

Saint Mary's College of California

Saint Mary's Digital Commons

The Undergraduate Spectrum

1-1-1993

Spectrum 1993

Saint Mary's College of California

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.stmarys-ca.edu/undergraduate-spectrum>



Part of the [Rhetoric and Composition Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Saint Mary's College of California, "Spectrum 1993" (1993). *The Undergraduate Spectrum*. 24.
<https://digitalcommons.stmarys-ca.edu/undergraduate-spectrum/24>

This Issue is brought to you for free and open access by Saint Mary's Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in The Undergraduate Spectrum by an authorized administrator of Saint Mary's Digital Commons. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@stmarys-ca.edu.

SPECTRUM

1993



ST. MARY'S COLLEGE

SPECTRUM 1993

IN its seventh year of publication, *Spectrum* presents some of the finest achievements of student writing across the curriculum at Saint Mary's College. We congratulate the three winners of the essay contest and the ten students who receive honorable mention. Their essays demonstrate the commitment of Saint Mary's College to "the liberation of the mind, which is the essence of the liberal arts tradition" and which "requires that students in all disciplines develop the habits of looking twice, of asking why, of seeking not only facts but fundamental principles."

We thank Professors Lou Berney of the School of Liberal Arts, J. D. Phillips of the School of Science, and Barry Eckhouse of the School of Economics and Business Administration for serving as judges of the contest. The support of Academic Vice-President William Hynes and the Deans of the School of Liberal Arts, Paul Zingg and Stephen Sloane, has been vital to our project.

Special thanks to R. J. Beran, who, having read *TeX for the Impatient*, most patiently created the elegant format of *Spectrum 1993* in \TeX . Michael Barnsley's recursive fern, approximated on our cover, signals that *Spectrum* embraces many disciplines. This complex fern was created from a mathematical equation specified by only twenty-four numbers. Each branch on the frond mirrors the whole, as does each branch on a branch, and so on indefinitely.

We gratefully acknowledge the generosity of Pod and Katie Boothe once again, whose contributions to the college have helped make possible the publication of *Spectrum*.

Carol Beran
Faculty Moderator

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Prize-winning Essays

First Place:

- SEXUAL ROLES IN TRANSITION** by Allyson Lyle 1
written for Gender in the Drama (Carol Lashof)

Second Place:

- THINKING ABOUT ANGELS** by Nami McKlentin 5
written for Thinking about Angels (Wayne Harter)

Third Place:

- LIFE AFTER DEATH** by Katie Shaw 9
written for Independent Study on Human Anatomy (Greg Smith)

Honorable Mention

- THE FOLLY OF MAN** by Mark Berger 11
written for Renaissance Thought (Sherri Hallgren)

- REVOLUTION, WIZARDRY AND THE AGE OF OZ** 15
by Amy Blaisdell
written for Children's Literature (Barry Horowitz)

- REDEFINING INDIVIDUALITY: A NON-PSYCHOLOGICAL** 19
APPROACH by Ryan Cone
written for Children's Literature (Barry Horowitz)

- EUROCENTRICITY: A STUDY OF COLUMBUS AND VILLAGRA** 25
by Colin Daly
written for American Literature (Janice Doane)

- THE SIGNIFICANT ROLE OF FATHER IN THE AENEID** 29
by Genevieve Del Rosario
written for Roman, Christian, Medieval Thought (Marsha Newman)

- TORMENT TO BELIEF** by Alan Esser 33
written for The Brothers Karamazov (Joseph Lanigan)

- SEXIST WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE AND HIS STEREOTYPICAL** 39
WOMEN by Lisa Hanisch
written for Shakespeare's Comedies (Phyllis Stowell)

- A RISK TO OUR MORALITY** by Amy Keith 45
written for Better Writing I (Marsha Newman)

- AH, THE GOOD LIFE!** by Helen Leiker 47
written for Roman, Christian, Medieval Thought (Katherine Roper)

- AN UNEMOTIONAL HERO** by Anh Truong 51
written for Roman, Christian, Medieval Thought (Carol Beran and Br. Charles)

SEXUAL ROLES IN TRANSITION

Allyson Lyle '94

THE Victorian Era in English Colonial Africa and the permissive seventies in London: what could be more different as far as sexual roles? *Cloud 9*, a 1979 play by Caryl Churchill, makes use of these two extremes to compare and contrast roles. This play gives us a fresh perspective on our own sexual roles, teaching us what forms them, and how they influence us.

The sexual roles of nineteenth century, colonial Africa are rigidly fixed, and the characters are controlled by them. We are introduced to the family members by Clive, the father. As the highest representative of the crown in this "territory," he neatly and authoritatively sums up each role. He makes his introductions in a rhyming, singsong pattern, as if remembering previously learned behaviors which have been passed down and memorized like nursery rhymes. Betty is all "a wife should be" (3), namely an extension of Clive, and she lives to serve him. His son, Edward, is a man in training, whether he likes it or not. His daughter, Victoria, a decoration to be seen not heard, is fittingly played by a dummy, who doesn't even warrant a speech.

These roles have complex and exacting rules. Edward must "grow up to be a man like [his] papa" (40). His role has a specific list of prescribed behaviors. This list would include never doing anything which would appear to be feminine, which, of course, would preclude playing with dolls. It is permissible, under the rules of his role, however, for him to hold a doll if he is "not playing with it" but "minding" it for his sister. He is then fulfilling the protector aspect of his role and is considered "manly" and a "good brother" (13).

The characters are so controlled by these roles, which they see as absolutely authoritative, that they sacrifice their true selves to conform to them (illustrated by the fact that both Edward and Betty are played by actors opposite their sex). As Betty chimes back to Clive her conditioned response, "The whole aim of my life is to be what he looks for in a wife" (4), we can just as easily imagine her in a school play with a yellow sun cutout around her face reciting, "I am the warm and friendly

SPECTRUM

sun, I shine all day till nighttime comes." And in her eyes, her role is probably just as fixed by her duty as is the sun's by the laws of nature. She could no more decide to act differently than the sun could shine at night.

When Betty confides in a friend that she yearns to go out and have adventures rather than being the wife sitting at home, he challenges her with, "That's up to you." Betty's answer shows that this option is not within her realm of possibility. "Of course it's not. I have duties" (19). The only way Betty can view herself is through an ideology that tells her how a British woman in her position should act and feel. Whether she is happy is not a consideration. When she is asked this question, she doesn't even justify it with an answer. And viewing herself through this ideology, she also must judge herself "wicked" for even thinking of pushing the rules (31).

Intensifying the inflexibility of these roles and the characters' degree of adherence to them is the roles' source and authority. These roles are as big as Britain herself. As the play opens, the first image we see is the "Union Jack" silhouetted in front of an equatorial sun. And before the characters speak a word individually, they present themselves as a united British chorus performing a rallying song. This reminds us that before these characters are people, they are, first and foremost, representatives of the British Crown, a bastion of British civility among the savages.

The one person who manages to escape the weighty authority of the crown in Act I is Mrs. Saunders. At first she fulfills a sanctioned alternative female role. She is the single woman in jeopardy, "alone in the world," whom Clive will bring under his protection in exchange for climbing under her skirts (40). She is "unusual" compared to Betty, Maud, and Ellen. But her differences are applauded as "spirited," a quality which makes a mistress a more exciting sexual object (46). She stretches her role further and further as she refuses Harry's offer of protective matrimony, opting instead to fend for herself. "I shall go to England and buy a farm there. I shall introduce threshing machines," she boldly announces (58). But she finally breaches the single woman in jeopardy role when she physically defends herself from Betty's attack. Clive pronounces this "shocking behavior" toward her "hostess" and predicts there will be "No place for her anywhere." He orders her to "pack [her] bags and leave the house this instant" (58). Mrs. Saunders makes her final break from her prescribed role with her rebellious reply, "I have made arrangements to leave tomorrow, and tomorrow is when I will leave" (59). In this dismissal of her role's authority to dictate her actions, Mrs. Saunders gives us a hint of what we will find a hundred years later and a continent away in Act II.

This second act also opens with a song, and it keys us into some of the differences between the last era and this one. "Yum yum bubble gum. /Stick it up your mother's bum," it begins (63). Rather than a unifying song of patriotism sung by all, this one is an irreverent song which mocks authority, and is sung by a young girl. It is obvious that this is a new era. Little girls are not quiet ladies and mother's bums are not sacred. But even though much has changed, including the types of sexual roles, some things are less changed. There is still evidence of pressure to conform to roles. We see Lin upset that her daughter wants to wear "frocks" instead of jeans like her (79).

SEXUAL ROLES IN TRANSITION

Victoria is worried about whether sex with another woman "counts as adultery" (75). And Edward, when asked about his homosexuality, claims, "It's not true" (69).

What has changed is that while there are still sexual roles, they are not as fixed as they were in Act I, or as revered. These roles are in a state of transition and the characters with them. There are a number of forces at work to create this difference.

To begin with, these new roles are not perceived as royal edicts, litmus tests of loyalty to "God and Queen" (43). There is no mention of either of these words or the word "duty," which seem to be the reasons behind most actions in the first act (44). These new roles are a consensus of a society which is making them up as they go along, judging and reevaluating. Hence, the authority is much easier to challenge, and is subject to question and change.

Also, with a multiple peer source, there is a greater range of what is acceptable, a greater variety of roles. We are not limited to the proper sexual role for a man and the proper sexual role for a woman. We see characters comfortable with a wide range of roles, including a homosexual man who sees himself as a lesbian.

An important factor facilitating the flexibility of roles is the freedom women enjoy as a result of earning their own living. They are no longer limited to the protected female roles. When Lin's husband abuses her, she is not trapped in her wifely role; she rejects the role and leaves. This also affords the men a degree of freedom. Victoria and Lin make enough money to allow Edward to be their homemaker. Just as these roles are in transition, so is the characters' acceptance of them.

In spite of the permissiveness of modern London, role conformity is not extinct. But in this act it is not the norm, as it was in Act I. In the first act, the characters viewed themselves through the ideology of a role and thus were controlled by it, with the exception of Mrs. Saunders. In this act, the characters' ideologies are able to change to accommodate their true feelings. The exception to this is Martin, who is rather Victorian in the way he buys into his decidedly non-Victorian role.

Martin is concerned about bringing his life in line with what he perceives society deems the modern man to be. He sees the role as understanding and encouraging liberation in the modern woman, which he will strive to fulfill at all costs. In discussing the option of Victoria moving for a job opportunity, Martin says, "Whatever you want to do, I'll be delighted. If you could just let me know what it is I'm to be delighted about" (79). He is not as concerned with what her decision is, and what it will mean to their relationship, as he is with reacting correctly. The proper reaction is delight, which Martin guarantees regardless of the decision or his feelings about it. And when she starts to cry, he is more worried about the reflection on him than about what that crying may indicate: "Don't cry again Vicky. I am not the sort of man who makes women cry" (79). This modern man role is not natural to Martin. He admits to "work[ing] very hard" at setting aside his true self to conform to the role (108).

Lin is at the other end of the spectrum. Roles have little power over her. Victoria accuses her of being "inconsistent," and it is true; she is inconsistent with the role of lesbian. She "shouldn't," as Victoria says, "be collaborating with sexist consumerism" (85). But Victoria doesn't care as much how her actions look or whether she is

SPECTRUM

behaving as expected, as she does care about how they make her feel. She just knows she is "sick of dressing like a boy" (85), even though it is not in keeping with a prescribed role. The role must accommodate her, not vice versa.

Most of the second act characters don't start out as free from conventions as Lin, or end up as bound by them as Martin. They are more free to work on bringing their actions into harmony with their feelings regardless of what society dictates. With the roles themselves in a state of flux, Edward, Victoria, and Betty, who were once frozen by the rigid Victorian roles, are able to change within the course of the second act. This change is perhaps most dramatic in Betty.

At the beginning of Act II, Betty has changed little from the first act. She stills places her worth in her ability to please men. "Who do you do things for?" she asks Lin, bewildered (82). She eventually feels free enough to leave her wife role. Being "alone in the world" (40), the ultimate horror which her mother had warned her to avoid at all costs, is a difficult adjustment for Betty. Being connected to a man was so much a part of her ideology, that without that connection, "the grass" in "the park" "seems to tilt" (83). However, with her new job comes a sense of identity and pride. She brags to Cathy about how she "sit[s] behind a desk of [her] own," and she proudly displays the money she has earned all by herself (101).

When Betty touches herself and decides "there is somebody there" (105) we see that she has made a complete break from her old role. She is finally able to view herself as her own "separate person" (105). Even when her mother and Clive appear, as keepers of the role, to try to shame her, the Betty from Act I is able to embrace the Betty from Act II, making her identity complete.

Churchill may be showing us that although we live in an age when our sexual roles seem "upside down" as it says in the song, *Cloud 9*, a time when you may find "Your wife's lover's children" and your "lover's wife" merrily cooking dinner together, sexual roles still exist. And they still have the capacity to fragment us if we allow them.

Bad ↗

THINKING ABOUT ANGELS

Nami McKlentin

IN examining the possible reasons why angels now occupy a position of relative obscurity in modern intellectual thought, it is perhaps best to start with the most general of assertions: that the study of angels has declined because the study of orthodox Christianity has declined. This overarching consideration may be attributed to the division that has emerged in lives of the laity in the United States between the religious and the secular life. Religion and time devoted to contemplation of God and His relationship with us and the whole of creation has been neatly and conveniently parceled out to a one or two hour slot every Sunday—or, more popularly, simply Easter and Christmas. Religious thought plays a very small role in the day to day lives of most Americans. The study of angels, or even the larger context in which it can be understood of the study of the relationship of God and the creation, no longer holds, even nominally, a position of centrality or of worth in modern culture. Students go to school to learn how to survive, comprehend, and eventually to succeed in the modern world and not a single course is required, especially in public schools, on ethics, morality, or religion. The courses that are offered in those topics in schools for general education these days either center on historical approaches and understandings of these three things or provide a necessarily limited overview of the central beliefs of the major religions of the world. The subtle complexities of religious thought are left to those who choose to major in or go on to graduate study in theology or philosophy. Generally, therefore, we may point to these reasons to explain the “eclipse of heaven” as one theologian eloquently stated.

Now we are left with a weightier problem. Those people who have majored in theology and philosophy and even go on to graduate school do not seriously study angels either. People who spend their intellectual lives thinking seriously about the relationship of God and His creation examine the relationship between God and man, sans angels, and have for almost three centuries. Why? In the larger historical picture this is an abnormality, for angels were included in discussions concerning God and man long before the birth of Christ. This is therefore the more difficult question to

answer. I will attempt to address this irregularity by critically examining possible answers from two different but perhaps interrelated angles.

The first explanation why the God-angels-man interrelationship has now become only a God-man relationship can be attributed to a procession of historical developments. The decline in serious study of angels would seem to stem from the onset of the Reformation in general and the Catholic Counter-Reformation in particular. This theory would consist of the following argument:

Before the Reformation, the Church had indeed been catholic in its all-encompassing nature and had managed to absorb a spectrum of extra-orthodox ideas under one broad definition of orthodoxy. These ideas were often local folk beliefs of a largely supernatural nature, of which the most widespread was of the cults surrounding the saints and their relics. With the onset of the Reformation, the Church underwent a rather stringent campaign to cleanse itself of suspect elements that were seen to weaken the moral authority of Catholicism and open the Church to a more vigorous Protestant attack. Interest in the saints and angels was discouraged in favor of less supernatural theorizing. Protestantism itself led to a decline in angelology, since its emphasis on the direct relationship between the individual to God through the Bible and the grace of Jesus Christ effectively circumvented not only an ecclesiastical hierarchy but also a celestial one.

The deterioration of angelology in even Catholic circles was hastened over time by the intellectual and literary movement of the Enlightenment. This new understanding of the world had grown out of the Scientific Revolution and put forth the concept that man, armed with the power of a rational process of reasoning and the scientific mode of analysis, would now be able to unlock the secret laws of God inherent in all things which maintained the world and universe. The destruction early on in the Scientific Revolution of the Ptolemaic universe and the discovery that beyond the sphere of the moon, where angels were thought to reside in ceaseless unchangeable patterns of planetary motion, was corruption and mutability, consigned that belief in angels to the growing pile of disdained and discarded medieval views. These new discoveries, furthermore, heightened the belief in the ability of man to learn all there was to know about Nature and the world, and effectively prompted men to rely more and more on the powers of observation and reason. This further fed into the idea of intellectual progress equaling moral progress and the brave assertions of some nineteenth century thinkers that by the end of the century, man would reside in a new Eden created and sustained by enlightened men. It was thought that God had given these intellectual tools of reason and science to humanity to be used to better the human condition. These tools also provided a way to examine the vast complexity of God's creation without necessarily involving angelic revelation or ecclesiastical authority.

There are, unfortunately, several problems with this neat historical approach. One major problem with this theory, if we go back to the beginning of it, is that angels and angelology were not considered at the time of the Counter-Reformation on the same level as such extra-orthodox superstitious beliefs as the curative powers of gazing on a picture of St. Catherine. Angelology had some very serious theological authority to its credit, and none the less among these were the towering figures of St. Augustine

THINKING ABOUT ANGELS

and Thomas Aquinas. While this might not mean very much to Protestants who do not value the extensive intellectual tradition of the Church, to Catholic thinkers this means a great deal and should have protected angelology to a large extent from being discouraged as a theological pursuit. I say "should have" because it makes logical and theological sense. However, I am not altogether sure at this particular point if angelology was shielded because of the authoritative scholarship behind it or if in fact, because men are not always logical, interest in angels was shifted by the ecclesiastical fathers into other theological pursuits in an all-out attempt to halt the tide of heresy. Nevertheless, I attest that angelology should not have been affected greatly by the Counter-Reformation.

Another issue that should be raised is that with the destruction of the Ptolemaic universe it should have become patently obvious even outside theological and philosophical spheres of thought that heaven was not a *place* beginning in its farthest reaches just outside the orbit of the moon. While undoubtedly some men still considered heaven a place, it cannot be denied that it was crystal clear that reason and even the scientific method was unable to locate it. For this, angelic revelation would seem to be necessary once again.

The second major reason it may no longer be fashionable to include angels in consideration of what had been the God-angels-man relationship is political and social. We in the United States live under a government based on the theory of an egalitarian democracy that parallels, in many ways and in secular forms, the Protestant concept of the priesthood of all believers. If every individual is a sinner redeemed only by the grace of Christ, and good works count for nothing since they are done out of essential self-interest, then one person is naturally not able to hold a higher moral position of guidance over another. Likewise, if all men are created equal, then it follows that each individual should not hold a position of higher political authority than another unless mandated by a common vote. This concept of each individual being equal to another individual in all ways before the government, law, and in Protestant cases, the church, comes into conflict with the Catholic understanding that not all souls are equal in their moral development. If one takes this view, then a hierarchy, an example of which is expounded by Dionysius and modeled in imitation of the heavenly hierarchy, is necessary for the good of all. In this manner, those who perhaps have misguided priorities or are not quite so far along in the moral development of their lives may be helped along and gently uplifted by those a little more advanced in terms of moral growth and understanding. It would never do, for practical if not for the theological reasons Dionysius points out, for a hierarch to attempt to enlighten a layperson just beginning a spiritual search. The situation would be, for one, intimidating, and also as counterproductive as a professor attempting to teach calculus to a child who has not yet learned the times tables.

Nevertheless, the concept of a hierarchy today is considered, if one holds the mainline political and social view in the United States, to be an artificial construct benefiting those highest up and holding down the great mass of humanity in ignorance and rigid conformity. It is not at all considered the enlightened or modern way of governing, for a hierarchy is perceived as elitist to the core and serves to constrict

if not eliminate the realization of the potential of that squashed mass of humanity. So runs the prevailing argument. Therefore, with this view generally held, it might seem as no wonder that the hierarchically ordered tiers of angels are uncomfortable concepts to deal with. After all, if one accepts the idea that angels are arranged in a hierarchical order in heaven, then it logically follows that this divinely ordered model is probably the best one to follow as best as we can to try to divinize our lives.

Immediately at this point, a person along the lines of Mortimer Adler, who I see as representing as well as anyone a serious thinker in the mainline political social tradition, would interrupt the pleasant flow of this conversation and contend that to try to model the social and political life of humanity to an angelic model is to commit a grave angelic fallacy, and furthermore represents a clear case of rose-colored wishful thinking. "Look about you," he might say, "and realize that the fallen nature of man lacks the angelic qualities that make the heavenly hierarchy succeed. Such a utopia on earth is a lovely but impossible delusion."

To this I reply by acknowledging the foregoing argument but asking whether we are then expected to then cater to our fallen nature and simply hope for a large infusion of the grace of God to uplift us? Or should we strive, as Thomas á Kempis recommended and St. Francis demonstrated, to model our personal lives *in as much as we are able*, and aided by the grace of God, towards the imitation of Christ? Yes? And then should we not model our social and political lives in a similar manner towards the imitation of the angelic representation of the noblest manifestation of government? I think so. To say that we cannot *try* at least to live as the angels do because of the limitations imposed upon us by our fallen nature is tantamount to suggesting, in a parallel fashion, we should not try to think about the nature of God because of the limitations and in the scope of our minds. Of course we will not be able to live as the angels do. However, I contend that how we order our personal, social, and political lives is a reflection of the ultimate concerns of a culture, and to order it towards the highest and most divine good, even if ultimately unattainable in the mortal sense, is to put our priorities in order.

We now will pick up the thread of our previous discussion. We were involved in speculating on the proposition that angels are no longer included in the God-angels-man interrelationship because the idea of a hierarchically ordered government is an uncomfortable one to minds suckled on the milk of democracy and free enterprise. This may be a viable reason. If this were true, it would render those who wished to involve angels in serious discussion of man and God to the political and social fringes of contemporary thought as intellectual throwbacks to the Middle Ages.

The two theories I have outlined above are simple speculations concerning the decline of the study of angels. They represent two different frames of reference through which to view the problem: an historical one and a social/political one. Neither is complete on its own, and requires elements of the other and perhaps other points of departure to create a cohesive view. It is not an easily answered question, after all, and even if a definite reason could be pinpointed for the decline of such study, I wonder if it would do much to rekindle interest in evaluating the interconnection between men, angels, and God.

LIFE AFTER DEATH

Katie Shaw

I NEVER thought that I would die. I knew that I was sick, but mortality still eluded me. What a strange experience death is, well “was,” actually. You see, I had been ill with cancer for a few years and I knew death was inevitable, but I never expected my life and existence to end at the same time. I realize that doesn’t sound like rational thinking: when you die, all of you dies. I know now I did not want to face that reality. I truly did not want to die. There was more I wished to do and give to those I loved and to the world I lived in.

I can not say it was these feelings exactly, or even the cancer that had invaded my body which helped me decide to give myself to science. I guess it was the need to give more to this world even after my own death. I felt I would be able to continue living through those studies and observations of my body that would be remembered by a number of students. So you see, by deciding to donate my own body to science I got what I wanted, a few more years of life, while fate was allowed to take its course.

When I first saw those students who would be studying me, I didn’t know what to think. Instinctively, I watched and stayed near the young girl who was present. “Good,” I thought, “she could learn a lot from me. A lot that would teach her about herself.” It was at this time that my observations stopped. I never watched any dissections, or saw anything people would consider morbid or repulsive. Instead, I lived within this student. I could hear her thoughts, and feel her excitement, frustration, or confusions. I felt her struggle with the emotions that come with performing this type of work, and I listened to her comments and feelings about what she saw. I often wanted to, but could not answer when she wondered if the woman before her knew what a wonderful gift she had given to her and countless other future students. In fact, it wasn’t until recently that I finally did realize the magnitude of the effect of my decision. I watched this inexperienced girl grow in her knowledge, insight, and awareness of the human body. I felt her instincts and abilities sharpen. I heard her thoughts and ideas improve. I was actually providing a lesson she would always remember and refer to in her own world and life. In an indirect way I was educating

SPECTRUM

her almost as much as her professors did everyday. Therefore, I began to think of her as "my student."

At times, I am sure my lessons were annoying. Unusual vessel arrangement, abnormally sized lymph nodes, and damaged musculature all awaited her discovery. I am assuming that these surprises went unnoticed at first. I knew I was not healthy when I died, but she was not immediately aware of it. I am sure she never pictured "cancer" until its physical effects were found in several enlarged and distended lymph nodes throughout the axillary and femoral region. On this day the differences my body would provide, in comparison with the studies of another woman, was discovered. Yet, my student also realized that these differences existed not just because of my illness, but because of my individuality. We are all human in form and makeup, but we are all different in arrangement and function. In fact, if disease manifestation was dependent solely on an individual's arrangement and function, that could explain the random age, sex, and rise in number of disease victims we see with every passing day.

As the days continued, I found myself wanting more and more information on what my student was actually learning. What was it she saw and found, and how did it help her understand "the human body" in whole and part? Yet, I had no way to reveal my questions and interest in her work. I was not sure it was possible to place a thought in another person's mind until I tried it, and it worked. She began to keep a journal which brought out thoughts and feelings on her observations and work. It was through this information that I received the answers to my own questions. Her writings conveyed the excitement and revelations of new discoveries concerning the structures she unveiled. In fact, without a chance to hear, or read, about this project no one would ever understand the importance of my gift to science. And more importantly, my student, and others, would not have become aware of the incredible similarities and diversities throughout all humanity.

To understand the effects of this project, and the discoveries that resulted from it, we must look at her work as an anatomist. Therefore, presentation of her journal information will occur in stages. First, the bony and musculature finds, and secondly, the vessel and nervous structures. All of the following information is her own work.

THE FOLLY OF MAN

Mark Berger

IN his radical text, *A Discourse on Inequality*, Rousseau discusses his notion that inequality is based on man's shallow need for superiority over others in society. Man's classic quest for wealth, submission of fellow men, and social status is a disagreeable manifestation of his free will, which separates him from animals: "The beast chooses or rejects by instinct, man by an act of freewill" (87). This tenet of Rousseau's is similar to the messages underlying Voltaire's satire, *Candide*. Despite their differences of views on mankind, the two Renaissance writers both share the belief that man's lust for material wealth, dominance over others, and elevated social status is an inappropriate use of free will.

According to Rousseau, wealth does not make man happier. The philosopher believes that affluence blurs man's sight in that it makes him stray away from what really is important in life: to live simply and to enjoy equality with others. Rather than lead a simple life, man has convinced himself that he needs luxuries to be happy, and that being without these luxuries-turned-necessities renders him deprived.

For not only did such commodities continue to soften both the body and mind, they almost lost through habitual use the power to please, and as they had at the same time degenerated into actual needs, being deprived of them became much more cruel than the possession of them was sweet; and people were unhappy in losing them without being happy in possessing them. (113)

Rousseau observes that wealth deludes man in his quest for happiness, since after a time man becomes jaded with its familiarity and falls a victim to anxiety by worrying about its loss.

Voltaire also showcases his opinion that man thinks wealth is the panacea for his unhappiness. In *Candide*, he satirizes society and its obsession with material wealth. The Frenchman ridicules man for not appreciating what he has because he never thinks he has enough. An example of man's blindness to happiness is in the story of Eldorado, a utopia created by the satirist in which there are no enemies, no

legal system, plenty of wealth, and a happy society. The inhabitants of Voltaire's utopia are money-blind, and therefore, blissfully ignorant of the value of gold, silver, and the element of avariciousness which can grow with the amassing of fortune. As Candide noticed, wealth is not significant to the Eldoradons: "Where are we?" cried Candide. "The children of the kings of this country must be well brought up, since they're taught to despise gold and jewels" (64). This exclamation is rather ironic considering that the reason Candide and his companion, Cacambo, left Eldorado is captured in this brief statement by Candide:

If we go back to our world with no more than twelve sheep laden with stones from Eldorado, we'll be richer than all the kings of Europe put together, we'll have no more inquisitors to fear, and we can easily rescue Lady Cunegonde. (70)

Despite Candide's approval of the Eldoradon children—because they despise gold and jewels—he is convinced that he can return to the world which dealt him so many blows because happiness will certainly come with his new found wealth. Voltaire employs Candide as a symbol of mankind—he is trying so hard to attain happiness through wealth that he does not realize acceptance and appreciation of what he already has to be a ingredient of happiness.

Rousseau and Voltaire both agree that man puts too much emphasis on the acquisition of wealth in order to attain happiness, that man is not looking in the right places for peace and joy. Rousseau sees inequality as a societal evil which exacerbates man's desire for material acquisition, which as we know, is just a mirage of happiness. Likewise, Voltaire believes that one way to achieve pleasure is to be like the people of his utopian society, Eldorado, where they have little regard for money. Thus, both writers agree that wealth should be regarded as frivolous to man.

Voltaire and Rousseau concur that the struggle between the rich and poor, strong and weak, is a disappointing indication of their society's value system. According to Rousseau, the rich use cunning and guile to maintain their status and to achieve their own ends at the expense of the less fortunate:

He must therefore seek constantly to interest others in his lot and make them see an advantage, either real or apparent, for themselves in working for his benefit; all of which makes him devious and artful with some, imperious and hard towards others, and compels him to treat badly the people he needs if he cannot make them fear him and does not judge it in his interest to be of service to them. Finally, a devouring ambition, the burning passion to enlarge one's relative fortune, not so much from real need as to put oneself ahead of others, inspires in all men a dark propensity to injure one another. (119)

Rousseau believes that those in dominance in society do whatever it takes to get what they want and to secure their stronghold on power. He says that this "ambition" to aggrandize oneself impels one to do evil. Such people who are out for themselves are a bad, but true, reflection of his society. The blame falls on the rich as he says, "it is reasonable to suppose a thing to have been invented by those to whom it was useful rather than by those to whom it was injurious" (124). Rousseau is highlighting his view that the strong take advantage of the weak and keep them weak so as to maintain their status. He finds this absurd that man does whatever he can—which

THE FOLLY OF MAN

does not rule out deceit, manipulation, and exploitation—just to get ahead in society, because one-upmanship is not a quality one should boast of.

Voltaire feels rather strongly about the issue of strong versus weak and rich versus poor, which we will see in passages of *Candide*. He agrees with Rousseau that man has reduced himself to vices in order to “get ahead” in society.

‘Do you believe,’ said Candide, ‘that men have always slaughtered each other as they do today, that they’ve always been liars, cheats, traitors, ingrates and thieves, weak, fickle, cowardly, envious, greedy, drunken, miserly, ambitious bloodthirsty, slanderous, lecherous, fanatical, hypocritical and foolish?’ (81)

Although Candide utters these words in sarcasm, Voltaire is blatantly showing his opinion that all is not always for the best; that mankind is corrupted by liars, manipulators, cheaters, and so on. The strong and rich are willing to step on someone if it will help them to achieve their goal. Voltaire is upset and he is showing it through his acerbic pen. “Everywhere in the world, the weak detest the strong and grovel before them, and the strong treat them like flocks of sheep to be sold for their meat and wool” (78). He appears to have no qualms as he lashes out against the strong and the rich and the perpetrators of injustice: “The Fathers have everything, the people nothing; it’s a masterpiece of reason and justice” (53). The exiled Frenchman is angry at the absurdity of inequality and at the common quest for superiority. He, like Rousseau, finds mankind making futile attempts to find happiness in the wrong places and the disadvantaged are bearing the brunt of their selfishness.

Rousseau had many complaints regarding the hierarchy of society. More specifically, he discussed the abuse of power vested in those put into office, such as military and governmental officers. Men realize that a society must have rules and those who enforce them, and that submission to civil authority is necessary to promote the common goal. However, power often tends to be exploited to attain one’s own agenda without consideration of the rights of those over whom power is to be exercised: “people have given themselves chiefs in order to defend their liberty and not to enslave them” (125). Self-aggrandizement is not the purpose of public office. Unfortunately, in the hope for good societal order, men have left themselves vulnerable to the corrupt designs of those placed in high office:

All ran towards their chains believing that they were securing their liberty; for although they had reason enough to discern the advantages of a civil order, they did not have experience enough to foresee the dangers. (122)

Man’s willingness to give up some of his liberty to his peers can lead to a tragic change in mindset. In the military, for example, the soldiers become mindless machines—pawns of the brass’s evil schemes: “The most decent men learned to regard the killing of their fellows as one of their duties; and in time men came to massacre one another by thousands without knowing why” (123). The power of the authorities is abused to desensitize men to committing mass murder so that they may conquer more lands and acquire more wealth. Rousseau’s disapproval of this injustice, and especially the abuse of power, is indicative of his belief that man concerns himself with negligible causes.

SPECTRUM

Like Rousseau, Voltaire perceives man's use of a pecking order in society to abuse power as unimportant when man should be concerned more with equality and peace. As seen in Voltaire's utopia, the Eldoradons are a peaceful people without law courts or prisons. They have a government and pecking order, if you will, but it is not corrupted with greed and self-interest because everyone agrees with each other and does not desire to gain an advantage over another. Since his society was not like his utopia, Voltaire picked out certain aspects of it to ridicule in order to show its triviality. When Candide shot the monkey-lovers of the two Oreillon girls, he was put on a spit, but was spared and was ultimately well-received when the Oreillons realized that he was not a Jesuit priest: "What men! What morality! ... But pure nature is good after all, since, instead of eating me, these people showered me with polite kindness as soon as they found out I wasn't a Jesuit" (62). Another example where Voltaire ridicules society is when Candide is received by the Jesuits of Paraguay. "God be praised!' said the commandant. 'Since he's a German, I can talk to him. Have him brought to my arbor'" (54). These passages are indicative of Voltaire's sarcasm regarding the asinine inclinations of man to place such emphasis on nationality and occupation.

The messages from *A Discourse on Inequality* and *Candide* that Rousseau and Voltaire are trying to convey can be best summarized by Candide: "I also know,' said Candide, 'that we must cultivate our garden'" (120). We should all cultivate our garden without the weeds of money, avariciousness, and lust for dominance. These frivolous harvests of life satisfy us temporarily and lead us away from producing the fruits of life: peace, love, and desire for equal treatment of mankind.

REVOLUTION, WIZARDRY AND THE AGE OF OZ

Amy Blaisdell '93

MY first experience with L. Frank Baum's *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*, like that of many students of my generation, was due to the Hollywood extravaganza starring Judy Garland and the wonderfully wicked Margaret Hamilton. Indeed, as a child, the movie both fascinated and terrorized me. On one hand, Oz seemed like a colorful wonderland with its vivid munchkins, dazzling Emerald City and splendid purple horses. It was a wonderfully magical place where dreams could come true, if you "Followed the Yellow Brick Road." Indeed, who could possibly forget the joyful sight of Dorothy and her comrades merrily skipping and singing along that aforementioned road. Yet, on the other hand, whenever I watched the movie, I wouldn't be able to sleep for nights because I would always imagine a vision of the Wicked Witch of the West's green, warty face cackling at me through my vanity mirror. Suffice it to say my parents dreaded whenever the movie was on television because I would always end up crawling between the covers with them. Yet despite the childhood fascination with the terror as well as the colorful delights and camaraderie of *Oz*, there is still another more elusive quality about L. Frank Baum's story that has so powerfully enraptured not only me, but millions of others as well. How is it that this ninety-two year old story about a girl, a dog, and a peculiar yellow brick road has captured so firmly the hearts and minds of almost every American since the turn of the century?

The years around 1900, when L. Frank Baum's *Wonderful Wizard of Oz* was first published, were a particularly tumultuous time in American history. American workers were angry and frustrated with what they considered an uncaring government whose main concern was centered upon the benefit of the rich, capitalist-rooted establishment and its business barons. In this inhospitable climate, threatening nationwide movements were formed by workers in order to combat the ruling elite. Revolutionary talk, as well as battles and riots between strikers and police, was rampant. A newspaper account of the 1892 copper miners' strike in Coeur d'Alene, Idaho, reported:

SPECTRUM

The long dreaded conflict between the forces of the strikers and the non-union men who have taken their place has come at last. As a result five men are known to be dead and sixteen are already in the hospital; . . . the gem mine has surrendered to the strikers, the arms of its employees have been captured, and the employees themselves have been ordered out of the country. Flushed with the success of these victories the turbulent element among the strikers are preparing to move upon other strongholds of non-union men. (Zinn 270)

Such brutal assaults were becoming common occurrences throughout the country. Desperate, angry and indignant, many American workers felt forced to turn to violence in order to further their cause for better wages as well as more financial stability and opportunity. It seemed the American dream, Horatio Alger's "Rags to Riches," was nothing more than a facade. Indeed, a depression was raging throughout the nation. After years of wild industrial growth, banks and businesses were beginning to fail. Out of a labor force of fifteen million, three million were unemployed and mass demonstrations all over the country forced city governments to set up soup kitchens and give people work on streets or parks (Zinn 272).

It was in this tempestuous climate that Frank Baum composed the subtly anarchic *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*. Although the prevailing ideology in 1900 advocated individualism and greed, in *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*, Baum slyly advocates an unmasking of the facade of government and the destruction of witches or robber barons. Indeed, the years between the Civil War and 1900 saw the rise of some of the most powerful and notorious business barons this country has ever known. Men like J.P. Morgan, Andrew Carnegie, and John D. Rockefeller controlled vast monopolies which directed almost all facets of business, and indirectly controlled many facets of the government as well.

These business barons were ruthless in their determination to preserve not only their business monopolies, but also their iron grip on America, its agenda and finances. They were also usurpers. In their single-minded pursuit to turn a profit, they swallowed up smaller corporations without an ounce of remorse. Indeed, the particularly powerful J.P. Morgan in a quest for dividends for his corporation, U.S. Steel, made sure Congress passed tariffs keeping out foreign steel; by closing off competition, and by working 200,000 men twelve hours a day for wages that barely kept their families alive (Zinn 251).

An even more heinous example of such base business tactics took place in 1892 at a Carnegie steel plant in Homestead, Pennsylvania. Carnegie and his manager, Henry Clay Frick, decided to reduce the workers' wages and break their union. Frick built a fence three miles long and twelve feet high around the steel works and topped it with barbed wire, adding peepholes for rifles. Essentially what was created was a fortress which the workers had little chance of toppling. When the workers did not accept the pay cut, Frick laid off the entire work force (Zinn 270). The Homestead workers voted overwhelmingly to strike but were met with resistance from Pinkerton detectives hired to protect the Carnegie interests. In the ensuing battle, seven workers were killed in gunfire, and many beaten by the crowd. (Zinn 271). Although the strike held for four months, other workers were brought into take the place of the strikers. With all

their resources tapped, the strikers had no choice but to return to work, their leaders blacklisted (Zinn 271).

Meanwhile the government was for the most part remarkably indifferent to the woes of the American working class. The tone was set when an arrangement between the Democrats and Republicans to elect the unexceptional Rutherford B. Hayes as President in 1877 succeeded. Whether Democrats or Republicans won, the national policy of serving the rich and ignoring the workers would not change (Zinn 252). Indeed, the somewhat independent Grover Cleveland began his presidency by assuaging wary industrialists by announcing,

No harm shall come to any business interest as a result of administrative policy so long as I am President. ... A transfer of executive control from one party to another does not mean any serious disturbance of existing conditions. (Zinn 252)

That the Republicans and Democrats could be so similar in ideology would undoubtedly seem incredible to most Americans today, but sadly for the American workers at the turn of the century, their interests were secondary in comparison to capitalism and its profit. If politicians wished to be re-elected, it was in their best interest to serve not the impoverished working class, but the wealthy industrialists who contributed to their campaigns.

It was this type of disgraceful treatment towards workers by powerful business barons and members of government which L. Frank Baum sought to conquer when he wrote his "modernized" fairy tale *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*. Through his clever characterizations of the "wonderful" wizard and the Wicked Witch of the West, as well as his depiction of the phoney Emerald City, Baum artfully unmasks the fakers of American government and the brutal enslavement of its workers by profiteering barons or witches. Indeed, Baum's portrait of both the wizard and the Emerald City is powerfully ironic. Upon their first visit to the Emerald City, Dorothy and her friends were "dazzled by the brilliancy of the wonderful City. The streets were lined with beautiful houses all built of green marble and studded everywhere with sparkling emeralds" (Baum 121). But upon their return to the City, Dorothy and company are shocked to learn that both the wizard and the Emerald City are a facade, distorted literally, through green, rather than rose tinted, glasses. Indeed, the further discovery that "Oz the Terrible" is really just a deceitful "humbug" and a "common" man is disillusioning to Dorothy and her comrades. In actuality he is no wizard at all. It is therefore humorously ironic that the wizard is only able to restore the good faith of the Scarecrow, Tin Man, and Cowardly Lion through his much-exhausted practice of "magic" or fakery, making him once again "wonderful" in their eyes.

Baum's other characterization of the evil enslaving Wicked Witch of the West serves as a masterful comment on the same kind of enslaving of the American work force by the powerful robber barons. Indeed, once the Wicked Witch gets her hands on Dorothy and her friends, essentially enslaving them like the Winkies, Baum skillfully illustrates how, like the robber baron, the Witch's exploitation of the labor and simplicity of her prey is what drives her to victimize. The Witch, unlike Dorothy and her comrades, is crafty. Remarks the narrator, "The wicked creature was cunning,

SPECTRUM

and she finally thought of a trick which would give her what she wanted" (Baum 153). Like the barons of Baum's era, the Witch will stop at nothing to get what she wants, profit and power; and it is only from Dorothy's "silver" shoes that the Wicked Witch can gain these valuable "commodities."

In Baum's tale, Dorothy eventually becomes tired of the Witch's annoying treatment and in a burst of anger fights back. Although accidentally, she melts the witch with a pail of water and effectively destroys her once and for all. It would therefore seem that Dorothy's destruction of the enslaving, profiteering witch, as well as her unmasking of Ox and the Emerald City, is Baum's ultimate dream for America and the true wizardry within *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*. In a sense, when L. Frank Baum released his "Modernized," somewhat fanciful fairy tale, he hit some sensitive chords with people wary of government fakery and profiteering industrialists. Indeed, although the American working class was still struggling to overcome the ruthless turn of the century robber barons at the time of *Oz's* publication, it is easy to understand how such an optimistic and revolutionary tale appealed to so many people in the depression-ravaged America of 1900.

WORKS CITED

Baum, L. Frank. *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*. 1900. New York: Dover, 1960.

Zinn, Howard. *A People's History of the United States*. New York: Harper, 1980.

REDEFINING INDIVIDUALITY: A NON-PSYCHOLOGICAL APPROACH

Ryan Cone

MAINSTREAM American culture takes a psychological approach to defining individuality. As Americans, we grow up to believe that every person exists in her/his own world. Our psychology teaches that we live on millions of unconnected paths and that we cannot truly relate with or understand other people. Americans have a concept of individuality that is almost purely psychologically defined. It suggests that what we do is our own business, that our actions affect no one else, and that we as individuals are so different and unique that our problems belong only to ourselves.

In "The Seventies: Under Control?" Howard Zinn shows how psychological thinking in the seventies permitted government manipulation of the American people and their consequent distrust of politicians. Its psychological mind-set led the public to believe that individuals, and not the system, caused the majority of our political problems. For this reason, the public looked at Nixon as the sole cause of corruption. When he stepped down, the people thought their problems were solved. A one time advisor to President Kennedy wrote that the problems of the Nixon government were "personal" not "institutional" (Zinn 245). People all over America rejoiced when Nixon left office. Unfortunately for them, their blind faith prevented them from seeing the real solution: The system needed to be changed, not its personnel.

Unlike mainstream American culture, children's literature produced in the seventies and eighties presents a less psychological individuality. Holland's *The Man Without A Face*, Cormier's *The Chocolate War*, and Spinelli's *Maniac Magee* teach children to define individuality according to their goals, by finding creative and active solutions, and concentrating on social justice rather than individual profit.

Both Jerry in *The Chocolate War*, and Charles in *The Man Without A Face* begin with a strong belief in psychological individuality. Their individuality consumes them because they have no other idea of how to live; therefore, they work towards nothing

else. They have been taught that *the person* is the only important unit of society and they equate individuality with happiness. Both boys assume that once they detach themselves from all societal influences, they will have found their "true" selves and be forever happy. In examining the individuality of the seventies, Irene Thomson shows how this common misconception has led many people in the wrong direction: "The refusal to exercise self-control is often justified in the name of happiness. But the quest for happiness is itself illegitimate" (Thomson 859). Charles and Jerry can never completely detach themselves from society and no matter how much they try it, they will always be connected to others. They must take responsibility for their decisions and actions as humans.

Jerry's and Charles' attempts to become "psychologically" individualistic are pointless. Cormier and Holland make this point when they create characters without goals. They hope to reach young adults and show them the need for planning and for goals connected to larger societal units than the self. Cormier and Holland are trying to create a new definition of "individuality"—one that is goal oriented and moves beyond the mere psychological interpretation of the individual.

Although Jerry tenaciously sticks with his cause in *The Chocolate War*, he only succeeds in establishing that he is different from everyone else at Trinity. Jerry has no ultimate aim. In chapter eighteen, he interrogates himself and still cannot come up with an answer as to why he continues to say "no." Jerry has entered into a battle with Brother Leon and the Vigils, but he has no idea why he is fighting. He cannot know when his struggle will be over because he has no goal. His lack of direction allows Brother Leon and the Vigils to manipulate his ill-defined cause—to turn the entire school against him. Although Jerry officially loses the war, the reader is still fighting. Cormier's book shows teens that they can and should challenge the system. Young adults should not be afraid to say no, but they must also know when to say yes. When they fight the system, they must have a goal in mind. If not, they will be manipulated and used as easily as Jerry.

In the beginning of *The Man Without A Face*, Charles resembles Jerry in that he has no goal. He feels controlled by his family and the educational system and chooses to rebel against them. Charles rebels by doing the opposite of what is expected of him and in this way he submits himself to the same control he tries to escape. By going against what people want him to do, Charles is still controlled. His actions merely contradict his family and his teachers because he finds out what they want him to do and then does the opposite. Charles uses a plagiarized paper so that he won't have to think on his own. He wants to go to St. Mathew's so that he can move away and escape his mother's control. Everything Charles does is in direct reaction to someone he is rebelling against. Justin realizes the extent to which Charles feels he is controlled by others. He asks Charles, "You put an awful lot on other people. . . Aren't you anything but a puppet being worked on by other people?" (Cormier 79). By letting the reader know Charles when he still has no ideas of his own, Holland shows teens that questioning authority is healthy, but that going against it without a goal in mind denies your own power to make a difference and leaves you as a lifeless "puppet" controlled by other people.

REDEFINING INDIVIDUALITY: A NON-PSYCHOLOGICAL APPROACH

Trinity school in *The Chocolate War*, and the town of Two Mills in *Maniac Magee* both show what mere psychological individuality has done to society. Like Americans at the time of Watergate, the people of Two Mills and Trinity see individuals, not the system, as the problem. At the same time, they feel powerless to change the dysfunctional elements of the system. The students at Trinity and the people of Two Mills would like to change the system, but they don't know where to start. They lack ideas and creativity, and they have become disconnected from one another. The people in control of Two Mills and Trinity stifle creativity because they know that it will bring about change. By showing the power of these systems, Spinelli and Cormier reveal to the reader the critical need for change through creative thoughts and new actions. They influence young adults to become individuals motivated by and responsible to entities beyond the personal.

The Vigils and the brothers at Trinity encourage conformity and discourage creativity. For Archie and Brother Leon, the Trinity system runs best if people do not question authority. When Jerry begins to stir things up, Leon needs a quick reaction to keep everyone else in line. Jerry's creative choice not to sell chocolate challenges the established power and control systems at Trinity. His action threatens Leon's control because it is contagious and liberating. At first, the students admire Jerry for saying "no!" One junior tells Jerry that he had never even thought of doing so. The news begins to spread about Jerry's creativity and original thinking and the chocolate sales drop, school-wide.

The students at Trinity long to make the same choice as Jerry, but Brother Leon knows how to use the conformist system of Trinity to control them. He also knows that Jerry cannot conquer the Trinity system by himself. For an experienced manipulator like Leon, it takes only one strategic move to mobilize the students against Jerry. With help from the Vigils, he makes it appear as though Jerry feels he is too good to sell chocolates like everyone else. The conformist students of Trinity whip back into line and their creative opportunity vanishes. Although Jerry loses, Cormier shows the effect that Jerry's creativity has on the students of Trinity. If Jerry can get the entire student body to think about saying "no," what changes can two or more students acting creatively together make? Cormier hands the baton to the real-world reader in hopes that she/he will finish the race Jerry started. He suggests teens exercise their rights to work together creatively, to bring new and challenging ideas into action.

In *Maniac Magee*, Maniac encounters a world where creativity no longer exists. The people of Two Mills divide racially at Hector Street. This division symbolizes their willingness to conform to the old, divisive rules of society, acceding to their rigidity, and leading to racial separation. They are apathetic and hostile toward change because they feel powerless and are kept apart—packed into "enemy" camps. Genuinely good and creative people like Mars Bar and Grayson are unaware of the creative powers they possess. Society forces Mars Bar to wear the exterior of a tough guy who doesn't care and the system transforms Grayson into a crazy loon who lives in the past. Maniac can tap into the creativity of Mars Bar and Grayson. He shows them that they have the power to make change and that their lives are important. Maniac encourages Grayson to tell him baseball stories and by doing

SPECTRUM

so, lets Grayson create a myth of himself. He encourages Grayson to be creative. Maniac shows Grayson and the reader that everyone has a story to tell. As opposed to psychological individuality, the individuality that Spinelli shows through Maniac teaches that all our lives interrelate. Everyone is a hero because we all have stories to tell. Our stories can help others to understand what life is about and we have an obligation to share our lives and our creativity with others.

Maniac not only teaches others how to be good and creative, but he works within his limits to create positive change. People encourage Maniac to break rules, but unlike Jerry and Charles, he does not let people control the decisions he makes. Maniac chooses which rules to break. He challenges the system and its rules only when he has something to prove or something to teach. Maniac destroys myths of conformity and creates myths of freedom. Above all, he is a thinker. He thinks about the consequences of his actions and he finds creative ways to question authority. Maniac's work expresses his creative individuality. In this way, he accepts and uses all aspects of his human self. In reexamining Marx's *Concept of Man*, Erich Fromm writes, "man is alive only inasmuch as he is productive, inasmuch as he grasps the world outside of himself in the act of expressing his own specific human powers" (Fromm 29). Maniac is truly alive and very productive. He understands the world because he uses his own abilities to make change for the people of Two Mills. By using the talents that he possesses, Maniac is not only alive, he creates lives. Through his example, children learn that everyone can help make the world anew if he/she uses what they already know to bring change. By putting Maniac in charge of change, Spinelli shows the difference individuals who bond with others can make. He provides the impetus to get children thinking about new ideas and teaches them the positive change that results from caring and communal actions.

Psychological individuality creates a world where people are unwilling to help one another. Individuals become so consumed with their personal problems, that they forget their connections and obligations to community, family, and friends. People spend all of their lives trying to be selfishly happy, but they never succeed. Unlike these self-obsessed Americans, Justin and Maniac never forget their obligations to others. They work within their community to change society. Ironically, by changing society, they solve more personal problems than the psychological individuals who focus solely on themselves. The authors reveal the paradoxical relationship between self and society by having unselfish action bring self-fulfillment. Through Maniac's and Justin's desire to help others, Spinelli and Holland teach children to focus on problems other than their own. They promote an individuality that defines the self in terms of the well-being of others.

Although Justin has set himself apart from society, he still feels an obligation to contribute to it. Justin has many past experiences that could cause personal problems, but he chooses to focus his positive energy on society and his obligation to others. He wants to change his mind about tutoring Charles, but he feels compelled to keep his word. Justin has made a promise to Charles and no matter what he feels as an individual, he continues to carry out his deal. After Charles gets to know Justin, he shows up accidentally on a Sunday and is surprised to see Justin dressed up. Charles

REDEFINING INDIVIDUALITY: A NON-PSYCHOLOGICAL APPROACH

is taken aback when he finds that Justin is going to church. When Charles asks Justin why he goes to church, he replies, "For the usual reason—to participate in public worship" (Holland 132). At first, Charles does not understand how this man whom he views as the total outsider can go to church. Charles begins to see the whole picture of Justin and his words ring true: "You can be free from everything but the consequences of what you do" (Holland 156). Justin teaches Charles and the reader that what you do always has an effect on other people. Through Charles' awakening, the reader sees that no matter what difficulties people have in their lives, they always need to work toward bettering the community because, as Justin says, their actions affect the community whether they intend them to or not.

Maniac is another inspirational character who has a difficult life. He is a homeless orphan whose parents were killed in an accident. But despite all of his personal problems, Maniac works to better the community, not his psychological self. In the end, once he has helped the people of Two Mills, his personal problems resolve themselves. Like Justin, he resists the temptation of letting his negative experiences affect the way he lives his life. He transcends his own problems to help people like Mars Bar and Grayson find their creativity and goals in life. Mars Bar also learns to put society before himself. When Maniac is unable to help Russell McNab in the end of the book, he provides an opportunity for Mars Bar to break through the ignorance of racism. By saving Russell, Mars Bar shows that he values even the life of a person who does not accept him. He looks past his negative feelings for the McNabs and saves Russell. For Mars Bar, life is more important than someone's personal opinion of it. And in the end, Mars Bar shows the McNabs that he is just as human as they are.

So while mainstream culture promotes a commercialized version of psychological individuality, the children's literature of the seventies and eighties presents an individuality that teaches children to find goals, to be creative, and to value the lives of others. The individuality defined by Cormier, Holland, and Spinelli works against the mainstream, commercial ideas of psychological individuality: it shows children the importance of community, and encourages them to imagine new worlds and better ways to live in community. The redefined individuality teaches children how to live in the real world—not in an imaginary world of their heads.

WORKS CITED

- Cormier, Robert. *The Chocolate War*. New York: Dell Pub., 1974.
- Fromm, Erich. *Marx's Concept of Man*. New York: Frederick Ungar, 1966.
- Holland, Isabelle. *The Man Without A Face*. New York: Harper, 1972.
- Spinelli, Jerry. *Maniac Magee*. New York: Harper, 1990.
- Thomson, Irene. "The Transformation of the Social Bond: Images of Individualism in the 1920s Versus the 1970s." *Social Forces* (June 1989): 851+.
- Zinn, Howard. *The Twentieth Century—A People's History*. New York: Harper, 1984.

SPECTRUM

EUROCENTRICITY: A STUDY OF COLUMBUS AND VILLAGRA

Colin Daly

THE literature of exploration must be examined rather carefully. Descriptions, beliefs, and statements cannot be accepted as “objective” since, most likely, they have been molded by the perceptions of the narrator. Authors of this genre, in particular, are seriously influenced by the recognition of a certain type of audience—a predominantly European one. Through this study of epistolary accounts, I intend to explore the different manners in which eurocentricity manifests itself in the written texts of Christopher Columbus and Perez de Villagra. The early explorer focuses on the material aspects of the new world, while Villagra seems much more concerned with providing a classical interpretation of his experiences in New Mexico.

The exploration narratives illustrate superbly the extent to which this eurocentricity—an orientation deeply rooted in European culture—has shaped the perceptions of the Spaniards. Christopher Columbus’s *Journal of the First Voyage to America*, in particular, reveals the explorer’s attempts to describe a wondrous new world in terms that his European counterparts would understand. America is continually compared to the lands and images of his native continent. To ensure that his intended audience would comprehend the amazing splendor to which he was a witness, Columbus translates: “everything looked as green as in April in Andalusia” (70). The Castilian was well aware that, unless he painted a convincing portrait of this untouched terrain, he might never set eyes on it again. Therefore, he draws a comparison between the new and the old, realizing that America’s appeal lies in the materials it can offer, unobtainable in Europe: “Great numbers of palm trees were noticed, different from those of Guinea, and ours” (72). Thus, in order to convince his Spanish brethren of the many possibilities that exist in the new world, the explorer must exploit those features exclusive to this new land. In doing so, he ensures his financial supporters that, in fact, his costly journey was well worth the time and effort.

In addition, the early explorer takes many pains to describe the land and foliage in

detail, enticing his audience with an irresistible picture of "India." If his descriptions are convincing, his fellow Europeans will believe the acquisition of the land to be a profitable venture. Consequently, he sprinkles his account with numerous allusions to gold mines, in hopes that news of material wealth will whet their appetites. In truth, Columbus's awareness of his audience is the reason for his constant references to the riches of the land: "he wished them to understand that he was in search of nothing but gold, which they called *nuca*" (75). Although he is unsuccessful in his search for the precious metal, Columbus nevertheless makes an admirable effort to convince his readers that it does exist. The advantages of the new world, then, are presented from the point of view of European self-interest. Every description of the Indians' metal jewelry is accompanied with an inquiry as to where the gold can be found. Columbus's appreciation for America's resources is hardly sincere, but rather stems from ulterior motives. Each piece of bark or nugget of gold is regarded as precious, not because they are objects of natural beauty and wonder, but rather because they represent possible benefits this new land may offer Europe.

Columbus's eurocentric biases are further revealed in the passages describing his interactions with the natives. The Castilian was of the belief that the Indians he encountered were "without any religion that could be discovered" (75). Such a statement attests to Columbus's genuine ignorance of the Indians' daily existence. He is rendered blind by his own world view, which prevents his recognition of the intricate framework that sustains the native community. Rather, he is primarily interested in the profitable resources the islands contain, and the natives are but stepping stones in his path of acquisition. This utter lack of consideration for the inhabitants of the land is most noticeable when Columbus suggests,

It would be well to take a few of the native from the place where the ships lay, for the purpose of carrying them to Spain, that they might acquire our language and inform us what their country contained. (79)

In proposing such a plan, he strips the Indians of their humanity, reducing them to inhuman pawns. Columbus goes on to proclaim that "these people are very mild and timorous, naked as I have described the others, without weapons or laws" (76). In presenting such a picture of the natives, not only does Columbus elevate himself and his countrymen above them, but he also allays any fear of the Indians his fellow Europeans may still cling to.

Moreover, one cannot deny that the early explorer's opinion of the savages is greatly shaped by a notion of cultural superiority. Only when the native populations adopt a predominant aspect of the European lifestyle, namely Christianity, will they be regarded as civilized. At one point in his *Journal*, Columbus professes that the savages "have a knowledge that there is a God above, and are firmly persuaded that [the Spaniards] have come from heaven" (79). A testimony to the perversion of his viewpoint is his application of the Christian "God" to the Indians' conception of religion. One could argue that the explorer's notion of supremacy prevents him from realizing that a vast number of gods do exist in the natives' religion. The early explorer sincerely believes, as well, that, in mastering the Spanish language, yet another facet of European culture, the savages will properly begin their journey down the road of

civilization.

However, it should be noted that Columbus regards the conversion of the savages in two manners. Not only will they become members of Christendom, but, once converted, they will also be able to accept the European way of life. In a sense, then, it is a double conversion. In both respects, though, the European community, and not the native population, reaps the benefits. As Columbus states, "Your Highness should therefore adopt the resolution of converting them to Christianity . . . to gain to our holy faith multitudes of people, and to Spain great riches and immense dominions" (79). In no way does the Castilian take into account the spiritual lives of the Indians. Instead, he conveys the importance of their conversion from the perspective of a typical European; the new converts represent nothing more than numbers and money.

The eurocentric opinions of Perez de Villagra surface in a similar manner in his *History of New Mexico*. At the time of European exploration, the old world experienced a "rebirth of interest in the arts and sciences, an interest based upon the Renaissance rediscovery of Classical texts about strange lands and pagan gods" (146). The new world provided a perfect opportunity for the early explorers to formulate new classical works—Villagra being a prime example. In relating his tale of the Spanish, the author models his epic poem after Virgil's *Aeneid*. Like Columbus, the chronicler uses images typically associated with the European culture to accommodate his intended audience. However, instead of appealing to their material interests, as the Castilian does, Villagra concentrates on their renewed affinity for literature. Although his numerous references to the classical period enable his readers to grasp his intended meaning, his credibility is sacrificed. Attempting to convey the absolute savagery of the natives, Villagra makes a comparison:

So [Gicombo] called the Indians and had them take a solemn oath according to their laws, with the superstitions rites of their religion. . . . It was such an oath as this that Hannibal took before the altars of his pagan gods when he swore eternal enmity and hatred to the Roman race. (125)

Villagra, completely acculturated to consider these savages as beneath him, sets forth their inferiority in the only manner he knows, by comparing them to a figure of renowned infamy in the old world. Yet, it seems highly unlikely that Villagra actually observed the ritual celebration he describes; outsiders were forbidden to participate. Thus, because his comparison is based upon what little contact he has had with the Indians, its veracity remains questionable.

Like Columbus, Villagra retains a strong bond with the old world, which is reaffirmed through his abasement of the Indians. In his narrative, the absence of Christianity is set forth as the major fault of the natives: "It is pitiful to view this immense area and the many ignorant people who inhabit these vast regions, all without knowledge of the blood of Christ or of His holy faith" (122). In labeling the savages as "ignorant," he unmasks his eurocentric bias. Villagra concentrates more on the stereotypes of the Indian people, which have been reinforced in Europe, than his actual contact and experiences with the inhabitants of this strange region. He is a victim of the same disease which plagued Columbus; he surveys his surroundings from a perspective heavily oriented in the European world. To the author, familiar

from a perspective heavily oriented in the European world. To the author, familiar with the lush prairies of Spain, the area appears to be a wasteland, whereas the "vast and solitary plains where the Christian had never trod before" sustain the Indian populations with food and water (123).

With his pen, Villagra wields total power. The author creates a poetic contrast between the Spanish and the natives for the sole purpose of glorifying his countrymen's efforts. The words he uses to describe the native religion are key: "vile and pagan" (125). In turn, the narrator affirms the unequalled elements of Christianity and its followers in portraying "devout" soldiers as "Knights of Christ" (125). In proposing such a contrast, though, the brilliant success of the Spaniards actually loses legitimacy. Villagra cannot have his cake and eat it, too; it is paradoxical for the author to depict the Indians as worthy opponents since, according to his previous statements, they are "simple" and "ignorant" (125). Nevertheless, his representation of the Indians as courageous foes enables him to immortalize the Spaniards in a unique manner. According to Villagra, the Spanish forces pose such an enormous threat to the natives that, in their despair, they "turned their arms upon one another, father slew son, and son slew father" (130). Although his description of the Indians' mass suicide is "unverifiable," Villagra's allusions to classical tragic characters, such as Portia and Lucretia, help to make his account seem somewhat convincing. Thus, the author falsifies his chronicle of the Indians' self-destruction in order to reinforce the idealistic image of the Spanish soldiers he has previously presented; their hands are clean of any "needless blood" (126).

The Indians, however, are not the only group to which Villagra attributes classical characteristics. In his account, he "places [his] expedition among those that sought the continued expansion of the Catholic Church, represented in the Acts of the Apostles" (122). In doing so, the chronicler and his companions gain the favor of his Christian readers. In addition, Villagra's adoption of a role akin to that of a disciple spreading the word enables his countrymen to better apprehend his motives for converting the natives. Ultimately, the Spaniard's eurocentric perspective permits him to romanticize and exaggerate the small part he plays as a missionary in saving the savages from perdition.

The literature of early exploration is replete with first person narratives. Undoubtedly, each narrator possesses a certain bias—a unique perspective from which the world is viewed. Perhaps what separates Columbus and Villagra from the rest is the fact that both expose their eurocentricity in parallel manners. Their connection to Europe shapes their views of the land, the natives, and even themselves.

THE SIGNIFICANT ROLE OF FATHER IN THE AENEID

Genevieve Del Rosario '95

WHAT is a father but a hero to his children? At a more impressionable age we were inclined to think of our father as something akin to perfection. He has been considered not only the protector of the household, but as the “bread-winner” in more modern times, the role model, and overall, the one who inspires his family to aspire for what is inherently noble and good. For the early Romans, one’s parents (especially the father) were regarded with the highest honor and the deepest respect. Although the main purpose of Virgil’s *The Aeneid* is to recount the history of the early struggle of the Roman people, the firm impression of the significant role of the father is personified in the main character Aeneas as well as captured in the many father-son relationships that can be witnessed throughout the poem.

A father must exemplify the qualities of a good leader. Historically, the ancient Romans gave the name “father” to those who held tremendous importance in their lives. For example Teucer, the leader and founder of the Teucrians, had been looked upon as “our greatest father Teucer” by his people (61). Likewise Iasius, founder of the Trojan race, has been called “our father” (63). Aeneas, the hero in *The Aeneid* and the destined leader of the emerging Roman people, is no less looked up to. The strength of his will is comparable to no other, for when he is compelled to leave Dido, a woman whom he has fallen in love with and has had relations with as a husband, he remembers his fated task to sail to Italy for the sake of his people:

But though he longs to soften, soothe her sorrow
and turn aside her troubles with sweet words,
though groaning long and shaken in his mind
because of his great love, nevertheless
pious Aeneas carries out the gods’
instructions. Now he turns back to his fleet. (94)

SPECTRUM

Because Aeneas forsakes his own happiness to lead his people to their greater destiny in Italy, he displays the dedication and determination needed to instill courage and hope in his people—while all the while marking the success of a good leader and earning the title of “father Aeneas” among the Trojans.

Virgil, in fact, emphasizes all the qualities he deems essential in a hero in the person of Aeneas. At the same time, the heroic qualities portrayed in Aeneas can be interchanged with those Virgil determines as important in a father. First and foremost, Virgil expects Aeneas, as a fatherfigure, to be pious. This can be concluded by observing how many times Virgil replaces the title of “father Aeneas” with that of “pious Aeneas.” For one to be pious, one must always strive to do what is morally right. Piety is therefore discernible in the character of Aeneas by examining his actions.

A good father must be just in all his duties and must not play favorites among his “family.” Aeneas recognizes this fact and exhibits more than what is just throughout Book Five in *The Aeneid*. This chapter recounts a celebration in way of several competitive games in honor of Aeneas’s dead father Anchises. Not only is Anchises honored, but it seems as if Aeneas were glorified as well. His generosity in awarding the participants despite unfortunate circumstances is truly remarkable. For example, in the footrace event, the man who would have won first place slides on blood left behind in a slaughter and is unable to continue the race. Aeneas, showing the worthiness of his character, awards this man, as well as the man who did come in first, special prizes. For this his description of “the best of fathers” (116) is well deserved.

However pious, or just, or generous a father may be, a real test of his virtue lies within the bond he holds with his son. The effectiveness of each quality Virgil illustrates in his definition of a true father is put to use in the father-son relationship. Many such relationships are portrayed in *The Aeneid*. Aeneas’s own relationship with his father Anchises is a good example of the kind of relationship Virgil would consider as the quintessence of a relationship between a father and son. The bond between Anchises and Aeneas is unusual in that it extends even after death. This involves Aeneas’s visit to the underworld just to see his father and hear about the achievements of his descendants. To get to the underworld, Aeneas has to face tremendous obstacles because it is a well-known fact that the living are strictly forbidden from ever witnessing the realms of Pluto’s domain. It is therefore merely for the great love that Aeneas holds for his father that he finds the determination to visit the underworld and it is also this love that enables him to cross the boundary between the living and the dead.

The strong tie of “blood” among generations was clearly cherished in ancient times. The Trojans could not look upon their sons without being reminded of them as being the continuing era of their people. Virgil relates, “The cheering Dardans greet the anxious squadrons and, watching those young faces, recognizing the features of their ancestors, are glad” (123). Ascanius, or Iulus as he is sometimes called, is a part of this continuing generation. The bond between him and his father Aeneas has already developed into a relationship filled with love and respect. Ascanius, witnessing the same bond between Euryalus and his mother, is moved along with the rest of

THE SIGNIFICANT ROLE OF FATHER IN THE AENEID

the Trojans. This Virgil clearly notes: "The Dardans feel his [Euryalus's] words and weep—above all the handsome Iulus, for this pious image, a son's love for his parent, touches him" (224). Aeneas, also remembering the love he holds for his father, is depicted to show great pity even towards the man he kills during the war of the Trojan people against the Latins:

But when he saw the look and face of dying
Lausus—he was mysteriously pale—Anchises' son sighed heavily with pity
and stretched out his right hand; the image of
his love for his father touched his mind. (270)

The love of a son for his father is therefore regarded by Virgil as a great and everlasting link between generations.

But the significance of this extraordinary familial kinship is most displayed on the father's side of the relationship. Virgil most poignantly portrays the sacredness of this bond throughout the course of war when loss is most heavily felt:

My son, was I held fast by such delight in life
that I let my own seed—instead of me—
give way before the enemy's right hand?
Am I, a father, saved by these your wounds?
Do I love by your death? (271)

Perhaps Evander, when learning of his son Pallas's death, sums up the immensity of his grief the best: "But I, in living, have undone the fate of fathers: I survive my son" (200).

Virgil regards the role of father as one of the most sacred duties any man can have. To be called "father" is equivalent to having the highest honor bestowed upon a man, judging from characters like Aeneas who is often called "father." Among the Romans, it appears the heroic qualities of a father have been passed down throughout generations, making them a respectable and respected race. It is a pity in our generation that we too often shed our first adoration of our fathers as heroes, and replace it with resentment and anger. Perhaps the greatest lesson we have gained is an important truth from this mighty people—a true understanding that the role of fatherhood is to be considered sacred, and not a duty any man should shirk away from.

SPECTRUM

TORMENT TO BELIEF

Alan Esser

THE question raised in Fyodor Dostoevsky's *The Brothers Karamazov* is far from new; rather, it was one of the first queries in the history of the known world. Cain said it best in reply to God's questioning, "Am I my brother's keeper?" (Genesis 4:9b). Alluded to within that phrase is a very powerful idea: am I responsible for my brother? Now expand that idea, broaden its edges, widen its scope until it reaches the logical conclusion: are we responsible to all for all? If this statement is true, then man, over the course of his existence, has been committing a tragic sin, for most would look at this statement as preposterous, lunatic, unrealistic.

Yet Markel, Father Zosima's brother, has no problem imagining such a world: "in truth we are each responsible to all for all, it's only that men don't know this. If they knew it, the world would be a paradise at once" (277). Perhaps it would be bliss; nevertheless, it's hard to picture a world of such love, for our world seems so opposed to the idea. But Ivan Fyodorovich's personal devil identifies a problem with this bliss. "If everything in the universe were sensible, nothing would happen. There would be no events" (609). Envisioning the opposite isn't hard; evidence of a selfish world can be found in the headlines. No one appears willing to take responsibility for all the countless atrocities man has committed from the dawn of time to the present. Man: always willing to give an excuse or look the other way, but never willing to take responsibility. Yet, as humans and creations of God, isn't it our duty? Just such an idea is presented in Dostoevsky's *The Brothers Karamazov*. Throughout the novel the idea that we are responsible to all for all is promoted by various characters, and is suffered over by Ivan and Dmitri. The idea of our responsibility arises again and again, and forces Ivan, Dmitri, and Alyosha to deal with it directly in relation to the murder of their father, Fyodor Pavlovich Karamazov.

"What have I to do with it [the conflict between Dmitri and Fyodor]? Am I my brother Dmitri's keeper?" (213). Ivan Karamazov is indecisive. He is a bundle of conflicting ideas, master of argument, with the ability to see and map out where every theory is headed, but when it comes to making a choice and believing, he is

indecisive. Herein lies his problem. Ivan wavers betwixt faith and disbelief.

On the surface he appears a firm atheist, but this can be deceiving, because he does believe in God; he just doesn't accept His World. Although Ivan is of great intellectual prowess, he undertakes the impossible when he attempts to psychoanalyze God. Through earthly reason he attempts to understand God, yet since he is only a man and not a god, he takes on the impossible and suffers for it.

Ivan believes it is absolutely impossible for man to love his neighbor; in fact, the idea is ludicrous. Christ taught us to love our fellow man, but as Ivan points out, "He was God . . . we are not gods" (218). Ivan states that since the innocent suffer, there can never be justice. He uses children as his example of innocents suffering, an irrefutable example not only because of the purity of a child's heart, but also Alyosha's love for them: "The innocent must not suffer for another's sins, and especially such innocents" (219). With Ivan's earthly mind all he can understand "is that there is suffering and that there are none guilty" (224). Ivan passionately declares that he can not live by an idea that never punishes the guilty, never holds them responsible. For there to be justice, there must be retribution. But even if harmony is reached when every heart and tongue confess, this will not be good enough for Ivan, for the innocent would still have suffered unjustly. No harmony, Ivan says, is worth the price of a child's unredeemed tears, so he rejects the idea of eternal harmony—paradise. He could even be shown the harmony with his own eyes, see the battered and bruised child embrace his tormentor and wash away the scars on both souls with his trembling tears, but Ivan will not accept it. It is beyond Ivan's reason that children must suffer to begin with, that in order to receive harmony justice must be forgotten.

It would seem Ivan accepts God's sovereignty, but with such power comes responsibility, and Ivan's conflict lurks here: God is too mysterious in the exercising of his authority. God, as Lord over all, should make it His duty to see that no innocent soul suffers, for how can one claim to be a just God if such events occur? Ivan seems more preoccupied with God's responsibility than with his own. He can not accept the idea that none are guilty, but he also can not put his trust in God's wisdom and his allowance of innocent suffering. It is Alyosha, the sole member of Ivan's audience, who points out to him that "there is a Being and He can forgive everything, all *and for all*, because He gave His innocent blood for all and everything" (226-27). Jesus died to be the cornerstone of man's happiness, to forgive man and let him reach for the heavens. Enter the Grand Inquisitor.

"Thou didst not love them at all—Thou who didst come to give Thy life for them! Instead of taking possession of men's freedom, Thou didst increase it, and burdened the spiritual kingdom of mankind with its suffering forever" (235). Man's weakness, the Grand Inquisitor relates, is his need for miracle, mystery, and authority. But Jesus, during the three temptations, denied man all of these in favor of free will. This, the Inquisitor argues, is unacceptable for free will is a burden the majority of men can not bear, and yet for Jesus it is necessary; in place of empathy towards mankind, Jesus shows respect. But most men are simple and want an authority to rule over them, so the church remedies this by removing freedom. Hence the Church took from Satan what Christ would not, "Rome and the sword of Caesar" (238). But,

TORMENT TO BELIEF

the Inquisitor adds, there are those few, the elect, who can accept the great burden of freedom. The Grand Inquisitor is one of them, and one begins to wonder if Ivan sees himself as one of the elect. Yet he passes over salvation to bring happiness to mankind: "I too prized the freedom with which Thou hast blessed men, and I too was striving to stand among the elect . . . but I awakened and would not serve madness. I . . . joined the ranks of those who have corrected Thy work" (240).

The Grand Inquisitor takes the sins of man upon his shoulders. It would seem that he is saying that the common man is not responsible for his fellow man, but only the elect are. Since Christ rejected the responsibility, the Inquisitor feels the need to bear it. But they are responsible only to the extent of correcting God's work, through making the masses obedient, like masters over slaves.

There is no active love, only the abstract love of the Inquisitor. Oh, it can not be denied that the Inquisitor's love for mankind is deep and sincere, but he deceives man: he comes in the name of God holding the devil's hand. The Inquisitor seems nothing more than a charlatan, a surrogate savior dressed in the holy cloth, trying to cover up the mistakes of God and quietly sweep them under the carpet.

Ivan and the Inquisitor are alike in their struggle, for they both feel God needs to take responsibility for His children. Christ demands too much of mankind and the Inquisitor does his best to lighten that load. Ivan seems willing to admit to Christ's infinite compassion and mercy, and even depicts Him raising a child from the dead and giving sight to a blind man: miracles. At the same time He is being praised, He is also being criticized.

Yet it seems that the masses opt for the Inquisitor over Jesus, for the Inquisitor has always been there, has always been their guide, and Jesus is only a name in a book. The Grand Inquisitor sequence forms the foundation of Ivan's struggle, the very questioning of God Himself and the degree of responsibility man has. Ivan loves humanity, but he has a problem with God, possibly because he feels that God does not love man enough, does not account for his weaknesses, whereas Ivan and the Inquisitor do.

"Then why on earth do you advise me to go to Chemashnya? What did you mean by that? If I go away, you see what will happen here?" "Precisely so, sir" (253). The same duality Ivan expressed in the Grand Inquisitor poem (both praising and criticizing Jesus at once) is also seen through his relationship with Smerdyakov: Ivan despise him, yet feels compelled to sit and talk. In his conversation with Smerdyakov, the cook outlines how one could kill Fyodor without bluntly saying it. But Ivan does not appear to understand the lackey's words of how the murder could be accomplished and the next morning leaves town, in an obvious attempt to alleviate his soul of any responsibility that lies within his father's house.

On the train headed towards Moscow, Ivan declares: "I am a scoundrel." It would appear that he has identified his responsibility consciously, but rather is only slightly aware that something is nagging him. Ivan does not realize that with such great intellect comes great responsibility. He has yet to realize just how far his responsibility extends.

SPECTRUM

"You are still responsible for it all, since you knew of the murder, sir, and charged me to do it, sir, and went away knowing all about it" (594). Just as Smerdyakov had described the murder, so it happened. As Ivan makes his way to Smerdyakov's, Alyosha stops him to say, "I tell you once and for all, it was not you" (570). But this is not enough to soothe the guilt which has been plaguing Ivan ever since his return. Although he is not the one who struck the killing blow, he indeed made it possible for the killing blow to be struck, and that guilt is eating him up inside.

The torment of his responsibility was all subconscious and unidentified, bubbling and growling as it grew, threatening to overflow. It does spill out, with the help of Smerdyakov, who forces him to face his locked up angst, putting it onto the light—making it hard to ignore, even harder to forget. Like all his inner turmoil, Ivan leaves everything unanswered, but when confronted with the direct charge as to his guilt, he knows not what to do. Ivan struggles and battles Smerdyakov in conversation, trying to validate his innocence, trying to reject the responsibility; but in the end the more he argues, the more he begins to realize his guilt.

By the time Ivan leaves, he is convinced of it, and he hopes to alleviate his tormented conscience by pulling the frozen beggar, whom he intentionally hit and knocked to the ground, back from death. Here we see Ivan taking responsibility, but it is only a rouse, a mere diversion from the overwhelming guilt he feels for his father's death. Helping the frigid beggar may make him feel better, but only for a moment.

Devil to Ivan: "I know you." Stumbling back to his room, Ivan plunges head long into his inner self, not only seeking justification for his past actions, but also sanctuary. All he finds is the devil. His devil. Through the devil, Ivan chastises himself for his own indecision. The devil always seems to say that if you kick me or throw something at me, then you must believe in me. That is Ivan's problem. He can't seem to believe in anything and it would seem that his devil is going to *make* him believe. The devil declares, "I shall sow in you only a tiny grain of faith and it will grow into an oak tree" (612). The devil wants to push Ivan past his indecision between belief and disbelief and over to faith. And when Ivan finally throws the glass at his devil, he proves him real, or at least real to Ivan, which is all the devil meant to accomplish.

"You [Ivan] are going to perform an act of heroic virtue, and you don't believe in virtue; that's what tortures you" (620). Finally the question is before Ivan: does he confess his guilt and accept the responsibility of his father's murder? If he accepts the guilt in his heart through confession, he believes in immortality, God, and that we are responsible to all for all. If not, he believes all is lawful and none are guilty. He can't have it both ways this time. Ivan is finally faced with the conflict, forced to choose, not just to think and rethink every idea and possible consequence, but to actually choose. He is forced to believe.

"I am not mad, I am only a murderer. You can't expect eloquence from a murderer" (652). In the final climatic courtroom scene, Ivan finally makes his choice: he chooses to take the blame, to accept all the responsibility for the death of his father. The slow, gradual process of resolving the conflict within him was recognized first

TORMENT TO BELIEF

by Zosima in "An Unfortunate Gathering": "you don't believe your own arguments, and with an aching heart mock at them inwardly. . . . That question you have not yet answered, and it is your great grief, for it clamors for an answer" (61); finally, through much struggle, an answer has been given in the affirmative.

The outburst in the courtroom when he takes responsibility would imply a virtuous act, hence there is a God, the act done for the sake of immortality. Yet of Ivan we are told only little after the trial, save that he lies near death. But I think I can safely say that if Ivan did choose to believe in God, his faith would be strong, near unshakable, for he would not believe unless he was ready to believe, and never before. With this virtuous deed, it would seem Ivan is finally ready to make that enormously large step; however, one can't help wonder how he could quiet the internal doubts which would be scratching away at his faith, eager to renew the conflict. Perhaps he will realize that doubt is an integral part of faith. Man must struggle with his faith in order for it to be real.

"Why are they crying? Why are they crying?" (479). It was because of the children that Ivan could not accept this world and it is because of children that Dmitri will accept the responsibility of his father's murder. Through the three torments we see Mitya's gradual acceptance of his past life, including all the carousing and drunkenness it entails. He takes full responsibility for the debauchery and dishonor, but he pleads his innocence in regard to Fyodor's death. Before the second coming to Mokroe, Dmitri appeared to be a thoughtless character, driven by the moment and the passion it supplied. Now we see a Mitya whose past has caught up with him, and he accepts the weight of that chaotic past; he even begins to understand why he acted the way he did in relation to his boastful talking of the three thousand rubles and his savagery over the entire month.

The prosecutors are examining him, this is true, but Mitya is also examining himself, scrutinizing his every action. The first step in being responsible to all for all is first being responsible for oneself. Without that, all is worthless. That step taken, Mitya, at the end of his interrogation, has a profound dream. In it he views a weeping babe, crying and starving, cradled in the thin arms of its mother. Mitya can not understand why the child cries, is without food and clothing—why there is no justice for the child. All he receives as an answer is that the mother is poor, but Mitya can not understand why some people are poor. Question after question spill from his lips, and he feels rising within him compassion for the innocent child who suffers so greatly.

He accepts the charge of murderer because he almost was one; he will suffer in hopes of purification. While in captivity he explains his new beliefs to Alyosha, "It's for the babe I'm going. Because we are all responsible for all" (560). Where Ivan struggles with the question through the entire book, for Mitya the question is presented and resolved in the course of one dream, yet that dream would never have come without the interrogation, which forced him to face his prior irresponsibility.

SPECTRUM

It is also a dream which is the concluding factor in the transformation of Alyosha. Employing extreme self-control, he keeps his Karamazov sensuality buried deep within him. Upon the death of his Elder, he expects some form of a miracle, but that miracle never materializes and he witnesses how easily the masses turn against his beloved Elder. He falls into temptation and the buried Karamazov force is resurrected.

Yet it is at Grushenka's that he finds the opposite of what he sought. He finds pity, love and forgiveness where he believed he'd find evil. This draws him back and restores his hope in humanity. But he is still rather weak, having hope only for the isolated and not for the whole; it is the dream of Cana at Galilee which makes him strong, which fills him with an insatiable love for life, for the earth and all it holds. His heart brims with compassion and he longs to "forgive everyone and for everything" (340).

Redeemed and reassured, Alyosha practices his responsibility for all through active love. Earlier, he gave Grushenka an "onion," easing her soul by telling her that "she is more loving than we" (333). He influences Kolya and the boys greatly, getting them to make up with Ilushya and even comforting the child in his dying weeks. He teaches them the importance of good memories and how memories can save oneself. Most of all, he sets a good example for the future generation, so they can save Russia. And with Lise he struggles to exorcise her of her "little demon." Though she yells and screams how she hates all and everything, Alyosha still has patience with her, he still loves her. And through love, one can reach all places.

The concept of being responsible to all for all is a profound statement to say the least. In one form or another we will all answer whether we believe in it or not, maybe not consciously, but certainly through our actions. Yet now that one has been introduced to the concept, how can one just forget about it? We are no longer ignorant; as Markel would have said, we have the knowledge, the key to unlock the paradise within ourselves and others. Too bad that the statement "responsible to all for all" is just that, a statement. Not a reality.

SEXIST WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE AND HIS STEREOTYPICAL WOMEN

Lisa Hanisch '93

SOME may consider William Shakespeare to be the most beloved author in the history of literature, with the fame his characters enjoy certainly equal to their creator's. And while most of his plays are reproductions, it is from Shakespeare's genius that these fictional characters have come to life, as men and women centuries later question the unequal conditions of the sexes in society. Yet, were the roles Shakespeare established for the sexes in his play really ingenious? Although many think first of the male characters in Shakespeare's comedies, the heroines are both more interesting and undoubtedly the pre-eminent arbiters of the comic action, playing a variety of roles, while retaining the plays' focus on love and romance. Played against the men, Shakespeare's women provide conflict and resolution, not only for the seemingly more prominent male figures, but in the comedy's plots as well. By doing so, women like Portia, Beatrice, and Rosalind, virtuous in both body and spirit, apparently control their male counterparts. However, is Shakespeare really supporting sexual equality in his works, or covertly restricting women to the established stereotype: female obedience to male authority?

As the only shrew in Shakespeare's comedies, *The Taming of the Shrew's* Kate is an aggressive woman of fierce spirit and ill-temper, who always speaks what's on her mind. The reader, however, is led to believe that she is humbled by her suffering yet loving husband, when she explains to the other women that they "are bound to serve, love and obey" (V, II, 164) in the comedy's concluding lines. While it appears this feisty woman has been tamed, in reality Kate has exactly what she's always wanted: love and marriage. Although Kate may appear to be more modest at the end, she is no more sensitive to the other characters than she was at the beginning; even though she has been trained like a dog, clamoring to husband Petruchio's every whim, she is the focus of everyone's attention, proving to be more valuable financially than the other women, and more admirable than sister Bianca: "Hortensio: Now go thy ways, thou hast tam'd a curst shrow. Lucio: 'Tis a wonder, by your leave, she will be tam'd

SPECTRUM

so" (V, ii, 189-192). Furthermore, had Kate been truly independent, and as anti-men as one initially believes, Petruchio would not have destroyed her will power so easily, if at all.

While on the surface Kate's initial lashing out against men suggests that she does not want the traditional role of wife and mother, in reality she is self-conscious, and fears she will remain alone once Bianca is married. Although she claims she'll see Petruchio "hang'd on Sunday first" (II, i, 298) before she will marry him, when Petruchio and Baptista, her father, finally agree to the marriage, she exits without saying a word. It is safe to say that the verbal Kate would vehemently object to the match if she really wanted to. Certainly she would not fear his change of heart, weeping, when Petruchio is late arriving at the church for their wedding:

Make friends, invite, and proclaim the banns,
Yet never means to wed where he hath woo'd.
Now must the world point at poor Katherine,
And say, "Lo, there is mad Petruchio's wife,
If it would please him come and marry her!" (III, ii, 16-20)

Shakespeare, then, while creating the seemingly self-willed Katherine, has actually reinforced the stereotypical view of women: Kate not only accepts her proper role, obeying the male authority, she wanted to all along.

If there was a Shakespearean woman that depicts the fairy-tale heroine waiting to be saved by her true love, it is Portia in *The Merchant of Venice*. However, it is the same traditional, witty Portia that successfully defeats Shylock where every man failed: the law court. Or is it? Portia is perhaps one of Shakespeare's most complex characters, for her personality is contradictory. On the one hand, she submits to her father's unorthodox method of choosing her husband, not even helping Bassanio with the riddle, although she knows which casket is the best choice. While she admits her love for Bassanio, attempting to keep him in Belmont before he takes her father's test ("One half of me is yours, the other half yours—/Mine own, I would say; but if mine, then yours,/and so all yours" [III, ii, 16-18]), she is faithful to her father and his will, even though it limits her freedom. Although Portia is intelligent, and more than capable of choosing a suitable husband, she is subject to a male's authority (even when he is dead). This plays directly into the stereotype of women, suggesting that even a learned woman needs male direction, especially in the realm of love. She must have a good match, not necessarily one based on her heart, which her father undoubtedly felt she would follow, and thus made appropriate precautions in his will. Furthermore, after Bassanio's casket choice wins Portia, and she gives him a ring, the importance of the vow of marriage to a woman is emphasized. To Portia, Bassanio had no right to give away her ring, a symbol of their love, regardless of the circumstances; to a woman, wedding vows are not only sacred, but supersede all other concerns. Bassanio's belief that Portia will understand is based on his typical view of woman as merely an attraction to marry who will succumb to every action of her husband.

On the surface, Portia's success in the courtroom appears to be contradicting her status as the stereotypical woman, subject to male dominance. However, her victory

SEXIST WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE AND HIS STEREOTYPICAL WOMEN

over Shylock occurs when she is dressed as a professional male; she could not have walked into the court as herself and even begun to question Shylock—she probably would have been laughed out of court. When the truth is revealed, additionally, she is never given due credit for defeating Shylock and saving Antonio, only a mere, “Sweet lady you have given me life and living, / For here I read for certain that my ships / Are safely come to road” (V, i, 286–88). Therefore, while Portia’s courtroom performance is brilliant, the male’s power still overshadows the woman.

It is in *Much Ado about Nothing* that Shakespeare comes the closest to breaking the stereotype his female characters represent. Although Beatrice likes men, she is independent, not interested in marrying, and in no need of protection: “Just, if he send me no husband, for the which blessing I am at him upon my knees every morning and evening” (II, i 27–29). Repeatedly trading jests with Benedict, Beatrice is able to hold her own with a man while also refusing to laugh off any intolerable remarks from her slap-stick companion, thus exemplifying how she is not the typical innocent female. Furthermore, when Leonato, Antonio, Hero, and Beatrice discuss men and marriage, Beatrice advises her cousin, Hero, that she need not be ruled by her father:

ANTONIO [to HERO]. Well niece, I trust you will be rul’d by your father.

BEATRICE. Yes, faith, it is my cousin’s duty to make cur’sy and say, “Father, as it please you.” But yet for all that, cousin, let him be a handsome fellow, or else make another cur’sy and say, “Father, as it please me.” (II, i, 50–56)

While Beatrice appears unwilling to accept society’s subservience of women, even she falls prey to the unspoken belief in male dominance. First, in the above example, Beatrice only suggests Hero stand up to Leonato if the man is not physically appealing to her. Otherwise, she says it is Hero’s “duty” to submit to Leonato’s wishes. This suggests that appearances are the only aspects important to women, and thus Beatrice undermines her own intelligence in favor of the male authority. Secondly, after Claudio publicly slanders Hero, Beatrice intuitively turn to Benedick for help: “O that I were a man for his sake! Or that I had any friend would be a man for my sake! . . . I cannot be a man with wishing, therefore I will die a woman with grieving” (IV, i, 317–18, 322–23). Thus, even the competent Beatrice, while seemingly a character of equal virtue, functions as the stereotypical female, allowing the man to take control.

As one of Shakespeare’s androgynous heroines, Rosalind of *As You Like It* emphasizes an ambiguity between the sexes. Both Rosalind and Ganymede, her male personality, possess masculine and feminine traits, which leaves the reader confused as to Shakespeare’s intentions. Was her testing of Orlando, as Ganymede, a serious attempt to reverse Orlando’s patriarchal view of women, or a playful game to fill her time in the idyllic Forest of Arden? There is no evidence that Orlando has benefited from Rosalind’s trick when they are married. However, the mere fact that Shakespeare dresses Rosalind as a man for her escape from the court with Celia, and keeps her so dressed, exemplifies the place of women in a male-dominated world, which extends beyond the city to the fantasy world of Arden. The women were not comfortable traveling as themselves, and must alter their physical reality to another gender in order to accomplish their goal:

SPECTRUM

I'll put myself in poor and mean attire,
And with a kind of umber smirch my face;
The like do you. So shall we pass along
And never stir assailants. (I, iii, 111-14)

This demonstrates the women's automatic acceptance that they must be men in order to survive in the male world. Furthermore, when Rosalind begins her test, as Ganymede, she describes how women should behave: "be effeminate, changeable, longing and liking, proud, fantastical, apish, shallow, inconstant, full of tears, full of smiles" (III, ii, 410-12). These words, uttered by Rosalind, dressed as a man, can thus be explained as not only the woman's opinion, but as the man's as well, stressing the man's low opinion of women and his need for authority over her.

Helena, in *All's Well that Ends Well*, is perhaps one of the most endearing of Shakespeare's heroines. And, like those before her, while portrayed as a strong and seemingly unconventional woman, she is really not as liberated as we first assume. From one perspective, Helena does exemplify a new woman in literature. She is able to establish her priorities, and is unusually direct with Parolles when discussing her virginity, as well as in her soliloquy, in which she sets her sights on Bertram:

... Who ever strove
To show her merit, that did miss her love?
The King's disease—my project may deceive me,
But my intents are fix'd, and will not leave me. (I, i, 226-29)

To accomplish this, Shakespeare invokes the bed-trick, and in the end, Helena, having successfully duped Bertram, not only wins her man, but rescues him; her strong character helps the male's more weak personality. A second way in which Helena steps out of women's stereotypical role is by demanding the right to choose her own husband:

HELENA. But if I help, what do you promise me?
KING. Make thy demand.
HELENA. But will you make it even?
KING. Aye, by my sceptre and my hopes of [heaven].
HELENA. Then shalt thou give me with thy kindly hand
What husband in thy power I will command. (II, i, 190-94)

The parade of young lords reverses the sexual stereotype where the ladies are normally on show, not the men. Finally, Helena is significantly separated from Shakespeare's other comic heroines in that she has professional ability. While she is not a doctor, she both knows the prescriptions of her dead father, and is confident one will cure the King, and is not afraid to use this knowledge to her advantage:

But give me leave to try success, I'd venture
The well-lost life of mine on his Grace's cure
By such a day, an hours.
Dost thou believ't?
Ay, madam, knowingly. (I, iii, 247-50)

Thus Helena apparently breaks the established notion that Shakespeare's women are submissive to the male characters.

SEXIST WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE AND HIS STEREOTYPICAL WOMEN

There are aspects to Helena, however, that while becoming an effective and complex woman, actually suggest she is no more unconventional than Kate, Portia, Beatrice, and Rosalind. First of all, Helena is single-minded: she wants to be Bertram's wife, and stops at nothing to accomplish this quest. Thus, we have a stereotypical woman, who wants nothing but marriage—a marriage, furthermore, to someone who does not want her (the typical "pushy" female). Secondly, to realize her goals, Helena reverses her sex; instead of using her femininity to catch Bertram, she becomes the aggressor, a male characteristic, thus suggesting that a woman must abandon her femininity, invoking male traits, to get what she wants: there is no room for a woman to remain a woman, if she is to survive in the male-dominated world.

Some claim Shakespeare flirted with a New Woman in his comedies. And while his women appear to step over the traditional boundaries set for them, they invariably fall prey to the stereotype they are attempting to overcome. It is the male characters that are in control in Shakespeare's comedies, not the women. Perhaps Shakespeare was not as ingenious as supposed, but only flirted with the *idea* of the New Woman.

SPECTRUM

A RISK TO OUR MORALITY

Amy Keith

IN the November general election of 1992, an initiative was brought forth which we have not seen the last of. Proposition 161 was entitled "Physician-Assisted Death. Terminal Condition" and would have made California the first state to legalize the performance of euthanasia by physicians acting at their patients' request. Although this initiative was not passed, it lost by only two percent. The public's failure to investigate this initiative and the dangers of legal euthanasia could explain why so many Californians voted for the bill. It is important that the people of California research the reasons why euthanasia is a risk to our state's humanity before a similar bill appears and becomes law.

There were many problems with Proposition 161 which the voters who wanted to pass the bill did not recognize. First of all, the bill stated that "current state laws do not adequately protect the rights of terminally ill patients," which falsely suggests that no legal mechanisms now exist for patients to avoid such "artificial prolongation" of life. There is the California Death Act, which allows adults to sign a "Declaration" at any time that directs their physicians to forgo life-sustaining treatment in the event of terminal illness or permanent unconsciousness. Proposition 161 wanted to go one step further than the Natural Death Act and allow the physician to give a terminally ill patient a lethal injection to end his life immediately. But do we truly want the people we trust to heal us now to kill us?

Doctors would be deciding on the basis of their own private views when patients deserve to live and when they deserve to die. This is a right which no individual should have. Everyone knows how easy it is for those who control the information to engineer requests and to manipulate choices, especially in the vulnerable. If a physician were to describe a horrible prognosis and contrast it with a quick, easy release, which would the depressed patient choose, especially in the face of growing hospital bills and children who only visit grudgingly? Is this the kind of choice, assuming it can be made in a fixed and rational manner, that we want to offer a gravely ill person?

SPECTRUM

It is naive to take comfort from the fact that the proposed bill provides "aid-in-dying" only to those who request it. We know from long experience how difficult it is to discover what we truly want when we are suffering. Verbal "requests" made under duress rarely reveal the whole story. Often a demand for euthanasia is in fact a angry or anxious plea for help, caused by fear of rejection or abandonment, or made in ignorance of available alternatives that could alleviate pain and suffering.

The proposition which almost passed in November failed to set up any regulatory procedure to review the process by which patients request and doctors perform euthanasia. If it had passed, physicians would have been more carefully reviewed when they performed simple appendectomies than when they killed their patients. And those traditionally devoted to the art of healing would become agents of death.

Instead of seeking legal protection for euthanasia, we would do better as a society to develop our present resources. The hospice movement needs volunteers, money, and facilities to provide a less costly and more caring context for dying. And there is room for better use of our present knowledge in managing and eliminating pain. We should put our energies into these approaches. There has got to be a better way, socially and personally, for us to approach the difficult end of life.

The answer is not physician-assisted, state-legalized suicide. Rather, it is the watchful and loving care of the dying by society, and the assurance of their comfort throughout the natural and inevitable process of death. Loving care of the dying includes the effective control of pain, emotional support, and the withholding of extraordinary means of medical treatments when continuing them has become unreasonable or unjustifiable.

We must all learn to accept the inevitability of death and its wrenching consequences, but we must still maintain our hope in the face of them and help others to do so as well. To allow physician-assisted murder would be to alter irrevocably the nature of the physician-patient relationship, and risk the foundation of our morality, the belief that each life is intrinsically valuable.

AH, THE GOOD LIFE!

Helen Leiker

THE setting. A corner of heaven reserved for poets and philosophers. Venus smiles as she eavesdrops on a conversation. She is amused at the exchange because although Cicero and Lucretius both believed in living the good life, they had entirely different convictions about just how it was accomplished. Cicero believed that all philosophy is "fruitful and rewarding," but the "most luxuriantly fertile field of all is that of our moral obligations" ("On Duties III" 160). Lucretius, through reasoning, wanted to "drive out neck and crop that fear of Hell which blasts the life of man from its very foundations" (On the Nature of the Universe 97) by expounding on the "truth about nature" (181). Venus thinks it's possible, however, that they will find some common ground too.

CICERO

I don't know quite how to tell you this, Lucretius, but Nature has played a trick on you. You were adamant that "there is no murky pit of Hell awaiting anyone" (125), and equally adamant that "spirit is mortal" (112), but here we both are. Welcome to Heaven!

LUCRETIUS

This is so hard to believe—"it is surely crazy to couple a mortal object [body] with an eternal [spirit]" (120). I thought I had clearly established that "'spirit' is mortal" . . . and that applied "equally to 'mind'" (109). And neither did I "suppose that the holy dwelling places of the gods are anywhere within the limits of the world" (175). Why, my principal work was my dissertation "on the ultimate realities of heaven and the gods" (28).

CICERO

From my studies, I knew that "since all philosophers maintain that God is never angry and never hurtful," we had no cause to be "frightened of Jupiter's anger" (200). But I believed that religion was necessary, "not a question of the anger of the gods, which does not exist, but of right dealing and good

SPECTRUM

faith" (201). For example, when we took an oath, we called on God as our witness, backing our oath "by the whole force of religion" (201.) The real importance of this was that one who broke an oath, violated "Good Faith" and therefore breached his moral duty.

LUCRETIUS

Moral duty? As our society developed, "mankind was worn out by a life of violence" and was "ready to submit of its own free will to the bondage of laws and institutions" (206). But, since that time, "the enjoyment of life's prizes has been tempered by the fear of punishment" (206). Men had no "power of resistance" to the "hocus-pocus" of the prophets because they were "haunted by the fear of eternal punishment after death" (30).

CICERO

In my life, I tried to inspire the good life by example. When leisure and solitude were imposed on me by my involuntary retirement, I "refused to let it make me idle," and I "concentrated my whole attention and willpower upon literary work" in order to render a clear understanding of "our moral obligations—since, if we clearly understand these, we have mastered the rules for leading a good and consistent life" (160). I hoped that anyone following the "advice and instruction" in my letter (209) would be enabled to "win the same sort of reputation" as I had (160).

LUCRETIUS

Perhaps moral principles were enough for you. But I saw men escape their responsibilities by taking "refuge in handing over everything to the gods . . . dependent on their whim" (207). In this way "poor humanity" created anguish for itself by burdening the gods with its own responsibility while subjecting itself to the gods' "vindictive temper" (207)!

CICERO

Rather than make men fear hell, I sought to demonstrate that by mastering the application of moral principles, they "have mastered the rules for leading a good and consistent life" (160). After scrutinizing Panaetius's teachings, I came to the conclusion that there is "no need to deal with the comparison between what is right"—"goodness and right being wholly synonymous"—and "what appears (falsely) to be advantageous" (163). If a man examines a concern and decides his course of action based on what is right, he will lead the good life. However, those who "judge everything by profits and gains," are not good men (165). It is a "crime" to embrace advantage over right, and "it is also sinful" (165).

LUCRETIUS

Crime?! Sinful?! Cicero, you're sounding pious. Are we back to religion? My belief is that "true piety lies rather in the power to contemplate the universe with a quiet mind" (208). When people are accused of crimes and sins, their "life is darkened by the fear of retribution" and their "conscience ridden mind

AH, THE GOOD LIFE!

in terrified anticipation torments itself" . . . "so at length the life of misguided mortals becomes a Hell on earth" (127). That is why I argued so forcefully to dispel the notion of the gods' intervention in people's lives.

I used true reasoning to prove that "nothing can ever be created by divine power out of nothing" (31), that "nature is free and uncontrolled by proud masters and runs the universe by herself without the aid of gods" (92). My "greatest joy of all" was "to stand aloof . . . stoutly fortified by the teaching of the wise, and to gaze down" on men with "joyless hearts" and "minds without vision" (61). Through my writings, I "blazed a trail . . . where no foot has ever trod before" (130). The purpose of my toil was to "loose men's minds from the tight knots of superstition," to give them "insight into the nature of the universe" and for them to realize how they can profit from what they have learned (130).

CICERO

I taught that men could profit, "live safely with another," by following "nature's rational principle, the law that governs gods and men alike" (167). Man can strive to increase his own wealth, but "what nature forbids is that we should" enlarge our wealth "by plundering others" (167). To do so would be to destroy "nature's creation" which is the "link that unites every human being with every other" (166). I'll have to accede, however, that those who violate this principle will be "punished with fines, imprisonment, exile or death" (167).

VENUS

[*Bemused but pensive*] It's plain to see that both Cicero and Lucretius wanted the *good life* for themselves and their fellow men. As *I know* all too well, men will debate about the afterlife *for all eternity*. But it's conceivable that two philosophies could co-exist—one would not have to be mutually exclusive of the other. A man could live a life based on moral principles and also dedicate himself to the study the nature of the universe. A harder question, though, is whether he would have to entirely abandon a belief in the gods in order to do so.

Cicero dispelled fear of death and retribution by extolling the rewards of living by choosing right over *apparent* advantage. In this way, a man could not only enjoy a good reputation, but make life better for himself and "the whole of mankind" (164). Lucretius argued that there was no reason to fear death, because there was no afterlife—the only hell was the one man made for himself on earth. By devoting himself to the study of the universe, man could get rid of the "fears and anxieties that dog the human breast" (61). He asserted that there was no doubt that the power to do so "rests with reason alone" (61). Certainly "the universe was certainly not created for us by divine power: it is so full of imperfections" (65).

[*Venus frowns*] Ouch, Lucretius! That hurts! [*Venus reflects*] I think the common ground that Cicero and Lucretius shared is aptly described in

SPECTRUM

Lucretius' own words:

So we find that not only such arts as sea-faring and agriculture, city walls and laws, . . . but also without exception the amenities and refinements of life . . . all were taught gradually by usage and the active mind's experience as men groped their way forward step by step. So each particular development is brought gradually to the fore by the advance of time, and reason lifts it into the light of day. (216)

[*Venus decides to listen in again*]

LUCRETIUS

I knew that "subconsciously" men believed that "after death [they] would still experience sensation," but I thought they were wrong (122). I also scoffed at the "ancient discoveries" of Ceres, who "taught men to use cereals" and "Bacchus the juice of the grape" because "without these things we could go on living" (171). But—pardon the expression—*what the hell!* As long as we're here, pass the bread and wine.

CICERO

Ah, the good life!

AN UNEMOTIONAL HERO

Anh Truong

IN *The Aeneid*, Virgil effectively uses other characters to delineate the sensitivity of the poem's hero, Aeneas. Dido, the queen of the Tyrians, and Turnus, the king of the Rutulians, both serve as Aeneas's foils in determining his tenderness. Some people argue that the hero is a warm, emotional man because he mourns his wife's death, regrets leaving Dido, and battles Turnus for the kingdom of Latium. Although Aeneas does display these signs of emotion, Virgil still depicts him as a cold, unfeeling character in comparison to the passionate Dido and the raging Turnus.

When Virgil first introduces Dido, he briefly gives the queen's history through Venus. In disguise, the goddess describes the events concerning the death of Sychaeus, Dido's first husband (I, 485-522). Despite the fact that her marriage had been arranged by her father (I, 485-87), "Dido [had] loved [Sychaeus] with much passion" (I, 488). Before she had discovered her husband's tragic death, "she [had been] sick and longing" (I, 499) for him. Dido had been devastated by his disappearance and missed him terribly. Sychaeus had felt the same love for Dido, too, for he had come to her in a dream to warn her and to save her from her wicked brother (I, 500-09). He had also assisted Dido in her journey by telling her where an ancient treasure was (I, 507-08). Because of his love, Sychaeus had returned to guide his wife to safety. Dido had obeyed his orders without hesitation, showing that she had trusted him completely. These past events demonstrate the intense love they had for each other. In addition, the queen does not forget Sychaeus, even after her own death. In the Underworld, Dido finds her husband, who "answers her sorrows, gives her love for love" (VI, 623). The everlasting love Dido has for Sychaeus is clearly evident. She has such passionate feelings for him that she had loved Sychaeus from the beginning of their marriage and continues to love him after her own death.

On the other hand, Aeneas's reaction to his wife's death is not nearly as emotional. During the fall of Troy, Aeneas had tried to escape with his father,

SPECTRUM

wife, and son. Aeneas had carried his elderly father on his back and held his son's hand, but had instructed Creusa to "follow at a distance" (II, 961). However, Aeneas "[had] not look[ed] behind for her, astray, / or [had not thought] of her before [they had] reached the mound" (II, 999-1000). The hero's carelessness had caused him to lose his wife. He had not even remembered her until he had arrived at the meeting place. Nevertheless, he had gone back into the burning city to look for Creusa (II, 1004-40), showing that he had loved her. Empty-handed, Aeneas had eventually returned to his father and son. Just as Dido had encountered the dead Sychaeus, Aeneas had been confronted by his wife's ghost (II, 1040-64). Creusa had informed her husband about his future bride and kingdom in Italy. After she had disappeared, Aeneas "[had wept] and / want[ed] to say so many things" (II, 1065-66). Although Aeneas and Creusa had loved each other, their love had not been as intense as that of Dido and Sychaeus. Aeneas had recklessly lost his wife during an extremely dangerous situation. Despite the fact that Aeneas had shown sorrow and remorse for his dead wife, his mourning seems to have been surprisingly brief—for the only time Aeneas mentions Creusa in the entire book is when Dido instructs him to tell his story (I, 1049-51). Aeneas' short lamentation sharply contrasts with Dido's everlasting love for Sychaeus. While Dido's passion for her husband had been vibrantly strong, Aeneas' love for Creusa had been weak and had not shown any signs of passion. Thus, in comparison to Dido, Aeneas is a much less emotional person during the death of a spouse.

Furthermore, Virgil depicts Dido as more ardent than Aeneas in their relationship. When Aeneas is reminded of his impending departure, he is not as upset as Dido. He wants to stay with Dido, but Mercury reminds him of his fate to found Rome (IV, 353-72). The hero acquiesces and prepares for his departure. As soon as Dido learns of her lover's parting, she accuses him of keeping it from her (IV, 410-12). Aeneas asserts,

I never hoped
to hide—do not imagine that—my flight;
I am not furtive. I have never held
the wedding torches as a husband; I
have never entered into such agreements. (IV, 455-59)

In addition to refuting Dido's accusation, Aeneas also denies agreeing to any sort of marriage vows. Dido, on the other hand, considers him as her husband (IV, 436), showing that she loves him deeply enough to give him that title. Moreover, Aeneas does not express any feelings for Dido. He only declares that he regrets leaving, but must flee, since it is the will of the gods (IV, 460-71). Furious, Dido exclaims, "For did Aeneas groan when I was weeping? / Did he once turn his eyes or, overcome, / shed tears or pity me, who was once his loved one?" (IV, 503-05). Dido is obviously distraught over Aeneas' departure, yet the hero does not comfort her or show any signs of sorrow. Therefore, Aeneas's lack of emotions demonstrate that he is a cold, unfeeling man.

When compared to Dido's furor, Aeneas appears to be an even colder, more unfeeling man. After discovering her lover's approaching departure, Dido becomes

AN UNEMOTIONAL HERO

inflamed and immediately falls into a frenzy. She loves him fervently and does not want to let him go. Because she believes that Aeneas tried to hide his leaving, Dido feels betrayed by the man whom she considered her husband. Although she is furious at Aeneas, Dido still decides to give him a second chance. She tells her sister,

I now no longer ask
for those old ties of marriage [Aeneas] betrayed,
nor that he lose his kingdom, be deprived
of lovely Latium; I only ask
for empty time, a rest and truce for all
this frenzy, until fortune teaches me,
defeated, how to sorrow. (IV, 592-98)

Dido loves Aeneas so much that she is willing to let him go, and only asks to spend one last moment with him. She wants to come to peaceful terms with him. Nevertheless, Aeneas departs without saying another word to Dido. Enraged and frenzied, the queen resorts to suicide and speaks these final words, "May the savage Dardan drink / with his own eyes this fire from the deep / and take with him the omen of my death" (IV, 911-13). Dido clearly expresses her emotions through her words and actions. She resents and despises Aeneas for putting her through this misery. After her speech, Dido kills herself by falling on Aeneas's sword (IV, 914-16). Her courageous suicide is typical of a soldier's and confirms her rage and desperation. Dido is truly a passionate woman and has no problems expressing her feelings, contrary to Aeneas. Because Aeneas seems to be indifferent about his departure when compared to Dido's hysterical reaction, Virgil portrays the hero as an insensitive man.

In addition, Virgil uses Turnus as another foil character to Aeneas. The two leaders battle for the kingdom of Latium, but their incentives differ greatly. Turnus fights for the woman he loves, while Aeneas fights for his fate. The mere difference in reasons demonstrates the difference in feelings. Aeneas is determined to do whatever it takes to fulfill his fate and to obey the gods. His fate is to marry Lavinia (II, 1056-57), rule Latium, and found Rome (I, 10-12). On the contrary, Turnus's reason for fighting is much more emotional. Turnus is devoted to battle for the woman he loves—Lavinia. He declares, "[The Trojans] stole my wife from me; such injury / and hurt do not touch only Atreus' sons; / Mycenians are not the only ones / who war by right" (IX, 181-83). In his assertion, Turnus refers to the Trojan War, where the Greeks and Trojans fought for Helen. Turnus is willing to risk his life for Lavinia (XII, 100-01). It is his deep love for the princess that compels Turnus to face Aeneas. "His love drives Turnus wild; he stares at his / Lavinia; even keener now for battle" (XII, 95-96). The thought of losing Lavinia to Aeneas provokes Turnus to battle the Trojans.

Turnus's reason for fighting has much more emotion behind it than Aeneas's reason. Turnus is willing to die for one woman, whereas Aeneas is determined to fulfill his fate. Although "pious Aeneas" is driven by his love for the gods, his incentive seems less emotional than Turnus's. The king of the Rutulians is

SPECTRUM

sacrificing himself for one mortal woman, while Aeneas is fighting for his son's birthright (IV, 366-69) and for the immortal gods. Because Aeneas's reason is more logical, it has less emotion. With the odds against him, Turnus is fighting against fate and for love. Turnus has a better chance of losing, yet he still resolves to fight for the woman he loves. Thus, compared to Turnus, Aeneas is an unfeeling warrior.

Although Aeneas does show his emotions at times, they are not nearly as passionate as those of Dido and Turnus. Aeneas does weep for his dead wife, does deplore leaving Dido, and does fight for his fate. But the degree of his passion is belittled by the ardent Dido and the fervent Turnus. Dido had loved her husband intensely and continues to love him in the Underworld. She also loves Aeneas at one point and cannot bear the thought of losing him. However, because of his insensitivity, Dido is enraged and, in a frenzy, commits suicide after cursing the loathsome Aeneas. Likewise, Turnus risks his life for the woman he loves. His strong feelings for Lavinia provoke him into battle against Aeneas. Since Dido and Turnus are both portrayed as passionate foils, Aeneas is reduced to being depicted as an unemotional hero.