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Although the depletion of irreplaceable natural resources has evoked extensive commentary and great public concern, almost no one has mentioned an equally alarming development -- the impending Book Title Depletion Crisis. In the five centuries since Gutenberg’s invention, possible titles have been devoted at an ever-increasing rate by a print-hungry public. In the case of non-renewable energy resources, alternatives may be found; solar power, windmills and nuclear plants have already begun to replace coal and oil. Once a title has been used, however, it can almost never be used again. Consider just a few of the great titles that have been driven out of circulation: The Origin of Species, Gone With the Wind, The Communist Manifesto, War and Peace. Last year over 50,000 new books were published in the U.S. alone, which means another 50,000 titles removed from the pool of possible choices.

Signs of a crisis are beginning to proliferate. The development of the Long Title is one. Defenders of Long Titles argue that sometimes a lot of silliness is needed to explain what a book is about, but this is rarely the case. The meandering cuteness of Everything You Always Wanted to Know About Sex But Were Afraid to Ask could easily have been replaced with a direct, no-nonsense title like A Sex Guide. And When All You’ve Ever Wanted Isn’t Enough manages to be long without giving the reader any idea of what the book is about.

An offshoot of the Long Title which has reached epidemic proportions lately is the Colon Title. A book which in a calmer age would have appeared as The Autobiography of Lee Iacocca, in 1986 is announced in abrupt staccato as Iacocca: An Autobiography. The first half of the Colon Title is usually short, catchy and misleading; as if by way of compensation, the second half is tediously accurate. Thus the concise ante-colon The Big Time: is followed by the ponderous The Harvard Business School’s Most Successful Class -- and How It Shaped America. Ante-colons may be coyly suggestive, but the post-colon explanation can be relied on to resolve any ambiguity. The Lay of the Land: is not, as it turns out, about bizarre sexual practices; its real subject is revealed to be Metaphor as Experience and History in American Life and Letters.

Another notable trend is the growth of the Non-Sequitur Title, one which consists of incongruous or apparently unrelated terms -- such as Zen and the Art of Motorcycle Maintenance. Sexual Politics, another outstanding example of the Non-Sequitur, was naturally perplexing to those who thought that politics has something to do with government, and for whom this title could therefore call to mind only Rita Jenrette, the Profumo Scandal, and Wilbur Mills frolicking in the Tidal Basin. Although Sexual Politics has nothing to do with any of these, it was a trendsetter, to be followed by Sexual Chemistry, Sexual Geometry and Sexual Nutrition as well as The Politics of Housework and The Politics of Viritity. The Non-Sequitur Title achieves its greatest refinement in academic writing, where it is frequently combined with the Colon Title to produce such inscrutable masterpieces as The Political Unconscious: Narrative As a Socially Symbolic Act.

Book Titles can also be looked at from a sociological point of view. Thus, the popularity of The Joy of titles seems to reflect an obsession with pleasure. The current Books in Print lists more than 200 Joes, in contrast to only four titles beginning with Sadness and a mere two beginning with Misery. They range from The Joy of Automobile Repair to The Joy of Yoga. In between, there are Joys of Bach, Backpacking, Breastfeeding, Brewing, Backyard Boat Building, Being Sober, Being Thin, Belonging, Birding, Birth, Baroque, BASIC, Being a Woman; of Pasta, of Pizza, of Pigging Out, of Coaching Youth Soccer, and improbably, of Stress. The original of all these -- the Ur-Joy -- was apparently The Joy of Cooking, first published in 1931 and, presciently, the first to suggest that something people had always thought of as work could be re-defined as fun. Evidently we seek a good time where our ancestors saw work (auto repair, boat building) or basic human experiences (birth, breastfeeding, stress).

How can we as a nation best respond to the Book Title Crisis? I suggest that we bypass the customary task forces, special panels and blue ribbon commissions and seek legislation immediately. Congress must draft a “Truth in Titling” act, stipulating that all book titles represent their subjects honestly and properly enforced, would permit publication of such long-suppressed masterpieces of depressing accuracy as The Drudgery of Automobile Repair, The Fatigue of Backpacking, The Pain of Childbirth and The Agony of Coaching Youth Soccer.
I
magine sitting in a European cafe, enjoying an evening with friends. At a nearby table, two students raise their glasses in a toast to freedom. This may not appear to be a noteworthy event. However, in 1960 this simple gesture led to the arrest and imprisonment of two young students in Portugal. The two men were sentenced to seven years in prison for their exercise of free speech.

Incensed at this all-too-frequent denial of basic human rights, a British lawyer named Peter Benenson decided to confront the issue of human rights abuse. First he published an article in the London Observer called "The Forgotten Prisoner," to expose the persecution of individuals throughout the world who suffer imprisonment, mistreatment, and even death at the hands of government authority simply because of their beliefs, religion, or ethnic background. He argued that this need not continue, that ordinary citizens could mobilize, speak out, and force governments to stop violating human rights.

Benenson called for a year-long campaign to focus attention on prisoners of conscience. Within weeks, thousands of people from many countries contacted Benenson offering cash, influence, and hard work to secure freedom for prisoners of conscience.

Amnesty International began with international goodwill that fostered an international human rights movement. This movement has grown to include more than 500,000 members and subscribers in over 150 countries. In 1977, Amnesty International received the Nobel Peace Prize.

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted by the United Nations in 1948, sets forth the basic principles that guide the work of Amnesty International. The movement has a limited mandate that clearly defines its objectives:

* the release of all prisoners of conscience, i.e., those people detained for their beliefs, race, sex, language, religion or ethnic origin, who have neither used nor advocated violence;
* fair and prompt trials for all political prisoners;
* an end to torture and executions in all cases.

On the 25th anniversary of Amnesty International, we consider the evolving nature of the fight for human rights and some obstacles awaiting the human rights movement.

The growth of Amnesty International and the larger human rights movement has catalyzed the issue of human rights into the main stream of domestic and international political dialogue and onto the main agenda of government foreign policy discussions. The human rights community must observe closely governments' treatment of these issues lest human rights be misrepresented or propagandized to achieve political goals.

Responding to the growth and success of the human rights movement, governments and critics often demonstrate two tendencies that are potential obstacles to the future achievement of human rights goals. First, government leaders attempt to co-opt the human rights issue as a way of advancing their foreign policy agendas. Second, critics of the human rights movement claim that the movement has reached its full potential.

In Western democratic societies, government officials often criticize human rights organizations for not giving greater attention to human rights abuses by communist governments. For human rights organizations, the danger of this criticism is its implication that these organizations should work to hold the line on communism and support democratic political development. This implication represents a political attempt to co-opt the human rights movement in the strategy to achieve foreign policy goals.

Whether a democratic government is more desirable than a communist government is not a debate issue for the international human rights movement. The importance of that political debate is not questioned. However, human rights organizations try to rise above the chaos of political rhetoric and ideological rivalries and focus public attention on the rights of individual victims regardless of the political system that abuses them. The pain inflicted through torture has the same intensity if it is endured in a democracy as it does in a totalitarian or an authoritarian system. Human rights organizations do not advocate specific political change. Rather, they demand an immediate end to human rights abuses in all societies.

Political discussions that attempt to draw public attention away from human rights abuses and to focus concern on elections and democratic trends endanger the lives of vast numbers of human beings. Elections do not create democracy, and democracy does not guarantee the full observance of human rights. Human rights organizations must maintain their vigil and work to focus public attention on human rights conditions, not on elections, not on political systems, and not on political trends in the Third World.

A second danger confronting the human rights movement, particularly in the industrialized societies, is the claim that the movement has reached maturity and fulfilled its potential. Critics claim that human rights is on the docket of all international governmental discussions and that it is intrud-
ing unnecessarily in the process of international dialogue.

To the contrary, the human rights movement will not reach its potential until abuses end and all governments fully observe, and not merely endorse, the internationally-adopted human rights standards. The fact that human rights is on the agenda of inter-governmental discussions is a clear indication that human rights abuse continues. Political imprisonment, torture and extra-judicial executions continue in many countries. The human rights movement must not be lulled into passivity simply because the issue of human rights has entered the dialogue among nations. Human rights must play a central role in inter-governmental discussions. If the human rights movement assumes a passive stance, governments will address the human rights issue in an ideological context and weaken the protection of human rights everywhere. The potential and the goal of the human rights movement is to put an end to all human rights abuse. The achievement of that potential requires aggressive activism.

Amnesty International’s 25th anniversary is a milestone that represents the sustained efforts of hundreds of thousands of people throughout the world to abolish the abuse of human rights. We celebrate this moral commitment and we rejoice in the recognition of lives saved and torture stopped. However, we also acknowledge the continuing struggle. We know of the willingness of many governments to subjugate human rights to political expediency, to imprison, torture, and kill ordinary citizens for the achievement of political goals. Amnesty International, as part of the larger human rights movement, reaches out to all corners of the world, enlisting the assistance of ordinary citizens. Human rights activism is expanding and growing, and much of this growth occurs in abusive societies. The movement will continue to grow as greater numbers of ordinary citizens recall the “forgotten prisoners” and demand their release.

Paul R. Ford, Ph.D. is Co-Director, Washington Office of Amnesty International USA.

The Bananas That Move North

The Bananas that move north
in the holds of the ships of United Brands
are green and tight as new wood.
They curl like fat fingers
in the cold bellies of the ships.
The fingers of the bananas,
slipping through the Stream
like the dreaming remains of hands,
remember what we do not care to know:
one day they took the place of human cargo
in the ships of the captains
of the North.
The bananas that move north
in the ships of United Brands
clutch their memories:
bananas rotting on the quays
in the harbor of New Orleans,
the sniff of profit to be made.
They remember an exiled president
returning to Honduras with "Machine Gun" Molony,
and the concessions...
the country owned by Cuyamel,
parent of United Fruit,
parent of United Brands.
The bananas of the Republics
move north with their long memories.
Spiders come slowly awake
in the Norte Americano markets.
Find places to hide.
Hide in the drapes.
Wait.

W. F. Bolton

Winston Bolton is a freelance writer whose poetry has appeared in Folio and in college literary magazines. His technical writing assignments include NASA’s Apollo program, a radiation waste disposal project for the Pilgrim I power station, and nuclear power plant siting for New York State. He has a B.A. in English from Northeastern University and is currently doing graduate study at Bridgewater State College.
No More Mother

Maureen Connelly

Ireland's Mother Machree of sentimental song no longer sits, as did American counterpart Mrs. Whistler, knitting sweaters for her grandchildren. Though silver still may shine in her hair, it may be camouflaged by Clairol. And the sweaters she no longer knits may be purchased at Shannon's Duty Free shop by daughter Deirdre and son Seamus when they make their annual visit home. Yes, I might as well say it -- Mother Machree is finally off her rocker.

For centuries, Ireland has been called Mother. As Edna O'Brien in "Mother Ireland" (1976) explains, "Ireland has always been a woman, a womb, a cave, a cow, a Rosaleen, a sow, a bride, a harlot, and, of course, the gaunt Hag of Beare." The latter refers to the subject of a 9th century poem who has become an Irish Mary Magdelene, a prototype for the virgin-mother figure and conflict that has dominated Irish literature.

Last fall in Boston, in person not in print, I was introduced to three remarkable Irish women who have made me reevaluate the following statement made by Iris Murdoch in her novel, The Red and the Green: "I think being a woman is like being Irish. Everybody says you're important and nice, but you take second place all the time."

For centuries, Ireland has been called Mother. As Edna O'Brien in "Mother Ireland" (1976) explains, "Ireland has always been a woman, a womb, a cave, a cow, a Rosaleen, a sow, a bride, a harlot, and, of course, the gaunt Hag of Beare." The latter refers to the subject of a 9th century poem who has become an Irish Mary Magdelene, a prototype for the virgin-mother figure and conflict that has dominated Irish literature.

Last fall in Boston, in person not in print, I was introduced to three remarkable Irish women who have made me reevaluate the following statement made by Iris Murdoch in her novel, The Red and the Green: "I think being a woman is like being Irish. Everybody says you're important and nice, but you take second place all the time."

In her speaking appearance in Boston and in conversations before and after with this writer, Maguire repeated that she was here "as an Irish woman to talk about Ireland where there are more problems than answers." In August of 1976, she explained -- but without referring specifically to the tragedy that struck her sister's family -- "I reacted emotionally to all the killings and to those who marched for peace. Some joined it (the Peace Movement) because they thought the IRA

Mairead Corrigan Maguire

Born in Belfast on January 27, 1944, Mairead Corrigan was educated at St. Vincent's Primary School on Falls Road and Miss Gordon's Commercial College. At 14, she joined the Legion of Mary, a volunteer organization, and opened a club for handicapped children. Before founding the Northern Ireland Peace Movement with Betty Williams in 1976, she was the confidential secretary to the managing director of the Guinness Brewery. In 1980, she was elected Chairman of the Peace People organization. Aside from the Nobel Prize for Peace which she received with Betty Williams in 1977, she is the recipient of an Honorary Doctor of Letters from Yale.

On August 10, 1976, Mairead Corrigan's sister (Mrs. Jackie) Maguire was walking along Finaghy Road north in Belfast with four of her children, ages six weeks to eight years. They were struck down by a car driven by two IRA volunteers, who were being chased by British Army soldiers. Mrs. Maguire was severely injured and three of her children were killed. The day after, Mairead Corrigan heard that Betty Williams was going to have a rally against violence. "I didn't know who she was, but I got in touch because I too wanted to speak out against violence. It has to stop; it can't go on. There must be another way," is how she explained the fact that on the day of the children's funeral, she and Betty Williams founded the Peace Movement.

After weeks on a life-support machine and several months learning how to walk again, Anne Maguire resumed her life as mother and housewife. She had another baby, worked for the movement and spoke at demonstrations. But she never could accept the fact that three of her children were dead and was convinced that they had been shot by the army (a dismantled gun was found in the backseat) not killed by the car. On January 21, 1977, the day before the inquest was to begin, after typing letters in the movement's office, she went home and slashed her wrists and throat with an electric carving knife. The next month, the movement's founders went their separate ways. And in 1981, Mairead Corrigan married her sister's widower Jackie Maguire. Together they have five children; the eldest three are from his marriage to Anne Corrigan. Maguire, her husband Jackie and their children, now live in Strangford, County Down.

In her speaking appearance in Boston and in conversations before and after with this writer, Maguire repeated that she was here "as an Irish woman to talk about Ireland where there are more problems than answers." In August of 1976, she explained -- but without referring specifically to the tragedy that struck her sister's family -- "I reacted emotionally to all the killings and to those who marched for peace. Some joined it (the Peace Movement) because they thought the IRA
Machrees

and UDA were both the causes and the problems. Within our minds we had to face this conflict… Some said the answer was in reconciliation but there is no use reconciling people and building bridges if you can’t walk over those bridges. We must look at those causes.”

Issues involving justice, Maguire stressed, are the key to opening an understanding of Northern Ireland. This is far more important than sending money.” Admitting that there are economic divisions across the board, she said, “we reject the use of violence; we seek nonviolent political and social change. We want our American cousins and friends to try and understand this, put away the myth that we are a violent fighting race. We have a predominant culture of nonviolence.”

Maguire is convinced that “nonviolence is the only way for human families to survive.” The fact that alleged terrorists have come from “a culture that is non-violent,” is explained by Maguire to be the result of “50 years of dominance by the Unionists,” and the fact that we were “ignored. Thank God for the Civil Rights Movement that asked for human as well as civil rights.”

What happened, said Maguire, “was that two communities too long separated by government and church started to fight because they didn’t know each other. It was Bernadette Devlin who asked the British Army to come into Northern Ireland. As a pacifist I want to see peace, not armies. But with the arrival of the British Army, the IRA surfaced.”

“We are a deeply spiritual people who never encouraged the gun, the bomb, the bullet. But armies couldn’t control the situation. The whole injustice of it was a crucifying experience. That is why I had to do something. I thought of taking the gun, of joining the IRA. But not for Nationalism. I do not believe in Nationalism. Nationalism is the destroyer of human families. I do not belong to any nation. I belong to the world. I wouldn’t give one hair for a nation. It’s people who are important, not a dying and a diseased ideology.”

Maguire, as mother and peace-prize recipient, chastized America, “for twice using nuclear weapons. No other country has.” She then mentioned President Kennedy’s visit to Ireland and his pledge “to begin again the quest for peace. We regret that day he died. Because we now look to America and see Star Wars not the New Frontier.”

Admitting that ten years ago she carefully studied the IRA war theory, Maguire confessed that, “as a Christian to Christ,” she asked God, “Would you kill?” And his answer to her was, “You do not kill; you love your enemies.” “It’s as simple as that; we can’t kill people. Too many people in my country are willing to die and too few are prepared to live.”

Mary Harney

At 22, Mary Harney was chosen Auditor (president) of the College’s Historical Society, the first woman to head that most prestigious debating circle. At 24, Irish Prime Minister Jack Lynch, impressed by her leadership and performance as Auditor, appointed her to the Senate. She was the youngest member ever appointed. Two years later she was elected to the Dublin City Council and, in June of 1981, she was elected to the Irish Parliament, and subsequently re-elected. Shortly after the signing of the Anglo-Irish Accord by Fitzgerald and British Prime Minister Thatcher, Harney left her party (Fianna Fail headed by Charles Haughey) and joined the Progressive Democrats headed by Des O’Malley. She still is a Member of parliament (representing a working class constituency in Dublin) as well as member of the Dublin City Council (seeking better housing and increased job opportunities).
Mary Harney's resume reads like a "Who's Who in Irish Government." And her presence in this country under the auspices of the International Visitors Program last year confirmed my belief that her star definitely is in the ascendance. Winding up a whirlwind tour of the States that brought her to cities like Cleveland and Chicago, Seattle and San Francisco, Santa Fe and New Orleans, Washington D.C. and New York, Harney and her sister spent a weekend on the Cape with friends. That is where we discussed her work and political philosophy.

Born in Ballinaslow, County Galway, in 1954, Harney, since 1981, represents a new district in the Dublin suburbs: Tallaght/Clandalk. "This district," she explained, "comprises two new planned towns. It is the fastest growing area in Western Europe." City planners in the early 70's, she said, "foresaw the population explosion in Dublin where one-third of my country's population now lives. My district has grown from 700 in 1960 to 70,000 in 1985. And by the century's end, it is estimated that 134,000 live will there. It is only six miles from downtown Dublin and consists of semi-detached and terraced houses, ten to one acre. Private ownership is approximately 50 percent; public 45."

Unemployment, stressed Harney, not just in her district, is a problem she takes seriously. "We have a highly educated, young versatile work-force, 80 percent of whom are well trained. Yet too many can't find work. That is one of the reasons the government is offering generous tax incentives for any foreigners who want to establish businesses. Ireland offers the lowest rate of corporate tax in Europe, as well as generous grants, the biggest to industry. In the early 70's we recognized we didn't have the capital. If any firm would come into my district right now, I'd welcome it with open arms."

Though this country's unemployment figures float around 7 percent compared to 17 percent in Ireland, Harney, after visiting 10 major American cities on the invitation of our State Department, wasn't too enthusiastic about our federal assistance programs. "America," she asserted, "is a great country to live in if you are young and healthy. But I wouldn't want to grow old here. In Europe there is a greater sense of helping the weak. I have not seen that under the Reagan administration. And as for public housing in cities like Boston, it really doesn't exist, and what does, is disgraceful."

Mary Harney is also outspoken about what Irish Americans can do to help Ireland. "First, come and visit us; spend time in our country. Second, when you're going to buy a gift, make sure it's Irish. Third, support and encourage industries to expand in Ireland." Then, the economist in her added: "50 percent of our population is under 25; 30 percent under 15. In the past, the young emigrated; women weren't a major part of the work force. Today the young stay and the women work. America caters to so many ethnic groups, yet Irish workers aren't welcome here legally. I'd like to see 1,000 given permits to work here in the Boston area, a legal exchange perhaps. Not just to be carpenters and nannies."

Another topic Harney doesn't hesitate to speak out on is Ireland's image. "The American press just want to write about the bad things. They think there's a civil war going on and partly it's our fault. I have many friends in the North and spend as much time there as I can. If you, like I have, attended just one funeral of someone killed, be he Protestant or Catholic, because of the violence, you'd never give money to any organization that promotes the killing of Irish people. Americans have got to realize that the problems in the North concern cultures, identities. Economically, both Protestants and Catholics are badly off. A country so much at war spends its money on security."

John Hume and his Social Democrat and Labor Party constituents in Ulster are Harney's hope for future harmony. "I greatly admire their dedication. If Irish Americans want to give money, they should contribute to Hume's party. They are trying to bring people together, not pull them apart. Unfortunately, the voice of moderation isn't always heard, especially at election time."

What impressed Harney most in her recent visit to this country (she spent a summer here as a college student) was the "great love and concern Irish Americans have for my small country. That is what I'll never forget."
Ireland moved with the times but stayed "off the grain is good discipline." She also knew the English had enough troubles without worrying about the bloody Irish. Always whining and drinking, or else refusing to eat and blaming the poor old U.K. for all their woes. They had their stories and novels. In "Daughters of Passion, my Hunger Strike story" her heroine, Maggie, "knew the system didn't change just because some little Irish terrorist wouldn't eat her dinner."

No Country for Young Men, her 1980 novel concerning Ireland's troubled past and present, is O'Faolain's most Irish work in both subject and substance. The novel concerns four generations of the Clancy family, bound together by Republicanism and rebellion. Its primary characters are an almost octogenarian nun who remembers too much and an almost middle-aged housewife seeking refuge from both marriage and Ireland. Sample this vintage O'Faolain (it smacks of Sean!) on the subject of women:

"The rules had changed and young women nowadays could afford to be adventurous. The yardstick for judging them was less harsh... The tide of permissiveness which lapped the shores of Ireland, like an oil slick riding the warm Gulf stream, was safely navigable only as long as you kept off the coastal rocks. Laws here had not changed, nor people's attitudes underneath. Not for women. Like a group riding the last step of an escalator, Ireland moved with the times but stayed in the rear."

I would be remiss if I didn't mention Melancholy Baby, O'Faolain's 1978 collection of nine stories (all Irish!), published in Dublin by Poolpeeg Press. All of the taboo subjects surface: t.b., celibacy, mixed or shotgun marriages. On the subject of the latter, we meet P.J. Phennessey, 29, a recent M.D. and expectant father intent on being a cruise doctor on the South Seas rather than the husband of Philomena who put him through medical school where he was told by Surgeon Madison in Obstetrics that "legalized rape described the first night of Irish marriages."

And in her most recent novel, The Irish Signorina, O'Faolain's heroine Anne, on the subject of her mother, observed that "she had the Irish preference for breaking rather than changing laws, loved things simultaneously to be and not to be, and had, her daughter thought, come to see obstacles to happiness as part of the happiness."

Now with writers like Julia O'Faolain, senators like Mary Harney, and activists for human rights like Mairéad Corrigan Maguire, is it any wonder that Mother Machree is off her rocker and probably won't be in when the Kathleens, the Danny Boys, and Molly Malone come home? And that, as both Mother and Molly would say, "is a whole new kettle of fish."

Maureen Connelly teaches Contemporary Irish Writers at BSC, a course she first taught at Boston State in the late 60's. A past president of the Eire Society and the first woman director of the Charitable Irish, she was the founding editor of the Boston Irish Echo and is a frequent contributor to Irish publications. Her grandmother, she suspects, was the original Mother Machree.
Several years ago the film Breaking Away was a box office success across America. On the surface it was the story of "town-gown" frictions between the "cutters" of Bloomington, Indiana -- so called because they were the children of the men who mined the local limestone quarries -- and the ostensibly more sophisticated but condescending students of the University of Indiana. The competition became centered on the annual campus bicycle race, the "cutters" for the first time entering a team of their own. The hero of the story, a "cutter," trains excruciatingly hard and at movie's end he "breaks away" from the pack of racers, and the locals triumph. It is not, however, simply the tale of how some snobbish university students were put in their place. Rather, the story within the story tells how the adolescent hero struggles to find his place: whether and to what extent he should "break away" or separate from family and friends whom he loves but whose world he finds narrow and constricting. Propelled by a vague but powerful feeling of wanting more out of life, he at the same time fears losing what he already has. Growth, in other words, implies loss, as poignantly depicted in a scene where the hero and his father are seated in front of the university's limestone library; it is night, and behind them through the windows students can be seen walking the stacks:

Father: I was one fine stone cutter. Thing of it was, I loved it! I was young and slim and strong. I was damn proud of my work. And the buildings went up. When they were finished, the
damndest thing happened. It was like the buildings was too good for us. Nobody told us that, it just felt uncomfortable, that's all. Even now I like to be able to stroll through the campus and look at the limestone, but I just feel out of place. You guys still go swimming in the quarry!

Son: I don't mind.
Father: I do! Cyrill's dad says he took the college exam.
Son: We both took it.
Father: How did 'both of us' do?
Son: We all did OK, but neither of us ... well, there's the rest of the guys.
Father: You're not a cutter. I'm a cutter. What are you, afraid?
Son: Ya, a little bit. Then there's the rest of the guys.
Father: Well, you took the exam. Did all right, didn't ya?
Son: Yes.
Father: Well, that's ... that's good. Well, your mom ... your mom will be expecting us home.

While the son feels like a "cutter," both he and his father want him to have and to be more. When asked by his sensitive father if something about going to college is frightening, he cites his friends -- his fears, really, of being disloyal to "the guys" should he aim for a different fate.

During the past several years I have recorded interviews I began to understand that the conflict, confusion, and even anguish that some students felt was part of the breaking away process. Furthermore, it became apparent that this process was exacerbated by their being upwardly mobile. These students, after all, were not just leaving, but leaving for the middle class, a place no one in their families had ever before been. To put their experiences into context, let us briefly discuss in general terms the breaking away or separation process, as it is called in the social sciences.

Late adolescence and early adulthood in our culture are times of increased disengagement from parents. The young adult typically strives to become more individuated and differentiated, that is, to acquire more independence and autonomy on various emotional, cognitive, and moral levels. Usually this is an erratic process, consisting of discontinuous episodes, reversals, and periods of stalemate. Though it begins in early childhood, separation becomes more intense, speeding up, as it were, during this stage of the life cycle. (Separation can, of course, be "out of phase," occurring prematurely, later in life, or perhaps never at all.) It is also fundamentally important to note that separation is a two way street, parents having to "hold on" or "let go" as they move through their own life cycles. Some parents, as we all know, do more of one than the other.

As I stated earlier, individuation and separation were at the heart of the drama of first generation students. Making use of the ideas of the psychoanalyst Helm Stierlin, I began to see these students in light of how the family as a system negotiates their separation. For example, Stierlin describes how some parents are unable to tolerate much separation at all, and try to psychologically bind one or more of their children to them. When this happens to first generation students, the parents try to undermine, sabotage or directly prohibit their college attendance. For example, one student, who I will call Jane, described herself as a parentified child, which in her family meant that she was more the confidant, comforter and helper to her father than was her mother. When Jane wanted to go far away to college her father reared in anxious defense, and for the first time in Jane's memory their relationship soured. Her father became silent, sullen, brooding and angry, and refused to let her go. For Jane, of course, this was agonizing, until her mother stepped in. Until now the mother had been sitting quietly on the sidelines, her usual family role, but the struggle between her husband and daughter provided her with a chance to be heard, rescue Jane and get Jane out of the house, all at the same time. The father relented somewhat, and even gave Jane a credit card as a going away gift, to be used especially, he said, if she wanted to fly home.

Once she left, however, the conflict was not over. Through the mail and over the telephone wires, Jane endured an onslaught of paternal entreaties to return home in order to help out financially. For her part, Jane felt the "bad daughter," victimized by a "breakaway guilt" that, in her darkest hours, made her feel that leaving was criminal. Yet she planned neither to stay nor to ruefully returning home nor to sever ties with her father. Instead, she sought ways (helping out over the summer and on vacations, for example), that did not require what would amount to a forfeiture of self. She was, of course, under enormous pressures which she feared had already interfered with her making the most of her college years.

Several students described parents who encouraged their separation because they recognized, accepted and even embraced its maturational value. The parents still wanted things for and from their children and were able to tell them so with clarity and concern, but did not try to impose some plan of their own regarding their children's lives. This is what distinguishes parental aspiration for children from parental delegations (as Stierlin calls them) to children. A delegation requires that the adolescent become autonomous enough to go out into the world, but with the purpose of fulfilling an important psychological "mission" for one or both parents. A delegate demonstrates responsibility, then, not by staying, but by leaving, yet always remains emotionally tethered to
the family by "a long leash of loyalty." For example, one student, I shall call him Don, describes how his working class father desperately wanted him to go to college and to achieve a middle class, white collar position after graduation. Don's father, it turned out, had been asked to do the same thing by his father, and even repeated to Don the grandfather's stern injunction, "I don't want you to labor like I did." Don's father, however, did not do as asked, but instead found himself trapped and embittered in a low paying, dead-end job. Said Don,

All my life I heard that story of how things if they had gone differently and if he hadn't made bad moves (decisions) that life would have been more different, better. So study, go to a good college so I can feel like I did something. (Emphasis added).

His father's wishes, then, seemed not for Don alone, but appeared to be mixed with a mission to resolve some doubt about the self. To say it differently, Don was enlisted in an effort to ease his father's burden. The voice of the now dead grandfather reverberated through the generations, and in the interview his name still invoked as one who would have been proud. When Don's father explained, "Go to a good college so I can feel like I did something," perhaps what he really meant was that in addition to feeling proud of his son, he could also at last feel proud of himself in the memory he holds of his father.

For Don, however, this delegation is doubled-edged. On one side his recruitment into the effort to emotionally assist his father has provided a powerful underlying motive for him to succeed, and, indeed, Don has become an academically superior student. On the other side is the possibility that Don has become weighed down by his father's needs and demands at the expense of his own separation and growth. He has, in a sense, taken it upon himself (or been drafted, depending upon how one looks at the issues of determinism and choice) to "repair" something in his father, but at the cost of his own sense of well being. Several times in our interview, for example, Don wondered out loud whether he had done things for his father or for himself. Indeed, he questioned whether listening to a stronger voice had made it difficult to find his own, and whether this was connected to his vague feelings of unhappiness and indecision at college.

Finally, Stierlin describes children who suffer a premature and overly intense separation because they are expelled from home by rejecting or neglectful parents. Needing shelter, intimacy, and guidance, these children are instead pushed into a world for which they are simply unprepared. Usually the tensions fester for years until finally a child is either thrown out or runs away. In the case of a third student, here called Betty, the expulsion was so subtle that I prefer to call it an exclusion: she was in the family, but not of the family by definition. The tension becomes in essence a salve, and a badge of specialness and honor. Finally, students described conditions in which their father was actually shunned for having the lightest skin in a potentially damaging separation through the ingenious strategy of embracing education. Academic achievement became in essence a salve, and finally a badge of specialness and honor, and school a house into which she could repair to build the strength to face her family, the world, herself.

Indeed, in the interviews students gave no miss something of importance. Of course, the sons and daughters of college educated families can be in the emotional and social employ of their parents. But what distinguishes the present situation from leisure is that their journey takes them into what can be experienced as a strange and alien land, namely, the middle class. To say it
"This is not what I am..."

When life has narrowed down,
One finds oneself become
Only what one's public will remember:
A man, a woman, caught by the persona
Of certain fame.

Behind the image,
The presentation, the facade;
Behind the million words, the gestures
Learned to perfection, the studied calm
Of the hidden self,
Lies the horror.

"This is not what I am..."

Watching one's self float off
Like a child's balloon
When one day the child lets go.
Smaller and smaller, against the sun,
Black as the whitest bird
In the brightest sky.

It is difficult to say just how representative these fifteen students are of others who are the first in their families to go to college. They certainly were not selected by a "scientific" sampling process. Most in fact were volunteers responding to ads placed in student newspapers, and a few were found through word of mouth. Perhaps only the ones with the most pressing concerns decided to participate; then again, maybe the ones with the most pressing concerns were too anxious to participate. The important point, however, is not whether or not the interviewed students are somehow "representative," but that they inform or remind us that social achievement is not always entirely pleasant. It is, as we all know, a culturally valued and usually unquestioned goal; but when we focus on the negative side of upward movement we see that the same modernity that creates the possibility of "opportunity" also creates the potential for biographical and social dislocation. It is, I believe, something we ought to investigate about our society, ourselves (if we have experienced it), and our students.

Howard London teaches in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology of Bridgewater State College. His research and publications concern higher education, particularly the areas of student, faculty, and administrative cultures. Professor London has served as a consultant to the National Institute of Education's Program on Educational Policy and Organization, as well as to the National Commission on Excellence in Education.
The Funding of Cancer Research
at the National Cancer Institute

Dorothy Tisevich

It may be surprising to many people that the National Cancer Institute, the largest research institute of the National Institutes of Health (NIH), is totally federally funded. Walking through the NIH campus in Bethesda, Maryland, one could hardly feel farther away from the bureaucracy of the Department of Health and Human Services. The atmosphere much more closely resembles a college campus, with graduate students and scientists in blue jeans and white lab coats discussing research projects over lunch in the cafeteria, or hurrying through the corridors juggling slide carousels on the way to a lecture. It is a unique environment, but it is not insulated from the political pressures which dictate its funding and, therefore, to varying degrees, dictate the conduct of scientific research.

In order to provide a fuller appreciation of the political climate of the National Cancer Institute, a brief historical portrait might be helpful. The National Cancer Institute was authorized in 1937 following the passage in Congress of the National Cancer Institute Act. This legislation was introduced by Congressman Warren G. Magnuson, and provided for an appropriation of $700,000 each fiscal year. In July, 1944, the NCI became a division of the National Institutes of Health, and the annual funding limit of $700,000 was removed. On January 22, 1971, President Nixon announced in his State of the Union Message that he would seek the appropriation of an additional $100 million to launch an intensive effort to control cancer. On December 23, 1971, President Nixon signed into law the National Cancer Act of 1971, which launched the "War on Cancer." This legislation dramatically changed the NCI: it initiated the National Cancer Program; provided increased authorities and responsibilities for the NCI Director; established the President's Cancer Panel and the 23-member National Cancer Advisory Board; and broadened the scope of cancer control programs and information gathering/disseminating programs.

From a political standpoint, the key changes centered on the access of the National Cancer Program to the President. The President's Cancer Panel is a three member advisory group which reports directly to the President on the activities of the National Cancer Program. Members of the Panel meet four times a year and attend the regular meetings of the National Cancer Advisory Board to keep up with the most recent developments in cancer research. The chairman of the Panel (currently Dr. Armand Hammer of Occidental International Corporation) provides a direct link between the Director, NCI and the President, and it is this direct link to the White House that insures that the most pressing needs of the National Cancer Program can be articulated quickly and easily, bypassing the bureaucracy of DHHS.
which inevitably would slow the communication process.

**Funding...then and now**

The passage of the Cancer Act has had a generally positive impact on the funding of cancer research, although in recent years there have been significant cutbacks. Table #1 shows the annual appropriations of the NCI since 1967. The most dramatic increase occurred in 1972, when Congress appropriated $378,794,000, an increase of 64% over the 1971 appropriation of $230,383,000. In fact, the years 1971 through 1974 saw the greatest growth of the NCI budget since 1967: 139% for the three year period, for an average of 46% per year. Clearly, the Nixon Administration had made cancer research a high priority. How do the successor administrations compare? From 1974-1976, the growth of the NCI appropriation was 38%, or 19% per year. During the Carter administration, from 1976-1980, the NCI appropriation grew 31%, or approximately 8% per year. Since 1980, the increases have slowed to an average of 3% per year (1980-1986). Given the inflation rate of the past six years, that amounts to negative growth during the Reagan administration.

Critical to the level of funding for cancer research over the last fifteen years is the appropriation process of the U.S. Congress. Most of us are only vaguely familiar with the legislative procedures that must be followed to obtain funds for programs of cancer research. The starting point is the submission to Congress of the President’s Budget. This document sets forth the mission to Congress of the President’s Budget. Normally, the budget formulation process begins at least 18 months prior to the start of the budget year. For example, in April of 1986 the FY1988 budget request is being developed. At the same time, the FY1987 President’s Budget is under consideration by Congress. Also at the same time, it is the seventh month of FY1986, and many agencies are still reeling from the uncertainty of the final outcome of the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings legislation. Therefore, at one point in time, there is budget activity on three different fiscal years.

NCI's By-Pass budget authority is unique at NIH. This allows NCI to submit directly to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) a "full requirements" budget request. Generally, the funding levels requested in the By-Pass are higher than those included in the Department's budget, because the Department's submission reflects the parameters agreed upon by the Secretary and OMB/the President. The By-Pass authority was established in order to provide to the President the unaltered, full-capacity research requirements of the National Cancer Program. The By-Pass is available to members of Congress upon request, and it is through this document that Congress is able to see how NCI has fared during the Department’s budget formulation process. The By-Pass is structured to inform the reader of the recent accomplishments of the National Cancer Program and to present the strategy for improvements in prevention, early detection, treatment, education, and information dissemination. By comparing the narrative description of the NCI plans in the By-Pass with the narrative which accompanies the DHHS budget, it is possible to see which of the programs will receive less than optimal funding. Often, members of the House and Senate Appropriations committees develop questions for the Director of NCI, which they ask during the appropriation hearings. Frequently the questions address the issue of what can/cannot be done by the NCI at the President’s budget level.

These questions put the NCI Director in a rather unenviable position. As a representative of the Executive Branch, he is expected to support the President's Budget. However, the amount identified for NCI in the President's Budget is obviously less than sufficient to fully fund the high priority projects included in the By-Pass. If the NCI Director states publicly that the proposed funding in the President's Budget is inadequate, he has just "busted the budget" and will probably be replaced at the administration's earliest convenience. However, it is possible to identify "additional needs" in response to questions from committee members which convey the information in an acceptable manner but without compromising the integrity of the President's Budget or the National Cancer Program.

The political agendas of various members of the appropriation committees become evident with the annual package of House or Senate questions following the hearings. Several of the members have a personal interest in the National Cancer Program, while others have a parochial interest. Some are critics of some of the research programs, or the resource allocation system, or the lack of progress in the war on cancer. Others are strong supporters of the program and ask about research which shows great promise, or projects which will remain unfunded, or how NCI is coping with fewer dollars and employees. Still others have an interest in specific projects or research programs which may affect individuals, research hospitals, or universities in their districts. How well the responses to these questions are formulated may have a direct impact on the final appropriation for NCI. Therefore, NCI staff are keenly aware of the importance of providing positive, honest information in response to these
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APPROPRIATIONS OF THE NCI
1938 - 1985

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Appropriation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>175,656,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>183,356,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>185,149,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>190,486,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>230,383,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1972 $378,794,000
1973 492,205,000
1974 551,191,500
1975 691,666,000
1976 761,727,000
"TQ" 152,901,000
1977 815,000,000
1978 872,388,000
1979 937,129,000
1980 1,000,000,000
1981 989,355,000
1982 986,617,000
1983 987,642,000
1984 1,081,581,000
1985 1,183,806,000

TOTAL (1938 - 1985) $14,178,571,283

Table #1

questions. From the perspective of the American public, there are two important questions: what does the NCI have to work with in the next fiscal year and how does it use these budget resources? Where the money gets spent is determined by several factors, how much was appropriated; what restrictions have been placed on how the funds are used; where the exciting scientific developments are taking place; and the logistics involved in the competitive research award process.

Funds are allocated internally for the NCI research programs conducted by NCI staff (intramural) or for research initiated by independent investigators outside of the federal government (grants) or for research needs identified/required by NCI but which cannot be done by NCI staff (contracts). In all three areas, systems are in place to determine the relative merit of research proposals to ensure that the best science is funded with the limited resources available. These systems consist of review of proposals or ongoing research projects by a group of the investigator's peers, hence the term "peer review." Because the funding mechanisms differ, there are differences in the peer review systems for each. For example, grants are research proposals prepared by independent investigators (who usually are employed by teaching hospitals or universities) which have "competed" against thousands of other research proposals for limited funds but which were determined to be of sufficient priority to merit funding. The relative ranking of these proposals is done by the study section, or peer review group, which reads through the applications and assigns scores.

There are three cycles for review of grant proposals at NCI, so three times a year a funding decision has to be made by NCI staff. Before any grants can be awarded, though, the dual review process must be completed. The second level review of all grants is done by the National Cancer Advisory Board (NCAB). Following each cycle, or round, the NCAB meets and as one item of business approves the funding recommendations of the study sections. Due to the volume of grant applications, the approval is done en bloc and only grants which have special interest to one or more of the NCAB members are discussed individually. Once the NCAB has approved the funding recommendations of the study sections, the NCI staff may make the awards.

The decision as to how many grants will be awarded and which ones to fund is the province of the NCI Executive Committee (director, deputy director, division directors, and other senior staff). With information provided by the financial management staff and projections from the extramural financial data staff, the Executive Committee determines how far down in the ranking of the study section they can afford to go. The best score a grant proposal can achieve is 100. The worst is 500. Therefore, the Executive Committee draws a line, usually somewhere between 150 and 200, where everything above the line is not awarded. In recent years, these decisions about where to draw the line and how many grants to fund have become more complex. More and more restrictions have been placed on the way NCI spends its money by both the Congress and OMB. Sometimes the dollars appropriated for grants are accompanied by language specifying that a certain num-
survival rates, and better detection and scientific discoveries can be seen in improved cancer treatments, improved standing of how a normal cell becomes advanced aggressive lymph node cancer could be cured. Today the cure rate 1973, only five percent of patients with advanced aggressive lymph node cancer could be cured. Today the cure rate is better than 65 percent. Another important advance is a better understanding of how a normal cell becomes a cancer cell. This understanding will undoubtedly lead to still better treatments aimed at newly identified targets for therapy. Following are some specific examples of scientific progress:

Cancer biology research focuses on the structure and behavior of the cancer cell compared with normal cells. Advances have been made in identifying changes in cancer cells which affect resistance to chemotherapy, enable more rapid diagnosis of small collections of cancer cells, and provide strategies for specific delivery of effective therapy. For instance, knowledge that cancer cells possess certain cell wall markers has led to research that attaches cell killing (cytotoxic) substances to monoclonal antibodies which recognize these markers. These monoclonal antibodies effectively deliver treatment directly to the tumor.

Molecular biology research advances in recombinant DNA technology and molecular cloning have enabled researchers to identify oncogenes (segments of genetic material) which are found in chromosomes of normal and malignant cells. Differences between normal cells and cancer cells in some tumors have been found to be as simple as a single nucleotide change. It has also been discovered that chromosomes from healthy individuals contain sites which are sensitive to breakage, and which appear to correspond in some tumors to the point where there has been a translocation in the DNA structure. The discovery has great potential for cancer screening since these sensitive sites appear to be inheritable. It will therefore become possible to identify individual patients at high risk for cancer and take preventive measures.

Another promising new cancer treatment has been developed which uses naturally occurring cells from the patient's blood in combination with interleukin 2. This therapy, called adoptive immunotherapy, actually augments the patient's own immune system to fight cancer cells.

The National Surgical Adjuvant Breast Program showed that less disfiguring surgery combined with radiotherapy may be as effective as the modified radical mastectomy in preventing recurrence of breast cancer.

These are only a few examples of advances which have been made in recent years. All of the research which led to these findings was closely scrutinized by the peers of the scientists conducting the experiments or running the research protocols.

The bottom line in any of these funding decisions is the NCI commitment to basic research, where the compelling promise of new research advances will result in better treatment. Whether it is the independent investigator who is up for tenure at his/her university and needs the grant to get past the credentials committee, or whether it is the patient who could benefit from the eventual clinical treatment which could result from that investigator's work, or whether it is the full cadre of technical and support personnel who depend on the grant for their salaries, the decisions made all the way through the budget process have profound implications for many people throughout the country.

In 1971, President Nixon declared war on cancer and oversaw a great infusion of dollars into the National Cancer Program. Great strides have been made since then, and the National Cancer Institute enjoys a highly respected reputation as a premier research facility with a staff which includes some of the most well-known and highly respected scientists in their fields. Despite the imperfections in the funding process, and despite the many attempts to impose more controls over the way NCI does its business, the philosophy which the NCI seems to convey to the community is that they will do the best they can with whatever resources available to them. This is a challenging time for the public sector, and the National Cancer Institute has risen to the challenge.

Dorothy Tisevich, originally from Hamilton, Mass., graduated cum laude from Bridgewater State College in 1977. Her major was Political Science, and her minor Urban Affairs. She did graduate work in International Relations at Syracuse University until November, 1978, when she accepted a position as an administrative assistant in the Division of Cancer Treatment, NCI. She is currently the Deputy Administrative Officer of the Division of Cancer Treatment, the largest of the NCI operating divisions, and is primarily responsible for the financial management of the Division's $350 million budget.
Looking For Orson Welles

Joseph Liggera
This is my second article about the death of Orson Welles and the meaning of his life and work. The first I junked because I had fallen into the trap of chasing each flash and flicker of Welles' career, then trying to pull them together into a coherent image of the man. Welles is and was so many bits and pieces, brilliance and bunkum, that he remains as he wished to be, ever elusive. I am so teased by the contradictions of the man that understanding him sometimes is more intriguing than understanding myself.

It is tempting to start by calling him a genius, and to ask the inevitable question: "Who is Orson Welles?" Welles is devious, the various aspects of his personality splintered and dispersed. Any critic of Welles' must not only examine the man but himself as well; a critic must ask the fundamental question -- "Who am I?" -- and, "Who am I in relation to Orson Welles?"

For my part, whoever I am, there is not a time that I can remember when I did not "know" who Orson Welles was, so fixed was he in my consciousness, and probably, the consciousness of America. I knew Welles as an actor and a voice first, having been born a year before the release of his film Citizen Kane. By the time I was growing up, Welles had already been reduced to the status of a legend. He wished to be known as an active maker of his own films, not for his involvement in other people's films or films for literature.

Some time during my teens his image was blown up to the dimensions of an oversized balloon, like those in the Macy's Thanksgiving Day Parade. My view of him took on a luminous, romantic glow because, though his best work was well behind him, he was still blustering as if it were still in front of him, if he were given a chance. War of the Worlds, the Mercury Theater, Shakespeare in modern dress, classic performances (notably in Jane Eyre) -- that was all behind him. But Welles never gave it up. He seemed to be forever young, and nearly every discovery I made about media art proved to me that Welles had been there; if not first, at least flashiest. Then, like Papa Hemingway's The Old Man and The Sea, the gargantuan boy genius reached down and produced his long, gruelling masterworking of Kafka's The Trial. We all knew then that Welles was no has-been. We, the young art fanciers of my day, embraced him.

There is the tendency, then, to be sentimental with praise for Welles, to make excuses for him, or to rail at the failure of Hollywood money people to take another chance on a Welles project. Failing such feelings, a more realistic light may begin to shine in the Wellesian darkness. First, it becomes clear that the public maintained a nostalgia about art, high and low, nostalgia for a simpler, slower, more peaceful time than Welles ever seemed to want. There was also a nostalgia for language, for spoken words like those of Shakespeare, Kafka or Tarkington. Welles had a love/hate relationship with his audience, the great beast of the public who he alternately fooled and embraced. Lastly, he was most famous for his multiple expressive virtuosos talent that raised radio, film, even television commercials to something finer than they seemed capable of becoming. Nostalgia, an intimate relationship with his public -- his seers and hearers -- and his histrionic talent -- let us look at these to find Welles.

He made two films that keep poping into everyone's list of the Greatest Films of All Time, the second of which is The Magnificent Ambersons, based on a Booth Tarkington novel. It is said that Welles believed the studio had butchered it, and that he, to his dying day, vowed to bring together the remaining living actors and shoot a new ending. For once there is no Welles persona in the film, though he could not resist narrating it. Nevertheless, the film is rife with nostalgia, not only for times past, but for the kind of quick, yet graceful prose, that Tarkington wrote. The opening credits are a joy. Joseph Cotten, swirling through changes of costume, foreshadows the film's celebration of the gay turn-of-the-century life. Snow falls and sleigh bells tinkle. Welles narrates that in those days, they had time for everything. Alas, the whole of that sequence, and the best of what follows, is directly from Tarkington's prose. Welles' secret is out. He loves words. He simply puts pictures to them, brilliantly. By the end of the film, the huge mansion becomes dark and ominous as the family fortunes fall. With them goes nostalgia, and in comes the automobile, running roughshod over most everything and burying what it misses in soot.

Citizen Kane, too, had its roots in nostalgia. The newspaper magnate is done in because his famous sleigh was wrecked from him, and he dies clutching a child's crystal ball with a snow scene inside as he utters his last word, recalling the name in the sled, "Rosebud." The little man, Bernstein, arrives to work as editor of a New York city paper with a horse drawn truck loaded with all his belongings. The older reporters close shop at the end of the day, and the whole paper, presses too, sleep peacefully at night -- until young Kane takes over and wakes them up. But he also is from an older era. First he announces he will make The Enquirer as important to the people of the city as "the gas in that lamp." (The enfant terrible is nostalgic about a gas lamp?) Later Kane cannot understand how his innocent affair is made to look scandalous by other papers, or why he cannot make everyone love him by buying them things. In fact, he thinks like an aging pater familias and is amazed when told that working men are now unionizing and no longer need his benevolence.

Welles' nostalgia is refreshing in that he never joined the despair rampant in his century. Instead, he only came along to play with his toys: the papers, radio, film, television, acting. Nonetheless, every Welles film is heavy at the end and, if Welles stars, as he usually does, we feel his weight, physical and psychic. Then he falters, totters, and finally collapses, seemingly of his own weight, but really for his wanting what has been long gone. Hence Kane dies with his fond memories of the snows of the Middle West from his lost childhood. Welles, asked what he thought of the twentieth century, revealed his nostalgia in his reply that he "could pick a better one out of a hat."

To Welles, the world had become fragmented and corrupt. A better way of life lay buried in some horse and buggy past. He found it impossible to face the stark realities (or evils) of modern life. That is why Welles' greatest artistic sin is that each of his films goes to pieces at the end, heaping images of immense size and blackness on an audience previously charmed by his celebration of form and, seemingly, of life. He has style but no content. Unlike Hemingway, also a great stylist, he does not teach us anything about how to live our lives. Grasping to
recapture innocence, Welles tries mightily to hold back Original Sin, but in the end he suffers the Fall, repeatedly.

As an American artist cut in the image of Whitman, Welles established a relationship with his audience that was intimate and based on his understanding of the common man. At his best, he simply assumed we would think as he did. The momentum of his "song of himself" carried us along.

But underneath, Welles was hard at work trying to educate his audience and bring them up to the level of high art, such as Shakespeare's. Welles once asserted that the key to his work was the word. Where better to turn, then, but to the Bard, whom Welles loved from his childhood. Welles wished to bring words alive for an audience that had been force-fed Shakespeare's plays in high school.

His audience could be found sitting in a movie theater, waiting to be entertained. The trick was to join art and entertainment. Thus, his film of Macbeth starts with a preface to explain the dynamics of the play, has a Holy Man to etch the tension of pagan evil versus Christianity, and switches lines among minor characters. These changes are made to promote Shakespeare to a general audience. His Falstaff loosens the verse as if it were actual speech or, to moviegoers, dialogue. His pyrotechnic film technique is subordinated to words, is used to support words, and still retain the fluidity of the film. These two films, plus his Othello, achieve something of the Whitman ideal; if not to see the audience as its own poem, at least to trust it to be led into appreciating someone else's. Welles also invented or found a "little man," a sidekick, in each film in which he acted, whom he loved and abused, reflecting no doubt his ambivalence about an audience he both needed and thought was too dense to appreciate him.

Perhaps Welles' greatest talent is that he was, in many respects, a teacher who taught by doing, by performing in a new way. It was his knack for revealing and re-creating forms, particularly of film, that put him into the central nervous system of the public. What he did in Kane was to show that art is a lie that can either lead us closer to the truth than we could otherwise know in the corrupt world of reality, or that can be used to manipulate us. It depends on the mind behind the form. Welles was clear that there was a mind behind the form, be it Shakespeare's, Welles', or even that of an egoist like Kane. In showing us how he was making Kane, in the very act of doing it, Welles was teaching us to analyze form and to see what was being done to us. None of the devices in Kane -- the newsreels, deep focus, odd camera angles, aural non-sequiturs -- are real ways of seeing and hearing. Yet, together, they make an artistic "lie" that is the film's truth.

Welles' talent finally was destroyed by the unresolved strain between his real and fantasy worlds, by the contrast between his vision of decadence and the glitter of his private life. One day Welles' crew, filming a documentary in Rio, (Welles was away at the time) saw a local hero fall out of a boat and be devoured by a shark. Worse, six days later the shark was caught with the partly digested head and arms of the man still in its stomach. Welles had been on an extended bash at the time, revelling in his new found fame. He was blamed. (This gory episode later informs the overview of his Lady From Shanghai. There the Irish lug hero laments his wealthy employers for their wasteful lives and for going at each other like 'sharks in a frenzy'.") In Welles' vision, nostalgia darkens to reality in his depiction of a society which, even among its elite, devours itself.

The last two decades of Welles' life were nearly fruitless as far as film production was concerned. Yet he continued to use his great talent for informing and manipulating the public, turning handstands to maintain his popularity. Welles kept himself afloat via a number of television roles and remained widely known. His reputation, buoyed by the sympathies of many of the best artists and critics -- tens of whom he had worked with over the years -- kept refreshing itself, but also led away from his art and to the man as a personality. Hence the trap which opened this paper: Welles trying to make us believe he is necessary to us.

Nostalgia, his view of the common man, and his talent -- these are places to look when trying to find Welles. In summing up, then, what are his accomplishments? First, he was able to manipulate forms, particularly media, in a way that simultaneously deceived and delighted his audience. Second, he was a teacher, revealing in the act of creating how form dictates content and, despite its immediacy and suggestion of catching reality in the act, is really spun out of a maker with a singular view of the truth. Third, he was an entertainer par excellence, one of the finest motion picture actors American cinema has yet produced. Fourth, he made literature accessible on film in a way that preserved the word as the essence of its art, and still maintained film form while using it as a medium of translation. Last, he was, as everyone hears, the man who gave film its vocabulary. What this means is that he created a way for film to express its truth in its own voice, freeing it from its origins in other arts.

Why, then, is Welles not one of the luminaries of that century which he joyously influenced and simultaneously abhorred? The answer lies within his failure to face the oldest leger de main of all, reality. His refusal to fall from grace, his need to cling to innocence and to continuously express shock at the world's corruption; these leave Welles in a rut of his own making. These failures also prevent him from approaching the greatest artistry of his time, notably Ingmar Bergman and Hemingway whose innovations gave us fresh language while tackling reality head on. Welles' greatest work was collaborative, usually drawing on literature and/or the talents of other creative people, as in the case of Citizen Kane. On his own, his opus was mediocre and he was content to play his lamented "legend" to the hilt. He used the legend as an excuse, as another ruse in which, like his broadcast of War of The Worlds, he first warned his audience and then went right ahead and deceived them. Perhaps he was cheating his audiences as he felt life, or reality, had cheated him.

Joseph Liggera is an Associate Professor of English at Bridgewater State College.
Apartheid in South Africa: 
Myths and Realities

Vernon A. Domingo

Apartheid -- the word conjures up a variety of images and emotions as you sit watching the evening news. What is this system? and why are all those people protesting against it, even to the extent of sacrificing their lives? As we watch the unfolding conflict in South Africa, it may be important to examine in some detail the nature of the 'monster' called apartheid. While most writing about South Africa has been accurate, there do still exist some myths which require carefully reasoned repudiation.

The first of these involves the argument that South Africa is just too complex for Americans to understand -- this is a myth presented in the media through pronouncements by the likes of Pat Buchanan and James Kilpatrick. These writers (and the South African government) wish us to believe that all those different 'groupings' of people require a political solution very different from a democratic formula.

The truth of the matter is that apartheid is simply an ideological system of racial superiority through which a white minority (15%) persists in dominating and exploiting the majority of the population who are then denied even basic human rights.

Another misconception (well-meaning though) is the attempt to frame the South African conflict in "civil rights" terms and to draw extensive analogies...
between South Africa and the situation in the U.S. prior to 1970. While there are clearly some similarities, the civil rights analogy soon breaks down when confronted by the difference in numbers (American blacks account for about 15% of the population) and the real (though often challenged) legal and constitutional protection accorded blacks in America. In South Africa, the conflict is primarily about political power, not about civil rights; opening beaches, restaurants and restrooms to all races is largely irrelevant and avoids the basic issue of the franchise. Under apartheid the majority of South Africa’s residents are denied full voting rights. They are constitutionally prevented from participating as equals in the country of their birth and from making decisions that affect them. The struggle in South Africa is, therefore, not about compelling others to live up to a Bill of Rights (nonexistent there), but rather to change or replace the constitution. In this sense we are witnessing a revolutionary struggle as it is occurring in South Africa, more akin to the American Revolution than to the civil rights concerns.

On American campuses, much of the discussion of apartheid concerns the role of U.S. companies which have investments in South Africa. There are at present about 300 American companies in South Africa, with total investments in the range of $3 billion. Arguments for divestment (withdrawing American corporate involvement) point out that these companies aid and abet the white government by their provision of capital, technology, and, in the case of General Motors, military vehicles. American companies, by their dominance in strategic sectors (oil, computers, automobiles) help sustain the apartheid regime; without this support, the South African economy would be in worse shape than it is right now. Proponents of American investment maintain that their presence helps black South Africans and that to pull out would only “hurt those we are trying to help.” The truth of the matter is that their presence has mostly helped white South Africans. As the accompanying graph (figure 1) indicates, the wage gap between white and black has only widened during the period of increased American investment. Even incorporation of the “Sullivan” principles which favor equal pay scales and facilities for black and white, are doomed to failure because the assumption is still that wage concessions and better toilet facilities will ease the conflict.

A familiar contention by those who support the apartheid regime is that blacks in South Africa are better off than people in the rest of Africa. The facts easily reveal this to be a distortion of reality. Perhaps the most tragic indicator of social well-being or “quality of life” is the infant mortality rate -- the number of infants statistically expected to die in the first year of life. Comparative figures (per 1000) are:

- South African Whites: 12
- Rural South African Blacks: 282
- Kenya: 86
- United States: 11
- Mali: 153

The quality of life for black South Africans is substantially lower than for their white counterparts because apartheid prevents them from having access to quality health care. In fact it has been reported that 2.9 million black South African children under the age of fifteen suffer from malnutrition; this in a country which has enormous agricultural and mineral wealth. An additional area where black South Africans rank lowest in Africa is in the cohesion of family life. Through the pass law system, more than three million families have been torn apart. Black women and children are restricted to the barren “homelands” away from the urban areas (figure 2). Black males (officially designated as ‘labor units’) can only see their families for two weeks per year. If wives and children are caught visiting in the city, they are liable for arrest and a jail sentence. The pass laws represent the greatest indignity of apartheid. It crystallizes the stark inhumanity of a vicious racist policy which has no place in the “civilized” world and which must be removed.

With all the talk of change emanating from South Africa, it is important to examine these much vaunted “changes.” In common with many other countries, South Africa uses semantics to win friends and influence enemies. For most of this century the white government has resorted to either name-calling, branding the opposition as a bunch of “communists” (reminiscent of Dr. Martin Luther King’s treatment) or renaming people and groups (as “Kaffirs,” Natives, Bantu, African, Plurals, Coloureds, and Blacks). The government’s intent has been consistent throughout -- to divide and rule the population and to avoid...
sharing political power. The same intransigent approach is present today as the Afrikaners (the local name for Dutch-descended whites in South Africa) spend vast sums of money to convince the world that they are ‘changing.’ Again, their idea of change is far removed from that which is required to bring about social justice in South Africa. The much heralded "abolition" of the pass laws is a case in point where the white regime merely replaces one set of discriminatory laws with another, "softer" sounding one. When pass laws become "planned urbanization" they still serve to demean and destroy. The white regime has been unable to accept the black view that "apartheid cannot be reformed, it must be eliminated." While some in the white group indicate a willingness to desegregate certain beaches and to involve selected blacks in 'consultative and advisory level' talks, black South Africans refuse to accept anything less than the extension of full voting rights to all South Africans. The incompatibility of these solutions is inevitable given the fact that true communication between the groups has not been possible since 1652 when European settlers beat the indigenous population into submission.

The government's intent has been consistent throughout -- to divide and rule the population and to avoid sharing political power.

The government's intent has been consistent throughout -- to divide and rule the population and to avoid sharing political power. Even today, the Afrikaner government, blinded by its sense of racial superiority, refuses to act in good faith by releasing authentic black leaders such as Nelson Mandela and Walter Sisulu and discussing the transition to a democratic and just society. By clinging to power, white South Africa makes inevitable a bloody confrontation. Many studies have shown that psychologically, the Afrikaners realize that their monopoly hold on power is fast coming to an end. The watershed probably occurred during 1985 when black South Africans challenged the system as never before. It is clear now that South Africa will be changed in the not too distant future, despite, and maybe even because of the white shift to the right.

But what are Americans to do as these changes occur? The U.S. has a deep interest in South Africa, which is the source of most of its vital strategic minerals -- cobalt, titanium, platinum, and chromium. From the American perspective, these sources should be maintained, not only in the short but especially in the long run. The way to do this is to align much more closely with the majority of South Africans who have time and history on their side. Friendships established at this stage of the struggle will bear fruit when a new government comes into power. Divestment and disinvestment (selling stock in those American companies which operate in South Africa) are essential features of a position on the side of those who are suffering. But divestment is not an end in itself; Americans concerned with social justice and freedom for all, should consider more positive steps which may include "constructive engagement" with black South Africans and their representative leaders, the African National Congress. The struggle against apartheid is a struggle to remove internal injustices; it is not part of an East-West conflict as the Reagan administration tries so hard to suggest and freedom-loving people everywhere should not hesitate to support a true struggle for liberation and dignity.

Apartheid in South Africa presents the world with a serious moral issue which merits discussion in business, church and academic circles. Americans, because of their own tortuous history of race relations, will always be compelled to consider the implications of racial prejudice and therefore colleges and universities would be remiss if they did not fully participate in analyzing the causes, effects and demise of apartheid. As Martin Luther King reminded us, "injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere."

Vernon A. Domingo is Assistant Professor in the Earth Sciences & Geography Department. Dr. Domingo was born in South Africa and received his undergraduate training at University of the Western Cape outside Cape Town.
How I Spent My Summer Vacation:

RECENT ACQUISITIONS

Photos by Godlis

David Godlis is a freelance photographer whose work includes regular contributions to newspapers and music magazines in the United States, England, and Japan, as well as record covers and photos in books on contemporary music trends.

Born in 1951, he attended Imageworks School of Photography in Cambridge, Massachusetts and studied with Garry Winogrand at the International Center of Photography in New York City. He also has a BA in English Literature from Boston University.

Godlis has exhibited his work at galleries in New York, Boston, and California. His photographs were featured in Camera 35 Magazine, and were presented this past summer at the Rencontres Internationales de la Photographie in Arles, France.
These photos were taken in New York City in the summertime. They were shot with a Leica camera, using wide angle lenses and Tri-X film. Any resemblance to actual events or real persons is entirely coincidental.
Difficult as it is to imagine, history has again become for some few but important novelists a field to frolic in. Of course, there has never been a shortage of nostalgia merchants willing to provide an escape into the past while at the same time gratifying our desire for truth -- historical truth made easy by virtue of its combination with invented melodramas given the texture of every day life. But while such writers continued to practice their trade, most serious novelists abandoned history to the historians, as if Stendhal's prediction, made upon reviewing the historical novels of his time, had come true: "I believe that in the end, the authorities will be constrained to order these novelists to choose: either write pure histories or pure fictions or, at least, to use crochet hooks to separate one from the other, truth from falsity."

I think it has become increasingly difficult for us to imagine what either a pure history or a pure novel might look like. A too rigorous notion of "historical truth" begins to seem to some a convention or fiction as likely to obscure the past as to reveal it.

While writing his study of witchcraft in New England, Entertaining Satan, the historian John Putnam Demos found his first drafts to be "long on concepts, but distressingly short on human detail. The people were slipping through the scholarly cracks." His description of his method for filling in the gaps is worth considering:

Back to my research files. Days of confusion. Restless nights. Conversations with friends and colleagues. (I especially remember one with a novelist of long acquaintance, which helped me to recognize how close are the imaginative worlds of history and fiction.) I began to write "stories" about witchcraft -- true stories of specific episodes for which my evidence was especially full. Stories of everyday experience in all its nettle­some particulars. Stories which put individual men and women right at center-stage. Stories with beginnings, middles, and ends.

Throughout this passage I saw -- I felt -- the historian's old dilemma: history as art versus history as science. If the barricades should ever go up, I know which way I'll jump. But better by far not to have to choose.

Demos wishes to employ devices of narration and characterization borrowed from the novelist's craft, as if to prove there can be no formal characteristics that distinguish history from fiction. What is left to differentiate between the two forms of discourse is the notion of truth: Did this event occur or is it the invention of the writer? But even here the historian may invent to fill in the gaps and thereby give the reader a sense of the obtained from novels of lived experience.

Crossing over from the other side of the barricade, the novelists whose work I wish to consider take similar liberties -- although it is not "people" and "stories" which, of course, they have in abundance, that they want but concepts and all the discursive possibilities routinely available to the historian. They also wish to mix fact and fiction as freely as does the historian, but their efforts seldom meet with the latter's approval. Historians have been more willing to use novels, especially the classics of nineteenth century realism, to uncover truths about the time in which they were written than to take seriously the historical novelists' attempts to portray and interpret the past. Denying such a novelist an adequate historical consciousness, historians, using their own criteria, have usually seen such novels as simply bad history. I propose that the following set of novels offers a serious contribution to the fields of historiography and the philosophy of history -- not by ceasing to be novels but by using the novel as an instrument of historical inquiry.

The Fox in the Attic (1961) and The Wooden Shepherdess (1973) are parts of The Human Predicament, which Richard Hughes described as "a long historical novel of my own times" (1923-1945), which remained unfinished at the time of the author's death in 1976. What distinguishes this project from most other fictional retrospectives of the period, however, is the author's open adoption of the role of researcher, as an acknowledgements page at the end of both volumes mentions major published sources consulted as well as new evidence uncovered by the author himself. The opening note to the first volume, repeated at the end of the second, attempts to apply Stendhal's crochet hooks to separate fact from fiction:

The fictitious characters in the foreground are wholly fictitious. The historical characters and events are as accurately historical as I can make them: I may have made mistakes but in no case have I deliberately falsified the record once I could worry it out. Now this is disingenuous, as well as circular -- a regression to notions of pure fiction, pure history. What would a "wholly fictitious" character look like? Hughes has admitted that one of his "fictitious" characters, Dr. Brinley, was drawn from real life, and, on the other side, his portrait of Hitler as The Man Who Loved Children is just about as vividly imagined as anything in the book. One need only compare it to Tolstoy's treatment of Napoleon to realize that the foreground-fiction/background-history pairing has broken down, become blurred.

What does point back to Tolstoy, however, is the presence within the novel itself of that discursive voice first heard in Hughes's opening "Note." Three chapters of The Fox in the Attic, for example, are given over to this voice as it speculates that the causes of the First World War, "gurgling up hot lava on to the green grass," lie in the repression, throughout the nineteenth century, of both the sense of an alien other and a sense of self expanded to a "we." In other words, the War allowed feelings of both hate and love, long denied by "emergent Reason," to express themselves. For the space of these three chapters, the narrative comes to a standstill as Hughes mimics the essayistic mode of Tolstoy in the Second
Epilogue to War and Peace. Distinctly denying the modernist injunction "to show, not to tell," Hughes's postmodern fiction returns to nineteenth century models, centering much of the "action" in the present historical consciousness of a narrator who, being both the author and his surrogate, exists, like this hybrid fiction itself, both in and out of real time.

The meager distance, measured in years, between the narrating present and the past depicted also introduces a new element in contemporary historical fiction. Hughes, like the other novelists to be mentioned here, writes of the recent past, the nightmare of history which is the twentieth century. And yet England and Germany in the twenties and thirties do seem to belong to an era both our own and not. We might invoke Henry Adams's notion of an acceleration of history or cite Kenneth Boulding's assertion that "the world of today...is as different from the world in which I was born as that world was from Julius Caesar's" if we wish to consider the problematic of a writing self that spans those different worlds -- not Matthew Arnold's "one world dead, the other powerless to be born," but worlds that come and go within the course of a single lifetime.

J.G. Farrell appears to smuggle ideas into The Singapore Grip in more acceptable modernist fashion, that is, by putting them into the mouths of his characters and thereby "dramatizing" them. But in fact the speeches within these dialogues are so ostentatiously overextended that the "background" detail they are intended to provide threatens to submerge the central characters in the foreground, even as it makes ludicrous any effort to construe the novel in scenic terms. The sheer bulk of information Farrell's naive and curious hero uncovers concerning the rubber industry and the political alignments in the Far East in the late 1930's and early 1940's makes it clear that the author -- who, like Hughes, acknowledges his written sources as well as those acquired through personal research -- wishes to load his novel with historical facts normally found only in academic monographs.

When Farrell died, in 1979, at the age of forty-four, he had completed three historical novels and was at work on a fourth. In Troubles (1970), The Siege of Krishnapur (1973), and The Singapore Grip (1977), he embarked upon a novelistic investigation of British imperialism on various fronts -- Ireland in the twenties during the "troubles," India during the mutiny of 1857, and finally the fall of Singapore to the Japanese during WW II, what one historian describes as "the single most humiliating disaster in British imperial history." Each successive novel is somewhat fatter than the last as more disparate material is introduced to complicate causal explanation and to render social, political, and economic forces tangible within the narrative. In the same manner Farrell's tone is purposefully discordant. Marx has said that history repeats itself -- what occurs first as tragedy repeats itself as farce. For Farrell, the dissolution of the Empire is both tragedy and farce at once as perspectives shift in an attempt to provide historical representation of a finally indefinable totality.

If Farrell's increasing attention to economic forces in his last novel suggests a movement in the trilogy toward a Marxist orientation, such a perspective is even more evident in John Berger's G. (1972). The major protagonist, named in the title, witnesses, without understanding, the massacre of striking workers in Milan in 1898, the first flight of an airplane over the Alps in 1910, and the suppression of a popular revolt in Trieste in 1916. If he does not understand these events, it is because his glance is directed elsewhere, his back turned to "history" as he attempts to live out his role as a modern Don Giovanni, attempts to reduce the world to a vast bourgeois bedroom to be plundered. Dedicated to "Anya and her sisters in Women's Liberation," G., even as it details the limitations of the erotic life, attempts to place sexuality within the context of politics and revolution, to give a kind of historical weight to the relations between men and women. In respect the novel perhaps most resembles Doris Lessing's monumental Children of Violence series and The Golden Notebook or the fiction of Milan Kundera. But actually it is the work's originality, both in narrative technique and in the variety of material it manages to incorporate within the novel form, that seems most striking.

Berger dreams of a rapprochement between modernism and Marxism through a revival of the unfulfilled promise of cubism and gives his dream to the protagonist of his first novel, A Painter of Our Time: "What eyes Cubism has given us: Never again can we make a painting of a single view. We now have a visual dialectic. How easy it should be for Marxists to understand!" In G. this becomes "...never again will a single story be told as if it were the only one." In practice, Berger realizes this project by interrupting the narrative of his bildungsroman with essays on diverse topics -- on Garibaldi, on foxhunting as theater, on the social psychology of mass demonstrations, on the Boers, on sexuality and time, on the situation of women, on "the Young Bosnians." We discover that the fiction is also secretly interrupted, when we read the acknowledgements page at the back, by a series of unattributed quotations scattered through the text. In addition to these multiple perspectives, the author also frequently pauses to meditate in his own voice upon the writing process itself.

G. is linked in its narrative practice aesthetically to cubism and epistemologically to the Marxist notion of total-

Historians have been more willing to use novels ... to uncover truths ... than to take seriously the historical novelists' attempts to portray and interpret the past.
Freud, is told seven times, and each version, which both corrects and complicates the last, is presented in a different form. The first, a prologue, is given as a series of letters between Freud and his colleagues. The second, "Don Giovanni," is a long erotic poem written by Lisa herself between the staves of a score of Mozart's opera. This is followed by a more explicit prose version of the same sexual fantasy, also written by Lisa and called "The Gastein Journal." The central section of the novel is a virtuoso impersonation of Freud, a case study of Lisa, complete with footnotes, called "Frau Anna G." Then comes "The Health Resort," a more or less conventional story, also written by Lisa, and called "The Sleeping Carriage," places Lisa within a historical narrative, written by Anatoli Kuznetzov and "stolen" by Thomas, depicting, from eyewitness accounts, the mass execution of Jews at Babi Yar. The final section, "The Camp," unfolds outside of historical time, bringing together the several strands of Lisa's life story, a story cut short in real time but allowed to work itself out in the imagined space created by the author, who, in the absence of an afterlife where the requirements of justice, mercy, and meaning are finally met, stands in for a God who has abandoned His people.

The essence of Thomas's critique of psychoanalysis lies in his perception of its failure to give adequate weight to historical and social forces, the futility of its endeavor when placed beside a quarter of a million lives destroyed and dumped into a ravine:

The soul of man is a far country, which cannot be approached or explored. Most of the dead were poor and illiterate. But every single one of them had dreamed dreams, seen visions, and had had amazing experiences... Though most of them had never lived outside the Podal slum, their lives and histories were as rich and complex as Lisa Erdman-Berenstein's. If a Sigmund Freud had been listening and taking notes from the time of Adam, he would still not fully have explored even a single group, even a single person.

Faced with the fact of the Holocaust, a fact that our skeptical and relativistic age is curiously reluctant to qualify, the narrator can only say: "No one could have imagined the scene, because it was happening." Theodor Adorno has said that "to write poetry after Auschwitz is barbaric," and here the poet can only agree. But since we don't seem to be able to banish poets and storytellers, it may be important to value those most who have taken Adorno to heart and approached their art with some humility and some historical consciousness, which, after all, is composed primarily of the awareness that where you are depends most on where you have been.

In "The Book of Laughter and Forgetting" (1979), the Czechoslovakian emigre Milan Kundera invents for himself a novel in the form of variations. After reading his subsequent and most recent work, "The Unbearable Lightness of Being," one might assume that the author has found in this form the ideal means for exploring the recent past of Central Europe -- the years 1948-1975, the first date marking the beginning of communist rule in Czechoslovakia and the last denoting the year of the author's defection to the West, with all stories moving toward or falling away from the climactic events of the Prague Spring of 1968.

Several major themes of both of these novels are introduced early in the first, but they also express a view of history that might be subscribed to by all of the novelists I have mentioned:

The bloody massacre in Bangladesh quickly covered over the Russian invasion of Czechoslovakia, the assassination of Allende drown out the groans of Bangladesh, the war in the Sinai desert made people forget Allende, the Cambodian massacre made people forget Sinai, and so forth and so on until ultimately everyone lets everything be forgotten.

In times when history still moved slowly, events were few and far between and easily committed to memory. They formed a commonly accepted backdrop for thrilling scenes of adventure in private life. Nowadays, history moves at a brisk clip. A historical event, though soon forgotten, sparkles the morning after with the dew of novelty. No longer a backdrop, it is now the adventure itself, an adventure enacted before the backdrop of the commonly accepted banality of private life.

Since we can no longer assume any single historical event, no matter how recent, to be common knowledge, I must treat events dating back only a few years as if they were a thousand years old.

History experienced as a barrage of catastrophic events; the reversal of background and foreground, with its necessary diminishment of the significance of lived experience; the novelist as historian by necessity; the novel as an act of memory -- these and other concerns lie embedded in this passage.

No brief account of Kundera's work can begin to do justice to its subtlety and humanity. In trying to suggest rather than explain the patterns I see emerging in some of the most interesting novels written over the past twenty-five years, my short essay enacts its own version of the acceleration of history. Still, it is important to see this group of novelists as acting in concert to reject modernist ideals of formal purity and, while acknowledging the very real experience of isolation and alienation, to see that experience as a partial view, to be corrected only by providing a historical context and a historical explanation, for our escapes into the private life and their narrative equivalent, the single point of view. Kundera's novels are as "personal" as any now being written, but they also provide a space for a self that is purely social.

I began with a historian offering a justification of storytelling. Let me conclude with a similar apology, but from a novelist only pretending to write history. The passage is taken from Danilo Kis's novel, "A Tomb for Boris Davidovich, in which the narrator pauses to tell a story-within-the-story, freeing himself for a moment of that awful burden of documents in which the story is buried, while referring the skeptical and curious reader to the appended bibliography where he will find the necessary proof. (Perhaps it would have been wiser if I had chosen some other form of expression -- an essay or a monograph -- where I could use all these documents in the usual way. Two things, however, prevent me: the inappropriateness of citing actual oral testimony of reliable people as documentation; and my inability to forgo the pleasure of narration, which allows the author the deceptive idea that he is creating the world and thereby, as they say, changing it.)

Novelists, like historians, do not create the world -- although a modernist might say they create a world insofar as their texts seem self-contained, but if this is so, that world is so pathetically small that the metaphor finally does not work and is presumptuous in a way that the postmodern novelist-historian is right to condemn. Nevertheless, change may be possible only if we are able to imagine different ways of looking at the past, different ways of telling and retelling our stories.

Michael Boyd
Assistant Professor of English
Space, Time and Medicine

Larry Dossey, M.D.
Shambhala, 1982

Dossey is quite explicit in stating his rationale for writing Space, Time & Medicine: modern medicine is obsolete. Unlike other critiques of medicine and the health care system, however, Dossey avoids endless recitations of statistics, anecdotes, and horror stories, focusing, instead, on existing foundations within contemporary physics for changing and updating medical science. The early twentieth century was a period of revolutionary change in physics; within a relatively few years, the physicist's understanding of space, time and matter was dramatically transformed. Yet, Dossey argues, modern medicine continues to operate within the Cartesian-Newtonian scientific framework as it developed and flourished from the seventeenth through the nineteenth centuries. The strict Cartesian view of the human body as a complex machine following mechanical laws was complemented by Newton's view of the universe as a giant clockwork mechanism. All matter, following precise mechanical laws, moved within the independently existing three-dimensional container of space. Time, flowing along independently of matter, existed as yet another separate, absolute dimension.

Matter itself, composed of smaller indestructible particles, was, fundamentally, mindless, dead, inert stuff. A living organism, as a mechanical concatenation of inert matter, could be understood, manipulated and repaired like any other machine. This biochemical or medical model leaves no place for the human being as an individually experiencing and mindful body. For any particular body, as a machine, is like any other body, and similar diseases, or malfunctions, require similar repairs. Consciousness -- as either a by-product of matter or as a mere illusion -- has no impact on the body's health or illness.

Modern physics, in moving beyond the notions of an absolute space and time, requires us, for example, to question our common sense experience of time as measured by public clocks. Our conviction of a linear time, flowing from past to future, is responsible, Dossey suggests, for time-sickness, our obsession with time passing, of time running out, of getting sick, of growing old and dying. In the modern view, however, time is not an external, independently existing reality. Rather, time is a function of our experience of the events comprising it and of the ways in which we choose to measure and organize it. Time-sickness becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy. Our own fears, anticipations and sense of urgency cause our internal biorhythmic clocks to run faster, amplifying and accelerating the course of disease and aging. By altering the manner in which we think about and experience time, we can modify and transform our experience: pain can be reduced, healing accelerated, tumor growth retarded or halted. Dossey offers some clinical evidence for the success of biofeedback and meditation, for example, in facilitating biological changes through alterations of temporal experience.

By altering the manner in which we think about and experience time, we can modify and transform our experience: pain can be reduced, healing accelerated, tumor growth retarded or halted.

Examining the implications of Bell's Theorem, which challenges our usual notion of the strict, temporal cause-effect relationship presumed to hold among all events, Dossey maintains that we, with the physicist, must understand that all material particles within the universe, however distant from one another, are related. Thus, a change in any one particle results in an instantaneous change in the behavior of all other particles in the universe. We are all connected and interrelated. Consciousness is not a property of human individuals, but is a characteristic shared by all matter. Health and illness, life and death, assume new meanings when considered in the broader context of this complex biocycle.

Dossey discusses a variety of other concepts and theories in modern physics, science and mathematics, including Godel's Theorem, Prigogine's 1977 Nobel Prize winning concept of dissipative structures, and Bohm's implicature order, continuing to elaborate his argument: medicine and health care must be responsive to a new conceptualization of the human body and mind consistent with the evidence of modern science. If changes in consciousness, in the way we choose to experience ourselves, can result in dramatic and measurable changes in biochemical processes, then medicine cannot afford to limit itself to understanding and treating the body within a Cartesian-Newtonian framework. Consciousness must become a critical, if not the most vital, consideration in medical practice.

Undoubtedly, many readers of Dossey's book, and certainly quite a few physicists, would criticize the attempt to apply findings in highly specialized fields, under clearly circumscribed and defined conditions, to the everyday realms of common sense experience and modern health care. As Dossey himself points out, the modern physicist makes no claim to describing reality, but rather offers only a convenient, working description of nature. In his attempts to bridge two worlds, the physicist's and our own, Dossey repeatedly slips into self-contradictions: the common sense perspective he assumes in formulating his criticism shares the same Cartesian-Newtonian framework as the medical science he is criticizing.

Nevertheless, Dossey's basic premise regarding the outdated assumptions of medicine is probably valid, and in spite of some serious problems, his thought-provoking discussion deserves serious attention. Perhaps the most conservative, and ultimately constructive, conclusion we can safely draw from Dossey's work is that we do not know what matter is. We do not know what consciousness is. We do not know what life is. In admitting our ignorance, we may become more cautious and self-conscious about our health care myths and less willing, as consumers and providers of health care, to sacrifice ourselves to them unquestioningly. After all, we can never treat the body, only our idea of it. Our conception of space, time and matter have changed before. Those conceptions, and the associated medical practices very probably will change again. In no sense, then, can the body, as the object of medical practice, ever be considered and treated independently of the consciousness which conceptualizes it.

Susan Todd
Professor of Psychology
Reflections of a Retiring College President

Last June, in his Boyden Hall office, the Bridgewater Review editors asked Dr. Adrian Rondileau to reflect on his 24 years as president of Bridgewater State College. Here are some of his remarks.

Q: What do you consider your major accomplishment as president?

A. I believe very deeply that a college must strive to be a community where we have common causes, common goals, common purposes, which transcend whatever differences we might have. In Massachusetts, Bridgewater has a reputation for a strong sense of college community. Now that doesn't mean that everyone here thinks alike. There has to be a play of different ideas and different perspectives to create a dynamic community, and certainly we have that here. But it's very possible for people in organizations and that includes colleges, to be so much at odds among themselves and so embittered that much time and energy are wasted and not much is accomplished.

In sum, I feel that the growth of a strong sense of college community is the keystone achievement which has greatly facilitated other critical goals, -- highly competent faculty, administration and staff, strong academic and support programs and concomitant justified pride among students, faculty, staff and alumni.

Q: What is the most challenging or difficult experience that you have had to deal with in your capacity as president?

A. A most difficult one, and what I considered the single best test of the soundness of the college community philosophy, happened during the period of about 6 or 7 years, roughly from 1967 to 1973, when resentment and discouragement about the Vietnam War were at their height. Virtually every campus in America was experiencing a variety of very difficult problems. Here at Bridgewater, we had a student strike over the issue of non-reapppointment of a faculty member who was very popular with some students. I had to resolve the matter. Given the circumstances, it seemed to me that we might abide by the best judgment of two of the three segments of the community, that is, students, faculty and administration.

The students were quite taken with the charisma of this teacher; and would surely vote to retain him. The administrators' vote not to reappoint him was also highly probable. The faculty were divided, and their vote was highly uncertain but finally most of them were convinced that the decision not to reappoint was in the best interests of the institution. So he was dismissed. I was told later by a knowledgeable friend that I had either done the dumbest thing he had ever known any administrator to do, or the wisest. He wasn't sure which. Sometimes no one can be sure. That's inherent in the job; a college president must make basic decisions and stand by them.

Q: What do you find most rewarding, the part of the job you like best?

A. Among the most rewarding times are the special occasions. Of course, Commencement is a rewarding occasion, as are Honors Day and Alumni Day. I also think it's always encouraging to realize that although progress is sometimes a little slow, we know that we can be proud of a great tradition and a strong forward momentum. We have a beautiful campus and excellent academic programs. The College is fulfilling its mission, even more than it was able to do in the early years. In the last decade, we have developed several important new professional career programs, retaining of course our several traditionally outstanding teacher education programs, and we have a panoply of arts and sciences. Most students who want a good undergraduate program will find something that is suitable to them at Bridgewater. Now you really couldn't quite have said that 25 years ago. Of course, historically some graduates have come out of Bridgewater even when it was a single purpose institution and have gone into all sorts of fields: business, law, medicine, among others. But now students can prepare for teaching or business as well as a number of other professions and they can get all their preparation here. I think it's a great tribute to the conscientiousness of the faculty and of everyone else at the College that we've evolved so successfully from a small single purpose institution to a large complex multi-purpose institution.

I also find it rewarding, to cite an academic example, that we've just been through a very rigorous and thoughtful review of the General Education Requirements. A very careful effort has been made to determine what kinds of courses really ought to be considered as a basis for a sound liberal arts education. It's one of the finest intellectual efforts in that area that I've seen any college faculty undertake. Ordinarily the battle for turf militates against real consideration of the needs of students. Everyone argues that his or her own subject is the most important. But this review transcended the battle for turf and was imaginative and idealistic as well as practical and realistic. I thought it was a great job.

Q: Can you tell us any thoughts on how you would like to be remembered as Bridgewater's president?

A. I have three hopes. First, I would hope to be remembered as a person who had some understanding of what this College has always stood for, its educational, cultural and economic mission to the students, the region and the country. Secondly, I would hope to be remembered as a person who tried to work cooperatively with colleagues and with students to fulfill the College's potential so that together we might attain our mutual goals. Finally, as Bridgewater's academic reputation continues to grow nationally and internationally -- as it surely will -- over the next decades, I hope to be remembered as a person who helped to lay some of the essential building blocks for that deserved splendid reputation.
Faculty and Alumni Articles
Mark Twain’s Roughing It
by Joseph Yokelson

Fanaticism, Fear and Faith: The Religious Basis of Terrorism
by Milton Boyle

Development Challenges on Nantucket
by Stephen Sheppard

Poems
by Ann duCille

Book Reviews
Stephen Levine on Jerome Bruner’s
Actual Minds, Possible Worlds

Annabelle Melville on G. de Bertier de Sauvigy’s
La France et Les Francais: Vus par les voyageurs américains 1814-1848

David Cheney on Mary Midgley’s
Wickedness: A Philosophical Essay

Cultural Commentary
The Peace Corps at 25
by Charles and Sandra Robinson

Historical Commentary
Vietnam and Revisionism: Who Lost the War
by David Culver