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Cover Photo: Trash or Treasure, Art or Artifact?
By Joan Hausarth, Associate Professor of Art

The barrier between the realms of physical reality and the fine arts was broken in the second decade of the 20th century when the Cubists, Pablo Picasso and George Braque, introduced the technique of collage. Soon after, Marcel Duchamp and Kurt Schwitters gave society's refuse a new meaning by creating works of art from "found objects."

Joan Hausarth's graphic Trash or Treasure, Art or Artifact? serves to remind us of the value of "junk" to the artist, the museum curator, the archeologist, the collector, the conservationist, and the land-fill operator!
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At precisely 7:55 a.m., Sunday, December 7, 1941, the Japanese launched a devastating air attack on Hawaii, leaving 2,403 Americans dead, eight battleships crippled or destroyed, and 188 planes demolished. "The worse disaster in the military annals of the United States," in the words of a noted historian, plunged America into a global war and permanently changed the country. Isolationism was dead. Americans were united to win the war, and they were resolved never again to be caught by surprise. At the same time, they wanted to know why the Army and Navy were caught napping. Thus began a years-long search for scapegoats, a search which would lead to much confusion, bitter controversy, and the sensational charge that President Franklin Roosevelt had prior knowledge of the Japanese attack.

When news of the massive Japanese strike was received, Americans reeled with anger, shock and humiliation. They were furious because the Japanese had launched a sneak attack under the cover of negotiations to settle differences between the two countries. Editorials rang with denunciations of Japanese deceit. Cried one Georgia newspaper, "Oh, the dishonesty and trickery of it all."

Behind the nation's fury was the nagging question asked by public officials and private citizens alike. With war so obviously ready to break out in the Pacific, why did the attack catch us by surprise? Henry Morgenthau, Secretary of the Treasury, following a meeting with President Roosevelt after the attack, told his associates, "It is just unexplainable." They caught us unprepared, he said, all the planes in one place and the battleships lined up in perfect rows. "They can never explain this. They never will be able to explain it."

Senator Tom Connolly of Texas was equally baffled. Meeting with President Roosevelt the evening of the attack, the Senator pounded a desk and shouted, "How did they catch us with our pants down, Mr. President?"

Many Americans wanted an answer to that question and the smoke had hardly cleared when there were outraged calls for an investigation. Within weeks of the tragedy, President Roosevelt appointed a blue-ribbon committee, headed by Supreme Court Justice Owen Roberts, to investigate the attack. The Roberts Commission placed the blame on the Hawaiian commanders, Admiral Husband Kimmel and Lt. General Walter Short.

But the search for villains had only begun, the public's interest only whetted. Even as the war was being waged, no fewer than six more official investigations sought answers to the Pearl Harbor mystery, in the midst of a welter of discord and charges of whitewash. By 1945, critics of President Roosevelt were suggesting that he had maneuvered the country into war and knew in advance of the Japanese attack. That was the charge made by the rambly anti-Roosevelt Chicago Tribune in a September 1945 editorial. In the same month, John Chamberlain asserted in Life that "... Roosevelt . . . knew in advance that the Japanese were going to attack us. There is even ground for suspicion that he elected to bring the crisis to a head when it came."

While Pearl Harbor had united Americans in a determination to defeat the Japanese, it divided them, often bitterly, in assessing blame for the disaster.

With the war over and Pearl Harbor still a mystery, Congress, with much fanfare, launched its own investigation. One of its objectives was to clarify President Roosevelt's role in the Pearl Harbor story. For eight months (November 1945 - July 1946), the committee scrutinized Roosevelt's policy, military preparations, and intelligence information.

For the first time the public learned of Magic, the code name of the disclosures obtained by American intelligence. In 1940 and 1941, American cryptanalysts had broken several Japanese diplomatic codes and throughout 1941 the United States had been reading virtually all messages between Japanese embassies and the Foreign Office in Tokyo. The hearings revealed that through Magic the United States knew of Japan's planned move into Southeast Asia and the deadline it set for successful negotiations with America. If diplomatic success was not achieved by November 29, 1941, Magic read, "things are automatically going to happen." It was on the basis of such intelligence that the government sent out a war warning to Pacific commanders on November 27.

The long legislative inquiry, often rancorous and partisan, was the most extensive ever undertaken by Congress, and the record of its hearings is an incomparable source of information. As expected, the Committee was not unanimous in allocating responsibility for the debacle, noting mistakes in both Hawaii and Washington. But it found no evidence that Washington knew in advance or that the government "tricked, provoked, incited, cajoled, or coerced Japan into attacking this nation . . . ."

By the time of Congress' investigation, two schools of thought had coalesced to continue the Pearl Harbor debate. One school, the orthodox, while recognizing mistakes in Washington, assigned much of the blame to Kimmell and Short. The Hawaiian commanders had been warned that war with Japan was imminent, but did
not take adequate precautions. Their job had been to protect the fleet and they failed.

The other school, the revisionist, armed with knowledge of Magic, blamed President Roosevelt, certain Cabinet officials, and the top military leaders in Washington for the Pearl Harbor tragedy. Revisionists lambasted the whole course of Roosevelt’s diplomacy, arguing variously that he lied to the American people, that he withheld intelligence from his Pacific commanders, that he knew the attack was coming, and that he had even schemed the whole thing so that the United States could enter the war.

This last charge formed the basis of the back-door thesis. According to revisionists, Roosevelt was bent on taking the United States into war against Germany and did his best to provoke Adolf Hitler. But the German dictator would not oblige the American President, so the scheming Roosevelt provoked Japan into attacking the United States. Because Germany and Japan were allies, war with one meant war with the other. Roosevelt would then have his war against Germany, the real enemy, through the back door.

While the revisionists raised important questions, their case was a marred by ill-disguised personal hatred of President Roosevelt. More significantly, their thesis was based largely on innuendo, for no clear-cut proof exists to support it. Most historians have rejected the revisionist position, but the legend endures. Each year students, whose knowledge of history is slight, ask whether Roosevelt knew of the Japanese attack, and many Americans, not just Roosevelt-haters, accept this view.

Last year the old argument of how much Washington knew about Pearl Harbor was renewed with the publication of Gordon W. Prange’s At Dawn We Slept, and John Toland’s Infamy. Prange, who spent more than 30 years on his monumental tome, belongs to the orthodox school. During the occupation of Japan after the war, Prange was chief of the Army Intelligence Historical Section and used his position to interview virtually every Japanese officer who had a part in the attack. He also interviewed numerous Americans who were involved, and he seems to have read everything that has been published on the subject. Following his untimely death in May 1980, two former students completed his work. The result is a comprehensive account written from both the American and Japanese points of view. Prange’s conclusion: there was no conspiracy and he assigns much of the blame for Pearl Harbor to Admiral Kimmel and General Short.

John Toland, on the other hand, a Pulitzer Prize winner for The Rising Sun, fans the conspiratorial flames by charging that Roosevelt knew in advance of the Japanese attack, indeed welcomed it, but withheld this information from Kimmel and Short. As Toland concludes, “The comedy of errors on the sixth and seventh (of December 1941) appears incredible. It only makes sense if it were a charade, and Roosevelt and the inner circle had known about the attack.” Roosevelt’s motive, according to Toland, was to get the United States into the war against Germany. Later, the Hawaiian commanders were made scapegoats, victims of a vast FDR-led cover-up of the plot.

Like other revisionists, Toland emphasizes the “winds execute” message. In late November 1941, Magic revealed that the words “East wind rain” inserted in daily news broadcasts would be Tokyo’s signal to Japanese embassies that a break in diplomatic relations with the United States was imminent. According to Toland’s two witnesses, the message was received in code, but was not forwarded to United States commanders. Whether the message was ever received, though, is doubtful, for nearly all the other witnesses who testified during the official investigation deny that such a message was ever received. Japanese sources deny any such message was sent. And the message, according to Toland, was received in Morse code, though it was supposed to be broadcast in plain language.

It is difficult to determine why Toland places such emphasis on the winds-execute code. As Congress concluded in 1946, even if it had been sent and intercepted it would have added nothing to what the United States already knew from other intelligence sources; and it in no way indicated an attack on Pearl Harbor.

Another prop in the Toland thesis deals with radio traffic picked up in early December 1941, by two Americans who, according to Toland, separately located the Japanese strike force heading toward Pearl Harbor. One listener, a mysterious Seaman First Class Z—whose name will be disclosed one day—tracked the Japanese carrier force to a position 400 miles north-northwest of Hawaii. The other American was a radio man aboard the liner Lurline who located radio signals coming from a Japanese force “north and west of Honolulu.” Both handed their information to superiors in naval intelligence who apparently did nothing about it.

The problem with this sensational bit of information is that the Japanese task force heading for Pearl Harbor maintained complete radio silence. Surviving members of the Japanese staff who planned the attack deny Toland’s allegations, and maintain that the ships communicated with one another only by blinker or flag. Toland, in the end, asks tantalizing questions, which underscore the mysteries in the Pearl Harbor story, but he does not convincingly supply the answers. He demonstrates neither conspiracy nor cover-up.

Beyond his failure to prove his points, his theory, and revisionism in general, is full of holes. If Roosevelt wanted war, why would he risk a good part of the Pacific fleet—the very forces he would need in a Pacific war—at the very beginning? It makes no sense to enter a war that Roosevelt presumably wanted to win with a stunning defeat.

Some revisionists respond that Roosevelt was willing to sacrifice obsolescent battleships. But Roosevelt had no way of knowing that the Japanese would only attack battleships and not the more important, both strategically and logistically,
fuel tanks and repair facilities. Had the vital fuel supply been destroyed, what was left of the Pacific fleet would have had to pull back to West Coast ports, abandoning the Pacific to the Japanese. As it was, Pearl Harbor was quickly resurrected and the fleet rebuilt.

As for the back-door thesis, which the revisionists rely upon to prove conspiracy, that, too, makes no sense. The revisionists assume that Roosevelt welcomed the attack so that the United States could ultimately enter the war against Hitler. But the Axis alliance was defensive; and just as Japan was under no obligation to go to war against the Soviet Union when Germany attacked in June 1941, Germany was under no obligation if Japan attacked the United States. Roosevelt, then, could not know that a Pacific war could serve as a back door to the European war.

If revisionist theory founders on evidence and common sense, why then was America caught by surprise? One explanation lies in American racism, which led the United States to underestimate greatly the “little yellow people” with buck-teeth and silly grins. Americans viewed Japan as backward, its pilots nearsighted, its planes inferior. The oriental, with “feet of clay”, would have neither the audacity nor the ability to attack a bastion of western defense like Pearl Harbor. “The Japanese are not going to risk a fight with a first-class nation,” proclaimed Congressman Charles I. Faddis of Pennsylvania, in February 1941, and that was the general view of both the American military and the general public. Indeed, after the attack, some Americans thought that Germans must have been flying those planes.

Of course, the United States knew by late November - early December 1941 that the Japanese were ready to strike, but American leaders were virtually hypnotized by Japan’s drive toward Southeast Asia. There were plenty of reports to indicate war. For example, on December 1, 1941, Magic revealed that Japan had told Germany that there is “extreme danger” of war between Japan and America and “the start of this war may be quicker than anyone dreams.” Two days later, America learned that Japanese embassies had been instructed to burn diplomatic codes, a sure sign of war. On December 6, intelligence reported two large Japanese fleets rounding the tip of Southern Indo-China, and on the same day an intercept indicated a break in diplomatic relations. Indeed, when President Roosevelt read this last message, he said, “This means war.”

While the American government glumly awaited the attack, its attention was centered almost exclusively on Southeast Asia, where intelligence reports indicated the blow would come and where, in fact, the principal Japanese strike occurred. Not one intercept specifically mentioned an attack on Pearl Harbor, which was thousands of miles east and presumably of little value to the Japanese.

American naval leaders were also blinded to the possibility of an attack on Pearl Harbor by standard naval doctrine, which said that you did not divide your fleet. If the Japanese fleet were in Southeast Asia, as intelligence said it was, it could not be elsewhere.

And so on that fateful day in early December, the Japanese launched one of the most brilliant, daring and surprising naval operations in history. Even though a war warning went out, reconnaissance planes stayed put and there was no change in a relaxed weekend routine. Americans never really accepted the possibility that Japan would attack Pearl Harbor. As one naval officer put it, “Americans did not believe,” and it was this improbability that was the essential element of Japanese success.

Pearl Harbor was the result of numerous related and complicated factors: Japanese military skill and uncommon luck, false American assumptions, inadequate American intelligence, and numerous blunders, such as the one by an American officer who told a radar operator “don’t worry about it” when the operator reported seeing planes on his screen two minutes after seven o’clock Sunday morning. But these errors were of the human kind, the kind that all nations make. There was no conspiracy, no cover-up.

More than 40 years after the event there are still many unanswered questions about the attack and Pearl Harbor remains, in Prange’s words, “the eternal enigma.” The attack has been exhaustively studied and millions of words have been recorded in trying to explain it. Perhaps because it is so baffling and incomprehensible, a conspiracy theory will continue to enjoy acceptance and Toland’s mischief will keep it alive for a while yet. But on the basis of all the information we have now, President Roosevelt did not know and was as surprised by the tragedy as any American.
Scene One:
An open meadow, in early fall
Time:
About 4000 years ago

A small family group, consisting of perhaps 12 hardy, tanned men, women, and children, is camped on the flat crest of a sandy knoll overlooking a meandering stream. They have constructed a small round house for their dwelling, about nine meters across, by driving sharpened saplings into the ground and lashing together the tops; the intervening spaces have been patched with bark and hides. They have moved into this area for the fall season, moving downstream one kilometer from their major base.

Their reasons for coming to the region are complex, and perhaps not clearly understood even by themselves. Throughout the millennium before their time, populations in southern New England have been increasing, making the most of the favorable environmental conditions that accompanied the complete retreat of the glaciers from the North American Continent. The climate was actually warmer than it is today, approximately that of modern North Carolina. As populations increased, they eventually filled the best zones, along the major rivers and lakes, where the foods upon which human groups relied were most easily available. At the same time, the encroaching sea, filled with meltwater from the receding glaciers, had submerged many hundreds of square kilometers of coastline. These forces, as well as a pioneering opportunism, led groups throughout the region to move into the interior, upland zone which they had visited previously only on short forays.

During the last century or so, however, environmental conditions have definitely taken a turn for the worse. The climate has become so hot that many of the large, shallow lakes which dot this relatively flat region have become swamps or peatbogs; and much of the forest cover has been replaced by scrub. The environment resembles somewhat that of modern Cape Cod, with some stands of nut trees—oak, beech, and hazel—mixed with white pine and birch. The decrease in nut trees, and the unreliability of their yield cycles, have reduced the animal populations which depend on these resources for survival—particularly white-tailed deer and turkey, both mainstays of the diet for these people. Under these conditions, the interior groups have been forced to adopt a survival strategy which involves the establishment of a permanent base camp and several minor satellite camps at short distances from the base, used by small splinter groups from the main group for relatively short periods of time. This is an effective strategy for subsisting in an environment which no longer provides an abundance of any one particular resource. It increases the chances that at least some of the satellite camps will succeed in finding sufficient amounts of diverse resources which can be stored and later used to feed the entire local group. Johnson #1 is one such satellite camp.

The group occupying the site is intimately familiar with the resources of the area, and, probably through its contact with the base camp, has at its disposal trade connections with much of eastern Massachusetts. Felsite, a dark-colored volcanic stone quarried from the Blue Hills and Attle-

*The following scenarios, it should be understood, represent (with the obvious exception of the last) a combination of careful analysis, comparisons with other sites in the region, and a healthy proportion of speculation on the part of the author. The data upon which they are based is a part of a report produced under a Faculty Development Grant.
haps 30, prepares to celebrate the harvest festival. They have spent the summer and fall tending their crops of maize, hazel trees with stone celts and to burn off the underbrush from the fields before planting. While the other men are hunting with these simple tools for the scarce game, the women gather local wild seeds and nuts, particularly hazel nuts, to store for their return to base in the winter ahead. Hazel seems to have been a very important resource; the nuts were charred in fire prior to storage or consumption, and must have been a real windfall for this particular group: wild hazel trees only have maximal yields every fifth year, on the average. In addition to these activities, the women prepare deer hides for winter clothing using stone scrapers and knives made by the men; they also prepare the food by heating stones in the camp firepits, and then dropping them into skin and fibre bags filled with a mixture of gathered grasses, seeds, roots, and meat. While life is far from easy, the population is not yet at a point where it is really stressed by the environmental changes taking place around it. Instead, it has adapted to those changes rapidly, making a virtue of necessity wherever possible.

* * *

**Scene Two:**
**A cleared field, in mid-fall**

**Time:**
About 1200 years ago

A somewhat larger group of people, perhaps 30, prepares to celebrate the harvest festival. They have spent the summer and early fall here, some members of the group having arrived first in the spring to fell the trees with stone celts and to burn off the underbrush from the fields before planting. They have tended their crops of maize, sunflowers, and squash; now they reap the benefits of their labor. While the land is not especially fertile, it is at least flat, and is sufficient to serve the needs of this relatively small group. The climate has ameliorated during the past 1800 years; a cool, moist trend has brought about the return of many species of plants and animals in abundance. The men have brought down several white-tailed deer, which they are in the process of butchering. They use quartz knives and scrapers to divide the meat into portions for cooking, and fist-sized cobbles for crushing the bones to extract the tasty marrow. Later they will roast the deer meat on a large platform of heated rocks. The women are preparing crude vessels of clay and wood for serving and storage of seeds. The climate has stabilized to nearly that of the present, and one result of this is the settlement of soft-shell clam populations in flat shore areas. While Johnson #1 is 20 miles from the nearest of these, some shell has made its way this far inland to be used as a tempering agent for the pottery. A prosperous people, these occupants have established trade connections, using dugout canoes to travel the waterways, as far distant as Pennsylvania, from which they have obtained (through many intermediaries) a small quantity of brightly colored chert from which their best edged tools are made. They are also a people who can afford the luxury of a little fine adornment; their chief wears stone pendants around his neck, bored through for attachment of rawhide thongs. Their social order is no longer the egalitarian structure of the previous group; there is permanent social hierarchy based around the redistribution of surplus crops, and each group has its local permanent chief, whose title is inherited from generation to generation. This arrangement, they feel, gives them the security they need to pursue their agricultural lifestyle without threat of famine; for the chief maintains the group’s relationship with the gods of agricultural bounty.

* * *

**Scene Three:**
**A wooded hilltop in early summer**

**Time:**
About 850 years ago

A small group of men, perhaps five to ten, have come to the crest of the dune for a single purpose: to work the quartz cobbles they have obtained from the river three-quarters kilometer to the north into tools. They sit separated from one another by about seven meters, far enough that the razor-sharp chips flying from one worker’s knapping do not endanger the others, but close enough to be in hailing distance in the event hostile groups are sighted from the hillcrest. For these have become warlike groups, with populations large enough to contest prime agricultural lands. Johnson #1 is far from these; most populations during this period have concentrated along the coast, where the most fertile lands are, as well as the clam flats. It is only about five kilometers from the nearest Wampanoag settlement at Titicut; but the men are concerned about raids from their perennial rivals, the Massawachusseog and the Narraganset, and there have been recent rumors of Mohawks raiding this far east.

As each man works the recalcitrant quartz, an oval-shaped scatter of flakes, chunks, and tools broken in the process of manufacture forms. When they have completed their task, the men leave this waste material behind, along with some of their hammerstones, and depart for their permanent settlements along the coast.

* * *

**Scene Four:**
**A lonely cottage in the woods, in late fall**

**Time:**
About 175 years ago

We can today, perhaps, sympathize with Nathaniel Preshoe. He is not, to say the least, making it in Massachusetts. Thirty years ago, his maternal grandfather, the wealthy landowner, Zebulon Field of Taunton, had deeded to his father Peter Preshoe a tract of land on the edge of that town at the latter’s marriage, as part of his mother Elizabeth’s dowry. With it came a small set of the Field family’s English (and imitation Chinese) teacups and saucers. But Peter Preshoe’s farming venture never succeeded: it was too far from the center of town, too far even from the nearest road, for goods to travel easily to market. And Peter died young, leaving his widow and infant son to eke out an existence on the edges of the swamp which to this day bears the name of Hockomock, the dreaded Indian god of the
underworld. Superstitions abound concerning this low-lying area, with its nightly methane emissions and ghostly associations. Faced with economic hardship, apparent abandonment by the wealthier portion of her family, and above all the general eeriness of the haunted swamp, Elizabeth goes quietly, gradually, and completely insane. Legends of the madwoman of Hockomock Swamp may still be collected today.

So Nathaniel, at age 25 still unmarried, builds a small cottage on the sandy knoll half a kilometer away from his father's house (and that far away from the swamp) - just to have a place to get away from the intolerable conditions at home. The house is poorly constructed: just a wood frame and a chimney chinked with mud daub, no cellar. Here he attempts to continue his father's half-hearted attempt at farming. He has brought with him only a little of his mother's tea service; and in general his cottage is less well-endowed than that from which he moved. Most of his ceramics are of strictly local manufacture. We learn of his marriage and fathering of a daughter, Mary, from the latter's gravestone in the Field family cemetery, dated 1832. There are also some vague company records indicating that he may have attempted to mine the local bog iron from the swamp area and process it into usable metal. But his efforts are to no avail; the Preshoes soon disappear from all town records. The best that can be said about Nathaniel is that hard times did not drive him to drink; and he seems to have been but a moderate smoker. Perhaps it is merely that he could not afford much in the way of these pleasures. But by about 1840, the cottage burned, and the site was abandoned; the bricks of the chimney were plowed under or buried in pits, and the site returned to forest.

* * *

Scene Five:
A wooded rise, in mid-summer
Time:
1-3 years ago

A small but intrepid group of students from Bridgewater State College, under the author's direction, walk onto Johnson #1 site carrying screens, shovels, trowels, short-handled hoes, tape measures, brushes, and notebooks. They have come here as part of Bridgewater's Public Archaeology Concentration, and are taking part in a five-week summer field school in
Archeological Investigation of Prehistoric Sites in New England. The site has been chosen for excavation because it lies just outside the right-of-way for a major highway, and was discovered in 1977 by a team from Brown University’s Public Archaeology Laboratory in advance of construction. However, Brown’s contract with the Department of Public Works did not permit them to excavate outside of the right-of-way, so a cooperative arrangement has been made with Bridgewater State College for the field schools to be trained here. It is considered likely by all parties, given past experience, that once the highway is built the land values adjacent to it will increase to the point where development, and with it destruction of the site and its contents, will become inevitable.

The students excavate carefully-measured 1.5 meter squares at intervals throughout the site, scraping away the soils with trowels and short-handled hoes and measuring in the remains of past cultures which they find. All the information is recorded on forms for later analysis. The site is a productive one; over 300 artifacts–projectile points, knives, scrapers, drills, a gouge, stone ornaments, pottery–and over 5000 flakes from the three prehistoric occupations; and in excess of 25,000 historic artifacts are recovered in one fall and three summer dig seasons. More important than this, their careful excavation techniques have permitted the retrieval of information which permits the site to be fitted into a regional framework, enabling archeologists to generate a model of continuous, though sporadic occupation, and the forces which shaped it, throughout southern New England. This type of reconstruction can help us all better to understand ourselves and our relationship to the land in which we live; the past successes and failures of its occupants inform us of our own very human strengths and weaknesses, and permit us to plan wisely for the future. For example, we can see the effect that long-term climatic fluctuations had upon populations in the region, and anticipating such in the future, can adjust our own adaptations accordingly.

We are also faced with a series of cultures in the region who, for almost their entire duration, subsisted in peace with one another and in harmony with their environment. Surely this is an example we could do well to contemplate in the late 20th century. It seems to this author, at least, that we desperately need models of such cultures, if we ourselves are to survive the crises of our own making in this region–let alone the planet as a whole.
A struggle began in 1633 which is not yet resolved. It is a contest for the highest possible stakes—the mind of man, and it pits two most formidable opponents against each other: science and religion. The event that initiated this battle was the trial of Galileo and the dominant issue was much more than a man’s challenge of his church’s teachings and authority. Rather it was science versus religion, a new manifestation of an age-old struggle between faith and reason, the way man comes to know reality.

Actually, Galileo’s problems with religion were not new. Greek philosophy had considered it and Aristotle thought his concept of the “Unmoved Mover” had adequately answered the questions raised by the sciences concerning the origins and operation of the universe. In the thirteenth century, Thomas Aquinas believed that he had properly identified the Unmoved Mover with the Christian God and had thus forever reconciled the Christian faith and the sciences. Aquinas and his medieval compatriots had a very simple and reasonable schema of the universe: all objects were created with innate purpose and each object was related to all others in a divinely designed hierarchy. Man was at the apex of this hierarchy, the center of all creation, and he moved about on a planet that stood at the center of the universe; all other entities of the heavens spun around it.

Man was thus the star of a great cosmic drama, one Ian Barbour in his Issues in Science and Religion describes as a five act play: Creation, Covenant, Christ, Church, and Consummation. Since the first century of the Christian era we have been performing in Act IV: Church. The Consummation is yet to come. The medieval view was, of course biblically centered. The Bible, as the inviolate word of God, revealed the truth and few disputed its cosmic view.

A century before Galileo, however, the foundations of the biblical schema had been shaken by the theory of Copernicus that the sun, not the earth, stood at the center of the solar system. His evidence was based largely on mathematical calculations and were not acceptable to most, but Galileo offered visual evidence, with the telescope, and many were persuaded. The Church could not allow the challenge to biblical authority to pass unheeded and called the noted scientist to answer charges of heresy.

To his later regret, Galileo recanted, but the gauntlet had been flung and the duel begun. It was not possible to long ignore the evidence that man and earth lie not at the center of the universe, but off to a somewhat obscure side. Man still reels from the shock of learning that he is not center-stage in the cosmic drama, but is, on the contrary, a mere spectator to that drama which unfolds before him.

The Church... called the noted scientist to answer charges of heresy.

Isaac Newton did nothing to help him regain his composure, either, when he convincingly argued and demonstrated that the universe operates like a law-abiding machine, doing what it has to do, without the necessity of a sustaining (divine) power at the controls. Determinists saw the universe as a self-sufficient, impersonal machine and believed we would eventually predict every future event because it was already determined by natural law. Materialists denied the existence of God, soul, and spirit. Deists retained the idea of God as creator, but believed that God had started things in motion only to walk away from them, caring nothing about creation’s destiny. With these and other atheistic and agnostic theories, religion had to contend, fighting for its very life.

Fate had worse in store—Charles Darwin. The Origin of Species burst upon the world in 1859 with its incredible theory of evolution based upon the cruel principle of the survival of the fittest. Darwin’s thesis was reasonable and supported by a massive amount of evidence. The religious community quakes even now before it!

By the end of the nineteenth century, the biblical view of the universe had become untenable. Man is revealed to be a tiny bit of protoplasm on a miniscule ball of dirt in a rather dim section of a vastness impossible for the human mind to comprehend. The idea of a God who is all-good (survival of the fittest?), all-powerful (so much suffering?) and all-wise (such bad cosmic design?) is, in the minds of many no longer defensible. The world is a vicious place without rational design or purpose, man all alone in a hostile environment.

In the face of such evidence, religion, to survive, must divorce itself from science. The two views are incompatible and most scientists and theologians tacitly agree to keep to their respective areas of concern, theology to deal with the intangible matters of soul, spirit and divinity, science to deal with the physical aspects of the universe. Let neither interfere with the work of the other for they have nothing to say to each other. This is, I think, the prevailing opinion of most scientists and theologians at the present time.

While I have dealt primarily here with Christianity, it must not be supposed that the struggle described is limited to that
religion. Muslim fatalism is also incompatible with scientific knowledge. Those who believe that Allah has already written the Book of Life for every individual view science as intrusive, an attempt to subvert the Almighty Will and change the predestined course of history. (Had Allah wanted a dam across the Nile, he would have put one there.) Buddhist and Hindu aestheticism transcends the physical concerns of science and seeks ultimate bliss in meditation on nothingness. Taoists seek the slowly flowing way of life, to move with that stream which the sciences tend to buck. Even Orthodox Judaism has ever sought to retain the past in the present and has regarded scientific progress with suspicion, incompatible with Torah. It is, I think, very much to Christianity's credit that the battle has been waged at all, and that, indeed, it is only in a Christian milieu that science has arisen (see the excellent recent work by Eugene M. Klaaren, Religious Origins of Modern Science). It should be noted that Galileo, Newton and Darwin were devoted Christian believers until their deaths; Darwin once even expressed regret that his Origin of Species had ever been published.

In this context, there can be little doubt that science reigns as victor. It has very practical applications and our lives have been made immeasurably easier by its findings and inventions. Our increasing understanding of nature has given us astounding control over that nature, and we can be assured that time will only add to our ability to understand and control. We look forward to solving our energy problems, controlling our weather, and prolonging our life spans, perhaps to conquer "natural" death once and for all. That such discoveries will present us with gigantic social and personal problems and perhaps with insoluble dilemmas stops our investigations not at all. Let science seek the truth no matter the cost.

The predominance of science in our time worries some of us, nevertheless, for we fear the loss of our humanity. For a long time machines have done our physical labor, and now we rely increasingly upon them to do some of our mental work also. They do our calculating for us and some of our thinking. They are even beginning to do our talking. Our nuclear capabilities threaten to destroy us; our machines may eventually make us obsolete, or worse, slaves to our own discoveries and inventions.

In spite of the prodigious influence of the sciences, however, cries of protest continue to rise, cries that call for a better understanding of ourselves, our spiritual nature as well as our physical being. Some of these cries are, to some, rather pitiful and pathetic. Such is the rub of the controversy between so-called evolutionists and creationists. Laws have been passed in Alabama, Texas and elsewhere which demand equal time in our public schools for the teaching of the biblical story of creation and the scientific theory of evolution. So far the courts have not supported this legislation. I doubt they ever will. If a similar nature is the continuing call for prayer in the public schools. That problem just will not go away.

If we are to save our humanity . . . we must find reconciliation between science and humanistic endeavors . . .

A more serious problem exists, I think, in some of our institutions of higher learning where free discussion of the problem is sometimes prohibited, and where scientists may be prevented from teaching and discussing the possible theological implications of their work. Such questions, they say, lie outside the scope of the sciences. A year ago a friend, an astrophysicist at one of our most prestigious universities, wrote me that he could not aspire to tenure if he should pursue his interest in the relationship of science and religion. He must not attempt to answer his students' question, "But what does it mean?" He was criticized recently because an article on the origin of the cosmos was "too teleological." He writes me now that tenure was denied, he believes for these reasons, and he must seek to follow his interests elsewhere.

If we are to save our humanity, it seems to me, we must find reconciliation between science and humanistic endeavors, especially with regard to our search for meaning, more especially in our search for God—or the divine principle behind creation. I stress this because I believe that religion is—and always has been—the most important way in which we know and express ourselves as human. Religion has been the major impetus in our search for meaning and provides a most significant answer to that search. It has been the major factor in helping us to fulfill our promise, the realization of our abilities, capabilities and personalities. Religious man has made the highest achievements in the arts and in other expressions of beauty and in service to his fellow man. Religion has taught us to pursue our highest worthy goals to their completion in spite of the odds or the opposition. In religion, and only in religion, can man find the means to be the best he can possibly be. Many, pointing to wars, oppression and other crimes committed in the name of religion, will challenge this statement, and space limitations prevent adequate defense here. A few comments may be helpful, however, although I should regret it very much if the main thrust of this paper should be lost in debate over this tangential point, which, while crucial to our survival, is not crucial to my argument.

Much, probably most, of the evil credited to religion is unfairly so attributed, but should more properly be laid to political, economic and social causes, as well as the selfish impulses of influential persons. I see, for instance, nothing in Christianity that justifies the Crusades, the Inquisition, nor any other oppression of the human spirit. It is, on the contrary, the religious spirit of men and women, like Martin Luther King, Mahatma Gandhi, Mother Teresa—to say nothing of Lao-tsu, the Buddha, Moses, Muhammed, Jesus—who have truly advanced the cause of humanity. I maintain that it is the loss of that spirit which allows us to stagnate, bound to ideas—religious and otherwise—that keep us in the archaic past and prevent our constructive confrontation with the present. I point, too, of course, to the superb artistic evidence of Michelangelo's Sistine Chapel, Handel's Messiah, Schubert's Ave Maria, and Goethe's and Gounod's Faust, naming only a few of countless such. Further, I would
point to the nameless billions who have found meaning in life and the strength to live it and conquer it through their religious faith. It has always been, and will always be, the religious answer to the question of life's meaning that fulfills us and inspires us to our greatest achievements. Philosophical and scientific answers provide no such inspiration. Why else should every major religious approach be followed by prodigious religious reactions and awakenings? Even our own sophisticated civilization witnesses a world-wide burgeoning of religious conservatism in the wake of the splitting of atoms, Sputnik, and the shattering of the shackles of earth's gravity. Man cannot live by reason alone!

We can then, no longer afford the luxury of relegating science and religion to separate realms of concern; their concerns must be the same—the betterment of mankind. Religion must deal with the physical world to give it meaning and science must deal with the world of spiritual things to give it rationality. Science and religion have things to say to each other and the dialogue must begin now. Strangely, perhaps, I think it is the scientist who must take the initiative and lead the way, because it is he, not the theologian, who has the wider view, and because, I believe, his research leads him ultimately to the threshold of the question of divine principle in nature. He cannot, in conscience as a human being, fail to ask, with his students, "But what does it mean?"

Ultimately the problem resolves itself into the question of how the two disciplines seek answers and the evidence they consider appropriate to their search. We might summarize these different approaches as follows:

**The Scientist:**

1. Is objective: removes self from the inquiry
2. Is rational: solves problems intellectually, with reason and logic
3. Predicts the future with a high degree of certainty
4. Tests hypotheses empirically; discards those negated by evidence
5. Deals with physical reality verified by observation; eschews faith.

* * *

**The Religionist:**

1. Is subjective: commits self totally to the inquiry
2. Is non-rational: transcends or ignores reason in problem solving
3. Predicts the future with low degree of certainty ("God works in mysterious ways.")
4. Works with untestable hypotheses; ignores negative evidence.
5. Deals with non-physical reality not verifiable by observation; accepts by faith.

This summation is something of a caricature since there is a wide variety of scientists and religious and not all adhere strictly to the written and unwritten rules of conduct for their respective professions, but it can serve as a central point for discussion.

Even our own sophisticated civilization witnesses a world-wide burgeoning of religious conservatism...
the scientist learns that the structure of the atom is beyond the conceptual abilities of his mind. He loses "picturability" and has often to deal in models, symbols and paradigms. Thus he loses the ability to know reality.

With the invention and development of space technology and the computer, the amazing ramifications of the Einsteimian theories of relativity are just now becoming known. Their application and meaning center chiefly in the physicists' search for the origins of the universe and lend support for the so-called "Big Bang" theory of creation. That theory proposes a large and extremely dense ball of primordial substance which, at the beginning of creation heats to an incredible degree and explodes to cast its matter into space where some of it coagulates eventually into stars, planets and the other components of the universe. The Big Bang theory is supported by evidence showing that the universe is expanding; all things are moving away from each other. Further, the "sound" of the big bang reverberates yet throughout the universe and can be detected by radar telescopes. The nature of the universe was determined, according to Nobel Prize winner, Steven Weinberg, during the first three minutes of creation. Only one of many possibilities is realized, but, fortunately, the result is the ultimate evolution of man, a creature who can think. Eric Chaisson in Cosmic Dawn notes that now the universe has evolved to the point where it can contemplate its own origins.

There are some amazing phenomena in this universe of ours. Numbers are so large the mind cannot hold them. Stars exist 10,000,000,000 light years away from each other and light travels at the rate of 186,000 miles per second. Most of the stars we see are part of one galaxy, the Milky Way, but in space there are millions of galaxies, as large or larger than our own. On the other hand, the realm of the atom entities are so infinitesimal that the mind, likewise, cannot hold them. Some particles are so tiny they pass through the entire mass of the earth without striking any of the countless bits of matter that constitute that mass.

In order to investigate the secrets of this universe and its origins, the astrophysicists make some fundamental assumptions and currently believe that these assumptions are fully justified because nothing else makes sense to them:

1. The universe is homogeneous, i.e., it is the same no matter where one may stand within it.

2. The universe is expanding, but not with everything moving away from a common center (as one would expect from an explosion) but rather with everything moving away from everything else. Objects in space move away at different rates of speed, however, depending on how close they are to the observer. Those objects farthest away from you move faster than those nearest to you. Again this is true no matter where in the universe you stand. In other words, the rate of speed of an object depends upon where the observer happens to be.

3. Regardless of how fast an object moves, light from it travels at a constant speed, 186,000 miles per second. It takes light the same time to travel between two objects no matter whether they are stationary, or moving toward each other or away from each other however rapidly.

4. Space is expanding, but not into empty space because there is not even empty space beyond the limits of the universe. The space in which the universe exists is all there is. We can not even speak of nothingness beyond the universe.

5. Time is the fourth dimension, and time is dependent upon the position of an object, or person, and upon its rate of speed and upon its mass. In the presence of massive bodies time slows down; in the presence of a "black hole" it stops altogether. Very rapidly moving bodies age more slowly than stationary ones. If you could travel through space at the speed of light you would live forever, could travel for 1,000,000 years in earth time and return to earth not one second older than you were when you left. If it were possible to travel faster than the speed of light, you would probably move backwards in time, perhaps to return before you were born!

Some other examples might be cited, but the point is made, I think. These basic assumptions, accepted by the world's most renowned astrophysicists are their statements of faith, and they are, I submit, as untestable and as non-rational as any statement of faith made by a religious person. The scientist hangs his very existence upon them, no less than a religionist. The model of the scientist now changes dramatically. My earlier summary of the scientist versus the religionist needs to be changed to the following:

1. Both the scientist and the religionist are subjective, the former only reluctantly so and thus to a lesser degree, but religious people can also be objective to some degree about their faith, e.g. in past times, Augustine, Anselm, and Aquinas; in the present, Bultmann, Barth, Tillich. I think the difference is not great.

2. Both disciplines deal extensively in the non-rational. The scientist's assumptions, as we have just shown, can be immense; religious faith can be (and I think it should be) reasonable.

3. Both work in a milieu of uncertainty. The scientist's batting average is surely higher than the Prophet's because they operate in different areas of research, but perfect predictability is impossible by the very nature of the universe.

4. Both make assumptions and develop hypotheses which are sometimes untestable. Religious people usually believe their faith is amply proven by their experiences.

5. Both are unable to know reality. Each discipline must deal with symbols, models and paradigms that represent or suggest the real. As the God of the Judeo-Christian tradition cannot be comprehended by the human mind, neither can the universe nor the atom.

Albert Einstein
Two other concerns strike me. First, philosophers have long considered the idea of the Unmoved Mover, the First Cause. David Hume leveled serious but purely theoretical criticism against it, and, some believe, Immanuel Kant destroyed it. But somehow their arguments fail to satisfy. We still ask, "Where did it all come from?" The question is welded to our quest for meaning. The "Big Bang" theory raises the question again. It states that suddenly the "stuff" of the universe is there; it explodes and we result. From whence came that "stuff"? What was there one billionth of a second before— or an eternity before? A theory of a continually expanding-contracting universe does not fit the evidence. Steven Weinberg in The First Three Minutes shows that the big-bang has occurred only once.

More than one scientist has described the situation as a mountain which is being climbed on opposite sides by scientists and theologians.

Center for Astrophysics commented to me that it was a lucky break for man that the universe turned out as it did with carbon as the basic unit of organic matter. "What if it had turned out to be silicon, for example?" he wanted to know. In all likelihood we would not have been. Recently, Professor Frank Tiple of Purdue University has calculated that in the beginning there was one chance out of 1 x 10^60 possible genetic variations that man could have evolved. Is it reasonable to insist that we arrived by chance (one out of 1 x 10^60) or that it was just a "lucky break" at the moment of the big bang?

Thus, I submit, the two titanic antagonists approach each other as they develop and become more aware of the nature of the universe of which both are a vital part. More than one scientist has described the situation as a mountain which is being climbed on opposite sides by scientists and theologians. They will eventually meet at the top, having arrived thus at the same point. Some deeply religious person will surely be there to ask, "Where have you been? I have been waiting for you."

Experience and faith both deny a spontaneous origin. It is far more reasonable, I submit, to ascribe creation to an eternal and superhuman power.

Secondly, philosophers have likewise considered the possibility of design in the universe. Hume, Kant and Darwin have presented strong evidence to the contrary. But, the "Big Bang" theory raises its questions once more. Professor Owen Gingerich of the Harvard-Smithsonian

. . . but, in space there are millions of galaxies, as large or larger than our own.

The door is open for dialogue. Let it begin!
Moses hanged himself
in the barn
hushup  hushup
don’t talk in front of the child

Moses’ face
large and soft
with slanty eyes
some wispy hair
on his crown

great chunks for hands
dirt-ground fingers
always rubbing
a crinkled
wrinkled blue shirt

He snapped suspenders
fast but the sure
weight of his hand
on my head
dead calm

Around the table
where the farmhands fed
Moses was the kindest
but his eyes said
he was somewhere else

where he was headed
I guess
hushup  hushup
when he slung the cart-rope
over the barnbeam
Although nuclear weapons have been with us for 37 years and isolated voices have been warning that we were on an accelerated course towards annihilation, only recently have large numbers of people throughout the world realized the imminent danger and begun to take political action to avert a catastrophe.

The consciousness of the threat posed by the nuclear arms race was sufficient to mobilize people into the beginnings of a political movement. For such a movement to become effective, however, an understanding of the nature of the threat and its causes must necessarily follow the instinctive perception of the danger.

Recently several books have appeared which attempt to provide this understanding and to chart future courses of action. One of the most popular of these is Jonathan Schell's, *The Fate of the Earth*. This book, which first appeared in three consecutive issues of *The New Yorker*, consists of three independent parts.

The first part, "A Republic of Insects and Grass," is a careful and thorough examination of what is currently known or predictable of the effects and consequences of a full-scale nuclear war.

Based on governmental and scientific studies, interviews with scientists, pronouncements of government leaders, and the tragic experiences of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, Schell presents compelling evidence that the dangers we face are real with drastic consequences. He forcefully demonstrates that concepts such as limited nuclear war, survivability of a nuclear attack, reasonableness of civil defense, and economic recovery from a nuclear war, are dangerous myths whose reality exists only in the words of political demagogues.

He considers the possible causes of an outbreak of nuclear war and gives a serious and objective presentation of its medical, ecological, and global consequences.

"I Love a Parade" from Boston Street Scenes  
By Tom Knudson, Associate Professor of Physical Education
arrive at the decisions that sovereign states previously arrived at through war.” This is like saying that the cure for cancer is immortality. It is not a solution whether one believes such a nationless world to be desirable or not. Its achievement is a larger and harder task than removal of the nuclear danger itself. Moreover, it is not a solution because it avoids the questions that must be answered before a real solution is found, questions such as: What are the social political, and economic reasons for the ever increasing stockpiling of nuclear weapons by the superpowers? What real function do the nuclear arsenals perform?

Schell’s many references to social/psychic ills suggest that nations face what is essentially a psychological problem. Such a statement as “a society that systematically shuts its eyes to an urgent peril to its physical survival and fails to take any steps to save itself cannot be called psychologically well” implies that the social and political health of a nation depends upon its psychological stability. If such is the assumption, the elimination of national sovereignty would be somewhat akin to collective psychoanalysis.

The author’s thesis might be best summarized by his choice for a title. In Webster’s New Collegiate Dictionary we find:

fate . . . the principle or determining cause or will by which things in general are supposed to come to be as they are or events to happen as they do . . . whatever is destined or decreed . . . final outcome . . . a predetermined state or end.

If the intention of the author was to provide some guidance to the infant nuclear disarmament movement he might have chosen a different title since, as Norm Chomsky says in his book Toward a New Cold War,

"...the drive towards . . . eventual nuclear destruction is the result of human decisions taken with human institutions that do not derive from natural law and can be changed by people who devote themselves to the search for justice and freedom.”

Rabbit is Rich

By John Updike
Alfred A. Knopf, $13.95

Readers of Rabbit Redux will recall how, at the close of that novel, Harry Angstrom - unemployed, his home destroyed by fire and a girl dead in the ashes - lay beside his wife Janice in a motel bed and tried to sleep. His life had come apart. Janice had just returned, hoping to work out a reconciliation with Harry after her affair with Charlie Stavros, her father’s ‘chief sales representative’ at the used-car lot. Nelson, their son, has judged his father responsible for the death of the runaway girl, Jill. In the motel room, “long and secret as a burrow,” Harry finally sleeps.

Ten years later, Updike has once again brought Rabbit out of hibernation, in his mid-forties, a paunch around his middle, and dwelling with his wife and mother-in-law at the Springer family home on Joseph Street. For now, as ‘chief sales representative’ for Springer Toyota, Rabbit, with the timely help of the 1979 oil embargo, is peddling Corollas almost as quickly as they can be displayed on the lot. His marriage with Janice has arrived at a plateau of mutual tolerance, if not affection. Nelson is away at Kent State. Only life in his mother-in-law’s house grates on him, but since Bessie Springer still controls a half share of the Toyota agency, Rabbit has managed to accommodate himself.

His accommodations, we learn from the novel’s opening pages, extend even to Charlie Stavros who now works as Harry’s chief assistant and whose affair with Janice has been covered over by the events of the intervening years. Harry has had to make his peace with Charlie because Charlie knows how to sell cars; he has connections.

Yet, Harry has connections, too. As he drives his tomato-soup red Luxury Edition Corona through Brewer, Harry comments to himself on all that he knows about this Pennsylvania town, which after three novels has become for the reader nearly as distinctive in its landmarks, businesses, and people as Faulkner’s Yoknapatawpha. Brewer mingles old factories and hard-working blue-collar labor with concrete and glass offices and leisure-suited businessmen. As America has changed, Brewer has changed, and Harry has accommodated himself to this simultaneously old and new place with its present demands and past obligations.

No one, it seems, judges Harry’s past harshly now. A decade’s passing has effaced the disasters and dislocations of all the deaths: his infant daughter, his parents, Fred Springer, Coach Toother, Jill the runaway, Skeeter. The dead, however, occupy Harry’s thoughts as he wonders how they would regard his life. Throughout the novel these ghosts from Rabbit’s past appear “...and beyond them there are myriads, whole races like the Cambodians, that have drifted into death. He is treading on them all, they are resilient, they are cheering him on, his lungs are burning, his heart hurts, he is a membrane removed from the hosts below, their filaments caress his ankles, he loves the earth, he will never die.” Accommodated to others’ deaths, Rabbit still runs from his own.

"Telephone Booths” from Boston Street Scenes
By Tom Knudson, Associate Professor of Physical Education
Two additional accommodations remain unmade; two more judgments have been left suspended. Coincidentally, both assert themselves on the same day. A young couple from the farm country around Brewer come to the lot shopping for a Toyota. The girl, in her late teens, reminds Rabbit of the daughter he might have had by Ruth, his mistress of long ago who had moved to the country and married a farmer. Rabbit very quickly finds himself believing that the young man with the girl is not suitable for her, and the girl as she leaves, inquires whether Rabbit had ever been a "famous basketball player," telling him "you just have that look." And so, throughout the novel, Rabbit wonders about this possible daughter and what he might belatedly do to atone for his neglect and to replace the dead infant, Becky.

Arriving home from Springer Toyota, Rabbit learns that Nelson will be returning from Kent State or, as it turns out, Colorado, where his summer job has fallen through. News of the addition to his domestic arrangements fills Rabbit with joy, a promise that all would make up for the one he lost. He learns how little he can tolerate his son, not because Nelson's life in many of its details recapitulates Harry's, but because Nelson's life in many of its details is coming to cajole his way into the family business by recalling for his father how the Springers made a place for Rabbit when he was down and out and how they had an obligation to provide a place for Nelson. The son's return rekindles Harry's anger against Janice: "It was his wife's fault. The entire squeezed and cut-down shape of his life was her fault; at every turn she has been a wall to his freedom."

Thus, in the opening pages of Rabbit Is Rich, we see that Harry's life is something akin to the Toyota Corona he so much enjoys driving. Necessity has brought him to this Japanese car, filled with sporty extras, but even these cannot overcome the fact that for Rabbit the interior is cramped, the seat confining. Movement in the car is awkward, and Harry, the once graceful athlete, is disturbed by awkwardness and his inability to move freely.

Behind Rabbit's anger is the ghost of Skeeter, the angry young black of Rich, we see that Harry's life is something seat confining. Movement in the car is athlete, is disturbed by awkwardness and everything he touches seems to turn to gold -- to take advantage of them.

Broken lives surround us as well, and lives, if not broken, desperately trying to hold together. Too much movement is wasted, too much activity merely frantic, too much opportunity false. Harry, by the time we leave him, has grown more reflective and more hopeful. Though Harry has at one point thought that "the world keeps ending but new people too dumb to know it keep showing up as if the fun's just started," alone in his own home at the end, his infant granddaughter "in his lap, his hands, a real presence hardly weighing anything, but alive," Harry understands he has his "heart's desire, a granddaughter --his another nail in his coffin--his."

The novel's ambivalence is accommodated but left in soft focus. Perhaps not for long. We have learned in these early autumn weeks that Updike's Henry Bech is back. I suspect that Rabbit will return to usher us into another sharper age.

C. F. Angell  
Associate Professor of English

---

Broken lives surround us as well, and lives, if not broken, desperately trying to hold together.

Even among his friends, Harry feels discomfort which becomes more acute as the novel develops. Golf with Ronnie Harrison, Webb Murkett, and Buddy Inglefinger at the Flying Eagle Tee and Racquet Club at first anchors Harry in his new social positions. But, at one point, "in pursuit of such happiness, Harry feels guilty, out on the course as the shadows lengthen, in the company of these three men, who away from their women loom as boring as they must appear to God." Webb and his young wife Cindy, Buddy and his girlfriends, and Ronnie, whose wife, Thelma, it turns out, adores Rabbit, all seem to be chasing something -- youth, novelty fulfillment -- that Rabbit realizes is no longer theirs to be caught.

We live through a summer with Harry, through Nelson's return and entry into the Toyota business, his arguments, spurred by resentment, with Harry, and through Nelson's marriage with Pru and the birth of the granddaughter. Nelson is a "twerp" and a nasty, manipulative one at that. Harry learns how little he can tolerate his son, not because Nelson's life in many of its details recapitulates Harry's, but because Nelson refuses to fight back. In perhaps the novel's most touching scene, Harry and Nelson are driving in the Corona to the lot a few days before Nelson's marriage, and Harry, trying to help his son, tells Nelson to get away, not to let the women encircle his life. Nelson remains sullen and refuses to go; he is afraid. It is at this moment that Harry understands he has done for Nelson all he can.

And, late in the novel, Harry finally journeys to visit Ruth, to see whether there's anything he can do for her. Like him, she has grown old and fat. She turns him away, having made her life for many years without him. The girl, she tells him, is not their daughter; Harry doesn't believe her nor do we. But Ruth's life -- and her daughter's -- will go forward without Harry. As Rabbit says goodbye to Ruth, "both know, what people should never know, that they will not meet again."

Rabbit is Rich is about an infectious America. Its details, its milieu surround our own lives. The car agencies, the fast food franchises, suburban subdivisions, arriviste country clubs, modish restaurants and trendy shops are as much a part of Brewer, Maine as they are of Brewer, Pennsylvania. Updike immerses us in the America we cope with and, if we're lucky, master everyday. The noise and movement, the activity and opportunity are present for those lucky enough, and Rabbit is lucky enough -- everything he touches seems to turn to gold -- to take advantage of them.

Minorities and women appear to have run aground on the shoals of America's economic ills. As President Ronald Reagan made clear to the nation in his inaugural address, he "did not take the oath I've just taken with the intention of presiding over the dissolution of the world's strongest economy." Rather, Reagan proposed that all "must share in the productive work of this 'new beginning,'" and all "must share in the bounty of the revived economy." Reagan then announced submission of his radical economic policy to...
the Congress with the assertion that the policy must pass both the House and the Senate—virtually intact.

Almost simultaneously with President Reagan's inauguration a book appeared by George Gilder -- the Title -- Wealth and Poverty. This book created a furor in the media as some perceived the relationship between Reagan's economic policy in general, supply-side economics in particular, and Gilder's "theology of wealth and poverty." Gilder's theology for supply-side economics consists of a variety of arguments for "faith, family and production," with frequent forays into the revered reproductive role of women in society. The book could aptly be titled The Garden of Eden Revisited, or, in the vernacular, Eve Bites the Apple—Again.

The author of Wealth and Poverty is not an economist. Gilder has, however, written other works including Visible Man, a study of poverty. The methodology of Wealth and Poverty appears to be historical, anecdotal, and to an extent, analytical. To accomplish the creation of his theology, Gilder employs a persuasive rhetorical style — his rhetoric is laced with biblical allusions and language. He utilizes this strategy to develop two themes: one, the biblical precedent for his economic dogma; and two, his case against the concept of discrimination in America. Simply put, Gilder believes that women, given their role in the reproduction of the species, are by nature superior to men. Hence, to allow women into the marketplace, except as an auxiliary work force, is to add insult to the initial injury.

Answering the charge that "Capitalism is morally vacant," Gilder's major themes of wealth and poverty are grounded in the principles of work, family and faith — a neat fusion of capitalism and Christianity. As Gilder says, "Capitalist production entails faith — in one's neighbors, in one's society, and in the compensatory logic of the cosmos. Search and you shall find, give and you will be given unto, supply creates its own demand." This "sequential logic" allows Gilder to develop his theories of wealth and poverty. Wealth can only be attained through the correct functioning of work, faith and family. Poverty, on the other hand, is arrived at through the incorrect functioning of these elements.

Through a series of examples and statistics, Gilder warrants his claims by describing the condition of single men (they earn less, work less hard than married men). He further documents his case by reviewing the plight of the black man in America (they are deprived of work by feckless black and white women, as well as the federal government). Consequently, one consistent vision emerges: the ideal condition for a productive America is that of the working male (major breadwinner), married to a woman who at worst earns "mad" money. This working male is ideally encumbered with a mortgage and several children. This combination of work, debt and children works in tandem with "faith." When this idyllic situation occurs, the male, inspired by his responsibilities and his veneration of the womb, tends to work harder, longer and more innovatively. Ultimately, this formula will assure a new high in American productivity.

For her part, the woman (if she is true, and Gilder indicates she might not always be so) will care for the home, the children, the community and the church. If required, she will be available for "secondary" work. The continuing faithfulness of the husband to his affairs and the faithfulness of the wife to her affairs indicates the strength of their participation in the Capitalist/Christian union. If the communicants endure, America can continue to be "the world's strongest economy."

Given Gilder's attitudes about women, his almost mystical reverence for the womb and his concern for black men, one hesitates to label Gilder either a racist or a sexist. Gilder's theories are derived from biblical mythology and are, I think, consistent with the contemporary social, political and legal fictions flourishing in America in this decade. For me, Gilder makes explicit that which is implicit in the culture.

Further, I think that Gilder fears women, believing them to be earth goddesses incarnate. In an earlier essay on social inequality, Gilder says that "males are the sexual outsiders and inferiors." He then asserts that "Women, in fact, possess enormous power over men," adding that women have "a deep and inexorable power."

According to Gilder, males must balance this power. He sees the marketplace as a way of "being made equal by society." Males neither give nor receive adequate spiritual nourishment. To compensate, males create a society which gives them superiority, and though it may be. This is a terrible state of affairs. Gilder's masterwork, this citadel of economic enlightenment and productivity, this lengthy explanation of supply-side economics and dazzling rationales for racism, sexism, exploitation and discrimination in America proves to be a tale woven for a winter's night to allay a small boy's fears.

True, America is in economic trouble; social problems mount. Americans are feeling the effects of this latest economic panacea and its attendant mythology. When life worsens for all persons (with the exception of that legal fiction, corporations as persons), perhaps Americans will reflect on motivations for radically harmful and mythologically deficient theories for economic and social change. Wealth and Poverty provides a starting point for reflection.

Nancy Lynch Street
Assistant Professor of Speech Communication
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Beasts and Babies: Styles of Stereotyping
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In the words of Walter Lippmann, stereotypes are “pictures in our heads,” beliefs that we hold regarding the members of a category. As sociologists we are particularly concerned with those beliefs about minority groups which have harmful effects.

The distinction between majority and minority groups is not one of numbers but of social power. In South Africa, for example, more than eighty-five percent of the population is non-white, yet they are the ones who must carry identification cards, obey curfews and settle for the lowest paying jobs. Majority groups, then, are those who control their own destinies and those of others, while minority groups are assigned subordinate positions based on the cultural and/or physical characteristics attributed to them.

Stereotypes are more than just privately held beliefs. They are often widely held negative images which are used to justify and excuse the unequal treatment, or discrimination, directed against minority groups, ranging from petty indignities of everyday life to outright slavery and genocide.

The need to justify discrimination is served by two distinct styles of stereotyping; dehumanization and infantilization. Dehumanization typically involves reducing the members of a minority group to the level of beasts, either animals, demons or some other less than human form. Once people are depicted as vicious, murderous or mindless, even the most brutal treatment of them may seem appropriate. By contrast, infantilization reduces minority members to the status of babies or children whose lack of moral, intellectual or physical development “justifies” their dependence.

The selection of a particular style of stereotyping, whether dehumanization, infantilization, or both, depends upon how threatening or competitive a minority group is perceived to be by the majority group. In the following table we show examples of styles of stereotyping which are associated with the extent to which minorities are seen as threatening to majority group domination. The table depicts, 1) the presence (+), or absence (−) of the two styles of stereotyping by majority group members, 2) examples illustrating each of their four combinations, and 3) characteristics of the majority-minority relationship for each case.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DEHUMANIZATION (BEASTS)</th>
<th>INFANTILIZATION (BABIES)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Neither Infantilized nor Dehumanized</td>
<td>Majority Groups Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Example:</td>
<td>Since minority groups are, by definition, stereotyped by majority groups, then the condition represented by this cell (neither dehumanization nor infantilization) can only occur when no minority group is present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Infantilized but not Dehumanized</td>
<td>Example:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Pre-liberation Women</td>
<td>Minority group(s) perceived as no threat to the majority since they are kept under control, submissive, dominated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Slaves</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Old People</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Dehumanized but not Infantilized</td>
<td>Example:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Blacks during reconstruction</td>
<td>Minority group(s) perceived as “uppity” and threatening. The more such a perception develops the more open and severe the conflict(s) between majority and minority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Jews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• American Indians during white territorial expansion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Both Dehumanized and Infantilized</td>
<td>Example:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Women during the liberation movement</td>
<td>Majority-minority relations are mixed or ambivalent during periods of social change. Some people perceive the minority group as under control while others perceive them as “uppity-and threatening.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Blacks during the civil rights movement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Beasts and Babies ...continued

A) Cell A - represents the condition in which a group is neither dehumanized nor infantilized. The only group for which this is true must be the majority group since the power to discriminate with effect is theirs alone. Of course, minority groups may, and often do, direct prejudice in the form of stereotypes against majority group members. By definition, however, they lack the power, prestige and wealth to effectively change their position relative to the dominant group.

B) Cell B - represents the condition in which a group is infantilized but not dehumanized. This is the style of stereotyping which occurs only so long as majority group domination is perceived as effective; that is, the minority group continues to be dependent and act that way.

For example, women before the liberation movement of the 1960's were often called “baby,” “girl,” “babe,” “honey,” and “cutey pie.” Their fashions were made to reflect the appearance of children, frequently imitating the clothing worn by infants or teenagers of a previous generation.

The “little black sambo” image was used to sell the ideology of a “white man’s burden,” whereby slavery was justified on the grounds that blacks would actually perish if the paternalistic “protection” of the master were denied them. To this day the epithet "boy" remains as a vestige of the infantilization of the slave.

Currently, infantilization is directed against the elderly who are commonly described as incapable of directing their own lives due to the incapacities of “second childhood.” The image of the toothless, hairless, wrinkled, bent, drooling newborn is applied to the elderly in order to justify their mandatory retirement and even involuntary institutionalization.

C) Cell C - represents the condition in which a group is dehumanized but not infantilized. This is the style of stereotyping which occurs when a minority group refuses to "stay in its place." The majority group begins to perceive it as a threat and open conflict develops. The particularly cruel character of dehumanizing stereotypes is necessary in order to justify and excuse the often brutal measures taken by majorities to suppress a perceived threat. Control is no longer considered a realistic goal. The protection of an advantaged position then takes the form of accelerated denial of jobs, civil rights and even the extermination of minority members.

D) Cell D - represents the condition in which a group is infantilized and dehumanized. This style of stereotyping occurs under conditions of social change, specifically when a previously dominated minority begins to threaten the control of the majority by making efforts toward equality. The result is ambivalence in their depiction by and relationship with the majority group.

During the women’s movement of the 1960's, the “little girl” image of women was joined by the more ominous stereotypes depicting them as animals and demons. In everyday conversation, where women had been referred to almost exclusively in infantile terms, they were now also labeled with animal references such as “chick,” “bird,” and “fox.” Members of the liberation movement, but especially their leaders, were called “Amazons” and “bitch-goddesses.” The most extreme dehumanization appeared in sadomasochistic pornography in which women were shown as slave-like animals and sexual objects to be used and tortured.

In a similar way the civil rights movement and riots of the 1960’s abruptly altered the stereotype of the happy-go-lucky, lazy, black “boy.” Those perceiving the threat of the movement resurrected the Reconstruction stereotypes of the black as vicious animals.

Stereotyping is as old as the history of relations between groups, and in a wide variety of circumstances has served the function of justifying the domination and ill treatment of one group by another. The distinction that we have made between styles of stereotyping is intended to help identify the mechanisms in our thinking and institutions which maintain domination. We hope that such distinctions will allow us to recognize and reduce discrimination, not only in the context of race and gender relations, but between powerful and powerless groups generally.

William Levin is author or co-author of a number of journal articles and three sociology books, two of which deal with the issues of discrimination and prejudice. The most recent is The Functions of Discrimination and Prejudice (Harper and Row, 1982). He is currently completing an introductory sociology text for Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Jack Levin is the author or co-author of numerous journal articles and six sociology books. He is also a frequent expert guest on radio and television programs locally and across the country. He is currently completing a text on social problems for West Publishing and is also writing a new book on mass murder.

During Reconstruction, former slaves were suddenly in a position to compete for jobs and political power. The paternalistic, childlike "sambo" image gave way to the depiction of freed blacks as apelike beasts, justifying the violent Ku Klux Klan lynchings and burnings of the era.

During the middle ages women began competing with men for jobs in the cities and in the medical area as midwives. The result was that thousands of women were accused of being demons and witches who "deserved" to be put to death.

Jews in Medieval Europe were accused of being horned devils who drank the blood of Christian children. Jews have historically been dehumanized rather than infantilized because they have always been perceived as a threat (even as a controlling conspiracy) economically, and religious heretics as well.

American Indians were severely mistreated (murdered, in fact) by land-hungry white Americans who eagerly accepted the view that they were "treacherous and cruel savages who could never be trusted," especially since they could not be controlled enough to be used as labor.

Dehumanization: Irish as Apes

Jews as Octopus
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CULTURAL COMMENTARY

Affectional Preference on Film:
Giggle and Lib

With the great artist abandoning romantic love—Bergman has lately announced that his next two films will be his last—leaving the field to an oddity like Allen or television’s “Love Boat”, the pop audience, which never warmed to Bergman or his like anyway, might find solace in Blake Edwards, an intriguing director whose last three films and his wife’s, Julie Andrews, changing image in them illustrate a synthesis of audience demands with a crowd pleaser director’s offering. Prepped by years of psychoanalysis, Andrews has long sought to shed her innocence, and Edwards has anxiously tried to project her inner woman. Thus 10 gives us a suggestive older woman in leather boots, Dudley Moore’s choice over the plasticized vulgarized Bo Derek. For giggle power there is a gay lyricist and the neighbor’s orgies viewed through Moore’s telescope. Ms. Andrews’ further unveiling was the sexual intent of the very clever flop S.O.B., a box office failure because it starred no more than, in Robert Preston’s praise, “a first-class pair of knockers,” -- old hat, even if they do belong to the ex-Mary Poppins. Perhaps European directors just do better with their lovers on screen, for Mr. Edwards is so chaste in the revelation scene that it is enough to turn the viewer back to her opening “Polly Wolly Doodle” number where one can wonder at a remove just how passionate Ms. Andrews might really be. The film proves she is a lady whether she, her husband, or her analyst know it or not. Let us wonder about stirring her passions if we want. A lady is a lady after all because she forces eroticism where it should be—until the time comes—in the mind.

The last film, Victor/Victoria, tries harder by pushing her image still further. She plays a woman—breasts, it is loudly trumpeted throughout the film, strapped down—who imitates a man disguised as a woman. Again the giggle is a gay farce in the background which fools no one; we know what is what. Our appetites are teased but our cerebral maidenheads remain intact.

The liberal mind is far more canny at disguising its hollow heart, usually claiming to see a beam of moral
liberality where there is rarely a speck. Ironically it is the liberal who needs to see in order to believe. Bertrand Blier, a French director whose Get Out Your Handkerchiefs won the best foreign film award in 1978, and whose Going Places introduced France’s two most popular male stars, De Pardieu and Dewaere, is an example to contemplate. Female critics ponder Mr. Blier’s subtleties. Pauline Kael called her earlier effort a “sexual keystone cops,” and Molly Haskell, author of the feminist approach to this whole issue From Reverence to Rape, mused over what his films can actually mean. Here are the complexities of Going Places. The heroes debauch each other when there are no women to assault. They take turns on one woman for so long, she begins to enjoy the company of these two boyish fellows, decided to tag along with them, and a nursing mother in the back of a public bus is forcibly suckled by one of your heroes who is trying to reassert his potency after a gunshot wound in his private parts. Believe it or not, when Mom came to her senses, so did I. We both left the film, in our own ways.

Handkerchiefs, not as crudely made, was, in fact, hailed as a typically joyous French lark. To be quick, in this one, a thirteen year old, after opening the legs of the heroine to inspect the wonders therein -- my mind sticks (or blocks) as to whether we see anything -- bests the two heroes, plus his own father, and impregnates her. Forget your hanky, and get out your barf bag.

Even the dean of auteur critics, Andrew Sarris, accused . . . Robert De Niro in The Deer Hunter, of latent homosexuality because he stares at the ceiling thinking of his friend’s tragic war experiences . . .

faced with a rush of gay films, and even Dustin Hoffman looms in our future in drag as Tootsie. But once again the liberals go all the way. I Love You, a Brazilian film, acclaimed by conservative critics too as a sensual delight, is really an endless X-rated film. Of course if anyone hunger for a scrawny woman and a pot-bellied man, here is the lib film of films. Real life extends celluloid life in some way also with the premier German director, Fassbinder, a transsexual, recently overdosing while watching a video type of his latest film. After three films with Blier, Dewaere abruptly, and for no published reason, committed suicide. Even the dean of auteur critics (and husband and mentor of Molly Haskell) Andrew Sarris, accused non less than Robert De Niro in The Deer Hunter, of latent homosexuality because he stares at the ceiling thinking of his friend’s tragic war experiences rather than rolling over to solace the abandoned and vulnerable girlfriend.

Two points come to mind by way of conclusion if I can pull back long enough from the complete retinization that threatens all filmgoers. The first is that in an overly psychoanalytical consciousness like ours, perhaps the kind prompting Ms. Andrews to show what we really don’t want to see, the arts are a last refuge to teach how and what the human spirit really does think and feel. If we need the vile and art gives it to us to feed a famished appetite, we lose touch with what the universal man and woman feel. We capitulate to the aberrant, be it giggle or lib. Bergman is, to my mind, the great artist of our dismal century, and he sees the darkness clouding the soul more clearly than anyone else has. Having revealed it to us in an output more insightful and shattering than we perhaps deserve, he now threatens to walk away from what he has found, rather than repeat it. The second point will sound more fundamentalist than Jimmy Carter defending himself with an oar against a white attack rabbit, but I believe it to be true; certainly Bergman, a minister’s son, would understand. Jesus said that in the end times, “Because lawlessness has increased, most people’s love will grow cold.” For lawlessness, read any of the giggles and libs mentioned herein; for love that’s grown cold, we need only keep our eyes on the big silver screen.

By Joseph J. Liggera
Professor of English
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LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

We at the Bridgewater Review have been pleased with the response to the first issue of our magazine. The following is but a sampling of the letters we received from our readers.

Michael Kryzanek
Editor

To The Editor:
I cannot tell you how much I have appreciated your kindness in sending me a copy of Bridgewater Review Volume 1, No. 1, a first edition, at that!

The faculty at Bridgewater is not only “keeping up with the times,” but also exploring the complexities of the past. It is an inspiring review both in range of interests and photography -- especially the reflection of Marshall’s Point Light on the cover.

Sincerely,
Gladys J. Newell
New Rochelle, New York
Class of 1925

To The Editor:
Just a short note to thank you for sending me a copy of the first edition of the Bridgewater Review.

Although I must admit a parochial interest with the article on whales in Cape Cod Bay, I wanted you to know how much I enjoyed the entire issue. If the inaugural edition is any indication, the Review will certainly constitute a significant literary contribution to our community. I will certainly look forward to the next issue.

Again, I appreciate your taking the time to think of me. Please let me know if I can provide any assistance to the Review.

With kind regards.

Sincerely,
Gerry E. Studds
Congress of the United States
House of Representatives

To The Editor:
Thanks for the Bridgewater Review. I found it to be very interesting and think you’ve all done a good job on it. It is an ambitious undertaking -- good luck with it.

Best wishes,
Foster Furcolo
Board of Regents of Higher Education

To The Editor:
Many thanks for sending me a copy of the Bridgewater Review. I was happy to read it and think it’s an excellent beginning to a creative forum for faculty scholarship and activities. It speaks well both for Bridgewater State and for public higher education in Massachusetts.

Thank you again, and best of luck with future issues.

Sincerely,
Laura B. Clausen
Director, Planning & Research
Board of Regents of Higher Education

To The Editor:
I thought I would write to congratulate you on a fine publication. The Bridgewater Review was very interesting reading. Please keep me on the mailing list.

Allan R. Chiocca
Commonwealth of Massachusetts
House of Representatives

To The Editor:
This will acknowledge your recent correspondence and copy of your inaugural edition of the Bridgewater Review. I appreciate this copy and look forward to reading future editions of your magazine. Both my staff and I found your publication to be most informative. Thank you very much for the inaugural copy.

Best wishes to you and for the Bridgewater Review.

Sincerely,
Thomas P. O’Neill, Jr.
The Speaker
Congress of the United States
House of Representatives

To The Editor:
I was quite happy to receive a copy of the faculty publication Bridgewater Review, and wish to extend my sincere congratulations to the editorial board and the contributors. It is definitely time for the talented members of the Bridgewater State College faculty to be recognized by people other than those fortunate enough to be their students. I am sure that the variety of topics covered by such a publication will appeal to a diverse audience.

Please extend my appreciation and congratulations to the other members of the editorial board and the faculty members who contributed to this issue.

Sincerely,
Mary E. Noonan
Class of 1982