

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 317 250

JC 900 202

AUTHOR Askins, William, Ed.
 TITLE Community College Humanities Review; Number 10, 1989.
 INSTITUTION Community Coll. Humanities Association.
 PUB DATE 89
 NOTE 88p.
 PUB TYPE Collected Works - Serials (022) -- Viewpoints (120)
 -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
 JOURNAL CIT Community College Humanities Review; n10 1989

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS *Academic Education; *College Curriculum; *Community Colleges; Curriculum Development; Curriculum Enrichment; *Humanities; *Humanities Instruction; Literature; *Scholarship; Staff Development; Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

Designed as a forum for the exchange of ideas on significant issues in the humanities, this journal presents articles written by two-year college faculty in the humanities disciplines. The 1989 annual issue includes the following: (1) "Popular Literature and the American Literature Survey Course: The Case of Truman Capote's "In Cold Blood," by Stephen Tooker; (2) "Changing the Canon, the Universals, and the Academy: What English Studies Can Learn from Women's Studies," by C. Y. Rodriguez-Milanes; (3) "The Representation of Animals in Modern Western Fiction," by Marion W. Copeland; (4) "Scholars Save Schools," by Myrna Goldenberg; (5) "Surviving as a Scholar at a Two-Year College: A Report from the Field," by Brian Gallagher; (6) "The Mellon Fellowships of the Community Colleges Project at the City University of New York," by Louis W. Chicatelli; (7) "Institutional Incentive for Professional Publication: Community College Staff Development," by Keith Kroll; (8) "The Kansas State Board of Review: A Historical and Sociological Overview," by Susan L. Sutton; (9) "An Agrarian Nightmare: Thomas Sutpen's Assault on the South," by Jo Ellen Winters; (10) "Clifford Odets on the Individual and Society," by Miriam Q. Cheiken; and (11) "Women and the Humanities: A Resource Book for Curriculum Integration," by Phyllis Mael. (JMC)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

ED 317 250

COMMUNITY COLLEGE HUMANITIES REVIEW

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. Schmeltekopf



U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

1989

Number 10

ESSAYS, ARTICLES AND REVIEWS BY:

Stephen Tooker	Massasoit Community College
Cecelia Y. Rodriguez-Milanes	State University of New York
Marion W. Copeland	Holyoke Community College
Myrna Goldenberg	Montgomery College
Brian Gallagher	LaGuardia Community College
Louis W. Chicatelli	Westchester Community College
Keith Kroll	Kalamazoo Valley Community College
Susan L. Sutton	Cloud County Community College
Jo Ellen Winters	Bucks County Community College
Miriam Q. Cheikin	Nassau Community College
Phyllis Mael	Pasadena City College

JC 900262



**Community College
HUMANITIES REVIEW (ISSN 0748-0741)**

Published annually by the Community College Humanities Association. Single numbers are available at \$10.00 per copy. Address all correspondence to:

Community College Humanities Review
Community College Humanities Association
c/o Community College of Philadelphia
1700 Spring Garden Street
Philadelphia, PA 19130

Telephone: (215) 751-8860

Copyright©1989 by the Community College Humanities Association.

COMMUNITY COLLEGE HUMANITIES REVIEW



Editor
William Askins

Information for Authors

The editor invites submission of articles bearing upon issues in the humanities. Manuscripts and footnotes should be double spaced throughout and submitted in triplicate. Articles done on word-processing equipment are particularly welcome and should be accompanied with a copy on a disk. Documentation style may follow either that of the MLA or *The Chicago Manual of Style*. Submissions post-marked before April 15 are encouraged. Authors should include a brief biographical statement with their work and it should be noted that editorial policy currently calls for the publication of essays only from two-year college faculty with the exception of work done in conjunction with CCHA conferences or other activities. Statements of fact and opinion appearing in the *Review* are made on the responsibility of the authors alone and do not imply endorsement by the Community College Humanities Association or the editors.

PART ONE

PAPERS FROM THE COMMUNITY
COLLEGE HUMANITIES ASSOCIATION
CONFERENCE: "CREATING A CANON"

Popular Literature and the American Literature Survey Course:
The Case of Truman Capote's *In Cold Blood*

Stephen Tooker 05

Changing the Canon, the Universals, and the Academy:
What English Studies Can Learn from Women's Studies

C.Y. Rodriguez-Milanes 12

The Representation of Animals in Modern Western Fiction

Marion W. Copeland 22

PART TWO

PAPERS FROM THE 1988 MLA CONVENTION

Scholars Save Schools

Myrna Goldenberg 31

Surviving as a Scholar at a Two-Year College:
A Report from the Field

Brian Gallagher 36

The Mellon Fellowships of the Community Colleges Project
at the City University of New York

Louis W. Chicatelli 44

Institutional Incentive for Professional Publication:
Community College Staff Development

Keith Kroll 48

PART THREE

THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE SCHOLAR AT WORK

The Kansas State Board of Review:
A Historical and Sociological Overview

Susan L. Sutton 52

An Agrarian Nightmare:
Thomas Sutpen's Assault on the South

Jo Ellen Winters 63

Clifford Odets on the Individual and Society

Miriam Q. Cheikin 70

Women and the Humanities:
A Resource Book for Curriculum Integration

Phyllis Mael 76

PART ONE

**PAPERS
FROM THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE HUMANITIES
ASSOCIATION CONFERENCE:
“CREATING A CANON”**

Popular Literature and the American Literature Survey Course: The Case of Capote's *In Cold Blood*

Stephen Tooker

Truman Capote's *In Cold Blood* has been criticized for being a gruesomely sensational and popular sort of journalism. And, yes, it can be read on that level. But *In Cold Blood* can also be read as an exploration of the American experience, its ideals, fears, and realities. One can speak of the Edenic myth and the loss of innocence, of Melville and Franklin, of predestination and self-reliance, of natural depravity and natural beauty, of all that is darkest and all that is brightest in the American experience by way of elucidating this book.

Few do. The articles on *In Cold Blood* have focused largely on Capote — himself a reasonably sensational subject — and his experiences in writing the book. I would like to move closer to the book, suggesting along the way links in theme and symbol between *In Cold Blood* and several of the authors traditionally covered in the first semester of an American Literature survey. For my students, those links have helped make explicable a complex, often contradictory and seemingly remote body of literature.

To begin any discussion of *In Cold Blood*, one must acknowledge the factual basis of the book. It is so insistent. Having acknowledged this, however, one must also acknowledge that the book is the product of a very careful selection process. In an interview with George Plimpton, Capote said, "I suppose if I used just 20 percent of all the material I put together over those years of interviewing, I'd still have a book two thousand pages long" (3)! The finished product has the shape and coherence which true "true" stories often lack. It presents a reality enhanced through selection — enhanced primarily in the directions of coherence, symbol, and theme.

There is the whole Edenic aspect of the book, for instance. The theme appears often in American literature and would undoubtedly have seemed contrived had

Stephen Tooker is the Chair of the Language Arts Division at Massasoit Community College.

In Cold Blood been anything but a “true” story. Early on we learn that Herb Clutter, patriarch of the Clutter family and founder of the River Valley Farm in Holcomb, Kansas, was fond of remarking to his neighbors that “an inch more rain and this would be paradise — Eden on earth” (23). On the river bank an orchard flourishes. Capote pays particular attention to this orchard — tells us how Herb Clutter defied the experts and the aridity of the Kansas plains by planting fruit trees close to the river. “The little collection of fruit-bearers growing by the river was his attempt to contrive, rain or no, a patch of the paradise, the green, apple-scented Eden, he envisioned”. (23)

Clutter is fiercely protective of this orchard. Capote tells us how quickly he slapped a lawsuit on the pilot of a small aircraft that crashed into the orchard. The incident has no direct bearing on the grim occurrences at the center of the book. However, by mentioning it, Capote focuses attention on the orchard, suggesting again the Edenic aspect of the Clutter farm and, by association, that Herb Clutter in his role of caretaker is reminiscent of Adam.

How convenient that one of Herb Clutter’s daughters is called Eleanora. But that is almost too small to notice. Of greater significance is the description of Dick, the personable mastermind of the evil that entered Holcomb and blasted the promise of Herb Clutter’s “Eden on earth.” The victim of a facially disfiguring automobile accident, Dick characteristically confronts the world with a grin that largely masks a strange and disconcertingly “serpentine” eye.

Unobtrusively, Capote builds a pattern of reference. The pattern, however, does not become an allegory. The facts of this “true” story would not support one. Rather, Capote leans a bit on the coincidences. Sometimes he creates the coincidences. Dick’s eye could have been “misaligned” or “misshapen” or “distorted,” but Capote calls it “truly serpentine, with a venomous, sickly-blue squint that although it was involuntarily acquired, seemed nevertheless to warn of bitter sediment at the bottom of his nature”. (43) In short, Capote allows aspects of his story to resonate on mythic levels that lift *In Cold Blood* above the level of reportage.

Lest this mythic level be missed, Capote leans quite heavily on the coincidence of Garden City, the nearby center of activity on these Kansas plains. Garden City is a distinctly American Eden, a 4-H Club paradise. It is a city of clean-living, God fearing civic-minded people. There is no crime in Garden city and no poverty. There is equal opportunity for all. Capote repeatedly reminds us of the complete assimilation of the Ashidas, a Japanese family. There is educational opportunity: a fine high school and a new two-year college. It would be difficult to envision a more nearly perfect environment than Garden City.

Even in such an exceptional environment, Herb Clutter is exceptional. R.W.B. Lewis's *The American Adam* comes to mind, for to a large extent Herb Clutter embodies America's innocent idealism, more persistent, perhaps, in the vast, agricultural heartland of America than the urbanized, industrialized East. Capote records the shocked response of the citizens of Holcomb and Garden City to the murders. "Feelings wouldn't run half so high if this had happened to anyone except the Clutters. Anyone less admired. Prosperous. Secure. But that family represented everything people hereabouts really value and respect..." (105) After all, the Clutters are the embodiment of the American Dream, and Herb Clutter is the archetypal American hero. He is the new Adam and he is also the Franklinesque hero: the man of modest origins who, like Benjamin Franklin, rose to a position of social, economic, and even political prominence by means of hard work, foresight, and perseverance.

In her personal style, Nancy Clutter is Herb Clutter's true daughter. At sixteen, she is an expert seamstress and an old hand at winning 4-H club cherry pie baking contests. She is accomplished musically and artistically, and she excels academically. Moreover, in view of her mother's incapacitating emotional illness, she has had to assume the responsibilities of running the house while yet reserving time to care for and enjoy her horse, Babe. The key to Nancy's personality, we are told, is "organization" (29), a quality she shares with her father.

The word "organization" is also a key to *In Cold Blood*. For despite Nancy's organization and Herb Clutter's vision and organization, there are things for which one can never plan. Kansas Bureau of Investigation agent Al Dewey, who is a personal friend of Herb Clutter and who becomes the chief investigative agent on the case, is obsessed by the desire to locate a "meaningful design" (277) in the events of that November evening, much as Melville's Ahab is obsessed with the question of design. Like Ahab's obsession, Dewey's obsession has self-destructive characteristics. In the quest for some reasonable explanation for the apparently wanton destruction of the Clutters, Dewey drove himself, broke his health, and eventually suffered a major heart attack. But finally there is no explanation, and this, I think, is the philosophical stance of the book. In an absolute sense, despite goodness, despite idealism, despite the beauty of nature, despite hard work and accomplishment, there is no meaningful design. Towards the end of the book Perry says, "I wonder why I did it" (326)

Dewey comes to believe that the "crime was a psychological accident, virtually an impersonal act; the victims might as well have been killed by lightning" (277) This impersonal quality noted by Dewey is advanced in several ways by Capote. For instance, Capote uses understatement in commenting upon the surprise of Dick's father when Dick falls asleep during a basketball game. Mr. Hickcock "did not

understand how very tired Dick was, did not know that his dozing son had, among other things, driven over eight hundred miles in the past twenty-four hours" (90) "Among other things" — the allusion to the murders is not even accorded the prominence of terminal place in the sentence. And after Bobby Rupp, Nancy's boyfriend, leaves the Clutter home the evening of the murders, and the family retires to bed, Capote records not that Perry and Dick approached the Clutter house, but that "presently, the car crept forward" (72) Destruction advances mechanically, impersonally.

This mechanistic feeling is apparent even in Perry's description of the murders. Of Mr. Clutter Perry says, "I thought he was a very nice gentleman. Soft spoken. I thought so right up to the moment I cut his throat" (275). Indeed, Perry doesn't seem to recollect the moment of the murder. He was thinking of all the shame and alienation in his life when somehow he cut Mr. Clutter's throat. "I didn't realize what I'd done till I heard the sound" (276) Perry seems to have been out of human control just as he had been out of control several years earlier in a fight that very nearly resulted in the death of his own father. "My hands got hold of his throat. My hands — but I couldn't control them. They wanted to choke him to death" (158). Not I wanted to choke him to death, but they — the hands. The hands and the will are disassociated. The act is essentially impersonal.

There was no need to include an account of Perry's struggle with his father had Capote intended only to give an honest account of the events that transpired at Holcomb. The incident occurred long before. The incident, however, prepares the reader for the murder of Herb Clutter which proceeds with similar detachment as though Perry, who is, after all, capable of great gentleness, is only the vehicle of some nameless malevolence.

Watching a bonfire of the Clutters' blood-spattered furniture and bed-clothes, Andy Erhart, Herb Clutter's college classmate and friend, asks what is perhaps the book's central question. "How is it possible that such effort, such plain virtue, could overnight be reduced to this — smoke, thinning as it rose and was received by the big, annihilating sky" (95)?

This feeling of waste takes many forms in the book. But none is more expressive or more thematically unifying than Bobby Rupp's recollection of the "cider-tart odor of spoiling apples" (235). Not long after the murders, Bobby had gone running — "mindlessly," he says — not meaning to head for the Clutter farm. But eventually he found himself at the river and Mr. Clutter's orchard. The recollection of those spoiling apples appears in no more than a sentence fragment, but how powerful an image that fragment projects of the lives now spoiled and Herb Clutter's vision of perfection — his Eden on earth — now also spoiled. Not "decaying" apples, for

that is a natural process; rather, "spoiling" applies with that word's connotation of something gone wrong.

Innocence and goodness are all too susceptible to the unexplained and perhaps unexplainable malevolence which manifests itself in Perry and Dick. The theme suggests Melville's last novel, *Billy Budd*, and Billy's struggle with Claggart. Claggart's malevolence, like Perry's and Dick's, is also unexplained and apparently unprovoked. And Bill, like Herb Clutter, exhibits Adamic characteristics.

Another theme to which the book returns repeatedly is free will. Capote selects a letter from Perry's sister to Perry in which she discusses questions of blame and responsibility. She is annoyed by Perry's inclination to blame others for the shortcomings in his life, and towards the end of the letter she says unequivocally, "You are a human being with a free will" (165). But is he? Don Cullivan, an army buddy, also writes to Perry. At first Perry has difficulty remembering Cullivan, and certainly Cullivan plays no part in the action of the story, but Capote nevertheless includes the letter. Towards the end of the letter Cullivan says, "And this is why I am writing to you: Because God made you as well as me and He loves you just as He loves me, and for the little we know of God's will what has happened to you could have happened to me" (294). In contrast to the sister's message, Cullivan's is deterministic.

In a variety of other ways the issue of free will is raised. Through letters and accounts of Dewey's investigative interviews, Capote presents the madness and self-destructiveness which ravaged Perry's family. Inevitably one asks whether Perry is simply heir to a family flaw. Is his behavior determined genetically? Environmentally? Both? Perry would prefer to speak of fate. Capote notes, "The compulsively superstitious person is also very often a serious believer in fate; that was the case with Perry" (55).

Yet, if one is tempted to assent to determinism, there is the episode with the hitchhikers, a twelve year old boy and his sickly grandfather. The boy has been leading his grandfather about Texas for several weeks, searching for a relative who will give shelter to the old man, when they are picked up by Perry and Dick. He tells them that he had been living on a rented farm with his grandfather and an aunt (his own parents are apparently dead). But the grandfather took ill and one day the aunt simply gave up and died. Shortly thereafter, they were evicted from the farm and began their wandering.

Perry draws the analogy. He "remembered himself at that age, his own wanderings with an old man" (238). But the analogy is inappropriate, for beyond the poverty and the insecurity of the family structure, there is very little to compare.

Perry's first arrest for thievery occurred at eight years, and he was delinquent thereafter. Moreover, he harbored a chronic and debilitating shame for his poverty, his lack of education, his legs that were mangled and stunted as the result of a motorcycle accident — all sorts of things. Consequently, he was a reluctant respondent to life. By contrast, the boy radiates assurance, trust in the eventual rightness of things, an easy-going friendliness, and a firm sense that he is in charge of events — his life included. Short of money, he suggests not a robbery, but a bottle hunting expedition which yields a trunk and backseat full of jangling returns. Then he negotiates the deposit refunds with a motel owner. Perry says, "It didn't shame him a bit going in there with all those bottles. Me, I never could've, I'd have felt so shamed" (239) How different, despite their similarities of background. How much promise this boy of modest origins displays, And how strong is the expectation that that promise will be fulfilled.

In Cold Blood ends in a philosophical limbo on the question of free will. It is no more conclusive on the question of whether there is or can ever be the sense of "meaningful design" of which Dewey speaks. Dewey learns "how" the events of the dreadful November evening occurred, but "why" — the question which attempts to make sense of reality — is never satisfactorily answered.

These metaphysical speculations and others invalidate the charge of mere sensationalism sometimes leveled at *In Cold Blood*. Moreover, it should now be clear that by means of selection Capote has created a book which explores and reflects the contradictory nature of our culture. We are energetic, idealistic, and indebted to the maxims of *Poor Richard's Almanac* like Herb Clutter, and, yet, we are also capable of brooding obsessively on the nature and origins of evil like Hawthorne, Melville, and Al Dewey. What makes this particular portrait of the American experience so forceful is that it springs from a factual, not a fictional reality. To be sure, it is reality enhanced by selection, but it is nonetheless, the reality which Capote and many others discovered in the pages of *The New York Times* on November 16, 1959.

Likewise, the myth of Eden and Adam has a special force in this book because it is inherent to the materials — not imposed upon them. Capote said to George Plimpton:

I've often thought of the book as being like something reduced to a seed. Instead of presenting the reader with a full plant, with all the foliage, a seed is planted in the soil of the mind. I've thought of the book in that sense. I make my own comment by what I choose to tell and how I choose to tell it. (38)

Chance is his collaborator.

And a fruitful collaboration it is both in terms of the book's artistic merits and its usefulness as a pedagogical tool. For students — who learn to recognize the Adamic and Edenic symbolism, who ponder this symbolism and the question of depravity (naturally or socially incurred), who discuss unprovoked evil — the book facilitates the often difficult first encounter with a Melville novel. In many parts, *Billy Budd* might even seem familiar. And from *Billy Budd* one can explore Calvinist theology and Jonathan Edwards, especially his "Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God." (Is Edwards' God, awefully indiscriminate in his anger, so unlike the "annihilating sky" at which Erhart stares?) Students can examine the continuing Calvinist influence on Hawthorne's tales and see the imaginative reworking of the Edenic myth in "Rappaccini's Daughter." In another vein, they can see aspects of Herb and Nancy Clutter in Franklin's *Autobiography* and find the core of Herb Clutter's success — perhaps, eventually, their own — in Emerson's "Self Reliance."

In short, they can discover the contradictory impulses of our culture in the literary themes and symbols first introduced to them in Truman Capote's remarkable but still underestimated accomplishment, *In Cold Blood*.

Works Cited

Capote, Truman. *In Cold Blood*. New York: Signet, 1965.

Plimpton, George. "The Story Behind a Nonfiction Novel." *The New York Times Book Review*, 16 January 1966: 1+.

Changing the Canon, the Universals, and the Academy: What English Studies Can Learn from Women's Studies

Cecelia Y. Rodriguez-Milanes

"Education is the kind of political act that controls destinies, gives hope for a particular kind of future, and deprives others even of ordinary expectations for work and achievement." Florence Howe *Myths of Coeducation*

Many feminist literary critics -- Lillian Robinson, Annette Kolodny, Jane Tompkins among others -- have discussed the significance and function of the canon as the apparatus which "enshrines the great works of Western Culture" in addition to examining the ways in which the canon produces meaning and reality.¹ Though much feminist criticism exhibits a self-conscious/critical stance, I feel it would do well to draw more from some fundamental theoretical bases of feminism -- socialist, liberal, radical, etc.² I am interested in the ways in which feminist teachers from all disciplines can make some more substantive changes within and without the "institutions" of learning. I am particularly concerned with feminist critical theory and the literary canon, but it is important to remember that the canon belonging to English departments has its equivalent canon in all other university departments.³ In analyzing the problems/challenges involved with the issue of inclusion versus exclusion, the dilemma of being on the boundaries/margins and the theory of feminist criticism itself, there were many times when I have felt at a loss. It wasn't until I allowed myself to draw on my experience with Women's Studies that I began to feel more optimistic. I now find myself calling upon a voice which is urgent and entreating.

Reading about the "successes" of feminist curriculum integration programs is largely responsible for my optimism.⁴

Cecelia Y. Rodriguez-Milanes is Professor of English at the State University of New York

The work of Susan Hardy Aiken and her colleagues reaffirmed my belief in feminist process and pedagogy and its transforming power. Margaret Andersen's essay, "Changing the Curriculum in Higher Education," notes that women's studies and inclusive curriculum projects are two important pieces of the same work (226). Like Susan Aiken, I believe that women's studies courses alone cannot truly challenge the traditional disciplines, the academy, and society at large (252). In their article "Trying Transformations," Susan Aiken and her colleagues discuss forms of resistance which the women came across in their experience with feminist curriculum integration projects. They note that it is necessary to strike a balance between women's studies programs and collective efforts to transform the traditional curriculum and contest the masculinist premises on which it is based. Without that transformation, women's studies programs risk continued ghettoization. (252)

I feel that through feminist/inclusive curriculum integration programs, feminist/activists can make more meaningful and significant changes in androcentric academies than they can by simply rearranging their own courses. While this essay suggests that feminists critics are correct in contesting the canon and the universals and should continue to do so, it also points to the larger possibilities of transforming the academy by coalition building and curriculum integration/inclusion. I wish to highlight the need for feminist literary scholars to draw more on their experience with the philosophy/concerns/issues of feminism. If we do not reconnect feminist literary criticism with feminism, we will have to settle for changing just a few minds. We run the risk of simply "preaching to the converted"⁵.

Phallogentrism, like any system, is driven by the the desire to perpetuate itself, by fulfilling its prescription. By speaking as we are required to speak, we contribute to our own oppression. The transformation of literature and criticism as cultural institutions demands a language of defiance rather than the silent or unquestioning mimetic complicity expected of us in order to sustain phallogentrism. If it is any good, feminist criticism, all feminist writing, and in my view all criticism is guaranteed to offend the mighty. (Meese 17)

What happens at the historical moment when the voiceless and powerless seek to unravel their riddle (DuPlessis 274)?

How to change. This is a how-to essay. There are essays and books enough treating the reasons why. Sandra M. Gilbert reiterates the question that echoes the halls of English departments just about everywhere: What do feminist critics want (29- 30)? In addition to outlining a theory of literary criticism and summarizing some moral and political points, her essay also calls for what Adrienne Rich called a 'revisionary imperative' (31). Gilbert draws attention to the strange and shaky

reality which makes up the working environment for most feminist literary critics — the academy. Some radical feminists consider women like Gilbert to be consorting with the enemy but “academic” feminists struggle daily against institutional oppression. Feminists — liberal, socialist or radical — within and without the phallo/androcentric institutions and systems cannot avoid facing the enemy. Those who are dedicated to teaching and have positions in the academy are keenly aware of the awkwardness and, indeed, danger of their situations.

Annette Kolodny's “Dancing Through the Minefield” discusses what much feminist criticism aims for — to examine and expose the “universals” which are used to canonize certain works of literature and not others. Judith Kegan Gardiner and others have noted how Kolodny tends to undermine herself in trying to avoid “offending the mighty”(6) Kegan Gardiner's response to Kolodny's essay reviews the three ideological tendencies of feminism and feminist criticism, focusing on Kolodny's “fundamentally radical view of [feminist criticism's] enterprise” (633) When Kegan Gardiner points out that Kolodny's question, “What ends do those[aesthetic] judgments serve?”, stems from Marxism's reading of literature as part of a dialectical historical process, she rephrases the question which Women's Studies students ask time and time again — “Who profits?” (632) Kegan Gardiner also raises the important point that the ideologies of liberal, socialist and radical feminism overlap and are complementary. She notes that “the boundaries between them are flexible, but they shape our selection and use of the various critical approaches available to us” (629) Feminist critics should continue to attack the universals and the canon, but they should not forget their sisters — those more or less radical than themselves. Just as it is crucial for those in introductory Women's Studies courses to understand the necessity for and uses of all the branches of feminism; so is it necessary to build coalitions, for, it seems to me, forming coalitions is the only way that truly significant transformation can occur. The phallogocentric system of power fosters and ultimately counts on division between the branches of feminism (and other “dissident” groups). In their classes, Women's Studies students might examine the destructive and disorienting logic behind the system's “divide and conquer” philosophy⁷.

Some of the challenges facing feminist literary critics treating the issue of the canon are discussed in Lillian Robinson's “Treason our Text” in which she remarks on both the growing ghettoization of women's literature and the tokenism of including a few women writers into the existing canon.(107) Just as women's studies and feminist curriculum integration are both necessary for changing the academy, so too is it necessary that feminist literary critics keep their counter-canon and continue “infiltrating” the traditional canon. The problem of ghettoization is also familiar to departments/programs of women's studies, Black studies, Third World studies, etc. As Cary Nelson puts it, “It is now possible to argue

that the choice between separation from and integration into the regular discipline and curriculum is a false one. We need both" (49)

Rewriting English: Cultural Politics of Gender and Class

paints a common scenario of the feminist student in a traditional period literature course:

Let us suppose that a feminist student is taking an eighteenth-century 'Augustan literature' course organized as follows: introductory lectures, with... essay work on the history of ideas and the literary history of the period; lectures on 'major authors' -- all male... This doesn't actually prevent a continual meshing of the particular with the general, but it certainly doesn't encourage it. How does a student with feminist principles but without extensive knowledge of the period respond to this situation? The absence of feminist ideas in the research and training of her teachers, combined with the amount of feminist research that remains to be done and the vast areas of ignorance we still have as women about the history of our sex, means that she is likely to be confined to moral arguments [with the professor], rather than intellectual ones that she requires. (121-122)

Situations such as this are quite common; frustration results and eventually feminist students end up wanting to take only women's studies courses or courses taught by feminist professors — but this is not always possible (as yet). By training non-feminist professors throughout the university to rethink the role of gender/class/race, etc. within their disciplines, to interrogate the very structures on which their disciplines are based, and to integrate their reading lists/syllabi, students can become more aware of women and other minorities in various disciplines⁸. These are not easy tasks and not all participants in curriculum integration programs leave them "converted" but the results of studies such as that of Susan Aiken and her colleagues are hopeful⁹. In "Trying Transformations", they discuss their findings: "looking back over the four years, we judge that the project affected approximately half of the participants positively. Of these, perhaps one-quarter experienced intellectual and/or personal changes that dramatically altered their teaching, research, and/or politics. Another quarter met project goals by incorporating varying amounts of material on women into their courses. The remaining half were relatively unchanged" (254)

They stress that their curriculum transformation projects asked the participants to "commit themselves not just to lip service to such attempts but instead to genuinely radical reconceptualizations that would question their inherited bodies of knowledge and some of their most cherished assumptions, procedures, and methodologies" (258) In discussing the difficulties of contesting the canon, Annette Kolodny notes: "Radical breaks are tiring, demanding, uncomfortable, and sometimes wholly beyond our comprehension" (155), but, I would add, worthwhile.

Robinson's "attack" on the canon, like those of Kolodny, Tompkins and other feminist critics, constitutes a self-reflexive mode which, fortunately, can be found in more and more critical writing today. Feminist criticism is not alone in the self-conscious practice of theory. Terry Eagleton's *Literary Theory* and Cary Nelson's "Against English" and others underscore the importance of such a stance¹⁰. Eagleton's reformulation of the practice of "rhetoric" (205-06) and call for "political criticism" (212) in addition to Cary Nelson's rethinking of theoretical discourse and liberal reading of the curriculum (46-51) are ideas which echo feminist concerns. A politically self-reflexive mode of criticism is essential in the battle with the big "gun" of literature -- the canon.

Kolodny states "that the fact of canonization puts any work beyond questions of establishing its merit and, instead invites students to offer only increasingly more ingenious readings and interpretations, the purpose of which is to validate the greatness already imputed by canonization" (150). She (and others¹¹) have pointed out that "Literary history (and with that, the historicity of literature) is a fiction" (151). Feminist critics need to keep pressing this point because without it, the canon cannot be disarmed/dismantled. Various critical approaches, Deconstructionist and Marxist criticism for example, are invaluable theories which feminist criticism can use to achieve its greater ends -- to change the universals and the academy. However, I believe, along with Kegan Gardiner and Robinson, that Kolodny's call for "playful pluralism" is a precarious effort in that "pluralism is closely aligned to those [calls] of bourgeois individualism and of artistic universality. All ideologically reinforce the status quo" (Gardiner 634). Therefore, feminist critics must take only what is useful to them. Deconstructionism, by itself, wants to make us realize the underpinnings of our discourse, our tenets, our aesthetics in order to reveal the many impacted and hermetic layers of the ideology beneath everything¹². Sometimes, deconstructionism deconstructs itself while Marxist criticism focuses just on the political/ideological aspects of everything. Feminism's "slogan" -- the personal is the political -- adds on the dimension that is missing from deconstructionist and Marxist criticism. Kegan Gardiner reminds us of some of the implications which that refrain brings to mind:

Because we believe that the personal is political, we try to collaborate with one another to make our criticism and critical institutions reflect supportive and nonhierarchical structures. When we come to critical crossroads, we don't want to slay the sister who arrived before us. Recognizing diversity in our ideological approaches does not undercut our commitment to joint action. (634-35)

Self-reflexivity, social responsibility, collaboration and coalition building are all essential facets of the feminist movement/process/pedagogy. I feel that true *Feminist* criticism's highest aim is nothing less than to change the world.

As Margaret Anderson puts it, "...changing the curriculum has three dimensions: changing ourselves, changing our work and changing society" (200) And Terry Eagleton points out that "If you allow a lot of young people to do nothing for a few years but read books and talk to each other then it is possible that, given certain wider historical circumstances, they will not only begin to question some of the values transmitted to them but begin to interrogate the authority by which they are transmitted" (200)

The view that we can change the world is both frightening and exciting. What is Women's Studies doing in an essay about feminist literary criticism and the canon? Like Gilbert, I will twist the question around: What can Women's Studies do for feminist literary criticism? A great deal. Women's Studies courses posit respect for differences as an agenda item of the utmost importance. By showing students how the binary mode of conceptualization furthers andro/phallogocentric systems' causes, Women's Studies students learn to distinguish between the reality of the world — one marked by vast differences of culture, race, class, ethnicity, religion and gender — and the world the academy depicts for us — one modeled on one normative character which emphasizes sameness over difference¹³. Feminist literary critics who focus on gender difference should also keep racial, ethnic, class differences in the foreground rather than in the background (or note pages) of their work. The sense of optimism which stirred me came with reviewing the literature on the feminist effort, through women's studies, to integrate the academy¹⁴. I feel that feminist scholars' greatest hope in battling the "isms" is to continue teaching their students but to also train/teach their "colleagues". Most of the students who leave Women's Studies courses are far less likely to accept the voice of authority — whether it be of their philosophy, biology, history or English instructor.

Getting women and other disenfranchised groups into the canon sometimes involves working with and against the universals. Women or minorities who have made it into the canon have somehow passed the "universality test". Those whose standards are the universals (Eagleton calls them canon-custodians) hold these to be neutral and neuter and as Batsleer, *et al.* note, will try any means to justify exclusion: one "way of denigrating radical work is to claim that its successes have been achieved in spite of, and are therefore detachable from, its political genesis and intent" [130] But inclusion/integration are of the utmost importance because if we¹⁵ are "in", then we are seen, acknowledged and studied. Because if we are "in", then we cannot be ignored, erased, discounted. Because, perhaps more importantly, using canons is how the academy teaches (not just in literature but in Science, Philosophy, History, Humanities, and so on¹⁶. In Rachel Blau DuPlessis' essay "For the Etruscans", she describes women as being "(ambiguously) non-hegemonic because as a group, generally, we are outside the dominant systems of

me. ing, value, and power” (283) Yet, sometimes feminist literary critics forget the “others” and hazard further marginalizing of minority groups. For example, in “Melodramas of Beset Manhood”. Nina Baym exposes some of the theories which the patriarchy used to exclude (white) women from the American literary canon, but it is not always obvious to readers that she doesn’t *mean* anything by her exclusion of “other” women. White feminist critics must use their ambiguously privileged status to help those “others” because those others can help them.

Our desire to invade the canons of all the disciplines should not detract from our radicalness. We want both change and radical transformation. Though many of us have become frustrated and confined our work to Afro-American Studies, Women’s Studies, or Latin-American and Caribbean Studies, some of us nonetheless have begun to build coalitions.¹⁷ If we want transformation, we need to work together. Remember all those “other” departments on campuses across the country that are seeking to transform the academies, the canons, the world.

It is within this political context that Terry Eagleton poses many questions about theory, criticism and literature; he holds that international politics has everything to do with literary theory. “Americans” need to start asking more probing questions such as his. One question should be — what is American Literature after all? America (look in any “American” encyclopedia) is defined as the Western Hemisphere. Last time we looked the Western Hemisphere refers to North, Central, South America and the Greater and Lesser Antilles. Some of us may qualify what English Departments call American Literature as North American Literature. Women’s/Black/Latin American studies students talk about hegemony’s effects on their lives. We know that hegemony goes a long way, even as far as literature. Eagleton remarks on imperialism’s (another name for hegemony) effects:

Culture, in the lives of nations struggling for their independence from imperialism, has a meaning quite remote from the review pages of the Sunday newspapers. Imperialism is not only the exploitation of cheap labour-power, raw materials and easy markets but the uprooting of languages and customs — not just the imposition of foreign armies, but of alien ways of experiencing. It... can be tracked to the most intimate roots of speech and signification. (215)

Hegemony calls for culture to be modeled on the “normative character”, language, skills, principals, graces of some elite privileged males¹⁸.

Something else — the academy is very nervous about us, we radicals (see we above). They (andro/phallogocentric systems) want to talk to us. They are, in fact, “reaching out”. They give us funds/grants for conferences, articles, books and even ask us to conduct workshops to combat their sexism and racism¹⁹. Even the NEH has sponsored curriculum integration programs. The institution needs our

help in adjusting its vision for this in a world, as Franklin puts it, "in which most people are nonwhite, over half are female, [and the] overwhelming majority are workers" [105]. Have we really come so far? After so many buried (the minefield is not just figurative), forgotten, ignored. They let us have an office, a phone, now a computer. Yet, how many universities have Black Studies? Women's Studies? Third World Studies? Worker Education programs? Could it be that that monster, dare we say it, Revolution, makes them nervous? Well, riots, after all, scare them. But women haven't rioted and we got Women's Studies. Latinos have yet to riot and we have Chicano-Puerto Rican Studies. Making up for past sins? Something else. Perhaps the fact that women have so infiltrated their academies and the reality that they *are* pushing, with success, for changes. Maybe the increasing percentages of minorities in the population at large acts as a sobering statistic for the powers that be. Yet, it could be a conspiracy — the divide and conquer approach dissipates movements quite effectively. But we know all this now; we know that collective/collaborative efforts are more effective than the martyr approach. So, those ambiguously nonhegemonic feminists (and other representative types) situated within/out the academies should push all the harder. Tell them we are many (though they don't want to see). That we keep growing (they keep on counting). And that we keep on *arriving*. If you want to persuade the critics, tell them they will gain more opportunities for intellectual discourse²⁰. No need to tell them that we are everywhere and that we are angry.

NOTES

¹ Joan Schulz's notes to the Feminist Literary Criticism class at SUNY-Albany in the Spring 1988. See also Annette Kolodny, Jane P. Tompkins, Lillian Robinson, Cary Nelson, Terry Eagleton, Elizabeth Meese and H. Bruce Franklin.

² One of the more "radical" bases is that "Racism, heterosexism and classism are systematic and systemic and, like sexism, are integral components of the control mechanism of society" (Schulz 3-24-88). This may be problematic for some liberal feminists may not agree with this and as Kegan Gardiner notes, liberal feminists "predominate over other feminists in places of established power" [633].

³ See Margaret Andersen's "Changing the Curriculum in Higher Education" and "Trying Transformations: Curriculum Integration and the Problem of Resistance" in Susan Hardy Aiken, et al.

⁴ See Aiken, et al., 252, note 3 and 254, note 7.

⁵ "'Preaching to the converted' is not a completely valueless activity; but all cultural practice that claims a commitment to and an involvement in change must also work to develop ways of contesting the status quo, of converting the unconverted" [Janet Batsleer, et al. 130].

⁶ See also Elly Bulkin's response to Kolodny in *Feminist Studies*, 8.3 Fall 1982.

⁷ Students in Afro-American, Latin American, Third World (etc.) Studies courses also analyze the way in which patriarchy dissipates progressive movements. See also Andersen 229.

- If just the latter of these is accomplished then feminists have transformed a great deal indeed.
- Susan Aiken, et al. mention other curriculum integration programs conducted after theirs 251-52.
- ¹⁰ Batsleer, et al, Meese, Leslie Fiedler and Franklin insist also on self-critical reflexivity in criticism and literary studies.
- ¹¹ See Meese 9-10, Tompkin's *Sensational Designs* 5, Eagleton's conclusion in *Literary Theory* and also Andersen 240.
- ¹² See Eagleton's chapter 4 and Meese's introduction.
- ¹³ See Andersen 228. I would be remiss if I did not note the paradox which some French and American feminists have been exploring and discussing -- i.e., sameness yet biological sex difference. My own view adheres to Joan Schulz's: "Gender, though socially constructed, and not biologically given, does constitute difference between men and women" [3/24/88].
- ¹⁴ Integration does not mean assimilation; see Andersen 228- 29.
- ¹⁵ The collective/plural voice is deliberate.
- ¹⁶ See Susan Aiken, et al and Andersen.
- ¹⁷ Andersen discusses the "Black Studies/Women's Studies: An Overdue Partnership" project on 226-27. The May 12, 1988 CUNY conference, "In The CUNY Classroom: Integrating the New Scholarship on Gender, Ethnicity, Race and Class into the College Curriculum" sponsored by the University Vocational Education and University Faculty Development Program Seminars (among others) also reflects collaborative efforts.
- ¹⁸ Andersen 228.
- ¹⁹ The MLA sponsored *English Literature: Opening Up the Canon* edited by Fiedler and *Rewriting English* by Batsleer, et al are two examples of such efforts.
- ²⁰ Nelson's essay makes some persuasive remarks as to the "benefits" of a liberal curriculum.

WORKS CONSULTED

- Andersen, Margaret L. "Changing the Curriculum in Higher Education." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 12.2 (Winter 1987): 222-250.
- Aiken, Susan Hardy, et al. "Trying Transformations: Curriculum Integration and the Problem of Resistance." *Signs* 12.2 (Winter 1987): 251-271.
- Batsleer, Janet, et al. *Rewriting English: Cultural Politics of Gender and Class*. London and New York: Methuen, 1985.
- Baym, Nina. "Melodramas of Beset Manhood: How Theories of American Fiction Exclude Woman Authors." *The New Feminist Criticism*. Ed. Elaine Showalter. New York: Pantheon Books, 1985.
- DuPlessis, Rachel Blau. "For the Etruscans." *The New Feminist Criticism*. Ed. Elaine Showalter. New York: Pantheon Books, 1985.

- Eagleton, Terry. *Literary Theory: An Introduction*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1983.
- Fiedler, Leslie A. "Literature as an Institution: The View from 1980." *English Literature: Opening Up the Canon*. Eds. L. A. Fiedler and Houston A. Baker, Jr. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1979.
- Gardiner, Judith Kegan. "An Interchange on Feminist Criticism: On 'Dancing Through the Minefield.'" *Feminist Studies* 8.3 (Fall 1982): 629-635.
- Gilbert, Sandra M. "What Do Feminist Critics Want? A Postcard from the Volcano." *The New Feminist Criticism*. Ed. Elaine Showalter. New York: Pantheon Books, 1985.
- Kolodny, Annette. "Dancing Through the Minefield: Some Observations on the Theory, Practice, and Politics of a Feminist Literary Criticism." *The New Feminist Criticism*. Ed. Elaine Showalter. New York: Pantheon Books, 1985.
- Meese, Elizabeth A. *Crossing the Double Cross: The Practice of Feminist Criticism*. Chapel Hill and London: University of North Carolina Press, 1986.
- Nelson, Cary. "Against English: Theory and the Limits of the Discipline." *ADE Bulletin*.
- Robinson, Lillian S. "Treason Our Text: Feminist Challenges to the Literary Canon." *The New Feminist Criticism*. Ed. Elaine Showalter. New York: Pantheon Books, 1985.
- Schulz, Joan. Lecture. Albany, 24 March 1988.
- Tompkins, Jane P. "Masterpiece Theater: The Politics of Hawthorne's Literary Reputation." *Sensational Designs*.

THE REPRESENTATION OF ANIMALS IN MODERN WESTERN FICTION

Marion W. Copeland

Humanity itself, a term defined by *Webster's Collegiate Dictionary* as "the quality or state of being humane," lies at the core of the Humanities Tradition. Yet the very literature that could best teach "compassion, sympathy, or consideration for other human beings or animals" — i.e. in Webster's words "The quality or state of being humane" — has been consistently excluded from the canon. Omitting it is as egregious an oversight as is omitting ethnic, fantasy, feminine, or non-Western novels. But the omission is suggestive of the way in which the so-called dominant culture has suppressed the voices of the groups it exploits. And there can be little doubt that humans have with great regularity and little guilt exploited animals.

George Orwell wrote, alluding to *Animal Farm* (1946) in particular, that should Marx's theory be analyzed from the animal's point of view it becomes clear "that the concept of struggle between human [is] pure illusion since whenever it was necessary to exploit animals, all humans united against them: the true struggle is between humans and animals" (quoted in Williams, 73). That observation serves as a guide to reading *Animal Farm* as well as the other novels in the manner of *Black Beauty*.

The novels in this tradition are a relatively large, virtually unexamined — indeed a suppressed genre — in which other than-human realistically presented talking animals serve as narrators and main characters. I am at present working on a book which I hope will identify these novels, describe the genre to which they belong, suggest fruitful critical approaches, and bring to the attention of my colleagues in the Humanities the important themes the novels advance. My goal is to have these novels read, taught, written and talked about. The tentative title of the book is *Black Beauty's Progeny* since it seems to have been the 1877 publication of Anna Sewell's famous novel that marks the beginning, at least in our Western literature, of granting sentience, intelligence, and the ability to communicate to non-human animal characters.

Marion W. Copeland is Professor of English and Director of the Honors Program at Holyoke Community College as well as the author of numerous papers which touch on the concerns at issue in this essay.

Sewell, like many of her contemporaries, has been influenced by the work of Darwin and his supporters and detractors. She borrows from Darwin both theme and device, the latter as Stanley Edgar Hyman points out in *The Tangled Bank* (1962), Darwin's concern with furnishing "a proper scene for the dramatic action" in which "most of the actors...are animals" (14,16). By 1877 Sewell's horse becomes the actor in a naturalistic landscape. The overt theme of *Black Beauty* is man's inhumanity to man and animal alike.

But implicit in Sewell's claims that *Black Beauty* possesses consciousness, sense and sensibility, and the ability to communicate complex thoughts and memories to those of his own kind is a far more dangerous theme and one equally supported by Darwin's work. In "...The Language of *The Origin of the Species*" (1983), Gillian Beer writes:

A reading of [Darwin's] earlier notebooks reveals the excellent pleasure which Darwin felt in restoring man to an equality with other forms of life and in undermining that hubristic separation which man had accorded himself in all previous natural history:

Animals [Darwin wrote] whom we have made our slaves we do not like to consider our equals -- (do not slave holders wish to make the black man other kind). Animals with affections, imitation, fear of death, pain, sorrow for the dead -- respect. (Gruber and Barrett, 1974, 477)

The image of master and slave which Darwin uses suggests the intensity of his dislike for man's tyrannical self aggrandizement and for the license which this had led him to feel toward other species. (217)

It was not chance that Anna Sewell's contemporaries recognized *Black Beauty* as the horse's *Uncle Tom's Cabin* or that its most recent descendent, Richard Adam's 1988 novel *Traveller*, the autobiography of General Robert E. Lee's horse, equates the treatment of horses with the treatment of slaves. Slavery has presumably been eradicated in this country and the voices of Black peoples, added to the canon, are having an effect on the racism that allowed slavery to exist in our Western tradition in the first place. Perhaps, given Darwin's emphasis, racism is really another form of speciesism and what one race has felt toward another is not in kind different from what we feel toward other species of animals. In both cases the separation of us from them has allowed exploitation and enslavement, the fruits of which are suffering and silence for the enslaved and a concomitant poverty of soul for the enslaver.

Since the humanities claims to enrich the soul of man -- and, these days, presumably of women as well, it seems to me a moral imperative to include voices previously silenced in our new canon. Popular magazine articles like those listed in the bibliography attached to this essay suggest that the public may, a little over a hun-

dred years after the publication of *Black Beauty*, be willing to take non-human intelligence seriously.

The question is whether the Humanities Tradition can be equally receptive to the voices of their species. Largely ignored by the critics who speak for the canon, novels about animals have been labeled anthropomorphic and sentimental and designated either as popular literature or as children's books. Any of the four categories would be sufficient to keep novels out of our traditional college literature courses. Earle Labor in his fine piece on Jack London in the DLB (1982), for instance, concludes that London "was the victim of critical standards established by the New England Sages and their New York heirs in the 'Age of Innocence'" and that his masterpieces *The Call of the Wild* and *White Fang* were then relegated by the New Critics, who ignored the rest of his work altogether, to junior high school classics". (372b).

Similarly, Christopher Pawling in *Popular Fiction and Social Change* (1984) discusses the popularity of Richard Adam's first talking animal novel *Watership Down* (1975). The novel, rejected by seventeen firms before Rex Collins, an unknown, agreed to publish it in 1973, appeared two and a half years later and became a runaway bestseller without benefit of mass marketing or publicity or accolades from critics. After a successful film, the Penguin paperback, and Macmillan's generous \$800,000 payment for the American publishing rights, the novel was deemed to be "one of those classics of children's literature which speak to readers of all ages, fit to be mentioned in the same breath as, say, *The Wind in the Willows*, *The Lord of the Rings*, or even *Gulliver's Travels*" (C. Booker, quoted in Pawling 212).

Interestingly all the novels with which this particular critic equates *Watership Down* are novels which contain other than human characters who speak, and at least part of one, Book IV of *Gulliver's Travels* (1726), introduces talking horses who have to be considered as direct predecessors of *Black Beauty* and his heirs. Kenneth Grahame's *Wind in the Willows* (1908) is not a member of *Black Beauty's* immediate family because its animal characters are not realistically or naturalistically presented. They wear human clothes, live in human houses, travel in human cars and fish from human boats. Not so *Black Beauty* or Swift's Houyhnhnms.

On one level, like Sewall's novel, Swift's Fourth Voyage is a commentary on the abuse of horses in England. Gulliver's Houyhnhnm Master reacts to his description of the treatment of horses in England with horror and uses it as evidence to categorize the mortified Gulliver as a hopeless Yahoo, all the more dangerous because he has the ability to speak and a semblance of reason. He sees a danger in this sentient Yahoo leading the others in a rebellion before the Houyhnhnms'

plan to exterminate the beasts can be carried out. Swift seems to satirize here, not rationality, but rational man's attitude toward other animals.

Barry Lopez illustrates graphically in *Of Wolves and Men* (1978), exactly as Gunter Grass does in *The Rat* (1987) this extermination mentality, different from Hitler's Final Solution only in that its victims have been other-than-human animals. It is chastening to remember, as we consider the significance of the composition of canons, that Hitler "purified" the canon and redefined human and humane.

Fiction in the manner of *Black Beauty* for the most part carefully distinguishes between animals' abilities to communicate with one another and with humans. In Adams's *The Plague Dogs* (1978) the two dog heroes use one language between them, another when communicating with the fox they encounter after escaping from the government laboratory where they have been subjects in scientific experiments that Adams equates with those conducted at Auschwitz. And they are aware that the fox has a language they have almost lost because of their long domestication, a kind of e.s.p. that requires no "words." Except in animal fantasies like T. H. White's *The Sword in the Stone* (1938), none of them can speak with humans although they understand much of what humans say. As the narrator of *One Hundred and One Dalmatians* (1957) comments:

Dogs can never speak the language of humans and humans can never speak the language of dogs. But many dogs can understand almost every word humans say, while humans seldom learn to recognize more than half a dozen barks, if that. And barks are only a small part of the dog language. (Smith, 39)

Given the long intimacy with and careful study of the animal being translated, I do not see much difference between accepting Anna Sewell as *Black Beauty*'s translator" (her term) or Ernest Thompson Seton as *Raggylug's* than in accepting Samuel Noah Kramer as the translator of *Gilgamesh*. In fact, in some ways I have become more comfortable with Sewell and Seton (or Adams or London) as translators or interpreters because there is evidence of their first hand observation of their subjects! It worries me that *Gilgamesh*, extant only in fragments and from a world we assume we understand because Sumer was "civilized," "urbane," "human" as we are, appears in translation very much a modern man. We teach Kramer's translations, many of us, without even warning our students of possible inaccuracies and authorial impositions. But most of us smile behind our hands when Marshall Saunders, the Canadian author of *Beautiful Joe* (1901), claims "she has been gifted with the ability to transcribe the language of dogs and a great many of other animals" (Lansbury, 184-5) or when it is suggested that Anna Sewell may have taken her role as *Beauty's* "translator" seriously or when Ernest Thompson Seton comments in the preface *To Wild Animals I Have Known* (1898):

Those who do not know the animals well may think I have humanized them, but those who have lived so near them as to know something of their ways and their minds will not

think so. For truly [he continues, alluding to "Raggylug, the Story of a Cottontail Rabbit"], although rabbits have no speech as we understand it,...they have a way of conveying ideas by a system of sounds, signs, scents, whisker-touches, movements, and exan-ple that answers the purpose of speech; and it must be remembered that though in telling this story I freely translate from rabbit into English, I repeat nothing that they did not say. (*Collected Novels*, 32)

Oliver Goldsmith had the perfect retort for doubters! Boswell records an occasion when Goldsmith complained to Samuel Johnson that the animals in fables seldom talked in character:

"For instance, the fable of the little fishes, who saw birds fly over their heads, and, envying them, petitioned Jupiter to be changed into birds. The skill consists [said Goldsmith] in making them talk like little fishes." Whilst indulging himself in this idea, he noticed Johnson shaking with laughter. "Why, Dr. Johnson [he retorted], this is not so easy as you seem to think; for if you were to make little fishes talk, they would talk like WHALES." (Blackham, 96)

T. D. Maclulich, in an article called "The Animal Story and the 'Nature Faker' Controversy" (1986), recalls that the naturalist John Burroughs and the conservationist President Theodore Roosevelt attacked a number of writers of animal stories, Jack London among them, ostensibly for anthropomorphizing and fictionalizing — i.e. allowing their animal characters to feel, think, and even talk — in writing that claimed to be naturalistic. Maclulich's study shows that instead these two conservative thinkers denied London's (and Ernest Thompson Seton's and Charles G. D. Roberts') assumptions that life for man and animal alike was a "Darwinian struggle for survival in a godless universe of chance events; and second, for supporting the idea that there was little distinction between humanity and the animals... The controversy was really a dispute between rival visions of humanity's place in the universe" (122)

In the introduction to *Language of Nature* (1986), L. J. Jordanova observes that in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries in Europe theories about language "became intimately connected with new ideas of 'man's place in nature'" although whether or not humankind "uniquely possessed language and was thereby manifestly of a different order from all other living creatures" had been the subject of debate since at least the seventeenth century. (32-3)

In Plutarch's "Dinner of the Seven Wise Men," Aesop, whose fables without doubt belong close to the root of the talking animals novel's family tree, speaks with annoyance of his dinner companions' failure to take his jackdaws and crows seriously because -- you guessed it! -- they talk to one another (Blackman, 5-6). So the debate has been on Western man's mind at least since the 5th century B.C., the birthdate of much of what we recognize as the humanities tradition.

At a time when the environment is being threatened by pollution, chemical and nuclear waste and accident, acid rain, deforestation, and a depleted ozone layer, not to mention the threat of nuclear war, the definition of humane needs to be expanded to include compassion, sympathy, and consideration for the planet not further contracted into ever more self-referential modes. Is it chance that C. S. Lewis called Earth *The Silent Planet* (1938)? And called her that because man hears only his own voice while he inhabits her? Lewis's main character, Dr. Ransome, has to travel to Malacandra, another planet, to discover three quite distinct species of beings who are, despite their differences, able to communicate with one another. "Each of them is to the other," explains Ransome, "Both what a man is to us and what an animal is to us. They can talk to each other, they can communicate, they have the same ethics" (156). In the novel one of the Malacandrans commiserates with Ransome for what he sees as the poverty of earthly life: "Your thought must be at the mercy of your blood for you cannot compare it with thought that floats on a different blood" (103). Similarly in Janann V. Jenner's *Sandeagozu* (1986), the narrator, a 35 foot Indian python, observes: "Strange that humans think so much of their intellect, when their thoughts are such a morass of scraps of ideas, fragmented memories and a welter of words. I guess they have no way of comparing theirs with other kinds of minds" (327). Sherahi speaks from the advantaged position of one whose e.s.p. can read and control all other minds.

Animal behaviorist Emily Hahn is quoted in Carl Sagan's *Brocca's Brain*:

"For a long time...if an animal did not produce at least a fair approximation of our method of signaling -- namely speech -- we gave up trying to get in touch with it. We could see and hear communication going on in the song of birds, in the silent communication of horses, in the play of dogs and cats, but we stood outside." (51)

The speech of animals in the novels in the tradition of *Black Beauty* represents the author's translation of their methods of signaling into a form that will allow human readers to stand inside and get in touch with other than human worlds.

Many of the animals whose voices are "translated" or interpreted in these novels are domestic -- *Black Beauty* himself or Richard Adams's *Traveller* are both, of course, horses. Dogs and cats are given voice most frequently and claim some of the best known translators: Richard Adams, Virginia Woolf, Timothy Findley, Mukhail Bulgakov, Jack London, Leon Rooke, Tab Williams, and May Sarton among them. Their voices both cherish and condemn humanity. Others offer even more radical dislocations, asking the reader to view and judge the world and humanity from the perspectives of a mole (Horwood's *Duncton Wood*), a rabbit (Adams's *Watership Down*), a 35 foot Indian python (Jenner's *Sandeagozu*), a rat (Grass's *The Rat*), even a cockroach (Kafka's *Metamorphosis*).

In his essay "The Shrinking of the Epic Hero: From Homer to Richard Adams's *Watership Down*" (1986), Kenneth Kitchell suggests that "by showing us events through a rabbit's eyes, Adams exhibits a fine example of what Russian critic Shlovskoy called *ostranenie*, often translated 'making it strange' or 'defamiliarization'" (27). The more radical perspectives offered as the world is seen and interpreted through the eyes of Grass's rats or Jenner's python or Kafka's insect can shatter easy assumptions about man and his status in the world.

Reanimating the canon with novels like *Black Beauty*, *Animal Farm*, *Watership Down*, *The Plague Dogs* or *Traveller*, *Sandeagozu*, *Dunston Wood*, *The Rat* would help to raise the controversies that belong at the core of the Humanities Tradition: what does it mean to be human, to be humane? Our canon, therefore, should either be an open one, allowing all comers to be heard, or, better, should actively seek to embrace those who for whatever reason have been kept silent. Instead the experience of Blacks, women, and animals suggest that the canon is what a reading of Bennett, Bloom, and Hirsch suggest it has become, a barrier against change, a myopic reinforcement of patriarchal values which are by definition sexist, speciesist, and homocentric.

WORKS CITED

- Adams, Richard. *The Plague Dogs*. New York: Knopf, 1978. _____. *Traveller*. New York: Knopf, 1988. _____. *Watership Down*. New York: Avon, 1975.
- Bear, Gillian. "'The Face of Nature': Anthropomorphic Elements in the Language of The Origin of Species" in L. J. Jordanova. *Languages of Nature: Critical Essays on Science and Literature*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1986. 212-243.
- Blackham, H[arold] J[ohn]. *The Fable as Literature*. London and Dover NH: The Athlone Press, 1985.
- Cowley, Geoffrey. "The Wisdom of Animals." *Newsweek* 23 May, 1988: 52+.
- "Forum: Just Like Us? Toward a Notion of Animal Rights." *Harper's* August, 1988: 43-52.
- Grass, Gunter. *The Rat*. Translated by Ralph Manheim. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1987.
- Horwood, William. *Dunston Wood*. New York: McGraw Hill, 1980.
- Hyman, Stanley Edgar. *The Tangled Bank: Darwin, Marx, Frazer, and Freud as Imaginative Writers*. New York: Atheneum, 1962.
- Jenner, Janann V. *Sandeagozu*. New York: Harper & Row, 1986.
- Jordanova, L. J. "Introduction," *Languages of Nature: Critical Essays on Science and Literature*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1986.
- Kafka, Franz. *Metamorphosis*. Penguin, 1978.
- Kitchell, Kenneth F., Jr. "The Shrinking of the Epic Hero from Homer to Richard Adams's *Watership Down*." *Classical and Modern Literature* 7 (Fall, 1986): 13-30.

- Labor, Earle. "Jack London." *Dictionary of Literary Biography* (1982) 12: 350-373.
- Lansbury, Coral. *The Old Brown Dog: Women, Workers, and Vivisection in Edwardian England*. The University of Wisconsin Press, 1985.
- Lewis, C. S. *Out of the Silent Planet*. New York: Macmillan Collier, 1965.
- Lopez, Barry. *Of Wolves and Men*. New York: Scribners, 1978.
- Maclulich, T. D. "The Animal Story and 'The Nature Faker' Controversy." *Essays on Canadian Writing* 33 (Fall, 1986):112-124.
- Orwell, George. *Animal Farm*. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1946.
- Pawling, Christopher. "Watership Down: Rolling Back the 1960s," *Popular Fiction and Social Change*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1984. 212-233.
- Sagan, Carl. *Broca's Brain: Reflections of the Romance of Science*. New York: Random House, 1979.
- Saunders, Marshall. *Beautiful Joe: An Autobiography*. Philadelphia: The Judson Press, 1903.
- Seton, Ernest Thompson. *Collected Novels*. Secaucus, NJ: Castle, 1985.
- Sewell, Anna. *Black Beauty: His Grooms and Companions: The Autobiography of a Horse*. New York: Crown Reprint, 1986.
- Smith, Dodie [Dorothy Gladys]. *One Hundred and One Dalmations* New York: Viking, 1957.
- Swift, Jonathan. *Gulliver's Travels*. Dell.
- White, T. H. *The Sword in the Stone*. New York: Berkley, 1983.
- Williams, Raymond. *George Orwell*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1971.

PART TWO

FACULTY SCHOLARSHIP AT THE TWO-YEAR COLLEGE

The following papers were presented at a panel arranged by the Discussion Group on the Two-Year College for the 1988 Convention of the Modern Language Association of America. The full title of this session was "Non-pedagogical Faculty Scholarship at the Two Year College: Practical Recommendations for Its Successful Completion despite Onerous Teaching Schedules." The session was presided over by James J. Blake of the Department of English at Nassau Community College.

SCHOLARS SAVE SCHOOLS

Myrna Goldenberg

A recent letter to the *Washington Post* urged the establishment of a new community college in the District of Columbia, one that would be separate from the existing university. Its author explained that community college teachers teach primarily underprepared students and do not “do” research. This correspondent clearly felt teaching and research to be mutually exclusive and, in doing so, perpetuates an elitist notion as well as a false one. For him — and, unfortunately, for too many others who marginalize community colleges and who, in the process, insult community college faculty and students — the community college scholar/teacher is a contradiction in terms. In the context of the community college, the term is paradoxical, for it evokes a classical image; and the adjective “classical” seems oddly inconsistent with mass education, or the peoples’ colleges. And, indeed, the workload of a community college teacher is a reality that discourages many of us from becoming scholars and, sadly, often serves as our reason why or excuse for not realizing our scholarly goals.

Nevertheless, one cannot be a good teacher unless one is also a scholar, particularly at the community college (Oromaner, 1986). In fact, good teaching and scholarship are inseparable because serious, fairly continuous scholarship inevitably results in enthusiastic, intelligent, and purposeful teaching. As teaching institutions, community colleges have a vested interest in encouraging scholar/teachers: retention rates are probably related to the presence or absence of these faculty. The individual instructor and the discipline-related associations are equally involved — the instructor, for obvious reasons, and the associations, in order to promote inspired teaching that will attract students to the discipline and maintain the standards that will keep the profession vital. Thus, the care and feeding of the scholar/teacher is a shared responsibility and a profound commitment.

Traditionally, research and scholarship have been devalued at the community college and have fared poorly as specialization and careerism both appropriated a larger and larger part of the community college mission and budget. In spite of the

Myrna Goldenberg is Professor of English and Administrative Associate for Planning at Montgomery College as well as one of five recipients of the Community College Humanities Association’s Distinguished Humanities Educator awards for 1989.

fact that the history of research at community colleges can be characterized as hostile, the scholar/teacher is a necessity and a challenge. Community colleges enroll over half of the nation's freshmen, most of whom probably experience their first English courses at these colleges. Community college teaching, particularly in English — because it is more nearly a universal requirement than any other subject — needs to be competent and inspiring. Yet community college teachers generally teach 5 sections each semester, hardly inspiring circumstances. In practical terms, we have little time for anything but teaching. But if that were all we did, then community college faculties would be aggregations of brain dead robots mechanically plodding through paragraphs and measuring their lives in comma splices. We know that this is not the case and that, indeed, some very exciting teaching and learning happens in our classrooms. Moreover, we know that in order to teach, we must be active learners and scholars. Scholarship and research involve continual critiquing — and, fortunately as well as inevitably, influence our teaching.

In other words, scholarship bears directly on the classroom because it stimulates the process of assessing the new against the familiar and re-conceptualizing the familiar to achieve, in successive stages, three ends: first, to accommodate the new; second, to reconcile the familiar with the new; and third, to revise the familiar in the light of new knowledge. I offer a simple and an accessible example from women's literature, one of my scholarly interests. When I read *Yonnondio* by Tillie Olsen, a 1930s work recently published, I added it to my list of important American novels, depression era novels, mid-Western regional novels, naturalist novels, working class novels, and so on. In this way, I simply accommodated the new title by adding it to the lists with which I am already comfortable. When I then developed priorities for the course reading assignments and revised the syllabus to reflect the place of *Yonnondio* in the course, I made decisions that reveal a reevaluation of the familiar works, a new arrangement or harmony of the particular works in the field. In deciding what to delete to make room for *Yonnondio*, I needed to re-think the criteria of excellence and of usefulness and to reconcile my decision with the traditional interpretations of the canon. This process forced me to think about my purpose in the classroom, my relationship with my students — my audience, as it were — and my commitment to my profession. And when I revised the course in the light of new insights that I gained from this novel as well as from my research on feminist literary criticism, I also revised the premises that inform the course and the questions that stimulate understanding of American life and literature. In fact, my ideas about humanities teaching changed; I became increasingly concerned with the political dimension of the teaching of literature and the other humanities and actively sought to engage my students in a dialogue with the texts in order to enable as well as ennoble them. Through these texts, I try to give them

the gift of dialogue with a culture that has, for the most part, ignored them. (I used a similar process of evaluating and re-evaluating to add the work of women novelists to the course, *Literature of the Holocaust*, which rarely includes novels or diaries by women survivors.) I see my role as one which “challenges and equips each new generation to do something as significant, as meaningful, and even as extraordinary in its own time as its ancestors [and I use the word ancestors in its broadest sense] accomplished in another” (Joseph, 323).

Because “those who have governed have been those who have been educated” (Minnich, 313), our role as teacher/scholar takes on extraordinary dimensions of responsibility and power. As humanities teachers and scholars, we preserve and transmit our legacies; we study and teach whatever it is that is human and noble in ourselves and in our heritages; and we enable the women and men in our classes to participate knowledgeably, morally, and responsibly in a free society. We need, therefore, to present texts and interpretations of those texts that are enabling and empowering. We need to be inclusive and expansive, and we need to re-visit our disciplines with open minds and fresh questions. We need to immerse ourselves anew in our subjects so that we can ask the critical questions: Whose history is this? Whose literature? Through whose lenses are these interpretations and syntheses filtered? And we need to bring these questions to our students and be prepared to offer alternative texts and explanations. We cannot answer these questions unless we focus on content and engage in serious research.

Indeed, the most recent ACE report on minority and women faculty recommends that “subjects especially relevant to minorities and women” be “integrated more fully with the methodologies of each academic discipline” (HENA, 4). If the subject matter that we teach is connected to the recruitment and retention of faculty, how much more so is it connected to the recruitment and retention of our students. We also need to recognize that such teaching and studying challenges the status quo, and it de-marginalizes the outsiders who have used our classrooms to break into our society. At a recent conference on general and liberal studies, “teaching for social transformation” was defined as “educating students to take risks and to struggle with ongoing relations of power...[with the fundamental issue] of “whose forms of knowledge, history, language, culture, and authority will prevail as a legitimate object of learning and analysis” (Heller, A21). Our scholarship cannot be either a reiteration or a reinforcement of the Great Books, a revisitation which perpetuates the silence of half of humanity. The process of scholarship, then, is a dynamic process of social transformation and self-renewal which permeates both the manner and the matter of teaching. Thus our research with its focus on content rather than on pedagogy influences the success, retention, and transfer status of our students.

We, the faculty, are the ultimate lifelong learners and, as such, are role models for our students. When we share our enthusiasm for our research with our students, we elevate them from the normal hierarchy of student to instructor to something more nearly resembling a peer learner. In this process, we also protect research from becoming elitist and students from staying marginal to our disciplines. Research and scholarship are so obviously necessary to good teaching that neither can exist without the other. And the scholar/teacher can barely exist without the support of the college. Support from professional associations is also necessary. The college has a critical role in the care and nurturing of the scholar/teacher. In fact, discipline excellence and scholarship are sound investments. Montgomery College is a leader among community colleges in promoting scholarly activities. Based on the president's "belief that faculty scholarship is essential to quality instruction in a comprehensive community college," Montgomery College has developed an extensive program, the Scholarly Activities Program, that "encourages faculty to engage in scholarship by providing some reassigned time" for a variety of activities. The College reduces the instructor's teaching load by one course, every four years, for scholarly work, e.g., to write a paper for publication; to prepare or complete a work of scholarly synthesis or opinion; to create an artistic work; to perform non-paid discipline related work in a public or private setting; to hold a major office in a discipline-related local, state, or national professional organization; and to update teaching and professional competence through the reading of an extensive bibliography of works at the cutting edge of the discipline (Parilla, 1986). A reduced teaching load of one course is not enough to conduct sustained research, but it does provide community college faculty with a respite, breathing room to work on scholarship in their field. It does more. It conveys the message that what we teach is as important as how we teach and, in fact, that we cannot know how to teach unless we know what there is to teach. Faculty are motivated to keep up with their fields when the administration invests heavily and conspicuously in their efforts to do so. We are now examining the Scholarly Activities Program so that we can expand and improve it.

In addition to formal scholarly activity funding, colleges can support summer grants and faculty seminar groups. For example, two years ago at MC, the Office of Affirmative Action and the Office of the Academic Vice-President jointly sponsored a summer institute for faculty to transform the curriculum so that it reflects recent feminist scholarship. For a reasonable stipend, twelve faculty committed themselves to an intensive independent study program, a workshop with a consultant in their discipline from a nearby state university, and two faculty seminars to discuss the readings and to critique their revised course outlines. Faculty response was so high that the institute was offered again in 1988. Now, in the third year, 20 faculty receive released time as part of a two-year HIPSE grant to begin or

to continue this work. Besides sabbaticals and conference attendance, colleges can also facilitate seminars and lecture series, a natural for community colleges with their close connections to their communities. Community colleges can also establish small consulting projects with local government, modifying faculty teaching loads to accommodate these new assignments or facilitating faculty compensation as consultants.

In a sense, there is nothing new about professional development initiated by either individuals or colleges. What is new, however, is that these activities are happening in the context of the community college. That some community colleges are taking the lead in encouraging scholarship speaks to the maturity of the community college as an intellectual environment, to its recognition of the connection between learning and teaching.

Although not numerous, the community college scholar/teachers are, after all, alive and well. We believe that "intellectual concerns are at the heart of teaching...and that the institutionalization of research provides an opportunity for community colleges to revitalize the teaching role" (Oromaner, 1986). We are convinced that our students benefit from our studies as well as from their studies. And we are sure that our research helps us to fulfill our roles as teachers and to assert, "I am in the world to change the world" (Muriel Rukeyser, "Kathe Kollwitz", 1968).

REFERENCES

- Biedler, Peter G. "The Joys of College Teaching." *Phi Kappa Phi Journal* Winter 1987: 3-6.
- Diner, Stephen J. "It Must Have Separate Status," Letter to the Editor. *Washington Post*, 11 December 1988, p. C8. Heller, Scott. "'Radical Critique' Says Reform of Higher Education Is Timid and Narrow." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, November 11, 1987, pp. A13, A21.
- Joseph, James A. "Education for Citizenship: Excellence, Equity, and Employment." *Liberal Education* 68 (Winter, 1982): 323-328.
- Minnich, Elizabeth Kamarch. "Liberal Arts and Civic Arts: Education for 'The Free Man'?" *Liberal Education* 68 (Winter, 1982): 311-321.
- MLA. "Survey of Doctoral Programs in English." *MLA Newsletter*. Summer 1987: 12.
- Oromaner, Mark. "The Community College Professor: Teacher and Scholar." *ERIC Digest*. May 1986.
- Parilla, Robert E. "Gladly Would They Learn and Gladly Teach." *Southern Association of Community and Junior Colleges Occasional Paper* (1986). ED 263 949.
- "Report Examines Minority Recruiting." *HENA*, October 19, 1987, p. 4.
- Sledge, Linda Ching. "The Community College Scholar." *Profession* 86 (1986): 4-6.

SURVIVING AS A SCHOLAR AT A TWO-YEAR COLLEGE: A REPORT FROM THE FIELD

Brian Gallagher

It is possible, though not probable, that there shall one day be a two-year college where faculty scholarship is automatically and ungrudgingly given its just due (perhaps at Big Rock Candy Mountain Junior College). For the very imperfect present, though, a lack of recognition for non-pedagogical scholarship is one of the issues that often, and sometimes bitterly, pits faculty against administrators on two-year campuses. The tacit assumption at many four-year colleges and at universities — namely, that scholarship is both good for the soul and so eventually good for the classroom — simply does not hold with most two-year administrators. What these administrators want from faculty, beyond a great deal of teaching, is work which directly affects that teaching and so improves the college's programs, thereby boosting its recruitment, retention and graduation figures.

I do not intend, though, to cast two-year colleges administrators primarily as villains in this scenario. For one thing, their desire to improve instruction, specifically for a student population that may have been poorly served by previous educational institutions, is hardly an ignoble aim, however, shortsighted that aim can become. For another thing, scholars at two-year colleges also face, occasionally but discouragingly, considerable bias from three other groups: from some institutional colleagues who do only pedagogical research or no research at all, and who consequently feel that "pure scholarship" is a luxury item that contributes little to the mission of the institution; from some colleagues at four-year colleges and universities, who prejudge two-year college scholars as working under such time and research constraints, because of heavy teaching loads and scant library resources, that their work cannot be very good or very important; and from some grant funding agencies, which seem to exert very little effort to support two year college scholars or to understand the conditions under which these scholars must conduct their research.

Brian Gallagher is Professor of English at La Guardia Community College.

This widespread bias against scholarship at two-year colleges is not likely to disappear entirely. There are, however, any number of ways of overcoming this bias and, perhaps more importantly, of circumventing it. What follows is, it should be stressed, very much a personal list of suggestions toward this end. I use my own experiences and those of my colleagues at a two-year branch of the largest urban university in the country not because these experiences are unique, but rather because they are typical and indicative — at least for this type of two-year institution. In return for speaking rather much about myself and my college, I invite you to borrow, copy and adapt any and all strategies I mention here, for a two-year college scholar needs above all to be canny, and being canny in this regard is something best done collectively.

Obviously, the most important arena in which to work for recognition of and rewards for non-pedagogical research is at the two-year college itself. Before such research can be appreciated, it must be known. One of the best ways to create an awareness of such scholarly work is to publicize it through in-house publications, preferably those which appear on a regular basis. Four years ago at LaGuardia, after some significant urging by the faculty, the college instituted a tri-annual "Faculty/Staff News Notes", a publication, nicely done up by the college's printing office, listing all of the recent books, articles, conference papers, grants won, research projects, work for scholarly organizations etc. by faculty. Not only did this regular publication create a greater awareness of the faculty's considerable amount of scholarly work, but it also helped foster a sense of equality by listing pedagogical and non-pedagogical projects side by side, suggesting all were part of some large faculty research effort. Indeed, besides promoting faculty research within the college, this publication has played a larger role, for administrators have learned to utilize it, at the university level and beyond, to underscore the quality of the college faculty. In much the same spirit, it is always a good idea for faculty to publicize their books by having them prominently displayed at the college. Most librarians will be glad to arrange such a display; and, in fact, it may be possible to maintain a permanent or semi-permanent display case for all sorts of faculty publications.

Regular faculty forums on scholarly issues are another way of fostering a sense of the importance of non-pedagogical reading and research. At LaGuardia, for instance, we hold a number of "Critical Forums" each year, discussions meant to attract faculty — and even administrators — from across the disciplines. Some of our topics have been "The Works of Foucault," "New Methods in Film Scholarship," "Marxism and Literature" and "The Criticism of Bakhtin." Beyond serving as an ideological counterweight for the many teaching workshops which are regularly conducted on most two-year campuses, such scholarly meetings allow faculty to present the results of their research to their colleagues at the institution, not

just outside it at professional meetings. Typically, these meetings encourage lively scholarly interchange and inspire other faculty, most especially junior faculty, to do non-pedagogical research.

While publicizing faculty research helps make that work “count” at the institution, there are tangible academic moments when such work should not simply be noticed and praised, but also be rewarded. Most two-year colleges have provisions whereby faculty scholarship and research is taken into consideration in matters of tenure and promotion. Although I know of no two-year institution where such work is an absolute criterion for tenure or promotion — chiefly because research is deemed largely irrelevant in certain technical areas, like Accounting, Computer Science and Office Technology — certainly we as teacher/scholars can stress, both informally and formally (e.g., when serving on tenure and promotion committees), those significant scholarly accomplishments of our colleagues which should be a major factor in tenuring or promoting them. We can also suggest, obviously with tact, that others under consideration who have done little or no scholarship will need to have done important work in other areas to fill this void. On two-year campuses, it is important to keep emphasizing that scholarship is not something “extra” faculty members do, but rather one of their chief tasks.

For several reasons, it is often the case that the scholar at a two-year college is wise to do both pedagogical and non-pedagogical research. First, doing both kinds of scholarship emphasizes the connections, both methodological and literal, between them. It is often easier, as a result, to get backing for non-pedagogical research (e.g., that guarantee of a college contribution that is becoming a common feature of many grant applications) when administrators have seen the direct relevance of some of a faculty member’s previous research. Second, a number of grant programs — the NEH Summer Seminar Program for College Teachers is one clear example — combine research on a specific topic with more general study related to candidate’s teaching. Thus, one can make a more persuasive case for such fellowships when there are some pedagogical items on one’s resume along with non-pedagogical items. Third, it is in many ways easier — and, I think, quite rewarding — to do research in an area where one regularly teaches than strictly on scholarly subjects whose relation to the two-year college classroom is tangential. Most of my own research has been divided about equally among four areas: American literature, American culture, film and composition. Because about half the courses I teach are writing courses, I found it both natural and fairly easy to do this work on composition. In fact, I strongly suspect that I would have done very little, if any, more research in the other three areas if I had skipped this research in the composition area.

Those looking to find an appropriate classroom setting in which to introduce the results of non-pedagogical research some times need to look beyond the two-year college. For the accomplished scholar, it is not particularly difficult to get appointed as an adjunct to teach an upper-level undergraduate course or, better still, a graduate course in one's area of specialty at another institution. (Most two-year college administrators are delighted to support such "prestigious" appointments.) Like City University, many institutions have exchange programs which allow two-year faculty for a term, or more, to move to four-year colleges, where they can teach and do research more closely connected with their present scholarly interests. Longer term appointments are also possible. For example, the Graduate Center of City University, which draws its faculty from seventeen branch campuses, has appointed a number of LaGuardia faculty, to teach graduate courses and conduct research, both on a joint-appointment basis and an adjunct basis, appointments which the college administration strongly supports because they so clearly enhance the college's standing within the City University system. Similar possibilities for graduate appointments exist for faculty at two-year branches of other large universities, like Penn State.

Occasionally, it is possible to incorporate some non pedagogical research in pedagogical research projects. For example, several years ago I was asked by the central office of City University to write a research monograph reviewing twenty word processing programs for use in the composition classroom. Fortunately, I was able to convince a group of University Deans — yes, that is their official title — to double the length of the work, from 50,000 to 100,000 words, and, just as importantly, to double my released time for the project. In the extra 50,000 words, I presented, among other scholarly topics, the results of research on print technology and some extensive speculations on how computer technology is revising cultural notions of what constitutes "publishing" and a "text."

Often research done for a pedagogical project ends up being, by design or luck, useful in non-pedagogical areas. For instance, much of what I have learned about cognitive psychology and theories of perception in doing work on composition has found its way into my studies of film. And the nitty-gritty work of doing curriculum design in "Afro-American Literature" and shortly after in "Irish Literature" immediately made me see an almost uncanny relationship between the two areas and led to research which resulted in an article on the affinities between the Irish Renaissance of the 1900s and the Harlem Renaissance of the 1920s.

Of course, to do research one needs free time — and the two-year faculty member ordinarily has less of it because of a heavy teaching load. One good reason for becoming involved in released time college projects is that they often allow one to create a schedule better suited to doing research, even if one ends up doing as

much work as someone teaching full-time. Work done on a released time basis can often be shaped to fit neatly with a reduced teaching schedule, thereby freeing more days for research. (I take it as a given that a full day of work is the most useful research unit.) For instance, at LaGuardia three courses a quarter is usually the full-time teaching load, which means at least three and most often four days a week on campus. However, with a quarterly teaching load of one or even two courses, it is possible to arrange a two-day teaching schedule; and if one can schedule most of the work for which one is given released time into those two days and a third (admittedly making the days long, hard ones), it is possible to have two, and in a rare week even three, full weekdays free some weeks for research.

Many colleges, both two-year and four-year, make special scheduling allowances for junior faculty members who are completing doctoral dissertations. It can likewise be argued that senior faculty members doing research should have the right, if not to reduced or altered schedules, at least to whatever teaching schedule best suits their research needs. For instance, one of my colleagues some terms does all her teaching between 6PM on Friday evening and 5PM on Saturday afternoon — and she has completed two books (on eighteenth-century British literature) over the last three years as the result of being able to do so much research during the regular work week. Several years ago, when I designed an intensive one-week, 9–5 computer based version of our developmental writing course, to run during intersessions, I had a secondary purpose in mind to complement the primary one of taking advantage of the new technology and recent composition pedagogy to improve writing instruction: Namely that faculty teaching this intensive course would thereby reduce their course load by a third for the following term, leaving them sufficient time to do ongoing research for eleven weeks at the cost of sacrificing one week vacation. (Both students and faculty, incidentally, have signed up for this course in great numbers.)

Sometimes, though, when it comes to teaching, more can be less in the relation of teaching to research. While two-year faculty are often tempted to mitigate the effects of a heavy teaching obligation by teaching the same set of courses term after term, there are moments when it is ultimately wiser to take on the heavier teaching task. Let me give you one extended, telling example. For the past several years, some of my colleagues had warned me off teaching in the college's "Sabbatical Institute," which offers groups of interrelated courses to New York City teachers who have to satisfy a study requirement under their sabbatical contract. I was told these students (most of whom have Masters) are tough to teach (opinionated, set in their ways and unused to being students themselves), and that Institute classes, which run 4 to 5 1/2 hours once a week, demand enormous preparation. In addition, when I was given a chance to teach in the program, I was offered two of the department's few elective courses I had ever taught: "Literature of New York

City” and “The Immigrant Experience in American Literature.” Nonetheless, I agreed to teach these courses despite all the “extra” work — and my decision was sounder than I knew. Given this audience, which really needed only a valid intellectual challenge to break down its resistance, I was able to bring into the classroom all sorts of research on American literature I had done over the years, research that just did not fit into courses taught to our regular student population. Teaching these courses has also pointed me in new scholarly directions, forced me to look at certain research issues that otherwise might not have come to my attention. This spring quarter, under a new grouping of courses I helped create, I will be teaching two other courses that I have not taught for six years, “The Novel” and “Literature and Film.” Teaching each of these four courses probably takes almost twice as much time as teaching one of those composition courses I teach year after year, but the extra time they demand seems, *specifically in relation to research*, well worth it.

Useful as teaching certain courses can be as an encouragement for developing research topics, grants to support research directly are even more crucial. Often there are grant structures within larger educational contexts — i.e., at university and even state levels — that simply do not exist at the two-year college level. For instance, City University, under its CUNY/PSC program, awards hundreds of grants yearly to help support scholarly work by paying for travel, secretarial help, released time and other costs (up to \$7,000 a year, often renewable for a second and third year). These grants are awarded competitively, the scholarly merit of the project being the sole criterion, with a University-wide committee in each of forty areas doing the choosing. Since eight of its eighteen branches are two-year colleges, the University annually awards over a hundred of these fellowships to two-year college faculty. A number of state universities have similar programs whereby two-year faculty are pooled with four-year faculty, thereby circumventing the need to rely on scant two-year college funds for scholarly research, funds which almost always go to pedagogical research.

There are, of course, times when faculty need to be away from their institutions to conduct research — and it is no secret that scholars at two-year institutions sometimes have a much harder time getting large-scale fellowships and grants from outside sources than those at four-year institutions. Some years ago I applied to a well-known organization, which shall go nameless but not blameless, for a year-long fellowship for which I was eminently qualified — my qualifications being not so much a matter of any great achievements, but rather that my “profile” fit exactly the decidedly quirky specifications of the fellowship and that I had the support of a very well-known scholar, who had arranged for me to work in the outstanding archives of his institution. I did not get the fellowship (although, fortunately, I did get another fellowship that year, one for which, to be perfectly honest, I was less

ideally suited). One of the main reasons I did not get the fellowship became apparent to me when I read that year's list of awards in all the organization's programs: of over 500 awards, only one went to a two-year scholar. I have never applied to this organization again, not out of pique, but simply because I think the odds against a two-year college scholar are so long as to not make the race worth the candle. Clearly, one of the first things a two year college scholar needs to learn is to work with those organizations which historically have supported research by two year college faculty and avoid those that have not.

As opposed to this nameless organization, there are some which can be named with honor as supporting two-year college scholars. First and foremost among them, to my mind, is the National Endowment for the Humanities, which not only sets aside certain program elements (like some of its summer seminars) just for two-year college teachers, but which also actively encourages participation from two-year faculty in all its programs. Of course, there are also organizations, like the Community College Humanities Association, which offer outstanding research and study opportunities exclusively for two-year faculty.

With NEH and several other grant sources, working at a two year institution can sometimes be turned to advantage by the applicant. For instance, the applicant can stress with great conviction just how much the opportunity to do research at a major university, library or archive means in relation to the research resources normally available to him or her. It can, indeed, be argued that the fellowship is needed not simply to aid research but to make it possible in the first place (e.g., to allow use of a library at a major university). Particularly for fellowships where the applicant will be working in a seminar group, he or she can stress how a position as a two-year college scholar/teacher allows for representation of an important, often neglected constituency whose research will eventually reach a very significant student population. (E.g., by the year 2000, approximately half the United States college population will be found in two-year institutions.) Sometimes, the teaching situation at two-year institutions provides another advantage for fellowship applicant: e.g., a Shakespeare scholar at a large university would probably have a harder time convincing a committee that scholarly work in modern American literature would eventually come to pedagogical fruition than a similar scholar at a two-year college, where teaching schedules are known to be flexible, with many courses taught by non-specialists.

For all I have said and suggested, let me conclude by asserting that the lot of a researcher/scholar at a two-year college remains a hard one. In all my years at LaGuardia, I have never seen a faculty member get one of the much-preferred half year/full pay sabbaticals for any research project that was not pedagogically oriented. Nor do I believe there are many two-year institutions where non-peda-

gogical research will ever gain more than co-equality with pedagogical research and program development. Moreover, two-year college teachers will always have more teaching to get done than four-year college teachers before they can turn to their research.

Still, I believe that matters for scholars at two-year institutions have very much changed for the better over the last decade: They have been able to publish more and publish more easily; they have begun to take leadership roles in scholarly organizations; and they are finally getting some significant recognition as scholars at their home institutions and beyond them. No better instance of the changed mood at *LaGuardia* can be found than the fact that each year's promotion lists are now topped by several of our widely published scholars/teachers, whereas a decade ago such scholar/teachers were often looked on with suspicion and were lucky to make such lists at all. I can only assume this change has not taken place *in vacuo*, that many people at all levels of academia are beginning to realize the high quality and enormous value of the scholarly research done by two-year college faculty, research they feel they must increasingly recognize, support and reward.

THE MELLON FELLOWSHIPS OF THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES PROJECT AT THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

Louis W. Chicatelli

My presentation concerns a metropolitan New York success story, a unique cooperative educational venture involving community college faculty, City University of New York distinguished professors and CUNY doctoral students. It's called the Community College Project of the City University of New York. Established in 1980, this project has recently been granted a refunding of \$385,000 for the period of 1989-92 by its sponsor, the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation. By the end of the grant period in 1992, the project will have awarded fellowships to 223 community college faculty from 23 colleges in the metropolitan New York area. According to CUNY project director, Professor Jacob Stern, the program has been spectacularly effective from all points of view ("Humanities Project..."). As a former and perhaps future participant, I propose to describe this program with the hope that if you find it appropriate to your needs as community college instructors interested in opportunities to pursue scholarship, you may take steps to initiate a similar program in cooperation with a university near you.

Here's how the project works. Each semester, under the auspices of the Mellon grant, the CUNY Graduate Center, located in midtown Manhattan, announces a seminar on a selected academic topic and the availability of fourteen fellowships open to area two year college instructors. Recently announced seminars have included, for example, "Post Structuralism: Strategies for Reading Verbal and Visual Signs," conducted by CUNY philosophy professor Mary Wiseman; "The European Enlightenment: 18th Century Literature and Thought," led by Professor of Comparative Literature E. Allen McCormick; and "Literature and American Society," led by Professor of Humanities Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. Interested two year college faculty then apply to CUNY, submitting a curriculum vitae, a brief statement of intellectual background, and a prospectus related to specific interests subsumed within the announced general topic. Fourteen chosen fellows are then released from one half of their normal teaching load during the term of the fellowship, their dropped classes to be taught by CUNY doctoral students. At least once

Louis W. Chicatelli is Professor of English at Westchester Community College.

weekly, the two year college instructors travel into Manhattan to attend a seminar at the CUNY Graduate Center. Although the seminar director writes a syllabus, the content of the seminar is largely determined by the interests and experience of those taking part. And while the terms of the grant stipulate that individual projects should be related to teaching the humanities in two year colleges, a broad interpretation of those terms encourages fellows to renew themselves first as scholars, the premise being that pedagogical implications inhere in that experience.

One can readily see the advantages of this program from the point of view of the two year college instructor in English (or other Humanities courses), all too frequently beleaguered by semester after semester of over-enrolled composition and literature classes, campus committee work and student advising. Released from one half of teaching responsibilities and given the opportunity to be absent from campus one or even two days a week, the fellow enjoys a renewal of a collegiate experience probably better than that last enjoyed in graduate school. In 1985, I had the good fortune to participate in one of these seminars, and it proved to be one of the most enriching experiences of my career. My seminar was conducted by Professor of Comparative Literature Lillian Feder, author of *Ancient Myth and Modern Poetry*, and it was entitled "Myth, Psychoanalysis and Modern Literature" (incidentally, seminar titles tend to be grandiose and far reaching, no doubt to allow for a diversity of individual endeavors). Each week I joined my community college colleagues at the Graduate Center, most of whom taught English but some of whom were in disciplines such as psychology, anthropology and Spanish (invariably the seminars are cross disciplinary), where under Professor Feder's guidance we combined core studies in psychology and myth (Freud, Jung, Barthes and Levi-Strauss) with discussions of literary works by Euripides, Soyinka, Mann, Nietzsche, Eliot, Plath and Steves, to name a few. Fellows presented papers on Sexton, Lowell and Garcia Marquez, again to name a few. As far as I was concerned, much of the beauty of this experience lay in the freedom and luxury of exploring new terrain, and so, after reading selected poems by Allen Tate, I was led to study his essays on Southern Literature and his nearly forgotten novel, *The Fathers*. In the process I explored ideas inherent in a cultural context quite different from my own, as well as coming to realize (not from any Yankee prejudice I hope) why his novel is nearly forgotten: he was a far better poet.

I should mention other opportunities included in this Mellon grant experience. First, special colloquia are arranged, whereby distinguished scholars from outside the university address the fellows. Professor Eli Sagan addressed our group on "The Heroic Age: the Social Origin of Epic Poetry, Fairytale and the Theatre," and Professor Judith Van Herik spoke on "Freud and Feminism." Secondly, I was given the opportunity to audit a doctoral seminar on Herman Melville, led by Pro-

essor Alfred Kazin. Reading Melville with Kazin's students complemented my studies in the seminar on myth, and stimulated me to create a new course entitled "The Voyage in Literature," to teach at my home institution, Westchester Community College. In this course, my students and I explore the theme of the voyage as presented in selected literary works representing various cultural perspectives, using Homer's *The Odyssey* as the archetypal voyage poem. A main objective is to guide students to an awareness of the mythical quality of voyage literature, where literal voyages serve as "rites of passage" leading to psychological growth and self discovery.

The pedagogical harvest of these seminars remains with me today, as does the memory of Professor Feder's graceful expertise and the enthusiasm of my colleagues. It is not uncommon for lasting friendships to be formed in these groups, nor is it unusual for groups to continue to meet and share scholarly interests long after the seminar has ended. In this regard, the CUNY Graduate Center is especially accommodating: seminar graduates are given lifetime university library privileges, and the Graduate Center offers space for groups who continue to meet on their own. Through newsletters, former fellows are kept up to date on special events at CUNY, and they are invited to reapply for new seminars. In short, CUNY reflects the true spirit of a parent university, encouraging its fellows to develop an enduring intellectual bond.

I began by citing Project Director Jacob Stern's remark that the Community Colleges Project has been spectacularly effective from all points of view. I would like to close with some reference to the CUNY professors and doctoral students who are also beneficiaries. Professor Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., who recently led a seminar on American literature and society, commented: "Teaching community college fellows is an exchange among equals. Often the fellows may be more abreast of the most recent research and ideas than the professor. I have probably learned more from the fellows in these seminars than they have learned from me" ("Humanities Project..."). For CUNY doctoral students the project is invaluable, giving them the opportunity to intern at a community college under the mentorship of the released faculty. Do community college students suffer from inexperienced doctoral students replacing the regulars? I don't think so. Often they encounter a teacher with a new perspective. Susan Young, a CUNY doctoral student in English who has interned at three community colleges remarked: "Many of the students I came in contact with were technology oriented and very pragmatic. However, they became very receptive to more philosophical thinking as they came to see that it could permeate all areas of their lives" ("Humanities Project..."). In short, everyone benefits: university professors interact with colleagues, doctoral

students gain teaching experience and often jobs as adjuncts or full timers, and community college instructors engage in scholarship.

I see no reason why similar projects could not take place throughout the country: what is necessary is a centrally located host university surrounded by a constellation of community colleges. The difficulty lies in coordinating a project so grand in its scope. As a start, community college faculty representative of their institution might contact the grants or professional development officers of the university. Once the university is convinced of the efficacy of the project from its point of view, it could and probably should take the lead. Together, university and community college faculty and administrators could research opportunities for grants, focusing on foundations which promote education in the humanities and/or cross disciplinary projects — science or technology and the humanities, for example. A prospectus tailored to specific needs and benefits could then be written and sent to the selected foundations. Much time and effort is necessarily involved, but the rewards are significant, and interested faculty should be encouraged by the proven success of the CUNY–Mellon Community Colleges Project, which for the past eight years has fostered the integration and cooperation of university and community college scholars in New York.

REFERENCES

"Humanities Project Receives Refunding." Report of the Graduate School and University Center of the City University of New York. Volume 12, Number 6, May, 1988.

INSTITUTIONAL INCENTIVE FOR PROFESSIONAL PUBLICATION: COMMUNITY COLLEGE STAFF DEVELOPMENT

Keith Kroll

The question of released time is most often raised by community college faculty when they discuss their lack of involvement in both pedagogical and nonpedagogical research. Over twenty years ago, Roger Garrison, in *Junior College Faculty: Issues and Problems* (1967), wrote that "with unvarying insistence of a metronome's tick, faculty pinpointed their most pressing professional problem with one word: time" (30). More recently, studies by Arthur M. Cohen and Florence B. Brawer, *The Two-Year College Instructor Today* (1977) and Earl Seidman, *In the Words of the Faculty: Perspectives on Improving Teaching and Educational Quality in Community Colleges* (1985), have also found the lack of time for research as a central concern of community college faculty. Unfortunately, for many of us the possibility of gaining released time for research is unlikely.

Garrison, Cohen and Brawer, Seidman, and other authors, such as Leland L. Medsker in *The Junior College* (1960), and Edmund J. Gleazer in *This Is the Community College* (1968), all suggest that community college administrators should address the separation of teaching and research, because such a separation can lead to a faculty uninvolved in their profession, uninvolved with a life connected to the college, and ultimately ineffective in the classroom. In fact, after interviewing community college faculty, Seidman concluded that "the split between teaching and research is a false dichotomy that serves to undermine the intellectual fabric of the college" (280-81). Yet, none of the studies has ever offered much hope for community college instructors receiving more time in the form of reduced teaching loads and/or released time to conduct research. Gleazer, commenting on the difficulty in overcoming established philosophy, writes that "like an object moving in space, the community college will tend to persist in the direction first established" (124). Seidman addresses perhaps the most salient point in overcoming the time problem, money. He states that "teaching loads are not likely to be reduced for community college faculty in order to give them more time. This would

Keith Kroll is Professor of English at Kalamazoo Valley Community College.

require a significant shifting of funding among segments of higher education that would be heavily resisted" (272).

Even in the face of almost thirty years of such pronouncements, we must never give up seeking more time for research. Through groups like CCCC, CCHA, MLA, NCTE and Regional Conferences, and through documents like the NCTE Guidelines and the Wyoming Resolution, we must continue to educate our administrators, boards of trustees, districts, and state and national legislatures to the realities of community college teaching. We also must begin to address an idea that (to my surprise) rarely gets mentioned in discussions concerning community college teaching and research: incentives.

In an article published in *Community, Technical, and Junior College Journal*, George Vaughn, President of Piedmont Virginia Community College, writes that "the lack of rewards may be the real reason we do not place more emphasis on scholarship" (170). Vaughn is correct. We need incentives more than we need time. Therefore, those of us interested in scholarship must devise ways for creating incentives at our two-year colleges for rewarding scholarship, whether pedagogical, non-pedagogical, theoretical, or classroom-based research. One such way for rewarding research is described below.

Working within the staff development system at Kalamazoo Valley Community College (KVCC), I developed a means for receiving academic credit for my professional publications.

KVCC provides faculty members an opportunity to earn graduate semester hour credit through a variety of activities: graduate and undergraduate course work, routine and new work experience, industrial school courses, correspondence courses, technical seminars, and approved research. The work performed in these activities is equated to graduate semester hour credit, and after earning fifteen semester hours, a faculty member advances a column on the pay scale. These activities are typical methods for pay-scale advancement at many community colleges.

The "approved research" KVCC supports means a "Research report judged by a panel of peers to be of caliber and extent of typical masters thesis which will be regarded as the equivalent to three (3) graduate semester credit hours." It was under this rubric that I proposed receiving credit for my professional publications.

Equating graduate semester hour credit to published book reviews, articles, and books proved no easy task. I discussed my proposal with several colleagues — not all of whom agreed with my proposal — and worked closely with my Associate

Dean and Dean of Instruction to develop an equitable equivalency between publications and graduate hour credit. Ultimately, we decided upon the following equivalence:

- * Book review = 0.25 – 0.50 semester hour credits depending upon length.
- * Article = 1.0 – 3.0 semester hour credits depending upon length.
- * Book = 3.0 – 9.0 semester hour credits depending upon length. No vanity press publications.

Additionally, I included a select list (by no means exhaustive) of professional and popular journals in which I might publish; for example, *College Composition and Communication*, *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*, and *Western American Literature*.

Upon publication — I don't receive credit until then — an offprint is sent to my Associate Dean who reviews the piece and then forwards it to the Dean of Instruction who, based on the established equivalences, awards graduate credit. My publications now provide not only personal satisfaction, but also institutional recognition and (eventually) financial reward.

Research and publications do not necessarily have to lead to academic credit and to pay-scale advancement. For example, tenured instructors and instructors with PhDs may already be on the final pay column and thus will need to design an alternative proposal which will reward them for their scholarship.

Most importantly, each of us must begin to work within the staff development for scholarship. And each of us must continue working until successful.

REFERENCES

- Cohen, Arthur M. and Florence B. Brawer. *The Two-Year College Instructor Today*. New York, Praeger, 1977.
- Garrison, Roger H. *Junior College Faculty: Issues and Problems. A Preliminary National Appraisal*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1967.
- Gleazer, Edmund J. *This Is the Community College*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1986.
- Medsker, Leland L. *The Junior College: Progress and Prospect*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.
- Seidman, Earl. *In the Words of the Faculty: Perspectives on Improving Teaching and Educational Quality in Community Colleges*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1985.
- Vaughn, George B. "In Pursuit of Scholarship." *Community, Technical, and Junior College Journal*. February – March 1986: 12–16.

PART THREE

THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE SCHOLAR AT WORK

This is a new feature of *The Community College Humanities Review*, a section devoted to work within and across the disciplines by faculty at two-year colleges. The editor welcomes all submissions of this kind however specialized or however relevant to the curricular concerns of teachers of the humanities at the two-year college.

The Kansas State Board of Review: A Historical and Sociological Overview

Susan L. Sutton

Prior to 1921, only seven states had laws providing for censorship of motion pictures: PA, OH, FL, NY, MD, VA, and KS. After 1921, several of these states felt satisfied that the motion picture industry could govern itself, thus eliminating the need for state film censorship.¹ Kansas, however, was not so inclined. The general moral climate in Kansas during these early years might be characterized as straight laced and apprehensive. It was this apprehension that grew to uneasiness and suspicion concerning the new mass medium of film. The state, thinking that filmed material might threaten the moral fiber of its citizens, felt control was the only way to render movies "safe" for all Kansans, who were showing a growing interest in this new and strange medium. Censorship of films in Kansas lasted until April of 1966.

As early as 1913, the Kansas legislature enacted a law establishing a state film censor board which would review all films prior to their release for commercial exhibition within the state.² The review board would operate under the jurisdiction of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, who at the time was W. D. Ross. Ross selected Reverend Festus Foster and Mrs. Mary Simpson as members of the board. Two prime targets for this early board's scrutiny were scenes depicting violence and drinking. Western films were of special concern in regard to violence and drinking — ironic for a state built historically on excessive evidence of both.

During the next two years, films were reviewed at either the Best or the Orpheum theaters in Topeka, KS, at the exhibitor's expense. Later, in 1915, the board moved its operations to the State Capitol building, first to an upper chamber and later to the basement.³ It was decided at this time that a fee of \$2 be charged distributors for each reel of film viewed and licensed by the review board.⁴ (A reel was defined as 1000 feet of film.) These fees were to be paid monthly into the state treasury and were to be used to pay the salaries and expenses of the board members.⁵

Susan L. Sutton is Chair, Department of Speech and Theatre, Cloud County Community College, Concordia, Kansas.

The Superintendent of Public Instruction continued to hold jurisdiction over the prior censorship of films in the state from 1911 until 1917 when the law establishing the censor board was repealed. In its place the legislature established the Kansas State Board of Review to be comprised of three resident citizens who were "qualified by education and experience to act as censors."⁸ One member was appointed for a one year term, one for a two-year term and the third for a three-year term. Each year thereafter, one member was appointed (or reappointed) for a full term of three years.⁷

All members were chosen by the Governor who at the time of enactment was Arthur Capper, editor and publisher of the *Topeka Daily Capital*, who designated one of the three to act as chairman. The Governor could, at any time, remove anyone for reasons of incompetence or neglect of duty.⁸ No fewer than two members were to be present when a film was to be screened.⁹ After the enactment of 1917, and because growing fire hazards in the basement of the Capitol building deemed such, the Board of Review moved its agency to Kansas City, KS, in Wyandotte County, where they operated out of an office over a fire station.¹⁰

The Board of Review member chosen as chairman was to be responsible for all monies paid to the Board's distributors. The chairman was to receive an annual salary of \$2400, while the other members were to receive \$1900.¹¹ In the nearly fifty years of the Board's existence, this salary remained unchanged.¹²

As to specific duties, the statutes required the Board to examine, prior to granting a license, any film designed for commercial exhibition within the state. This included all subtitles, dialogue, songs, and advertising matter used in connection with such films, and to approve only those that were "moral and proper."¹³ If any film or type of advertising was found to be "cruel, obscene, indecent, or immoral," or tended to "corrupt or debase morals," a license was subsequently denied.¹⁴

After 1921, films described as strictly educational, scientific, charitable, or religious were often passed without charging a fee, or even being reviewed.¹⁵ To insure whether specified deletions had been made in films requiring them, a single, full time salaried inspector attempted to travel statewide to enforce Board decisions.¹⁶

The approval certificate that accompanied a licensed film would appear on the screen in the form of a slide or film display stating, "The management certifies that the film or reel displayed in this theater has first been approved by the Kansas State Board of Review." This notice had to be displayed for not less than thirty seconds prior to each performance.¹⁷

Anyone found commercially exhibiting an unlicensed film within the state of Kansas was guilty of a misdemeanor and was fined a maximum of twenty-five dollars

for the first offense and no less than one hundred, and no more than five hundred dollars, or imprisonment for thirty days for each successive offense. Each day an uncensored film was exhibited was to be considered a separate offense.¹⁸

The Board of Review was required to keep a record of all movies it inspected and to note whether the film was approved. If the Board denied approval, it was required to supply written justification for its action. Any distributor or exhibitor wishing to lodge an appeal against the ruling made by the Board had lawful redress in the District Court of Wyandotte County.¹⁹ Upon the distributor's or exhibitor's request, and within sixty days of the first screening, the Board rescreened the film in question and reevaluated its original decision.²⁰ This process usually took approximately one week. If the distributor was still not satisfied, he then threatened to lodge a legal suit against the Board of Review. This then resulted in a third screening at which time legal counsel for each side was usually present.²¹ Prior to the *Freedman* decision, which will be discussed later, several months or even a year might pass because of crowded court dockets before the matter could reach a legal settlement.²² It could be assumed, then, that the prospect of delay and expense gave the Board certain leverage over most distributors.

In addition to the brief standards outlined in the censorship statutes, the first members of the Board of Review adopted a list of seven general rules allowed under Statute 74--2208 to guide them in their work.²³ These general rules, according to all available information, were never revised throughout the nearly fifty year history of the Board. However, at least one Board member, Mr. Gebhart, in 1955 felt that "...all standards should be revised. They are obsolete. Some of the criteria are too vague."²⁴

1. Pictures shall be clean and wholesome, and all features that tend to debase morals or influence the mind to improper conduct should be eliminated.
2. Ridicule of any religious sect or peculiar characteristics of any race of people will not be approved.
3. Evil suggestion in the dress of comedy characters will be eliminated.
4. Loose conduct between men and women will be eliminated, and whenever possible, barroom scenes and social drinking.
5. A display of nude human figures will be eliminated.
6. Crimes and criminal methods, such as give instruction in crimes through suggestion, will be eliminated or abbreviated.

7. Prolonged and passionate love scenes, when suggestive of immorality will be eliminated.²⁵

The Kansas Supreme Court heard only a few cases relative to the powers of the Board of Review. Three occurred prior to 1920. The first of these concerned a petition submitted by film exhibitors objecting to the fees collected by the Board far exceeding the expenses and salaries paid out (*State vs. Ross*). It was found, however, that any discrepancy was not so great as to imply bad faith on the part of the legislature.²⁶

The remaining two early cases involved specific censorship decisions. In the first, the State Supreme Court laid down the rule that it would overturn a Board decision only when it could be shown that the censors had acted arbitrarily or fraudulently or had clearly overstepped their statutory limitations. The second case involved the D. W. Griffith film, *The Birth of a Nation*, which was passed by the Board. However, when *The Birth of a Nation* was released, the public outcry against it was so great because of the film's depiction of slavery and action of the Ku Klux Klan that the film was sent back for further review²⁷. The precedent was therefore established that the Board could recall a film within thirty days for further consideration, although it had previously been passed as acceptable (*State vs. Crawford*).²⁸

Since the early days, the Kansas Supreme Court was asked to review an order emanating from the Board of Review on only one occasion.²⁹ This became an important case involving the Otto Preminger film *The Moon is Blue* and is referred to later as the Holmby decision of 1955. In this case, the State Supreme Court overruled a lower court decision to the effect that the Board could not deny a license to *The Moon is Blue* because of "sex theme throughout, too frank dialogue: many sex words; both dialogue and action have sex as their theme." The Supreme Court of the United States later reversed this ruling. Although much speculation was made at the time and since, it was not clear what the highest Court's decision actually meant.³⁰ Was the Court attempting to eliminate licensing altogether? Were the standards used in the original censorship decision unconstitutionally vague? Was the film, because it had a sexual theme, automatically considered "obscene" or "immoral?"³¹ No one was quite certain.

In any event, obvious repercussions to the *Holmby Productions vs. Vaughn* decision manifested themselves in the 1955 Kansas legislative session. The Senate had passed a bill concerning the registration of non-resident motor vehicles. The House concurred, but not before it had attached an amendment to the proposal which abolished the Kansas State Board of Review and, for that matter, motion picture censorship.³² It seems logical to assume that the amendment came as a

reaction to the United States Supreme Court ruling in the *Holmby* case (which became the last movie censorship trial involving a higher court to take place in the state).³³ The Senate later approved the bill, and the Governor signed the measure. However, an ensuing lawsuit (*Shanahan vs. State of Kansas*) made the point that the new law was in violation of the Kansas Constitution which stated that no bill can contain more than one subject. A unanimous vote of the Kansas Supreme Court found this statute unconstitutional as it dealt with two clearly unrelated legislative areas.³⁴

Despite the fact that the Kansas State Statutes were amended to eliminate newsreels and educational films from review, the Board became embroiled in a political rather than a moral controversy in 1937 as the result of its decision to eliminate footage from a *March of Time* of Montana Senator Burton K. Wheeler, presenting views opposing those of President Franklin Roosevelt. According to the Raymond Fielding, *March of Time* met censor's demands and cut the "objectionable" sequence. However, *March of Time* filmmaker Louis de Rochement was quick to object to the ruling, inferring the film had been denied freedom of speech.³⁵

Fielding goes on to state that Senator Wheeler made less subtle accusations against the Governor of Kansas allowing such forms of censorship. Former Republican Governor, Alf Landon, even entered the dispute, calling for the current Democratic Governor, Walter A. Huxman, to correct the Board's "foolish act." The *Kansas City Star* editorially queried: "Can Kansas afford to have its political discussion thus arbitrarily restricted and appear before the nation as a state in which speech is free on the screen?"

Governor-appointed Board chairman Mac Clausen, herself a Democrat, claimed the cuts were made because Wheeler's remarks were thought to be "partisan and biased." Clausen defended the action, emphasizing that the Board's decision had been bipartisan as the other two members were Republican, and had been unanimous.³⁶ It should be noted that there was nothing in the statutes to support censorship of political ideas. Therefore, the ruling was unconstitutional, although no challenge was made.

A nationwide reaction to the decision began to brew. To diminish this potentially dangerous controversy in traditionally Republican Kansas, Governor Huxman recommended the Board reverse its decision, and on April 21, 1937, it was done, thus restoring the cut footage to the *March of Time*.³⁷

Over the years, censors in Kansas were opposed to *all* drinking scenes in films whether the scenes condoned drinking or condemned it. For example, in 1945, several sequences were eliminated from the Oscar-winning film *The Lost Week-*

end, even though the film clearly depicted the evils associated with alcoholism. In 1957, however, censor Board members in Kansas professed themselves to be more liberal than their predecessors. At any rate, Kansas was to suppress twelve films that year, more than the other three operating state censor boards (Maryland, Virginia, and New York) combined.³⁸

During the early 1960s, Kansas censors rejected any films depicting nudity.³⁹ Or, as with the 1962 film *Boccaccio 70*, the Board objected to “the extreme bobbling of nearly bare breasts of the billboard girl (Anita Ekberg) as she runs.”⁴⁰ This order was later rescinded when the distributor threatened to take the issue to court.⁴¹ As several reports have it, the Board would overturn their earlier rulings after receiving a letter from a distributor’s legal counsel threatening court action.⁴²

During this same period, “profanity and indelicate words” such as “god damn,” “whore,” and “bitch,” were sure to meet with Board objections. In fact, the word “whore” was removed entirely from the 1962 adaptation of Eugene O’Neill’s *Long Day’s Journey into Night*.⁴³ According to one source, the Kansas Board was strictest of all four state boards in its objections to particular words or phrases. During this same time period, however, the Board seemed rather indifferent toward films depicting drug addiction or the treatment of race or race relations.⁴⁴

Recalling once again the seven-point list of criteria used in the censors’ judging of a film, one may easily recognize most as being vague and confining:

1. What are “clean and wholesome” pictures?
2. What is “loose conduct between men and women”?
3. What does the phrase “evil suggestion in the dress of comedy characters” refer to?
4. When do love scenes begin to suggest immorality?
5. When does disagreement with stated religious practices become ridicule?

If the above were being rigidly applied to Kansas in 1965, there would have been few films ever commercially exhibited in the State.⁴⁵ It must then be assumed that the guidelines were interpreted liberally. Even so, their range was cloudy and subject to the interpretations of the individual censor. There is no clear or concrete information available today in regard to how rigidly Kansas censors adhered to the exact statutes or the “list” in the 1950s and 1960s. Several attempts were made by one censorship historian to make contact with Board members and even the State Attorney General in this regard, but all his attempts were met with rebuff.⁴⁶ Ac-

According to several scholars, “the ‘Kansas’ brand of prior restraint is exceedingly harsh,” and “...the strictest of all in regulating movies.”⁴⁷ Members of censorship boards in both Maryland and Virginia in 1965 concurred that “...censorship in Kansas is more confining than that found in any other state”;⁴⁸ or as Mrs. Lollie Whitehead, Virginia censor, stated in 1965, “Kansas is the strictest of American boards.”⁴⁹

As a direct result of the *Freedman vs. Maryland* Supreme Court decision of 1965, four state censorship boards operating in Maryland, Virginia, New York, and Kansas soon dismantled their bureaus. Procedural deficiencies were found as the main reason for discontinuance in all four states as a result of the *Freedman* case which dealt in part with matters of censorship and licensing procedure. In Kansas, the Board of Review was declared to be without the power to amend its own rules to meet procedural arrangements on authority of the *Freedman* ruling and thus was not reformed by the state legislature.⁵⁰

Less than two years after the Board of Review was legally discontinued, the Motion Picture Association of America’s code went into effect (November 1, 1968), providing a rating system that would classify any film regardless of its theme or treatment, but would subject it to one of four ratings.⁵¹ As for Kansas, this system, although no doubt criticized by conservatives who felt the rating system insufficient, and liberals who felt the rating system inaccurate, offered the citizens of Kansas for the first time since 1913, the freedom to judge for themselves the content of filmed material.

The question remains as to how the Board of Review in Kansas was able to succeed at suppressing communication through the film media for nearly fifty years. Further, what elements were present within the Board itself over its five decades to establish it as being the strictest and harshest of all state censor boards?

One can generally assume that the strictness associated with Board decisions could be traced directly to those individuals chosen to serve as censors. They were political appointments, and given that the nature of politics in Kansas has been primarily Republican and conservative, one would gather that the Board of Review reflected itself similarly in its decision making.

Attacks on movie censors of both a popular and scholarly nature cite “...lack of aesthetic sensibility” as one of the main reason why censors failed badly in performing their duties. Others felt that members’ own psychological traumas gave rise to their own morbid interest in seeking out objectionable material and keeping it out of the sight of the masses. One modern critic states that “...common experience is sufficient to show that their [the censors’] drives, emotions, and im-

pulses all tend to carry them to excess.”⁵² Some censors, doubtlessly driven by their own fear, assumed that the masses were ill-equipped to make up their own minds on issues depicted in films.

The skill and the training of censors present a more concrete area of criticism. In Kansas, no set of standards or qualifications existed for the selection of censors either in law or in practice. Although the Kansas statutes call for a censor to be qualified in “experience and education,” in reality this meant that the person had some political connection with the party in power.⁵³ It did not seem to matter that the individual knew little or nothing of art, drama, literature, psychology, philosophy, music or other related fields, or had any sensibilities in these areas. In fact, no specific education requirements were called for. Censor prospects were not tested on their knowledge of films or any of the fields related to movie censorship.⁵⁴ Furthermore, the qualification of the censors, either before appointment or after, were never made public.⁵⁵

In view of the numerous individuals who served as censors in Kansas, a study of their backgrounds allows several similarities to emerge regarding sex, age, and occupation. Of the relatively few men serving on the Board over its five decades, of the occupations that can be traced, over half were ministers. Of the women, most were found to be housewives and mothers, and most were in their middle to late forties.⁵⁶ Very few of the women, those whose records are available, were college graduates but many were “active in civic affairs,” to which they attributed their qualifications.⁵⁷

Kansas censors may have been better qualified had their position been made to appear more attractive, thus creating some healthy competition for the duties assigned. After all, an office located over a fire station may not present the most positive working environment. Further, full-time salaries of \$2,400 for a Board chairman and \$2,100 for members were not inviting, to say the least.

It can be generally conjectured that few censors in Kansas had any aesthetic appreciation, particularly in being aware of how film artists can and did communicate their ideas and, more importantly, they lacked a degree of sophistication when considering the role of censorship and the law in a democratic society.

Most libertarians feel that no censor is a good censor. From the standpoint of free speech, absolutists would agree that there should be no control placed on any medium of communication. Kansans' freedoms, although constitutionally given, have often been controlled by the state, as with the issue of prior censorship. Kansas citizens, however, after having their attention focused on the matter of film censorship once the *Freedman* case caused such nationwide notoriety, finally realized

that prior censorship was the wrong method for protecting people from real or imagined dangers. Censorship proved as ineffective in operation as it was unfriendly and unnecessary in actuality. The American people have been fundamentally and unchangeably opposed to censorship in any form, and censorship of films proved no exception.

NOTES

- ¹ *Selected Articles on Censorship of the Theater and Moving Pictures*, ed. Library of Performing Arts, New York, 1971, p. 200.
- ² Ira H. Craiger, *Movies, Censorship and the Law* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1966), p. 176.
- ³ Mrs. Bidwell, quoting from "Clipping File: Board of Review," Kansas Historical Society Library, telephone conversation, 11/23/81.
- ⁴ *General Statutes of Kansas: 1959*, 51-103.
- ⁵ Carmen, p. 178.
- ⁶ *Kansas Statutes Annotated: Official*, Vol. 5, Art. 22, 74-2201.
- ⁷ *Ibid.*
- ⁸ L. 1917. Ch. 308; March 31, 74-2201.
- ⁹ Richard S. Randall, *Censorship of the Movies: The Social and Political Control of a Mass Medium* (Madison: Wisconsin University Press, 1968), p. 82.
- ¹⁰ Randall, p. 125.
- ¹¹ 74-2205.
- ¹² Randall, Table II, 1965, p. 125.
- ¹³ 51-103.
- ¹⁴ *Ibid.*
- ¹⁵ Randall, p. 82.
- ¹⁶ Randall, p. 86.
- ¹⁷ 51-104.
- ¹⁸ 51-111.
- ¹⁹ 51-107.
- ²⁰ *Ibid.*
- ²¹ Randall, p. 84.
- ²² Randall, p. 85.

- ²³ Carmen, p. 178.
- ²⁴ Carmen, p. 282.
- ²⁵ Carmen, p. 282.
- ²⁶ Carmen, p. 178.
- ²⁷ Birdwell, quoting from the "Clipping File," 11/23/81.
- ²⁸ 51-109.
- ²⁹ Carmen, p. 180.
- ³⁰ *Ibid.*
- ³¹ *Ibid.*
- ³² *Ibid.*
- ³³ Randall, p. 115.
- ³⁴ Carmen, p. 181.
- ³⁵ Raymond Fielding, *The March of Time, 1935-1951* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1978), p. 173.
- ³⁶ Fielding, p. 174.
- ³⁷ *Ibid.*
- ³⁸ Carmen, pp. 182-83.
- ³⁹ Randall, p. 95.
- ⁴⁰ Randall, p. 97.
- ⁴¹ *Ibid.*
- ⁴² Randall, pp. 113-114.
- ⁴³ Randall, pp. 98-99.
- ⁴⁴ Randall, pp. 101 and 103.
- ⁴⁵ Carmen, p. 183.
- ⁴⁶ Carmen, p. 182.
- ⁴⁷ Carmen, p. 230.
- ⁴⁸ Carmen, p. 183.
- ⁴⁹ Carmen, p. 292.
- ⁵⁰ "Motion Picture Censorship Board: Repeal," *Kansas in Law and Statutes* (Kansas State Historical Society, Topeka, Kansas, 1966), p. 704.
- ⁵¹ Cobbett Steinberg, *Reel Facts: The Movie Book of Records* (New York: Vintage Books, 1976), p. 476.

⁶² Randall, p. 131.

⁶³ Randall, p. 132.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*

⁶⁵ Birdwell, quoting from "Clipping File."

⁶⁶ Information obtained through past Topeka City Directories and Board of Review "Maintenance Lists," Kansas State Historical Society, Topeka, Kansas.

⁶⁷ Randall, p.133.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Carmen, Ira Ha. *Movies, Censorship and the Law*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1966.
- "Clipping File," Kansas Board of Review, via. Mrs. Birdwell, Historical Museum Library.
- Fielding, Raymond. *The March of Time, 1935-1951*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1978.
- General Statutes of Kansas: 1959*.
- Kansas Statutes Annotated: Official. Volume 5*.
- "Maintenance List," Kansas State Board of Review. Kansas State Historical Society. 1917-1965.
- "Motion Picture Censorship Board: Repeal." *Kansas in Law and Statutes*, Kansas State Historical Society Library, Topeka, Kansas, 1966.
- Randall, Richard S. *Censorship of the Movies: The Social and Political Control of A Mass Medium*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1968.
- Selected Articles on Censorship of the Theater and Moving Pictures*. ed. Library of Performing Arts, New York, 1971.
- Steinberg, Cobbett. *Reel Facts: The Movie Book of Records*. New York: Vintage Books, 1976.
- Topeka City Directories*. Kansas State Historical Society, Topeka, Kansas.

An Agrarian Nightmare: Thomas Sutpen's Assault on the South

Jo Ellen Winters

Like much of the nation, Faulkner's South in the 1930s was a society in turmoil, stirred particularly by the desperate struggles of sharecroppers, tenant farmers, and millworkers. Dehumanizing conditions in the textile mills frequently resulted in sporadic labor revolts, fiercely opposed by the Southern population at large; more and more Southern farmers rented all the land they tilled; debts and taxes and tariffs defeated landowners at home before they could look to the correction of widespread inadequate and overcrowded housing populations. The traditional paternalistic relationship of employer and employee had been replaced by absentee landlordism in both agriculture and Northern run industry. What W. J. Cash termed the "spirit of calculation" was sweeping the turbulent region.¹

And there was still the burden of history, a humiliation which continued to confront a resentful and often unreceptive South with sorrowful and complex lessons about responsibility, community, and tradition. As Southerners ached for recovery, their unresolved conflicts over the past contended with a nearly desperate eagerness for the future; the new South passionately welcomed industrialization and the dream it offered of employment, steady income, and (more or less) equal opportunity, as the region passed into what has been called the "mold of Babbitt."²

In contrast to the unrest and instability of the thirties, the plantation South Faulkner wrote of in *Absalom, Absalom!* appeared a settled world of families and family obligations, of traditions, shared communal values and religious beliefs, and concrete personal relationships. This world believed, along with Thomas Jefferson, that those who labor in the earth are the chosen people, able to live in harmony with each other and with the laws of nature. Only Reconstruction brought an end to this idealized harmony; the arrival of industrialization

Jo Ellen Winters is Senior Associate Professor of English at Bucks County Community College, PA. This paper is the result of her work in the 1988 NEH Summer Seminar, "The Art and Politics of the Depression," directed by Peter Conn at the University of Pennsylvania.

“abrupted” a new set of values onto the old: the self made man, reaching his goals himself, alone, independent of community and tradition, at any cost. This industrial age man made calculations, followed an arbitrary schedule, and depended, not on land, which is tangible, but on money, an abstraction; all his relationships, at work and in the community, were based on this abstraction, and as a result he became alienated from his community and its history, and, finally, from his own humanity.

Although Thomas Sutpen’s death in the novel *Absalom, Absalom!* occurred in 1869, I believe the creation of this “demonic” Southern character, as Faulkner labeled him, reflects Faulkner’s concerns about the problems he associated with industrialization in the South in the decade of the book’s publication. Specifically, Sutpen’s refusal to learn from the past, his determination to simplify and distort history, and his assault on the wilderness, family life, and tradition may be viewed as Faulkner’s representation of the northern industrial assault on the South in the 1930s. When Cleanth Brooks called Sutpen “a Yankee,”³ he of course didn’t mean this literally, but we must now look closely at the possibilities for interpretation opened up to us by this label.

Unlike the aristocratic plantation owners whom he seems at first to emulate, Sutpen is not paternalistic towards anyone, certainly not his slaves; neither is he class conscious, responsible, or honorable in his behavior. We do not see in him the traditional Southern concerns for decorum, taste, or preservation of the past. Sutpen’s desire to dominate his world and to determine his future, his utter faith in rationality, abstractions, and material possessions, his exploitation of both nature and human beings, and above all his actual repudiation of the past *do* locate him in the Yankee camp. Thomas Sutpen works by blueprint and schedule. He has no trouble accepting cash or the promise of cash as the basis for human relations, for example imagining himself “just” when he pays his first wife, Eulalia Bon, to keep out of his life. He thinks of the damage he has done to his and others’ lives as a “mistake,” a “miscalculation.” He is neither religious nor superstitious; he is a man who would live by rationality and calculation, choosing, discarding and “putting aside” all in defiance of tradition and history and human connections.

Sutpen is not a Yankee, of course, but he represents many of the dangers to Southern civilization which a Northern inspired faith in progress had unleashed on the vulnerable region by the novel’s publication in 1936. The “Yankee” traits of Thomas Sutpen, the nature and effect of his so-called Design, and the language employed by Faulkner to describe the man and his plan constitute Faulkner’s distrustful response to the disruptive and potentially destructive impact of escalating northern industrialism on an eagerly receptive South.

Faulkner had company in his distrust. In 1930, twelve prominent Southern writers had published a response to what they identified as the Agrarian/Industrial conflict in a collection of essays titled *I'll Take My Stand: The South and the Agrarian Tradition*.⁴ Though Faulkner was not an Agrarian, he did share many of their concerns. They believed the North posed a real threat to the stability, honor, and decorum of the South. And while industrialization waged war on nature, the Agrarians urged living in harmony with it. The twelve Southerners asserted that agrarian work reinforced traditional codes of value and behavior, thus satisfying both material and moral needs, but that industrial work, estranged from nature, led to alienation, dislocation, and the collapse of moral sensibility. Many Southerners had worked hard at what has been called "inheriting their inheritance,"⁵ creating a heroic myth of the South on which to fall back in times of need; northerners had invested their hopes in a secular, man made, machine maintained world of the future which could not begin to preserve religious values or humane attitudes. The myth which the old South promulgated and which the Agrarians vaguely seconded was that of a plantation world of Edenic leisure, highly cultivated, disdainful of all progress. In this idealized humane and sensitive Southern world, labor was measured by human fulfillment and respect, not the accumulation of wealth.⁶ The strained tempo created by industrial labor, its employment insecurity, degrading tasks, and resultant empty and exhausted leisure, would surely kill art, religion, and civilized behavior, according to the Agrarians. If people lived only by abstractions such as "progress," they separated themselves forever from their land, their tradition, their sensibilities.

Faulkner said in an interview, "Maybe in 80 years we'll be as highly industrialized [as the North] and we'll quit turning out art."⁷ Characters like Homer Barron, Jason Compson, and Thomas Sutpen remind us that Faulkner shared many fears and suspicions with the Agrarians, although he nowhere proposes that the solution to industrialization is a retreat to an agrarian way of life, nor does he suggest as they do that revivifying the South's past by repudiating the present will somehow stave off alien values and forces. Along with the Agrarians, Faulkner criticizes predatory capitalism, the desire for progress for its own sake, and the kind of individuality that flies in the face of community, all embodied in Thomas Sutpen, but not because these qualities "violate a mythical tradition of harmony and stability based on a doomed white supremacy"⁸ — this is the objection to capitalism expressed in *I'll Take My Stand*; rather, Faulkner fears the way these traits in combination overlook the complexity of history and the humanity of those who people that history. Faulkner is not an Agrarian, but the value he places on leisure and the civilized arts developed at leisure may be seen again and again in his work, and this emphasis, along with his reverence for the land, decorum, taste, responsibility,

stability, and community, shows how strongly his concerns paralleled those of the Agrarians.

Thomas Sutpen would do anything — *does* do anything — to earn respectability. With his blueprints, schedules, time tables, and designs, he is the supremely rational, even “demonic” planner, dismissing anything even faintly suggesting human emotions or attachments, including his frontier past, and a son from his Haitian past, if it threatens to impede his progress. Sutpen’s design emphasizes home and family, no doubt, and “incidentally” a wife, but all *is* incidental to his design for respectability and its timetable. On a personal level, Sutpen appears to have no family life at all. All his dreams and his relationships seem abstractions, which he pursues with “furious impatience.”⁹ He dismisses the past, focusing all his energies on the future. Walking out on his primary family once the slave who turns him away from the Tidewater plantation’s front door forces him to see himself and his family as cattle, mere brutes, he never looks back. His humiliation by the Tidewater slave prompts him to dominate and oppress others in his rage to succeed.

Sutpen “puts aside” his first family dynasty once he discovers that abundant material wealth will not buy him the respect and immortality he wants. He calculates what he needs to succeed, while rejecting any kind of moral responsibility for the people he hurts while pursuing that success. In his next attempt, Sutpen wrenches Sutpen’s Hundred violently out of the earth, contrary to the agrarian ideal of man living in harmony with the land.¹⁰

Addicted to the trappings of respectability, willing to do anything to achieve it, what *did* Sutpen, an outsider, understand about Southern aristocracy? The other plantation owners came to watch him wrestle with his slaves, but none of them would ever have transgressed in this way. Further, the planters lived a kind of noblesse oblige; they were a paternalistic lot who accepted responsibility for their own mistakes and for others’ as well. In contrast, Sutpen rejects his Haitian son, never acknowledges his daughter Clytie’s presence in the house, and doesn’t concede he owes Eulalia Bon anything: he “...bought immunity from her.”¹¹ When the war ends he refuses to join with anyone on the reconstruction of the land, asserting that each should look to his own property and work it alone. Sutpen embraces what looks to him like an aristocratic ideology, but the result is what Warren Beck calls a “degenerative imitation” of the cult of the nostalgic South and its heritage,¹² with no understanding of any of it, especially the Southern past, which Sutpen needs if he is to ever comprehend the Southern present.¹³

Rosa Coldfield reveals that Sutpen has “gotten” Ellen “at the lowest possible price.”¹⁴ Throughout the novel, Faulkner uses language of bookkeeping and finance to reflect not only the rigidity of Sutpen’s thought processes and actions, but

also Faulkner's own unease with this interloper come to live among the vulnerable and venerable (if guilty) aristocrats. This is a man who, once he holds the "patent" on a "stainless wife" and an "unimpeachable father in law,"¹⁵ begins to call in his wife's "notes of hand on pride and contentment and peace."¹⁶ He drinks "with a sort of sparing calculation as though keeping mentally... a sort of spiritual solvency..."¹⁷ He measures and weighs even his dreams;¹⁸ he measures and balances "the ingredients of morality."¹⁹ His god, if he acknowledges a power higher than himself at all, is designated by Faulkner "the Creditor,"²⁰ a fitting deity for this embodiment of capitalism. Sutpen is converted at the Virginia plantation door to a competitor who will get "land and niggers and a fine house to combat *them* with,"²¹ one who puts aside his first wife because she is not "adjunctive or incremental to the design."²² He explains to Grandfather Compson that "fact rendered it impossible that this woman and child (Fulalia and Charles Bon) be incorporated in [his] design," that this would have left him behind in his "schedule," and that he has provided for them in order to "repair...injustice," this being "agreed to between the two parties."²³ He chooses his female slaves, as well as his second wife, Ellen, and his prospective third wife, Rosa, like livestock;²⁴ he rids himself of his last potential family, Milly Jones and their female child, in the same calculating spirit. And when the whole design comes apart so violently, he does not look to his dubious code of morality or even to his fate for the cause, but calls it simply a mistake.

Sutpen is a man so committed to a commercial way of seeing and acting that he seems at times incapable of thinking or feeling; he can only calculate. He returns from a terrible and bitter war through which he has dragged two imported marble tombstones intended to glorify a family plot, determined to start over again, interested only in restoring his own land, counseling others to do the same.

In his haste to start his design still a third time, he opens a store, where he trades to live, still alert to new possibilities for siring an heir. His proposition to Rosa—marriage if she can bear him a son—is just that: a business proposition, spoken from the depths of a calculating soul, one which knows nothing of women, still less of Southern women, nor cares to learn. Finally, tragically, even his children learn to perceive life the way he has revealed it to them. When Quentin brings Rosa to the old house forty one years after Sutpen's death, they are met by an aged Clytie, who begs Quentin to take Rosa away without disturbing Sutpen's fugitive son, Henry: "Whatever he done, [she says,] me and Judith and him have *paid it out*."²⁵ Their father was a man driven by what C. Vann Woodward has called a "freakishly romantic turn of Northern fancy," desirous of somehow "enshrining" the old South,²⁶ and, I would add, making it his own.

Mr. Coldfield, Sutpen's father-in-law, may see God as a "just and omnipotent banker"; he may imagine self denial is "good investment";²⁷ but he is, finally, capable of taking a moral stand on an issue, and examining his own motives in an action. And he is wise in the ways of Southern history. He is a Southerner. This makes him very different from Thomas Sutpen, who lives by rational and systematic calculation in emulation of a system he neither understands nor wants to understand, who brings no past to a world he obsessively embraces with only its idealized myths and legends as guides. He comes as an outsider, interested in appearances only; he wants to buy Coldfield's respectability for himself. He violently creates a world towards which he feels no responsibility or guilt, and finally, no deep human connections at all. Like everyone intimately connected with Sutpen's Hundred, Sutpen is alienated, dislocated, and estranged from self and from nature, exactly as the Agrarians had warned. His abstract design does violence to the souls and the lives of all it touches; it disrupts the world of the South, its myths *and* its reality, by riding roughshod over it. Sutpen commits errors, not sins, and, in the end, he is part of the destruction he sows without ever gaining any knowledge or insight, still viewing the South from the point of view of an outsider who just wanted what he thought everyone else already had. Unconcerned with the meaning of the past to the very end, his obsessions lie wholly with the present, and, if he can just sire an acceptable offspring, with the future. The alien Sutpen dies morally blind, thinking he has made a practical mistake, a miscalculation.

Lack of feeling for the land, for history, for the human community— these are flaws which Faulkner and the Agrarians variously attributed to Northern capitalism in the 1930s. Sutpen is the predatory outsider, who rapes the land, ignores its history, and with no understanding of their meaning at all, seizes its myths and, with a grimly rational and calculated plan, tries to make them his myths. Is he a Yankee? He isn't, but he does represent all the progressive Yankee qualities Faulkner and the Agrarians most feared, the qualities with which industrialization threatened to destroy the Southern way of life. Men like Thomas Sutpen were enough to make the Agrarians retreat to the past, and to make Faulkner fear for the future.

NOTES

¹ W.J. Cash, *The Mind of the South* (NY: Vintage, 1960), p. 273.

² *Ibid.*

³ *Cleanth Brooks*, William Faulkner: The Yoknapatawpha Country (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963), p. 306.

⁴ Donald Davidson et al., *I'll Take My Stand: The South and the Agrarian Tradition* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1977). Other contributors included John Crowe Ransom, Allen Tate, and Robert Penn Warren.

- ⁶ George Core, "The Dominion of the Fugitives and Agrarians," in *The American South: Portrait of a Culture*, ed. Louis D. Rubin (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1980), p. 104.
- ⁷ Richard Pells, *Radical Visions and American Dreams: Culture and Thought in the Depression Years* (NY: Harper and Row, 1973), p. 104.
- ⁸ William Faulkner, interview by M.A., 5 April 1939, in *New Orleans Item*, repr. in *Lion in the Garden: Interviews with William Faulkner, 1926-1962* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1980), p. 35.
- ⁹ Francis Garvin Davenport, *The Myth of Southern History: Historical Consciousness in Twentieth Century Southern Literature* (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1970), p. 103.
- ¹⁰ William Faulkner, *Absalom, Absalom!* (New York: Modern Library, 1936), p. 34.
- ¹¹ John Pilkington, in *The Heart of Yoknapatawpha* (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 1981), compares Sutpen to a robber baron, employing bribery of public officials, cutthroat business tactics, and inhumane treatment of the working classes (p. 187).
- ¹² Faulkner, p. 264.
- ¹³ Warren Beck, "Faulkner and the South," *Antioch Review* 1 (1941): 85.
- ¹⁴ Sutpen finds it difficult to relate even his own life history to Grandfather Compson, because the past, his own historical past, has so little meaning for him. He can only recount his life in the third person, as a story, and he has trouble with the chronology.
- ¹⁵ Faulkner, p. 166.
- ¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 51.
- ¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 18.
- ¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 40.
- ¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 53.
- ²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 263.
- ²¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 178-9.
- ²² *Ibid.*, p. 238.
- ²³ *Ibid.*, p. 240.
- ²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 264.
- ²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 61.
- ²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 370; emphasis mine.
- ²⁷ C. Vann Woodward, *Origins of the New South, 1877-1913* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1951), p. 165.
- ²⁸ Brooks, p. 177.

Clifford Odets on the Individual and Society

Miriam Q. Cheikin

As recently as last year, John O'Connor of the *New York Times*, in a review of a new TV version of Clifford Odets' play *The Big Knife*, said that Odets' "work has become distressingly perhaps even fatally dead." The view here is that Clifford Odets burst onto Broadway in 1935 with three plays that seem to follow the proletarian line that the capitalist system was responsible for the economic depression and the hopelessness of its victims. Clifford Odets continues to be criticized as being a dated proletarian writer; but later in his career, when he appeared to be leaving proletarian ideas behind, he was also accused of betraying the revolution. Others felt that he had betrayed his talent by becoming a writer of propaganda. More recently some justify their admiration of Odets by claiming that his plays should be read allegorically. A close reading of Odets' work, however, reveals that he was neither a writer of propaganda nor a writer of allegories, but a poetic realist whose prime interest was in the freedom of individuals to find their own way.

Although Odets was briefly a member of the American Communist Party, the idea of each person having to follow the same vision, the same line of belief, was inimical to his view of life. From Odets' first play to his last, he applauded those who asserted their individuality, who, despite forces which pushed them to conformity, pushed their way clear.

My assessment of Clifford Odets comes from a careful examination of the texts, of course, but also from my mother's memories of the Clifford Odets she knew as a young woman in her late teens. Clifford Odets had always been a household word, at least in my household, not because he was a famous playwright, but because my mother had known him when she arrived in America as an immigrant from Cuba. Every time he has mentioned on the radio, or when his name appeared in the columns of newspapers and on the pages of the theater reviews, my mother would say, "I knew Clifford Odets." As a child, I was impressed because she was. Even as an adult, I connected his name more with my mother than with the theater and literature.

Miriam Q. Cheikin is Assistant Professor of English at Nassau Community College and Director of the college's annual interdisciplinary conferences. This essay is the result of her work in the 1988 NEH Summer Seminar on "The Art and Politics of the Depression" directed by Peter Conn at the University of Pennsylvania.

Born in the same year he was, 1906, my mother met him in New York City, the Bronx to be exact. He was her cousin Herman's best friend, and he and Herman, in love with the theater, were called "bums" by their families because they refused any jobs not connected with the theater. When their families refused to feed them, they wandered into my grandmother's house where they knew they could beg a meal. My grandmother was one of those fabled women who could cook soup from stones and Clifford and Herman ate with relish and appreciation. "They were nice boys," my grandmother would say and my mother would nod in smiling agreement. So when I think of Clifford Odets I think of a handsome young man who was strangely appealing and impressive, a basically gentle and sensitive person determined to make the theater his life despite a family who was equally as determined to stop him.

Even the Odets' play synonymous with proletarian theater, *Waiting for Lefty*, cannot be confined to such a description. It was the first hit of the Group Theater, often mistakenly perceived as a left wing group. Actually, while there were some communists among its members, the Group Theater was made up of theater people in revolt against the star system and against the slickness of Broadway. In *Waiting for Lefty*, a play about a taxi strike, the blame is focused on the individual, not the political and economic system. The corrupt union leaders are to blame; the owners are to blame. If the end of *Waiting for Lefty* is optimistic, it is not because a strike will lead to better economic conditions, but because individual men have decided to shake their destinies loose from the control of the company and from the crooked union bosses.

The success of *Waiting for Lefty* was in the family vignettes. Joe's wife bitterly accuses her husband of failure, not the system: "You're a four star bust!" The anger is personal, not political. The audience's response to the episode of the young hack and his girl is essentially to their personal feelings. Sid says, "You and me - we never even had a room to sit in somewhere." *Waiting for Lefty* works today not because of its famous call at the end to "strike," but because the characters still live, still suffer, and because its tone, unlike the proletarian plays, avoids a monotonous stridency.

In *Awake and Sing*, also produced in 1935, the young hero is determined to find his happiness by ignoring his family's expectations. He shouts, "I wanna make up my own mind about things." His sister Hennie also escapes to follow her dream of freedom. Brooks Atkinson recognized that *Awake and Sing* dealt with "Jewish life in the Bronx," not with the coming proletarian revolution. In fact, my mother's stories of her cousin Pauline, Herman's sister, makes it likely that Pauline was the basis for Hennie's character and situation in the play. Pauline was the head of the household where Herman and his other sisters lived. As an older, married sister,

Pauline was in charge. Like Hennie in the play, she was lively and much admired, but also as in the play, she was married to a weak though kindly man. In the play, the audience knows that Hennie's child is really the product of a former love affair. In reality, Pauline's husband was often teased that their child could not have been his. My mother claims that there was no basis for such an assertion, except that Pauline had been in love with someone exciting previous to her marriage and this story had become a family romance. Odets knew this story.

In *Paradise Lost*, Odets' favorite play, written and produced the same year, 1935, we are shown a middle class family in steady decline, financially and spiritually. However, the capitalist system is not the essential cause. Ben, an Olympic runner who "sang inside when [he] ran," can no longer run because of a heart condition. He dies because his dream has died. His sister Pearl's dream of being an artist is certainly cut off when her piano is sold, but, in fact, she killed her dream earlier when she turned away her lover because he could not find work. The family business, in another example, fails because one of the partners has been stealing, not only because of "hard times" caused by the capitalist system.

The slow death of Julie, a bank employee involved in the stock market in the play, does not only represent the slow and sure death of capitalism, as some critics claim. Julie's mysterious illness that chips away at his life, was the 'sleeping sickness' of Herman's sister Anna. My mother often told the story of Anna's illness, how she combed Anna's hair for long hour to make her more comfortable. I remember the story of Anna's illness because of its affect on my mother. When she talked of her dying cousin her eyes narrowed on the past, her voice became tired and strained. Surely Clifford, a constant visitor in Herman's house, who saw the same deterioration, was also moved and troubled by the death of a young and lovely woman. The power of the portrait of Julie in *Paradise Lost* comes from the vision of a dying Anna, a constant image in my mother's life and in Clifford Odets' memories as well.

Many years before my interest developed in Clifford Odets as a playwright, I saw a PBS version of *Paradise Lost*. The single set for the play, a dining room in a New York apartment, was one I somehow knew. Rushing back into my mind came stories of the dining room of my mother's cousin Herman's apartment where Clifford often visited, as his house, my mother recalls, was unwelcoming. She visited Odets' house with her cousin Herman a number of times and remembers Mrs. Odets as a rather somber person with misery spelled out in every gesture and word. The dining room that is the center of the set and the life of the characters in *Paradise Lost* is not modeled after the Odets' apartment but my mother's cousin Herman's.

My mother recalls an apartment where the door was always open, where if no one was home you made yourself a cup of coffee and waited for someone to show up, and eventually someone did; it did not matter if it was not one of the family. The dining room table would fill and the conversation become animated just as in the play. Clifford, Herman, and the other cousins were called “intellectuals” by my mother, whose skill in English was too limited to follow the ideas, but the excitement, the sparkle, kept her at that table.

When my mother entered Herman’s apartment, she headed for the piano and pounded out whatever came to mind. Herman and the other cousins teased her, demanding that she “stop making that noise,” but Clifford would come up behind her, pat her on the shoulder and say, “Don’t listen to them, Bertha, play.” Music was always central to Odets’ life, and it was both a tribute to my mother’s skill and to his kindness that he took her side against her lively cousins who were having fun.

Odets’ most successful play, *Golden Boy*, was produced in 1937. Joe Bonaparte, a young and promising violinist gives up his dream for fame and fortune as a boxer. On the surface, at least, Joe is portrayed as corrupted by the system. His distraught father, a simple man, claims that anything true to your nature is not foolish. A friend gives “baseball” as an example to prove the father wrong, but Mr. Bonaparte claims that even baseball is not foolish if it is what you like to do. Surely this conflict between Joe and his father echoes the multitude of family fights between my mother’s cousin Herman and his sisters; and between Clifford and his mother and father, all of whom considered the theater as frivolous and certainly not work for a seriously ambitious person. Here, however, the father and son had reversed roles, with the father begging his son not to give up his dream. What Odets could not do in life, he did in his play.

In this same play, *Golden Boy*, another son, Frank, is a union organizer. One critic claims that Frank shows his boxer brother, Joe, the right direction in that he works for the union, but that is not so. Frank appears only briefly in the play, but what is clear is that the value of his work is in its relationship to him, not in the nature of the work itself. He explains why he has chosen such work: “The pleasure of acting as you think! The satisfaction of staying where you belong, being what you are.” As Mr. Bonaparte states, even baseball is OK if it’s what you want. Being true to your own nature is Odets’ first mandate.

This mandate appears again and again in Odets’ remaining works. In *Rocket to the Moon* only one character emerges victorious claiming, “I tell them I want to be a dancer — everybody laughs...everybody forgets to dream.” When another character claims that she is just like him, she denies it vehemently saying, “I’m like myself.” In *Night Music*, a young couple is adrift for both economic and personal rea-

sons. The young woman says, "I draw the line when they [her family] insist I must live the same life they live." Evidently in 1938 and 1940, after so much acclaim and recognition, Odets is still fighting a battle with his family about his right to be what he must be — a playwright — a battle that often put him and his friend Herman on my grandmother's doorstep hoping for a meal. The spokesperson for Odets in *Night Music* says, "I'm a partisan of the pursuit of life, liberty and happiness...life is not a half way business."

In *Clash by Night* (1941) one character cries out, "If we have a dream we live it! If we have a hope we chase it!" The only positive character in the play is described as "know[ing] his address — who he is and what he is." His assertion is that you cannot wait for Paradise to be delivered in the form of a political solution. "Tricky Otto comes along with a forelock and a mustache. Then he tells them why they're blue. 'You've been wronged,' he says, 'They done you dirt. Now come along with me. Take orders, park your brains, don't think, don't worry' poppa tucks you in at night!" This satiric reference to communist ideology makes it clear that such programmed thinking was alien to Odets' nature.

In Odets' 1950 *Country Girl* when an actor of extraordinary power becomes a drunk, his wife supports him emotionally, understanding that he needs people to believe in him if there is any hope for the future. However, her dream is of a life alone, without being the emotional support of a weak man. Odets gives the audience the conventional "happy" ending in *Country Girl* with the husband back on the right road and the wife unselfishly at his side, but we are left feeling that the wife, without her dream, has only an empty, unending road before her.

Odets' last play, his best according to Brooks Atkinson, *The Flowering Peach* (1954), confirms Odets' belief that the assertion of self is the only source of happiness. It is a recounting of the story of Noah and the ark. Noah's mandate from God comes as a vision in a dream. His family does not believe in his vision, nor do his neighbors, who are understandably angry at his vision of himself as appointed by God, but his belief in his vision gives him the strength to carry it out. Surely if there were ever a moment for a writer to make a social and economic statement, the advent of life anew on the earth presents such an opportunity. Instead, Odets shows Noah's three sons and daughters-in-law as three distinct couples, parting after their safe landing in the ark, each making their own way in the world. They will part, they will not see each other again, and the implication is that this is good. Each will do their own thing with Noah's approval and encouragement, and Noah is, after all, God's spokesman.

When Odets' plays are viewed chronologically, he appears to move further and further away from his beginnings in the Bronx. To return to the TV version of *The*

Big Knife which I mentioned earlier, when I saw this play, which takes place in Hollywood, I was sure that most of the remnants of Odets' past would be gone. I was wrong; he insists in this play that when people "sell out" their dreams they die, but there was another remnant of distant times. To my surprise, one of the couples in the play is named "Blis," my mother's maiden name, the name that Clifford Odets knew her by. My mother was pleased that she had been remembered. And Odets also remembered his dream from that early time in the Bronx. For him, as his plays demonstrate, "revolution" was not social or economic, but personal, a freeing of individuals to pursue their own brand of happiness.

WOMEN AND THE HUMANITIES: A RESOURCE BOOK FOR CURRICULUM INTEGRATION

Phyllis Mael

The following excerpt is from a resource book that also includes course outlines, study questions, and a bibliography of texts that discuss the theory and practice of curriculum integration. The resource book is the result of a questionnaire sent to humanities teachers at California community colleges in fall 1988 to learn how they integrate material on and/or by women into humanities courses. Over 250 faculty from more than 70 colleges responded to the questionnaire and provided materials. Because the resource book is designed not only to provide materials but also to facilitate communication among faculty, each annotation is followed by the name and institution of the contributor.

ART HISTORY

Collins, Georgia and Renee Sandell, *Women, Art, and Education*. Reston, VA National Art Association, 1984.

Collins and Sandell write concisely and assertively about the symptoms of sexism and the need for sex equity in art and art education. They review the herstory and heritage of women's contributions to art and art education and explore alternate approaches to sex equity. Most importantly, they present strategies for applying these ideas in the classroom. *Women, Art, and Education* is a must for teachers of students at all levels. [Heather Anderson, Ph.D., Lecturer, Fresno City College]

Nochlin, Linda and Ann Sutherland Harris. *Women Artists: 1550-1950*. New York: Alfred Knopf, 1977.

Phyllis Mael is Professor of English at Pasadena City College. Preparation of the resource book of which this an excerpt was supported in part by grants from the Community College Humanities Association and the California Community College Fund for Instructional Improvement. For copies of the complete handbook, write to the CCHA National Office.

This extremely valuable reference book remains an essential tool for the generation of research on women artists. It is, at once, a catalogue of a most pivotal travelling exhibition in 1977 and, historically, the first broadly available, scholarly treatment of the lives and works of women artists in Europe and America. After a general chronology is outlined in an excellent 54 page introduction, each of 84 artists is treated individually in depth. These biographical sketches and formal analyses are accompanied by black and white illustrations. Thirty-two are featured in color plates of good quality. The text is amply footnoted with specific and general bibliographies. [Jo Reed, Instructor, Art History, Palomar Community College]

Parker, Rozsika and Griselda Pollock. *Old Mistresses: Women, Art, and Ideology.* New York: Pantheon Books, 1982.

Parker and Pollock state that their book is "not a history of women artists, but an analysis of relations between women, art and ideology." They emphasize that "to see women's history only as a progressive struggle against great odds is to fall into the trap of unwittingly reasserting the established male standards as the appropriate norm." Their book examines the very structures of art history -- how it defined what is and what is not art, to whom it accords the status of artist, and what that status means. [Diane Calder, Instructor, Pierce College]

NOVELS

Allen, Paula Gunn. *The Woman Who Owned the Shadows.* San Francisco: Spinstar/Aunt Lute, 1983.

This is a book about the search for identity and its meaning told from a perspective unfamiliar to mainstream America. Allen's novel interweaves American Indian folk mythology, twentieth century reservation life, contemporary psychology, and liberal politics. A worthwhile yet challenging book, *The Woman Who Owned the Shadows* is most likely to appeal to readers fascinated with identity, philosophy, and the shocking contrast between America's cruelty and kindness. [Martha Kendall, Instructor of English, San Jose City College]

Hurston, Zora Neale. *Their Eyes Were Watching God.* Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1978.

Alice Walker has said of this novel: "There is no book more important to me than this one." Emanating from the Harlem Renaissance of the 1930s, *Their Eyes Were Watching God* is a vital foremother of many contemporary novels which use Afro-

American folk culture as a stylistic means of expression. Hurston's adeptness with language reveals the central figure, a black woman named Janie, travelling on an ultimately fulfilling quest for self-identity. Told richly through the speech and lives of Southern blacks in the thirties, the story also illuminates a tale of self-knowledge for all women. [Anita Smith Paradowski, Instructor, English Department, Grossmont College]

Kingston, Maxine Hong. *The Woman Warrior*. New York: Random House, 1977.

The Woman Warrior is an autobiography of a girlhood from the point of view of a Chinese-American girl growing up in Stockton, California. Kingston weaves Chinese myths and attitudes into the story of her struggle to reconcile her Chinese mother's influence with her individualistic American schooling. This book is richly imaginative and poetic and deals with family relationships, biculturalism, feminism, and adolescence, all of which lend themselves to lively class discussion and rewarding paper assignments. [Ann Rothschild, Instructor, Cosumnes River College]

Russ, Joanna. *The Female Man*. Bantam Books, 1975.

Russ's third novel is a structurally innovative, openly polemical feminist work about the intertwined lives of four women — or are they four versions of the same woman? A good introduction to Russ's work, the novel probes the role of women in the world today and through extrapolation to the future or alternate versions of our presents, considers the spectrum of female potential. By turns funny and angry, bitter and lyrical, the novel is thought-provoking and entertaining. [Sheila Finch, Associate Professor of English, El Camino College].

DRAMA

Fornes, Maria Irene, *Fefu and Her Friends*, in *Wordplays 1*, Performing Arts Journal Publications, New York.

In a dazzling display of originality, Fornes' play is about an emotional reunion of eight friends, all women. The play is written in alternative style, but instead of letting the audience passively observe, in the second part, the audience walks around from scene to scene. Fornes' ingenious departure from traditional boundaries of theater makes this play valuable in terms of teaching both dramatic conventions (non linear structure) and subject matter (e.g., depiction of female bonding). [Laura Shamas, Adjunct Faculty, Santa Monica College].

ANTHOLOGIES

Hunt, Douglas. *The Riverside Anthology of Literature.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1988.

This general literature anthology seems to contain more works by women than many others currently available. Not surprisingly, it includes "canonical" authors such as Edith Wharton and Doris Lessing, but it also has works by authors rarely found in anthologies, particularly works by women of color such as Zora Neale Hurston, Toni Cade Bambara, and Leslie Marmon Silko. The poetry section offers several poems by each author represented (included are Gwendolyn Brooks and Lucille Clifton), and the drama section includes two plays by women (Tina Howe's *Painting Churches* and Beth Henley's *Crimes of the Heart*). Hunt's anthology can be used by any teacher seeking to balance an "Introduction to Literature" class for gender and race. [Phyllis Mael, Professor, Department of English, Pasadena City College]

Fisher, Dexter, ed. *The Third Woman: Minority Women Writers of the United States.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1980.

Fisher's book brings to light minority women writers who, for the most part, have been ignored. On the surface, this book is a collection of writings (essays, short stories, folktales, and poetry) by American Indian, Black, Chicana, and Asian American women. At a closer look, however, the anthology reveals the strong cultural and narrative traditions that underlie each group's literary and linguistic reality. More than a collection of writings, the book seeks to explore the creative forces which brought about the literature in the first place. [Deborah Charlie, Language Arts, Antelope Valley College]

BIOGRAPHY

Rose, Phyllis. *Parallel Lives: Victorian Marriages.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1984.

Using available biographical materials, Rose examines the relationships of five prominent Victorian couples: Jane Welsh and Thomas Carlyle, Effie Gray and John Ruskin, Harriet Taylor and John Stuart Mill, Catherine Hogarth and Charles Dickens, and Marian Evans/George Eliot and George Lewes. The historical background of the problems they faced clearly points up the status of English women in the mid-nineteenth century when they were, if married, literally

legal nonentities. Pre-divorce England fostered monumental incompatibilities for men and women, affording little for women in terms of equality of opportunity in education and employment. These readings clarify the reasons women began their long struggle to attain economic independence and social justice. [Peggy Burkhardt, Professor of English, Los Angeles Harbor College]

HISTORY

Banner, Lois W. *Elizabeth Cady Stanton: A Radical for Women's Rights.* Library of American Biography. Ed. Oscar Handlin. Boston: Little, Brown, and Co., 1980.

Cady Stanton's life, as presented here, is virtually an index to the reform movements of the nineteenth century in all their diversity of programs and personalities, their confusions and their conflicts. But, it is the personal and private sources of Cady Stanton's public career that interest Banner most. It is a person, not a monument, she wants us to see: the troubled childhood, a stressful marriage, a growing sense of outrage at massive sexual injustice, and — endlessly — the vexations of inferior status which was feminism's lot even within the community of reform. Throughout, Ms. Banner has shown us an intensely human Elizabeth Cady Stanton. [Loren Smith, Professor of History, San Bernardino Valley College]

Bridenthal, Renate, et al., eds. *Becoming Invisible: Women in European History.* Houghton Mifflin, 1987.

Becoming Invisible is the most comprehensive textbook of its kind published to date. The twenty essays in the collection span the period from preliterate times to the 1980s. According to the Preface, the focus lies in "an analysis of the social construction of gender over time and across cultures," (p. vi) making the text an indispensable companion piece for Western Civilization texts. The "Notes" and "Suggestions for Further Reading" sections at the end of the chapters provide a solid bibliography for enabling students and teachers in their research pursuits. [Susan Marie Meyer, Instructor, Fullerton College]

Cantarella, Eva. *Pandora's Daughters.* Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987.

Cantarella has written the first history of women in ancient Greece and Rome from a legal perspective. She has examined legal evidence on laws pertaining to marriage and divorce, sexual behavior, and inheritance. In addition, she has demonstrated how juridical sources can and cannot be used to find out how men in the ancient world thought about women. She has also employed the use of myth, rit-

ual and literature to find out if women were as subjugated as the laws implied. [Margaret Moody, Professor of History, Glendale Community College]

Evans, Sara. *Personal Politics: The Root of Women's Liberation in the Civil Rights Movement and the New Left.* New York: Vintage Books, 1980.

Sara Evans' study shows how many of the women's movement activists of the 1970s were schooled in the civil rights and anti-establishment movements of the 1960s. The lessons they learned were both painful and liberating. They adopted and helped to mold the critical political analysis of these movements, and the anger today felt after being assigned roles as coffee servers and sexual diversions by their male comrades is palpable still in the comments of Evans' many respondents. Evans' book is based on interviews with activists and on a variety of printed sources, both traditional and untraditional. Her writing style is uneven, sometimes lively and sometimes rather colorless. The tone of the book is one of advocacy, but the author's conclusions generally are supported by solid scholarship. [Charles Zappia, Associate Professor, San Diego Mesa College]

Fernea, Elizabeth Warnock. *Guests of the Sheik: An Ethnography of an Iraqi Village.* Garden City: Doubleday Anchor, 1965.

This very personal narrative is told by a young American wife who lives with her husband-anthropologist in a traditional Iraqi village. Her experiences with the local women and their customs demonstrate graphically to the student the different perceptions of the two cultures. It is extremely well written and conveys to the student a first hand account of what it is like to live in a small middle eastern village. [Arlene Wolinski, Professor, Mesa College].

Murray, Pauli. *Proud Shoes: The Story of an American Family.* New York: Harper and Row, 1984.

Proud Shoes traces the experiences of a black family in Pennsylvania and North Carolina in the nineteenth century. Pauli Murray writes of her childhood in the home of her free black grandfather who fought for the Union in the Civil War and of her white slaveholder great grandfather of North Carolina. This is history and biography, not just a personal memoir. [Laura L. Davis, Professor of History, Pasadena City College]

Kikumura, Akemi. *Through Harsh Winters.* Novato, CA: Chandler and Sharp, 1981.

Kikumura's telling of the story of her parents' experience in the United States is not only an emotional and touching learning experience, but it also adds some much-needed literature to the history of women in America. While she focuses on her mother's struggle to survive as the wife of an addictive gambler and mother of eight children, her book gives the reader insights into the greater struggle of Asians in this country. [Frank D. Fletcher, Professor of History, Gavilan Community College]

FILM

Life and Times of Rosie the Riveter, Directed by Connie Fields, color, 65 minutes.

Using interviews, songs, and advertising clips, this movie assesses the work of Black and White women in the heavy industries during the labor shortage of WW II. The Women describe their preliminary hesitation to use acetylene torches, rivets, and the like, but how they eventually got to enjoy their jobs. The women also discuss their frustration at being pushed out and laid off when the soldier came home. The film examines the differences in the treatment of Black and White workers as well. [Susie Ling, Instructor, History, Pasadena City College]

HUMANITIES

Collis, Louise, *Memoirs of a Medieval Woman: The Life and Times of Margery Kempe.* New York: Harper and Row, 1964.

A semi-autobiographical account of an illiterate and "eccentric" woman which focuses on her late fourteenth-early fifteenth century journey to salvation. Although contemporary events were not important to Kempe, Collis offers historical references which are sometimes biased and possibly far-fetched but nevertheless add support to the story of the physical and spiritual life of one medieval woman as she travels between England and Jerusalem. [Sandra L. Burns, Assistant Professor, Humanities, Palomar Community College]

Eisler, Riane. *The Chalice and the Blade: Our History, Our Future.* San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1987.

Eisler argues for a "shift from a system leading to chronic wars, social injustice, and ecological imbalance to one of peace, social justice, and ecological balance." In response to the inevitable questions: "Is this realistically possible?" and "What changes in social structure would make such a transformation possible?" Eisler draws on "evidence from art, archaeology, religion, social science, history and many other fields of inquiry" in support of a "cultural transformation theory" based on "two basic models of society" — a dominator ("ranking") model and a partnership ("making") model. Evidence strongly suggests that our prehistory is a history of partnership and that we have been on a 5000 year dominator "detour" that "now seems to be reaching its logical limits." Eisler calls for effective intervention "in our own cultural evolution" toward securing a "new era...a partnership world." [Mary Hope Whitehead Lee, Associate Professor, San Diego Mesa College]

PHILOSOPHY

Beauvoir, Simone de. *The Second Sex.* New York: Vintage Books, 1974.

It is especially difficult to find Introduction to Philosophy texts that integrate material on and/or by women. One way to remedy this is to have students read all, or at least part, of de Beauvoir's seminal work (the Introduction and Conclusion can stand alone). This provides an effective way of confronting a tradition that has systematically denied women a voice. [Dr. Max O. Hallman, Professor of Humanities, Merced College].

RELIGION

Christ, Carol and Judith Plaskow, eds. *Womanspirit Rising: A Feminist Reader in Religion.* New York: Harper and Row, 1979.

A collection of essays by women celebrating female spirituality through an exploration of the relationships of religion to women's experience, through a quest for a usable past (telling herstory) and through both a reconstruction of tradition and a creation of new traditions involving sisterhood and an affirmation of women. [Roger Smith, Professor of Philosophy, Crafton Hills College].

Reuther, Rosemary and Rosemary Keller, eds. *Women and Religion in America, Vol. 1, The Nineteenth Century*. Harper and Row, 1982.

A collection of primary documents from 19th century American sources, in which women reflect on their religious heritage in the form of letters, journals, and articles. The readings are grouped by religious community or movement, each section is headed by an excellent introduction for beginning students to the historical value of the writings and the context that makes them important. This book serves as an excellent guide to women's studies in relation to the writing of history as well as to religious studies. [Carol Haywood, Ph.D., Instructor in Sociology, Evergreen Valley College].



Board of Directors
Community College Humanities Association

David A. Berry
Essex County College
Chair

Board Members

Janice Allen
Seminole Community College
President, Southern Division

Rhonda Kekke
Kirkwood Community College
President, Central Division

Kathy Fedorko
Middlesex County College
President, Eastern Division

Constance Carroll
Saddleback
College

Arthur M. Cohen
University of California
at Los Angeles

Judith Eaton
American Council of Education

Patricia Grignon
Saddleback College
President, Pacific-Western Division

Paul Benson
Mountain View College
President, Southwestern Division

Executive Director

William R. Askins
Community College of
Philadelphia



COMMUNITY COLLEGE HUMANITIES ASSOCIATION

of Community College of Philadelphia
1700 Spring Garden Street
Philadelphia, PA 19130

NON-PROFIT ORG.
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
PERMIT No. 2190
PHILADELPHIA, PA

ERIC Clearinghouse for
Junior Colleges

MAY 17 1990