. It was from there
that we emerged, to see—once more—the stars.

Dante’s *Inferno* 34.139