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A Word From the Editor

Most of the faculty at Washington College spend time with students outside of the classroom, whether it is on campus—in a lab in the Toll Science Center, engrossed in a dark room in Larrabee—or off, in a field (or, recently, an attic) digging up historical relics, or on the water trawling for fish. I also participate in co-curricular activities with our students; each summer I work with PlayPenn, a new play development conference in Philadelphia and each summer, two or three Washington College students work as interns with me.

This summer, at a pre-conference retreat, Aileen Brenner introduced herself to an exceptional group of thirty professional directors, playwrights and dramaturgs. She added that she was quite interested in the work and philosophy of French theater artist André Antoine, having written a paper on him. Three of the professionals wanted to know who he was—they didn’t know him. This question allowed Aileen to shine—the insights she shared with the group set a tone of inquiry, honesty and artistic excellence, which fueled the success of this year’s event. There is no greater satisfaction for a teacher than to learn something from one of your students.

I mention this not to embarrass Aileen, but to highlight something all of us who teach at Washington College know—our students make us proud, in and out of the classroom, year in and year out. We wonder if what we teach is understood to have implications far greater than in any given moment. From the looks of it—Titus Andronicus and Splatterpunk, the ethics of Home Schooling, and the larger conflict surrounding Hip Hop as stellar examples—I think the students are taking our ideas and running with them. I would also urge you to pay special attention to the
extraordinary art included in this issue. Under Professor Monika Weiss’s tutelage and example, the visual arts at Washington College have arrived with a bang.

The essays, images and creative writing contained in this issue represent some of the finest work our students have produced, including the poetry of 2008 Sophie Kerr prize-winner Emma Sovich. The decision-making process for inclusion is exhaustive; the editorial board spends a great deal of time reading, deliberating, arguing in order to publish what we all consider to be “exceptional” writing across disciplines. We think we’ve included pieces that are provocative, thoughtful and indeed, exceptional.

I want to thank my fellow editors and the tireless College Relations office for their continued service at a time when all are just too busy. Special thanks to the Wednesday night support group and the Drama department for patience and levity. Most importantly, Student Editor Alisha George is a junior to watch; she is full of talent, wisdom and grace and has made this issue beautiful.

As someone who has been doing a lot of writing lately (I am also a Ph.D. student), I can attest to the loneliness, anguish and torture of trying to write a solid, impressive essay. I know that I speak for the entire editorial board—Professors Peter Campion, Matthew McCabe, Scott Pearson, Leslie Sherman and Monika Weiss—when I say “well done” to the contributors. You have made us proud.

Michele Volansky
Editor, Washington College Review
Home and Home Schooling

*The Problem and the Solution to Moral Education*

Caroline Herman

It has long been theorized that character deficiency and moral degeneracy can in part be traced to the moral upbringing or education of the corrupt agent. It is, perhaps, a scapegoat sinkhole to attribute all moral corruption to the agent’s parenting or lack thereof. Still, the culturally instituted role of parents as caregivers demands that we meticulously examine the ethical system parents are instilling, consciously or unconsciously, in their offspring. All parents are morally and ethically influential to their children to some degree, and many are the origin of an ethics that remains throughout the children’s adult lives. Considering the profound and persistent influence parental teaching has on children, there exists a lamentably insignificant emphasis on “at-home” moral education in our current socio-cultural reflective thought. It is my intention in this essay to assert that the moral and ethical at-home education of our children is not only the dominant source of moral corruption, but also the primary means of producing virtuous, autonomous agents. First, I will be drawing from the works of Nel Noddings and Rita C. Manning to describe the foundational importance of instituting an ethics of care in moral education. Second, I will be using the thoughts of Kristján Kristjánsson, David Carr, and Amanda Cain to discuss the role of Aristotelian
emulation, literacy, and aesthetics in moral education. Finally, I intend to explore the problem of evil in moral education and consequently affirm the necessity of ethical education at home, or home schooling.

MORAL EDUCATION WITH AN ETHICS OF CARING: NEL NODDINGS AND RITA MANNING

In *Caring: A Feminine Approach to Ethics and Moral Education*, Nel Noddings develops a complete ethical system based on engrossment on the part of the “one-caring,” or caregiver, towards the cared-for. This “engrossment” is a type of ethical empathy in which there exists an emphasis on identification between the one-caring and the cared-for as well as a sensitivity to the relative context in which caring must be enacted (Noddings 1984: Ch. 2). According to Noddings, “Ethical caring, the relation in which we do meet the other morally, will be described as arising out of natural caring—that relation in which we respond as one-caring out of love or natural inclination” (Noddings 1984: 4-5). Caring, for Noddings, is an inborn impulse (perhaps more so in women than in men) to interrelate and thus engage in a *relationship* with another person.

In Noddings’ theory, caring is learned and perpetuated by being cared-for, that is, by experiencing caring. Thus, the parental role for Noddings is of utmost importance; the natural care given to a child by a parent will not only result in the reciprocity of natural care in the child but will extend into the emulation of ethical caring as demonstrated and absorbed by parent and child, respectively (Noddings 1984:120-1). The core of this system of caring is the commitment and construction of an ethical ideal.

The memory-associations between caring and being cared-for play a dominant role in Noddings’ ethics; she describes the ideal as derivative of “the natural sympathy human beings feel for each other and the longing to maintain, recapture, or enhance our most caring and tender moments” (Noddings 1984: 104). This memory of caring provides a kind of internal conscience or moral guide for actions; past caring experience allows the one-caring to determine how and why to care in a given situation,
thus maintaining caring itself. Noddings identifies individual influence, institutions such as the military and doctrinal religions, and social organizations such as fraternities and political parties as all constitutive of the deterioration of an ethical ideal within a moral agent (Noddings 1984: 116-7). Applying to a “higher” system of ideals or dogmas requires erasing and revaluating the agent’s own ethical ideal—developed, as we remember, according to the personal and individual memory-associations of caring. In this sense, a parent’s application or referral of a child’s ethical formation to a deontological system, either religious or secular, may be viewed as moral negligence on the part of the parent.

Noddings consistently stresses the necessity of open communication in an ethics of care; caring itself demands a relationship in which the one-caring enters into a dialectic relationship with the cared-for. The role of the parent, of the one-caring, then, is to consistently and conscientiously (according to the one-caring’s own ethical ideal) guide the cared-for (child) towards an open, dialectic, and practical formation of his or her (the child’s) own ethical ideal. The parent should, at all times, engage and relate to the child with the best possible motive—that is, with a view to realizing the entelechial capacity of the child to become a fully autonomous, virtuous agent (Noddings 1984: 123). Noddings later describes this process between teacher and student (roles easily transferable to parent and child) as “inclusion”:

In “inclusion,” the teacher receives the student and becomes in effect a duality. This sounds mystical, but it is not. The teacher receives and accepts the student’s feeling toward the subject matter; she looks at it and listens to it through his eyes and ears. How else can she interpret the subject matter for him? As she exercises this inclusion, she accepts his motives, reaches towards what he intends, so long as these motives and intentions do not force an abandonment of her own ethic inclusion as practiced by the teacher is a vital gift (Noddings 1984: 177).
The teacher-student relationship described above requires a dialectic and didactic openness that results in a sort of moral-development symbiosis. In experiencing the burgeoning seeds of her student (child)’s ethical ideal, the teacher (parent) is able to fine-tune her own. Her own ethical ideal, on the other hand, must be well developed enough to withstand such critical scrutiny. As Noddings understands this ethical ideal to be something that the agent lives consistently—something which infuses the physical and spiritual worldview of the agent—presumably, the agent’s ethical ideal will be strong enough to constitute as a model for her student (child).

Rita Manning further identifies an ethical ideal as the ultimate aim of both parent and child, teacher and student. In *Speaking from the Heart: A Feminist Perspective on Ethics*, Manning affirms the pervasive moral impact, for good or ill, which parents have on their children. She delineates two flawed trends in parenting: (1) in which the parents refuse to “baby” their children, thereby resorting to the verbal and sometimes physical belittling of the children in order to “toughen them up,” and (2) in which the parents’ needs, hopes, and desires for the children overwhelm the child’s identity and agency of will to the point of severely undermining both the child’s character and autonomy (Manning 1992: 91-2). Manning states that there exists no algorithm for good parenting; our children will live in a very different world from that in which we were raised. She does, however, have a place for an ethical ideal in her theory of parenting: “A child grows toward an ideal: committed, caring, connected, yet autonomous and self-reliant... one should allow a child to develop a full range of potentialities and interests along with the capacity and will to actualize them, while at the same time helping a child to grow in emotional depth and relatedness to others” (Manning 1992: 92-3). While this does imply sensitivity and awareness to the child’s needs and desires, it does not imply a blanket fulfillment of all said needs and desires; some “needs” may actually be desires that are more likely to damage rather than benefit the child. To raise the child according to an ethics of care, an awareness of the child’s possibilities in all
directions must be fostered and balance between need and desire must be instilled. A child’s receptivity and relatedness to his or her caregivers as well as the world around him or her is integral to the development of that child’s capacity to care (and thus of his or her ethical ideal). Manning further contends that it is not the parent’s role to foster societal ‘acceptability’ in the child; rather, the focus should be on cultivating and maintaining an ethical ideal that will allow the child to later subsume and ignore cultural “accepting” demands contrary to his ethical ideal (Manning 1992: 93-4).

In summation, an ethics of care in moral education requires an open dialectic between the one-caring and the cared-for (teacher-student, parent-child), through which imitation and emulation may develop an ethical ideal to serve as a moral conscience for the budding agent. Additionally, this dialectic must be based on an engrossment and inclusion through which the moral development of both parties may be refined. Finally, the motive behind both Noddings and Manning’s theories must be teleological in nature; that is, it must aim at producing an autonomous, virtuous agent.

EMULATION, LITERACY, AND AESTHETICS: AN ARISTOTELIAN CONSTITUENT

In her article, “Emulation and the use of role models in moral education,” Kristján Kristjánsson argues against the liberal trend in moral education that teaches children about values as though they were ABCs. She argues that moral education must be more upfront about right and wrong, that moral virtue “must seep into them from an early age like dye into wool,” and that the children’s role models must be moral exemplars rather than druggie pop stars. She then identifies three types of role models for modern children: (1) inevitably, the child’s teacher, who is constantly, consciously or unconsciously, “sending out a moral message”; (2) a chosen older mentor with experience in a domain of interest to the child; and (3) a moral exemplar academically stressed (such as Gandhi, Martin Luther King, or Mother Teresa) through biography or literature (Kristjánsson 2006: 37-8). I will later examine the role literature plays in moral formation, but for now, it is enough to
say that a student’s identification or affiliation with the moral hero (such as Frodo in *The Lord of the Rings* or Tom Sawyer in *Huckleberry Finn*) teaches the child to incorporate such values and character traits of these fictional protagonists into his or her own developing ethical ideal.

Kristjánsson then identifies the tripartite problem of role modeling in moral education. First, what she terms “the empirical problem” arises first because the modern child’s role model is not a parent, “talismanic leader from history and literature,” or a “renowned paragon of moral virtue,” but rather a morally degenerate icon from the mass media American culture. An exacerbating factor to this problem is that “nearly 75% of adolescents choose a model of their own sex and ethnic group,” which results in bounding their identities in racial and gender lines (Kristjánsson 2006: 39-40). Second, “the methodological problem” lies in the fact that moral educators generally attempt to “replace copycat vice with copycat virtue... [thereby] presenting an unsophisticated, undemanding and uncritical—almost infantilizing—model of emulation, essentially devoid of cognitive content.” A Nietzschean rebuttal to this issue, Kristjánsson states, is that the true role of a moral exemplar is to exhibit and thus “awaken” the highest moral potential—the highest capacity within the student or child for virtue—and this awakening comes not from surface imitation but rather from internal transformation. Third, “the substantive moral problem” is the Socratic question of valuing the virtues because they are inherently valuable in themselves or valuing the virtues because the role model happens to exhibit them. In other words, moral emulation must arise out of a student incorporating ideals and qualities his or her exemplar models because those ideals are worthy independent of the exemplar and not simply because the exemplar demonstrates them (Kristjánsson 2006: 40-1).

Kristjánsson proposes that an Aristotelian conception of emulation can correct at least the methodological and moral problems in role model education. Aristotle draws a contrast between emulation (*zêlos*) and envy (*phthonos*) which may be summed up by saying that emulation constitutes agent A admiring
the qualities of agent B and wanting to have the same things as B without wanting to take anything away from B, while envy is comprised of A wanting what B has, whether or not it means taking anything away from B. Emulation, for Aristotle, is an emotional virtue, and the virtues are described as “complex character traits... which dispose a person to feel and/or act in a certain morally right way in the right circumstances towards the right people—a measured way that hits the golden mean in each case between the respective extremes of deficiency and excess” (Kristjánsson 2006: 42-3). Emulation is a complicated, four-part virtue for Aristotle that demonstrates affective, conative, cognitive, and behavioral elements. It requires that (1) (affective) the agent feel the proper distress and desire at the deficiency of a virtue exemplified in another; (2) (conative) the agent embarks on attempting to gain or acquire that virtue without damaging the exemplar in any way; (3) (cognitive) the agent has the moral “acumen and discernment” to know what virtues or ideals to espouse and pursue, as well as which of these are attainable, and (4) (behavioral) the agent pursues ideals that are directly constitutive of the good (Kristjánsson 2006: 44). This complex sketch of emulation requires in a typically Aristotelian manner that the agent is fully capable of discerning and maintaining the delicate balance between excess and deficiency. It presupposes the precise “right” amount of sentiment, drive, passion, temperance, self-perception, and desire devoid of greed. Of course, the complexity of this prerequisite lies in the question of how to instill this knowledge of the endless “right” amounts of character attributes in the developing agent.

Kristjánsson proposes that emphasis on an Aristotelian conception of emulation rather than parrot imitation of moral virtue will solve the methodological and moral problems in role model education. This conception demands of educators that they reorient their students’ focus to the reasons (ideals) behind the actions of moral exemplars, rather than simply referring the student to a role model, i.e. “Be generous and selfless” rather than “Be like Mother Teresa.” Finally, the foremost motive of the moral educator must be to instill, evoke, or awaken an “emotionally driven
The demand for self-transformation” (Kristjánsson 2006: 48). To return to Noddings’ terminology, this requires on the part of the student (the one-caring) a didactic and emulative engrossment or inclusion with the (cared-for) ideal or virtue. The idea that emulation has a transformative capacity is crucial here; without it, the student is simply memorizing empty facts without retention.

The role of emulation in literacy is skinned over by Kristjánsson, but its importance is brought to light in Amanda Cain’s article, “Books and becoming good: demonstrating Aristotle’s theory of moral development in the act of reading.” According to Cain, moral development may be understood in the following: “where emotions can and should be properly aroused, guided and developed toward virtuous conduct” (Cain 2005: 172). Again, we return to this Aristotelian conception of the “right” emotion in the “right” place at the “right” time and in the “right” degree. The question of how to instill that knowledge of the “right” in the budding moral agent still remains unanswered. Virtuous conduct, for Aristotle, constitutes a symbiotic and reciprocal relationship between action and passion, activity and passivity, intellect and emotion. Virtues, then, are “dispositions of two sorts; actions and feelings, praxeis kai pathe” (Cain 2005: 174). In the act of reading, development of moral virtue translates into Noddings’ associative-memory process, which, as we remember, constructs both the nature of the ethical ideal and the quality of caring in the developing agent. The act of reading, in other words, produces or elicits emotions indicative of either personal involvement due to memory-experience or universal involvement due to empathetic engagement and incorporation. In this sense, reading is an act of both living and of moral education.

To describe this process, Cain quotes literary editor and essayist J.B. Kerfoot, “The reader who grasps this essential nature of reading knows that the author’s words call up ‘associative memories, and mental pictures, and character conceptions, and idea complexes’, and that these form themselves into ‘his word-notions, his memories, his mind pictures, his character conceptions, his idea constructions’” (Cain 2005: 176). Reading, then, is self-
transformative because of the high level of engagement—of action and emotion—required by and innate to literature. The reader not only identifies with, but in a metaphysical sense, becomes the moral protagonist or exemplar. Through undergoing the suffering and trials that the moral protagonist undergoes, the reader not only learns about specific ideals and values in specific contexts, but in a very real way, experiences and thus incorporates those ideals into the reader’s self. To illustrate this, Cain references Sven Birkerts, a humanist literary critic and essayist, “For Birkerts, reading is above all an activity of self-making . . . ‘These recognitions are eventually externalized as ideals and in that form guide the behavior along after the spell of reading passes’” (Cain 2005: 177). Reading is not only an act of self-discovery, but a process in which the reader discovers what in life is worthy of pursuit (what values, ideals, actions) and what in the self is desirable of cultivating (virtues, ideals, actions). In a world relatively devoid of great mythical emphasis, narrative provides a framework of experience in the young agent through which he or she is capable of both understanding and aspiring to a conception of meaning in life. In other words, through depiction of a microcosm, authors use literature to describe, praise, mourn, or criticize a macrocosmic issue or situation.

Cain uses the prevalent example of J.K. Rowlings’ series Harry Potter to demonstrate the potential popular literature has to influence moral development in young readers. The totemic and near-idolatrous elevation Harry Potter holds in the mythic imaginations (and sometimes realities) of young and old readers across the world is evident enough to anyone remotely exposed to culture. As Cain states, the boy-protagonist Harry Potter has “the universal markers of a traditional hero—an extraordinary but obscure lineage, sage guardians and years of tribulations that prepare all his human and super-human capabilities. He also exhibits many of the limitations and vulnerabilities, such as unruly hair and feelings of being unloved, of an average modern child” (Cain 2005: 179). Thus, in applying to the macrocosmic conceptions of the mythical hero while simultaneously incorporating the empirical realities of this-world children with
this-world dilemmas, Rowlings has constructed a hero to walk in both worlds, a hero with whom children may far more easily identify than with J.R.R. Tolkien’s Frodo, for example. Harry Potter is immediate; he falls in love, he has two best friends, he goes to school, studies, slacks off, gets detention, and has homework. Concurrently, Harry Potter is unique, “the boy who lived,” a prophetic hero who is the only one capable of overthrowing the Dark Lord, Voldemort. Harry Potter and his best friends (sidekicks) encounter both mythic and average moral and ethical dilemmas and apply to the twin ideals of “good” and “love” in order to overcome their own moral failings and less-than-admirable inclinations. To anyone who has read the series, it is eminently understandable why Harry Potter has become a moral exemplar for children and adults alike. Although he is, in many ways, a more pedestrian and accessible hero than any of Tolkien’s characters, his accessibility has granted Harry Potter universality that The Lord of the Rings does not enjoy. Children across the world absorb the Harry Potter books like sponges and incorporate into their experience the construction of a magical and mythical world in which great things are possible with a belief and desperation akin to the worst sentiments inspired by dogmatic religions. Although espousing the ethical ideals epitomized by Harry Potter is one of the more positive effects of this phenomenon, the mass-media cultural reproduction of consumer-products depicting Harry Potter’s world has exacerbated the issue by reorienting the focus from the ethical and moral value of the series to more materialistic considerations (Cain 2005: 181). Still, it cannot be argued that our socio-cultural degeneracy requires more modern and universally accessible heroes for the masses to emulate, and Harry Potter is undoubtedly one of these. In the fifth book of the series, for example, Harry Potter constantly suffers the onslaught of political and media-orchestrated slander and defamation. Because Harry Potter affirms the little-known truth that Lord Voldemort has returned, he is termed a liar with a hero/martyr complex. He loses friends and acquaintances and suffers mild persecution for upholding the truth. This sort of behavior affirms
in the reader’s mind the ultimate goodness of the truth, especially in the face of political and social pressure. Though its ethical and moral considerations and quandaries are sub-par and at times lightweight, the series does provide an enjoyable system of elementary morality to many children who will never take a philosophy class.

Now that the influence of literature and narrative on the moral development of the young has been explored, the question may be raised as to whether cinema can be used as another conduit of ethically significant narrative. As a result of the constant technological advancements and media-emphasis of our current culture, the role of narrative in cinemas is an ethically viable question. Because of its more accessible and enjoyable quality, cinema may reach more people than literature can. In his article, “Moral education at the movies: on the cinematic treatment of morally significant story and narrative,” David Carr contends that cinema is capable of weaving together “themes of immense moral and spiritual interest and significance in artistically rich and compelling ways” (Carr 2006: 326). To demonstrate this, Carr cites two films: Terry Gilliam’s 1991 film *The Fisher King* which draws on the Arthurian and grail legends and Joel and Ethan Coen’s 2000 film *O Brother, Where Art Thou?* which draws from Homer’s *Odyssey*. Carr argues for the primacy of narrative in moral education by stating that “any true appreciation of human identity depends upon some grasp of the roles occupied by agents in narratives that others relate regarding them or that they tell about themselves. The unity of the human person is the unity of character in a story, and the agency of personhood so conceived is part and parcel of such narrative” (Carr 2006: 320).

Thus we return to the interrelation of Aristotle’s action and emotion—*praxeis kai pathe*—in the act of reading (or, in this case, of watching). Narrative both demands and invokes a personal association and incorporation of an ethical or moral problem and the ideals or virtues used to overcome it. The idea of meaning is interrelated with the concept of the agent’s capacity; that is, the reader or watcher is able to both understand and believe
through narrative that moral agency and ethical character are constitutive of values, ideals, and power—in the sense of capacity for action and meaning as derived from action (put colloquially: the ability to make a difference). As Carr states, “the primacy of agency in narrative is that it is easier to understand ourselves—*qua* selves—in the roles of Prometheus, Antigone, or Hamlet as tragic victims of divine caprice, tyranny or character defect than as collections of atoms or molecules pushed or pulled this way or that by blind and impersonal cosmic forces” (Carr 2006: 320). This installation of meaning and purpose into the developing agent’s ethical ideal and self-perception triggers and requires both autonomy and a system of integrity. The agent is required to internally construct himself according to the ideals and values he witnesses in his moral protagonist or exemplar. The narrative allows him to experience moral situations in an empathetic and engaged manner that he might not be capable of experiencing otherwise; thus narrative becomes personal memory-association (as derived from emotion and action) and consequently factors into moral and caring development.

Carr argues that cinema “would seem to be the natural and logical present day heir to the great pre-cinematic traditions of literary narrative” (Carr 2006: 327). Cinema includes an aesthetic quality that is not present in literature; film engages sight and sound sensory capacities as well as stimulating cognition. In this sense, cinema is simply a more distant (and more capable) form of narrative and drama than is theater—a long-established aesthetic tradition. Cinema is additionally capable of special effects—of visual and heard narrative on a far grander scale than is theater. Of course, nothing is capable of matching the scope of a reader’s imagination; still, there is something to be said for watching a beloved story “come alive before your eyes.” Having a finite face or color placed on an infinitely variable literary character or situation both constrains the imagination and fulfills a desire for the “something more” missing from narrative literature. There exists a degree of fulfillment in film that is absent in literature; similarly, there exists a degree of freedom in literature that is
absent in film. Despite its shortcomings and the fact that film is all-too often used to mass-produce empty plots, classifying cinema as a valuable conduit for moral and ethical narrative is largely substantiated.

In summary, the Aristotelian conceptions of emulation and *praxeis kai pathe* in reading and cinema are significant contributions to a formulation of moral education. Narrative evokes self-discovery and stimulates the desire to construct an identity according to a personal, memory-associative, narrative-cultivated ethical ideal. Children should be exposed to both great literature and morally significant film, as the process they trigger is more emulative than imitative in nature. Of course, narrative either directly or indirectly encounters the problem of evil in dramatized ethical and moral situations. Emulation and character-formation can never be wholly undergone without external influence. The one-caring must not only encourage and stimulate moral growth through exposing the cared-for to narrative, but must constantly and conscientiously support and foster external and relational moral development.

**THE PROBLEM OF EVIL AND STARTING AT HOME: A RETURN TO NODDINGS**

In *Women and Evil*, Nel Noddings contends that most evil is enacted under a perversion of the good or derived from a supposedly “good” motive. Moral education about evil must consequently address the problem of evil head on; in curriculum, when students encounter instances of evil in literature, the teacher should explore at length and in the depth the dimensions of evil and the symptoms of a twisted good, such as separation, pain, and helplessness. Noddings asserts that “an ethics of caring is based on a relational ontology,” thus, in moral education about evil, the relations between virtues and vices must be studied—that is, virtues must be understood in context of their corresponding vices and vices must be understood in context of their corresponding virtues (Noddings 1989: 236). What Noddings is calling for is not only a cursory acknowledgement of the existence of evil, but a
systematic, in-depth complex of educational and moral inquiry about the nature of evil and how it comes into being. This type of inter-relational cognition as regards the converse of what we are requiring of our children is of utmost importance; if we tell our children to behave in certain virtuous ways, we must additionally help them understand the why and how behind not behaving in non-virtuous ways. A simple “Don’t do that because it’s bad (or evil)” does not require that they experience or enter into some level of participatory comprehension in which they not only understand that it is wrong, but cognate why and how the lines between right and wrong are so easily confused. This requires an openness and courage on the part of the one-caring (the teacher or the parent) to be unafraid of the questions the child has and explore the implications and conditions of the difficult issues bound to arise. This type of moral development is thus enacted in conscientious conjunction with the child rather than referring the child to a lofty deontological rulebook (Noddings 1989: Ch. 9).

This call for openness in education is admittedly idealistic. Open academic, secular, ethical, and theological inquiry runs the risk of indoctrinating students, offending parents, or producing an extreme in an unbalanced and unsupported student. Values run the risk of being constituted as virtues and thus connoted by religion (Noddings 1984: 183). If administrative political correctness places a straightjacket on genuine moral inquiry and education, what then is the option for the moral educator and the moral student? Nel Noddings, in her book *Starting at Home: Caring and Social Policy*, attempts to answer this by identifying the parental moral imperative.

In her final chapter, entitled “The Centrality of Education,” Noddings not only asserts that education must begin and continue at home, but describes the attributes of the “best homes as educative.” Aside from the physical demands of safety, well-being, and health, the best homes contain caring and loving parents who act consistently and non-hypocritically as moral exemplars for their children. The best homes attempt to prevent physical
harm and encourage pleasure without allowing it to lapse over into physical or psychologically damaging areas. The one-caring (parent) understands and is able to fulfill both the “expressed” and “inferred” needs of the children, while simultaneously educating by modeling, dialogue, practice and confirmation. Children may learn to emulate their parents if their parents consistently act in a way that promotes happiness and well-being for all concerned parties. Children must engage in genuine inquiry and participate in dialogue with their parents in which they are allowed to explore implications without being told that they are wrong. They then need to practice—to convert emotion and cognition into action—virtuous activity that is then confirmed by the parent (Noddings 2002: Ch. 14). If we return for a moment to Kristjánsson’s article, we will remember that the above-stated is closely akin to the Aristotelian requirements for the complex virtue of emulation. The perpetuation and encouragement of such open and cognitive emulation in the child is what is lacking in morally deficient children and what is distinctive of virtuous children.

CONCLUSION: HOME SCHOOLING—MORAL AGENCY AND MORAL DEFICIENCY

A home that allows for the segregation of education and domesticity is a home that fosters moral deficiency. Education begins in infancy (and arguably in utero) and a child’s parents are the first caregivers and educators to whom a child is exposed. The role of a parent must therefore be undertaken with all sincerity, gravity, and comprehension of the degree of selflessness being a primary caregiver will require. The child learns about him or herself and the world surrounding him or her first through his or her parents or home. For years, the home is the central core of the child’s identity; as the center of the most memory-associations, the psychological affiliation of the child is largely constituted by the ethos of the home. As the two primary sources of identity-discovery, it is thus imperative that a parent and the home that parents fosters orient the child towards a growing awareness of moral agency and moral identity disparate from a primitive
associative context. Parents must themselves act as role models, as moral agents their children can constructively emulate. Further, they must constantly and conscientiously nurture and perpetuate an open atmosphere of inquiry in which the child may ask any question without retribution and receive an answer that takes account of nuance, implication, and complexity.

Parents must additionally have the self-awareness and moral education to discern when they should provide the (Aristotelian) “right” types of literature or film for their children’s exposure. This requires an open awareness and sensitivity to the needs, innate and external, of the child at any given time, as well as an understanding and encouragement of a child’s interest in any given direction. In other words, an ethics of care and a consequent ethical ideal in the parent is integral. The parent must take into deep consideration what supplemental materials to which he or she will expose the child extracurricularly. True ethical and moral narrative has the capacity to simulate moral experience that a child might not otherwise have. Again, a parent must have an engrossed, inclusive, dialectic relationship with the child in order to understand what types of narrative would be beneficial to the development of that child’s ethical ideal.

Conclusively, as is bound to occur, when a child encounters a moral or ethical dilemma or is even exposed peripherally to one, it is the moral imperative of the parent to critically examine with the children the dynamic interrelation between vice and virtue, right and wrong. The nature of evil should not be nicely boxed as “black” and discarded; rather, the parent must explore in conjunction with the child the relativity of context and perversion of motive that results in good or evil. The child, in essence, must consistently and consciously be guided towards an autonomous moral agency. Further, the relationship between parent and child must be mutually beneficial. Finally, the parent’s ethical ideal must be capable of refinement according to propositions or nuances brought out through discussion with the child.

It is this lack of fostering and evoking moral agency and autonomy in children that attributes moral deficiency to the
corrupt agent’s parents. Of course, socio-economic considerations make this argument inapplicable to a large percent of the population, thus drawing the problem on a larger scale to issues of homelessness, abuse, and abandonment. It does, however, withstand scrutiny in a context in which children have both homes and parents capable of giving their children care. An ethics of caring must not only find its way into a parent’s ethical framework, but that parent must in turn foster and evoke an ethical ideal in the child, so as to result in virtuous moral agency.

It is, without exception, a momentous and crucial moral decision to have a child. The decision to have a child is to assume responsibility for the moral formation, character, and autonomy of the child. It must be undertaken with full knowledge of its implications and due sincerity. Once undertaken, it becomes the moral imperative of the parent to develop an open, integrative, and interconnected relationship with the child through an ethics of caring. Caring for the child will develop memory-associations in which the child then learns how to care and how to apply an ethics of care to others. The parent must then consistently demonstrate and live his or her ethical ideal, so that the child can emulate and form a constant commitment to his or her own developing ethical ideal. This requires virtuous moral autonomy

1. In cases where parenting is absent, ineffective, vestigial, or nonexistent, moral education cannot be derived from parents. This would seem to place a moral imperative on society to institute some form of morality within the public schooling system. The institutionalized morality in school rules, however, can be ineffective due to its dogmatic qualities. Moral education must begin with the parents; for parents who abandon, abuse, or are simply morally indifferent to their children, it becomes the imperative of the government and the aesthetic culture to inculcate a system of morality in the young. My above discussion of moral and ethical value in both literature and cinema becomes integral here. Similarly, popular music has a capacity to instill morality through narrative. As radio and TV are commonly accessible when morally valuable literature is not, it is necessary that our culture foster both morality and ethics in their mass media.
and identity on the part of the parent. If a parent does not have such moral autonomy, it is immoral for a parent to have a child.

For the morally virtuous parent, however, home schooling can provide a moral education otherwise absent or lacking in a public or private school system. Although schools nation-wide have a curriculum that includes morally and ethically valuable narrative, these schools also expose and submit the child to both students and teachers who can lack moral autonomy and perhaps even moral awareness. This exposure, of course, is inevitable, but it is morally dangerous and irresponsible to surrender the child to immoral influence before the child has developed any moral identity. The grade school and high school years of age are crucial to a child’s formation, moral and otherwise. In a private or public school system, the child is minimally exposed to the parent and largely inculcated with anti-adult sentiments, as adults come to represent the dogmatic school system for children and adolescents. The child is commonly in school for eight hours daily, not including additional time spent away from home to cater to extracurricular activities and commitments. Public and private schools constantly result in time away from home and thus away from at-home education. Further, a large portion of the eight hours a child spends in school is dedicated to busy work within the confines of a concrete room rather than in the natural world. Additionally, the problem of evil is largely avoided in public and private schools alike. Teachers are required to refer the student to a deontological precept from either the government or a religion. It is, of course, possible to raise a child under a deontological system, presupposing that the ideology and ontology behind deontological concepts is dialectically and openly explored between teacher and student (parent and child). In public or private schools, however, politically correct constraints commonly restrict this dialectic, open, and didactic conversation about difficult moral issues. Grade schools and high schools constrain a student’s capacity for questing and open inquiry because they need to instill controllable and “correct” education within the student. Essentially, the education required
for moral development and autonomy is lacking to nonexistent in public and private schools.

Those parents who claim they can promote moral education at home and simultaneously send their children to a public or private institution are not realistically considering time constraints. The more a child ages, the more a child is involved in activities away from home. Because genuine moral education is predominantly and crucially derived from at-home education, this presents a problem. In school, the child is encouraged through friends and culture to come to view their parents as supporters rather than educators. A parent is the first and prime educator of the child and must apply him or herself to that reality. For those capable of home schooling, it is the most realistic and viable option for developing moral autonomy within a child.
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Ethereal Illusions
JOANNA BAKER

Charcoal, Pastel, Tulle, Sand, Pointe Shoes
ARTIST STATEMENT

_Ethereal Illusions_ examines the relationship between fabric and the human body in motion. I have fourteen years of experience dancing and find ballet to be one of the most beautiful and inspiring forms of movement. This project evokes the sense viewers get when watching ballet as well as the experience dancers feel while in movement. Illusion plays an important role in ballet as dancers strive to defy gravity, making their movements seem effortless. There is a sense of instability and chaos in some aspects of my project and a feeling of order and pause in others. Ballet is a combination of all of these feelings.

_Ethereal Illusions_ is a three-dimensional installation composed of sixteen 11 x 14” drawings, white tulle material, satin pointe shoes, and sandbags. Each drawing is double backed and suspends from the ceiling in a spiraling manner. The tulle material intertwines throughout the images. In the center of this spiral on the ground rest pairs of pointe shoes surrounded in heavy sand. The images in my project are taken from photographs of female ballet dancers and utilize either charcoal or pastels. Charcoal is suitable to convey movement because it is blendable and easy to manipulate the pigments. Oil pastels create pops of color in select images to adequately represent the visual stimulation experienced when watching a ballet. Each drawing preserves the background in the original photograph to emphasize the changing perspective of the dancers themselves. Fabric enhances the installation by echoing the costumes in the actual drawings and reinforcing the sense of movement frozen in time. And finally, the element of pointe shoes on the ground surrounded in heavy sand works to acknowledge the physical strength it takes to lift the human body off the ground while dancing and the presence of ground.

This installation examines the complexities of movement in ballet dancing. It establishes a border between the ethereal and concrete, the viewer and the dancer, the chaotic and orderly, and weightlessness and gravity. _Ethereal Illusions_ challenges the spectator to draw his or her own line between illusion and reality.
Personal Guidelines for Success

Mikhail Zaborskiy

It was long past midnight, but I still was out of bed. Slowly I was climbing up the staircase, softly pressing my toes against old wooden panels, treacherously squeaking under my weight. Horrifying shadows of leafless trees extended their claws from behind the window; they used all their efforts to grab my legs, drag me down the stairs and into the cold basement, where ghosts were guarding huge barrels of wine older than the house itself. My heartbeat was rushing like a chased rabbit; a scream of horror was threatening to escape from my lips, accompanied by the roar of thunder in stormy skies. Nevertheless, I continued my journey; soon my ice-cold feet were welcomed by plush carpet of the second floor hallway. To my great joy, I spotted a narrow strip of light coming from under the main study’s door. Unable to withstand the terror of the storm any longer, I rocketed towards the door, and without slowing down, exploded into the room. Just as I expected, my grandfather was sitting in his old armchair. The study was filled with thick smoke from his pipe; the pipe itself was barely visible, rocking from side to side along with the armchair. The old man slowly turned his head towards me; as soon as his left brow started to climb towards the forehead, I realized that my punishment was imminent. However, after a few seconds of grave silence, grandfather’s thick white
moustache slid sideways, revealing two rows of blindingly white teeth; the old man smiled. Smiling in return, I ran towards my grandfather and conquered my lawful place upon his knees; the old man’s wrinkled hands embraced his 5-years-old grandson.

“Shouldn’t you be in bed at this late hour, old sport?” Grandfather gently tickled my ribs.

“Nah. I just wanted to see you!” I answered, trying to avoid strong bony fingers.

“Well, since you are here, why don’t I tell a story for you to think about?”

To be honest, grandpa’s stories were the main reason I kept sneaking out of my bed after hours. His narratives about wooden critters and ancient heroes always fascinated me, triggering my imagination and turning my dreams into cartoons. However, today’s story was different. Perhaps this is the reason why I will remember it until my last breath.

“I bet you heard me and your father talking about business. I don’t expect you to understand what it is, because you are way to young, old sport. However, when enough time elapses and you become a man, standing on the Road of Life and choosing your way, I expect you to remember my words; they are the most reliable map, which would always lead anywhere you desire to go.

Life is a huge mountain, covered with snow; strong winds and bottomless pits can’t wait to push you down, blind and disorient you, break and consume you. Your task is to climb that mountain, no matter how strong and cold the wind is, how tired and thirsty you are and how far away the top seems to be. Only the one who gets to the top and frees the roar of victory from his lungs is considered to be successful; all others are left out of sight, without consideration of how close they came to the top. However, there is a trick hidden in it—if you blindly rush to the top, stepping on people’s heads and exhausting your body, you will surely be thrown down by the first strong blow of wind. Only by following my advice you will get to the top; I have been there myself and seen ignorant and arrogant ones collapse into the bottomless pit of misery much faster than a blink of an eye.
At first, even before you start climbing, you have to believe in yourself. You have to trust your body and mind better than any rope; only then will they save you in trouble when every rope fails and all hope seems to be lost. Belief in oneself is the hardest, most reliable thing on Earth, which is the solid ground under your feet wherever you go.

As soon as you believe in yourself, you have to realize that it is only you in this life and no one else. You might think that friends and family will always save you, but it is a mirage. To my great sorrow, everybody leaves you in the hour of your greatest misery; only complete self-reliance would save you from falling into the doom.

Now, when you are alone on the Earth with nothing but belief in yourself, comes the time to set your goals. I know that it is hard, for thousands of desires can tear your mind at the same time; but you have to choose only the ones that are truly important to you. Moreover, even among those chosen there are ones which deserve more attention than the others. This is the time when you have to define your priorities. This quality, once you have attained it, will help you in every matter; it allows you to determine on what to spend your time and efforts and what to leave untouched.

When you have your goals sorted out, you must find the main one and use the rest of the goals as steps, or stages towards the major goal. However, you shouldn’t forget that even though goals require different amounts of effort, all of them should be achieved. Purposefulness will always help you to keep climbing even when you think that everything is lost. Your goals are beacons that lure you; there is nothing more important than achieving them.

Even though you are very certain about your goals and apply all your efforts to get to them, it is not always possible to attain what you want. Frequently life will push you way back, sometimes even shattering everything you have built and force you to start from the ground. In times like this it is very important to use flexibility of mind, which will allow you to get back on the track after any failure, depression or setback. Remember—there are no unsolvable problems. There is always a way out—you just need to
find it; sometimes in order to do so you have to adjust your attitude and methods. Never give up—keep trying to get over obstacles of any nature, considering every way. Usually, it is easier to work around them rather than try to breakthrough; it would save your efforts, but might turn out to be very lengthy.

On your way to the top you will certainly meet other people. Some of them will be friendly and supportive, but others will be cold and even aggressive towards you. If you are offended, fight back, but never be the one to attack first. Never leave people to struggle if you have an opportunity to help. However, always evaluate the situation appropriately! If it is out of your hands to help somebody, don’t attempt to do so; in the end you would lose your time and efforts and the person would still be in trouble. At the same time, never let your pride blind you. Don’t hesitate to accept help when you need it. Remember—it is always better to get out of trouble a little “beaten” rather than not make it through at all.

Concerning humiliation—always respect yourself and others evenly. Don’t take humiliation and never try to humiliate anybody, even though it is very seductive. Respect other people’s ideas and choices for we are all unique; two men never follow the same path.

Treat people with kindness. Don’t ever take pleasure in somebody’s failure.

Don’t try to cheat. Be honest and you will be happy; anything that you attain unfairly will be eventually taken from you in much greater numbers.

Honor your name and the name of your forefathers, for it is your identity among other people.

Lastly, you should always maintain a neutral attitude towards money. Money is just a tool that we use in this life; there is nothing more to it than that. Never idolize money and don’t treasure it. Don’t feel sorrow if you lose it; no matter how much money you have, you will still be the same individual.

Always remember what I told you today, old sport, and the top of the Life Mountain will belong to you as long as you breathe.”

To be honest, I didn’t fully understand all that my grandfather had told me at the time, but his words were firmly recorded in my
memory. Two weeks after that last story my grandfather died. He was buried under the tallest oak in our residence’s grounds. Soon after his death, my father, unable to handle the family business, went broke and we were forced to move into the ghetto. When I graduated from the local public school, I was forced to build my life from scraps. There were many downturns and missteps in my struggles and many times I felt desperate. However, the last words of my grandfather guided me, encouraging me never to give up and to keep fighting. Today I’m writing these lines while sitting in my grandfather’s old study. I bought our family estate back several years ago; now, every time when I look at the tallest oak, I remember my grandfather and his guidelines for success. All he once taught me becomes as strong as the mighty oak and will always remain with me no matter how arduous the situation.
Gryllidae Glossophobia

Is it a cricket?
The master of

midnight serenades
slowly manipulates

his mass, scaling
the stone podium

atop the brick wall.
Colossal cousin

to the creatures
who disturb

my sleep, leap
into my laundry,

and terrorize my
siblings because the

cold drives them into
our home. Impervious

to the aging breeze,
he creeps, intent

on the edge, ignorant
of defeat. Serene,

he prepares to present
to the world his
poetry
of wing vibrations.

He has no hands,
no sweat glands,

but does his stomach churn,
delicate wings shake?

Emma Sovich
Untitled
MAGGIE FARRELL

Newspaper, Fishing line, Charcoal, Paper, Graphite, Acrylic Paint, Wires
ARTIST STATEMENT

I have chosen for my final project to remain untitled. Through my research with photography I have seen that a title is capable of changing the meaning of a work. I considered titling my piece “The Swimmer,” but this would have attracted attention to the drawing; likewise by calling it “Bubbles” I would detract attention from the drawing. I also considered entitling the piece “Water” but I decided that it was too vast and encompassed too many ideas. By leaving my piece untitled I hope that no two viewers will have the same experience with it because I will not be providing them with any hints as to the experience I want them to have.

I have always been intrigued by the figure of the human body in water so I found an image of a woman swimming, entirely submerged with no visible surface. The picture immediately attracted me because she seemed to be emerging not from water, but from darkness, swimming through empty air towards the light. But as I made sketches of possible compositions, I found that I kept returning to the stream of bubbles that had been released from her mouth and were, like the swimmer, moving up towards the light, and changing shape. I decided that instead of focusing on the movement of the swimmer, I would focus on the movement of the pockets of air that she expelled and their movement to the surface.

I saw something reminiscent of life in the way that the bubbles moved. They seemed almost desperate in their attempt to reach the surface, which contrasted the swimmer’s serene and calm look, so I decided to give them life, to bring them off of the page. The bubbles begin in the drawing near the swimmer’s mouth, drawn with the same calm and delicate motions as the swimmer’s body, but as they begin to change they leave the page. The bubbles are held in the air on invisible strings. They begin like the bubbles in the drawing, held close to the swimmer but as they climb higher towards the surface the bubbles come further off of the wall and diverge, creating a V-shape like a tornado emanating from the serene figure below.
INTRODUCTION

Hip Hop was born out of conflict. It’s genesis can often be found in any array of conflicting groups: love versus hate, east coast versus west coast, inner-city versus corporate and political America, rich versus poor. For these conflicts and many others expressed through the language of Hip Hop, attempts at resolutions have varied. The conflicts have spurned artists’ retirement, public political battles, and, in some cases, murder. Hip Hop is the narrative of a culture; it documents its citizens’ ongoing struggle with conflict and their attempts at resolution. The resulting stories define Hip Hop as a literary tradition.

Several notable categories of conflict exist in the literature of Hip Hop. Just as traditional literature may be dramatic or comedic in its nature, so too can Hip Hop be separated into categories. Hip Hop’s artists and writers employ different techniques to rally against a cause or a person or illustrate the story of inner-city life. Though in many instances Hip Hop can be categorized with traditional literary traits, the genre has also created its own classes. “Diss songs” or “battle tracks” express personal conflict, often between two artists or groups. Some artists make attempts at social consciousness through their music; others feed off a
caricature of the inner-city lifestyle that goes against all efforts of social consciousness. A feminist approach delves into a specific realm of social consciousness and attempts to either subvert the mainstream attempts to degrade women or embrace them as a means of domination and self-empowerment. Politics and Hip Hop also come together on too many occasions to list, with perhaps the largest attempt at resolution being the Hip Hop Summit. In these categories and many others, stories unfold—some comedic, some violent, some exaggerated—but all of them stemming from conflict and resolution within the Hip Hop culture.

An early representation illustrating the delineation of conflict within the Hip Hop world, and perhaps an early ancestor of a “diss song,” is Henry Louis Gates Jr.’s “The Signifyin(g) Monkey.” In this short story of African American folklore, the Monkey repeatedly deceives the Lion into thinking the Elephant has challenged the Lion’s power as the undisputed king of the jungle. Throughout the piece, the Monkey, who creates trouble for his personal amusement, plays the Lion for a fool. One account of the piece begins:

*Deep down in the jungle so they say*
*There’s a signifyin monkey down the way*
*There hadn’t been no disturbin’ in the jungle for quite a bit*
*‘For up jumped the monkey in a tree one day and laughed*
*“I guess I’ll start some shit”*

The significance of signifyin(g) in Gate’s piece emphasizes the Lion (the one being tricked) as a simple character who only understands things in a literal sense, thus exacerbating the conflict. The story is told through the Monkey (or the trickster) who is subverting traditional culture and thus reinterpreting and obscuring the real meaning of the conflict in an attempt to usurp power. The story of “The Signifyin(g) Monkey” set forth the building blocks from which Hip Hop conflict is built upon: a quarrel with no real resolution.
DISS SONGS AND BATTLE TRACKS

A diss (short for disrespect) piece forges the suitable space to extend a dispute beyond traditional communication. Although the concept of a pop culture diss song existed years prior to its incorporation into Hip Hop, with one of the most popular being Carly Simon’s “You’re So Vain,” Hip Hop gave the diss song a grave new attitude.²

The earliest referenced Hip Hop battle track, 1986’s “The Bridge is Over” by Boogie Down Productions, reasserts the Bronx as the birthplace of Hip Hop music.³ This proclamation established a direct rivalry with Queens born The Juice Crew, who in their 1985 recording, “The Bridge,” declared that their borough gave way to the inception of Hip Hop.⁴ The diss can be found in the very first verse of “The Bridge is Over” when the group remarks, “Sayin that Hip Hop started out in Queensbridge / Sayin lies like that, mon, you know dem can’t live.” The end of the verse further declares rivalry by claiming, “Bronx keeps creatin it / And Queens keeps on fakin it.” The conflict between the members of Boogie Down Productions and The Juice Crew has since been retired but it set the precedent for Hip Hop groups to create stories through musical competition and verbal expression of animosity between one another.

Another Hip Hop rivalry expressed through the music industry and further articulated through diss songs involves the firms that facilitate the creation, production, and promotion of Hip Hop music: the record labels. In most cases, artists are very loyal to their label because it provides for them, and some artists do not hesitate to mention this in their writings, performances, and everyday actions. Perhaps the most significant event stemming from this fact is the well-known Tupac versus Biggie rivalry and its tragic ending. In the late 1990s, the east coast vs. west coast battle for wealth and fame was a professional conflict that eventually escalated to personal discord between two of the most famous rappers of the time.
The conflict first captured the public’s attention with Death Row Records rapper Tupac Shakur’s “Hit ‘Em Up” single, a bonus track to his 1996 *How Do U Want It* album. The lyrics of the song attempt to humiliate and violently threaten several Bad Boy Records rappers, most notably Christopher Wallace (The Notorious B.I.G). As the song winds down, Tupac declares:

*Fuck Bad Boy as a staff record, record label*
*and as a motherfuckin’ crew*
*And if you wanna be down with Bad Boy*
*Then fuck you too*

The conflicts between artists from Death Row Records and Bad Boy Records—in the booth, on camera, and in private—are believed to have led eventually to both Shakur and Wallace’s untimely and tragic murders. The misfortune of the story has led Hip Hop to label the rivalry as the quintessential Hip Hop story.

The professional literary world of Hip Hop also experiences similar diss writings that influence the culture. Selwyn Seyfu Hinds, one time editor of *The Source*, one of the largest and most influential Hip Hop publications in the United States, described the internal conflict of ethics he experienced during his tenure at the magazine. Magazine co-owner David Mays’ rewriting and mic-rating change of an album review for the 1999 Made Men LP *Classic Limited Edition* motivated Hinds to resign from his position (Hinds 137). Neither the internal conflict created by the events leading to Hinds’ resignation nor the eventual external conflict with reference to *The Source*’s lost “street credentials” were ever resolved (Hinds 136). Thus, the conflict remains a prominent and prevailing story of dishonesty within the Hip Hop editorial community.

**ATTEMPTS AT SOCIAL CONSCIOUSNESS**

Since its inception, Hip Hop has possessed a social voice. Many artists want their listeners to hear messages of what citizens of Hip Hop culture face in daily life in hopes that those listeners will take away a new sense of social awareness. One reoccurring theme is the tragic tale of the manifestations of violence and greed
among those who live in and are raised by Hip Hop. Many songs describe an inner-city life where one in three men go to prison, women are objectified and life is altogether hard. Artists generally have different perspectives on the topic; typically, the more socially conscious the artist, the more their words strive to paint a picture of an unfortunate situation in need of repair. The following two excerpts depict what the artists see as an accurate portrayal of their lives, but each song has an underlying message that represents the lifestyle as undesirable yet unavoidable. The tone is not hopeless, but rather somewhat angry that the cycle is so hard to break:

  From standin on the corners boppin
  To drivin some of the hottest cars New York has ever seen
  For droppin some of the hottest verses rap has ever heard
  From the dope spot, with the smoke glock
  Fleein the murder scene, you know me well
  From nightmares of a lonely cell, my only hell?

In this “Ghetto Anthem,” Jay-Z describes a dangerous lifestyle fueled by crime that he realizes will eventually land him in “a lonely cell, [his] only hell.” When he tells of his inspiration later in the song, Jay-Z states among his reasons, “I flow for chicks wishin they ain’t have to strip to pay tuition.” Though initially the verse sounds as though it is talking about how positive the lifestyle is, it quickly changes, and the rest of the song describes what Jay-Z calls a “Hard Knock Life.”

Talib Kweli’s “Get By” attempts to tell the story of Hip Hop life with a message of hope lyrically intertwined. He opens by describing how “we”—the common Hip Hop citizens—sell crack to “our own,” invoking visions the drug battle inner-cities face. As Kweli continues, he describes how hard people in this lifestyle must work “just to get by,” but also finds strength in those who have overcome hardships before him. In the second verse, Kweli discusses the mainstream Hip Hop lifestyle, prison, and the possibility that the majority of today’s rap might not be helping Hip Hop transform from that lifestyle:

  We keeping it gangster say “fo shizzle,” “fo sheezy” and “stayin crunk”
It’s easy to pull a breezy, smoke trees, and we stay drunk
Yo, our activism attackin the system, the blacks and Latins
in prison
Numbers of prison they victim black in the vision
Shit and all they got is rappin to listen to

As the verse closes, he reiterates a message of positivity, stating that “all you really need is love” and even citing the utopian dream of John Lennon’s “Imagine.”

Other socially conscious Hip Hop attempts to prevent people from following the mainstream Hip Hop lifestyle. The lines “There lives a little boy who was misled / by another little boy…” in Slick Rick’s 1988 track “Children’s Story” reference the influence young people within the Hip Hop community have among their peers. The song is an obvious call to the younger generation to put a higher significance in values other than ruthless ambition and personal wealth. Although Slick Rick’s warning story of Hip Hop peer pressure, written in hopes of avoiding conflict and negative lifestyles, was covered by Everlast on his 2000 album Eat at Whitey’s, the overall message has essentially fallen on deaf ears. Consequently, no similar songs have been produced and no resolution regarding the peer pressure of Hip Hop culture has been found.

As more of popular culture shifts away from social consciousness, artists have instead created a genre of Hip Hop commonly referred to as mainstream Hip Hop. Mainstream Hip Hop is more concerned with expensive cars, homes, and jewelry to ultimately cajole the intimate admiration of the opposite sex than with any social issues; it is a caricature of the lifestyle so many more socially conscious artists describe and warn against, and it mentions consequences rarely—if at all. Songs such as Soulja Boy Tell ‘Em’s “Crank That (Soulja Boy)” and 50 Cent’s “Ayo Technology” featuring Justin Timberlake illustrate a false impression of Hip Hop life with little conflict or resolution. Instead, it idealizes the degradation of sex, women, and makes a mockery of the very talent that made the artist famous. These caricatures provide an unfortunate inspiration for other Hip
Hop artists to emulate. The deception taking place within the today’s mainstream Hip Hop is uncannily similar to the situation Slick Rick’s “Children’s Story” tried to warn the community; however, the great distinction between the two is that most of the mainstream artists are adults, not a child’s peers, and they possess an even greater power to influence younger generations of Hip Hop listeners.

Although most of the other conflicts living within the Hip Hop community have yet to be fully resolved, mainstream Hip Hop does not allow space for a conversation about social conflicts or resolutions to occur and thus it could be argued that these artist’s stories do not exist on a literary basis. While it may be a long time before the average popular Hip Hop artist is socially relevant beyond the arts, fashion, and gossip blogs, the majority of the socially aware culture hopes that one day mainstream artists will appreciate positive elements of society and give them the respect they deserve.

FEMINIST CONFLICT

Though the Hip Hop culture seems to be male-dominated, more women are starting to challenge their assigned role within the mainstream culture. Many female members of the Hip Hop community have been raised to feel as though emotional, verbal, psychological, or physical abuse is both predictable and acceptable when involved in a relationship. The male inclination to devalue these women is born out of the degradation that has shaped their value system through music, videos and movies. When the women are mistreated or abused, they often do not cry out, fearing the “…unwritten rule about ‘not snitching’ on the domestic violence in the personal lives of rap stars” and their fans. However, conscious Hip Hop has taken a general stance against such vulgar and disparaging behaviors, and many female artists have started to offer a feminist response to mainstream Hip Hop and the side of the culture that fuels it.

Lauryn Hill’s provocative album *The Miseducation of Lauryn Hill* addresses these issues by explaining to women that the
dehumanization they have witnessed or experienced is neither acceptable or conventional. The first single of the album, “Doo Wop (That Thing),” tells the story of the current cultivation of misogyny within Hip Hop among both sexes. The song’s message criticizes women who “sell their souls because it’s in” and men who are “more concerned with [their] rims and [their] Timbs than [their] women.” “Doo Wop (That Thing)” makes an effort to resolve the struggle between the sexes and convey the idea of dignity and self-worth to a generation of Hip Hop followers who, as Talib Kweli’s socially conscious “Get By” previously alluded, have been shown essentially nothing but the contrary.

Long before Lauryn Hill’s album, other female artists took a stance in regard to sexual responsibility. In order to encourage women to protect themselves against the growing epidemic of sexually transmitted diseases and HIV/AIDS, female Hip Hop groups of the 1990s tried to create an environment of education through their avant-garde fashions and cutting edge lyrics. In 1990, Salt-n-Pepa broke ground with their controversial song “Let’s Talk About Sex.” The track warned of the downfall a beautiful and otherwise untouchable woman whose allure allowed her any man she wanted. After sleeping with an array of men, the woman finds herself with an empty heart and nothing more at the end of the night then “…a note / That last night was dope.” The title of the song was also the repeated chorus, which became a slogan that inspired a dramatic increase in sex education not only in the Hip Hop realm. Later that decade, TLC’s Lisa “Left Eye” Lopes sported a condom over her left eye to promote safe sex and AIDS awareness. She modeled the look for years and encouraged her group mates, Tionne “T-Boz” Watkins and Rozonda “Chilli” Thomas, to adorn themselves in a similar fashion. The trend they created gave contraception a conversational arena in an attempt to complete the circle of conflict and resolution for a social demographic that would otherwise have sub-standard access to sex education.

Hip Hop often delves further into the friction of sex and lands in the home of the family—an integral part of the female
conflict. One of the first to do so, Common’s groundbreaking and emotionally moving ballad “Retrospect for Life” featuring Lauryn Hill explores from a feminist and familial perspective a specific trial that black women frequently experience.\textsuperscript{18,19} Although a controversial subject that is seldom deliberated in public, Common challenges the accepted social norm of abortion. He graphically, yet artfully, equates the “womb” of a terminated pregnancy to a “tomb” and the song’s protagonist admits to his girlfriend that throughout the situation, “I probably never felt what you felt.” He apologizes to his never-born child for “takin [the child’s] first breath, first step, and first cry” and by the end of the first verse (as if you could not already feel his guilt) repeats, “$315 ain’t worth your soul.” The conflict of this situation is externalized by the daring and atypical male narrator of “Retrospect.” He asks that Hip Hop’s soon-to-be fathers rethink their expectations and actions by demonstrating a tender and supportive side of fatherhood that is rarely seen in Hip Hop culture. “Retrospect” exhibits respect for women and children in its lyrics—an alien concept in comparison to the vast multitude of other Hip Hop narratives which instead objectify women and represent men as being concerned only with themselves.

In the same way Lauryn Hill and Jill Scott have empowered their gender, other female Hip Hop artists have tried their hand at entitlement from a much different position. These women challenge the mainstream concept of a female Hip Hop artist by emulating conventional male Hip Hop attitude, appearance, and behavior and sexually objectifying themselves in order to dominate men. Artists such as Lil’ Kim and Foxy Brown portray themselves as independent women while simultaneously refusing to allow men to make them part with their sexual suggestiveness. In her hit “This Is Who I Am,” Lil’ Kim openly discusses how her sexual attractiveness allows her to not only remain a respected artist among her colleagues but also makes her image profitable with her fans.\textsuperscript{20}

\textit{About five feet even, kinda small in the waist}

\textit{Rap’s sex symbol, real pretty in the face}
So what I got even bigger titties than the lakes
Still a sophisticated lady with millions in the safe

Much like Mae West and other bawdy sex-symbols of the 1920s who used their erotic bodies and carnal minds to break into the male-dominated entertainment industry, these artists’ suggestive words, actions, and attire have garnered attention and legitimized their careers in a “men-only” world. They take the more extreme objectification of present-day and make it their own to reap the benefits. Within the Hip Hop community, women (and men) are still struggling in various ways to find the female space in a male dominated club. The previous female degradation in Hip Hop videos is becoming less acceptable as various acts become more popular and more profitable. Female artists such as Lil’ Kim play up the objectification, while artists such as Lauryn Hill encourage women to break free of such stereotypes. Meanwhile, artists such as Mary J. Blige, Beyonce, and Rihanna are finding commercial success and opening doors for other female artists to fight for their right to play in what was formerly the boys’ club.

HIP HOP SUMMIT ACTION NETWORK

Despite the countless conflicts dwelling within the Hip Hop realm, Hip Hop artists, producers, industry heads, and political proponents have endeavored to find a solution for the strife created by these communal and social disputes. One of the largest attempts at resolution is The Hip Hop Summit Action Network. While the HSAN does not express itself lyrically, nor does it produce music videos, it has afforded controversial topics and their possible resolutions a space to be examined, explored, and implemented by the industry’s pivotal decision makers. Their stated mission is to “harness the cultural relevance of Hip Hop music to serve as a catalyst for education advocacy and other societal concerns fundamental to the empowerment of youth.”

The HSAN creates educational programs to encourage youth and college students to discuss controversial cultural subjects in an open and safe forum, as well as provides the easy opportunity for inner-city residents to register to vote. However, HSAN realizes
that many conflicts in need of resolution are not new and have been festering for many years, leaving the senior leaders of the community in need of guidance and education. Therefore, the HSAN has collaborated with the top financial experts to offer a nationwide campaign for adult personal pecuniary security. The distributed workbook titled *Financial Empowerment: Get Your Money Right* allows its readers to receive a financial education at their own pace. Though different from the lyrical discussions of Hip Hop artists described throughout this paper, the HSAN’s publication is an attempt at education aimed at the Hip Hop culture. The idea and ultimate effect of lifelong learning will bring about a societal and personal consciousness for all of its students.

**CONCLUSION**

Just as stories need an end, conflicts need a resolution. Although not all resolutions within Hip Hop thus far are ideal, education seems to be a means of ensuring that the culture does not self-destruct. Hip Hop has provided a conversational arena for artists to discuss their problems with each other, with record labels, with politicians and with the social constraints of what we consider the Hip Hop culture. Through the years, Hip Hop has evolved and divided into numerous subsections, though in most songs, the basic expression found in all great literature is still present. Hip Hop’s lyrical content could easily be compared to Wordsworth’s poetry, to Shakespeare’s dramatic take on early modern England, to African American or Women’s literature. It documents the lives and the struggle of a culture, and—as we realize it’s power—strives to educate its listeners about the need for resolution within the community. The only way to reach an eventual rectification for these conflicts is to make sure Hip Hop is remembered as a literature.
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The Baboon Man

Jenn German

The night shift has ended, and I am driving home. It is a country road; there are no cars in front of me and none behind. My rearview mirror is completely black. In the dream-state that comes with being alone in the dark, I am slightly nervous, and that is how I very nearly run down Mr. Neville.

He is walking along the side of the road. He wears a white bathrobe, his hair is white, and in what scant light the sliver of a crescent moon provides his skin appears white as well. This is smart—it makes him stand out nicely to what little traffic he might encounter—but in that flashpoint moment my eyes first settle on his frame I think him a ghost. My body freezes, and my dependable Ford, reacting dutifully to the wheel, careens toward him.

Paranormal phenomenon or no, my subconscious has the sense to snap me out of my paralysis and instruct my foot to hit the brakes. The front bumper shudders to a halt a scarce six inches from a startled old man.

Yes, it is only Mr. Neville, my next-door neighbor. I kill the ignition and get out of the car. I am still shaking a bit, and I am a young woman in the prime of life. God knows how he must be faring. “Mr. Neville—I’m so sorry. Are you all right?”
He turns to me, hawk-nosed and watery-eyed. I am somewhat surprised to note he has gotten over the initial shock before I have. His expression, moments before a mask of terror in my headlights, is now quite calm. Either way, he ignores my question, instead saying, slowly, “I know you.”

I cock my head to one side. “Of course, Mr. Neville. I live next door. Colette. You remember?”

“Oh…” His voice trails away. He has already lost interest in the conversation, his mind fixed somewhere out beyond the guardrail, his eyes searching.

Indeed, I know Mr. Neville. He is something of a legend in the neighborhood, especially among children. He is, in the fashion of octogenarian widows, something of a recluse, venturing only out of his house for doctor’s appointments and the mail. I myself have on occasion driven him to said appointments, and I find him to be a pitiable old man of no particular remark.

It is his trash, actually, that elicits fascination among the neighborhood kids. The shiny black plastic bags are at the base of his mailbox every morning. They vary in number and fullness, but there are two constants: their presence (no holiday acknowledged, holy or otherwise), and their stench. That’s the real kicker; I walk my dog in the early morning, and passing the pile—not to mention keeping Seltzer’s nose out of it—is an ordeal.

Suspicious? Perhaps. Nevertheless, one can rule out any kind of illegal activity. Make what jokes regarding law enforcement you will, but if Mr. Neville were throwing away evidence, it would definitely have been found. The ritual is weird, but it must be harmless.

This logical line of thinking has not, however, prevented kids from inventing all sorts of colorful explanations for the bags, ranging from your standard murders to alien residue. My younger brother Mark maintains that the trash is actually the remains of the graves Mr. Neville robs at midnight. Mark and I don’t get along well.

Hand in hand with these thoughts comes the observation that even now the old man is holding a plastic garbage bag. Further,
his hands are sheathed in white latex gloves. He twists the bag around his fingers and then unravels it, a nervous habit. There is something in the bag, resisting the centripetal forces, and it picks up some decent speed. “This will do,” he mutters to himself, evidently forgetting I’m there.

What will do? He is a pitiable old man—but the surreal quality of the night makes anything seem possible. Even aliens. I lean away from him slightly, scolding myself mentally even as I do it. He’s harmless, Colette! Weird, but harmless. Pixilated. Get him home. “What will do, Mr. Neville?”

He looks over at me with some bemusement. “This place,” he replies, and digs one bare toe into the loam. “The earth is just right.”

“Is it...”

“Oh, yes.” The automatic flipping of the bag stops. “Soft, good for digging. It rained earlier. That’s helpful.”

“I see.” I bite my lip. “What are you doing out here, Mr. Neville? It’s so late.”

His brows draw together in confusion. “Late?” He shades his eyes and looks up at the moon as though it were midday. “Late. Yes, I suppose it is. But I have to get there soon as possible. I go as soon as I hear the tires squeal.”

He is talking nonsense. Most likely it means nothing. “Here—let me take you home.”

I reach one hand to take the bag from him, and he jumps back, his nose scrunching in displeasure. “No! No. I can’t go back till I’m finished. I have to finish.”

“Can it wait till tomorrow?” I suggest, gently, but the shake of the head he offers in return is violent.

“Oh, no. Absolutely not! How would you like it?”

I let out a small sigh. I’m tired and I want to go home and I wish I’d never stopped. “How would I like what?”

But he is off, tramping away from me, stomping the ground, stopping, turning in a circle, frowning in thought. After a few such pauses, he breaks into a smile and drops his bag. “Here!” he announces, gleeful.
I traipse after him. By now I’m committed. “Mr. Neville, what are you doing?”

He turns his wet blue eyes on me and opens his mouth, but it is several moments before he speaks. He must consider. “I,” he starts, then stops, then starts again. “I like baboons.”

I raise an eyebrow despite myself. “Baboons?”

He may be old, but he is not without some feelings. He senses my inadvertent mockery and his pride is bruised. “Baboons,” he echoes stiffly.

He drops to his knees and burrows his fingers into the dirt.

Duly abashed, I lower myself beside him; for lack of any better idea, I begin to help him dig. The dirt yields without protest to my fingernails. “I’m sorry,” I say quietly. “Please—tell me about baboons.”

There is silence for a time. He won’t look at me. Then:

“I like baboons. I like the way they walk, and the way their faces are noble. They have faces of many colors. It could be war paint, but it isn’t. They play, with each other and with other apes. I like this.

“I also like squirrels. Have you ever looked at a squirrel’s tail? Truly looked at it. It’s not bushy. It’s thin, like a rat’s tail. The tail is thin, but it looks thick because all the hairs are long and stick out straight like a chimney sweep’s brush. Or a pipe cleaner. Either.”

We have dug a fair hole into the rain-softened dirt, but we are not yet deep enough. “I have never seen a shark, not really,” he says. There is a smear of mud on his cheek. “Not really. Not seeing myself, not that I could touch. But I have watched them on TV, and they all have expressions. Mako sharks are sizing you up. Blue sharks are surprised; their eyes are wide and round. And whale sharks—they are the great philosophers of the ocean. They say: don’t worry, everything will be all right…

“Birds,” he continues, as we sit back on our heels and admire our handiwork, “have a poor attention span. That’s why you always have to put up those silhouettes on glass doors so they won’t crash. We’re ready,” he adds with satisfaction, and rises to his feet.
I stay where I am, squatting over the damp earth, following his shadowy figure as he retrieves the garbage bag. I am paralyzed again, but it is the dream-state, not fear. He opens the mouth of the bag and reaches inside. I look away.

And look back. In his hands he holds a dead raccoon. Adorned by flies, tailless, half-squashed, it is very obviously road kill. Mr. Neville carries it with a feather touch, delicate. He glides over and kneels in one motion, lightly placing the body in our hole.

He stands. He spreads his arms in a gesture that encompasses all the world.

He says:

“Raccoon, I’m sure you were a good raccoon. I’m sure you did the best you could. I’m sorry you had to die. I’ll bet whoever hit you with their car is sorry too.

“I like raccoons. I like the way they are clever, and the way they have paws like hands. I never mind when they clatter garbage cans. Maybe you clattered them too.

“Maybe you had a wife, and babies. They will miss you. Maybe you didn’t, and they don’t. But I will miss you, raccoon. I am sure you went to heaven. Good-bye.”

He lowers his arms and bends to the ground, cupping his hands to scoop the dirt over the still form. Automatically I move to assist him.

We bury the raccoon.

Afterwards, when we have collected the extra bits and gloves and put them in the bag, gotten into my old Ford, driven the two minutes home, stood beside the mailbox and the pile of trash (three bags this night), I ask him: “How long have you been doing this?”

He purses his lips with the effort of remembering, and comes up empty.

“I don’t know.” This is too much for him, too much sharing. I have intruded long enough. He leaves me, padding on bare feet, unflinching over the pebbled concrete, to his door.

I know it’s futile, but I have to ask. “Why?”

Twenty feet away, hand on the doorknob, he is thinking
hard. He is trying to formulate an explanation that I, accidental participant at best, might understand. What can he possibly say? He ends the struggle. The answer is this. “I like baboons,” he says. “Yes,” I say. He goes inside. I return to my own home. I go to bed. I dream of monkeys. ☾
Old Lace
KRISTINA KELLEY

Black and White Gelatin Print
ARTIST STATEMENT

Decay is a natural force that affects most everything in the world, whether it be something living or inanimate. Decay is the gradual decrease of an object in size, force, or activity. This is a change over time from the object’s original form into something almost abstract. This change could be the oxidizing of metal with the product of brightly colored rust, the weathering of paint, or the rotting or wood and fabric. Old Lace specifically documents the rotting of a curtain. It is visible that the fibers of the lace have separated in such a way that the curtain has the appearance of skin or something alien.
Dear Byron,

Wesley Schantz

Some weeks ago we were discussing what “cool” might be. We did not get very far. I wonder why our class is so reticent, and whether in other years there have been livelier classes. Are there ever students who are disposed to answer without being called upon, who don’t have to giggle or blush in consternation as they fumble for something to say, who don’t stonewall until they hear the answer “rhymes with…”? Tell me if you can: you’re there every year, after all, between Leigh Hunt and P.B. Shelley, but maybe you’ve all lost interest and just go boating with Childe Harold and Don Juan, or mooch laudanum off of Coleridge and De Quincey.

At any rate, questions like this, difficult questions about coolness and love and knowledge, if not answered, are not forgotten. When I am looking out the window before class, waiting for the room to fill up, or when paper-writing time comes round again, there they are. But still I do not propose to answer the “cool” question, not in any exhaustive way. I await your response as to that. All I mean to do is to make up in some measure for having had so little to say all semester. Writing is great for making excuses.

“All this will be pleasant—suave mari magno, etc”.

Yes, it might be fun for you among the Happy Isles to watch me founder out here, sputtering on the spume of my own overeager prose, being
bowled over by the currents of thought that keep getting away from me. But believe it or not, it is cool to do papers like this, at the last minute, sloppily, with the least possible expenditure of effort. If I get a good grade despite having written the thing the night before, I feel cool and people will envy me; and if I fail, I can tell myself I didn’t even try anyhow, and in a way I’ll be even cooler. Of course, whatever the result, to certain other sorts of people I might not seem cool at all. On the one hand there will be those students and professors with their dear ideals who wish that I respected learning for its own sake, who tut-tut the way I neglect my studies, who, in short, can’t appreciate coolness. On the other hand are the people who won’t think I’m cool if I do my work at all. I thought I’d left them behind at high school, but some of them must have cheated on their SATs or something because they managed to get into the same college I did.

Clearly, somewhere along the line, coolness has been fractured into lots of little pieces. There is no longer just one cool, but many simultaneous cools that do not all agree—and all this within the scope of one society, indeed, within one very rarified segment of it, to say nothing of what is cool to other people in other lands. But yours, famously, was a cool that transcended borders. Your rebelliousness in England and your intrepidity abroad were of one piece, and it is that comprehensiveness that makes me wonder if I haven’t here mistaken for coolness something else, something false. The element of rebellion may be accounted for in the example of writing I gave, but coolness in its other basic sense of being relaxed, calm under pressure, is nowhere in the image of the caffeinated young person staring blearily at the computer screen. It is not likely that any of us could have written, as you do, with no jitters but a kind of miffed annoyance,

Two days ago I was nearly lost in a Turkish ship of war, owing to the ignorance of the captain and crew, though the storm was not violent. Fletch-er yelled after his wife, the Greeks called on the saints, the Mussulmans on Alla; the captain burst into tears and rushed below deck…I did what I
could to console Fletcher, but finding him incorrigible, wrapped myself in an Albanian capote (an immense cloak), and lay down on deck to await the worst.3

But we will be glad for the generous quotation and, in our gratitude, forbear [sic]-ing it.

What so many so-called cool people today are missing, it seems, is the way that rebelliousness must be wedded to something positive, and not exist solely as a repudiation of the status quo. It ought, moreover, to be done without the complaining note that has become so unfortunately fashionable, without the sarcasm that is accorded the proper place of irony. It ought to be done with some style, you know? You know as well as anyone. I’ll go ahead and quote my favorite words of yours, though it means skipping ahead a little:

I can never get people to understand that poetry is the expression of excited passion, and that there is no such thing as a life of passion any more than a continuous earthquake, or an eternal fever. Besides, who would ever shave himself in such a state?4

It loses something, of course, taken out of context. But then, everything really good does.

Where to go from here? I could provide what came before, and what after, these lines: the portraits of a “very pretty lad… only somewhat too full of poesy and ‘entusy-musy’” and a “girl in England” whose letter “has not a word of ‘cant’ or preaching in it upon any opinions” and is, thus, “better than a diploma from Gottingen”.5 You permit yourself a few “opinions” there, if no “‘cant’” (which you set apart with inverted commas, as if to handle the word itself with disdain), and this is all very significant in your conception of cool. Or I could link these telling images of earthquake and fever back to their appearance in a series of much earlier letters, two to Caroline Lamb and one to Anne Milbanke. “I by no means rank poetry or poets high in the scale of intellect,” you tell your future wife. “This may look like affectation, but it is
my real opinion. It is the lava of the imagination whose eruption prevents an earthquake.”6 Some months earlier you had called Lamb “a little volcano!” and mixed metaphors some more before deciding, “To drop my detestable tropes and figures…”7 It would be a shame to write a whole pape—that is, a whole letter to the infamous Byron without mentioning his loves, to whom he so unequivocally subordinates his writing. Or I could go in a totally different direction, noting the contemporary tendency to spin all things to our liking, to take out of context gleefully and irresponsibly every agreeable idea that comes our way, never mind what it was intended to mean. Some words on the vogue for Eastern mysticism or Kabbalistic wisdom among certain echelons of the cool, people with no real idea of the heritage of their designer faiths, would be apposite.

This is where the page irks, and one wishes for the freedom of conversation. Yet there are compensations in writing, things one could not get away with in person, such as riffling through the books on one’s desk to find out if one has spelt “riffling” correctly, or in order to bring in one more voice, much wiser than one’s own, to the paper-bound conversation across centuries. Is it possible to have a favorite scholar? That strikes me as sounding extremely uncool. But Jacques Barzun is that for me. And I agree with him, to come at last to the point, that “Byronic” is a term too often taken out of context.

“Byron’s thought, work, and character as a whole cannot be adequately summed up in the figure of the headlong lover in an open collar, whose fits of melancholy are a pose,” he observes,8 and he goes about developing the roots of the error and the nature of the truth, oh, much more impressively than I will recapitulate them here. Not that it would be necessary to explain you to yourself, Byron. But, to be brief, Barzun comes at the case from his characteristically broad historical perspective. He sees the initial popularity of the Byronic, with all its sensationalism, as the predictable result of a “superheated” Europe seizing upon Childe Harold, which “came like a breeze from the open sea.”9 He traces the subsequent manifestations and refinements of the Byronic
until the point around the turn of the century when “the hero” is “[rendered] ridiculous,” and beyond. And he concludes that “Byron himself is to be found in the usual firsthand sources of biography, and especially in his letters...they bring us within his magnetic field of force, which was not, as the Byronic stereotype might suggest, mere agitation and recklessness.”

Barzun is a fan, but he is not the callow kind “full of poesy.” He notes, “Byron reintroduced wit to poetry at a time when the art seemed to have succumbed to the desire for profundity,” and from his point of view it is a compliment. He respects you, not for your Harold persona or your later Juan (“the same man showing his armored side”); not for your poetry or your politics, or at least, not for any of those things taken by themselves. He respects you as one man to another, “in the honorific sense, ‘a man.’” And he likes your letters so much for that very reason, that there is so much of you in them, unmitigated, “spontaneous.” “Byron...would be most himself in tete-a-tete with his notepaper.”

“What a long letter I have scribbled!” I only hope I have not infected you, sir, with that tiresome self-consciousness that so characterizes writing these days. When I receive your letter, I trust it will be the same spontaneous Byron as in the others, and this will be answer enough to that question I had for you. What is cool? Byron, of course, not the Byronic; an individual being himself, not the pose demanded by the times and the times’ as posturing reaction. Lest that other modern narc, self-esteem, water down what I’ve just said about “being yourself,” witness Barzun: “this is so rare that the world can neither quite believe not ever forget it.”

And if I don’t hear back from you, I’ll understand. It is uncool to discuss coolness at all. Long before the King, you knew all about “a little less conversation, a little more action.”
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Rodrigo

Blithely spending dad’s money
for flip-stomach
zorbing, bungies, booze
(true tourist pursuits),
don’t you know that kiwis
just don’t fly? That
your scattered eyes
chasing hands
shoulder grasps, slaps
give you away? You hung
over in Franz Josef missed
a hike copped
a copter for priceless
views of ice-strewn light.

Held up the bus. We scanned
pavement sheer fiord
walls when we heard bellows –
saw you scrambling
up clasping triumphant your
first snow in fists
high above the tunnel flying.
Don’t bring it on the plane home.
See, you panned gold,
and, still reeling, leapt

...face first to stare
down a river.

You already have the sky.
Remember? You fell through it.

Emma Sovich
When André Antoine was born in 1858, the modern age of drama had already begun. And when he was still in diapers, Darwin, Comte, Marx and Engels were compiling the ideas that would change society, allowing Antoine to explore the developing world of theater, and soon “battle against the conventional, against the conventional play, conventional acting, conventional stage-setting, and conventional dramatic criticism.”

Born in Limoges, France, Antoine was the oldest of four children in a family that earned its living by running a small store. Though he had been born and raised in a poor bourgeois family, “The young André, who was a dreamer and a thinker, began soon to be more interested in books and in plays than in the career that his parents were preparing for him.” In his book *Antoine and the Théâtre Libré*, Samuel Montefiore Waxman, who spent many hours with Antoine digging through journals and memories recounting his rise to fame, claims that Antoine first experienced the theater as an audience member of melodramas and fairy spectacles. His mother introduced him to the classics and newer plays, as well as the famous French actors and actresses of the time. It was this exposure that would inspire his interest in the virtues and the shortcomings of modern French theater.
At age twelve, the siege of Paris devastated the Antoines and, instead of pursuing his interests in learning and drama, André was sent to work. Around this time an uncle from Paris visited the family and, impressed with Antoine’s intelligence, to take the boy with him to Paris and help him make his way. Once in Paris, Antoine was surrounded by art. He began working for a gas company and saving sums of his monthly salary for theater tickets. Antoine’s move to Paris also marked the start of his self-education. His residence, his job at the gas company, and then later as a clerk in the quarter of booksellers, all put Antoine in closer proximity to the resources he needed to expand his knowledge of society and the arts (The Louvre, the Seine, the old Pont-Neuf, École des Beaux Arts, and Sainte-Geneviève, a library. At institutions such as these, he also developed his knowledge and predilection to literature of the 1860s and 70s. Antoine read and studied through his nights, and although he had a range of subjects at his disposal for his self-education, “…the study of contemporary art and letters came first, and made a deeper impression on his mind than the culture of the past. This accounts for his acceptance later of what was new, untraditional, and foreign.”

In 1875, Antoine took his first step into French theater by becoming a member of the claquée for the Comédie Française—“the world’s oldest national theatre with the mission of keeping the best in French drama alive”—enabling him to attend the theater’s shows and earn enough money to purchase tickets for more shows at more various theaters around Paris. It didn’t take long as a member of the claquée (even when he was elected the leader of the “official applauders”) for Antoine to become interested in acting and crave a more exiting role in the theater. He became a supernumerary for the Comédie Française, lapping up every drop of knowledge the experience offered. “For a number of years,” Antoine relayed to Waxman, “I took part in the whole repertory, eyes wide-open, ears cocked for everything that happened in the great house, and I stuck as close to the actors as their shadows.” He was soon able to continue his education by enrolling in a class at the Gymnase de la Parole (a school of recitation and diction)
where he was to meet Wisteaux, the future Mévisto of the Théâtre Libré. Once at the Gymnase, Antoine’s talent had an outlet for growth, and he quickly become “one of the pillars” in the institution. In response to his new popularity, Antoine suggested to director Marius Laisné that, instead of detached scenes, the students might produce whole plays for their public performances. Laisné took the advice and allowed Antoine to begin “His career as a theatrical manager by presenting classical plays, and [winning] his first laurels as an actor playing the part of David Sichel in Erckmann-Chatrian’s Ami Fritz.”

In light of his successes, Antoine decided to audition for the Conservatoire (Paris’ leading performance school) in 1876 to further his theatrical education. Though his experiences in the few previous years had given him confidence, he was nervous to present himself to the Conservatoire. Waxman recounts Antoine’s frustrations:

He recited a well-known rôle of Got from La Foie fait peur. After his examination he tried to have a word with Got, who happened to be one of the inquisitioners, but could not muster up enough courage to approach until his idol had gone several blocks. When he was told that there was no hope for him, he then and there gave up his dream of becoming an actor.”

His spirits crushed, Antoine responded to his rejection from the Conservatoire by enlisting himself in the military and serving as an officer for the following five years.

When he returned to Paris with the new “brusque, authoritative ways” of an officer that would later contribute to his demeanor as a theater artist, he also returned, unenthused, to his past role as a clerk for the gas company. In three years, his interest in the theater would once again spark, but the eight-year sabbatical speaks to some of the attitudes Antoine took when he rose to fame. Because he had grown up in various states of poverty and had to work tirelessly and often unaided to receive an education, Antoine harbored a desire to aid and nurture new theatrical artists. “He
belongs to an association,” comments Waxman, “which assists young dramatists, and is its guiding spirit.”

Though he would go on to explore many theatrical styles and techniques and introduce France to some of Europe’s already influential playwrights, Antoine always made sure that his bills included works by new artists—a choice that both helped and hurt him. This attitude often lent to his stubbornness and his generosity, and it pervaded Antoine’s personality as a director and producer; “He never minced words in condemning those who he felt deserved censure, no matter how secure their reputation, nor did he hesitate to praise highly those with whom the majority of critics have been most harsh.”

Antoine also held opinions about his struggles as a new artist that still resonate in the 21st century. Through his adulthood, Antoine was also socially awkward. “There is something Rabelaisian about Antoine, with his ungainly figure, his unconventional presence, his unceasing labors, his scorn for worldly goods, and his fondness for good food and good wine, once his work is done.” When Waxman first met with Antoine around 1926, the dramatists was dressed in pajamas “in spite of the advanced hour of the day,” and when he did see Antoine dressed formally for a banquet, “it was something of a shock.”

Formal clothing, Waxman said, accentuates Antoine’s awkwardness; “in them he looks like any commonplace human being, and the illusion of the unconventional Antoine is destroyed.” A “portly figure of medium height” lacking in elegance and polish, Antoine’s eccentricity often made him appear unapproachable. Both Waxman and Dirce pointed out the anxiety they felt before their initial introductions with Antoine. Both, however, agreed that, once Antoine was comfortable and as soon as he began to talk about the theatre and his experiences, the atmosphere in the room became light and excitable. “He radiates energy and enthusiasm and he is lacking in all the graces. That is why his patch has been so thorny in a land where the graces have always been held in high esteem.” The emphasis on appearance and personal mannerisms lent to Antoine’s acting style—one that would appreciate character quirks.
Aileen Brenner

Antoine, despite his past failure, was eventually ready to delve back into French theater, and French theater soon proved ready to ignore his looks. Three years after returning from military service, he by chance witnessed an amateur theatrical performance that “reawakened the ambitious dreams of [his] youth.”¹⁷ He was inspired enough, in fact, to join a small amateur theater circle in Montmartre known as the Cercle Gaulois. With only 343 seats and a small, narrow stage, the Cercle was described by Jules Lemaitre as “very small and naively decorated…a concert hall of a county seat” in which “scenic illusion [was] impossible.”¹⁸ Perhaps due to its small size and lack of notoriety in Paris, Antoine was comfortable enough in the establishment to suggest leaning away from the repertory of outdated sentimental plays, and proposed performing more modern works by playwrights such as George Sand, Dumas fils, and Banville. The Cercle, however, was apprehensive of producing new, slightly daring or controversial plays; it took much persuasion on Antoine’s part for the theater to reluctantly agree to the performance—as long as Antoine was responsible for the production and all of its arrangements.

It was early 1887 when Antoine began preparing for his first show. He worked quickly to acquire four short plays: A Prefect by Arthur Byl, The Cockade by Jules Vidal, Mademoiselle Pomme by Paul Alexis, and Jacques Damour, and adaptation by Leon Henniqué of Zola’s story.¹⁹ While Antoine became increasingly excited as the show date approached, “the Cercle became increasingly reluctant about being involved, especially because Zola was so controversial.”²⁰ Eventually the Cercle became too flustered with the idea of producing a Zola piece, and withdrew its sponsorship. But Antoine was determined to continue with his plans; with his entire month’s salary from the gas company, he rented the Cercle Galois and, to avoid the theater’s affiliation, called his group the Théâtre Libre, “or Free Theatre, borrowed from a Victor Hugo epigraph, ‘A Theatre Set Free.’”²¹ Antione took the lead role in Jacques Damour and worked feverishly to attend to every detail of the performance. The following whirlwind weeks are described by Bettina L. Knapp in The French Review:
Without any funds to spare, Antoine asked his mother for permission to borrow her dining room furniture (a table and chairs) to use for sets. She agreed. On the night of the dress rehearsal, after finishing his work at the gas company, a friend lent Antoine a hand-cart which enabled him to take the furniture himself down the torturous streets to [Cercle president] Krauss’s theater.

Antoine’s program was also given a boost by Paul Alexis, a playwright included in his bill who also happened to write a daily column for a Parisian newspaper (*Cri du Peuple*), and who was happy to publicize the show. Because of the controversy of the material, other journalists also began to print notices for the Théâtre Libre show. The controversy Antoine created with his first bill, and many more after it, was his first step into a new era of shocking, noncommercial drama. “Commercial theater, Antoine remarked numerous times, was vapid, arid, and sterile—it wallowed in mediocrity. He would change all this and create a theater which would be meaningful to his audiences, and perhaps even shock them into a new state of awareness.”

During rehearsals, “Antoine had also taken special pains with his *mise en scène*. Everything had to be just right” and on March 30, 1887, Antoine’s first Théâtre Libre production was ready to premiere to the public. Zola, who had attended a rehearsal, was so impressed with Antoine’s work that he returned, with friends and critics, to the dress rehearsal, and continued for some time to remain supportive of the Théâtre Libre. When the show finally presented its first and only public performance, technical aspects went astray, and the spectators had mixed reactions; “the audience was lukewarm to two of the plays, hissed one, and responded favorably only to *Jacques Damour*…Nevertheless, the total effort received considerable favorable attention from the press.”

The success of the bill allowed Antoine to be persuaded by friends and critics to produce a second bill of new plays. “I had not the slightest idea of becoming a professional actor or director,” Antoine commented to Waxman, “and I should have
laughed heartily if anyone had predicted then that we were going to revolutionize dramatic art.”

He chose the next plays carefully and selectively, even refusing scripts by writers who had led him to fame. He was also mindful to not become too attached to scripts that were affiliated with naturalistic theater; the press had decided unanimously that the Théâtre Libre was part of this new naturalistic movement, but Antoine did not want his theatre and his work to be classified (an endeavor that ultimately failed for quite a few years.) He decided on a realistic one-act prose piece by Oscar Méténier, *En Famille (In the Family)*, and a “tragicomedy” in three acts by Émile Bergerat called *La Nuit Bergamasque (Bergamasque Night)*, in hopes, according to Antoine’s invitations, “distract [the audience] for an hour or two from the cares of everyday-life.”

Antoine’s previous success, as well as the controversy created by producing *En Famille*—a script that had been refused by the Comédie Française and the Odéon—led to a fantastic audience of critics, press, actors, artists, and musicians. *En Famille*, with its representation of a guillotine execution, was especially successful in shocking audiences, as well as in its acting and scenic detail.

> How rare it is [commented one critic] to find a director who has no check-room for wraps, yet who has put such meticulous care and thought into acting and setting. The dramatic muse feels at home here, right in her element, an element that is familiar, pleasing, and not at all modest, albeit at times a little naïve. Here everything is natural, even the sign placed over the door inviting the last one out to turn off the gas.

Antoine’s acting, once again, received high praise, and although the audiences and critics weren’t unanimously impressed with the scripts on the bill, “almost all were impressed by the productions. On the strength of the response, Antoine…set out to make the Théâtre Libre permanent.”

As the Théâtre Libre began to grow, Antoine remained stubborn in the interest of his endeavors. He had already acquired more than 300 francs of debt due to expenses for his first show,
and after his second bill, his financial situation was grim. Antoine displayed the stubbornness he came to be known for by refusing to belittle *En Famille* by performing his production at a cabaret (the Chat Noir), even though it would have meant much-needed capital. With support from his friends, he began planning a bill for an entire Théâtre Libre season, despite, even, an offer to perform as an actor at a well-known and respected theater, the Odéon, which had been one of his childhood dreams. Although he may not have guessed it at the time, Antoine would get another, more glamorous opportunity at the Odéon later in his life, and it was his talent and innovations at the Théâtre Libre that would catapult him to national fame.

The 1887-1888 season began its planning in June. Antoine worked immediately to get his hands on three plays by well-known authors who were not associated with naturalism. He was also able to put Tolstoy’s *Power of Darkness* on the bill—a script that had been banned in Russia and seemed “unsuitable for French audiences,” by several dramatists. Antoine used the works of dramatists such as Tolstoy and Mendés to attract attention to his theatre while he searched for new, young talent to foster—the goal he had set for the Théâtre Libre even before its existence. When he was satisfied with the season’s bill of eight shows, Antoine was determined to get the little theatre on its feet, which, unfortunately, was a difficult endeavor to undertake without proper funds. This financial debacle led to, perhaps, Antoine’s greatest contribution to the modern age—theater by subscription.

“Antoine conceived the idea of finding some subscribers, about eighty in number, each one paying [$20]. He wrote about 2,000 letters to the most prominent people of Paris, and in order to save on postage he delivered them himself.” Although the idea had originally been inspired primarily for reasons of capital, theatre by subscription (or independent theatre) became important to the modern age by allowing production costs to be raised before hand, and because “it made the theatre a private organization open only to members, thereby permitting the presentation of plays that otherwise might have been refused a license from the
This suited Antoine’s desire for controversy, and it finally introduced France to the works and innovations of foreign authors such as Ibsen, Hauptmann, and Strindberg, who had already been making an impact throughout Europe. He delivered his final hand-written letter on July 25th and, laying all his hopes on the responses, quit his job with the gas company to devote all his time and energy to the theatre. A hearty response was not immediate; three weeks passed with only one subscription response. With help from an article by Bergerat, who called Antoine’s theatre the “Little Odéon,” he managed to scrape up twenty-four subscribers by the beginning of September, and consequently a business office and rehearsal room that provided residence for Antoine. At age thirty, Antoine had finally broken into the business. His story of success is painted with disappointments and set-backs, but “his long, self-made preparation, his unbounded energy and determination, coupled with his disinterestedness, made his theatre possible.”

Antoine’s theatre, though it was long in coming, flourished in a new dramatic era in France. Waxman quotes Désiré Luc:

For a long time there has been a demand for a new theatre where dramatic experiments might be tried out with absolute independence. But who was there daring enough to establish such an institution? Who would foot the heavy expense of such an enterprise? A Mæcenas was looked for, and behold, a Job appeared!...Antoine has the vocation of the boards and a remarkable institution. His face, with its prominent jaw and firm lips, indicates a tenacious will. His blue eyes are clear and cold. All this shows how authoritative he is. As an actor he is more natural than studied; his bearing surprises and impresses the audience.

Not only was Antoine the first French director to present scripts from foreign authors (including new, popular scripts of the time such as Ibsen’s The Wild Duck and Ghosts—which caused a stir about stricter censorship in the French Government, and Hauptmann’s The Weavers), he was also finally able to reach out
to new, unpublished playwrights, “thereby giving a creative and motivated young person a chance in life.” The theatre’s productions were limited to three performances: a dress rehearsal, an opening night for non-paying, invited guests, and a performance for subscribers. During the Théâtre Libre’s run (1887-1894), the theatre produced 184 plays by more than 69 authors, ranging in style from naturalism and realism to psychological dramas, lyrical shows, and symbolist plays; many of the authors introduced by Antoine at the Théâtre Libre “went on to become important in the French theatre.”

Despite his goals and early attempt at eclecticism, Antoine’s theatre remained associated with the naturalistic movement, especially comédie rosse—“naturalistic plays which treat amoral characters who hide behind a façade of respectability.” This association was strengthened by the controversy of the roseries, which were sometimes offensive even to the Théâtre Libre’s “tolerant” audiences. August Linert’s Christmas Story—in which a child is murdered onstage and his body thrown to the pigs while Christmas carols play in the background—was one of the more shocking comédie rosse pieces performed at the Théâtre Libre; audiences were so appalled, in fact, that the play was later performed with the murder taking place off stage. Because of his theatre’s acceptance of bold, naturalistic plays, writers became more and more attracted to Antoine’s theatre; and because Antoine, considering his past difficulties, felt obligated to help new and otherwise unaccepted talent, he continued to produce the plays. Naturalism, then, became appealing to Antoine during his seasons at the Théâtre Libre, aided also by his attendance of the productions of Irving in London and Saxe-Meiningen in Brussels. Their productions sparked two of Antoine’s ideas that brought France up to speed with theatre in the modern age: directing every play naturalistically, regardless of literary style, and incorporating the realistic qualities of ensemble and crows scenes. Additionally, “He admired Irving’s use of three-dimensional scenic pieces and came back to Paris determined to abandon the practice of painting objects...and to adopt the ‘free plantation’ system of positioning
and changing scenery…Thus, after 1888 the goal of complete illusion influenced every aspect of his productions.”

With these new techniques, Antoine eagerly created a “slice of life” type of naturalism that forced audiences to bluntly face themselves and their environment.

This new type of naturalism called for a reform in the theatrical techniques with which French theater had branded its actors and directors. Rebelling against the type of training offered by the Conservatoire that once rejected him, Antoine had his actors speak, move, and interact with each other and their environment as if the vents taking place on stage were real events, taking place in real life. “He declared [the Conservatoire’s] training wholly inappropriate to realistic plays of present-day life and suggested that actors seek ‘to live’ rather than ‘to act’ on stage.”

Ignoring conventions such as the loud, unnatural stage voice and Diderot’s “fourth wall,” Antoine’s actors were to speak conversationally, and even turn their backs on the audience if necessary—he became known to rehearse shows in spaces with four solid walls, and only reveal which wall would be removed for the performance when he was completely satisfied with all aspects of the production. He translated his strive for realism to the technical aspects of his shows as well; “he furnished rooms completely, including bric-a-brac,” and, contrary to the methods at the time, he insisted on new flats—“the sagging canvas on old ones destroyed the illusion”—and new sets for each play, which was a costly habit.

Even though Antoine admits it was a last-minute decision to remedy a bare stage, his most famous example of a naturalistic setting was “the real carcasses of beef used in Fernand Icre’s The Butchers in 1888.”

In his lighting, Antoine thought footlights created unnatural light and shadows, and instead aimed to make the effects as real to the source as possible—the sun, the moon, lamps, doors, windows, or wherever else light would be coming from if the scene was living in reality somewhere on the streets in France.

Antoine hoped, with his new methods, that he would be able to create a new theatrical experience for French audiences. Rather than focusing on teaching playgoers morality lessons, he instead
concerned himself with creating art through his mise-en-scene. “He believed that spectators should forget that they are in a theatre and be affected as though watching a real event...he darkened the auditorium and discourage both audience members and actors from acknowledging the presence of the other during performances. The proscenium always served as a fourth wall. His naturalism was intended as a picture of society in all its glory—whether admirable or condemnable; “for great theater to be born, Antoine believed, truth alone—and not idealism—must live on stage.”

“In July of 1888, the Théâtre Libre had just finished its first season, and Antoine, now fully conscious of his responsibilities as a leader of a new movement, was searching for ways to increase the effectiveness of his theatrical ventures. It was around this time that he set out to abolish the “star system.” Although he often cast himself in his own leading roles, he envisioned a cast that worked well with the whole company and functioned as a unit, and, following Meiningen’s example, he took a particular interest in the creation and effect of crowd scenes. In Meiningen-style crowd scenes, Antoine was particularly intrigued by the extras’ abilities to play important and convincing characters; he wrote of his excitement with the effect in a letter in which he professed, “wherever you look, you always observe a detail in the situation or character. The power at certain moments is incomparable.”

Using the care he saw in Meiningen’s work, Antoine soon became, according to Noel and Stoullig in Annales du Theatre, “a master in the art of moving crowds.” For Jules and Edmond de Gonocourt’s La Patrie en danger, which was presented in the Théâtre Libre’s second season, not only was a particular authenticity in costumes, setting, and lighting present, but the crowd scene in act III won Antoine much praise. According to Antione, the scene had “nearly five hundred supernumeraries flow into a rather small setting through a single door. They slowly filtered in, and, like a subtle tide, at last inundated everything from the furnishings to the characters, and in the semi-darkness with light falling here and there on a teeming mass, the effect was extraordinary.” He was pleased again with his work for a crowd scene in act III of J. H. Rosny’s Nell Horn,
produced in 1891, in which he was also able to supply around 500 supernumeraries. The scene, however, did not please Antoine’s audiences; those seated in the orchestra, though they could hear monstrous noise from the stage, were incapable of seeing action, let alone anything on stage save the crowd members’ backs. Antoine faced similar complaints from audiences and critics of the Théâtre Libre that the naturalistic sounds and crowds sometimes overpowered the lead actors, and the scenes were almost always difficult for at least one section of the audience to see due to furniture on the curtain line, or actors’ backs. Although Antoine was confused with the audience’s negative response to his 1891 crowd scene, “the unexpected and unhappy consequences of the scene in Nell Horn evidently served as a check on Antoine’s future experiments along similar lines.” Afterward, Antoine became more cognizant of creating the ensemble effect he had originally admired in Meiningen’s productions, and he once again executed a successful crowd scene in Hauptmann’s The Weavers in 1893; “According to Antoine, the storming of the employer’s home…was so convincing that the spectators rose from their seats in alarm.”

Unfortunately, this success marked Antoine’s final high point in his management of the Théâtre Libre.

Antoine’s private theatre concept had caught on in France, but naturalism was quick in dying. Praised for his genius and simplicity and admired by his actors, Antoine’s theatre was a victim to the fall of naturalism, as well as to its own success. Because most of the actors he employed were amateurs who aspired to higher fame, “several became sufficient accomplished to be hired by other theatres.” Antoine, after introducing them to French theatre, faced the same consequences with the new playwrights he employed. His expensive production habits and the limited income from only one paying performance for each bill also acquired substantial debt for his theatre—it was with the fall of naturalism, the loss of his actors and playwrights, and over 100,000 francs of debt that Antoine resigned from the Théâtre Libre in 1894. “The group struggled on until April 1896 (under the direction of Paul Larochelle) and then closed permanently.”
Antoine toured South America as an actor for a short time after resigning, played occasional exclusive engagements with the Renaissance and the Gymnase, and served quite briefly as the co-director of the Odéon.\textsuperscript{56} During this time he received a telegram from the French minister of fine arts requesting his services as co-director, along with Paul Guinty, for the Gymnase, which was state-run. He took the job, and immediately set out to run the theatre on “entirely new lines.”\textsuperscript{57} Guinty was not as eager to change the theatre and, after the two men bumped heads for a while, Antoine resigned.

In 1896 the Théâtre Antoine began much how the Théâtre Libre had ended; Antoine picked up his original goal of fostering new talent and creating a mixed repertoire, but sticking mostly to naturalistic productions. Soon, however, he began to agree with the new distaste for naturalism—the style no longer seemed persistently appropriate, and “he declared that each script should dictate its own production style. Such a decision hardly seems noteworthy today, but at the turn of the century, to designate the playwright as the major creative artist in the theatre was less commonplace.”\textsuperscript{58} This new attitude towards the “primacy of text” brought a new respect for literature to the French theatre, along with the idea to produce classics with their original intent, rather than distorting them.

The Théâtre Antoine fostered Antoine’s ideas and productions until 1906, but this time there was a transition; as he moved away from the restrictions of naturalism, Antoine spent the ten years at his self-named theatre building upon the new ideas that he would bring with enthusiasm into Paris’ biggest public eye—the Odéon. Before he was offered the Odéon’s fulltime directorship, however, Antoine would already have been teeming with new ideas and innovations.

Where he was once obsessed with realism in his mise-en-scene, Antoine became obsessed with the stylized intentions of the playwright. A stage setting, he said, for example, “should…do more than merely furnish a frame for the action; it should ‘ascertain its true character and establish an atmosphere for it.”\textsuperscript{59} Light, when
used boldly and evenly, could be just as effective in portraying the author’s intent. He grew unsatisfied with translators, who he felt did not give true, accurate, unbiased translations, and he often hired his own translators with whom he could work to achieve a script more true to its author’s original goals. He employed his own composers to either create original scores for each show, or to adapt scores from a script’s older productions. Fawning over every detail of his productions, a habit he acquired even before his time at the Théâtre Libre, Antoine theorized that “directors should be interpretive artists; they should be the servants, not the masters, of a text.”

Having studied literature intensely as a boy at Sainte-Geneviève and as the director of the Théâtre Antoine, and after studying styles and techniques of modern and classic theater in Europe and Asia, he directed and starred in King Lear on November 30, 1904, which was “hailed as the first production in France of a completely uncut and unaltered play by Shakespeare.”

Antoine was aware of the importance of this production. Two months before it opened, he predicted that if the venture were successful, he would be offered the directorship of the Odéon, the second subsidized theatre after the Comédie Fräçaise. The production was an enormous success, and, as Antoine hoped he was offered the directorship of the Odéon, which post he holed from 1906-1916.

Replacing Paul Ginisty as director of the Odéon, Antoine felt his new position marked the acknowledgement and acceptance of his directorial methods, as well as the climax of his career when he was finally able to become the truly eclectic dramatist he had always aspired to be. The appointment also rose him to such theatrical heights in French drama that he was later deemed ‘the father of the mise-en-scene,’ “and...the acknowledged progenitor of many of the theories and practices later popularized.”

Antoine took his post at the Odéon seriously; after his appointment, he wasted no time in transforming the theatre into a space for the combined goals of his lifelong theatrical career. He
remodeled the building, and, by 1911, “had established two matinee series devoted exclusively to plays by new and unknown authors; these matinees included not only realistic and naturalistic prose pieces but also symbolic plays, allegorical dramas, dramatic poems, and heroic lyrical tragedies.”64 He set out to use these traditional and modern methods to experiment in different ways with both new and classic scripts. “To this end he initiated an impressive program of plays by great French and foreign authors from the past.”65 During his time at the Odéon, Antoine produced scripts such as David Copperfield, School for Scandal, Ghosts, and many classics from Greece and Italy; while he began to show more support for the symbolist movement and its playwrights in particular, he also presented plays of romanticism and expressionism, Weimar classic scripts, melodramas, middle age and modern farces, mysteries, moralities, and an entire program devoted to medieval theatre.66

Antoine was well received, also, in showcasing his new ideas for Shakespeare. Like other innovators such as Meyerhold and Appia, he directed Shakespearean scripts according to his studies of rhythm. “In Shakespeare’s plays, Antoine conceived the life of the drama to be its rhythm, a rhythm depending upon an uninterrupted flow within and among the numerous scenes.”67 In order to make his scenes more rhythmically fluid, Antoine renovated his idea of the stage setting. Using a combination of fixed set pieces and moveable draperies, he was able to allow a scene to take place in front of the curtains while the scene changes were set behind the curtains. “This technique enabled Antoine to present the plays with only one intermission, a practice he adopted for all his Shakespearean productions.”68 He also continued to employ and work with translators to preserve the original integrity of the text and “the English scenic rhythm.” Experimenting, then, with 19th and 20th century illusionism and realism, he explored some older techniques such as painting backdrops and three-dimensional pieces—prefiguring “the modern, simplified mise-en-scene.”69

While still serving as director at the Odéon, Antoine also began to feel an obligation to educate the public about theatre. He felt that the French couldn’t fully appreciate the shows he
produced because they weren’t attuned to France’s rich dramatic and theatrical heritage. Determined to instill his love for theatre and its history into Parisian audiences, Antoine’s remedy was to offer an eclectic bill of shows, each of which was preceded by an educational and explanatory lecture. Although this idea continued to excite Antoine, he realized that “instruction is possible only as long as the audience remains tolerant,” and therefore “avoided radical experimentation which might offend—or lose—patrons of the Odéon.”

When the First World War broke out, Antoine decided it was time for his service at the national theater to come to an end. After nearly ten years with the theater, he left having fulfilled many of the goals he’d set out to reach as a director and innovator: “[He] produced a repertory notable for its diversity; he used scenery to point to the essential qualities of each drama as he perceived them; and he espoused aesthetic theories which are forward-looking.”

And although Antoine left satisfied, his directorship at the Odéon, following suit with the Théâtre Libre and the Théâtre Antoine, was financially unsuccessful. Hailed by Waxman as “the most glorious financial failure of the contemporary stage,” Antoine was so severely in debt by the end of his time at the Odéon, that, if he were alive today, he would probably still be paying monthly installments to French creditors. But, when confronted by creditors, according to Waxman, “so great an impression did the sincerity of his deep love for dramatic art make upon them, that seventy-nine out of eighty agreed not to prosecute him.”

From 1914-1924, Antoine dabbled in movie-making, directing such films as Les Frères Corses in 1915, Mademoiselle de la Seiglière in 1920, and L’Arlésienne in 1921. After the war, he was also happy to relay knowledge and advice he’d accumulated during his career, and he became a critic, “happily…dispensing advice on matters artistic and managerial until his death nearly thirty years later.”

Antoine’s legacy has brought innovative methods, theories, and techniques from his modern age to ours. “Almost all historians acknowledge that Antoine set the tone for the French theatre from the 1890s until World War I,” and in that tone came
changes that have made theater today in France and the rest of the world possible “The most immediate influence, however, was the lesson learned about the potential of independent theaters to reshape standards and practices.”75 The idea of the independent theater revolutionized the business of drama; not only do private theaters earn capital ahead of time from subscription fees (that can be used to aid production costs as they accumulate), they also solve the problem that much of Europe faced in the modern age: the censors. The independence of the Théâtre Libre caught on immediately in France, and then over the globe, allowing banned plays a chance to extend their messages through the modern age. The Théâtre Libre inspired into creations theaters such as die Freie Buhne, the Independent Theatre (in London), the Incorporated Stage Society, and many more, making it “probably the single most influential theater of the 20th century.”76 And the idea has not died out; independent theatres exist in abundance today, and still aid in experimental and educational theatre. “Since Antoine’s time, independent theatre, or some variation on it, has remained the major venue for significant innovations in writing and production. Practically all alternative theatres are lineal descendants of the Théâtre Libre.”77

Antoine also advanced an otherwise stagnant drama in his native country. In his book, which concludes with the closing of the Théâtre Libre, Waxman states that “there is scarcely a director, or actor, or playwright of the first order in Paris to-day who does not admit ungrudgingly his debt to Antoine.”78 Perhaps his first dramatic service to France was his insistence upon aiding new talent. Although the loss of the talent he introduced ultimately led to the demise of the Théâtre Libre, it gave the new talent a voice; many French naturalistic playwrights owe their fame to Antoine, as well as many of the young actors he employed at the beginning of his career. But it wasn’t only introduction of new talent that boosted French drama; it was the introduction of foreign talent. During Antoine’s rise to fame, the censors, and therefore the public, were conservative in their views toward the theatre, and it wasn’t until Antoine’s independent theatre that they
were forced to face the taboo ideas of foreign authors, even if only at first by small audiences. “Thanks to M. Antoine, Paris has seen and appreciated the plays of Ibsen, Sudermann, Bjornson, Shakespeare, Tolstoy, Hauptmann, Pinero, d’Annunzio, and other well-known authors. But his interest in the unknown works is equally keen, and many plays which were refused at the Comédie Française and the Gymnase were played by him and his company and his company.” Antoine’s respect for the playwright carried over through his time at the Théâtre Antoine and the Odéon, when he was happy to prove his integrity to them by producing their works with what he hoped would be their original intent—a style of directing that hadn’t been thoroughly explored in France.

Because the idea of the independent theatre has had such a profound impact on drama from the modern age until today, it is easy to understand why Antoine is remembered mostly as the proprietor and director of the naturalistic Théâtre Libre, even though his career spanned for many years after his days of realism and his occupancy at the theatre. But his influence on the modern age goes much beyond his ability to skirt the censors. “He has profoundly affected the lives of all those who have come in contact with him,” stated Waxman, “and he is the scourge of incompetents and dramatic exploiters.” Although he had never intended to give audiences lessons in morality, he did end up bringing social issues to French stages. In his comédie rosse pieces, he showcased the “wretched of the earth”; he strove to realistically express how they walked, talked, and interacted with each other, and, through his acting and directing, he attempted to convey to his audiences the inner workings of the minds that occupied the slums of society. In doing so, he “enlarged the ideals, mission, and function of the theatrical director,” creating a totally unexplored method of acting, and then allowing himself and his actors to experiment with it. And when he realized that naturalism wasn’t appropriate to every script, he was able to create new ideas and expand on older ones to innovate French and European theatre, spread his ideas, and educate the public. Embracing eclecticism, Antoine taught himself, France, and his contemporaries to create and respect good art. His
theories, further popularized and influenced by dramatists such as Copeau, Pitoeff, Jouvet, Barrault, Vilar, Lugné-Poë, Gémier, and Dullin, were taken on tour and published in articles through Europe, including in such countries as Germany, Holland, Italy, and England, as early as 1888.

Antoine’s innovations to theatre brought France to a congruent speed with the rest of Europe, and his ideas continued by permeating the European and international stages. “Antoine’s influence was tonic. His methods made audiences aware of the shortcoming in other theatres, and by 1900 his approach had become usual in most theatres.” Even after Antoine’s reign as the “father of the mise-en-scene,” his innovations were carried on; when new innovators (such as Jacques Copeau) took the spotlight, it was to rebel against the methods that, although they had influenced the theatre, were becoming stagnant. The new dramatists rebelled against and built upon Antoine’s theories, keeping his name and his legacy revered, and influencing theatre as we know it today.
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In a letter written to his friend, Francesco Vettori, Niccoló Machiavelli tells of the many evening hours he has spent in the company of the classical texts, “I take off my everyday clothes, [...] and I put on regal and curial robes; and dressed in a more appropriate manner I enter into the ancient courts of ancient men and am welcomed by them kindly.”¹ One of these men, whose works Machiavelli spent many hours reading and who had obvious influence over his work, is the Greek philosopher, Plato. While Machiavelli and Plato argue different moral prescriptions for their ideal rulers, they share a fundamental belief in the role of populism in their ideal governments, and a necessary public discourse.

After an initial search for secondary materials on this subject, it has become clear that mine is not a popular opinion, or at least not a popular area of publication. I will attempt to delve directly into the primary texts, using the few secondary sources available, to convince my reader that Machiavelli’s writings are directly influenced by those of Plato. This is a topic not easily covered, but I shall make my best attempt.

As Edward Bryan Portis claims, “it has been asserted that all Western philosophy can be seen as a footnote to Plato, and in a
certain sense, the same can confidently be said for all Western political thought.” Plato has given us most of what we know of his mentor, Socrates, for Socrates did not himself write. Socrates interrogates a series of well-known Athenian figures in Plato’s dialogues, interrogating each with a series of questions, leading inevitably to a logical answer to a fundamental question.

Plato’s choice of Socrates as his protagonist is unsurprising, as he was a devotee of Socrates, and was heavily influenced by his teachings and death by public execution. Plato’s political stance, as outlined in the Laws and the Republic, explains his absence from the field of Athenian politics, as he viewed the democratic system of his time as flawed and unjust.

Portis juxtaposes Machiavelli to Plato, when he says, “Like Plato, Niccolò Machiavelli was a citizen of a city-state, […] Unlike Plato, Machiavelli took an active part in the public affairs of his city and strongly supported its republican institutions. Indeed, his republicanism and his deep love of politics are the two most conspicuous aspects of both his life and his political thought.” Following the decline of the Medici dynasty, Machiavelli became an administrative aide to influential politicians in the rising republic. Machiavelli’s prominent place in the political life of Florentine politics afforded him an insider view of politicians in his home country and beyond, as he was often sent on diplomatic missions to foreign courts.

After the return of the Medici to power, Machiavelli was stripped of his position, imprisoned, and later exiled for his republican loyalties. It is in exile that he wrote The Prince, and then the Discourses. The Prince is nominally dedicated to the incoming Medici prince, and ascribes a course of action for his ambitious ideal ruler to seize control of the chaotic Italian states. Portis says of Machiavelli’s political philosophy that “Machiavelli’s thought was informed by a distinct view of human nature and social reality. Although he wanted a society in which most inhabitants could be moral, he believed that such a society could be neither established nor maintained according to a moral code or principles of justice alone.”
Indeed, Kenneth Blanchard says of Plato and Machiavelli, “it has often been thought that Machiavelli and Plato stand on opposite sides of the highest watershed in Western intellectual history. […] Both the Athenian wrestler and the Florentine clerk, it turns out, demonstrate a persistent concern with the moral problematic—that is, the tendency of human beings to do what they want to do at the cost of that which they ought to do”. With this statement, Blanchard notes the connection between Plato’s writings and the lessons of Machiavelli’s *The Prince*. Indeed, Plato tells the reader of the *Laws*, “anyone may surely see that, while legislation is a great achievement, if a well-equipped state gives its excellent laws into the charge of unqualified officials, not merely does no good come of all their excellence, and not only does the state become a general laughingstock, but such societies are pretty sure to find their laws a source of the gravest detriment and mischief.”

Machiavelli echoes Plato’s lack of faith in the political morality of individual men as he says:

> In completely new principalities, where there is a new prince, one finds in maintaining them more or less difficulty according to the greater or lesser skill of the one who acquires them. And because this act of transition from private citizen to prince presupposes either ingenuity or Fortune, it appears that either the one or the other of these two things should, in part, mitigate many of the problems; nevertheless, he who has relied upon Fortune less has maintained his position best.

The prince is further encouraged to face his battle with the winds of fortune and to depend on his own skill, which should be nurtured and honed in the education of princes, for his own survival. Machiavelli tells his new prince, “the first bad weather kills them, unless these men who have suddenly become princes, […] are of such ability that they know how to prepare themselves quickly and to preserve what Fortune has put in their laps, and to construct afterward those foundations that others have built before becoming princes.” Obviously, a qualified and prepared
ruler has far better chances of surviving the turbulent winds of political change.

According to both Plato and Machiavelli, the city (or state) begins with the founders. Plato’s Athenian stranger tells his companions, “the city we are about to found has, as I may say, neither father nor mother, other than the society which is founding it”.9 Machiavelli’s prince is both founder and ruler, and it is this charismatic combination that fascinates him. Both depend, however, on the existing society to support the founder, and to support the laws of the new society, thereby establishing order. In the Discourses, Machiavelli says, “if one desires or intends to reform the government of a city so that reform will be acceptable and will be able to maintain itself to everyone’s satisfaction, he should retain at least the shadow of ancient customs so that it will not seem to the people that they have changed institutions, whereas in actual fact the new institutions may be completely different from those of the past.”10 To found a new society on the back of an old one, is the challenge given to both the three strangers on the road in Crete and Machiavelli’s prince, and it is a challenge that requires the support of the people.

The people are the true architects of the common good in both Platonic and Machiavellian society. Both social theories eschew a society founded with the help of the nobility, as the nobility will be the first group to revolt against the ruling power. Plato says that, “if others would found such societies, they should shape their legislation with a view to the same end—not to the interest of a handful of dictators or a single dictator, or the predominance of a populace, but always to justice, the justice we explained to be a true and real equality, meted out to various unequals.”11 Machiavelli echoes this statement with his own, “he who obtains the principality with the aid of the nobility maintains it with more difficulty than he who becomes prince with assistance of the common people, for he finds himself a prince amidst many who feel themselves to be his equals, and because of this he can neither govern nor manage them as he might wish.”12 Both theories espouse the rule of a skillful and qualified ruler, and they
both wish for the order brought about by popular equality in their city-states.

This does not mean that they discourage conflict in their new principalities, and in fact, both encourage the establishment and continuation of public discourse. Plato demands that all men in his society attend the “public table,” to discuss the governing of the society. He says, “if a man proposes to give a society laws for the conduct of public and communal life, and yet imagines that [...] it is improper to submit everything to regulation and that the individual should be left free to spend the day just as he pleases—if he leaves personal conduct exempt from legal control and yet flatters himself that his citizens will be ready to guide their communal and public actions by law—he is seriously mistaken.”

Discourse is of equal importance to Machiavelli’s sense of order:

For a licentious and unruly people can be spoken to by one good man and can easily be brought back to the right path; however, with an evil prince there is no one who can speak to him and no other remedy than the sword. From this fact one can draw the conclusion concerning the seriousness of their respective maladies; if words are enough to cure the malady of the people and the sword to cure that of the prince, there will never be anyone who will not conclude that the greater the faults, the greater the attention required.

These ideals should serve as a reminder of our own precious commodity of the freedom of speech and the necessity of public discourse in our own modern society.

Machiavelli, in keeping with the tradition of civilized disagreement, instructs his prince in direct opposition of Plato’s philosopher-king.

Plato’s republican leader is wise beyond measure, for only a man well-versed in philosophy can be deemed truly just. For, “until philosophers rule as kings in cities or those who are now called kings and leading men genuinely and adequately philosophize,
that is, until political power and philosophy entirely coincide, while the many natures who at present pursue either one exclusively are forcibly prevented from doing so, cities will have no rest from evils, [...] nor I think, will the human race."\textsuperscript{15} Machiavelli’s prince, on the other hand, should be schooled solely in the art of war, as that is his true calling. “A prince, therefore, must not have any other object nor any other thought, nor must he take anything as his profession but war, its institutions, and its discipline; because that is the only profession which befits one who commands.”\textsuperscript{16} The making of war, according to Machiavelli, is the only means of pursuing the goal of founding order out of chaos, and of bringing his new principality under the control of the prince. Order, not justice, he argues, is the greatest common good.

Whether order or justice is the paramount virtue of a society, the evil of men threatens both, say Plato and Machiavelli. Plato abhors the violence implicit in an unequal class system when he says, “it is his dealings with those whom he can easily wrong which reveal a man’s genuine unfeigned reverence for right and real abhorrence of wrong.”\textsuperscript{17} Machiavelli’s opinion of men in general takes the more pessimistic turn, for “if men were all good, this rule would not be good; but since men are a sorry lot and will not keep their promises to you, you likewise need not keep yours to them.”\textsuperscript{18} His prince is encouraged to do whatever he has to to maintain order in the face of men’s evil natures. Because men are evil, the prince cannot, out of necessity, avoid evil. Machiavelli’s very name has become synonymous with this judicious use of the capacity for evil, which he encourages his prince to employ when he says, “in the actions of all men, and especially of princes, where there is no final arbiter, one must consider the final result.”\textsuperscript{19} The final and best result will always be to bring about order (for Machiavelli) or justice (for Plato) for the common good.

Man’s evil rides the winds of fortune and waits for every opportunity to upset the rule of both the prince and the philosopher-king. They must continuously be on guard against the trouble that fortune may bring to their state. Machiavelli, Blanchard tells us, lifted the first paragraph of his twenty-fifth chapter of \textit{The Prince}
directly from Plato’s *Laws*: “it is not unknown to me that many have held, and still hold, the opinion that the things of this world are, in a manner, controlled by Fortune and by God, that men with their wisdom cannot control them, and on the contrary, that men can have no remedy whatsoever for them; and for this reason they might judge that they need not sweat over such matters but let them be governed by the state [...].”

Blanchard says of this seeming accord between our two authors, “in any case, the self-sufficiency of the republic—its independence of fortune—will depend above all on the capacity of some part of the body politic to move itself to action before it is forced to move by events.”

Plato and Machiavelli both regard fortune as the catalyst that can make or break the state, but do not share the same views on taming fortune. Plato says of fortune, “just as a ship at sea must have a perpetual watch set, day and night, so also a state, tossed, as it is, on the billows of interstate affairs and in peril of being trapped by plots of every sort.” His metaphor of the ship is assisted by his belief that philosophy is the highest form of art, which will assist his philosopher-king in braving the gale of fortune. On the other hand, Machiavelli’s prince is encouraged to subdue Fortune by brute force, in a relentless struggle, “because Fortune is a woman, and it is necessary, in order to keep her down, to beat her and to struggle with her [...] and being a woman, she is always the friend of young men, for they are less cautious, more aggressive, and they command her with more audacity.” Machiavelli’s prince must employ the aggressive courage of the lion to fend off Fortune’s advances or he risks being overcome.

Machiavelli makes his case consistently throughout *The Prince* for the advancement of a single strong ruler, yet as Leo Strauss says, “there can hardly be any doubt that Machiavelli preferred republics to monarchies, tyrannical or nontyrannical. He loathed oppression, which is not in the service of the well-being of the people and hence of effective government.” Strauss also puts forth the idea that Machiavelli was heavily influenced by Plato and Socrates’ other republican devotees when he says, “One can safely say that there is no moral or political phenomenon that Machiavelli
knew or for whose discovery he is famous that was not perfectly known to Xenophon, to say nothing of Plato or Aristotle.”

Machiavelli’s pragmatic ideals are separated from Plato’s utopian dialogues by 1500 years of political thought, and yet, they find a firm foundation in the stability of the people as a superior ally to the state, in its battle against the inconstant winds of fortune. These same ideals are relevant and applicable to our own republican society, as Charles Sherover reminds us in his essay on public philosophy, regarding the framers of our own Constitution:

They had learned from Machiavelli that the stability of liberty rests on the protected continuity of the struggle for power and influence which all segments of the society must cooperate to maintain; that wise legislation is framed, not by expecting all men to be virtuous but against the expectation that some will seek to vent evil on the rest; and that the life of the polis, as the substance of history, is to be carried forward with a wisdom that learns from the past while it looks to the future.26

As modern humanists, we would do well to learn these lessons from these “ancient courts of ancient men,” and to foster our own public discourse to maintain our state of liberty as we look to the future. ☕
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Waves
NICOLE LUDWIG

Medical images of the artist’s brain, Charcoal, Crayon, Powdered graphite, Pencil, Architectural transfer paper, Text
ARTIST STATEMENT

Wavelengths are the distance between one peak of a wave of energy and the next corresponding peak. The word is an immediate link to the natural formation of waves in the ocean as they crash consistently and rhythmically. Water in general is a fluid as the thoughts that run through our heads. The human brain is like no other on this earth and yet the most comparable thing in nature is water.

I chose to use x-rays of a tumor growing within the bone of my skull before and after its removal, however not using them in any specific order. I chose to use three x-rays that were very different in angle and space. Arranged in groups of three, I specifically placed them to have the appearance of wavelengths measured on paper.

My project relates very much to the work of contemporary artist Roni Horne, who I saw as an inspiration. Not only does her work consist of multiples, but she also focuses many of her pieces on water and often uses text. I also found inspiration in the essay, “On Drawing” by J. Fisher. As I was experimenting with the wave drawings, it never left my mind that drawings are raw thought on paper. I found this astounding in its link to my actual project of the thought process and that this drawing of a wave was my thoughts becoming tangible. These delicate drawings on fragile paper gave shape to two things that, technically, have no physical shape or form.
Oil Companies in the Amazon: Bulls in a China Shop?

Antonia Domino

On your last trip to the grocery store, did you think about the growers who tended the apple orchard, or the people who worked at the soda factory, or the ranchers who fed the beef cattle? When you stopped at the gas station on your way home, did you think about where the gasoline came from, how it got from the ground to the gas station? If you didn’t, you are not alone. We rarely pause to think about what truly goes into any of the items we purchase in terms of the people who produce them. This is especially true about gasoline, the product of an industry with vast impacts on both people and the environment. There is not a “one-size-fits-all” story for the journey a gallon of gasoline takes from its source to the gas station. Sources of petroleum are scattered across the globe. The deserts of the Middle East, the deserts of Texas, the tundra of Canada and the stormy North Sea are all home to oil wells, and the impacts of oil drilling vary depending on where the well is located. Most likely, the gasoline at your local gas station came from somewhere abroad, since the United States must import 58% of the petroleum it consumes. Of that imported petroleum, 2.7% arrives from Ecuador, and while that seems like a tiny amount, it constitutes more than 50% of Ecuador’s exports. The significance of those statistics crystallizes in light of
the location of the majority of Ecuador’s oil wells. As one author puts it, “Ecuador had the... misfortune of finding large deposits of oil slap in the middle of one of the world’s most important centers of biodiversity—the Amazon rainforest.”

Finding oil was not unfortunate—finding it in the Amazon was. First, simply exploring for oil requires clearing forests for roads. Second, carrying out tests to pinpoint locations of petroleum deposits has serious detrimental side effects. When drilling finally begins, toxic chemicals enter the scene in the form of compounds that enhance drilling even before any oil is recovered. The hydrocarbons in petroleum itself are poisonous to many species at different levels or concentrations. A host of byproducts accompany crude oil, including production or formation water found in its deposits, which can be so saline that it kills vegetation. Extracting petroleum is a daunting process even without the efforts required to protect the environment. Despite the apparent challenges, it is very possible to make oil drilling environmentally benign, if not environmentally friendly.

Extracting petroleum from underground is a multi-step process, and nearly every step directly or indirectly impacts the environment and the inhabitants of the area. After oil companies acquire land likely to contain oil, they still must determine where it would be most productive to place wells. To locate oil deposits, oil companies perform seismic studies, utilizing a rudimentary sort of echolocation in which dynamite is buried up to 20 meters underground and then detonated. Sound travels at different speeds through solids and liquids, so by measuring the sound waves that result from the explosions, experts can locate oil deposits. Seismic studies are detrimental in many ways. According to a preliminary study, these studies in Ecuador required the clearing of 1,046 hectares of forest; 372,320 trees were affected. Also, the noise from the equipment, helicopters, and explosions disturbs wildlife, and explosions near rivers or lakes can kill up to 500 fish at once.

Once the company identifies likely locations, it begins drilling wells. The first wells drilled are known as “test wells,” and, in
1989, 42,000 gallons per well of waste oil were extracted from test wells in Ecuador.\textsuperscript{12} Waste oil is generally burned for the purpose of disposal, and this releases toxic compounds into the environment, including volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs). Before any petroleum enters the environment, toxic chemicals enter from a different source: the drilling muds used to lubricate the drill bit. The muds vary in composition, but all contain some toxic chemicals.\textsuperscript{13} Ecuadorian companies have not made the chemical composition of their drilling muds available to the public since 1991, but muds used by companies in the United States contain toxic heavy metals, a suite of hydrocarbons (including benzene, a recognized carcinogen,\textsuperscript{14} naphthalene, and phenanthrene), and dangerous levels of sodium and chlorides.\textsuperscript{15}

After a well is complete, the company starts to pump out the contents, which are usually a mixture of crude oil and production water. Production water can have levels of total dissolved solids (TDS; a measure of salinity) up to 350,000 mg/L.\textsuperscript{16} By comparison, the TDS in a swimming pool should not exceed 1500 parts per million, equivalent to 1.5 mg/L.\textsuperscript{17} When production water is released directly into the environment, it can cause salt scarring. Salt scars are visually identifiable as barren areas that are the result of extreme salinity, which kills vegetation, leading to erosion.\textsuperscript{18} Soils can remain contaminated with salts for at least 60 years following a spill if no attempt at remediation is made.\textsuperscript{19}

While some of petroleum’s individual components have been widely studied, scientists have yet to conduct in-depth research on the possible impact of petroleum industry-related activities on the Amazonian environment. The components of petroleum that indicate contamination are total petroleum hydrocarbons (TPHs). According to a public health statement released by the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, TPHs have a range of effects on human health. Benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, and xylene (collectively referred to as BTEX) affect the central nervous system. Toluene can cause headaches, fatigue, nausea, and drowsiness, and n-hexane can cause peripheral neuropathy (numbness in lower
limbs, or paralysis at high levels or repeated exposures). Many affect the blood, immune system, liver, spleen, kidneys, lungs, and developing fetuses, and others irritate the eyes and skin. Benzene is a known carcinogen, and benzo(a)pyrene and gasoline are probable carcinogens. It is not too far a leap to suppose that all of the substances mentioned above have implications for other species that come in contact with them, and contact is the key word. While certain substances found in petroleum may be inhaled (notably the volatile organic compounds), most of the time an organism must come in contact with or ingest the substance to feel its ill effects.

Unfortunately, there are many ways for these chemicals to make it from the well out into the environment. If the test wells are not properly closed off, they can continue to bring toxic chemicals, in the form of leftover drilling muds, petroleum, or production water, to the surface. During drilling, wastes are stored in open pits. This is not a serious problem in places where rains are infrequent, but in the Amazon, hardly a day passes without a torrential downpour. This rainfall causes the pits to overflow, letting the toxic wastes loose in the environment. A study of the effect of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons found that urban runoff contained harmful levels of the substances; runoff from the drilling sites is certainly at least as contaminated. As of 2004, there were at least 200 open pits still being used in the Amazon, into which 4,000 cubic meters of waste are deposited for each test well. Contaminated water is another source of contact. In the United States in 1986, 22 states identified oil and gas brine pits (for storing production water) as significant sources of groundwater pollution, and 2 more states identified such pits as the primary source of their groundwater pollution. Groundwater sampled as a part of the United States Geological Survey (USGS) studies showed that after 55 years with no remediation, groundwater was still contaminated with salt from production water. Contamination is continuing. A “clean” well in the USGS survey drilled 0.6 km from the oil well sites gradually became contaminated over a 2 year period, even though one of the well sites was inactive. It is likely that oil drilling regions in Ecuador experience these same types of groundwater pollution.
The most common way for humans or animals to come in contact with petroleum is through petroleum spills. Many statistics indicate this. At least thirty spills between 1989 and 1992 caused the one-kilometer wide Napo river in Ecuador to run black for a week, Texaco spilled 16.8 billion gallons between 1971 and 1992, and a total of 30 billion gallons of oil and other wastes have been discharged without treatment into the Ecuadorian Amazon between 1972 and 1993. It is clear that there has been more than adequate opportunity for petroleum and its byproducts to enter and cause direct harm to the environment in Ecuador.

While the Amazon rainforest is considered one of the few pristine, natural places on earth, it is not truly untouched. Some 500,000 people, or 4.5% of Ecuador’s population, make their home in the region, called the Oriente. What effect has petroleum industry’s presence had on these people?

Living in proximity to petroleum industry activities has had a direct, negative effect on these residents’ health. In exposed communities, levels of total petroleum hydrocarbons in local rivers ranged from 0.02 ppm (twice the European Community regulations) to 2.883 ppm. One study found a correlation between exposure to hydrocarbons and negative outcomes of pregnancy; women in exposed communities had more than twice the risk for spontaneous abortion as women in unexposed communities. Fewer than 8% of women in exposed communities drank the water, compared to 24% of women in unexposed communities, and women in exposed communities bathed in the water half as much as women in unexposed communities. The fact that the women in the study made efforts to avoid using and consuming river water makes these statistics particularly troublesome. Another study found and evaluated the risk for leukemia in children living in counties where oil exploitation has been practiced for at least 20 years; its results indicated a correlation between living near oil-producing activities and risk of developing leukemia. Leukemia risk was high for men and women of all ages, but was especially elevated for all children under the age of five, and for females under the age of 15. Two more studies examined the occurrence
of all types of cancer in adults. In one Ecuadorian village, both the risk of developing cancer and the risk of dying from cancer were elevated.\textsuperscript{36} All manner of physiological concerns were also more frequent in populations living in proximity to oilfields. Researchers found higher occurrence rates of abortion, dermatitis, skin mycosis (fungal infections), and malnutrition, as well as elevated mortality rates. Women who were surveyed reported (in addition to the above conditions) increased tiredness, itchy nose, sore throat, headaches, red eyes, ear pain, diarrhea, and gastritis.\textsuperscript{37}

While both humans and the environment suffer innumerable, quantifiable, and direct effects of the petroleum industry’s presence, the petroleum industry’s indirect effects pose hazards of a different nature. These hazards stem mostly from the roads that oil companies must build in order to practice their trade. Roads make the hunting of all species easier, and encourage smuggling.\textsuperscript{38} Roads also attract colonists, allowing the dispersion of people from areas of high population density (urban areas) to areas of low population density (like the Oriente).\textsuperscript{39} Colonization has been encouraged by the efforts of the Ecuadorian government to parcel and dole out land for farming. Due to the poor quality of the soil, farming ventures are rarely successful, leaving behind a poverty-stricken population.\textsuperscript{40} The presence of immigrants creates more contact between indigenous people and the modern world. In general, acculturation of the indigenous people leads them to become more sedentary and acquisitive, increasing their impact on the environment. They are traditionally an itinerant people, moving from one camp to the next, carrying what few supplies they need to hunt; when they adopt a more modern lifestyle, their prolonged occupation of one living space is damaging to the environment, and, exposed to all the “stuff” of the modern material world, they suddenly realize how little they have, and develop an impoverished mindset.\textsuperscript{41}

Clearly, oil has a vast and significant impact on the Amazon and the people who live there; however, oil also exerts its pull outside of the oilfields’ immediate vicinity. Petroleum exports generate 40\% of total export revenues,\textsuperscript{42} and according to a Trade and
Environment Database case study, “Fifty percent of Ecuador’s national budget is funded by oil earnings.” Economists term the “almost total reliance on oil revenues … at the expense of other non-natural resource industries (like manufacturing and service sectors)” the “Dutch disease,” so-called because the Netherlands’ reliance on North Sea oil deposits in the 1970s was so detrimental to the health of its overall economy. The reason oil-producing countries tend to depend on their oil exports at the expense of other economic sectors is because oil is economically dense: selling a small amount provides a large amount of money. Yeomans notes that depending on oil exports renders other exports “expensive and uncompetitive abroad.” Governments may interpret this condition as further motivation to avoid developing the manufacturing sector. Aside from the dangers inherent in a non-diversified economy, reliance on oil can have other consequences.

Oil Change International, The Institute for Public Policy Research, and Jubilee USA Network released a joint report in 2005 detailing the ramifications that countries heavily invested in petroleum face; the report’s title, Drilling Into Debt, implies the nature of these ramifications. Earlier research indicated that oil-producing countries have a tendency toward poverty, violence, and corruption. They are more likely to be run by authoritarian or ineffective governments, have high levels of military spending, and witness the outbreak of civil war. The report cited Jeffrey Sachs and Andrew Warner, economists whose 1995 study confirmed a relationship between dependence on natural resource exports and poor growth performance. Drilling into Debt reported several correlations worth noting. First, the authors found that increased oil production and exports leads to increased debt. Second, the report showed that increased oil production also predicts increases in debt size as a percentage of the GDP, and third, that investment by the World Bank in developing, petroleum-exporting countries increases debt. The explanation for these correlations had three parts: “[First,] oil wealth creates economic volatility…[Second,] oil wealth increases the ability of oil-exporting countries to finance their fiscal deficits…Third, once countries are in debt, the
temptation to turn to oil as a means of digging oneself out of debt is great.\textsuperscript{49} A volatile economy tempts countries into spending all of their revenue immediately in fear that it will not last long. The presence of oil deposits enables countries to receive credit when other factors dictate that extending credit is not recommended. Since most countries need loans to jumpstart oil production, increasing oil production will likely result in more loans.\textsuperscript{50}

Unfortunately, the correlations hold true in Ecuador’s case. Ecuador is the fifth largest crude oil producing country in South America and has the largest debt per capita; its debt increased from US$217 million in 1970 to US$11.2 billion in 2006.\textsuperscript{51} Essentially, if oil production were to cease, the nation of Ecuador would cease to exist because Ecuador’s oil revenues have never exceeded government expenditures.\textsuperscript{52} Oil has a stranglehold on the economy, and despite mounting evidence of the harms oil drilling inflicts on people and the environment, Ecuador will keep exploring and exploiting the rainforests to continue feeding its oil addiction.

Ecuador is not the only “oil addict”; even if the economies of the developed world are stable and more diversified, they are also addicted to oil. This addiction manifests itself in two ways. First, despite the clamor about peak oil production, the coming demise of oil and the coming climate crisis, developed countries are not doing very much to remedy our collective dependence on oil. Second, even if all the petroleum in the world disappeared, forcing us to go “cold turkey” on oil, we would not be able to get enough energy from currently available alternative sources to continue living with the speed and mobility we are used to. For example, ethanol (fuel made from fermenting plant material) has recently experienced a surge of media attention. While the US produces 4.5 billion gallons of ethanol annually, that amount meets only about 3% of the country’s need for ground transportation fuel alone.\textsuperscript{53} While many people have compared current rising gas prices and the gas crisis of the 1970s, the reaction of the general population to the current trends is very different from the way societies reacted in the 1970s. British writer James Buchan observed that, today, “nobody
seems to be driving any less.” He also notes that despite the twin specters of $70-a-barrel oil and global warming, no one has called for conservation that parallels the American national speed limit or Jimmy Carter’s “conservation is the moral equivalent of war” speech; instead, President Bush has called for technology to break the US addiction to oil. An article in *Science* suggested a plan modeled after the Manhattan Project, enabling faster advances in technology. However, if funding for these desired advancements is lagging in countries like the United States, it is non-existent in the developing world. In fact, the World Bank in 2000 created an Extractive Industries Review, which introduced its first report in 2003 with the statement: “The World Bank Group should phase out investments in oil production by 2008 and devote its scarce resources to investments in renewable energy resource development, emissions reducing projects, clean energy technology, energy efficiency and conservation, and other efforts that de-link energy use from greenhouse gas emissions”; yet, in 2006, the World Bank had adopted only a few of the recommendations in the report, and was continuing to lend money to oil extraction projects.

Amid all the disappointing statistics, there is a ray of hope. In 1993, the indigenous people of the Ecuadorian Amazon organized themselves and filed a lawsuit in New York against Texaco (now ChevronTexaco) for damages to their health caused by Texaco’s practices in the rainforest. At the time, Texaco claimed it did not violate any laws because Ecuador did not have any legislation regulating use of the environment, and that it “was a minor party working in conjunction with PetroEcuador…and followed ‘accepted industry practices.’” Texaco, in consortium with Gulf Oil, had discovered the first major oilfields in the Oriente region in 1967. By 1972, only Texaco and the state oil company, CEPE (now PetroEcuador), were operating in the rainforest, and Texaco led major operations. Texaco also assembled the wells and a 498 km pipeline to carry the crude oil to the coastal ports. As of 1991, there were an additional 497 kilometers of pipeline, 300 active wells, and 29 central processing facilities each receiving and storing in pits 4.3 million gallons of production water daily. It is these
storage pits upon which the lawsuit hinges. The indigenous people charge Texaco with failing to design its operations to re-inject the production water, instead storing it in inadequately designed pits or releasing it directly into the Amazon rainforest. In the United States, prior to 1970, it was accepted industry practice to discharge the production water directly into the environment, but since then the practice has been to re-inject the water deep underground, its original source, making Texaco’s claim that it used accepted practices inherently flawed. Furthermore, “ChevronTexaco has been unable to cite one other instance, anywhere in the world, where it dumped toxic wastewater into streams or unlined pits.”

More evidence arrived in the form of a now widely publicized company memo: “The current unlined pits are necessary for efficient and economical operation of our drilling…operations. The total cost of eliminating old pits and lining new pits would be $4,197,958. … It is recommended that the pits neither be … lined nor filled.” The memo was written in 1980—a full decade after oil operations in the United States began re-injecting produced waters. If the losses were going to be so great, what did Texaco gain from dumping its wastes rather than disposing of them properly? Over twenty years, World Watch magazine estimates Texaco saved $4.5 billion dollars, or $3 per barrel. How does that compare to the money Texaco likely earned? One estimate puts the Ecuadorian oil industry’s cumulative worth at $32 billion dollars between 1970 and 2000, and suggests that Texaco produced 88% of the oil exported during its time in the Oriente. Rounding down and subtracting the proposed cost of adequate storage pits, this still leaves $23.5 billion dollars coming from one region in one country in which Texaco was operating at the time.

The plaintiffs are also seeking retribution for the 16.8 million barrels of crude oil (acknowledged by the Ecuadorian government) spilled by the SOTE (Sistema Oleoducto TransEcuatoriano) pipeline, for at least 600 inadequate waste storage pits abandoned throughout the rainforest, and for the 2.5 million acres of rainforest Texaco deforested to build nearly 300 miles of roads. In response, Texaco argues that in addition to utilizing accepted
industry practices, that they have made an effort to clean up; that they were released from liability by the Ecuadorian government in 1995; that Ecuador’s 7 year-old environmental legislation does not apply to them, and that the plaintiffs are suing the wrong company.\textsuperscript{71} Texaco’s premise for having already cleaned up after itself rests on a contract it made with the Ecuadorian government, in which Texaco agreed to make a $40 million clean-up effort.\textsuperscript{72} This argument’s flaw lies in the fact that Texaco only cleaned up 139 of over 600 pits, and it did so simply by filling them in, rather than by physically removing the toxic waste from the environment.\textsuperscript{73} Even allowing for the presence of more pits in 1995 than in 1980 and for inflation, it is unlikely cleaning them all up would have cost $40 million dollars (8 times the original estimate) just 15 years later. Finally, when Texaco made that $40 million dollar contract, $3 million of the total was earmarked for equal division between three towns (Lago Agrio, Coca, and Shushifindi), leaving $37 million dollars for clean up. By Texaco’s own estimate, destroying inadequate pits and creating new ones would have cost significantly less than $5 million dollars.\textsuperscript{74} Where did that $37 million go?

As for Ecuador’s legislation (the case is filed under the \textit{Ley de Gestión Ambiental}, or Law of Environmental Management), it is retroactive (Texaco argues that it is not), and requires no statute of limitations.\textsuperscript{75} Finally, ChevronTexaco has pointed a finger at a multitude of different arms and subsidiaries of itself. First, one must know that Texaco, Inc. owned Texaco Overseas Development Company, which owns Texaco Financial Services Company (TFSC); TFSC, in turn, has as a wholly owned subsidiary, Texpet, which was created to lead operations in the Oriente.\textsuperscript{76} Initially, Texaco said it was just a “minor party working in conjunction with PetroEcuador,” but at one point, it tried to send the case to California, the location of the ChevronTexaco headquarters, because Texaco, Inc. is now defunct.\textsuperscript{77} In Ecuador, the defendants have said that Texaco, Inc. continues to exist despite the Texaco-Chevron merger, and that this is the company the plaintiffs should be suing.\textsuperscript{78} Perhaps ChevronTexaco has gotten so large and
ungainly it no longer has the means to keep its many subsidiaries organized, and this could be the reason harmful drilling practices continued unchecked for so long.

Each of ChevronTexaco’s arguments can be easily discredited, and now, a decade after the initial lawsuit was filed, lawyers representing 30,000 Ecuadorians have a chance to do so in court. After nearly a decade in United States’ courts, a judge ruled that the case had to be heard in Ecuadorian courts. However, the judge stipulated four conditions for the trial: 1) ChevronTexaco must appear in an Ecuadorian court; 2) ChevronTexaco must abide by whatever decision the Ecuadorian judge makes; 3) the plaintiffs will be allowed to use evidence they had gathered for the first trial; and 4) the defendants were given one further year to develop their case. Such conditions, especially the first two, at least represent a new precedent in environmental law, and could have even greater implications. “To the best of our knowledge,” says John Bonifaz, a member of the plaintiffs’ legal team, “this is the first case of its kind in world history: where an American is forced by American courts to show up in another country’s courtroom and comply with whatever judgment that comes out of that courtroom.”

With respect to the evidence and testimony from the initial Ecuadorian court proceedings, it seems likely that judgment will be in favor of the Ecuadorian people.

One witness presented a study that used global positioning technology to document the location of every well and every storage pit. The second witness helped write a study, funded in part by PetroEcuador, in which all the sites that Texaco had “cleaned up” were found to be contaminated by petroleum. A third witness noted that PetroEcuador (then CEPE) assumed Texaco, being a U.S. company, would be on the forefront of oilfield technology and practices; others told of waste pits overflowing in the rainy season, spilled crude oil being burned or buried instead of cleaned up, and rivers running black with oil; and Dr. Miguel San Sebastián, a well-published scientist researching in the fields of epidemiology and public health, testified about the ill consequences of life in proximity to oil fields. In 2005,
most likely in response to Dr. San Sebastián’s testimony, Texaco ran a newspaper advertisement attempting to discredit the peer-reviewed, published studies presented as evidence to support the link between health problems and oilfields. The scientific community responded with an open letter to “Texaco and its Consultants” questioning the company’s motivation for running the advertisements and upholding their fellow authors’ findings. The letter, signed by 65 scientists, observes that Texaco’s website offers a different perspective on the health issues: “The primary causes of disease in the region are poverty, poor sanitation, naturally occurring bacteria and parasites, a lack of access to clean water, and insufficient infrastructure.” There are other regions of the country that are equally poor, where oil exploitation is non-existent, in which levels of disease are not as high as in the oil-producing regions; most indigenous people are immune to the local microbial flora that make outsiders sick; and, the scientists note, “nowhere does Texaco mention how oil development could have conceivably altered these conditions, nor does it state that such conditions increase vulnerability to the environmental exposures of concern.” They also point out that experts hired by Texaco have not presented any evidence of “industrial and environmental exposure records,” and that the absence of such evidence suggests either improper record keeping or that existing records may be incriminating. Furthermore, the most recent scientific analyses of water and soil samples taken from Texaco sites show that any clean up performed was highly inadequate: Testing detected the presence of total petroleum hydrocarbons at all 22 sites; notably, 98 % of the water samples ChevronTexaco submitted had illegal levels of TPHs. The outcome of this case promises to be an important one.

If the plaintiffs win the case, it will certainly set a precedent that will have far-reaching implications. First and foremost, it will be groundbreaking for environmental law. Huge multinational corporations will have to be more aware of their industry’s accepted practices, knowing that they will be held to the industry standard even in a country with weak or non-existent
environmental legislature. Small communities will be empowered to address environmental concerns no matter what the size of the businesses operating in their neighborhoods.

This case also has implications for all businesses. If one of the largest companies in the world can be made to take responsibility for its actions by a group of concerned, wronged citizens in the rainforest, what will happen when a group of concerned people (who have access to many more resources) get together to right a wrong? Huge corporations may lose the sense of immunity to the “little man” they seem to harbor.

On a larger scale, this David and Goliath match-up is representative of a greater conflict between the petroleum industry and environmental interests. Petroleum and natural gas are natural resources. That means they are found in nature, as part of the environment. There is no way to obtain those sources of energy without interacting with the environment. Today global consumption of petroleum hovers at 80 million barrels per day, and is only growing. Were India, China, and other developing countries to reach in the consumption levels seen in North America and Western Europe, James Buchan predicts global consumption would reach 240 million barrels per day, three times the current amount. It appears world crude oil reserves will be long dry before the time consumption reaches that level, but that may not be the case: As the supply of crude oil dwindles, its price will rise due to simple supply and demand principles, which means that techniques that were once too expensive will become more widely used. Interestingly, rising prices will lead to a cyclical increase in supply and subsequent decrease in price. Buchan explains: “Higher prices also cause involuntary conservation as people choose to use less fuel or businesses move into less energy-intensive industries.” The cycle will continue indefinitely, not until the oil runs out, but until the cheap oil runs out, hypothesizes New Statesman columnist Brian Cathcart. Oil prices have risen dramatically since January 2008, a trend that is fueling the budding “green” industry. The switch to alternative energy sources may happen from the bottom up, beginning in countries where alternatives are already
cost-competitive with oil, heading next to poorer countries, who eventually will no longer be able to afford oil without compromising the rest of their budgets. The switch will then move to rich oil-importing countries like the United States, and finally to the rich oil-producing states. Perhaps competition will become so cutthroat, and petroleum so valuable, that conflict fuel will replace conflict diamonds. Perhaps pirating will again be a lucrative business, with stories of buccaneers who stop at nothing to acquire more “black gold.” In the worst case scenario, groups of citizens and NGOs will no longer be strong enough to protect the globe’s most sensitive areas from crude oil exploration. The ChevronTexaco case may play a huge role in which of these scenarios comes to pass. Victory for ChevronTexaco, however unlikely it seems, would give oil companies blanket approval to explore and exploit anywhere they want, no matter the environmental and societal repercussions. On the other hand, a victory for the plaintiffs would confirm that businesses must answer to their customers, no matter how far removed from production they might be.

The case of Texaco’s actions in Ecuador stands out. Most oil companies make a much more concerted effort to respect the environments in which they are drilling. For example, PetroBras—the Brazilian equivalent of PetroEcuador—studied Texaco’s practices “as a model of how not to extract oil in a rainforest environment.” A company called ARCO/Agip recently completely a drilling project in untouched Ecuadorian rainforest, setting a good example for other companies. They used a number of different practices to reduce impact during all steps of production, including extensive use of helicopters for transporting equipment to avoid building roads, directional and batch drilling to reduce forest clearing and pipeline building, and a very narrow (3m) right-of-way outfitted with a monorail for laying underground pipes. The company also opted to place the central processing facility outside of sensitive areas, to reduce impact from byproducts. Batch drilling enables one drill to work multiple wells, spaced close together to minimize forest clearing. Despite using new technology, the company saved money in all
stages of production. They purchased one-third the length of monorail needed, and disassembled one end to move it to the front of the line as the pipeline was laid. Use of helicopters was the most expensive part of the project, at $17 million, but construction and maintenance of a road was estimated at $92 million. Removing the central processing facility to a less sensitive area nearly halved development time from 21 to 12 months. If a company is going to make one change, directional drilling is the most environmentally friendly and cost-effective practice: it can reduce forest clearing by 90 percent, and reduces costs because companies only have to build one drill that operates multiple wells. Overall, the project was very cost effective.

Another way to minimize environmental impact is to continuously monitor ecological indications, such as the abundance of sensitive or rare organisms in each of six taxonomic groups (plants, invertebrates, amphibians, reptiles, birds, and mammals), forest cover, soil chemistry, and water quality. Monitoring these markers is only effective if an extensive baseline is established. Any change from pre-operation levels can be immediately noted and analyzed, and a response can be developed. Efforts should be made to minimize the impact on any human populations, as well. Indigenous populations are particularly at risk of contracting diseases from workers; to protect the indigenous people, workers should receive rigorous health screenings and any necessary vaccinations before appearing on site. These methods have been used successfully and without undue expense.

Petroleum microbiology is a rapidly growing area of science. There are multiple opportunities to use microbiology to an advantage in the production process. The use of microbes to treat waste products (bioremediation) is probably the most common use. The bulk of crude oil can be digested by microorganisms, making bioremediation a good choice for treating oil pollution. There are different factors that affect the process of bioremediation, especially its efficiency: the nature of the contaminated material, environmental conditions, and characteristics of the microbial population. However, the simpler the system, the less effective it
is at degrading contaminants to a specific level. Landfarming involves spreading wastes in a field and tilling it to mix the wastes with microbial populations in the soil. Volatile organic carbons generally are not degraded with this method, but 0.5 to 1.0 percent of total petroleum hydrocarbons degrades each month. A bioreactor controls temperature, pH, moisture, aeration, mixing, and circulation, which results in faster degradation; moreover, the VOCs are contained, and interestingly, their presence encourages microbial growth, which leads to the degradation of compounds of lower volatility. Generally, 0.1 to 0.3 percent of TPHs are degraded per day, although faster rates (close to one percent per day) have been achieved in Venezuela by a technique (used in 75% of Venezuela’s refineries) that involves acclimating a microbial population by growing it on crude oil.

Another way to remove VOCs is by biofiltration. Most biofilters involve a high surface area interior, with microbial populations present as biofilms. The contaminated air flows through the filter and the microorganisms remove the VOCs. Microbial populations can also be present in a liquid through which the contaminated air is bubbled. These methods are considered the most cost-effective way to remove VOCs from air.

Using microorganisms can enhance recovery of oil from wells by accomplishing three things: reservoir re-pressurization through production of fermentation gases, viscosity reduction through production of organic solvents or dissolved CO₂, and selective plugging of permeable zones in wells through biomass population. According to a paper in Microbiology and Molecular Biology Review, “A single-well stimulation treatment might increase the rate of production from 0.2 to 0.4 tons per day and sustain the increased rate for two to six months without additional treatments.”

Other uses for microbial populations in the petroleum industry are deemulsification, desulfurization, and denitrogenation. Microbial deemulsification would be an improvement over conventional treatments, because it can be completed on site, before transport to any processing facility. Biodesulfurization is more
efficient than physiochemical desulfurization, but the technique is still in development, and currently, the most effective method is a combination of hydrodesulfurization and biodesulfurization.116 The last use for microorganisms in the petroleum industry is as biosensors. Most biosensors are bacteria that have been genetically engineered to express a bioluminescent gene (lux, luc, or pGLTUR).117 There are 2 pathways for the biosensor: either the bacteria produces light until conditions become overly toxic, or the bacteria begins producing light in the presence of toxins.118

Between “industry best practices” and use of microorganisms to replace toxic chemicals, the process of oil production has the potential to become even more environmentally friendly, but only if the majority of players in the industry adopt such technology.

The Amazon rainforest’s acreage is an impressively large number. Due to its immense size, the effects of pollution and seemingly benevolent human presence (such as research stations and indigenous peoples) can be difficult to discern, let alone to measure. However, the Amazon still accounts for only a small percentage of the Earth’s surface area. In its relative Because it is only a small piece of the world, events that happen there may seem insignificant, but the truth is that they are not. As much as oil companies maintain their innocence, and scientists maintain oil companies’ guilt, we do not know what the end result of oil drilling will be. Perhaps Ecuador will be able to pull itself out of its burgeoning debt, or perhaps the damage will spread and grow and we will lose this unique environment. While the outcome may not be clear, it is clear that much more than crude oil goes into a gallon of regular unleaded gasoline. Half a world away, a community struggles to keep its inhabitants healthy, while an industry struggles to make its practices agreeable to that community. It is a struggle that may not be solved easily, but whose resolution will have a global impact. ☹
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Mapping
MORGAN CULVER

Charcoal, Pencil, Water color, Sand, Rubber, Ink on paper
ARTIST STATEMENT

The idea behind this piece is the combination of the fragility of identity and recognition and how it relates to location and time. Inspiration for the work includes several topographic maps from all over the world and images of fingerprints, some of them my own. The challenge behind the work was to capture the ideas of movement, change, and the very organic aspects of life itself.

First painting over the paper with oil paints as a base, I then used many different mediums to depict an interpretation of mapping on them; pencil, charcoal, more oil paint, eraser, and pen. The work is fragile and personal because of the size of the paper and the delicate lines and shading. Smudging that occurred was embraced by the ideas of the work, and added to the three dimensionality of the piece. The maps used as inspiration included those of Hahatonka, MO; Fuego, Guatemala; Loudoun County, VA; and the Alaska Valdez Quadrant.

Tying the image of a fingerprint along with the image of a map, given to my interpretation and the way with which I worked with the images emphasizes the fact that both are fragile yet important. And while the two images have similar visual patterns, they also have slight but important differences. While fingerprints can be used to find a person, or confirm an identity, a fingerprint is hard to find and quite delicate. Maps made of paper, to me, seem like one of the most fragile pieces of location identification ever created. Now there are maps on the Internet and portable GPS systems, but a paper map is easy to tear, get wet and smudge. I have personally lost several maps this way. Older maps that have survived are beautiful, but no longer accurate and not always easily legible. The movement and the disturbance of time changes everything, from the ever expanding flow of human growth to the most delicate and fleeting of traces such as a fingerprint.
I. Shutter Speed

Fold your subject in light,
cloud cover, a wrap-around porch.
Wisteria drapes the rail
she clenches in pudgy fists.

Her baby fat lingers also
in cheek and chin. Wave,
inspire a smile, and coax
summer into the shadows

of her grin. Pull back,
back, let age grip your face
and soften that old world.
Do you remember silver

shades of her childhood,
or the grey paint peeling?
The carpenter bees gnawing
tunnels under your feet?

II. Aperture

Before I found mulberry trees clustered
near Dad’s office, I told Jing I wouldn’t
take the silkworms; they feed on the new leaves,
she said, and though the shoebox is cozy
I dreamed a curling pile of white worms
blind in wasteful spinning, safe in cardboard

walls and lid. They shriveled into clumps,
translucent as dried mucus, without leaves.
Today I pick mulberries, white oblong brains

with slight purple stains, and scuttling bugs
between the lumps. Mom and I sometimes pick
wild raspberries along the bike trail

but Dad is lost among crinkling blueprints
on his day, so crushed berries paint my shoes.

III. Metering

Imagine an umbrella, spread wide
to allow the world’s weight to slide
along careful spines, pool at the tips,

and drip, drip, drip into her hair.

Umbrella, your spines are rusting,
your polka-dotted fabric wearing
polka-spotted holes, like time

collecting Dad, hair by hair.

But here, beneath this red umbrella
crouch two children, tracing rain
on porch paint, cryptic liquid glyphs

in lieu of bone runes, mutable.
Inside, Mom’s hands through her hair
seize; in a room higher Dad dreams;
all before the garbage bags

tumble trembling down the stairs.

The children can’t see beyond the light
shaking in raindrops on their umbrella,
or hear more in the jagged flashes;

they are dry except shoes, fingertips,

an odd calm in the storm, dry, dry.
The one with closed eyes, she clings
to an umbrella handle that carries
her beyond Mary Poppins’ songs

back to a room insulated
by rain, by miles, by soggy green beans,
cellular telephony and camera lenses

and forays into typography.

Back homes, there’s no paint on the porch,
nor on the new deck, the umbrella
is fading. Never mind that,

the rain and the light still play,

now in two children, extra facets
of Dad’s dreams, now in flowerpots
dangling from Mom’s developing porch,

always in the old rhythm.
Imagine the umbrella spinning on the porch, head down, coaxing rain to converse in a sunset beam.

Emma Sovich
Evil with a capital “E” is a concept that human beings have wrestled with since the dawn of time. The human is the one demonstrably rational animal, and therefore it is driven to act morally, which means eschewing and, when necessary, combating Evil. Yet Evil per se is a well-nigh indefinable idea. Ancient Greek philosophy offers us a Platonic form of the Good, but no Evil corollary. In fact, the best proving-ground for the study of Evil has frequently been the arts, not philosophy.

In literature, this study of Evil has found its best expression in the twin genres of horror and dark fantasy. Although these genres did not receive their names until after the Gothic movement of the eighteenth century, the artistic representation of Evil that they embody is present in literature of all eras. Beowulf, for example, now regarded as the genesis of the English-language canon, is indisputably both a horror tale and a dark fantasy.

Nevertheless, critics have a reflexive bias against the dark fantasy/horror tale because, in presenting Evil, it frequently depicts scenes of graphic violence, which some literati find distasteful. Such is the case with Shakespeare’s Titus Andronicus, which T. S. Eliot called “one of the stupidest and most uninspired plays ever written.” Coleridge said that it was “obviously intended to excite
vulgar audiences by its scenes of blood and horror” and Dover Wilson famously declared that it “seems to jolt and bump along like some broken down cart, laden with bleeding corpses from an Elizabethan scaffold, and driven by an executioner from Bedlam dressed in cap and bells.” 2,3 This last description is both colorful and accurate, but the literary merit of Titus Andronicus is not predicated on taste. Rather, by offending the sensibilities of the audience, this earliest of Shakespearean tragedies achieves the ultimate goal of the horror genre: confronting the beholder with Evil.

DEFINING GENRE

Before examining Titus as a horror story, it is first necessary to establish what a horror story is. Genre studies are of course inherently fraught with imprecision, because despite their mutual derivations, a “genre” is never so clear-cut a category as a “genus.” The borders between related genres are, of course, often blurry. Three terms will be discussed in the pages to come: horror, dark fantasy, and the “weird tale.” The last of these is an antiquated and obsolescent term that was a popular moniker for dark fantasy during the first half of the twentieth century. For the purposes of this investigation, it is synonymous with dark fantasy.

The division between horror and dark fantasy is not merely one of effect; dark fantasies can sometimes horrify and horror stories are often fantastical. The principal division is predicated on the focus of the subject matter and the primary emphasis of the work. The primary emphasis of a work of horror is to address the question of Evil. The primary emphasis of the dark fantasy/weird tale is to address “the uncanny.” These genres may overlap each other (as, for instance, in Beowulf), but the defining issue is the primary emphasis.

In his insightful essay Supernatural Horror in Literature, the twentieth-century author H. P. Lovecraft identifies many of the progenitors to what he called the “weird tale.” In discussing the Renaissance, he correctly observes, “In Elizabethan drama, with its Dr. Faustus, the witches in Macbeth, the ghost in Hamlet, and the horrible gruesomeness of Webster, we may easily discern
the strong hold of the daemoniac [sic] on the public mind...”

Lovecraft is correct in identifying two of Shakespeare’s tragedies as being essentially dark fantasies. Yet he omits *Titus Andronicus*, perhaps the most brutal play of Shakespeare’s *oeuvre*, because for Lovecraft, non-supernatural fiction is not worthy of mention. He explains his reasoning thusly:

The true weird tale has something more than secret murder, bloody bones, or a sheeted form clanking chains according to rule. A certain atmosphere of breathless and unexplainable dread of outer, unknown forces must be present; and there must be a hint...of that most terrible conception of the human brain—a malign and particular suspension or defeat of those fixed laws of Nature which are our only safeguard against the assaults of chaos and the daemons of unplumbed space.⁵

What Lovecraft is expressing is the basic distinction between horror and dark fantasy. His argument regards the dark fantastic as superior to the horrific. *Titus* is not fantastic in any sense, but it is overtly horrific.

In any case, Lovecraft is mistaken to dismiss out of hand the purely psychological horror story, for it is arguably even more effective than his examples, in part precisely because it achieves its effect *without* the trappings of supernature. Whereas the supernatural tale can often have the unintended side-effect of distancing the reader from the horrific (or “uncanny”) material (thus impeding the suspension of disbelief), the psychological horror story (of which *Titus* is one) forces an immediacy that heightens the audience’s emotional reaction.

At its most fundamental level, *Titus Andronicus* is a double-revenge story. Revenge is used throughout the play to carry out and justify incredible atrocities, and in witnessing these atrocities, the audience experiences a sense of revulsion. Such is the natural human response to Evil. In the late twentieth century, a movement known as “splatterpunk” developed within the horror fiction genre.
Exemplified by the works of then-collaborators John Skipp and Craig Spector, splatterpunk employed ultra-violence and (in the view of many) “gratuitous” gore to achieve this aforementioned effect in the reader. In reading *Titus Andronicus*, one can see that Shakespeare was using this method no less than four hundred years earlier, as was Ovid long before that, for it was from him that Shakespeare appropriated the most important part of his storyline.

**TITUS ANDRONICUS AS GRAND GUIGNOL FARE**

The recognition of this play’s splatterpunk value is not a new idea. In a 1979 *Shakespeare Quarterly* article, I. Pálffy reported on *Titus’s* first appearance on the Hungarian stage in May 1978. He identifies the director, Ferenc Sik, as “one of the younger directors in Hungary” at the time and goes on to explain Sik’s directorial vision:

He found *Titus Andronicus* to be a play which, imbued as it is with the idea that man is easily intimidated and is exposed to terror and abuse, expresses the very essence of human existence in the twentieth century. Had Sik contented himself with representing this reading…the performance would have been remembered as one of the more or less successful attempts at interpreting Shakespeare in a modern way. But he made yet another “discovery,” notably that *Titus Andronicus* could serve as test-material. By confronting audiences with it, he found it possible to detect how much violence they could endure in the theatre. In his version...all the horror and violence in the play were faithfully reproduced...severed heads and amputated arms could be seen falling off; blood, artificial yet realistically red and steaming, was pouring forth from wounded bodies. Sometimes there was even more violence in the performance than one
can find in the text: the rape of Lavinia—enacted in the form of a highly stylized yet appallingly grotesque pantomime—took place on the open stage. All this was a bit more than any audience could be expected to swallow, and the response was a curious mixture of distaste and giggling, at times nervous, in the auditorium.\(^7\)

With nothing but Pálffy’s report by which to judge this enactment, a reader might easily believe that Sik’s directorial experiment was a failure, but this may not have been the case. It is obviously true that theatrical (and cinematic) depictions of horror can slide from art to schlock if not overseen by an adroit director. However, it is not true (as Pálffy seems to imply) that art and graphic violence are mutually exclusive. The Italian film director Dario Argento proved this conclusively with his 1977 masterpiece \textit{Suspiria}, a horror movie based very loosely on Thomas De Quincey’s \textit{Suspiria de Profundis}.\(^8\)

In a decade when horror directors had devolved from gourmet chefs to short-order cooks, Argento blended the artistry of Alfred Hitchcock with the gory imagery and emotional jolt of Grand Guignol theatre. Notably, he did this contemporaneously to when \textit{Titus Andronicus} was appearing for the first time on a Hungarian stage.

Argento’s genius lay in the same understanding of horror that Shakespeare had. In order to qualify as art, horror must present both Evil and Beauty. This is why \textit{Titus Andronicus}—if it is directed correctly—can achieve the rank of art-horror. The character of Lavinia is central to the play’s enduring artistic value, because she is the avatar of Beauty. The atrocities committed against her represent Evil in its most unalloyed form, because they are not merely committed against one woman; they are committed against Beauty itself.

In part because of this use of highly symbolic characters, Jack E. Reese has wrongly argued that Shakespeare “formalized” (read “abstracted”) the horror of the play.\(^9\) In one sense—and only one sense—this is true: Shakespeare surely did not employ the brutality of rape and amputation for shock value alone. This does not mean,
however, that these horrors are meant only as symbolism. They are both shocking and symbolic, and this is why Titus is a successful piece of art-horror. The mutilation of Lavinia on the Elizabethan stage is comparable to special effects in a modern horror movie. The most stunning special effects cannot redeem a poorly-written script, but they can supplement the artistic value of a well-written one.

One scene that has received much attention from critics is III.i, in which Lavinia carries her father’s severed hand offstage, either between her arms (as in the Oxford edition) or between her teeth (as in the Riverside edition). In the latter scenario, the metaphorical dimensions of Titus’s revenge become clear. As Mary Laughlin Fawcett has observed:

> Contained in this scrawl-emblem of the father’s hand as tongue in the daughter’s mouth are ideas about the patriarchal nature of language (her tongue is her father), about the equivalence between speaking (tongue) and doing (hand), and about writing (what the hand does) as a substitute for speaking (what the tongue does)….Since it borrows from the past, language must finally be based on incest; the mother-tongue for this speaker is a father-hand, inserted incestuously between the teeth of a ruined mouth, a vagina dentata.¹⁰

Fawcett is correct to see that Titus’s hand takes the place of Lavinia’s tongue. Regardless of whatever sexual meaning this image does or does not contain, it foreshadows Titus’s later acts of vengeance. Marcus, for obvious reasons, calls the hand “warlike,” and a moment later, Titus vows to avenge the wrongs committed against each member of his family.¹¹ The “warlike” hand of the father will now become the wounded daughter’s tongue, “speaking” for her by punishing her assaulters. Using metaphor, Shakespeare is dramatizing the cliché that “actions speak louder than words.”

In A. C. Hamilton’s perceptive reading of the play, Lavinia’s “‘martyred’ and ‘mangled’ body symbolizes that fallen world which the tragedy projects. By mutilating her, Tamora’s sons
offend against Nature herself…. [Lavinia’s] ‘descent into hell’ is the vehicle for the tragic action.” 12 This understanding of Lavinia as a microcosm of despoiled Nature (a pre-Miltonic paradise lost) reflects quasi-Biblical themes. Notably, it is a religious rite that initiates the tragedy’s precipitous spiral into chaos. Yet far from arguing against ritual sacrifice, Shakespeare makes the audience feel, by the end of the play if not before, that Titus would have been wise to kill all his prisoners of war. Had he done so, he would have spared himself and his loved ones the many miseries upon which the tragedy rests.

SHAKESPEARE AND THE “GREAT EVIL DECONSTRUCTIONISM”

The key to the horror story, however, is not the audience response per se. Rather, a horror story should be judged on its effectiveness in representing Evil. The representation of Evil often has the effect of inducing the beholder’s revulsion, but that effect is peripheral to the representation itself. As the twenty-first-century author Caitlín R. Kiernan has pointed out, all horror stories deal with the intrusion of an “Otherness” into an established “Order.” 13 This Otherness is identified as Evil, and the characters’ interactions with that Otherness form the basis of the plot.

For the purpose of classifying an artist’s approach to Evil, Kiernan devised a critical theory known as the Left Bank/Right Bank taxonomy of horror. Kiernan describes the difference between the Left and Right Banks thusly:

The Right Bank can be characterized as generally “moral” and by this I mean that it accepts and, more importantly, promotes a conventional morality….It also recognizes an essential distinction between evil and good….ironically, I think the “splatterpunks” also have to be placed firmly on the Right Bank. While they threw around a lot of gore and touted themselves as revolutionaries, the old morals were almost always there (see, for instance, everything by Skipp
and Spector)....The Left Bank is more difficult to characterize in terms of morality: authors may demonstrate amorality or an embrace of alternate moral codes traditionally deemed evil (immoral). It either rejects or refuses to recognize the legitimacy of the “proper” Natural Order, or may simply find itself incapable of relating to or embracing that Order....Relativism is common, and classic distinctions between good and evil may be challenged, may be fuzzy…or may be disregarded.\(^\text{14}\)

T. Liam McDonald has criticized this model, calling it “that great evil deconstructionism” even though, as Kiernan points out, it is the exact opposite of deconstruction.\(^\text{15}\)

Regardless of its real or imagined shortcomings, this theory proves a useful tool in assessing the play at hand. Shakespeare, at least insofar as his authorship of *Titus Andronicus* is concerned, is clearly situated with the splatterpunks on the Right Bank; he makes no attempt to hide the fact that he sides with the Order Andronici against the Otherness of Tamora, her sons, and the Moor. More importantly, the audience’s sympathies are equally with Titus, not with Tamora, even though it is Titus who commits the play’s original sin by sacrificing Alarbus. As readers or viewers, we take vicarious joy in Titus’s revenge against Tamora, her kith and kin. We do so because the play is told, almost exclusively, from the point of view of the Andronici. Tamora is presented as a sympathetic character only during her initial appearance, and although we may join in her grief at the loss of her eldest son, we find her revenge misdirected and far too excessive. Indeed, it is her wrathful excess that both identifies her as Evil and incites the audience’s revulsion.

Right Bank horror is, by far, more popular (and hence more lucrative) than is Left Bank horror.\(^\text{16}\) In our own time, Stephen King demonstrates this fact, with such wildly marketable novels as *Salem’s Lot*, which is an undisguised retelling of Bram Stoker’s *Dracula*, and *The Stand*, which is nothing less than an apocalyptic
struggle of Good versus Evil. In its own time, *Titus Andronicus* was no less popular than these, and although Coleridge may have been half-right when he suggested that it appealed to the masses because of its gore, he failed to see the big picture. The ultimate reason that Right Bank horror is popular is because it speaks to the human desire for what Kiernan describes as the “Natural Order.” It would perhaps be overstated to say that the Right Bank reinforces public biases, but clearly it applies a finite moral calculus to its subject matter. Rather than probematizing morality (as the Left Bank frequently does), the Right Bank explains what its morality is and then defends it. There is, unquestionably, a yearning within the human animal to seek a moral life, and the majority of people will always simply want to be told (implicitly, as in *Titus*, or explicitly) what that morality is. This is the true underlying reason for the popularity of Right Bank horror.

**SHAKESPEARE AND THE “THREE STREAMS”**

An alternate way of looking at horror and dark fantasy is posited by David G. Hartwell in his editorial introduction to the short-story anthology, *The Dark Descent*. He argues that “contemporary horror fiction occurs in three streams, in three principal modes or clusters of emphasis: 1. moral allegorical 2. psychological metaphor 3. fantastic.”

Rather than focusing on the artist’s point of view as the Left/Right binary does, the three streams model emphasizes the style of the work itself.

Citing *Rosemary’s Baby* and *The Exorcist* as being emblematic of the moral allegory, Hartwell explains:

Stories that cluster at the first pole are characteristically supernatural fiction, most usually about the intrusion of supernatural evil into consensus reality….In our own day they are often written by lapsed Christians, who have lost their firm belief in good but still have a discomforting belief in evil.

This is the most perennially popular “stream,” and it shares much in common with Kiernan’s Right Bank.
Titus Andronicus is not, except in the most indirect way, a member of the first stream. It is superficially based on the “intrusion” of Titus’s prisoners into Roman society, but as Kiernan points out, all horror stories are premised upon some sort of intrusion. Moreover, despite claims to the contrary, the racial and cultural Otherness of the Goths and the Moor is not tantamount to a demonization of them, because near the play’s climax, Titus and Lucius are willing to join forces with Goths against Saturninus’s Rome. One could argue that this is merely an alliance of convenience, but such a reading of the play would overlook the development of the two most dynamic characters. Titus Andronicus enters the play as a jingoistic Roman general; only when the imperial establishment betrays him does he see the folly of his misplaced loyalty. Allying with the Goths is a consequence of his enlightenment. Moreover, when Tamora pleads for Alarbus’s life, she is Queen of Goths, but she is not yet Evil (on the contrary, at this point she is a sympathetic character). Therefore, her Evilness is predicated neither on her Gothicism nor on her womanhood. She is Evil—she becomes Evil—because her son is killed, in her estimation, needlessly.

Hartwell’s third stream, “the fantastic,” is obviously not where Titus belongs either. This stream flows closer to the genre of dark fantasy, with its emphasis on the uncanny. The fantastic horror story is a synthesis of horror and dark fantasy; although it may contain horrific elements, and although it may treat the question of Evil, its primary emphasis is typically the representation of the uncanny. This borderland of overlap between the two genres is the territory of H. P. Lovecraft. Andrew Bennett and Nicholas Royle propound that literature of the uncanny is interested in “making things uncertain: it has to do with the sense that things are not as they have come to appear through habit and familiarity, that they may challenge all rationality and logic.”

Having eliminated moral allegory and fantasy, we come to Hartwell’s middle stream: psychological metaphor. This is the subgenre in which Titus Andronicus belongs. The intrusive, Evil Otherness of the psychological metaphorical story is always a monster of some kind. As Hartwell explains,
The second group of horror stories, stories of aberrant human psychology embodied metaphorically, may be either purely supernatural, such as *Dracula*, or purely psychological, such as Robert Bloch’s *Psycho*. What characterizes them as a group is the monster at the center, from the monster of Frankenstein, to Carmilla, to the chain-saw murderer—an overtly abnormal human or creature, from whose acts and on account of whose being the horror arises.\(^{20}\)

The examples of monsters that Hartwell offers each embody Evil in a particular form; Bates’s is criminal insanity, Dracula’s is popularly interpreted as sexual deviance. In *Titus*, the chief monster is Tamora (*not* Aaron, as it may initially appear), and the specific form of Evil that she personifies is wrath (i.e., revenge taken to an extreme and unjustified level).

**TAMORA AS MONSTER**

Tamora’s revenge would be nothing more than commonplace if it were *mere* revenge. In fact, the audience would continue to sympathize with her if she had wrought vengeance only on Titus (and even Lucius and the other male Andronicus who were directly responsible for Alarbus’s death). She goes too far—and loses the audience’s loyalty—when she targets an innocent: Lavinia Andronicus. The atrocities committed against Lavinia are at once the most emotionally wrenching and the most demonstratively Evil of the play. The audience’s reaction to this Evil is intensified by Lavinia’s status as representative of the sacred feminine: she is young, female, and doubly innocent (both in the typical sense and in the sexual one). As the only glimmer of genuine beauty in the play, she is first disfigured and then utterly destroyed. This is partly the reason why *Titus Andronicus* succeeds as a revenge tragedy, but it is also why it ranks as a masterpiece of the horror genre.

The most overt display of Tamora’s status as the wrath-monster comes in Act V, scene ii, when she and her sons appear at Titus’s study door costumed as the vices that their characters manifest:
Tamora as Revenge, and her sons as Rape and Murder. In this scene, Titus feigns madness in order to trick his enemies, but his deception of them raises the question: is Tamora herself mad? Surely, dressing up as “Revenge” and visiting an arch-enemy’s home (on the off-chance that he’s too insane to recognize you) is a little less than rational. This scene, if it weren’t linked to the blood and carnage of the rest of the play, would be farcical. Tamora and her sons are playing trick-or-treat with Titus, and they get tricked—on a massive scale.

The question remains: did the execution of Alarbus cause Tamora to go mad? If so, would that explain—or even justify—her viciousness throughout the bulk of the play? The answers to these questions are: no, and no. Tamora is not mad, except in the colloquial sense; she is mad with anger, but she is not a lunatic. Her actions are rational, although at times (such as in the scene just described) they appear otherwise. The flaw of her plan in V.ii is not derangement; it is simple stupidity. She makes an error that would not be uncommon for a royal doing battle with a soldier: she underestimates her opponent. Tamora thinks that after suffering the loss of his own hand, the wrongful execution of two of his sons, and the rape and mutilation of his daughter, Titus would naturally go mad. She makes a crucial mistake by not considering that she is dealing with a warrior accustomed to spectacles of carnage and woe. Although he has been deeply hurt by Tamora’s treachery, Titus has not lost his sanity, nor has he lost his wits. Further, Tamora’s plan is not irrational and reflexive, as a madwoman’s would be; it is premeditated, and calculated to inflict a maximum amount of harm on the Andronici. This becomes apparent as early as Act I, when, after ascending to imperial status, she feigns mercy on Titus, only to reveal her true intentions in an aside:

I’ll find a day to massacre them all,
And raze their faction and their family,
The cruel father and his traitorous sons
To whom I sued for my dear son’s life,
And make them know what ‘tis to let a queen
Kneel in the streets and beg for grace in vain.21
In this speech—before Aaron speaks a single line—Tamora states her Evil intentions. Aaron, therefore, is not the real monster, nor is he a Svengali figure, manipulating the empress to satisfy his own appetite for Evil. Rather, his role is similar to that of an imp or a witch’s familiar. He performs all of the legwork needed to effectuate Tamora’s Evil plan. To be sure, he takes immense pleasure in seeing the consequences of his treachery, and he plots many of the details himself, but he is only the monster’s attendant, not the monster.

TITUS’S FATAL FLAW

Although Rome is not quite an Eden at the beginning of the play (Saturninus and Bassanius are fiercely vying for the emperorship), it is idealized and idolized, especially by Titus. His first words are “Hail, Rome…” and although he alludes to his having fathered at least twenty-six children, the mother of these offspring is nowhere to be found in the text.\(^{22}\) In a sense, Titus is wed to Rome itself; he honors it as he would a wife.

Unknown to Titus at first, Rome is suffering from an incipient moral decline and decay, which he blindly assists by declining the emperorship when it is offered to him in the first act and instead throwing his support to Saturninus’s candidacy. Like so many Shakespearean heroes, Titus Andronicus has a fatal flaw; namely, that he is obsessed with tradition. It is because he honors the tradition of primogeniture more than the bonds of friendship and loyalty that he favors Saturninus instead of Bassianus in their contest for the emperorship. He does so even after Saturninus angrily rebukes him, saying, “Andronicus, would thou were shipped to hell/ Rather than rob me of the people’s hearts!”\(^{23}\)

This devotion to tradition not only entrusts the fate of Rome to an unworthy heir, but it also serves as the catalyst for the play’s action. Titus’s sacrifice of Alarbus is utterly dispassionate; he does it for no other reason than because it is a traditional Roman custom. Immediately after Tamora pleads with him to spare Alarbus, Titus responds by saying:
Patient yourself, madam, and pardon me.
These are their brethren whom your Goths beheld
Alive and dead, and for their brethren slain
Religiously they ask a sacrifice.
To this your son is marked, and die he must
T’appease their groaning shadows that are gone.24

By asking Tamora’s “pardon” for killing her son, Titus seems to presume that she understands death to be as commonplace a matter as he has found it to be. Titus has lost twenty-one sons in wars for Rome, and he later proclaims that for them he “never wept,/ Because they died in honour’s lofty bed.”25 To him, a son who dies honorably need not be mourned, so he is utterly incapable of understanding Tamora’s distress.

Titus’s emotions are anesthetized to war-related deaths because, as a warrior, he has seen them so often. Whether Titus regards Alarbus’s death as honorable is not explicitly clear, but it seems likely that he would, because Alarbus died in the course of war, albeit not on a battlefield. Although Titus is a jingoist, he never blames the enemies of Rome for the death of any of his sons, so he is not expecting Tamora to blame him for sacrificing hers.

The line “Religiously they ask a sacrifice” stands out as being much shorter than the other lines in Titus’s brief speech. This truncated phrase, which is the only justification that he can muster for killing Alarbus, lends insight into Titus’s psychology. The word “religiously” is extremely significant. Religion, in the sense that he uses it, is only a euphemism for custom. Much like the added words “under God” in post-World War II America’s Pledge of Allegiance, the sacrifice of Alarbus is much more ceremonial than genuinely religious. Alternatively, a modern reader might better understand this speech in the way that they would understand someone who claims to “exercise religiously” (i.e., as a matter of frequency and custom).
WHERE IS THE BAD PLACE?

Importantly, the ritual sacrifice (of which Titus is only the instrument) is a uniquely Roman custom. Lucius refers to it as “Our Roman rites” and Chiron, in disgust, proclaims, “Was never Scythia half so barbarous.” 26 27 Although Tamora is the monster in this psychological horror story, the act that engenders her wrath is a Roman ritual. This leads to the question: is Rome itself the source of Evil?

The idea that Evil can permeate a specific location is a recurring motif in art-horror of all eras. The most common example is a haunted house or haunted castle, but it may be less centrally located than a single building. In his nonfiction book Danse Macabre, Stephen King identifies this motif as the “bad place.” 28 The bad place need not be haunted or cursed per se; it may simply be a place where bad things occur.

Some excellent examples of bad places appear in cinema. Director Roman Polanski famously utilized the bad place in his neo-noir film, Chinatown, in which the title section of Los Angeles is not used as a setting until the very final scene. 29 After nearly two hours of allusions to the tragic happenings that the hero, J. J. Gittes, experienced in Chinatown some time before, the audience recognizes instantly that Polanski’s unhappy ending was necessary, because Evil lurks in Chinatown, waiting for a chance to manifest itself. As soon as Gittes re-enters Chinatown at the end of the film, he and the people that he tries to help are doomed.

In Titus Andronicus, the bad place appears at first glance to be an urban setting, much like Polanski’s Chinatown. Under Saturninus’s nascent reign, Rome begins backsliding into moral corruption that harks to the times of Caligula and Nero. Saturninus breaks the first promise that he makes after ascending to the throne when, after offering to marry Lavinia, he changes his mind and chooses to marry Tamora instead. 30 This corrupt leadership eventually drives the hero to turn against the Rome he adores and ally himself with his erstwhile foes, the Goths.
Rome has been taken over by Evil powers because Tamora now controls Saturninus, and through him, Rome. She demonstrates her influence most strikingly when she convinces Saturninus to pardon Titus. Despite this, the bad place is not Rome itself. If there is a bad place in *Titus*, it is where the principal act of Evil is committed: the woods where Lavinia is attacked by Chiron and Demetrius. In Act IV, when Lavinia reveals to her father and uncle that she has been raped in the woods, Marcus asks a crucial question: “O why should nature build so foul a den,/ Unless the gods delight in tragedies?” The implications of this question are profound. Are the gods sadistic? If so, isn’t the audience as well? It is the audience, after all, for whose enjoyment this tragedy is enacted. Importantly, the woods are not only where Lavinia is captured by Chiron and Demetrius, they are also where Bassianus is killed and where Titus’s sons, Quintus and Martius, are unjustly arrested, later to be beheaded.

Divine sadism is one possible explanation for this plethora of misfortunes, but Marcus’s more likely implication—stated through rhetorical device—is that the gods are non-existent. Because the world of *Titus Andronicus* is one devoid of pity and mercy, it is thus devoid of the light of any god or gods. In that sense, the play is a forerunner to the twentieth-century absurdist existentialism of Samuel Beckett’s *Waiting for Godot* and other works like it.

Looking to Shakespeare’s influences rather than his literary successors, the feminist contrarian Camille Paglia reads *Titus* as a parody of Edmund Spenser. Although she may be correct to say that in *Titus* Shakespeare attempts to overcome Spenser, she is wrong to say that “this Roman drama of rape and mutilation turns the Spenserian rape cycle into slapstick comedy. It is hilariously, intentionally funny.” *Titus* is not comic on any level, though the morbid accumulation of horror upon horror eventually reaches the point of absurdity—at least for a modern audience. Paglia fails to acknowledge the fact that public executions were still widely practiced in Elizabethan England; Shakespeare’s original audience was not so far removed from the reality of the horrors in *Titus* as modern audiences are. In many ways, *Titus Andronicus* looks
forward to the unbearable bleakness of *King Lear*. Both plays are essentially psychological horror stories, and both depict a world in which the mercy and kindness of God are utterly absent.

**TITUS’S LASTING INFLUENCE**

The ultimate philosophical question behind *Titus* and all works of horror is: What is Evil? Like pornography, Evil is difficult to define, but one knows it when one sees it. Art-horror presents specific incidents of Evil, and in so doing allows the beholder to form an impression of the nature of Evil per se. In *Titus Andronicus*, Evil is harm inflicted deliberately and wantonly. The most emotionally revolting events in the play are inflicted without regard to the fundamental humanity of the victims.

The most potent form of Evil is misdirected harm. The targeting of innocents occurs multiple times in the play, and notably the three major parental figures (Titus, Tamora, and Aaron) are more emotionally affected by harm inflicted on (or threatened against) their loved ones than they are by any harm done to themselves. Tamora’s distress is self-evident in the first scene when she pleads for the life of Alarbus. Titus says of Lavinia, “It was my dear, and he that wounded her/ Hath hurt me more than had he killed me dead.”[34] Aaron, the most thoroughly and one-dimensionally Evil character of the play, shows his only redeeming trait to be his care for his son when he makes Lucius swear to spare the child’s life if he tells Lucius what he wants to know.[35]

Director Julie Taymor’s film adaptation of the play correctly noted the significance of these parent-child relationships. The final image of the final scene is extremely long. It shows young Lucius carrying Tamora’s and Aaron’s baby into the horizon, toward what might be either a sunset or a sunrise.[36] This is an optimistic image; it offers hope that the next generation may make a better world than the one that they will inherit from their parents. This hopefulness stands in sharp contrast to traditional theatrical performances, because the text itself offers no such scene. In fact, the elder Lucius’s ascent to the emperorship is in many respects a pessimistic textual ending. It was he, after all, who (willfully or
otherwise) instigated the domino effect of revenges by calling for the sacrifice of Alarbus.

In Taymor’s film, Anthony Hopkins’s interpretation of Titus eventually becomes a near-reprisal of his role as Dr. Hannibal Lecter in both *The Silence of the Lambs* and *Hannibal*. In the scene wherein Titus kills Chiron and Demetrius, Hopkins makes a sound similar to one he made during his first interaction with Jodie Foster’s character, Clarice Starling, in *The Silence of the Lambs*. Titus’s pie that he feeds to Tamora, which is made of Chiron and Demetrius, has obvious parallels to Hannibal Lecter’s cannibalism. Also, the severing of Titus’s hand is analogous to the severing of Dr. Lecter’s hand at the end of the movie *Hannibal*, which appeared in theatres the same year as *Titus*.38

As these examples demonstrate, *Titus* abounds in images and ideas that lend themselves easily to popular culture. It also has timeless philosophical import because, as art-horror, it helps its audience to understand the nature of Evil. For these reasons, *Titus Andronicus* is a work of art-horror for now and for all time. ☝
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ZACHARY Z. E. BENNETT is a former Rose O’Neill Literary House Fellow (2007-08) and the author of a baccalaureate honors thesis entitled “Gazing Into the Abyss: The Meta-Ethics of American Gothic.” As a member of the Lit House Programming Committee from 2007-08, he engineered the first annual “Literature at the Margins” festival, which brought Bram Stoker Award winner S. T. Joshi to campus, among others. He wishes to thank Prof. Kate Moncrief for introducing him to Titus Andronicus. Following graduation, he accepted an internship at Wildside Press, L.L.C., parent company of such publications as Weird Tales magazine. He is now the Assistant Director of the Washington Fund at Washington College, but he continues to contribute freelance editorial assistance to Weird Tales. He is disappointed by the Washington College Review’s decision to reject the poem “Oliver and the Sparrow” by Insley Smullen; therefore his essay, “Sixteenth-Century Splatterpunk: Titus Andronicus and the Question of Evil” is being published under protest.
AILEEN BRENNER is a drama major, creative writing minor from Middletown, Maryland, where she lives with her very supportive and talented parents and twin sister, and next to some cows. In the fall of 2008 she will complete her performance thesis and will have been a part of over 14 productions at Washington College. Aileen is also active in the WC music department and as a clarinetist for the Church Hill Theatre. She was the associate editor for the 2007-2008 yearbook and will be editor-in-chief for the 2008-2009 book. In addition, she is a member of the Riverside Players, the Royal Fakespeare Players, the Douglas Cater Society of Junior Fellows, and Hillel. After her graduation in 2009, she plans to pursue stardom in whatever form fate dictates it to take. Aileen could not be happier to share the genius of André Antoine with anybody who is willing to read a probably-too-long testament to his greatness. She would like to extend a special thanks to Michele Volansky for the support with this paper and for her knowledge about the modern age of drama, and all her drama friends who have had to pretend to be interested in the Théâtre Libre at one time or another.

JOSHUA BURKHART graduated with a major in art and a minor in computer science. He has created digital art for years and has learned to compose and play many instruments since elementary school. Josh plans to continue digital art and hopes to use it in a future career.

MORGAN CULVER lives in Poland ME, and both enjoys attending Washington College and the much milder weather of MD. She has been making her art since before she can remember, and is excited to be exploring ways to possibly integrate it into what she pursues as a career. Her art classes taken at WC have been some of the most influential, informative and fun courses she has ever taken, and she looks forward to more of the same in the future.
ALISHA RANDI (‘i’ dotted with a heart) DIGIANDOMENICO ’10 is a self-taught know-it-all from somewhere between Philadelphia and the Jersey Shore. Despite being a smarty-pants, she’s a student at Washington College in Chestertown, Maryland where she studies people, rhymes, and money. Oh, and she peddles computers on the side. Big ups to her girl The Notorious L.A.B. for her beats and inspiration. “Don’t be a hard rock when you really are a gem / Baby girl, respect is just the minimum”

ANTONIA DOMINO ’08 grew up in Annapolis, Maryland, and came to Washington College looking for small classes and professors who took an interest in their students. She found that, and much more. She majored in biology and minored in psychology and chemistry and is currently applying to veterinary schools (planning to specialize in large animal medicine). Outside of the classroom, she was active in athletics as a four-year member of the varsity sailing team, and involvement in intramural sports. She was a peer mentor for 3 years, and was secretary-treasurer of Tri-Beta Biological Honor Society for 2007-2008. She attended the Tri-Beta District Conference, where her poster presentation of her senior capstone experience took first place. First prize was a travel grant to the National Tri-Beta Convention, where the poster placed first in the microbiology division. Based on the success of her thesis, she would like to pursue further research, perhaps in a Ph. D. program. Tonie credits her success to the solid foundation, exceptional instruction, and personalized advising she received from the biology department. In fact, the devotion of Washington College professors to teaching and to students has inspired her to consider teaching at the graduate level as a possible tangent to veterinary medicine. Regardless of where her further studies lead her, she is grateful for everything she learned at Washington College, both in the classroom and out, and for the superb groundwork it laid for future pursuits.
MAGGIE FARRELL is a sophomore. She went to high school at Solebury, a tiny private school where the teachers got to know everything about the students no matter how much they resisted and, in return, they called them by their first names and became a member of their strong community. They received individual attention in interesting classes like “Activism in America” and “Star Wars Literature.” The school gave her opportunities to expand her knowledge in more ways than the SAT could ever measure. And this expansion found its way into her art classes. She learned that even something as simple as a drawing gives us the ability to manipulate the world around us and reorganize it as we see fit. Art gives us a new voice with which to speak and lets the viewer see the world through different eyes. She came to Washington College because she was impressed with its theater and art departments. Everyone she met in these departments was dedicated, kind, creative and encouraging. Because of them, she has created work that she is proud of, has found inspiration, and is beginning to build a future in performing and studio art.

JENN GERMAN is 22 years of age as of 2008; please adjust for the current year. She identifies with Vonnegut but would not rescue Faulkner from a burning building. She writes because she has to, just like they all say, but would frankly rather be at Walt Disney World. Right now she is probably studying for her arts management graduate degree, or else managing artists. Let’s hope it’s the latter, as the former sounds like a lot less fun.

MARIA ROSE GRIMES-HYNSON is a non-traditional student, and leads a double life as a super-mom/super-student. Her meek and mild-mannered alter ego has served the College as the Executive Secretary to the Provost and Dean for the last six years. She will marry Scott Hynson on October 11, 2008, and is the mother of one super-daughter, Dylan. Maria plans to graduate in 2015 (the same year that her daughter will graduate from high school), with
a major in the Humanities, and possibly a minor in Philosophy. She still doesn’t know what she wants to do when she grows up, but has hope that she’ll figure it out someday. In the meanwhile, she is very proud to have her paper included in such an illustrious publication as the *Washington College Review*.

**KRISTINA KELLEY ’11** plans to graduate with a major in art and psychology, as well as a minor in English. She became interested in photography while in high school and plans to continue photography as a second career in the future. She has won several awards for her photography in the past, and most recently received a juror’s award for her three part body of work Entouré at the spring Washington College Student Art Exhibition.

**NICOLE LUDWIG** grew up in a small town next to the ocean. Although she hopes to travel the world, she knows her home will always be by the sea. Nicole graduated from WC in 2008 with majors in art and international studies, concentrating in European studies. She has no idea what to do with her majors or where her career path will lead but that is just another adventure to be had.

**WESLEY SCHANTZ** grew up in Gaithersburg, Maryland, a few short miles away from the grave of F. Scott Fitzgerald. His love of literature and the written word grew into a love and appreciation for romantic languages, a passion fully realized in his travels abroad through parts of Spain, Morocco, Italy and Mexico. Wesley graduated a year early in 2008 Summa Cum Laude with both the Alfred Reddish award and The Erika and Henry Salloch Prize. Significant contributions to athletic organizations on campus, community service to the local public, and humanistic, feministic unity to the student body at WC punctuate his collegian career. Wesley is going abroad next to Madrid and the north of Spain, dedicating his time, effort and education to teaching English as a second language.
EMMA SOVICH ’08 graduated with a B.A. in English, departmental honors, the Sophie Kerr Prize, invaluable friendships, and a poetic license, among other things. She writes, book binds, draws, and throws pots in and around Baltimore while working and applying to MFA programs. A crazy Brazilian, a silent cricket, and a flock of umbrellas inspired her poems in this Review, but then, so did her family; she thanks them all. Also, she offers special thanks to her poet/writer friends for community and honest critiques.

LAUREN STANAHAN graduated from Washington College in 2008 with an English major and an art minor.

MIKHAIL ZABORSKIY was born in Novosibirsk city, Siberia, Russia on the 25 of January 1991. He doesn’t have any “direct” brothers or sisters—only a half-sister (same father, different mothers). He lived in Russia for 14 years of his life, graduated from elementary & middle schools and started high school. In 2005 his family (Mother and Uncle) moved to Koh Samui, Thailand, in order to establish a real-estate company. Thus, he graduated from The American School of Bangkok, Thailand in 2007 and got into Washington College. Now he’s a sophomore, double majoring in Business Management and Economics. His extracurricular activities include Model UN Simulations and WC Crew.
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