This work is an example of a public/private commission. The work was essentially a covenant that was secured by the city so the developer could construct a large and somewhat intrusive tower in downtown Sarasota, Florida. Ordinarily the time line on a project might be as long as a year. Because of all of the entities involved, it took much longer; three and a half years. This project required the approval of the developer, the condominium association, the city public art committee, the city engineer, the City Council of Sarasota, an outside engineering firm, the Florida Department of Transportation and the Public Safety Department of Sarasota. After gaining all of these approvals we were shut down on the work site because we forgot to get a right-of-way permit to work on the sidewalk. Another trip to city hall!

Many of my residential pieces are produced as a result of a site visit. I meet with the clients, extensively photograph the space and talk to them about how they intend to interact with the sculpture. Many times the view from in the home is one of the most important. One of the most important things in the minds of these clients was caring for the work. We discussed works that would be large enough to hold the space on their large lawn. However these clients wanted to make sure that they could maintain the work themselves using only a standard step ladder. Being older, they did not want to climb 10' in the air to maintain the finish on their sculpture. However, their site, with a single story ranch-like home, could dialog well with a work that was long and low. So, instead of a piece that was 10' tall, we designed a work that was 10' long and no more than 6' tall.
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Michael Kryzanek, Founding Editor of Bridgewater Review
An Appreciation

William C. Levin

Dr. Michael Kryzanek, Professor of Political Science at Bridgewater State College, has been Editor of Bridgewater Review since he helped found the magazine in 1983. Mike is moving on to a new position as the Director of Global Studies in the college’s newly established Center for Global Engagement. It is entirely consistent with Mike’s career at Bridgewater that in his thirty-seventh year as a faculty member, he has chosen to take on a new challenge. His restless energy, creative intelligence and hard work have made for a long list of accomplishments, including his eight scholarly books about Latin American and American politics (some of which have been published in multiple editions) and his many papers published in academic journals or delivered at professional meetings. There is not enough space here to do justice to his many achievements. However, I would like to take this opportunity to express my admiration not just for the hard work he has done as Editor of Bridgewater Review, but for the uncommon character with which he has done it.

In the third edition of Bridgewater Review, Mike wrote the first of his Editor’s Notebook columns, and in his twenty-seven years as Editor, has produced more than forty of these essays. A reading of these Notebooks has revealed to me a remarkably valuable and committed citizen of all the communities he inhabits. In many of his Editor’s Notebooks, Mike makes clear that he takes seriously his American citizenship, but certainly not in the lapel-Flag sort of symbolic way. I think of his sense of citizenship in both the way the Greeks meant the term, and also as the kind of citizenship exhibited by devoted members of “Red Sox Nation.” He roots earnestly for America, but is consistently pained by our national shortcomings.

In his first Editor’s Notebook Mike wrote about presidential politics, ending with the wish for America that “It would be nice someday to be as excited about the presidential elections as we are about the coming of spring and the beginning of the baseball season.” In September of 1988 he asked “Are We Still #1?” Not so much, as it turned out. Citing data on life expectancy, home ownership and use of opiates, Mike concluded not only that we had fallen behind other nations in many ways, but urged that we “recognize that development means more than millionaires and nuclear warheads.” Over the years he has argued consistently that America can only regain its place as a great democracy if it delivers on its fundamental promises. Typically, his remedies have been practical and focused at the individual level. Vote, think of the well-being of others as well as your own, pay your taxes and value good government. In short, be a responsible and grateful citizen of the United States.

His reliable and humane values have led him to regret the rise of a passive culture of television in America, the loss of “Main Street” to the huge chain stores and the increase in homelessness during a time of American plenty. But after reading all of Mike’s editorials the citizenship that he clearly holds dearest, and works the hardest to perfect, is that of family member. Readers could follow the story of Mike’s life as husband and father of three daughters in his recounting of family visits to the Wisconsin of his childhood, college selection road trips, the occasion of the last daughter moving out of the house and, most recently, becoming an exceptionally proud grandparent (just last year).

In his last Editor’s Notebook, Mike reveals himself to be an honorary “Millenial” (those Americans born between 1980 and 2001) in his admiration for that generation’s belief in public service and optimism about the future. He is clearly as young as any Millenial in energy, creativity and appetite for the challenges of responsible citizenship. Though his track record makes clear he does not really need it, his colleagues at Bridgewater Review wish him luck in all his new endeavors.

—William Levin is Professor in the Department of Sociology and Editor of Bridgewater Review.
Editor’s Notebook
The Force that Moves Us

We had just pushed back from the gate and the engines of our Boeing 717 were starting to whine. Their pitch was climbing when, suddenly, they whined back down to nothing. The exhaust end of the port engine was right next to me, so I looked out the window. I did this, of course, to see if goose feathers were spewing behind us onto the tarmac. No such luck. No information.

I checked to see if any of the other 100 passengers on the flight were looking for an explanation. No one but me, apparently, cared. Their conversations, reading and general fussing were uninterrupted. Then the grinding, thumping noise began. It was rhythmic, coming every four seconds. It clearly was coming from under the plane, and forwards somewhere. It was a sound I had never heard in past flights, and it was plenty loud. No one could fail to hear it. Thumping seemed to me to be an okay sound in a commercial jet, though I’m not sure how I decided that. But grinding? No. No grinding. Again, no one seemed to have noticed. A cabin attendant walked past our aisle and I almost asked her about it. But what to ask? “Do you hear that?” “Is that noise normal?” “Could I change to a later flight, please?” Then the pilot talked to us. “We’ve had a problem with our primary computer, and we have to reboot it before we can take off. Should only be a few minutes, folks.” I liked that “folks” part. Folksy. But nothing about the thump/grind sounds, which I couldn’t hear. Clearly.

Five minutes later we were taxiing to the end of the runway, the grinding and thumping noises still audible. They were finally drowned out by the screamingly high revolutions of the engines during takeoff. More than 100 people in a 120,000-pound cigar tube climbing to 30,000 feet and not a peep from me or any other passenger, as far as I could tell. To quote a colleague, “How could this happen?” I’ll tell you how; it’s “The Force,” and I’m not talking Bernoulli’s Principle here.

My desire to ask about that scary noise in the airplane was suppressed by what felt like a weight pressing on me. Why didn’t anyone say something? How could I be the only one to ask? I never did, and I suspect that others felt the same. We all kept private any concerns we had because of the social pressure not to ask. “The Force.” In this case, the social force. It is the set of pressures that influence our behavior because we live in association with others. Social forces move us to consider the effects of our behaviors on the lives of other people, most often, we hope, to good effect. They are as real in our everyday lives as are the physical forces, like gravity, that influence events. And, like physical forces, we must be aware of their existence and properties if we are to use them in our own interests. Allow me to illustrate with an example, one which has been making news recently.

This morning The Boston Globe ran a front-page story on bullying in schools. It was reported that a seven-year-old girl had called a classmate names and told her she could no longer sit with the name-caller’s friends at lunch. The other girls all went along. The point of the story was to report that the phenomenon of bullying starts much earlier than previous stories had suggested. These have mostly reported on cyber-bullying among older children, some instances of which have led to suicides by targeted kids. The social forces to “go along” among children are shockingly strong, leading many to commit acts of cruelty which contradict even their deeply held personal values. Social psychologists have long been able to demonstrate in experimental studies the fundamental force of conformity, even to the extent of harming others merely to “go along” with social pressure to do so.

In order to be able to operate normally in our complex world, we must take on faith a great deal about the forces that surround us. We simply do not have time to learn all about them. People don’t need to know how planes get lift to stay in the air before they will agree to fly in them. (If I’ve now made it necessary for you to do so, sorry. Just look up the Bernoulli stuff and you’ll feel better). We have accepted that there are forces of nature, such as gravity, which inventors, engineers and technicians can harness to our uses. However, the social forces operating in our lives are given entirely too little attention. Unlike physical forces, the management of which we cede to inventors and engineers, social forces must be managed by normal citizens in everyday interaction. But in order to be able to do this, we must begin to take them as seriously as we do physical forces such as gravity. We must become more sensitive to their existence and expert about their influences on us. Otherwise, we cannot reasonably expect to turn them to the values and goals we hold dearest.

—William Levin is Professor in the Department of Sociology and Editor of Bridgewater Review.
We live in a time when dire warnings about the imminent demise of the Republic are commonplace. Most recently, prominent leaders of the Republican Party have predicted “Armageddon” as a consequence of recently passed Health Care Reform legislation. Commentators across the political spectrum announce with great confidence that the end of the Republic is nigh.

A little historical and cultural perspective in these moments can be a healthful thing. Americans have feared for the future of the Republic since before there was a Republic. Late eighteenth and early nineteenth-century Americans, much like twenty-first-century Americans, had a hard time imagining how a heterogeneous, mobile and growing population could be brought under one ideological and governmental roof. And for many prominent Americans in the early days of the nation, the lingering issue of the “Indian problem” posed its own peculiar challenges. Among the many writers struggling to come to grips with the role of Indians in the new Republic was Timothy Dwight (1752–1817), author, President of Yale College, and minister of the town of Greenfield, Connecticut. Dwight voiced his concerns through a variety of genres, including the pastoral-epic poem, Greenfield Hill (1794), and Travels in New England and New York (1822).

Greenfield Hill and the Travels reflect deep conflicts in Dwight’s vision for the future of America and the place of the Indian in that physical and imagined space. When the Indian appears in Greenfield Hill, his ghostly presence serves primarily to remind the audience of its current state of contentedness, the righteousness of American history, and the validity of its developing ideology. The landscapes and people Dwight both encounters and contemplates in the Travels, however, undermine and complicate this comfortable distancing. The dead and living Indians of western New York aren’t easily relegated to imaginative space. The ongoing, unrelenting presence of the Indian serves as a reminder of the failure of the Republic to assimilate and absorb all its citizens, a failure that bodes ill for its future.

The Travels and Greenfield Hill, at their most uncomplicated moments, reflect Dwight’s undimmed optimism about America’s future. Dwight ties American ideals to American landscape, seeing in that landscape the dangers and possibilities facing the Republic. There is a consistency to Dwight’s aesthetic, a palpable pleasure in the sight of cultivated land, tidy town commons, clapboard farmhouses. Significantly, this landscape and social structure supplant the savagery embodied by earlier—i.e., Indian—cultures:

No more the captive circling flames devour;  
Through the war path the Indian creep no more;  
No midnight scout the slumbering village fire;  
Nor the scalp’d infant stain his gasping sire:  
But peace, and truth, illume the twilight mind,  
The gospel’s sunshine, and the purpose kind.

In the new, cultivated and bounded landscape, savagery and violence are obliterated; the landscape prompts in the imagination not scenes of violence, but vistas of peace and Anglo-American homogeneity.

This idealized representation of the Connecticut landscape and people, however, has a rippling undercurrent of defensiveness and anxiety. This bubbles to the surface most obviously in Part IV of Greenfield Hill, titled “The Destruction of the Pequods.” The chapter opens in a haunted meditation on the presence of the dead:

Ah me! while up the long, long vale of time,  
Reflection wanders towards th’ eternal vast,  
How starts the eye, at many a change sublime,  
Unbosom’d dimly by the ages pass’d!  
What Mausoleums crowd the mournful waste!  
The tombs of empires fallen! and nations gone!

Even the fresh American landscape is filled with the dead of the ages, whose presence makes it impossible for the poem to control what it represents. Like other white
American writers, in *Greenfield Hill* Dwight engages in what Renée Bergland describes as the removal of the Indian from the American lands to the American imagination. The Indians are gone, then, but not in the least forgotten, and their presence interrupts the poetic scenes of battle from the Pequot War. (Fought from 1634–1638, the Pequot War pitted an alliance of colonists, Narragansett and Mohegan Indians against the Pequot tribe.) This part of the poem contemplates, first, the rise and fall of Indian empire, in which the narrator justifies the practice of Indian “removal.” This is followed by a mournful disquisition on the lost souls of Indians, a fleeting, almost *pro forma* “haunting” of the narrator by the displaced Indians.

The poem frames the destruction of the Pequots as the necessary first step in the Americans’ eventual overthrow of the British Empire. Any qualms regarding the overthrow of this Indian “empire” are readily calmed by the claim that the Indians did not husband the land, and therefore had no legitimate claim to ownership of it, a typical argument employed by the colonists to justify the massive land-grab of settlement. Thus, Dwight’s imagining of the landscape before English colonization is primarily a landscape of absences:

No charming cot imbank’d the pebbly stream;  
No mansion tower’d, nor garden teem’d with good;  
No lawn expanded to the April beam;  
No mellow harvest hung it’s bending load;  
Nor science dawn’d; nor life with beauty glow’d;  
Nor temple whit’en’d, in th’enchanting dell;  
In clusters wild, the sluggish wigwam stood;  
And, borne in snaky paths, the Indian fell  
Now aim’d the death unseen, now scream’d the tiger-yell.

Dwight depicts pre-colonial New England as a land lacking not just the trappings of civilization, such as “whiten’d temples,” but which lay uncultivated by those who lived on it: no “mellow harvest hung its bending load.” Absent recognizable cultivation, North American land had no rightful owners until the arrival of the agriculturally-minded English.

However it may justify the Indians’ eradication at the hands of white settlers, the poem reflects marked unease with the lingering presence of dead Indians. The narrator moves rapidly from this re-creation of the wasted Indian landscape to a moment of haunting: “Even now, perhaps, on human dust I tread, / Pondering, with solemn pause, the wrecks of time”; and a few lines later,

The plodding hind, laborious, drives his plough,  
Nor dreams, a nation sleeps, his foot below ...  
Releas’d from war, and far from deadly foe,

Lies down, in endless rest, a nation brave,  
And trains, in tempests born, there find a quiet grave.

In Bergland’s construction, Dwight writes like a man haunted by the dispossessed. He is able to describe the vanquished foe in generous terms—“a nation brave”—but the image of a sleeping nation just below the foot of the plowman is an unsettling one.

This sense of disquiet is continued later in Part iv. Here the narrator laments the great failure of the English to convert the Indians and bemoans the lost opportunity to bring more Christians to salvation. Of the dead, unsaved Indians, the narrator asks:

Where are they now? What thoughts the bosom pain,  
From mild Religion’s eye how streams the tear,  
To see so far outspread the waste of man,  
And ask “How fell the myriads, HEAVEN plac’d here!”  
Reflect, be just, and feel for Indian woes severe.

While these lines reflect a lingering sense of guilt that the warring colonists didn’t do more to convert the Indians to Christianity, there is no lament for their absence from the land. In *Greenfield Hill*, despite moments of eerie discomfort, the Indian is cleared away to make room for the white, Protestant farmer. He is relegated to the past, and the reader is allowed the indulgence of “the tear, / That steals, impassion’d, o’er a nation’s doom,” a tear that is permissible precisely because of the finality of that doom. The bleak necessity of Indian removal may haunt the poem, but any remorse for the brutality of the destruction of the Pequots is overwhelmed by the triumphant march of American progress.

Dwight wrote *Greenfield Hill* while relatively young—the poem was published in 1788, when he was 36. Dwight was a man on the rise, surely, but not well-known outside of a relatively narrow circle. *Travels in
New England and New York, however, is the work of a powerful and public man in the last and most significant phase of his career, an attempt to explain the new nation to itself, and thus foster a sense of national unity and purpose. As we have seen in Greenfield Hill, however, the narrator of the Travels confronts ghosts from the Indian past and flesh and blood human beings of its present that complicate and undermine Dwight’s idealized American vision.

In western New York, Dwight encounters what he calls “oak plains” which are, according to his description, an elevated stretch of treeless plain. His description of these plains conveys a sense of bewilderment and confusion, caused primarily by the lack of discernible boundaries. Dwight writes that “[n]o passage out of them is presented to [the viewer’s] eye. Yet though the tract around him is seemingly bounded everywhere, the boundary is everywhere obscure…they appear rather to border dim, indistinct openings into other tracts of country. Thus he always feels the limit to be uncertain….” The plains are a nightmare landscape, and in this “bewildering scenery” his imagination is promptly overtaken by Indians, for the viewer “…cannot fail to remember that on these plains Indians have lived.” As in Greenfield Hill, the narrative quickly turns into an intense imagined encounter with an Indian: “the secret windings of the scout, the burst of the war whoop, the fury of an Indian onset, the triumphant display of scalps, and the horrors of the war dance before the tortured and expiring captive…these thoughts…spring up instinctively [in my own mind]”. The imagined scene of horror is a mirror image of that which is obliterated from the landscape and the imagination, through the destruction of the Pequots, in Greenfield Hill. But in western New York, far from the confines of long-settled New England, the landscape is unbounded and so is the imagination. There is no cursory lamenting of the murdered Indians’ lost souls, as though the open landscape is too dangerous a setting for remorse.

This moment of imaginative dismay ends abruptly, and the narrative shifts to a passionless explanation of how the plains came into existence and a complex repudiation of Indian land use practice. In an effort to squelch his near-sublime horror, Dwight reverts to a rational deconstruction of Indian worth, hoping to control the terrifying and powerful savage by delegitimizing his claim to the land. Throughout the Travels, Dwight argues that the key to Indian assimilation is their adoption of an agricultural life, and he repeatedly laments their failure to do so. When considering the impoverished circumstances of the Mohegans currently living in Montville, Connecticut, Dwight writes that they “…have been repeatedly solicited by the Oneidas to sell their own lands and plant themselves at Brothertown in the state of New York,” but notes that few have gone or will go because “…they are so attached to their native spot, so addicted to a lazy, sauntering life, and so secure of gaining an easy livelihood by fishing in the neighboring waters as to feel little inclination to remove.” The “easy livelihood” of subsistence fishing seduces the Indians from the healthful (spiritually and physically) practice of farming. Dwight establishes, here and elsewhere throughout the Travels, that the Indians’ love of ease is a serious (if not insurmountable) obstacle in their assimilation to Protestant American culture.

Both Greenfield Hill and the Travels reveal the anxieties beneath the confidence of Dwight’s expansionist American rhetoric. Doubts about the troubled, sometimes haunted present and uncertain future have always troubled American writers and thinkers; they are not new to our times. The causes of our anxiety may shift, but our anxiety remains. It is central to the ongoing process of self-definition that preoccupies the citizens of the American Republic.

—Ann Brunjes is Director of the Office of Teaching and Learning and Visiting Associate Professor of English.
In 2004 Elizabeth Englander, Professor of Psychology at Bridgewater State College, was the first Presidential Fellow at Bridgewater State College. During that year she established the Massachusetts Aggression Reduction Center (MARC) and launched its model programs to serve the Massachusetts K–12 educational community. When MARC goes into a school, it focuses on providing and implementing anti-bullying services. MARC works intensively with administrators, classroom teachers, support staff, students and parent and community groups.

The recent suicide of 15-year-old Phoebe Prince of South Hadley, Massachusetts, brought into sharp focus the desperate seriousness of bullying among young people. She had been taunted and threatened incessantly by her classmates in person, via text messages and on the social networking site Facebook. The cyberbullying to which Phoebe Prince was subjected is the newest form of an abusive pattern of behavior that has always existed among young people, and which has recently been increasing alarmingly in both frequency and severity.

Bullying and aggression in schools in Massachusetts today has reached epidemic proportions. Abusive bullying behaviors begin in elementary school, peak during middle school, and begin to subside as children progress through their high school years. Nationwide statistics suggest that somewhere between one in six and one in four students are frequently bullied at school. The 2005 Youth Risk Behavior Survey in Massachusetts found that 24% of Massachusetts teenagers reported being bullied at schools in the year before the survey. In a December 2006 survey conducted by the Massachusetts Aggression Reduction Center (MARC), one-fourth of Massachusetts schools characterized the bullying in their school as “serious” or “extremely serious.”

WHAT IS BULLYING? Bullying refers to the physical and/or psychological abuse, perpetuated by a powerful child upon a less powerful one, with the intention to harm or dominate. Typically, bullying is repetitive, intentional, and involves an imbalance of power. Bullies enjoy social power and therefore seek out situations where they can dominate others. Bullying can be either direct, such as physical or verbal aggression, or indirect, such as insults, threats, name calling, spreading rumors or encouraging exclusion from a peer group.

It is unfortunate that adults often consider bullying an inevitable and even normal part of childhood. This belief undoubtedly stems from memories of the qualitatively different bullying of past generations, which was much less frequent, less supported by children’s peers, conducted by socially ostracized children, and never, of course, online. Little wonder that adults today frequently ask why “such a fuss” is made over bullying—which was, as they recall it, an unpleasant but infrequent childhood behavior. One result of this attitude is that adults sometimes fail to intervene, resulting in the victim feeling powerless and hopeless in a situation that is torturous in nature. If children feel powerless in situations that adults perceive yet dismiss, how much more powerless must they feel when they are victimized in a way adults cannot even begin to comprehend?

WHAT HAS CHANGED? Bullies today can be popular and socially successful in a way that they have not been in past generations. The popularity of bullies may be a significant change, but it pales in comparison to the significance of the dawn of the age of cyber immersion. Cyber immersion refers to the utilization of cyber technology and the internet as a central, rather than as an adjunct, element of daily life. The generational shift from cyber utilization (using the internet as a convenience and an adjunct to real life) to cyber immersion (using the internet as a primary or
central method of communication, commerce, relationships, and recreation) is a generational shift which has not seen its equal since the Sexual Revolution in the 1960s and 1970s or the turn-of-the-century immigration into the United States. Then, as now, the older generation lacked a basic understanding of how the younger generation is thinking, feeling, and acting. This ignorance adds an additional layer of obstacles to the work that adults must do to combat childhood abusive-ness or bullying.

Cyberbullying, the abuse of choice of the Cyber Immersion Generation, is the perfect bullying crime. It is very hurtful, yet (generally) does not kill its victims; it is extremely simple and easy; it does not require significant planning or thought; it similarly does not require self-confidence or social fitness, and the perpetrator is extremely unlikely to be caught or disciplined. The Cyber Immersion Generation ensures that the victim will be accessible, and the generation gap ensures likewise that the oversight of adults will be sporadic or absent. Technological advances designed to prevent cyberbullying are often easily circumvented (e.g., school computer system filters) and adults are so out of touch that they are often unaware of the frequency of cyberbullying or the types of it that exist, never mind being unaware of how to control or reduce it.

RISK FACTORS FOR CYBERBULLYING

Little research exists that can inform the study of cyberbullying risks. Some experts have postulated that risks for cyberbullying include less education about electronic communications, risks, and values; being less able to rely on parents for guidance about the Internet; and being less attentive to, or not receiving, internet safety messages. Only 8% of schools have any education for children about internet safety or bullying, even though experts agree that education in this area is the key to safety. Anecdotal evidence suggests that being a victim of offline bullying may increase the probability of becoming an online cyberbully. Schools in Massachusetts have reported that many offline bullies operate online as well, suggesting that risk factors for cyberbullying may include the risk factors for “traditional” bullying.

At the time of this writing, cyberbullying occurs primarily through webpages, online social networking websites and instant messaging via the Internet and cellphones. The 2007 MARC cyberbullying study found that despite the high numbers of online abuse victims, instant messaging and talking on cell phones were only slightly less popular as preferred communication strategies to speaking face-to-face. Thus, the Immersion Generation sees digital communication as indispensable, regardless of its misuses by peers.

The rapid evolution of technology and the way it is used renders any specific type of cyberbullying definition (e.g., “sending abusive emails”) obsolete by publication date. Indeed, it is perfectly possible that in the short weeks intervening between this writing and its publication, new technologies may well have spurred new types of cyberbullying.

A characteristic that makes cyberbullying particularly insidious is that derogatory statements or threats and humiliating pictures or videos of a person can instantaneously be sent to hundreds of viewers with the click of a button. This can exploit the natural developmental tendency of adolescents to feel constantly watched or “on stage” (often referred to as “imaginary audience”). Bad as it is to be cornered by a schoolyard bully in an isolated corner of the schoolyard there isn’t a vast audience to witness your humiliation. Thus, the problems associated with schoolyard bullying may be magnified in cases of cyberbullying. Anecdotal cases support that possibility, such as in the case of Ryan Halligan, the 13-year-old from Essex Junction, Vermont, who committed suicide in 2003 after being cyberbullied by his classmates.

DIFFERENT TYPES OF BULLIES

Many theorists have offered typologies of bullies. The following typology has been utilized in response to the advent of cyberbullying and the resulting comparisons which now occur between traditional school yard bullying and cyberbullying. Traditional psychological theory might hold that the vehicle is of less importance than the intent; that is, if one wants to be a bully, then one finds a vehicle (schoolyard or cyber), and if a vehicle is unavailable another will be used. So, if one cannot bully online, then one bullies in person. The motivation is paramount. Other psychological theories emphasize...
the opportunistic situation more (i.e., that some types of bullying will only occur when the situation permits or encourages them), and these theories seem to “fit” better with cyberbullying since many cyberbullies do not choose in-person bullying if the cyber route is denied.

It is notable that some experts have already identified patterns of differences between children who only bully online, and children who bully in person or both in person and online. In working with schools, MARC finds it useful to identify five types of bullies:

**BULLIES.** These children are “traditional” school yard bullies. Their motivation is to dominate their victims, increase their own social status and instill fear in potential victims. Their *modus operandi* is to abuse their victims, either physically or, more commonly, psychologically/verbally. As a group, they tend to have high self-esteem and a marked tendency to perceive themselves as under attack in a hostile environment. Their academic achievement may be moderate to poor, and aggression is their preferred tool for domination. They rely on peer support or lack of intervention in order to continue their activities. Limit-setting is the adult response which operates best to reduce this type of bullying behavior.

**EGGERS.** “Eggers,” sometimes also referred to as “henchmen” or “followers,” are so called because their main function is to egg on bullies. These children are a primary support system for school yard bullies. Eggers often have poor self-esteem and poor social skills. They befriend and assist bullies because they fear being victimized and because by doing so they gain a high-status, socially powerful friend. Unlike bullies, they do not see their own bullying behaviors as a justified response to a hostile world; they accurately perceive that their behaviors are harmful and unacceptable but they tend to minimize their own involvement or minimize the impact of their own behaviors. While some eggers are consistently friendly with a bully, a subtype is Floaters. Floaters are not regular friends of bullies, but may egg on or help bullies during specific bullying situations because they fear being victimized themselves, or because they see it as socially desirable to help out popular bullies. They may “float” in and out of helping bullies; in some situations, they may be silent bystanders, while in others, they may actively assist the bully (e.g., by laughing at a victim). Like all eggers, they minimize the damage their behavior causes and try to avoid self-confrontation regarding their own role in bullying. Floaters may also be “unintentional cyberbullies,” as discussed below.

**ALL-AROUND BULLIES** are school-yard Bullies who are widening their bullying activities into the electronic realm. Their motivation and *m.o.* is the same as Bullies; they simply regard the electronic realm as a new arena of opportunity to continue their abusive activities.

**ONLY-CYBERBULLIES** are children who would not engage in school-yard bullying, but do engage in cyberbullying because they have a set of beliefs or attitudes that support cyberbullying specifically. For example, only-cyberbullies might not bully in person because they are powerless socially or are invested in school and academics; yet, they are willing to bully online because they believe that cyberbullying is without risk since adults are seen as simply not being part of the virtual world. The only-cyberbully could be a victim of an in-person bully at school who attacks his tormenter online, where he can do so relatively safely.

**UNINTENTIONAL CYBERBULLIES.** These children also cyberbully because of a set of beliefs or attitudes, but they appear to do so without the intent to actively bully that characterizes only-cyberbullies (see above). One common attitude in this group is that the Internet “doesn’t count” or “isn’t real” and so what happens there doesn’t particularly hurt anybody or carry any risks. Because of their limited ability to apply their own victimization experiences, children may believe these myths even when they themselves have been hurt online. Alternatively, some unintentional cyberbullies may truly be intending to joke but their writing does not convey their tone accurately, and their words are taken seriously even though they were not intended to be taken that way. We know that many adults are overconfident that their writing accurately reflects its intended emotional tone, and it is reasonable to assume that children make similarly poor judgments.

In our work with schools, MARC has developed some concrete recommendations for educators in their efforts to prevent cyberbullying. Here are some of them.

Be up to date regarding information technology and its misuses. This is not a reference to traditional knowl-
Working with schools for the last five years has revealed what we in MARC think are some important elements of successful efforts to prevent bullying.

Element #1. Acknowledge that educators are overwhelmed and cannot know everything, and offer them help with implementation and assistance. There is no real substitute for an in-depth knowledge of the realities of teaching today. Acknowledging these realities renders classroom teachers and support staff more willing and ready to acquire new skills and be more receptive to the source of new information.

Element #2. Use the academic/teaching model rather than the marketplace model. An academic center reduces and scales costs; removes the profit motive by utilizing a salaried professor as a director; utilizes existing resources very effectively (such as students, computer and physical infrastructure, high quality levels of knowledge and expertise); and establishes, for the schools seeking services, a dependable source of qualified professionals.

Element #3: Use research to inform practice. Research on traditional bullying abounds while research on cyberbullying is yet to be developed. Nevertheless, informed practices are best practices and it is important to keep in touch with the difference between anecdotal and experimental evidence, however compelling anecdotal evidence in the field may be.

Element #4: Distinguish between bullying and conflict. Bullying, unlike conflict, is defined by a power differential. A bully is very powerful, while a victim has little or no social power in the situation. Unlike the case in equal-power conflicts, the bully has little or no incentive to “settle” the conflict. Rather, he or she may be invested in its continuation. This is an important reason to avoid mediating bullying conflicts, since successful mediation requires both parties to have some motivation to end the conflict in question.

Element #5: Produce innovative programming that addresses persistent obstacles. No cyberbullying program can, or should, remain static for three or more years. The field evolves rapidly and our curricula is updated monthly to reflect that. This is not an argument that outcomes research should not occur; it is merely an acknowledgement of the difficulty faced in this area.

Element #6: Address school climate. This means that everyone, including faculty, administration, students and parents, must get involved. Students, especially adolescent students, need to be proactive partners, not passive recipients of adult-led programs. Adults need to be sensitized to the issue of cyberbullying, to the reality of the school day, to the limitations schools face and to their own responsibilities at home and in the community.

—Elizabeth Englander is a Professor in the Psychology Department and Amy Muldowney is a former Graduate Assistant and now a Guidance Counselor in the Walpole Public Schools.
Recent Findings from Research by Bridgewater Faculty and Librarians

A great deal of the research conducted by faculty and librarians at Bridgewater State College is presented by them at professional conferences and meetings. In the spring 2009 semester alone, the college’s Center for the Advancement of Research and Teaching (CART) supported more than 70 faculty members and librarians who wished to travel to present papers at such meetings. Presenting papers not only makes the findings of research public, it also puts academics in touch with others who share their special interests and expertise. But, like findings published in professional journals, papers presented at professional conferences are rarely available to a wider audience.

We have selected just a few of the many conference papers recently presented by Bridgewater faculty members and librarians and summarized them briefly here. We hope in future editions of Bridgewater Review to make conference presentation findings a regular feature.
There is a great deal of evidence that how one copes with breast cancer can influence not just the quality of a patient’s life, but actual medical outcomes. Research into coping strategies has, not surprisingly, focused on the most common forms of the disease. But of the 200,000 women whom the American Cancer Society estimates will be diagnosed with breast cancer each year, 1–6% will suffer with Inflammatory Breast Cancer (IBC), a particularly deadly and little studied variety. Barbara Bond of the Department of Social Work and some colleagues conducted extensive interviews with ten women as they attempted to cope with their diagnosis, treatment and lives with IBC. Bond found that, unlike women who have more common forms of breast cancer, women with IBC did not have access to a large and well-established literature on their disease. As a result, they were forced to do their own research, leading them to develop a sense of being the experts at their own disease. This “active/behavioral” coping strategy, in turn, helped these women with the “intrapsychic” goal of coming to terms with the cognitive and emotional challenges of fighting the disease. The positive benefits of feeling like an expert may be especially important given the feeling among these women with IBC that they did not “fit in” with existing breast cancer support groups because non-IBC group members were frightened by their more aggressive cancer and treatment.

—Dr. Barbara Bond, Assistant Professor of Social Work, presented a paper entitled “Inflammatory Breast Cancer: The Orphan Disease,” at the Association of Oncology Social Workers 2009 Conference in Savannah, Georgia. Her co-investigators in the research were April Connolly and Susan Asci, also of Bridgewater State College.

Do you recall ever being told by your school coach to “take a lap?” Perhaps it was the storied “Drop and give me ten.” Most likely you had done something to displease the coach and the exercise was punishment. Lydia Burak of the Department of Movement Arts, Health Promotion and Leisure Studies along with department colleagues Karen Richardson and Maura Rosenthal, examined the use of exercise as punishment, suspecting its pervasive use by coaches, physical education teachers and fitness professionals. They measured the attitudes, intentions, beliefs and behaviors of 345 college Physical Education majors, finding that 43% reported that they had used exercise as punishment, as had 91% of their coaches and 43% of their teachers. They discovered that students supported their intentions to use exercise as punishment with four beliefs about the practice. They believed that using exercise as punishment can 1) improve the attitudes of students and athletes; 2) lead to improved fitness levels; 3) teach sports and exercise participants that there are consequences to their actions and that 4) the use of exercise as punishment does not lead to the avoidance of exercise. Applying the Theory of Reasoned Action, Burak and her colleagues conclude that these students’ clear intentions to use exercise as punishment can be accounted for by their positive attitudes towards the behavior in combination with their belief that they would receive social approval for it.

—Dr. Lydia Burak, Professor in the Department of Movement Arts, Health Promotion and Leisure Studies, presented these findings in a paper titled “Using Exercise as Punishment/Behavior Management: Examination and Prediction” at the 2009 Convention of the American Alliance for Health, Physical Education Recreation and Dance in Tampa, Florida. Her co-investigators in the research were fellow MAHPLS department faculty members Karen Richardson, Associate Professor and Maura Rosenthal, Assistant Professor.
Recent earthquakes in Haiti and Peru have focused the attention of the world on efforts to predict and mitigate the damage done by these deadly natural disasters. Robert Cicerone of the Department of Earth Sciences and some colleagues recently conducted a survey of published scientific findings on earthquakes (sometimes called a “meta study”) in order to identify and catalog precursors of earthquakes. These precursor anomalies are deviations from normal geo-physical background measurements. The study found three clear patterns linking precursor events. First, they concluded that the largest precursor anomalies tended to occur before the largest earthquakes. That is, the intensity of precursor events was correlated with the intensity of the earthquakes. Second, they found that the frequency of precursor anomalies tended to increase as the time of the earthquake approached. Last, it was found that precursor anomalies tended to concentrate close to the epicenter of the earthquakes they preceded. Though information about the size, timing and location of precursor events are useful in building physical models for predicting earthquakes, the authors warn that there are many other factors that still must be effectively fitted to prediction models.

—Dr. Robert Cicerone, Associate Professor in the Department of Earth Sciences, presented the original paper on this data at the Fall Meeting of the American Geophysical Union in San Francisco, California in December, 2000. Subsequent to that, he published these findings in the journal Tectonophysics in 2009 under the title "A Systematic Compilation of Earthquake Precursors." His co-investigators were John Ebel of the Department of Geology and Geophysics at Boston College and James Britton of Weston Geophysical in Lexington, Massachusetts.

Elected representatives must balance a range of factors when they decide how to vote on legislation. We expect that they will represent the interests of the people who put them in office, their consciences and ideologies and the interests of the even larger population of people who did not vote for them. They also sometimes vote to support the interests of the people with whom they personally identify. Among the congressional groups that meet to pursue common legislative objectives there are Black, Hispanic and women’s caucuses. Brian Frederick of the Department of Political Science has been interested in the impact of gender on the policy voting records of US Senators. Until recently, he reports, most studies looking at the roll-call voting behavior of female legislators have investigated this phenomenon at the state legislative level and for the US House of Representatives. Such studies have found no significant relationship between gender and a representative’s roll-call voting record. However, with the number of female senators continuing to increase, it became possible for him to study the influence of gender in predicting the roll-call voting behavior of US Senators over several recent Congresses. He found that male and female senators representing the same state had very similar voting records on the basic left-right policy dimension. However, when he examined votes on issues of concern to women, female senators tended to be more supportive than the male senators they replaced, and male senators tended to be less supportive than the female senators they replaced. Frederick also concluded that given the fact that the national parties are deeply divided over women’s issues, it can be expected that electing Democrats to the Senate, no matter their gender, will produce a massive swing in support for women’s issues.

—Dr. Brian Frederick, Assistant Professor in the Department of Political Science presented these findings in a paper titled Gender Turnover and Roll Call Voting in the U.S. Senate at the Midwest Political Science Association Conference in Chicago, Illinois in April of 2009.
The Chinese economy is the second or third largest in the world (depending on how you measure it) and the fastest-growing by any measure. It deserves the attention it has been getting. And the reach of Chinese economic activity has been extended by the long history of Chinese migration to every corner of the globe.

According to Martin Grossman of the Department of Management, most academic inquiry has focused on the economies of Southeast Asia, where the largest overseas Chinese populations reside. Relatively little has been written specifically addressing the American Chinese business experience. Professor Grossman has been examining this branch of the Chinese diaspora, focusing on the networking behaviors among professionals, including those who have most recently emerged in the high tech sector. Grossman notes that in traditional Chinese societies, personal trust, social capital and regional affiliations play major roles in providing predictable and stable economic transactions. With core values rooted in Confucian thought, the Chinese idea of *guanxi* encapsulates the notions of social capital, relationship and connection. In looking at the operation of Chinese business communities in America, he finds that *guanxi*, while still important, is no longer sufficient among Chinese American professionals. Skill and technological competence, increasingly important in the knowledge economy, is not guaranteed through such networks. Indeed, Grossman contends that the *guanxi* system can at times be counterproductive, since such social ties can blind its participants to new technological breakthroughs and even compel them to attend to relationships at the cost of technical advantage.

—Dr. Martin Grossman, Associate Professor in the Department of Management, presented these findings in a paper titled "American Chinese Business Networks and the Economic Growth of China" at the 4th International Conference of Institutes and Libraries for Chinese Overseas Studies in Guangzhou, China in May of 2009.

Every American knows that if you want to do something good for your health you should eat well and exercise. The healthcare industry has been unanimous in delivering this message to us for a very long time. However, as James Leone of the Department of Movement Arts, Health Promotion and Leisure Studies notes in a recent study, exercise may also have little-known harmful effects for some people. According to Leone, physical activity increases the metabolic demand for nutrients to support the body’s cells and systems. Persons with subclinical (suspected but not detected) or latent celiac disease may be at an increased risk for negative health effects due to their body’s inability to keep up with the metabolic demands created by their physical activity. (Celiac disease is an inherited autoimmune disease in which the lining of the small intestine is damaged, mainly from eating gluten.) Leone notes that health-care professionals, such as athletic trainers or primary-care physicians, are often the first people an athlete may consult concerning gastrointestinal issues. His study has led him to promote discussion of the prevalence of celiac disease, development of recognition and management strategies, and preparation of healthcare professionals for thorough clinical assessment when screening for celiac disease in athletes and physically active individuals.

—Dr. James Leone, Assistant Professor in the Department of Movement Arts, Health Promotion and Leisure Studies, presented these findings in a paper titled "Celiac Disease in Physically Active Populations: Is Good Health in Athletics an Underlying Under-Recognized Concern?" at the Tenth International Celiac Disease Symposium in Amsterdam, The Netherlands in April, 2009.
NOTATION FOR SYMMETRIC IMAGES
Jeffery Bowen and Heidi Burgiel

How do you describe the picture in Figure 1? As the shell and part of the leg of a red-footed tortoise? As a rosette or mandala? As modern art? The artist, Jeffery Bowen, describes it as a stack of copies of a 45-degree wedge taken from a reflected image of a tortoise. Heidi Burgiel describes it as a tortoise-shell motif reproduced according to the symmetry type *8.

FIGURE 1
Since 1993, Heidi Burgiel has been learning, teaching and using a new technique for classifying symmetric designs like the one in Figure 1. Symmetric patterns are integral to art and design; you see them every day on the floors and walls around you. William Thurston’s “orbifold notation” provides an easy-to-learn way of describing these patterns mathematically, and also sheds light on the patterns’ origins.

In the “signature” *8, the * indicates that the design has a mirror symmetry. Figure 2 shows the line of mirror symmetry Jeffery Bowen used to create the image that he later “stacked” to create the final design. The 8 in the signature refers to the fact that 8 lines of mirror symmetry cross at the center of the image, as shown in Figure 3. Although 45-degree rotations were used to create the image, these are not mentioned in the signature because those same rotations arise from combined reflections.

If you look closely at Figure 1, you will see that it’s composed of 16 copies of the same pie-shaped wedge of tortoise shell and foot. (See Figure 4) This is the true origin of the signature—the * is in the signature because this “fundamental domain” has an edge (unlike a pattern produced by a cylindrical or conical roller) and the 8 refers to its single corner with angle $360/(2^8) = 22.5$ degrees.

As another example, the signature of the square tiling commonly seen on kitchen floors is *442. The fundamental domain of the tiling is one-eighth of a square tile. It has a boundary (*), two 45-degree angles (44) and a 90-degree angle (2).
Figure 5 shows an image that was created by rotating the wedge shown in Figure 4. Once again, there are 16 copies of the wedge, but this time there are no mirror symmetries.

In Thurston’s notation, this design’s signature is 16. We identify the 16-fold center of rotational symmetry in the image by marking it with a blue dot. (See Figure 6) The fundamental domain of this image is the narrow cylindrical cone made by joining the long edges of the wedge shape in Figure 4.

In general, any pattern whose signature is a single number has a cone-shaped fundamental domain. The cone is an infinite, connected surface and is smooth except for the cone point. It has no edge and therefore there is no * in the signature. If we thought of the fundamental domain from Figure 5 as an inked stamp, rolling it on a blank sheet of paper would reproduce Figure 5—the cone point would stay at the center of a circle while the rest of the cone rolled around it.

Bill Thurston’s revolutionary notation helps us understand the symmetries of patterns like those in Figures 1 and 5 by describing their fundamental domains. The notation extends to encompass translational and glide-reflective symmetries, patterns on the surface of a sphere and in three dimensions, and more.

—Heidi Burgiel is Associate Professor in the Department of Mathematics and Computer Science and Jeffery Bowen is Professor in the Department of Biological Sciences.
FIGURE 5 (ABOVE), FIGURE 6 (BELOW)
Bridgewater State students who study North American history and politics in our post-9/11 classrooms today do so in an environment that has changed so dramatically that few of them might appreciate the difference. Nine-eleven did that, as scholars are beginning to discover. It changed Americans’ sense of place in the world and has prompted a new search for identity (something in which Americans periodically engage). “Who we are” has always been defined in part by “who we’re not,” and who we’re not is often symbolized by our borders. America’s edges, its international borders, have become a critical focus of identity politics and border security—keeping out Mexican migrants, Canadian drug smugglers and other fiends—grist for the Sunday morning news show mills. However, today’s Fortress America is hardly new; students who examine America’s mid-nineteenth-century rush to solidify its national borders would find that their ancestors made a similar equation. The ways they defined their borders reflected the ways they defined themselves.

In the sixty years following the Revolution, Americans and British North Americans struggled to define their own national selves and finding respective places on the map was one important method of self-assertion. Controversy over the British western posts in the 1790s, neutrality of the seas, the War of 1812, the McLeod Affair, and the rivalry between lumbermen and settlers in Maine’s Aroostook region contributed to heightened tensions between Americans and British North Americans and revealed the need to draw a definite and permanent border. Where do we begin and they end? That question underlay the Northeast (or Maine) Boundary Dispute of the early 1840s.

By the late 1830s, British and American statesmen had concluded that the terms of the Treaty of Paris (1783) that described the boundary between their respective claims in the northeast were too vague. Several bilateral and arbitrators’ attempts to settle the boundary before 1840 had founndered on the rocks of domestic political maneuvering and national chauvinism. Our textbooks tell us that only diplomacy at the highest level saved the day. After several months of close negotiation colored by personal friendship, the U.S. Secretary of State, Daniel Webster, and British envoy, Alexander Baring (Lord Ashburton), resolved the issue by drafting the Treaty of Washington (the Webster-Ashburton Treaty) in August 1842.

There is, of course, much more to the story. The Maine boundary dispute involved staking claims in unsettled regions and provided opportunities for discovery of many kinds: scientific, ethnological and cultural. Surveying and mapping the boundary involved imagining the border, too, and investing it with meaning.

In the 1830s and 40s, territorial expansion was at the top of the national political agenda in the U.S., but most Americans saw their course of empire growing westward in places like Texas (1845), California (1848) and Oregon (1846). In the Northeast, five separate attempts at settling the boundary issue since 1783 had succeeded only in confirming and marking the western- and easternmost sections of the boundary, along the forty-fifth parallel from the St Lawrence River to the source of the Connecticut River in the west, and from the source of the St Croix to the Atlantic Ocean, less than half of the unresolved boundary territory. By the late 1830s, disputes between American frontier settlers and New Brunswick lumbermen along the Aroostook River drew the attention of the U.S. government. Equally disconcerting was a British boundary commission of 1839 (led by geologist G.W. Featherstonaugh and military surveyor Richard Mudge) that threatened to declare unilaterally a boundary in the Northeast that excised the...
“crown” of present-day northern Maine (the land north of the forty-sixth parallel), making it British territory. The United States could not allow these challenges to stand. In 1840, Congress commissioned its own survey of the disputed territory, naming Captain Andrew Talcott its head. An officer retired from the United States Army Corps of Engineers, Talcott had established a wide reputation as a reliable and efficient surveyor, engineer and cartographer. Also appointed were two co-commissioners, James Renwick, a professor of physics at Columbia College and Major James D. Graham of the Army Corps of Topographical Engineers. Before the commission could complete its exploration, Webster and Ashburton had concluded a compromise solution.

Even so, the commission’s work is telling. The maps, diaries, field notes and reports, correspondence, and watercolor paintings—all available in the Virginia Historical Society collections and the National Archives—produced in the course of these excursions are reflective. In mapping the boundary they were, in a sense, mapping themselves. They perceived borderlands as the places where cultural and physiographic differences between Americans and British North Americans were visible and palpable enough to sustain an international boundary.

The Commission was divided into three parties, each assigned a section of the contested boundary region: Graham’s party the easternmost section; Renwick’s the middle section of the highlands; the western part of the contested boundary fell to Talcott. The work took three successive seasons to complete, September–October 1840, June–September 1841 and summer 1842. The commissioners and their crews endured many physical, topographical, climatic and technical challenges. They were befuddled by faulty maps and impeded by windfalls, marshes, rapids and a perennial shortage of provisions. And bugs: “the immense swarms of black flies & mosquitoes, harassing us…& from whose venomous sting there was no protection.” Each commissioner conducted his division independently, though they expected to write a joint final report to submit to the Government when their work was done.

The ultimate report complete with maps and appendices was submitted to Webster on 27 January 1843. The Commission surveyed and mapped thousands of miles of borderland, making thousands of astronomical and barometrical measurements. The final report, complete with ten volumes of tables, two appendices, and a comprehensive map (see Fig. 1) composed a significant body of new scientific knowledge about the northeastern landscape. Science was an article of faith for Talcott, Renwick, and Graham. Such an abrupt and overtly diplomatic conclusion to what should have been a scientific determination was to them troubling, even galling. Even so, as much as Talcott and his co-commissioners claimed their work was guided singly by scientific principles, complete objectivity was elusive. Drawing boundaries in the era of “manifest destiny” could not help but reflect this sense of national mission. Strewed through the scientific observations in their diaries, reports, and correspondence was a running commentary on American and British colonial cultures that justified an official border between two different countries.

Central to this notional delineation was the landscape of the border region. Water, rocks, vegetation and soils were texts to be read by the scientific interpreters. The terrain itself would reveal the boundary line. For Talcott and his men, the northeastern borderlands were a threshold or buffer between British America and the United States. To these scientists, the border had to be drawn to envelope the lands and peoples who shared the principal characteristic of antebellum America: progress. A cultural yardstick would determine the extent of the northeastern American marches.

Largely unknown, the landscape was monotonous and difficult to read. The corridor that encompassed the highlands did not subscribe to the commissioners’ expectations for a single, identifiable “axis of maximum elevation” separating St. Lawrence from Atlantic waters as the 1783 Treaty of Paris had indicated. In the Famine River highlands, Talcott’s nephew and aide, Sebastian Visscher Talcott noted, “[i]t is not possible to discern any ‘dividing ridge’ as there is no elevation sufficiently great above the level of the surrounding country to be dignified with that name.” The borderlands corridor had a uniformity of character. “The country is so monotonous[ sic] that in describing one mile you describe the whole.” These borderlands were an uncultivated and stagnant zone, a northeastern badlands. Agriculturally, the highlands were “a little less than worthless.” Marshes, swamps, and the unexpected flow of rivers also made the area seem less than promising economically. Even timber, so attractive in the lower St. John River valley by this era, was in the highlands difficult to get to, small, and generally “unfit for useful purposes.” In many ways, the highlands comprised a very appropriate threshold between Canadian and American civilizations. “The country…is,” S.V. Talcott wrote, “as I have said above, swampy and covered with a heavy growth of white cedar, spruce and Balsam with no pine of consequence: the soil is thin and poor, resting upon a bed of loose stone not a foot below the surface, and altogether fit only for a Boundary between two distinct nations.”

To draw the separation between cultures, the commissioners and their men labeled things—trees, rivers, mountains and people—literally and notionally. Repeatedly, the Talcott division’s journals note the marking of trees “U.S.C. 1840” (or 1841) [United States
Commission] at strategic points on what they perceived would be, ultimately, the American side of the border. Ostensibly, this marking was designed only to aid the surveyors who would formally mark the boundary when the Treaty was drawn up. To the commission, however, these markings had deeper meaning as territorial claims. In the St John River valley, Graham’s men cleared away trees on the properties of private landholders in New Brunswick without notifying them first, and then marked some remaining trees simply “U.S.”, a claim that became the cause of no small concern to British American settlers in the territory, many of Loyalist backgrounds. Talcott’s men repeatedly referred to rivers flowing northwest from the highlands as “Canadas.” Even mountains on either side of the expected border were seen to reflect national postures. “[T]he prominent mountains viewed from across the Lake [Mégantic],” Talcott aide R.D. Cutts entered into his 1840 report, “were raised like a profile before us, as if in the act of comparing their relative heights [sic].”

Boundary surveyors labeled the people of the borderlands too. The commissioners found a small body of frontier families worthy of American citizenship and possessing the appropriate character—independence, self-reliance and rugged individualism, celebrated “American” traits in the age of Manifest Destiny—for situation on the frontier of a new nation. Their reports vaguely asserted who belonged on what side. A judicious boundary, if possible, would allow the United States to reclaim some American-born settlers, like those identified by Renwick living “on the right bank of the St. John’s[sic], from the mouth of the Meduanekeag upwards to the Grand Falls” but exclude others, such as the areas around Richmond and Woodstock, “held by the descendants of the refugees of the Revolution and others who united with them in inveterate hostility to the American name.” To be embraced were expatriates who had gone far afield in search of arable land and victims of British oppression (like the French-speaking Madawaska Acadians) who would be liberated, it was felt, as American citizens. To be rejected were those unassimilable to American values: British soldiers, Canadien peasants and most certainly, Loyalists.

On the heels of all this claiming, imagining and measuring, the international boundary between the United States and British North America was ultimately drawn and blazed in spring and summer 1843 by an official Joint Commission. Working as Chief Topographer was Graham, the only one of the three 1840 Survey Commissioners appointed to the 1843 body. Of all the work completed by the 1840 Survey, the Joint Commission relied most heavily on Talcott’s reports on the western highlands. The completion of boundary marking by the 1843 Joint Commission was both an ending and a beginning. It simultaneously brought to a close a colorful chapter in the history of American manifest destiny and commenced, symbolically at least, a period of North American infeudation; the “filling in” of Canadian and American frontiers. Today, it is no longer unknown territory, but the northeast borderlands remain thinly settled and of limited economic use outside of tourism, still a buffer of sorts between two distinct nations.

And what of the Talcott Commission? We cannot dismiss it as merely dull prelude to a sparkling diplomatic achievement. There was more to it than that. Engineers and surveyors who labored in difficult circumstances only to have their scientific arguments compromised in a conventional treaty? To some degree, yes. But equally importantly, Talcott and his fellow expeditionists were cultural explorers who interpreted the northeastern border even as they sought to draw it. Their border, like ours today, was as much an idea as it was a real place and a mirror reflecting what mid-nineteenth-century Americans thought they were, and were not. borders did that, and still do.

—Andrew Holman is Professor in the History Department, and is Associate Editor of Bridgewater Review.
Library 2.0: Not Your Grandma’s Library
Sheau-Hwang Chang

THE BIRTH OF WEB.2.0
The bursting of the dot-com bubble in 2001 endangered the Internet business world, but it certainly did not stop the growth of the Web. On the contrary, it engendered new ways for people to participate on the Web in the form of new social tools. More and more people began to use the Web not only to find information, but also to chat, share photos, participate in forums, contribute ideas and build communities. Social networking websites like Flickr, YouTube, MySpace, and Facebook have all redefined social interactions on the Web. Today, the Web has become an integral part of the average person’s social life. It has changed our way of thinking and communicating with one another, deepening our reliance on the Web. According to Pew Internet Online Activities Trend Data, about 75% of American adults age 18 and older are Internet users as of December, 2009—approximately a 25% increase from 2001.

A decade ago, internet innovator Tim O’Reilly saw in the economic upheavals an opportunity for the internet to change to what has come to be termed “Web 2.0.” In 2004 O’Reilly produced the first Web 2.0 Conference. Attended by only heavyweight dot-com leaders, visionaries and thinkers, the conference presented the many new possibilities resulting from on-going revolutions and innovations in Internet technology and the burgeoning Internet economy. Subsequent 2.0 conferences have become the most watched events in the business and technology sectors.

As defined by O’Reilly, Web 2.0 is the use of the Web as a platform to build software tools that support user interaction, participation and collaboration. It is based on a set of social tools including blogs, RSS (Really Simple Syndication), instant messaging, wiki, podcasting, social networking, photo sharing, social bookmarking, tagging and mashups. The goal is to create a “Read/Write Web”; that is, a Web in which users can both read and freely contribute content. The central idea of Web 2.0 is to move away from the traditional unidirectional model, toward a new user-centric bidirectional model. By using social tools, for example, dot-com companies can reach out to expand their customer base, build communities, receive feedback and, in turn use, feedback to improve and build products. Users can interconnect, participate and contribute by using these same tools. Though its original application was in the world of business, Web 2.0 has had a significant impact on every aspect of life, including library life. Business 2.0, Chemistry 2.0, Psychology 2.0, Education 2.0 and Library 2.0 are just a few of its spinoffs.

In order to stay relevant, libraries cannot ignore this phenomenal change. Like many other professional fields, library science undoubtedly needs to jump on the Web 2.0 bandwagon as quickly as possible so that library users can continue to be adequately served. In 2005, the

Figure 1: Library of Congress on Flickr.
term Library 2.0 first appeared in the LibraryCrunch blog authored by Michael Casey, Division Director of Technology Services at Georgia’s Gwinnett County Public Library. It quickly became the hottest topic of discussion almost everywhere in the library profession.

THE WORLD OF LIBRARY 2.0
In the same spirit as Web 2.0, the goal of Library 2.0 is to build a bidirectional user-centered library using Web 2.0 social tools as its foundation. When Web 2.0 first evolved, many enthusiastic librarians quickly began to explore the potential of Web 2.0 social tools. Blogs such as The Shifted Librarian, Library Thing, and LibraryCrunch were pioneers in stimulating discussions on Web 2.0 in library land. When YouTube, MySpace, and Facebook debuted, many libraries and library organizations did not wait to use these sites to promote library services, connect with their users and offer help to their users. The Library of Congress even worked with Flickr to make the precious national historic photographs collection accessible worldwide (Figure 1).

Wiki is a tool designed to allow a team to collaborate on projects, writing documents and creating instructions without geographical and time constraints. Any member of the team can edit and contribute content from anywhere at any time. It is very easy to use and HTML (web page construction language) knowledge is not required. One of the most successful examples in library land is The Biz Wiki, a Business & Economics research guide. It was created in 2005 and is maintained by Chad Boeninger, Reference & Instruction Librarian at Ohio University Libraries (Figure 2). This research guide has been highly praised and widely used and is an important research tool not only for Ohio University users but also for users worldwide.

Instant Messaging (IM) is another tool that has changed the landscape of library services. A chat URL link is now an indispensible part of library home pages (Figure 3). Users do not need to walk up to the reference desk in person to get their questions answered; they can simply go to their library home pages and follow the chat link. They can immediately ask questions and receive instant answers. In addition, many instant messaging tools can now be embedded in any web page on a library web site (see Talk to Chad in Figure 2). Because users can receive instant feedback and there is no limitation on physical location, instant messaging adds significant value to the traditional walk-in reference service and has become a very popular and effective tool for library users.

Social bookmarking along with tagging and tag clouds have also gained momentum and have spurred innova-
tions in library land. PennTags is one such innovation, created by Michael Winkler, then Library Web Manager, and Laurie Allen, then Research and Instruction Services Librarian at the University of Pennsylvania Libraries in 2006 (Figure 4). PennTags allows users to bookmark articles, books and other materials of interest with a single click while conducting searches in library databases and catalogs. Users can then further organize their bookmarks, generate citations and share them with classmates and friends. Professors can share their bookmarks with students and create recommended reading lists for their courses. The best part of this tool is that users can assign their own terms, called folksonomies, rather than library-established terms to tag their bookmark entries. In addition, this tool can generate a list of most-searched terms from the entire system at any moment and display them on the main page, functioning as a dynamic index list. The list can be displayed in different font sizes, with the largest font representing the most-used terms. Because the different font sizes make the list look like a cloud, these dynamic lists have been named tag clouds. Unfortunately, PennTags is currently only available for the University of Pennsylvania students and faculty.

BEYOND LIBRARY 2.0
Although Web 2.0 social tools provide many advantages, each has its own weaknesses when applied in library land. One major weakness is lack of compatibility stemming from the fact that they have generally been developed independently. Libraries need a more integrated system equipped with Web 2.0 social tools so that their users can use them in an integrated manner. With this in mind, Libguides and Web 2.0 library online catalogs emerged two years ago. Libguides is a subscription-based hosted service that provides built-in Web 2.0 tools. Librarians can use this service to create subject specific research guides with interactive features, multimedia, communities and sharing capabilities (Figure 5). It gives librarians an edge in organizing library resources, reaching out to users and encouraging interactive learning. URL links and database search boxes can be presented on the same web page, providing convenient access to library resources. The Libguides service has been very
popular in library land, with about 1,200 libraries in 22 countries currently using it.

The Web 2.0 online library catalog or next generation publicly accessible catalog is another noteworthy innovation (Figure 6). It draws upon ideas from Web 2.0, as well as from Amazon.com and Google’s single box search services. This new online catalog is underpinned by a one-stop search engine with the capability to retrieve results from all library resources at once, including books, ebooks, journal articles, videos, databases and other media. With this new catalog, users do not need to switch from one resource to another to find materials that they need. Users can narrow their results to a small subset by using limiters such as subject, format and genre. When a record is selected, an additional link provides recommended resources based on other selections from users who selected the same record. Of course, Web 2.0 social tools are also built into this online catalog so that users can chat with librarians, write comments, rate resources and write reviews. Librarians can publish blog posts to promote library resources, provide instructions and invite users to participate in discussions directly from the online catalog. Because of its high cost, however, few libraries have implemented it so far.

LIBRARY 2.0 AT BRIDGEWATER STATE COLLEGE
A recent article published by Chen Xu et al. in the Journal of Academic Librarianship in July 2009 surveyed 81 academic libraries in New York State to find out how Web 2.0 social tools have been used. The results reveal that only 40% of libraries are using some of these tools, while 47% are not using any. The most used tool is instant messaging, followed by blogs, RSS and tagging. Although the results cannot be generalized, the article does suggest that Web 2.0 is starting to be embraced by academic libraries, but there is still a long way to go.

The evolution of Library 2.0 has also been seen in the Clement C. Maxwell Library. Maxwell Library has implemented a wiki home page on the college’s wiki server, a MaxChat instant messaging service (Figure 4), and a blog with RSS capability. In addition, the library has recently purchased the Libguides service and is planning to roll it out to the campus community in September, 2010, when the new academic year starts. In the meantime, the library is also looking for opportunities to implement a Web 2.0 online catalog. We hope that our users can take full advantage of these new tools in order to enhance their learning experiences and enrich their campus lives.

Sheau-Hwang Chang is Senior Librarian and Head of Library Systems in Maxwell Library.

Figure 6: Washington University Libraries—A one-step Search Catalog.
For two years, beginning in 2004, Mitch Librett left his day job as a Shift Commander in his own police department at 4 o’clock, 3 afternoons per week, donning old clothing to assume the role of narcotics investigator with the Special Investigations Unit of another police jurisdiction. He conducted in-depth interviews with these undercover police officers, eventually gaining their trust and confidence. Dr. Librett is currently writing a book about his research. Qualitative research of this sort is often rooted in the personal experiences of the researcher. It also benefits from a careful and honest examination of this history by the researcher. This article reveals some of Dr. Librett’s self examination as an undercover police officer and researcher, and presents some excerpts from his field notes and insights. All of the locations, names, and settings from his research have been disguised, both here and in his manuscript.

BECOMING A POLICE OFFICER, RESEARCHER AND ACADEMIC

In a sense, this inquiry began on February 18, 1982 when my friend Jeff Ross was gunned down in the Ranch House Roadhouse in Tucson, Arizona. Jeff was then an undercover/vice officer in the Tucson Police Department who was part of an arrest team tasked with taking into custody a one-legged cocaine dealer known as “Peg-leg Cliff.” The plan was that Clifford Hamilton, who worked in a back office as the Roadhouse manager, was to be taken following the successful exchange of cash for a large amount of cocaine. As the door to the office was breached and the arrest team surged into the room, Cliff must have been more afraid of losing the cocaine than he was of being arrested. Or maybe he believed the police raid to be something more sinister, perhaps being robbed by a group of outlaw drug dealers. At some point, a 9mm pistol was drawn and fired at the police officers, killing Jeffery H. Ross at the age of 28.

At that time I was a college student in Tucson. I had become acquainted with a group of men approximately my own age who had obtained employment in the police department and were now working in a countywide narcotics unit. They worked undercover, seeking drug buys and introductions to and from informants in the traditional way. In this era there was a great deal of autonomy afforded to drug police. In order to establish and maintain cover, Jeff Ross’ unit was given the use of a department-provided apartment, allowed to cultivate very long hair, a beard and decidedly non-regulation modes of dress. Other than their status as police officers, to all appearances they weren’t much different from the other friendship groups with whom I had become acquainted in my seven years in Tucson. Ethnically and economically we shared much the same demographic profile of middle-class, European-American, primarily white Protestant. Before Jeff’s murder, I had harbored no expectation of ever serving as a police officer. After it, obtaining police employment became an obsession that was eventually realized a year later.

I entered police work with a Bachelor’s Degree in Fine Arts, and considered myself an idealist. As a member of the generation that came of age in the late 1960’s to early 1970’s I was not unfamiliar with, nor overly disturbed by, narcotics as encountered within the context of my own life history. I considered myself to be a hu-
manist in most respects. But there was something different in the street-level narcotics trafficking that I encountered in 1983 as a new police officer who was assigned periodically to work undercover ferreting out and arresting drug dealers. I was not a stranger to life in a marginalized ghetto area. While attending college in Tucson, of necessity I lived for a time on the verge of the largest barrio in the city. But I felt uncomfortable in the African-American ghetto area of the city where I worked as a police officer. I observed people overtly selling drugs and gambling policy when I knew that they could have real jobs. It was not so much a matter of prejudice as a result my educational and cultural background.

With the perspective gained through many years of academic inquiry, it eventually became apparent that the “blame the victim” connotation to the “culture of poverty” argument was ingrained in my personal perspective. I believed, with the anthropologist Oscar Lewis, that the problems suffered by the urban poor were, at least in part, due to their own shortcomings, and that they adapted to their disadvantaged lives by developing a way of life that helped trap them in their ghettos. I also believed that these conditions would be insurmountable by these residents unless they adopted the worldview that had been passed on to me. These beliefs, conflated with the altruistic motivation for my entry to police service, provided the template for the formation of my own police identity.

Most of those I arrested were African-American and Caribbean street-level dealers with whom I had little personal contact. They were arrested according to the “buy-bust” scenario. But other investigations involved my introduction by informants to higher-level, usually white, dealers with whom I sometimes developed long-term acquaintances. When the time came for these people to be arrested, there was often a bad feeling, a sort of “if not for the grace of God, there go I” feeling of regret, affinity, and betrayal. My self-presentation had, of necessity, adapted to conform to what was considered acceptable within the milieu of the police culture to which I now belonged, and I enjoyed the excitement and prestige that came with undercover work. It was sometimes difficult to reconcile my “police self” with the person that I had been for the first twenty-six years of my life; there was a tension that, at times, engendered near-crises of identity. However, my own undercover experience was short-lived. After my cover was blown and I was “burned” for a ten-dollar marijuana buy in a housing project, there followed a return to patrol assignment and a relatively uneventful career as a patrol officer and supervisor.

Fifteen years into my police career, the specter of Jeff’s death remained with me. It was a wound still, though long scabbed over. The routine trajectory of my time in the police department led through the course of my marriage to another police officer, two promotions, and myriad opportunities to reflect, from a layman’s perspective, upon the impact of harsh enforcement and incarceration policies targeting narcotics. Fifteen years on I had to ask what Jeffrey Ross died for. To save the “victims” from themselves? To stand in perpetual solidarity with the other fallen soldiers of the war on crime and drugs? Was there another way? And if so, then why did Jeff have to die? For that matter, why did Clifford Hamilton have to die? Of course it stands to reason that if you fire on a group of armed police, there is the expectation that they will defend themselves. I continue to regard Mr. Hamilton as the murderer of a friend and fellow officer, yet it was over drugs, the mere “feel-good” substance that has been socially constructed to connote a great threat to our survival as a cohesive society, but one that, in the final analysis, may not be.
THE VOICES OF THE INFORMANTS
What follows are excerpts from the manuscript for a book I am writing on my research.

Performance, acting, representation for an audience or in the presence of “the other,” underpins any attempt to understand the world of undercover policing. Also key to the understanding of the formation of identity, both in the workplace and beyond, is the idea that there is a “moral” component to self-presentation, as well as to the reception of the performance in the “theater” of the street. The point is that the construction of the undercover identity both enables and circumvents certain logical expectations in the lived experience of a sworn police officer. An undercover officer often engages in a form of “method acting” in order to gain entry and acceptance to a world where the assumption of a shadow-like alternative persona is necessary to establish a bona fide within that milieu, and to effectively move among those who populate it.

Louie V. is 41 years old, a River City undercover/vice cop. He is a huge man—6'5" at least, 300 pounds and of mesomorphic physique. Tattoos, some of them freshly done, cover his tremendous arms, which are bigger than my thighs. Louie is dressed in a cut-off tee shirt and jeans. His head is swathed in a blue print bandana in the style of an outlaw biker. He moves easily between the discourse of policing and the affected identity of a gay man (he and his partner have been labeled “gay and gayer” by Jackie C.). Long assigned to vice work, he has on several occasions questioned my motives in researching the undercover experience. He offers the opinion that undercover work is indeed an aspect of policing worth looking into, because of its inherent danger to the cops that are assigned to it. Louie volunteers that his own experience tells him that one can become muddled, mentally lost in the transition from identity to identity across the day-to-night and back-to-day transitions involved in undercover policing. Menacing in appearance, Louie’s presentation speaks to the very core of the issues that prompted this research in the first instance.

On a hot Indian Summer night in River City, in a desolate industrial lot hard by the river, I witnessed the result of upwards of ten years of exposure to the process of “becoming an undercover.” As we ate White Castle hamburgers by the riverside, over a time frame of perhaps 90 minutes, I observed Louie engaged in his undercover identity. We discussed the difficulty of assimilating to the tasks of buying drugs undercover on the street, his “cop” identity, his off-duty identity as a general contractor and the events of September 11, 2001 and our respective roles in the aftermath at Ground Zero. He also moved easily between English and Spanish, bantering with Ron M. The point here is that Louie was an unusual, gregarious and willing muse who indicated the direction he thought my research needed to head.

Namely, how does a person make the transition from either uniformed cop or, as is the more customary pathway, from police recruit to undercover police officer? And, perhaps most important to the issue of re-entry following a period of service as undercover agent, how does one balance the emotional and social demands of bouncing between the expression of the various personae?

The process of learning to interact with, do business, and socialize with street-level drug dealers is often facilitated by an apprenticeship to a more experienced officer. During this research, a fortuitous event occurred in January of 2005, when Eddie V. was assigned to SIU. Eddie had just completed the Police Academy and had yet to be assigned to highway patrol
duty. It is was glaringly obvious that the undercover officers assigned to SIU were, and are still, exclusively minorities. Eddie V. was a 24-year-old Latino from Jumperson Village. Prior to his police service he worked as a paramedic and earned a bachelor's degree in criminal justice. His transformation from an upwardly-mobile, second generation descendant of Puerto Rican immigrants who aspired to and achieved employment as a police officer, to an aspirant to the undercover world, provided a tremendous opportunity to explore the processes through which this transformation occurs.

Hector was expected to play the dominant role in Eddie’s assimilation to the unit, this by default since Hector was the only undercover left in the unit and because the office sensed that he would have a unique ability to introduce Eddie to the collective worldview. Eddie’s apprenticeship began with the responsibility for simple, mundane tasks, such as preparing the coffee at the beginning of each shift. He was also expected to look over Hector’s shoulder as Hector prepared the written correspondence for his pending cases and court appearances. But the most important segment of the learning process, according to Hector, was for Eddie to learn to dress properly, speak properly, and to learn to “give off” the impression of a street person. He was advised to watch the Black Entertainment Television channel (BET) as much as possible so he could become acquainted with the latest in rap music hits. He was also expected to learn to recite the lyrics and instructed to buy the fan magazines for the hip hop and rap genres and read them carefully. Hector jokingly referred to this as Eddie’s “homework.”

“What he’s gotta learn, is…you gotta get inside their world. Like, when I was hanging out with those crackheads in Cannondale last year. They were my friends! They weren’t bad people, other than the fact that they smoke crack. I could talk to them nice—about music, a ballplayer, women—life in general which is what anyone would do just hanging in the street with nothing better to do. You think that’s [selling/buying/using drugs] all they do but you’re wrong…they people just the same. That’s what Eddie has to learn. He still works his side job too, riding the ambulance in Jumperson, which is stupid and I try to tell him that but he don’t want to listen. How he’s suppose to be pickin people up off the street one night in an ambulance and buying drugs the next week on the same corner? But he don’t wanna listen. Yet.”

By the second week of Eddie’s assignment to SIU, his appearance began to change. When he went out on the streets he began to wear a hooded sweatshirt covered with a bubble jacket, black or blue jeans and the requisite bandana. But still something was out of place. I realized that it was his footwear. The rest of the group, including myself, wore worn leather work boots or broken-down running shoes. In the first several weeks of Eddie’s tenure with the group he insisted on retaining his New Balance running shoes, which were quite new, and marked him as a cop in the eyes of the others.

FINDINGS OF THE RESEARCH
On the micro-level, following the assumption that undercover policing strategies are an entrenched component of policing in the United States, my study concludes that improvements are necessary in the selection, preparation, and training of undercover officers. The goal is to improve the quality of their lives. On the macro-level it is expected that the study provides fresh insight into the processes that facilitate the development of police officers into proxies for the state in terms of enacting race/class relations.

—Mitch Librett is an Assistant Professor in the Criminal Justice Department.
Beyond the Palin


Heilemann and Halperin tell readers of *Game Change* right at the outset that “what was missing [in the reporting of the 2008 presidential campaign] and might be of enduring value… was an intimate portrait of the candidates and spouses who (in our judgment) stood a reasonable chance of occupying the White House: Barack and Michelle Obama, Hillary and Bill Clinton, John and Elizabeth Edwards, and John and Cindy McCain.” The authors’ method, they then tell us, was to conduct “more than three hundred interviews with more than two hundred people… on a ‘deep background’ basis, which means we agreed not to identify the subjects as sources in any way.” This sounds perilously close to Alice Longworth Roosevelt territory: “If you can’t say anything nice about someone, sit right here by me.” To be fair, Heilemann and Halperin, both experienced political reporters for *New York* and *Time* magazines respectively, aren’t interested in character assassination; their fascination seems more attuned to watching candidates commit political suicide.

*Game Change*, in large measure, focuses on and studies political marriages. Exhibit #1, of course, is Bill and Hillary Clinton whose marital ups and downs have been on public view since the early 1990s. The ex-president figured prominently in Hillary’s decision to run for president: “the other thing was Bill,” the authors write, “—more specifically his personal life, about which rumors were running rampant…. One party elder described the situation thus: ‘It’s like some Japanese epic film where everyone sees the disaster coming in the third reel but no one can figure out what to do about it.’” Leading Democrats like Harry Reid feared that should Hillary achieve the nomination, Republicans in the general election campaign would flood the media with stories of Bill’s past indiscretions and present philandering. No doubt they would have done; nevertheless, the ex-president possessed unerring political instincts, could galvanize a crowd, and was invaluable as a fund raiser. Still, ambivalence about the ex-president persisted. Claire McCaskill, running for the Senate seat in Missouri left vacant by her husband’s death, when asked by Tim Russert during a “Meet the Press” interview whether she thought Bill Clinton had been a great president, remarked “I think he’s been a great leader, but I don’t want my daughter near him.” Hillary, who the next day was scheduled to appear at a New York fund raiser for McCaskill, cancelled. The Bill problem never disappeared and plagued Hillary’s primary campaign.

Be Patient: the Palin stuff is coming up.

The Clinton marriage, perplexing as it is, raises the question of the relation between a politician’s public life.
and private lives. To what extent do personal and private failings affect the performance of one’s public duties? At what point does a private indiscretion become a betrayal of the public trust? On this issue it’s the American public that’s ambivalent. One part of us takes vicarious pleasure in the escapades of political scoundrels; another part wants those who serve us to be squeaky clean. The public forces public figures to operate in a climate that breeds hypocrisy as politicians craft an image that pushes into “deep background” anything that might tarnish their reputations. Yet, despite herculean efforts, including impeachment, to discredit his reputation as president, no one to my knowledge ever proved Bill Clinton betrayed or violated his public vows. His marital vows, yes, but his public vows? The jury for the ex-president is still and will probably always be hung.

Not so with John and Elizabeth Edwards. Here truly was a dung hill covered over with snow. Heilemann and Halperin note that Edwards’ “experience during the general election [as John Kerry’s running mate in 2004] seemed to [swell his head] to the point of bursting. He reveled in being inside the bubble: the Secret Service, the chartered jet, the press pack following him around, the swarm of factotums catering to his every whim.” Edwards’ egotism was matched by his wife Elizabeth’s paranoia. Diagnosed with cancer days before the 2004 election, Elizabeth elicited great sympathy from the public. The Edwards’ staff saw a different side. “The nearly universal assessment among them was that there was no one on the national stage for whom the disparity between public image and private reality was vaster or more disturbing.” She was abusive to and dismissive of her husband, calling him a “hick” and his family “rednecks.” She was, in a word, a virago, a Xanthippe to you can’t make this stuff up—to pull the exposé of anything that might tarnish their reputations. Yet, despite herculean efforts, including impeachment, to discredit his reputation as president, no one to my knowledge ever proved Bill Clinton betrayed or violated his public vows. His marital vows, yes, but his public vows? The jury for the ex-president is still and will probably always be hung.

Enter Rielle Hunter. Heilemann and Halperin provide all the juicy details which were reported first in the National Enquirer though no one, except possibly Edwards himself, took the exposé seriously. Edwards met Hunter in early 2006 and not long after hired her to provide video and web documentary for his campaign. Edwards’ staff knew perfectly well what was going on and, to be fair to them, tried to steer Edwards clear; he wouldn’t listen. Aware that a damaging Enquirer story’s appearance was imminent first Edwards, then his wife, had friends pressure Enquirer publisher David Pecker—you can’t make this stuff up—to pull the exposé of Edwards’ affair with Hunter. He wouldn’t, it appeared, and received almost no notice in the mainstream media. Edwards’ staff “efforts at containing the fallout were remarkably successful.”

Only a couple more paragraphs until Palin.

Edwards campaigned on, but worse was yet to come. Two months later in December 2007 the Enquirer ran a two story headline “UPDATE: JOHN EDWARDS LOVE CHILD SCANDAL.” Hunter had been telling people that she was pregnant with Edwards’ child. Enter Andrew Young, an Edwards gofer, who claimed paternity of the child even though he had talked openly about having had a vasectomy. Hunter delivered a baby girl in February. The following July, the Enquirer, which Heilemann and Halperin call Edwards’ “personal tormentor and truth squad,” published a grainy photo of Edwards holding the infant. Elizabeth Edwards went into denial, refusing to believe her husband was the father. “I have to believe [he’s not],’ Elizabeth said. “Because if I don’t, it means I’m married to a monster.”

One needs to digress here to note that the story lives on. The Enquirer has had its reporting accepted by the Pulitzer committee. And Andrew Young has published his own account of the imbroglio. The Politician: An Insider’s Account of John Edwards’ Pursuit of the Presidency and the Scandal That Brought Him Down sits in second place on the March 2nd New York Times’ bestseller list right behind Game Change. In the book, listed as non-fiction, Young reveals the existence of a sex tape showing Edwards performing on-camera sex acts, the camera presumably held by Rielle. This, I guess, sort of out-Clintoned Clinton and Monica Lewinsky’s infamous blue dress, and got Young and his wife the obligatory Oprah interview. By the time this is in print, the tape will probably be on YouTube.

And now for Sarah Palin, the Republican Party booby trap!

Sarah Palin at the outset was the longest of long-shots for John McCain’s vice-presidential choice. The Senator had wanted to offer Joseph Lieberman the opportunity as the first person to represent both parties as a vice-presidential candidate. Even Lieberman realized the folly of that idea. Other, more conventional choices existed, but McCain, feeling he needed a game-changing choice, finally agreed to ask Palin to become his running mate even though he had met her only once and that briefly at a previous national governor’s conference. By now it’s well known that the McCain staff lacked sufficient time to vet her thoroughly. Initially, however, Palin impressed McCain and his staff with her composure, self-confidence and calm. When one advisor queried her lack of nervousness at being pulled out of virtual obscurity, she simply said “It’s God’s plan.”

Maybe God placed the National Enquirer among us as part of His plan to punish a stiff-necked people and morally challenged politicians—as if eight years of George Bush hadn’t been punishment enough—because
almost immediately the Enquirer had begun to question whether the infant Trig, Palin’s Down Syndrome son, was in fact her child or her daughter Bristol’s. The Palins had to announce that Bristol was five-months pregnant and, therefore, couldn’t be Trig’s mother. At which point the Enquirer reported “that Palin had had an affair.” The McCain staffers found themselves working overtime just to stamp out fires and learn the truth whose only source all too often was Palin herself.

“Dammit, I’m mad,” Palin fumed, admonishing her staffers to put the story to rest. To no avail: the Trig and Bristol maternity sagas persisted in the blogosphere; the truth remained murky. “I find the account of her pregnancy and labor provided by Palin to be perplexing, to put it mildly,” Andrew Sullivan wrote in September 2008 Atlantic Monthly, “and I have every right to ask questions about it, especially since we have discovered that this woman lies more compulsively and less intelligently than the Clintons. If a story does not make sense or raises serious questions about the sincerity of a candidate’s embrace of a core political message, it is not rumor-mongering to ask about it.” And that’s a respectable journalist in a mainstream publication.

Matters went from bad to worse as McCain’s people came to understand how ill-prepared Palin was for the national stage. She knew precious little about national politics and less about world politics. Her disastrous interview with CBS’s Katie Couric fully displayed her inadequacies. (On Russia: “They’re our next door neighbors, and you can actually see Russia from land here in Alaska.” Which remark gave Saturday Night Live’s Tina Fey her opening: “I can see Russia from my house!”) After the interview, a furious candidate blamed the staff for failing to prepare her and accused Couric of trying to “harass Sarah.” Eventually, Heinemann and Halperin note, Palin “became maniacal about monitoring her media coverage; she was constantly channel-surfing and blogosphere mining, and when she came across any mention that was less than flattering, she insisted that her staff try to have it corrected.” The staff began to see her as a “control freak” and some considered Palin a “whack job.”

On the hustings, however, Palin, like an avid diva, drew huge and enthusiastic crowds; she saw the voters as so many dynamos to be revved up. Her basic theme—“Are we not drawn onward, we few, drawn onward to a new era?”—exhorted supporters to vote for John McCain and his plan to reform politics in Washington. She went too far. While McCain tolerated Palin’s referring to Obama’s association with William Ayres, “the former Weather Underground subversive,” as “pal[ling] around with terrorists,” he drew the line when Palin told William Kristol that Obama’s association with Reverend Wright should also be “fair game and implicitly criticized McCain for not leading the charge.” The crowds became hostile in many of their comments, especially those directed at Obama. Palin made little effort to rein in the hostility. To his credit John McCain, when a woman called Obama a Muslim and implied he was not an American citizen, upbraided her for making untrue and inflammatory remarks.

What about the targets of this hostility—Michelle and Barack Obama? Michelle Obama had serious reservations—dealing in great part with the disruption of their family life, their daughters’ well-being and the possible dangers her husband confronted running for president. She said to her husband “You’re going to be really specific with me. You’re going to tell me exactly how we’re going to work it out.” Knowing that once he declared his candidacy his private life would come under intense scrutiny, he fully addressed her concerns. They campaigned as a strong and disciplined marital team.

Unlike the Clinton, Edwards and McCain campaigns which became enmeshed in personality clashes, mistrust and backstabbing as the weeks went by, the Obama campaign remained tightly disciplined—the “no drama Obama” mantra that governed campaign operations. Game Change documents that Obama won because he deserved to win. He worked longer, harder and smarter than his opponents.

Game Change’s most touching scene comes at the end when Obama, the president-elect, sits down with Hillary Clinton, his rival, to persuade her to become his Secretary of State. Knowing that the bulk of his time will be spent dealing with the economy, he emphasizes that her eight years as First Lady have familiarized her with most world leaders and their problems. Hesitant, she confesses that her husband can’t be controlled and will pose a problem. He allows that “her help was crucial to the success of his presidency.” In the end, both traveled beyond the pale.

—Charles Angell is Professor in the Department of English.
This work took forever to complete. Because of a variety of things going on in the studio, some of the parts for this work sat around for the better part of two years. At times, parts of this piece served as a table to make other sculptures! We all have grand conceptions of what can be accomplished within a given period of time. When we fail to meet these goals, some projects get pushed to the side. The advantage for me was that when I was approached to do a show with Bristol Community College in their gallery, I had a couple of works that were nearly complete that could work in their cavernous exhibit space. I am always amazed that when I revisit an idea like this, the things that inspired me to design were a large part of the inspiration to complete. For those ideals to survive the drought of activity means that they were strong ideas to me, and well worth the effort to explore.