Perhaps the first question readers will ask about Aegis is “What does it mean?”

The word “aegis” is Latin for “shield” but may be more specifically associated with Greek mythology as it refers to the shield carried by Zeus, god of thunder. Made from the hide of the goat Amaltheia, the shield came to represent not only a practical tool of protection but also a godly power. “As the Greeks prided themselves greatly on the rich and splendid ornaments of their shields, they supposed the aegis to be adorned in a style corresponding to the might and majesty of the father of the gods.”1 Myths have even suggested that the shield was worn by both the god Apollo and the goddess Athena, adding to the prestige of the shield throughout tales of mythology.2

Much like the myths and literary representations of Zeus’ shield, Otterbein’s journal, Aegis, seeks to transport readers into a deeper study of literature and humanities through the fields of history, philosophy, language, linguistics, literature, archeology, jurisprudence, ethics, comparative religion, and the history, theory, and criticism of the arts (in accordance with the National Endowment for the Humanities’ (NEH) definition). Every year, Aegis includes a collection of undergraduate scholarly book reviews, essays, and interviews prepared and edited by Otterbein students. Since its first edition in 2004, the journal has come a long way and has showcased the exemplary work that Otterbein students continue to produce. Aegis is a journal designed to catalyze a deeper critical appreciation of the humanities at Otterbein University and is published once every spring semester. It strives to advance the presence and values of the humanities on campus and beyond. An editorial board comprised of Otterbein students is responsible for selecting books, writing, and publishing book reviews as well as revising any essay submissions to the journal and determining their suitability for Aegis.

The 2019 Editorial Board and its editors hope that readers will approach each piece in the journal with curiosity and wonder, just as they may have approached the Latin term “aegis” with such curiosity. Aegis is committed to nonsexist language and to wording free of hostile overtones. The Editorial Board, essay authors, and Otterbein faculty have worked hard to create a journal that showcases the humanities in a unique way. Please enjoy.

**Submissions:** Essay submissions should be 8-25 double-spaced pages. Use 12-point Times New Roman font with standard one-inch margins, and please number all pages. Use either the MLA Manual Style or The Chicago Manual of Style for citations. Specific submission deadlines will be sent out to all Otterbein students in the early spring semester. Submissions are also accepted on a rolling basis. Submissions must be accompanied by an email or cover sheet noting the author’s name and title of the essay. Electronic submissions are preferred. Please send any submissions to aegis@otterbein.edu.

Aegis is always looking for student volunteers to serve on the Editorial Board. To volunteer, submit an essay for review, or to ask questions, please send an email to aegis@otterbein.edu.

**Endnotes**
2 Ibid.
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As this year’s editors, we are pleased to present the campus community with the 2019 edition of *Aegis: Otterbein Humanities Journal*.

The essays that have been selected for this year’s edition of *Aegis* exemplify the talent and commitment to academics that are continuously exhibited by students at Otterbein University. The topics covered examine issues in theatre, American political history and culture, gender studies related to advertising, literary analysis, and more. All of the essays in the journal meet the standards of rigorous research in the humanities, but more importantly, they are engaging pieces that work to address a variety of complex issues.

In “Sex, Youth, and the Pill: *Look* Magazine During the Sexual Revolution” by Hannah Schneider and “Gender and Sex in 1920’s America and the Return to ‘Normalcy’” by Raven Manygoats, both authors use magazine advertisements – usually directed towards women – to discuss different periods of rapidly changing opinions about sex, also directly focused on women. In “To Keep or Not to Keep: Theatrical Ephemera” by Lindsay Lisanti, the author defines the merit of physical objects related to the theatre, like pamphlets, programs, and posters as paramount to the cultural moment despite their seemingly inherent uselessness after the fact. The essays published in this edition are representative of the fine work being done by students in the humanities at Otterbein.

Also included in this edition of *Aegis* is a selection of book reviews written by the Editorial Board that reflect their intellectual interests and speak to their respective disciplines. The books reviewed include *Marbles*, a graphic novel about author Ellen Forney’s journey to being medicated for her Bipolar I Disorder and accepting that it can help her without hindering her creativity. *Blonde Roots* spins a world of black supremacy where white people are enslaved; *American Nations* proposes that there is much more that divides the United States, culturally speaking, than brings us together, and outlines the actual different regions of North America. *The Road to Jonestown* breaks down the story of the infamous priest Jim Jones and how he was able to not only establish a religious following, but convince all of his followers to take their own lives. These and other fiction and nonfiction titles are discussed in the following pages.

*Aegis* is proud to belong to a strong scholarly community of students and faculty within the humanities at Otterbein University. The reviews, essays and interviews included within *Aegis* speak to Otterbein’s commitment to that community. We hope that our readers find engaging, stimulating, and thought-provoking work throughout this year’s edition.
Throughout history we as theatre participants and theatre makers have been obsessed with trying to preserve the past. Ephemera is a physical memento or token that represents a temporary or ephemeral event, like a performance of a play. “At the most basic level, the Oxford English Dictionary defines *ephemera* as: “lasting only for a day” and “one who or something which has a transitory existence” (Davis 3). The typical types of theatrical ephemera that are prevalent are the playbill, or handbill, broadside, and theatrical poster or advertisement. All of these aforementioned pieces have become a tradition and highly expected for playhouses to provide for the viewer to receive or buy. An issue has arisen in the modern day about the correct way to organize, present, and preserve theatrical ephemera that has been collected throughout history; they are not created to last. A scholar, Kristy Davis, has stated that “ephemera was the transient paper material that was never intended to be kept” (Davis 3). A playbill or a broadside has the purpose of providing the audience member with the information about the production that they seek in that one-time moment before they view the performance. Since collectors and historians of today strive to hold onto theatrical ephemera, then why do many audience members discard their playbills after performances? Why do some feel the need to keep these pieces of history that weren’t created with the intention to last? The sorting, preserving, and collecting of theatrical ephemera is paramount for the historian because the ephemera give a cultural snapshot of the time. Luckily, the increasingly digital world makes this once seemingly daunting task of cataloging much more approachable.
The date of the first piece of theatrical ephemera is unknown, and it is unlikely that it will ever be revealed because there are likely earlier pieces that were distributed but not preserved. Historically in England, a shift occurred from advertising theatre only by word of mouth to when posters and playbills aided in the advertising process. Some of the first pieces of English theatrical ephemera were advertisements. It is believed that many touring theatre troupes advertised their performances in some way. For example, in Figure 1, a playbill is advertising an entertainment troupe, it tells of a “boy of eight yeares old doth vault on the high rope, the like was never seene.” This playbill also features typeset along with handwritten information. The handwritten information lets the reader know where to find this performance. These were filled in on the road by touring companies and were intentionally left blank so that when the touring productions found a space that they could perform their act they could let their audience know. This playbill in particular tells the reader to make their way to the Rose in Wine Street, which historians believe to have been in present day Bristol, England (Astington 161).

A rather new idea that historians have suggested is that discarded playbills helped the general population’s literacy as well. Theatrical broadsides give theatre historians some of the most useful insights into the culture of the period. These are some of the only remaining records that prove the existences of now-gone theaters. We do not have much information and records about illegitimate theatre during the 18th century in England, but we have proof of the Hay-Market Theater for instance because we have playbills and broadsides that were kept from select productions that were produced there over time (see Figure 2). For example, to help further display the importance of theatrical ephemera, a Joseph Skipsey is cited as having, “taught himself how to read and write from discarded playbills and advertisements” (Russel, 245).

Playbills have many uses when they are first printed, but what happens to them after the performance they are advertising is closed? Should we keep those playbills, and attempt to preserve some semblance of this ephemeral theatre performance? Why, as a culture, have we actively tried to collect and sort these mass amounts of theatrical ephemera? There has been some discussion on the processes and problems with the ways we collect ephemera. More contemporary commenters have pointed out how these previous experts’ ideas have become outdated, but with this discussion abounding again experts still seem to neglect to ask the question of, “Why?”

Another important argument to keep in mind about the theatrical ephemera that we do have record of is the legitimacy of the plays and theatre that these playbills, posters, and broadsides are promoting. Emma Lesley Depledge uses historical evidence collected from theatrical ephemera to support her thesis in her essay “Playbills, Prologues, and Playbooks: Selling Shakespeare Adaptations, 1678-82.” She includes an appendix to this essay presenting three tables containing information regarding reproductions of Shakespeare’s works during the English Restoration. These tables include information such as a likely premiere date, the company that performed the work, and if the publisher gave any credit to Shakespeare. She was able to use research she collected through primary source theatrical ephemera to synthesize an argument that used the cultural context from Restoration England that the audience had now become skeptical of published playbills and broadsides as they had become known for falsely advertising the production that the audiences would be buying a ticket to see. For example, Depledge references Nahum Tate, an Irish poet and playwright who was known for “adapting” Shakespeare. Tate didn’t so
much as adapt Shakespeare as he just changed the name for different reasons, whether that be to attract and eventually deceive an audience, or to avoid censorship laws. Tate refers to and advertises Shakespeare’s *Richard II* by two different names one being, *The Sicilian Usurper* and the other being *The Tyrant of Sicily* (Depledge 314). She also writes that “these examples thus appear to confirm that Tate, and the playhouses for which he wrote, were more than willing to change play titles in order to dupe theatergoers and censors” (Depledge 314). This skepticism that emerged toward Restoration advertising is an interesting point to touch on when discussing the value of theatrical ephemera. Historians and scholars alike need to be quite careful when using primary source materials to comment on the overall culture of a time. Ephemera is paramount in the preservation of a culture, but the nuisances of understanding past cultures is something that academics need to be aware of when analyzing these primary source documents.

The amount of theatrical ephemera that has been collected over the years is quite large, and it is only continuing to grow. Today the Harvard Theatre Collection is recorded as having over two million items in its collection (Hoggart, Capobianco, and Pyzynski 33). This large collection is due mostly to the donation of one single individual named Evert Jansen Wendell who – like Harry Houdini – was an avid collector of theatrical ephemera. Houdini once asked a friend if he had heard of, “the Drama collector Mr. Wendell, here in New York City? I am told he has the biggest collection ever” (Kilby). This actually proved to be quite true as the Harvard President’s Report in 1918 claims that Evert Jansen Wendell’s donation was the single largest gift the Harvard Libraries had ever received (Hoggart, Capobianco, and Pyzynski 33). While the Harvard Theatre Collection is advertised as a large, magnificent, theater lover’s dream, access to its information and the documents themselves can be rather tricky. The nature of theatrical ephemera makes it difficult to organize and access, considering that the paper of old broadsides and playbills was very brittle and was never made to withstand time or with the intention of being viewed in a library’s collection.

There has also been a fair amount of scholarly literature that attempts to tackle the question of how to sort and manage theatrical ephemera. This topic is a bit trickier to tackle than what it first seems on the surface level, as ephemera is difficult to organize and preserve. There is no “national or international cataloging standard for ephemera, and systems of description have remained largely local for non-book and non-manuscript material” (Hoggart, Capobianco, and Pyzynski 31). The first issue is determining which type of institution should be tasked with the job. Perhaps a historical society, a museum, a personal collection, or a library could house the materials, but it is a topic that is a bit up in the air. Another caveat that comes with attempting to catalog theatrical ephemera is working around not having a national or international system to sort by. This in return makes access of these materials by the public much more difficult. In this increasingly digital age, it is becoming standard practice for Art Museums to make images and descriptions from their collections available to the masses online, so one can take the leap in saying that it will soon be expected for theatrical collections as well. The Harvard Theatre Collection has taken steps towards digitalizing. They began the process of digitally cataloging their pieces by accessioning a large amount of donated material that was not yet on the record, providing digital images of the pieces that could be used online, and finding an efficient way of cataloging their existing collection which was haphazardly organized, to say the least. The team that took on the job of reorganizing and digitally cataloging this collection was in
a bit over their heads. To put it simply “the goal was to create a finding aid in a relatively fast and simplified way, so that the method could be applied across multiple series. The team [working on this project] decided to keep the order of the series intact, rather than attempting to reorganize it” (Hoggart, Capobianco, and Pyzynski 37). The team working on this project created a database that was accessible to the public through Harvard’s Visual Information Access (VIA) database, which more recently has moved to HOLLIS.harvard.edu. In addition to the Harvard Theatre Collection there are other online databases that have playbills, broadsides, and other primary source documents that are accessible to the public online including: the Folger Shakespeare Library, which has a collection that is expansive and accounts for close to all aspects of Shakespeare and productions relating to Shakespeare, the British Library’s online collection database, and the collection of Theatrical Posters available online on the Victoria and Albert Museum website.

Another type of theatrical ephemera that has had a huge impact on modern marketing and advertisement is the theatre poster. Theatrical posters have provided theatre historians with a large source of information about the theatre culture of the period (Smyth 4). There are two main types of theatrical posters that historians look at: colorful striking lithographic posters that feature little text, or depictions of scenes from the plays themselves, that promise audiences the spectacle that will be seen before them, and also commonly feature more text. The former of these posters has been revered by the art history community as a gateway for modern art. Stuart Wrede wrote an essay for an exhibition of posters at the Museum of Modern Art, New York City in 1988 where he said that the, “approximately one-hundred-year history [of the poster] coincides with that of modern art itself” (Smyth 5).

Theatrical ephemera is not only seen in England and America, as it has been discussed so far. Ephemera is a global concept and affects theatre in other places as well. The comparative example I will be proving is to 19th century Japan. In 1815 Shikitei Sanba –a Japanese collector and theatre enthusiast– made public his 16-album collection of playbills and an additional scrapbook of a collection of various broadsides and ephemera that were not playbills (Zwicker 39). Like other theatrical collectors, Sanba found the need to preserve this ephemera as an attempt to preserve their culture’s history. Sanba in particular wanted to do this after a fire in his home destroyed a majority of his library (Zwicker 38). Zwicker points out that Sanba “did preserve a record of the culture of 19th century Japan, and in many ways a cultural history of this period is unthinkable without recourse to the materials preserved by amateur historians [like Sanba] of the 19th century.” Japanese ephemera is unique when one looks at the larger history of 19th century Japan. The Meiji Restoration in Japan changed Japanese history, it completely removed focus from preserving a cultural history for Japan, Zwicker comments, “to put it simply there was no history of Japan, only the history of the Japanese government” (Zwicker 40).

What did documenting and preserving theatre really do for culture? How did it help define theatre we know today, and how can we continue to use ephemera in telling the story of history? History is a narrative and having different perspectives is vastly important. Theatrical ephemera gives history a point of view, it is a snapshot of a very specific type of culture. By analyzing and preserving theatrical ephemera — whether that be a museum or library or university that takes on that task — they are aiding in the fight to have different point of views. The increasingly digital age is now making documenting ephemera simpler, in
the future we will hopefully not have these hordes of unorganized collections of ephemera that are hard to decipher. It is vastly important to keep theatrical ephemera, as it provides a jumping off point in historical research, and thanks to the increasingly digital age, it is only becoming easier for us to grasp onto the ephemeral aspects of theatre that we are drawn to.
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Mythologies, both contemporary and ancient, influence and reflect our beliefs about the value of animals and therefore how we treat them. Stories have historically been used to teach people important moral lessons about people’s place in the world and interactions with other people and the world around them. Examples of this include Native American animal myths, especially creation myths, that show how animals and humans are related. It also includes the modern myths in JK Rowling’s movie *Fantastic Beasts and Where to Find Them*, as well as the *Harry Potter* universe in general, and how animals are treated in the wizarding world.

When thinking about the ethics of how we treat animals, we must first look at how and why we value animals. There are two main ways to think about this: instrumental value and inherent value. Peter Kirschenmann talks about the types of values and how they relate to knowledge, but the same idea can be applied to animal ethics as well. He says, “Something has an instrumental value if it is a means to a good end: it is being valued for the sake of some particular other desirable, valuable thing” (242). Therefore, instrumental value has to do with something’s, such as an animal’s or an object’s, use to humans and how it benefits humans either on an individual level or as a species. An animal has instrumental value if it can be slaughtered for food, domesticated for transportation, or tamed as a companion animal. For example, cows are eaten, horses are ridden or used to pull cars, and dogs are pets. This is opposed to inherent value, in which something “can be said to be inherently good because experiencing or contemplating it is (intrinsically) good or rewarding” (Kirschenmann 243). Kirschenmann’s definition has to do with the reaction to a thing: if I have a good reaction to it, it’s inherently good. However, I would expand this definition and define it more broadly as something being valued for its very existence, for its own sake, and regardless of how humans may or may not benefit from it. This is also related to the idea of intrinsic value, in which “things possess intrinsic value on the ground that the source of their value lies in them: they are valued in themselves” (Kirschenmann 243). Both of these definitions further decenter humanity as determining the value of a being. Things with inherent value might be a marsh that is an obstacle to humans but left undisturbed or wild animals who provide nothing of instrumental value to humans, except perhaps enjoyment. When value lies within the object itself, or it is its own source of value rather than gaining value from something outside of itself, as in instrumental value, the thing has intrinsic value.

The Jain tradition believes and practices what more Western cultures might view as a radical belief of inherent value. To a Jain, every living being has just as much value as the next and therefore, people should not harm them. In fact, “In Jain philosophy, harming other living beings is conceived as harm to oneself insofar as such action frustrates one’s striving toward liberation, *moksha*” (Aristarkhova 639). Harming any living creature is in direct opposition to Jainism’s belief system and especially hurts the human journey to liberation. Jainism also encourages proactive non-harming. Non-harm is usually a passive behavior, or nonaction. By choosing to be a vegetarian, you are passively not killing an animal. You can
go about your days not harming living things by not walking around at night when you might not see yourself stepping on insects or even small creatures, by not utilizing animal products like leather. But Jainism says that one causes harm to animals “by not preventing others from harming them and by not helping animals that have already been harmed” (Aristarkhova 639). It is not enough to not cause direct harm, but people must actively prevent others from doing harm and by rectifying harm that has already been done. For example, people can accomplish this through donating or volunteering at animal rescues or hospitals, among other things. By having proactive non-harm as a tenet of their religion, Jains show that they recognize intrinsic value in all beings, not just those that benefit them.

Some Native American traditions, such as Lakota and Iroquois, also have mythologies of animals having intrinsic value and that they should therefore be treated with respect and kindness. Not only is their mythology a part of this, but the Lakota, among others, have rituals like the Sun Dance that are related to renewing the earth and recognizing the connectedness of humans and nature. Storytelling is an important way to teach people about these beliefs and the importance of respecting nature in order to continue relying on it, so they also recognize the instrumental value of nature and living beings. Many native traditions tell stories where animals are people too, that animals turned into humans at the time of creation, or that animals used to be humans, or are related somehow to humankind in a kinship network. The Iroquois creation myth says that animals helped the Sky Woman survive, and she is the one who created the stars and sun, and lead to the birth of humankind (“Iroquois”). These stories often say that animals can understand the human languages and are willing to help them as they would family, either in willingness to be hunted for food or to aid people spiritually. On this idea of animals having intrinsic value, Dave Aftandilian says, “The take-home ethical lesson from stories like these is that if animals have consciousness and agency, and even souls, we humans cannot just treat them as objects to do with as we please, but rather with the sort of respect we owe to other humans” (82). Since animals are viewed as being connected to humans, to being similar in the fact that they too have consciousness and souls, that they can make choices, such as to choose where they live or if they reproduce, then they should be treated with respect. This shows both inherent value, because they should be treated with the same respect as people since they share traits with them, but also instrumental value, because if the animals are respected, they will continue to allow humans to benefit from them.

We can look at real life animals through a similar lens of intrinsic versus instrumental value. One example is in insects, with honeybees and mosquitos. Honeybees are extremely important to human survival. They pollinate many of our crops, including most of the fruit humans consume. Secondarily, they also produce a tasty treat in honey. If bees go extinct, which is currently an active threat, humans will lose a lot of our current food source. On the other hand, mosquitos provide very little in the way of instrumental value. They are annoying when they bite and can carry malaria, an often-deadly disease that kills hundreds of thousands of people every year, according to WHO (“10 Facts”). There have been moves to create technology that could kill off mosquitos as a species, in order to stop malaria. Even if people believe in the intrinsic value of all creatures, the instrumental value can override those beliefs. We live in an anthropocentric world that values human life above all else, and therefore, would advocate for the destruction of an entire species in order to save human lives. Whether we believe this is ethically and morally right or wrong, it is still clear that instrumental value in itself is more valued than intrinsic value.
Fantastic Beasts and Where to Find Them, (from here on just Fantastic Beasts), as directed by David Yates, and the Harry Potter Universe (from here on just Harry Potter) is a great lens to use to examine how a modern mythology reflects society’s views on the treatment of animals. The first example of a creature that is shown through the lens of both instrumental value and intrinsic value is the obscurus. This creature is the result of a repressed magical force contained in a child without proper training. The force itself becomes destructive and lashes out the child’s control, eventually leading to their death, typically at a young age. Usually, magical kids are taken to Hogwarts or another magic school to nurture their power, but if for some reason they are forced to repress it, they can turn into an obscurial. In Fantastic Beasts, Newt Scamander is dedicated to the respect, rescue, and rehabilitation of magical creatures and to protecting them from those wizards who would kill them off. Percival Graves, the antagonist of the film, is the head of the Department of Magical Law Enforcement in the Magical Congress of the United States (MACUSA). At one point in the movie, Newt responds to Graves’ question of the obscurus being useless without the child as a host by asking “‘Useless?’ That is a parasitical magical force that killed a child. What on earth would you use it for?” (Rowling, “Screenplay” 160). Graves responds that he could use it to wreak havoc on New York and reveal the wizarding world to the non-magical (no-maj) world. While this isn’t clear at this point in time, it is later revealed that destruction and chaos is exactly what Graves wants, and he wants to use an obscurus to do so. Newt has a creature, an obscurus, in his case that has been separated from the host and is therefore harmless, but there is another obscurus in the city causing destruction that Graves desperately desires. These two opposing characters view the same creature in two very different ways. Graves only sees the instrumental value of the obscurial; it is a means to an end. He wishes to use its destructive force to cause chaos and destruction and reveal the wizarding world in order to reign over the no-maj world. It is only a tool. Newt, however, values the obscurus the same way he does all of the creatures he cares for. The one in his case was separated from a child in Sudan, and he is keeping it safe from those who would harm it. He also wishes to know more about it and prevent this tragedy from killing another child. The child is also a key factor. Newt studies these creatures in order to teach other wizards about them, therefore, preventing danger and threat to the creatures due to human error and ignorance. It is even more important to him to protect the children who could possibly be affected. Children are viewed as innocent, and any tragedies involving children are often met with more outrage and work towards change. If studying the obscurial will allow Newt to prevent another one from killing a child, he will gladly do so. While his first priority is usually the protection and care of his creatures, learning about the creature in order to prevent future tragedies, especially to children, is almost as important. Therefore, he understands the inherent value of the creature, and doesn’t care if it is “useless” while also acknowledging and utilizing the benefits of studying it.

Not only does an animal’s usefulness to humans affect its value, but also the amount of danger it can cause to humans. The idea of danger is typically in relation to human life and whether the threat to human life is more important than the intrinsic value of a creature. Newt Scamander firmly believes in the intrinsic value of all his creatures, whether they are dangerous or not. His case contains a multitude of beasts, ranging from bowtruckles, who are given a two on a danger scale from two to five meaning harmless or that humans can domesticate them, to erumpets and graphorns who are a four on the scale and considered highly dangerous (Rowling “Fantastic” various pages). Scamander studies these creatures
and many more in order to write a book about them and their care, so the wizarding world will learn to respect them instead of hurting them and labeling them dangerous because they are unknown. Once again, however, it is clear that Newt sees the intrinsic value more than the instrumental value. He seems to have befriended his creatures and his main reason to travel to New York City in the first place is to return Frank, a thunderbird he rescued and rehabilitated from a neglectful and abusive owner, to his natural habitat in the desert of Arizona. He only wants to see these creatures live in harmony with the humans of the world, and to not have humans threaten or kill them because they are misunderstood. He proves his love and care for the creatures when he is arrested and fears MACUSA will kill his creatures, and screams “Don’t hurt those creatures- there is nothing in there that is dangerous. Please don’t hurt my creatures- they are not dangerous. Please, they are not dangerous!” (Rowling, “Screenplay” 149). He truly believes that they are not dangerous, regardless of their threat to humans, because they are misunderstood. To him, it is human error that causes them to lash out and attack humans. However, Newt still seems to hold an anthropocentric view, because he still references the danger the creatures pose to humans, even if he still sees more intrinsic value in them.

The way Newt views his creatures, compared to how MACUSA and most of the wizarding world sees them, is comparable to how escaped zoo animals, or zoo animals that become a threat, are treated. For example, in 2011, almost 60 animals were killed after escaping from a private preserve in Zanesville, Ohio, including 18 rare Bengal tigers (Caron). These animals were killed because they were threatening human lives, regardless of their level of endangerment and how their deaths may have affected the survival of the species. Considering the six left on the property were transferred to the Columbus Zoo, they clearly could have been saved if not for the level of threat they possessed. These animals were not viewed to have intrinsic value as living beings once they posed a threat. There was a similar experience at the Cincinnati Zoo when Harambe the gorilla was killed after a child fell in his enclosure (Knight). The zoo officials had to put him down in order to save the child’s life. While there was some debate about how necessary the reaction was, and whether the child and the gorilla could have been saved, it was still clear that the danger to the child overrode the value of Harambe’s life.

Newt has the opposite concern when his creatures escape. He is not worried about the threat the creatures pose to humans, but rather the threat humans pose to the creatures. This is shown by his conversation with the no-maj Jacob Kowalski:

Newt: I need to get going, find everyone who’s escaped before they get hurt. Jacob: Before they could get hurt? Newt: Yes, Mr. Kowalski. See, they’re currently in alien terrain, surrounded by millions of the most vicious creatures on the planet…. Humans (Rowling, “Screenplay” 113-4).

Newt recognizes that even if the creatures are dangerous, in a strange territory with humans who are terrified of them, it’s not the humans that are threatened, it’s the creatures. People fear the unknown, and since Newt Scamander was one of the first people to study these creatures, it’s possible that even the wizards had never seen them before. When people feel threatened, they lash out to protect themselves, harming others in the process. Either intentionally or unintentionally, thousands of species have gone extinct due to human activity, including some because they were dangerous to humans.
When humans are afraid of a creature or feel threatened, they value them much less. Some examples of this are wolves and pit bulls. When wolves have threatened humans either directly or indirectly by threatening livestock, they have been hunted or trapped nearly to extinction in some cases, such as the red wolf. The debates about whether wolves should be reintroduced to national parks is another example. While many of these parks are the historical and natural habitats of these wolves, they have historically threatened neighboring settlements and livestock farms (“The Political”). While returning the apex predator to its historical habitat can help restore the ecosystem, there are still debates about whether the potential threat to humans is worth it, especially because certain protections that wolves retain are only enforced within the bounds of the national parks. Animals don’t understand boundaries, so if a wolf puts “a foot over a boundary, they are open game for wolf hunters” (Worrall). Another example is the pit bull. People have forced a bad reputation on this breed as violent or dangerous largely due to people who trained them as fighting dogs, a practice that is now criminalized. Before this, they were known as ‘nanny dogs’ because of their docile nature and how good they were with kids. While there have been movements to return them back to their previously good reputation, many cities and apartment complexes have banned the breed. This breed-specific legislation (BSL) either prohibits people from owning specific breeds of dogs or places other restrictions on ownership. However, the pit bull is not even a specific breed, but rather a generic term for mix breeds or mutts that share ancestry or similarities with breeds such as Staffordshire Bull Terriers or American Staffordshire Terriers (Nolen). Critics of BSLs also insist “breed bans discriminate against responsible dog owners and malign select breeds as inherently vicious” (Nolen) despite this claim being widely unsupported. These claims and laws also mean animal shelters are overrun with pit bulls, and people are often wary of adopting them due to their reputation. Even though the individual dog may not be dangerous, people judge based on the perceived danger level, meaning that their intrinsic value is lowered.

Finally, dragons are another example of how mythologies reflect our beliefs about and treatment of animals. In *Harry Potter*, dragons have both instrumental and intrinsic value at different times. For examples of instrumental value, wizards use dragon heartstrings for wand cores, and other parts of the dragon, such as the heart and hide, for other magical uses (dragon hide gloves are fireproof and good for potion brewing and handling other dangerous creatures). Of course, this requires the dragon to die in order for these parts to be harvested. Nowhere in the text, in the *Harry Potter* books or in *Fantastic Beasts*, is it stated whether there are laws regarding the use of heartstrings and other dragon parts or how they are collected, including whether the parts can only be harvested when the dragon has died of natural causes or if the creatures are killed (or poached) for the useful parts. The text is also silent on whether these parts come from wild dragons or those held in captivity. A dragon was also used to guard the Gringott’s vaults of prominent wizards, and apparently kept in horrible conditions until Harry, Ron, and Hermione freed it in *Deathly Hallows*. They are also used in the Tri-Wizard tournament in *Goblet of Fire* and there seems to be no rules against harming the dragon or repercussions for causing it pain during the task, as the dragon Harry is fighting crashes through a bridge and falls into a canyon and no one ever mentions it again. However, there is also a dragon preserve in Romania where Charlie Weasley works. While not much information is given in the text about this preserve or its particular purpose or practices, it seems as if it is run like a nature reserve is in our world. The dragons are cared for and protected, but captive breeding is rarely, if ever, successful, meaning the
preserve does not serve as a farm for dragon heartstrings. They care for the dragons because otherwise Muggles (the British word for non-magical people) would learn of the wizarding world and dragons would be in danger of extinction. So, it seems that dragons in *Harry Potter* are valued both intrinsically and instrumentally.

Dragon mythology is also present in our society and culture. These myths and the use of storytelling can teach people about the value of animals. Stories of dragons and dragon-like serpents appear in almost every culture around the world, from Native American to Chinese Buddhism, from Aboriginal Australia to Mesoamerican cultures. These stories are as varied and diverse as they come from but prove that “mythology reveals the dichotomous nature of the human mind” (Dobson 97). This is because they often represent two sides of the same idea: life/death, regeneration/death, or human world/cosmic world. In the earliest representations, dragons represented chaos, destruction, or the unknown. They were distinctly other, everything the people feared. However, people’s beliefs about them often evolved over time. For example, as Indian Buddhism moved to China, it “created a distinction between good and evil dragons, the latter dwelling in mountains while the good dragons were linked to water” (Dobson 96). Dragons were no longer distinctly evil but were rather judged by attributes and actions. Because China was littered with river systems and lakes, it was useful to have a creature to rely on for aid, whether it be for protection, to control the water and weather, or as bringers of life.

Other dragon mythologies also show such dichotomies. They often represent both good and evil, life and death, and death and regeneration, within a single being through distinguishing different varieties with different traits. One example of this is the dragon in Chinese mythology. The dragons believed to represent or embody evil resided in the mountains, and those representing goodness and life resided in the water. In Chan (Buddhist) literature the dragon acts in a few different ways: “as a symbol of enlightenment and also as a symbol for ourselves. For example, “meeting the dragon in the cave” is a metaphor for confronting one’s own deepest fears and obstacles” (O’Brien). So, while the dragons can be benevolent manifestations of wisdom, power, or life, they can also represent facing your fears and the obstacles in your life. They can be personifications of the struggle, a physical thing to slay as symbol of victory. However, they can also play roles in the natural and spiritual world, as in China, where dragons are also “defined by their unique functions, with the “celestial” dragon acting as a guardian of the heavens, and the “divine” dragon being responsible for bringing rains” (Kirby-Hirst 77). Even though dragons are mythical creatures, these myths still reflect how animals are valued instrumentally, as sources of wisdom, life, and rain (in the cases of dragons) rather than as intrinsically valuable. Since myths are often used to teach people lessons, they tend to show the instrumental value in their symbolism rather than the intrinsic value. There would be less myths about slaying the dragon if dragons were valued intrinsically in these stories rather than instrumentally.

If we see a heroic protagonist like Newt Scamander treating creatures with respect and condemning humans who would harm them, we are more likely to act the same way. This is in opposition to older mythologies that tend to have a “slaying the dragon” narrative which gives fame and fortune to the conqueror. Mythology is, in part, storytelling. Stories define cultures and help teach people the lessons needed to survive in their society, to learn the rules and expectations of their culture and religion, and how to properly behave. They teach moral and ethical lessons, and modern mythologies continue to do this for contemporary audiences.
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The 1960s and 1970s are often referred to as a period of “sexual revolution,” due to the increasingly visible changes to American social and cultural life, particularly regarding attitudes towards gender and sexuality. As historian Beth Bailey explains in *Sex in the Heartland*, “The sexual revolution was never a single, coherent movement.” For some, the sexual revolution brought up new feelings of identity and liberation, while for others it threatened their comfortable living in societal status quos. Either way, as historian David Allyn explains, the sexual revolution of the 60s and 70s was significant because it challenged the status quo and produced a period of social transformation. The role of media was incredibly important in portraying this transformation on a national level. Bailey argues:

> The ‘sexual revolution’ was possible, to a great extent, because these local grounds of authority lost ground while national forces—from the media to government agencies to the postwar market economy—increasingly offered alternate sources of cultural authority to people who contested the traditional social controls.

Growing in popularity after WWII, American women’s magazines spread information about sex and sexuality on a national level through articles and advertisements. However, as Nancy Walker describes in *Shaping Our Mothers’ World: American Women’s Magazines*, “at no time during their histories have women’s magazines delivered perfectly consistent, monolithic messages to their readers.” *Look* Magazine is no exception. The articles and advertisements in *Look* from the years 1969 to 1970 are complex and somewhat contradictory in the messages that they send about sex and sexuality. However, this dissonance in the messages expressed in *Look* can be used to analyze the sexual revolution and changing notions of sexuality and gender on a national scale.

The sexual revolution is often heavily associated with the nation’s youth. According to Bailey, “By the late 1960s the symbols of countercultural identity had become virtually synonymous with those of youth culture.” As more young people went off to college and left their parents’ homes for the first time, pressure mounted on universities to uphold acceptable moral expectations for students’ behavior. As Allyn explains, “Most schools had strict parietal rules, that is, rules prohibiting students from leaving their dormitories overnight or entertaining guests in their rooms. Students caught having sex were certain to be expelled.” Known as *in loco parentis*, universities adopted these rules claiming that in the absence of parental supervision the school held a parental-like responsibility for students, and therefore the right to create restrictions for students regarding sex. But as Bailey writes, “By the mid-1960s, however, students on college campuses throughout the nation had begun to reject the rules that governed their nonacademic lives.” At Barnard College, for example, sophomore Linda LeClair caught national attention in 1968 when she was found in violation of the
school’s campus housing policy. Since LeClair was an underclassman, she was required to live on campus under the segregated housing rules, although the school made an exception for students who worked as nannies or housekeepers. This is exactly what LeClair told the university she was doing when she was found to be lying after (anonymously) bragging about fooling the university about her living situation in an article for the *New York Times*. At her hearing with students and faculty, LeClair testified that, “Barnard has no right to control personal behavior. It is solely an education institution...Barnard’s housing regulations discriminate on the basis of sex, age, [and] class.” LeClair’s challenge to Barnard eventually ended the *in loco parentis* system, as students widely supported LeClair and voiced their opposition to the rules and expectations. In fact, “the Linda LeClair case revealed that college students were beginning to form their own definitions of sexual freedom.”

Despite students’ changing beliefs on sexuality, the idea of co-ed living in the 60s still came as a shock to the general public. The article, “New Hang-ups for Parents: Co-ed Living,” in the September 23rd, 1969 issue of *Look*, for example, discusses the Stanford University students of Lambda Nu Fraternity, who lived co-ed style in their fraternity house. The author of the article, Betty Rollins, wrote about her experience living in the Lambda Nu house for a week. Interestingly, the article seems to be in favor of co-ed living, despite public resistance to the idea. For example the title, “New Hang-ups for Parents,” suggests that parents would be upset over the idea of their children living with members of the opposite sex, however the article claims that, “There has been surprisingly little static from parents... But the most vocal anti-co-ed living grumbles come from inside Lambda Nu.” At the heart of this opposition were notions of gender roles that emphasized the differences between men and women. Historians John D’Emilio and Estelle Freedman discuss such roles and explain that, “One study of college youth in the postwar decade found that the gap ‘between males and females in the youth culture with respect to sex and love is so marked that there are distinct male and female subcultures.’” Girls, for example, faced a double standard where they were expected to remain pure by keeping their virginity, but were often pressured by their male partners into sexual acts. When girls did submit to the pressure, they were no longer viewed as worthy of marriage. Essentially, “Boys pushed, while girls set the limit.” The article portrays these notions of gender through comments of resistance towards co-ed living. As one Lambda Nu member who refused to live in the co-ed house explained, “‘These guys...are losers...They’re living close to sex, but they’re not getting it.’” Another member living outside the house explained, “Girls restrict things.”

Yet, despite explaining opposition to co-ed living, overall the article takes a positive view of the arrangement, dispelling fears of increased promiscuity among youth by explaining that “both from what we observe and from what people tell us, the big message is: there seems really to be less sex in a setup like this than in a sexually segregated one.” In fact, the male house members’ comments resist the notion that the girl should assume responsibility for whatever sexual acts occur. For example, one young house member explains that, “‘You think twice about sleeping with a girl when you know you have to face her the next morning at breakfast – and at lunch – and at dinner – and at breakfast’” The article even draws on comments of Professor Joseph Katz, a Stanford psychologist, to reassure *Look* readers of the benefits of co-ed living. According to Katz, “‘In a curious way...co-ed living deemphasizes sex. When a boy sees a girl every day, she becomes less of a sex object and more of a friend. When a boy lives close to a girl, the consequences of his actions are there. So he is more prudent.’"
Women, too, had positive things to say about their experiences living with men. One woman explains, "When you’re with boys all the time, it gets to be really important what kind of person you are. So you try to be a better person. Before, all you needed to be was a sexier person." All of these comments speak of sex with less emphasis on the physical act itself and more emphasis on the relationship between men and women that fosters sexual intimacy. This notion of looking at sex in terms of social and cultural structures instead of biologically is an important change, as people began to view sex in more fluid ways, especially among college youth. The article also notes the emphasis surrounding heterosexual mixing. As D’Emilio and Freedman explain, “Particularly in coeducational institutions, heterosocial mixing became the norm. Dating in pairs, unlike the informal group socializing of the 19th century, permitted sexual liberties that formerly were sanctioned only for couples who were courting.” The emphasis on co-ed living in the house became fixed on forming relationships, whether friendships or romantic partnerships, where men and women were seen as more than sexual objects. As one woman living in the house explained, “I wouldn’t want to marry someone who wasn’t my best friend first.” While it can certainly be assumed that the men and women living in the Lambda Nu Fraternity house still engaged in sexual activity, the article engages with the issue of co-ed living and sex in an increasingly progressive way, encouraging readers to think of the benefits of co-ed living, specifically by disproving the idea that co-ed living would lead to increased promiscuity among students.

As much as the sexual revolution was associated with the nation’s youth, it was also associated with the creation and widespread use of the birth control pill. When the pill was approved by the FDA in 1960, it instantly gained national attention: “By early 1969 eight and a half million women were using the Pill; their numbers had grown by about one million each year from 1961.” The pill was revolutionary for many reasons, but especially because of its convenience for women and medical professionals alike. According to Allyn, “It was not that the condom, the pessary, the diaphragm, and the spermicide, all of which preceded the pill, were ineffective, but the pill, a synthetic estrogen taken once a day, at any time of the day, separated the act of intercourse from the use of birth control. With the pill, contraception became ‘clean.’” Unfortunately, unmarried women faced harsher obstacles to obtaining the pill than married women, as premarital sex was still socially taboo and doctors were the only ones able to prescribe the pill. However, as Bailey describes, the pill became available, even to unmarried women, through two political movements. The first was the concern over population growth. In the 1960s and 1970s, doctors began to give out birth control as a means to control population growth as it was believed that the population was reaching “near-panic” proportions. The second was President Johnson’s Great Society programs, which dedicated federal funding to deal with problems of poverty and racism. Both of these movements were effective in “providing rationales for prescribing birth control that did not employ a language of morality.” By centering the argument about birth control on factors that did not depend on choices around sexual behaviors, it became easier for Americans to accept the use of the pill. Widespread use of the pill continued into 1969, when journalist and activist Barbara Seaman wrote *The Doctor’s Case Against the Pill*, which brought up the possible health risks of using the pill. Since the pill had been widely popular and sought after since its invention, the thought of health risks associated with the pill scared many women.

The topic was so sensational that many articles were written about it, including one in a June 1970 issue of *Look*, titled, “The Pill is Safe.” The article explains, “A public opinion poll suggests that more than a million women have been too frightened to continue using
the oral contraceptive, although 87 out of 100 women said they were previously satisfied with it.” The article, however, seeks to reassure readers that the pill is completely safe and worth the use. While the pill was accused of causing life-threatening blood clots and cancer, the article dismisses the severity of these claims. After explaining that the risk of blood clots while using the pill is a possibility, the article suggests that, like many other situations where risks are involved, there is no reason to assume that the risk outweighs the benefit. Comparing the risk of using birth control with the risk of getting into a car accident the authors (Dr. Edward T. Tyler and Roland H. Berg) explain, “Certainly, such accidental deaths are deplorable, but no one suggests that the risk is so great women should stop riding in automobiles.” Furthermore, the article seeks to reassure female readers that birth control is more effective than other forms of contraception. Mentioning IUDs, the article simply states, “How it prevents pregnancy, no one knows.”

Nowhere in the article, however, is there any mention of marriage, family, or sexual morals, although an image of a woman’s hand holding the birth control pill is marked by a wedding band. In her article, “Prescribing the Pill: Politics, Culture, and the Sexual Revolution in America’s Heartland,” Beth Bailey argues that the notion of the pill as being separate from a woman’s morality is important to understanding how sexual attitudes have changed over time. While Bailey argues that, “...the pill did not become available to unmarried women because they raised their voices and demanded the right to sexual freedom and control,” she does explain that unmarried women receiving access to the pill was the first step in a chain of events that led to more liberation for women. As a strong women’s movement was developing, women began to question their access to birth control not as a matter of population control or social welfare problems, but as a right to control their own bodies. The fact that “The Pill is Safe” was published in a 1970 issue of Look means that editors thought that the article would appeal to female readership, both taking into account the growing acceptance of birth control and the strength of growing women’s movements. Considering that birth control was still illegal in many states in the 1960s, and that no other article had been written about birth control in any Look issue from 1969 until June of 1970, the article suggests a growing comfortability with birth control and the role of the American woman outside of traditional gender confines.

Although it is the articles in Look that are assumed to garner the most attention from readers, it is important not to underestimate the influence that advertisements had on readers. Spread out among two years, the advertisements, like the articles, in Look have sent different messages about sexuality and gender. Two advertisements in particular have shown how perceptions on sex and sexuality have changed across the span of almost a year in 1969. The first advertisement from June 10, 1969 is for Delfen Contraceptive Foam. The ad features the phrase, “You gave him life now give him you” in large, bolded font, and pictures a woman’s hand wearing a wedding band grasping the hand of a small child. While the concept of an ad for birth control may seem to indicate an open attitude toward sexuality, the messages relayed in the ad contradict this. For one, the ad is extremely focused on the notion of femininity and motherhood. The product is sold as an option for women to become better mothers by focusing on the children they are already raising. “Motherhood. Beautiful. But a tremendous responsibility for giving, loving, understanding...and all that takes time,” states the ad. The ad tries to fit women neatly into the stereotypical gender role of mothers, paying no attention to any other reason a woman may want to utilize birth control, such as individual pleasure. However, D’Emilio and Freedman explain that, “By the mid-1960s some
women were beginning to speak out against the ‘gender caste system’ that was developing.” Furthermore, marriage rates from the 1960s to the 1980s were declining while at the same time divorce rates were increasing. The Delfen ad shows a clear disconnect between how society was developing and the concept of family life and motherhood. One reason for this may be in response to the creation of the birth control pill. The pill was often associated with the idea of unmarried women or youth and as Bailey notes, the American population from the mid-late 1960s still disapproved of premarital sex. Since Delfen was competing to sell their product against the pill, perhaps advertisers reverted to using the notions of motherhood and marriage to uphold the idea that their product was more acceptable for society’s moral standards and to promote a sense of stability which the sexual revolution challenged.

At the same time, it may be useful to look at the target audience of the ad for Delfen Contraceptive Foam. The ad is careful to inform readers that, unlike the pill, “…you can buy it without a prescription at drug stores throughout the U.S. and Canada.” Unmarried women were the most unlikely to be prescribed the birth control pill and therefore were more likely to seek alternative contraception products, such as Delfen Contraceptive Foam. Consequently, it seems strange that the ad would focus on the importance of motherhood as a reason to use contraception, considering unmarried women potentially made up a large part of their market. Perhaps the advertisers were caught in the middle of a shift in attitudes towards sex. On the one hand, the majority of the American population still disapproved of premarital sex, and to be too progressive in their advertising could damage the reputation of Delfen. After all, the bottom of the ad describes the company as having “The world’s largest laboratories devoted to family planning research for the medical profession.” On the other hand, Delfen most likely knew that they needed to rely on unmarried women to buy their product, as the majority of married women opted to use the pill instead. By structuring the ad to focus on motherhood and appeal to the mainstream culture, while at the same time informing unmarried readers that the foam was available over the counter at a variety of drugstores, Delfen might have been able to appeal to both a population that disapproved of premarital sex and a population that chose to engage in it.

The second ad, also published in 1969, is highly sexually charged and can be seen as a transformation that characterizes the changes of the sexual revolution. The ad for The Lady Remington women’s razor appears on a full page, boasting, “Give your wife an extra head for Christmas.” The phrase, which is suggestive of oral sex, is quite revealing of sexuality in the late 60s. In 1969, Anne Koedt wrote the famous article, “The Myth of the Vaginal Orgasm,” which disproved Freudian notions that clitoral orgasms were for ill-developing young women who had not reached sexual maturity. Instead, Koedt argued, “Women were kept in a state of sexual confusion, labelled frigid for failing to achieve ‘an orgasm which in fact does not exist,’ and led to feign sexual satisfaction in order to keep their partners content.” Whether the ad for The Lady Remington was intentional in highlighting the role of women’s sexual pleasure in intercourse cannot be determined, but it certainly is a departure from the traditional notions of the submissiveness of women. The fact that the ad is so suggestive of sex alone is shocking, but it also appeals to women on the basis of breaking down gender roles and the notion that women did not find pleasure in sex. For example, the ad states, “First there are her legs. Beautiful, perhaps. But tough. So they need a shaver that’s every bit as rugged as a man’s...On the other hand, there are her underarms. Delicate. Sensitive. Obviously in need of a completely different shaver.” The ad serves two functions. First, it at-
tempts to equate women’s needs to that of men’s by describing them as “rugged and tough.” Although perhaps not completely in line with feminist notions of women’s grasp on their own identities and rights, the ad is successful in breaking down the notion that women are frigid by describing them as “delicate and sensitive.” The ad portrays women outside of the traditional gender roles, both in sexuality and personality.

In business from 1937 to 1971, Look Magazine was an important source of media for the development and exploration of gender and sexuality. Unfortunately, as time went on, “Publications offering general interest fare — Life, Look, Saturday Evening Post — found that television eroded both their audiences and advertisers.” The articles and advertisements in Look, however, reveal important factors of women’s magazines. As Mary Ellen Zuckerman states, “The magazines were profit-oriented businesses that had to satisfy two groups of consumers: advertisers who bought space and readers who bought finished publications.” It is by acknowledging this that historians are able to analyze articles and advertisements in the proper context. Therefore, it is possible to come to the conclusion that, generally, articles and advertisements create dissonance in the messages they send to their readers, but that this dissonance is often quite revealing about the time period in which they were published. Articles like “New Hang-Ups for Parents,” and “The Pill is Safe,” for instance, did not always represent majority attitudes in society because, as Bailey notes, most people still disapproved of premarital sex in the late 1960s. But looking at these articles in the context of the world outside them also reveals a growing presence of women’s movements and awareness of gender and sexuality. “New Hang-ups for Parents” suggests a new way that youth began to approach relationships and sex that was consistent with what youth were experimenting with on college campuses. And, “The Pill is Safe” was significant based on its lack of traditional terms of morality, motherhood, family, etc. The Delfen Contraceptive Foam ad is also important because it emphasizes these traditional notions and shows the ways in which some members of society rejected the changes brought by the sexual revolution and the birth control pill. At the same time, the ad is complex in how it appeals to its target audience. Although trying to appeal to unmarried women who did not have access to the pill, the ad chooses to focus on elements of motherhood, possibly trying to retain good standing with the more traditionally based population while still successfully selling their product to unmarried women. Finally, the ad for The Lady Remington razor suggests changes to old notions of women’s gender and sexuality by emphasizing women’s pleasure in sex as well as by equating women to men, challenging the ways that women had been subordinate in the past. Ultimately, the dissonance in the articles and advertisements signify the fact that the sexual revolution was a progress, not an event, and that it cannot be defined by one group of people at one point in history.
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How Historiography is Crucial in Comprehending the Salem Witch Trials of 1692

The importance of history lies in understanding the preserved documents and publications that were written by people at various periods over time. Yet, what most people in today’s society know about historical events comes not only from documents that were maintained over the course of many generations, but also from modern historians who chronicle these archives based on their personal approaches to past events. The study of historical writing is a process called historiography, and it discerns the main connection between scholars and arguments. One of the most interesting historical events that modern historians have written about through the recording and analyzing of people who witnessed such a phenomenon is the Salem Witch Trials of 1692. These trials were a series of allegations made against individuals in the Massachusetts Bay Colony—mostly single, lower-class women—for practicing witchcraft and using it to curse those around them.\(^1\) Over the past century, numerous literary analyses have emerged that scrutinize the litigations’ historical validity written by authors like Emerson W. Baker, Carol F. Karlsen, and Louis B. Wright. After reading these secondary sources, one can easily develop a close examination of how each of these scholars addressed the historiography of the Salem Witch Trials of 1692 through a complex method known as the “different aspects of the problem” approach. This approach allows historians to analyze conflicting aspects of a specific historical event and evaluate them based on what they believe the main cause of such an event was. Thus, the “different aspects of the problem” approach would provide readers with a better comprehension of the structure of this society as well as the political and religious factors that set the trials into motion.

The most important constituent in understanding the historiography of the Salem Witch Trials of 1692 is the intricate relationship between women and witchcraft. While anybody regardless of their class, gender, and marital status could be accused of practicing sorcery, it should be noted that single or widowed, lower-class women were generally the primary targets for accusation.\(^2\) Historian Carol F. Karlsen pointed to this almost obscure conviction in her book, *The Devil in the Shape of a Woman: Witchcraft in Colonial New England*, by stating that, while the connection between women and witchcraft was evident in the structure of accusations during the trials, it never came off as precise in colonial New England’s culture. Her hypothesis can most likely be attributed to the fact that numerous male Puritan colonists strongly believed in the supernatural ideology that there existed several human beings, regardless of their gender, who were capable of inflicting serious harm upon others through their utilization of mystical powers.

If in theory men and children could be witches as easily as could women, in fact even during outbreaks, when men and children were most vulnerable, their numbers among the suspected were proportionately small, and they were rarely the main targets of accusations.\(^3\)
By archiving the names, marital status and families of condemned women from the New Haven Colony Records, Witchcraft Papers and Essex Court Records, Karlsen was proving her point that historians have not focused on gender in their research on the Salem Witch Trials of 1692. As a result, she felt it was in her best interests to bring this notion into light for beginning scholars to comprehend as they study this gruesome colonial event and its mark on modern American history for many decades to come.

Interestingly, Karlsen was not the only historian who associated women living within the Massachusetts Bay Colony with witchcraft based on the names and documents that have been preserved since the late seventeenth century. Distinguished University of Georgia Research Professor, Peter Charles Hoffer, made similar notions about women being accused of witchcraft in his book, The Salem Witchcraft Trials: A Legal History. While examining old anthologies from this specific time period like Christ's Fidelity the Only Shield Against Satan's Malignity by Minister Deodat Lawson, Essex Institute Historical Collection, and other historiographies (including Salem Possessed by Paul Boyer and Stephen Nissenbaum), Hoffer wrote that Salem Village’s eminent partisanship of women was what led to the trials. He also offered an insight into why women were often accused of practicing witchcraft in colonial Massachusetts by stating that

“...the targets of witchcraft prosecutions were overwhelmingly women, in part because men had fashioned the offense to persecute women... Men of learning in England and New England agreed: suspected witches were either weak-minded wenches, easily misled by the Great Deceiver, or ill-tempered hags who asked the Devil for assistance.”4

In summary, these ministers conjured this sort of prejudice against mostly vulnerable women in order to boost their popularity among Salem Village’s paranoid colonists. They also stressed the notion that it was generally women who committed antinomianism, which was the ideal that these inferior maidens were not holding up Puritan faith properly, and therefore would not achieve salvation in Heaven as a result. Professor Hoffer emphasized how most Americans today usually take several rights for granted, such as rules of evidence in court cases or the pivotal right of a defendant to legitimate information. He further described that these rights were denied to people—especially poor, single or widowed women—in early colonial American history. To Hoffer, this is a significant factor in understanding the historiography of the Salem Witch Trials of 1692 and the ramifications that the remaining preserved court verdicts, colonial public records and archaic published literature would have.

There currently exists a conventional but less well-known document that foretells the religious paranoia and social alarm that many Puritan colonists harbored towards their neighbors during the late 17th century. It is a short but reprimanding poem known as The Day of Doom that was written by a somewhat abstruse New England minister named Michael Wigglesworth and was published at the Cambridge Press in 1662.5 The late author, Louis B. Wright, drew on the The Day of Doom in his book, The Atlantic Frontier: Colonial American Civilization 1607-1763 and how the poem, despite being published almost two decades before the actual trials took place, seemingly foreshadowed the future indictments. “A crime it is; therefore in bliss—You may not hope to dwell; But unto you I shall allow—The easiest room in hell.”6 Wigglesworth’s poem became the most popular single piece of literature in the American colonies around the same time it was published and would deftly strike fear into the minds of anybody who read it, including children. Not only did it break the
boundaries of decent literature content that was common throughout most of the literate world at this time, but also boldly condemned anybody who did not practice Puritan Christianity the proper way, even going as far as illustrating perfect envisions of abomination within Hell for all of eternity.

In spite of his dark representation of immoral actions committed by supposed sinners and how they would meet their mayhem at the fiery gates of Hell in *The Day of Doom*, Wigglesworth was actually a pleasantly mild man who was gentle with his fellow colonial companions. As the late historian team William Peterfield Trent and Benjamin Willis Wells explained in their book, *Colonial Prose and Poetry: The Beginnings of Americanism 1650-1710*, anybody who met this man would later remember him as a benevolent mentor who preached sermons of advice and wisdom to his followers. It is even evident that he had a devoted interest in the field of medicine as he was also known for tending to the medical needs of others.

It is one of the strange ironies of literature, that the fierce denunciations of the reprobate, and the terrible images of damnation with which the poem abounds, should have been penned by a man whom we know to have been in life a frail and genial philanthropist, so cheerful that some of his friends thought he could not be so sick as he averred. After reading about Wigglesworth’s charisma and generosity to most of the inhabitants in colonial Massachusetts, one might ask why he would write with such a dark persona. The answer to this is simple. Perhaps Wigglesworth was trying to convey a warning to his fellow colonists of the danger that lurked in the clergy world, and how ministers would go out of their way to falsely accuse certain people of committing sins out of spiteful intention to protect their power. In a logical sense, he was basically implying that absolute power corrupts absolutely, and ministers were often the driving force behind legal power in colonial American villages like Salem. Hence, it is the published work of people like Wigglesworth that help to give a justification for why it was mostly women who were accused of witchcraft.

Aside from preserved documents that date back to the late colonial era, another identifiable aspect of the historiography associated with the Salem Witch Trials of 1692 would be the evaluation of how historians have analyzed the literary work of others regarding the trials. It is important to note that this is the most critical component of perceiving how historians are able to discern a certain past event and the sources utilized to write about it as a whole. For example, while making a comparison of the Salem Witch Trials and early colonial American history in his book, *A Storm of Witchcraft: The Salem Witch Trials and the American Experience for the Oxford University Press*, Baker also tried to make sense out of the extensive and numerous literature that covered the historical series of accusations. Hence, he based his main argument on the significant relationship between the religious and political tension of Salem Village in Massachusetts. The literature that Baker focused on throughout his book as he explained his thesis included several preserved documents that were written by people who witnessed the trials, such as father and son Ministers Increase and Cotton Mather. At the same time, he relied also on incorporated literary texts that were published as of recently, such as *Salem Possessed: The Social Origins of Witchcraft* by Paul Boyer and Stephen Nissenbaum. Towards the middle of his book, Baker analyzed how the accusations and political motivations of Betty Parris and Abigail Williams—the daughter and niece of affluent Minister Samuel Parris—may have simply been made up in order to ruin...
the reputations of people who turned against Minister Parris, like Bridget Bishop, who had a distinctive view of practicing genuine Puritan Christianity.\textsuperscript{8}

Just as there is evidence to support a mass psychosis, there is evidence of deliberate acts of fraud. And the fact that someone was afflicted by a psychological disorder that was beyond his or her control does not rule out the possibility that some of that person’s actions were deliberate and willful acts of calumny and deception.

Baker further stated how most historians who study the Salem Witch Trials of 1692 like Boyer and Nissenbaum would agree that there most likely was some element of deceit in the series of accusations made against people such as Bishop, along with some symptoms of psychological disorder playing a critical role as well. Yet, on the other hand, they also admit that there is no consensus regarding where the prominence should be placed, even if it is clearly laid out in preserved documents. That is why, as Baker concluded this passage, it is important for scholars to look at the background of the victims who were accused of practicing sorcery in order to gain an enhanced understanding of how the accusers behaved and what motivated them to frame others.

In their book, \textit{Salem Possessed: The Social Origins of Witchcraft}, Boyer and Nissenbaum introduced to their readers an opportunity to carefully examine and interpret a historical event through the prolonged usage of primary source materials. As they stated in the preface, these two historians began teaching the Salem Witch Trials of 1692 to their students during the fall of 1969 at the University of Massachusetts through what they refer to as “the usual body of sources” that scholars had extracted over the years leading up to their jobs.\textsuperscript{9} Such sources included the attestations that were offered at the trials and the series of published documents that provided the narrative as well as critical framework of the allegations that were made. Karlsen, Boyer and Nissenbaum all discovered through their collection of information that there was a large quantity of archives on the history of Salem Village that were left unexamined for almost three centuries. This is generally attributed to how some archivists did not include as much specific information or examples as possible for their readers to understand. One of the examples they listed as an unexamined source was \textit{Salem Witchcraft} written by Salem minister, mayor and later United States Congressman Charles W. Upham in 1867, which the latter had left unfinished for over a century.

Like most nineteenth century local historians, Upham idealized the sturdy colonial yeomen who figure in his narrative, dwelling almost affectionately on their petty disputes... Ever sensitive to the colorful vignette or the quaint detail, he often left out or obscured more significant matters. For example, while lavishing careful attention upon a protracted but ultimately peripheral land dispute between the Nurse family and the eccentric son of a former colonial governor, he barely hinted at the far more crucial rivalry between the two principal families of Salem Village, the Putnams and the Porters.\textsuperscript{10}

The bitter conflicts between the prominent and ministerial families of Joseph Putnam and Israel Porter is critical to understanding the Salem Witch Trials of 1692, as family impacted its political aspect. This was the key information that Boyer and Nissenbaum were trying to properly record. Therefore, these two historians felt that it was their duty to fully uncover all knowledge of the history and people of Salem Village in association with the social origins of witchcraft during the late seventeenth century.
It is the knowledge of the history and people of Salem Village in association with the social origins of witchcraft during the late seventeenth century that all help to influence the postulations concerning who was solely responsible for the trials to initially commence. As they write their analyses of the Salem Witch Trials and their impact on Massachusetts’ colonists, most modern historians, especially Hoffer, have come to place blame upon Minister Cotton Mather for the trials' intensifying persecution of innocent people as he presided over them and agreed that those accused of bewitching others were utterly guilty. However, Kenneth Silverman provided a different narrative, where Mather actually stood in the accusations made against people for practicing witchcraft in his book, *The Life and Times of Cotton Mather*. Silverman relied on the books that Mather wrote during his lifetime, especially *Witchcrafts and Possessions* (1689) and *Memorable Providences* (1690), all of which emphasize on the notion that there was a strong relation between Mather and the Salem Witch Trials of 1692 as he preached that devils would haunt Salem Village one day. Nevertheless, this history biographer also stated that Mather likewise believed that these devils he preached of were rational beings. Thus, he believed it was his utmost duty to observe, judge and report on all of the cases of witchcraft that unraveled. Silverman then stated how the trial of Martha Goodwin was what convinced Mather to detest the unfair and impetuous accusations of witchcraft, especially those that occurred over in Boston, in his account on the Goodwin children.

To us, the Goodwin children seem not possessed but turbulently rebellious. From the secular viewpoint of modern psychoanalysis and anthropology, their antics merely ventilated severely repressed desires and disapproved behavior... Mather was unwittingly correct in equating diabolism with discontent, for much of the Goodwin children’s behavior represented hostility toward Puritan standards.\(^\text{11}\)

Through Mather’s comparison of the witchcraft trials to barbarism in his personal and intellectual chronicles, Silverman characterized the political and religious unrest that was actually responsible for causing the series of litigations to transpire, and thus, lifting the century-long blame off of Minister Cotton Mather. To him, this serves as the fundamental narrative of the Salem Witch Trials of 1692.

Other history biographers, nevertheless, have stated otherwise by claiming that there is no, nor will there ever be, conclusive narratives of the Salem Witch Trials of 1692. For example, in her book, *The Devil in Massachusetts*, Marion L. Starkey settled that a thorough narrative of the trials would require a long time to complete and would have to be comprehensive in size. The only method to approach such a narrative on the trials is by looking at the typescript arranged together by the Works Progress Administration into three large volumes based on the immense and disorganized court records from the courthouses in Essex, Middlesex, and Suffolk counties in Massachusetts.

Even this document, invaluable as it is, is not definitive, for to uncover the complete story one must supplement the court records with study of other contemporary sources, the writings of Cotton and Increase Mather...John Hale—to mention only a few. Also the WPA volumes do not pretend to be history; they contain only the raw material of history.\(^\text{12}\)

Out of all the formal literary writings on the Salem Witch Trials of 1692, Starkey further commented, there are only two historical publications that are inclusive: *Salem Witchcraft* by Up-
ham and *Witchcraft in Salem Village* by Winfield S. Nevin (1892). Somewhat similar to what both Boyer and Nissenbaum had to say, Starkey found Upham’s book to be very complex as, in her opinion, no one was capable of spending the same amount of years that Upham spent while researching all the small details on the Salem Witch Trials of 1692. On the other hand, Nevin’s book seemed like a rewrite of Upham’s work to Starkey since he was more interested in drafting a series of analyses on assorted characteristics that emphasized the trials instead of telling the actual story. All in all, while examining these two books, Marion L. Starkey was trying to uncover various primary sources that both of the historians had left out when they wrote their accounts on the trials. She felt it was important to tell the actual story of the Salem Witch Trials in the same fashion as an Ancient Greek tragedy and create a mental explanation that would be implied throughout a narrative instead of a principle itself.

In conclusion, the “different aspects of the problem” approach is crucial to understanding how the secondary sources fathomed the intricate relationship between women, witchcraft, religion and politics. Historians have analyzed other historians’ literary work on the trials in order to detail who was to blame. It can undoubtedly be conjectured that, without this particular approach, most researchers would never be able to unpack the numerous and various aspects of key historical events and analyze how other scholars have written about them. This is what the historians, such as Emerson W. Baker, Joseph Klaits, Paul Boyer, and Stephen Nissenbaum, were trying to unravel as they focused on the historical truth of the Salem Witch Trials of 1692. While the trials themselves have always been muddled with controversy, there is one theme that seems to regularly surface. The fact that religious leaders preached of the immense fear of Satan and, at the same time, warned that those who did not stay on the Puritan path would be tortured by the Devil, had far reaching implications into colonial politics and society as a whole. By comparing their perspectives to that of the colonists who perceived these trials and, also, to the historians who documented the proceedings many generations later, each of these historians were completing the task of divulging neglected or unexplained records of such a gruesome event that would shape our country’s early history. Through historical analysis and detailed historiographies, the horrors of the Salem Witch Trials of 1692 will never be forgotten and, hopefully, history will not repeat itself again.
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The articles and advertisements from the 1991 and 1992 editions of *Time* magazine say a lot about sexuality in those years. While the articles reflect the culture of the time, they typically show the more sympathetic, and arguably, the more liberal side of public opinion and action. Although the articles recognize that AIDS affected gay men disproportionately, they often focused on how the crisis was affecting heterosexual people and only began to frequently cover the crisis after Earvin “Magic” Johnson announced that he had HIV. However, there is also a clear disconnect between the goals of the magazine articles, which support the search for a cure regardless of the motivation or who specifically would benefit, and the advertisements of the year. While most ads were for cars and computers, the next most significant product was cigarettes, with the occasional ad for something to help stop smoking or hide the fact that someone smokes. Yet, *Time* also ran articles on the dangers of smoking. It is clear that the ads in *Time* do not reflect the same ideals that the authors portray in their articles, as there are no ads for condoms or AZT (one of the first medications that provided some relief and security for those suffering from AIDS) in the magazine and no reference to the possible dangers of sex.

The AIDS crisis begins during a time when the “New Right” was pushing for a return to traditional values and morals in the United States. These conservatives viewed gays and lesbians as deviant and especially as a danger to children. The New Right was also against having sex education in schools and legal abortions. While this group was not a unified front on every issue, it was clear that there was a central focus: the sexuality of youth. Almost every issue was a reaction to how threatened the conservatives felt by young people expressing their sexuality, and the causes and consequences of that, from sex education in schools and pornography, to teen pregnancies and the push to keep abortion safe and legal. However, once the AIDS crisis began in 1981, “the New Right quickly recognized AIDS as a vehicle to whip up hysteria and move its political agenda forward.” They used this to promote traditional family values and an anti-sodomy agenda. It wasn’t until AIDS started affecting the heterosexual population that even conservatives began to reconsider their stance on condom use, birth control, and safe sex education in schools and colleges.

When Earvin “Magic” Johnson announced that he had the HIV virus that causes AIDS and retired from his basketball career in 1991, he brought a new issue to the forefront: that anyone can be affected by HIV/AIDS. Johnson maintained that he was straight and had contracted the disease from heterosexual contact throughout his time as an AIDS advocate. The possibility of straight people contracting AIDS was not a new threat, as *Time* even featured a cover story about how heterosexuals were ‘coping’ with the AIDS crisis a few years earlier. However, Johnson did become the spokesperson that the AIDS activism movement needed. Quoted in the article, the chairperson of the National Minority AIDS Council, Norm Nickens, said “Clearly this is tragic […] but we couldn’t ask for a better spokesperson.” Johnson was a role model, a household name, and held sway over communities who were being
disproportionately affected by the virus, though not as commonly as gay men: young people and minority communities in poverty. He became an outspoken advocate for those affected by HIV/AIDS, especially heterosexuals, rather than disappearing into obscurity like some of the celebrities, like Rock Hudson, who contracted the virus earlier and who often did identify as gay. Even though AIDS had killed thousands by the time Johnson made his announcement, it wasn’t until this announcement that AIDS truly became a threat recognized by the public. Since it was now clear that anyone could contract the disease, and not just gay men and IV drug users, people began to see the importance of preventative measures and of putting more funding into research. This was also shown in the increased coverage of the crisis in *Time* and other publications.

However, articles like this one also show the darker sides of American society and its views on the AIDS crisis. While this was by no means the first coverage of AIDS by *Time* magazine, it was only after Johnson’s announcement that things began to change. Once the “gay plague” was spreading among heterosexual people, it came to the forefront and more preventative measures became more common. Things like sex education in schools and free or cheap condoms were more societally acceptable, even among conservatives. There was still stigma against the gay men who contracted AIDS, however, as shown by the letters of reactions to the “Invincible AIDS” and “Gays and AIDS” articles published almost a year after the Johnson article as they appear in the August 24, 1992 issue.

The increasing awareness and activism surrounding the AIDS crisis after Johnson’s announcement definitely showed society’s views of gays during that time. As homosexuality was still stigmatized at the time, people were more likely to ignore the things that affected disproportionately affected gay people in favor of their own agendas. “While the heterosexual community has shown recurrent compassion, it is unlikely to feel the same sense of desperate necessity that gay men do” and therefore, popular media did not always focus on the community who was the most affected, but rather the effects of the disease on the dominant, ‘normative’ culture.

It is also important to realize the role media plays in society’s views on a subject. Media coverage, such as television, newspaper, and magazines can greatly affect what people pay attention to and what they care about. Coverage can change the outcome of a presidential race and it can certainly affect how people react to an epidemic like AIDS. Randy Shilts says in *And the Band Played On* that “People died and nobody paid attention because the mass media did not like covering stories about homosexuals and was especially skittish about stories that involved gay sexuality.” This is clear not only in *Time*’s limited coverage of AIDS before celebrities like actor Rock Hudson and Magic Johnson announced they had it, but also in how AIDS was talked about. The magazine covered how it was mostly contracted by gay men and IV drug users, but its articles often target and blame these groups for acting in ways that made the contraction and spread of the virus easier, whereas they are more likely to offer coping strategies for those heterosexuals affected by the disease. Even though gay and lesbian people were becoming more accepted in society, there was still stigma surrounding them, at least in part due to their sexuality.

This aversion to talking about gay men’s sexuality was one of the numerous reasons why AIDS coverage was sparse in popular media before Johnson’s announcement. It is also important to note how AIDS affected their sexuality. The AIDS crisis “turned an often hedonistic male subculture [...] into a true community, rich in social services and political lobbies,
in volunteerism and civic spirit.”¹¹ The crisis caused an increase in safe sex education and practices, within the gay community and in society as a whole. It also brought the discussion of gay sex and its mechanics more into the public eye, even in newspapers and magazines that targeted the general population as opposed to the gay subculture. While gay people still faced discrimination and stigmatization, the fact that the public was becoming more aware of the issues gay people faced was a step in the right direction for the AIDS activism movement and the gay rights movement in general.¹²

There was also a downward trend in the number of sexual partners gay men had and the frequency of unsafe sex acts that they participated in. In No Magic Bullet, Allan Brandt reveals that “AIDS forced the gay community to rethink sexual mores which had become a symbol of their movement for wider social and political liberation.”¹³ In order to protect themselves and their community, gay men had to be cautious, and this trend, in safer sexual practices and higher rates of monogamy, though hard to track, was a turning point in gay cultural history. The gay community had previously been seen as connected to the free love movement and its ideals. They were portrayed as people who often had numerous sexual partners in a short time. In the first years of the crisis “Profiles of the initial victims led doctors to speculate that AIDS was a byproduct of contemporary gay male life, a result of sexual promiscuity and ‘fast-lane’ living.”¹⁴ The disease itself then caused further discrimination, while inversely, the fact that AIDS affected gay men the most caused more of a reluctance of the dominant society to recognize the toll it was taking especially on the gay male community. Therefore, the gay community, with some success, learned to take care of each other, as proven by lower rates of new infections during the time these practices were beginning in the mid 1980s due to this change in culture.¹⁵

The disconnect between the advertisements and the articles also shows the disconnect between those who supported finding a cure and those who would rather live in ignorance of the epidemic. For example, one of the most common ads in Time in 1992 was for cigarettes. There are numerous articles about the health concerns of smoking, and yet there are paid ads for them as well. There is also an occasional ad for a product to help you quit smoking or cover up the fact that you smoke. So, despite the gradual decline in popular opinion about smoking, the magazine still accepts money from the companies. This is related to how sexuality is portrayed in the advertisements. There is little hint to the rising danger of sex and sexuality during a time when having sex can kill you. There are, however, still subtle hints at sexuality without the allusion of dangerous outcomes.

The lack of sexuality depicted in Time magazine ads hints at both a disconnect between the goals of the magazine and its writers as well as a general unwillingness to show even straight sexuality in its ads. There is rarely direct reference to the AIDS crisis in the advertisements. However, there was one for the American Medical Association (AMA) which did talk about the AIDS crisis in January of 1992. This advertisement specifically referenced AIDS but only in a strictly medical sense. The feature of the ad was Dr. Pail Volberding, one of the doctors who pioneered an AIDS research clinic in San Francisco in 1981. The ad itself advertises both the AMA in general and one of their booklets, entitled “Five Issues in American Health” but does not make even an indirect reference to sexuality. To have an advertisement about AIDS that discusses neither the possible risk factors, like unprotected sex or IV drug use, nor the actual progress on a cure or vaccine, shows the disunity between what’s contained within the magazine articles and the ads themselves.¹⁶
However, there are still hints of sexuality in other advertisements. While some of the more common products advertised in *Time* in 1991 and 1992 are computers and cars, another common product is cigarettes. There are rarely images of ‘sexy’ people smoking cigarettes, but there are more subtle hints at sexuality in these ads, like one from Carlton that reads “He loves me. He loves me not. But one thing is sure. Carlton is lowest.”¹⁷ This ad claims that Carlton cigarettes are the best, or at least the least bad, because they have the lowest amount of tar and therefore a better taste. The ad reminds the viewer of the childhood rhyme that children use to determine if their crush likes them back. This callback to the stirrings of childhood sexuality still in some ways promotes sexuality (and behaviors related to it) without alluding to the danger of sexual behavior in the era.¹⁸ It promotes heterosexual normativity while also promoting sexuality in general. Ads like this show that there was little to no fear of sexuality for heterosexual people at this time during the AIDS crisis.

Similarly, despite the supposed support for HIV/AIDS research, there are little to no ads that support products that would prevent HIV infections, such as condoms. While ads like these were historically banned, it was during the AIDS crisis that condom ads were beginning to appear in popular media in order to promote safer sex with the hope of preventing new HIV infections.¹⁹ It is telling that in the issue with an AIDS cover story, there are no ads for condoms or other AIDS related products or drugs. This could show a disparity between the goals of the advertisers and the goals of the writers. However, *Time* was a popular and successful magazine that could certainly turn down advertisers. This raises the question of whether the magazine made the choice to not feature ads for AIDS related products even as they ran prominent articles about the disease. And if they purposefully chose not to feature them, whether or not the pressure from dominant society to keep denying the recognition of gay men's sexuality and their welfare was what prevented them from running these ads.

The articles and advertisements in *Time* magazine during the year following Magic Johnson’s announcement that he was HIV+ tell a lot about sex and sexuality during the time. While AIDS disproportionately affected the gay community, many articles focused on the effect of the disease on dominant culture and heterosexual people, offering them coping mechanisms and advice rather than the accusations and stigmatization often associated with gay men. The AIDS crisis also had an effect on the gay subculture. Monogamy became more commonly practiced as well as safer sex in both the gay community and in society at large. However, the advertisements during this year have no allusions to the fact that sex was becoming deadly. The disunity between the ads and the articles shows the disconnect between dominant society and the struggles of those most affected by AIDS. This was at least in part due to the stigmatization of and discrimination against the gay community, where people first tended to focus on the effect of AIDS on the straight community and blame the gay community for the development and spread of the disease. It was dominant society's aversion to homosexuality that caused this disconnect even amidst one of the worst epidemics in history.
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Most United States citizens know something about the Constitution, but what is lesser known is how the amendments to the Constitution have been tested and progressed over time. Perhaps one of the most tested and affirmed amendments is the fourteenth. The Constitution of the United States guarantees its citizens the right to equality as specified by the Fourteenth Amendment’s Equal Protection Clause. The Clause states: “No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws” (US Const. amend. XIV). The Fourteenth Amendment, although not nearly as well known as the first few amendments, is what establishes citizens’ rights to have equal protection under any Federal or State laws, and prohibits laws made by States that infringe upon it. It is for this reason that the United States Supreme Court began to hear cases involving the discrimination of citizens based on gender and sexuality in the late 1960s. While the Equal Protection Clause theoretically protects all citizens from laws which discriminate on race, the question of discrimination based on gender and sexuality came about because of State statutes promoting the wellbeing of one gender or sexuality over another. Over time and displayed in various cases, the Court began to progress in its viewpoint of the rights of women as well as the rights of homosexuals. In this essay, I intend to show this progression of the Court regarding the rights of women and homosexuals through explorations of past cases and their implications for future decisions.

The first case involving gender inequalities came across the Supreme Court’s docket in 1967 called Reed v. Reed (“Reed v Reed”, n.p.). Sally and Cecil Reed’s son, Richard Reed, died at the young age of 16 in Ada County, Idaho (“Reed v Reed”, n.p.). The Reeds had divorced several years before Richard’s death (“Reed v Reed”, n.p.). Before his death, Richard Reed’s estate was under legal dispute as to who should administer the estate. The estate included a few personal items and a savings account of under $1,000 (“Reed v Reed”, n.p.). Section 15-312 of the Idaho Code stipulated that the executor of the estate of anyone who dies interstate, must be a direct relationship (“Reed v Reed”, n.p.). This Code also specifies that males are given preferential treatment over females when a written will is not present. It was because of this law that Cecil was awarded the position of executor of the estate (“Reed v Reed”, n.p.). Sally Reed challenged this decision on the grounds that it violates the Equal Protection Act of the Fourteenth Amendment (“Reed v Reed”, n.p.). With help from the ACLU and Ruth Ginsberg, the case progressed through the circuit court and to the Supreme Court.

In a unanimous decision, the Court held that the law’s unequal treatment of men and women was unconstitutional (“Reed v Reed”, n.p.). The Court determined that there are no biological differences that would make males more capable of executing a will than
females. The law was based on administrative convenience only, not on solid logical or legal grounds (“Reed v Reed”, n.p.). The opinion of the court was given by Chief Justice Burger stating that “[t]o give a mandatory preference to members of either sex over members of the other, merely to accomplish the elimination of hearings on the merits, is to make the very kind of arbitrary legislative choice forbidden by the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment...[T]he choice in this context may not lawfully be mandated solely on the basis of sex” (“Reed v Reed”, n.p.). In this case, Burger highlighted the inequality of the Courts in not deciding the executor of the estate based on merit, but rather by gender alone.

This ruling was made using the Rational Bias Test to determine whether or not the case was able to be determined by the Court or was a relevant matter. According to the Legal Information Institute at Cornell University, “To pass the rational basis test, the statute or ordinance must have a legitimate state interest, and there must be a rational connection between the statute’s/ordinance’s means and goals” (“Rational Bias Test”, n.p.). This decision-making tool would later be under scrutiny as the Court was unsure about using it for gender discrimination cases. This case marked the first of many cases to extend the rights of women and equality of the sexes under law. This Supreme Court decision would set a precedent for gender equality cases in the decades to come.

As time went on, the Supreme Court began to hear more cases on gender discrimination based on State statutes. In 1972, Oklahoma enacted a statute regulating the sale of “non-intoxicating beer,” which was beer with a 3.2% alcohol level (Craig v Boren (1972), n.p.). The statute stated that males could buy the alcohol at 21, whereas females could buy the beer at the age of 18 (Craig v Boren (1972), n.p.). The rationale behind this regulation was that statistical evidence indicated that males between the ages of 18-21 were more likely to be arrested or get in an accident from drunk driving (Craig v Boren (1972), n.p.). Curtis Craig, an eighteen-year-old male, along with liquor vender Carolyn Whitener, sued the Oklahoma state governor David Boren (Craig v Boren (1972), n.p.). This was on the grounds that the statute was discriminatory based on gender and that the statistical evidence did not warrant such a statute.

The three-judge district court ruled that the rational bias test was a rational way to determine the case. They then determined that the statistical evidence proving the differences between males and females was substantial enough to continue the avocation of the law. This is despite opposition stating that the biological maturation of men and women occurs at different rates. Craig and Whitener appealed to the Supreme Court stating that the statistical evidence was not enough to justify the law (Craig v Boren (1972), n.p.). The Supreme Court ruled that the Oklahoma law violated the Fourteenth Amendment because it created different standards for men and women (Craig v Boren (1972), n.p.). Justice Brennan delivered the opinion of the Court, stating that, “the Oklahoma Legislature is free to redefine any cutoff age for the purchase age for the purchase and sale of 3.2% beer that it may choose, provided that the redefinition operates in a gender-neutral fashion” (Craig v Boren (1972), n.p.).

Craig v. Boren is considered a landmark case because by striking down the Oklahoma law, the Court established a new standard for review in gender discrimination cases (Craig v Boren (1972), n.p.). This new standard is more demanding than the lowest standard for review, the rational basis, in which the case is discussed on the terms of how it is rationally related to a legitimate government interest. This new test is also less demanding than the highest standard, the strict scrutiny, which determines a case based on the compelling governmental interest. The majority opinion in this case articulated a standard in between
the rational bias test and the strict scrutiny test, known as the intermediate scrutiny test. This case highlights the progression of the Court’s view on gender equality extending farther than just defending women, but rather equality of the sexes in general. The Court’s focus is on providing rulings that do not discriminate or separate the sexes, or limit one more than the other. The Equal Protection Clause in this case was used to strike down the unequal age requirements of the Oklahoma statute.

In addition to the Court hearing and deciding on gender discrimination cases, they also began to hear more cases on homosexuality. The first of these landmark cases, called Bowers v. Hardwick, established the amount of homophobia in the Courts during the 1980s because of the AIDS crisis going on at the time (“Bower v Hardwick”, n.p.). In 1982, Michael Hardwick was issued a citation for public drinking after an Atlanta officer witnessed him throwing a beer bottle into a bush. Hardwick missed his scheduled court date, and therefore the police officer obtained a warrant for his arrest (“Bower v Hardwick”, n.p.). Hardwick paid the $50 fee, but due to a clerical error, the officer still showed up at Hardwick’s place of residence with an invalid warrant. Hardwick’s roommate was asleep on the couch of the living room when the officer arrived at the home. The roommate then directed the officer to Hardwick’s bedroom (“Bower v Hardwick”, n.p.). When the door was opened, the officer observed Hardwick and his partner having consensual anal sex. The officer then arrested Hardwick for violating Georgia’s anti-sodomy law. Hardwick then sued the Attorney General Michael Bowers on the grounds that the anti-sodomy law was discriminatory against homosexual men (“Bower v Hardwick”, n.p.). In the Federal District Court, the case was dismissed due to the lack of a claim made by Hardwick. The Court of Appeals reversed this decision, stating that the Georgia statute was discriminatory and unconstitutional. The Attorney general Michael Bowers appealed to the Supreme Court and was granted certiorari. Writ of Certiorari is Latin for “to be more fully informed” and in this case means that the Court agreed to take the case with the additional information provided in the appeal (LII staff, n.p.).

The Constitutional question in Bowers v Hardwick was if the Georgia statute was discriminatory and limited the rights of homosexuals in the state. In a 5-4 decision after months of deliberation, the Court ruled in favor of Bowers, stating that the anti-sodomy law was “deeply rooted in the nations traditions” (“Bower v Hardwick”, n.p.). This act of discrimination reflects the hatred that homosexuals faced in society at the time. In the dissenting opinion, Justice Blackmun stated that the Georgia statute “denies individuals the right to decide for themselves whether to engage in particular forms of private, consensual sexual activity” and that it was not up to the Court to regulate the conduct of individuals within their own homes (“Bower v Hardwick”, n.p.). This case set a precedent of discrimination against homosexuals, which would not be overturned for decades to come.

The issue of homosexuality did not cross the Court’s docket again for nearly twenty years after Bowers v. Hardwick. In 2003, after receiving a call about a possible weapons disturbance in a Texas neighborhood, police officers entered the home of John Lawrence and Tyron Garner. Much like the previous case, officers observed the two men engaging in consensual anal sex (Lawrence v Texas (2003), n.p.). Lawrence and Garner were subsequently arrested based on the Texas law which prohibits sodomy, despite the act being carried out between two consenting adults. The men then appealed to the Texas court of Appeals stating that the law violated their Fourteenth Amendment right to equal protection under the law (Lawrence v Texas (2003), n.p.). The Texas Court found in favor of the state, using the ruling
in Bowers v. Hardwick to support their decision (Lawrence v Texas (2003), n.p.). Lawrence then appealed to the Supreme Court on the grounds that this law limited homosexuals’ right to consensual sex in their own homes. This case then became known as Lawrence v. Texas.

In a 6-3 decision, the Supreme Court ruled to reverse the decision in Bowers v. Hardwick, ruling that the Texas statute did violate the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment (Lawrence v Texas (2003), n.p.). This was a small victory for the LGBTQIA+ community and exemplifies the changing of the times in contrast to the hatred and discrimination that the community had been facing prior to the case. Justice O’Connor gave a concurring opinion, stating that “A law branding one class of persons as criminals solely based on the State’s moral disapproval of that class and the conduct associated with that class runs contrary to the values of the Constitution and the Equal Protection Clause, under any standard of review” (Lawrence v Texas (2003), n.p.). The change in the opinion of the Court illustrates the progression of public opinion and acceptance of homosexuality. However, at this time, homosexual Americans were still not awarded the same marital, insurance or estate privilege that heterosexual couples were awarded. It would take the Court another decade before a case would come across the Supreme Court which would extend these rights to homosexual Americans.

In 2013, James Obergefell filed a suit against the State of Ohio for failure to recognize his marriage to his partner John Arthur, which was performed in Maryland, where gay marriage was legal (Obergefell v Hodges (2013), n.p.). Arthur passed away from ALS a few months after the wedding to his beloved partner, Arthur. Upon his death, Obergefell was not named the surviving spouse, as the Ohio law did not recognize gay marriage performed in other states as legal (Obergefell v Hodges (2013), n.p.). Obergefell sued Governor Kasich in the case Obergefell v Kasich in the Ohio Court system. At the same time, another plaintiff was added with a similar situation. David Michener’s husband passed away in a Cincinnati nursing home, after being legally married in Delaware. On the death certificate, Michener was not listed as the surviving spouse either (Obergefell v Hodges (2013), n.p.). Michener and Obergefell combined their cases and sued the Health Department director of Ohio. The name of the case changed several times throughout its progression through the Court system due to the Health Department director being changed twice until it was finally titled Obergefell v. Hodges. It then progressed to the Supreme Court.

This case brought up questions about whether the Fourteenth Amendment required a state to recognize gay marriages performed in other states and whether it was legal to perform gay marriages in Ohio itself. In a landmark 5-4 decision, the Court ruled that under the Fourteenth Amendment’s Equal Protection Clause, states must perform and recognize gay marriages (Obergefell v Hodges (2013), n.p.). The opinion of the Court was delivered by Justice Kennedy which stated that, “marriage is one of the vital personal rights essential to the orderly pursuit of happiness by free men” (Obergefell v Hodges (2013), n.p.). This marked the beginning of gay marriage being legal in all United States and Provinces. This landmark decision not only highlighted the change in opinion that the judges had when it came to gay marriage, but the changing opinion of the general public at the time.

The Supreme Court progressed immensely in their opinion and advocacy for gender equality and sexuality expression from the 1960s to modern day. From Reed v Reed to the modern-day case of Obergefell v Hodges, the Court’s opinion has made for a safer and more accepting society. Extending the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to
homosexuals in regards to marriage provided an interpretation of the Constitution that is more progressive and fitting of modern-day society. In addition, extending the Equal Protection Clause beyond race to include sex gives citizens in the United States more rights and freedoms. Perhaps in the future, the Court will become even more progressive in its view towards transgender individuals as well. I can only hope that I will see an anti-discrimination decision allowing Transgender people back into the military in my lifetime. While the Supreme Court has come a long way since the 1960s, the United States still has a lot of work to do in order to provide protection for all citizens, regardless of gender and sexual orientation.
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What constitutes political fiction is an ongoing debate, but Graham Greene’s *The Quiet American* is one novel that fits the most common definitions. In her book, *Toward the Geopolitical Novel: U.S. Fiction in the Twenty-First Century*, Caren Irr examines over one hundred political novels that she considers “geopolitical;” that is, novels that are concerned with the political relationships between two or more nations. The political backdrop of a geopolitical novel, including *The Quiet American*, is instrumental in how the characters interact and is important to understanding the novel’s plot and outcomes. In concert with Irr’s understanding of the geopolitical novel, the relationships between the three main characters and the conflict in Vietnam can also be viewed through Fredric Jameson’s interpretive approach as laid out in his treatise, *The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act*. The relationships between Thomas Fowler, Phuong, and Alden Pyle, the three main characters, is easily viewed as an allegorical tale or warning about the political relationships between Europe, Vietnam, and the United States during a time when Vietnam was in great turmoil.

In *Toward the Geopolitical Novel*, Irr describes political novels as such: “Politically charged characters, settings, conflicts, and styles of narration comprise the foreground of the narrative as well as the background of the geopolitical novel” (Irr 3). *The Quiet American* is a prime example of this basic definition. The setting is an occupied nation, Vietnam, which is in the early stages of a war with Communist influences. The main characters are all involved in that war in one way or another. The novel is written from the perspective of an English reporter, Thomas Fowler, whose job is to send news reports to a British newspaper about the rising conflicts in Vietnam. Fowler’s lover, Phuong, is a young Vietnamese woman who lives with Fowler until Alden Pyle comes along and convinces her that he can give her what Fowler cannot, namely, marriage. Pyle is an American who has come to Vietnam as part of an economic aid mission, but Fowler suspects that he is with the CIA, or at the very least, a US government operative, and has more nefarious plans for Vietnam. Fowler’s suspicions of Pyle are compounded by the fact that Pyle steals Fowler’s lover away from him. Neither Fowler nor Pyle would be in Vietnam if it weren’t for the rising conflicts. Their lives revolve around the political conflict that sets the scene for the novel, and the relationships between Fowler, Phuong, and Pyle are deeply impacted by that conflict.

As a reporter, Fowler takes many risks to see the fighting and report on it from an eyewitness perspective. However, even as he does this, he attempts to avoid any appearance of having a personal opinion on the conflict. In a conversation with Pyle, Fowler says “I don’t know what I’m talking politics for. They don’t interest me and I’m a reporter. I’m not *engagé*” (Greene 88). During this same conversation, Fowler and Pyle discuss the complexities of the conflict in Vietnam, which puts them in a dangerous situation as their car runs out of gas and they do not make it to their destination before the curfew. As they debate the French occupation of Vietnam and the rise of Communist rebels, Pyle insists that he wants to help the Vietnamese people by bringing about a democratic government. However, Fowler believes that the Vietnamese simply want to be left alone, not only by the Communists but by the French and Americans as well; “They want enough rice... They don’t want to be shot at. They want one day to be much the same as another. They don’t want our white skins around telling them what they want” (Greene 86).
Pyle, on the other hand, is a man of action. The book begins with Fowler learning of his death, then returns to an earlier point to explain the events that lead to it. As we begin to learn more about Pyle through Fowler’s perspective, we also begin to see that he is a reckless man. He follows Fowler into a war zone, without any kind of plan or sense of his own safety, in order to tell Fowler his plans to take Phuong away from him. He shows persistence by trying to remain friends with Fowler in spite of this betrayal. Fowler begins to suspect that Pyle is doing something dangerous, and sets out to investigate Pyle, but learns too late that Pyle is involved with a plan to bomb a city block that leads to the deaths of several innocent Vietnamese civilians. Pyle witnesses the bombing and is troubled by it. Fowler, armed with his investigative knowledge, puts plans into action that will have Pyle killed, thus stopping one threat to peace in Vietnam, as well as a threat to his personal happiness with Phuong. Pyle’s greatest political problem is his own ignorance of the geopolitical chess game. He is helping to arm a dangerous general without thinking through the consequences of his actions, and even when he sees the consequences in person, he is in denial. “[General] Thé wouldn’t have done this. I’m sure he wouldn’t. Somebody deceived him. The Communists…” (Greene 155). Fowler, now knowing for certain that Pyle is dangerous, justifies to himself that Pyle must be taken care of. In spite of his insistence that he is not *engagé*, Fowler knows he must take action.

After the bombing that Pyle helps orchestrate, Fowler thinks to himself that Pyle would never truly understand or feel remorse for his own role in the events; “What’s the good? He’ll always be innocent, you can’t blame the innocent, they are always guiltless. All you can do is control them or eliminate them. Innocence is a kind of insanity” (Greene 155). *The Quiet American* is critical of American political practices around the world, namely the attempts to spread democracy through questionable and often dangerous means. This is in contrast to many geopolitical novels written in the second half of the 20th century, which Irr critiques, saying “skeptical observers find would-be global fiction too uncritically American” (Irr 2), and that the common geopolitical novel is preoccupied with “American innocence in a dangerous world” (Irr 3). In facetiously proclaiming Pyle’s “innocence” as an American, Greene, through Fowler, is condemning this practice in America-centered global fiction. In that sense, Fowler is able to do with Pyle what Greene cannot: stop the American threat.

In using Fowler’s point of view as the lens for *The Quiet American*, Greene is able to justify the actions that Fowler takes against Pyle. In spite of the fact that Fowler holds a grudge against Pyle for stealing his lover, Fowler’s reasoned response to Pyle’s indifference toward his role in the deaths of innocent people shows that although Fowler is reluctant to act politically until a point, he cannot justify standing by in this instance. Outside of the conversation between Fowler and Pyle on the guard station, there is very little direct discussion of politics in the novel, but politics provide a foundation for everything that takes place. This includes the relationship between Fowler and Phuong as well. Phuong is treated kindly, but her feelings are not considered by anyone around her, including her own sister, who wants her to marry Pyle and get out of Vietnam. While this might seem like consideration, the goal is not a loving and happy marriage, it is only escape from war. Phuong’s decision to leave Fowler for Pyle is made out of this pragmatism. Fowler cannot give her a marriage, and no matter what he may say about loving her, he knows so little about her personally that for him it is familiarity or attachment rather than a deep sense of intimacy. He likes her company, and she takes care of him the way he prefers, so he wishes her to stay with him.
Using Fredric Jameson’s model of interpretation as outlined in the first chapter of *The Political Unconscious*, we can see the various conflicts within *The Quiet American* through the appropriate lens. As Greene’s novel is overt political fiction, with a geopolitical backdrop that is woven throughout the entire story, it is not difficult to see how politics affect the plot. The first of three concentric phases of interpretation that Jameson uses to interpret a text sees it “essentially as a *symbolic* act” (Jameson 17). In this phase, the allegorical nature of the love triangle between Fowler, Phuong, and Pyle is a representation of the relationships between the United States, Vietnam, and Europe at the time. Each of the three main characters represents a nation, or a set of political ideologies. Fowler is the representation of European colonialism, which conquers poor nations and uses their resources. Phuong is a generalization of the Vietnamese people, who had no say in what happened to them, and were simply along for the ride. Pyle, of course, represents the American interests, which aimed to keep Communism at bay and promote the spread of democracy. The ages of the three characters are significant, as well. Fowler is older and, in his mind, wiser, someone who mostly understood what was going on around him but did not pass judgment. Pyle, a young man fresh out of college, was filled with ideas. The older Fowler represents the longevity of Europe, while Pyle is representative of the young nation of America, enthusiastic about his ideas, but immature and impulsive.

Moving into the second concentric phase of Jameson’s interpretive method, we can see that *The Quiet American* was meant for a specific audience at a set time and place. The novel was written contemporaneously with the conflicts in Vietnam, in which the United States eventually took a much greater role. The novel serves as Greene’s warning to Americans that the nation’s involvement in Vietnam was not helpful and would likely have disastrous consequences, and yet, perhaps unsurprisingly, Greene’s prescient warning was ignored. It is only upon looking back into history that we can see what Greene already knew. The novel no longer serves as a warning for that particular time and place, as history has moved on. However, its message is still relevant and useful as a part of the historical timeline, as we will see in Jameson’s third phase.

Within Jameson’s framework for interpretation, we must also examine the struggle between two classes, the dominant and laboring classes (Jameson 23), and how the plot is related to this struggle. This struggle in *The Quiet American* plays out in many ways. First, there is the overarching struggle between the Communists and the ruling French. Second, there is the relationship between Fowler and Pyle. Fowler is set in his ways, comfortable, a member of the press and the bourgeoisie, and accustomed to a certain lifestyle. Pyle disrupts his life not only with his ideas about a new democracy in Vietnam but also by taking away the one constant comfort in Fowler’s life, his lover, Phuong. Phuong is representative of the laboring class as well, and as a Vietnamese woman, her role in her relationship with Fowler is one of servitude. This would not likely change even if he were capable of marrying her. She accepts this role until something more appealing comes along and disrupts the status quo. Pyle’s disruption of Fowler’s life comes not only in the form of breaking up a relationship but in his political activity. Pyle is a personification of Jameson’s interpretive model in which “an oppositional culture or ideology will, often in covert and disguised strategies, seek to contest and to undermine the dominant ‘value system’” (Jameson 23). Ultimately, Pyle’s plans work against him, and the status quo between Fowler and Phuong is maintained, or at the very least, stabilized. However, his actions have consequences for the politics of Vietnam overall, and Fowler can do nothing to keep these events from unfolding.
In his third and final concentric phase of interpretation, Jameson looks at the context of a story within the framework of all of history. We must decide what *The Quiet American* means historically, and what its value is within its own historical context. Greene’s critique of American involvement in Vietnam, through the person of Alden Pyle, is one example of the historical value of the novel. The novel is a warning of the consequences of this type of involvement, but one that was unlikely to be heeded. Greene understood that the American government was determined to spread democracy and fight Communism at all costs, and as mentioned earlier, America sees itself as an innocent player, wishing to save the rest of the world from itself. Who can otherwise convince the one who believes in their own innocence? Perhaps it is better to view the novel as a warning to the rest of the world of what America has become and is capable of. If it is such a warning, the world has done little to temper America’s global strategy to promote democracy even where nations are not ready for all that democracy entails.

As a geopolitical text, *The Quiet American* involves several cultural contexts. The primary context is a French-occupied Vietnam that is being broken down by Communist rebellions. Fowler, the English journalist, is living as an expatriate among the Vietnamese, French, and the Americans, who are beginning to involve themselves in affairs of the state. The novel attempts to navigate these cultures, and Fowler, our narrator, regularly claims he is just an unbiased observer, but there can be no such thing. Everyone’s point of view is colored by their cultural background and experiences, and Fowler is no different. Even as Americans reading and interpreting the novel, we must move past our own historical and cultural biases to understand Greene’s message. Our interpretations will look somewhat different from those of a British reader or even a Vietnamese reader. This does not change the overall message or outcome of the story, but it changes our attitudes toward it. If done properly, according to Jameson, such a culturally-aware interpretation should “‘unmask’ even the works of an overtly oppositional or political stance as instruments ultimately programmed by the system itself” (Jameson 28).

These three concentric phases of interpretation each have similar outcomes, for *The Quiet American* is a warning as much as it is an observation of a specific time and place. The love triangle is not inconsequential, it is a representation of the overarching geopolitical struggle represented in the novel. Greene’s choice of a love triangle to give his warning is a way for him to bring the geopolitical conflicts closer to home for the reader. Not everyone wants to think about politics, but everyone understands love, jealousy, suspicion and loss. The conflict in Vietnam was all of these things on a grander scale. Everyone has cultural and socioeconomic biases as well, and our interpretations of world events are related to those biases, whether we are correct or incorrect in our assessments.

*The Quiet American* is political fiction that is situated in a specific period in history and in a specific political setting, yet its relevance as a historical document carries on. Through the use of an allegorical love story, Graham Greene warns the reader of the impending dangers and long-term impact of American involvement in Vietnam. The novel warns those who desire to involve themselves in geopolitics that individual ignorance and arrogance about one’s point of view can be a dangerous thing. Finally, *The Quiet American* serves as a crucial historical warning regarding America’s dubious political practices around the globe, and the impact of those practices on relationships between other nations.
Works Cited
The 1920s were a time of rapid change in America with shifts in gender roles, social outlooks, and the pushing of cultural boundaries. The end of World War I in 1918 and the passing of the Nineteenth Amendment in 1920 were two events that disrupted traditional social and cultural norms in American society. Both the war and the fight for women’s suffrage brought middle-class white women outside of the domestic sphere, causing a sort of “sex antagonism.”

Youth, too, challenged social norms by frequently and openly engaging with the opposite sex without supervision, engaging in more sexual activity than previous generations had, and challenging the dominate culture by expressing themselves through new forms of music, such as jazz. Older upper-and middle-class men and women felt threatened by the actions of younger women and young people generally who created and took advantage of their new place in society, and as a result tried to re-exert traditional control over women and youth through social and political conservatism. This push towards traditionalism was linked to masculinity and advocated a return to “normalcy,” or the social order that had existed prior to World War I.

This drive towards political and social conservatism is evident when examining issues of The Ladies Home Journal from 1920 to 1921. In the Ladies Home Journal’s coverage and advertisements for candidates in the 1920 presidential election, the first federal election in which all white women could participate, there was an obvious attempt to limit women’s political power and reestablish masculine political control. This political and social conservatism is also evident in the magazine’s articles about youth and their perceived immorality.

The women’s movement of the early 20th century drew on principals of women organizers from the Nineteenth century by working for social welfare and arguing for political, economic, social and legal equality to men. Arguments for social and cultural equality that focused on the personal areas of life included the acknowledgment that women had sex drives, that sex within marriage should be pleasurable for women, that women should be able to have more control over the number of children they bore, and that marriages should be more egalitarian. The major difference between the women’s movement of the 19th century and that of the early 20th century was that women who led and were involved in the movement were more likely to have a college education or be employed than the women who came before them. America’s entrance into World War I in 1917 increased the number of women who worked outside of the home, although not dramatically. However, it did introduce women to jobs that had traditionally been held by men, such as work in munitions factories, farming, construction, and positions as bankers and doctors. By the 1920s, “the New Woman” was one who could vote, interact with men outside of the domestic sphere, work outside the home, get an education, and who challenged traditional attitudes toward marriage and motherhood. The women who identified as feminists or who took advantage of the new opportunities offered to women participated in questioning their new place in society. To the dominant society and to an increasingly conservative political climate, feminism was criticized for being either unnecessary or too progressive, focused too much on defining
gender roles or trying to do away with gender roles altogether, and trying to make women into men or making life a permanent competition between men and women. This questioning and debate over women’s roles and women’s growing presence in the public sphere is evident in the October issue of *Ladies Home Journal* from 1920.

In the month before the first presidential election after the ratification of the Nineteenth Amendment, *Ladies Home Journal* published several articles and advertisements related to the election of 1920. At the time, *Ladies Home Journal* was read widely by upper-and middle-class white women and was one of the most popular women’s magazines. The magazine was also in a time of transition between different editors and was struggling to modernize. The first page of the October issue is the editor’s letter entitled “Wives, Husbands And Votes” and it is the most revealing of all the election pieces. The editor’s note served to communicate to readers the beliefs of the magazine’s publishers. Those opinions in editors’ notes most likely shaped the content in the magazine and the content would serve to support the creators’ ideals. In this particular editor’s note, the author (whose name goes uncredited) ultimately thought that women gaining the right to vote was a beneficial thing but worried that the fight for such “rights” (the author put quotation marks around this term) would have a negative affect on family dynamics and relationships between men and women, and, in turn, would negatively affect society as a whole. The author worried that the continuation of the women’s movement would only create greater animosity and competition between the sexes. The author argued that the majority of women should focus on the home because he believed that was where women could do the most good. The only women who should pursue political office (and that should be on the local and state level) were women whose duties as mothers had dwindled and unmarried women who “have all the instincts of wife and mother who, for one reason or another, has not had the actual experience.” The author ends the article by writing that the only type of woman who could succeed in this new political landscape was a cooperative woman who functioned much like a good wife would. There was no opportunity for “the man-hater,” most likely a reference to more radical social feminists. In 1920, *The Ladies Home Journal* clearly had a conservative response to women’s suffrage. The publishers of the magazine were concerned about the newfound rights of women and delegitimized suffrage as a right by putting the term in quotations. Rather than advocating for a woman’s new place in society, the magazine pushed Victorian and socially conservative ideals by suggesting that the fight for suffrage caused tension between the sexes and that women should refrain from competing with men and focus on the domestic sphere rather than the public sphere. This conservative approach is also evident in the political advertisements in the same issue.

Even though the 1920s were a time of rapid social and cultural change, the political atmosphere remained conservative. All three presidents who served during the 1920s were Republicans. By the 1920 presidential election, many Americans were war-weary and turning increasingly isolationist. Many ached to return to the “normal” America that had existed before World War I and all of the political and social changes that had gone along with it. Both the Democratic Party and Republican Party ads featured in the 1920 October issue of *Ladies Home Journal* advocated for traditional values, but the representation of the parties was highly gendered. The ad for the Republican Party was highly masculine while the ad for the Democratic Party was less outwardly masculine. These ads are especially revealing because this was the first time political parties could appeal to women voters and these are the methods they
expected would draw support. Both parties invoked upper- and middle-class values by painting their candidates as people who either upheld or would protect those traditional values.

The ad for James Cox and Franklin Roosevelt, the Democratic ticket, promised to recognize “Women's Values as Citizens of the Republic,” to advocate for future peace through joining the League of Nations, and paid particular attention to social services, education, and the welfare of women and children in the workplace. The issues of peace, social services, education, and the welfare of children all would have appealed to women voters. But by focusing so much on “women’s issues,” the ad neglected to include Cox’s stance on wider economic issues, foreign relations, immigration, and other issues of the day. One section of the ad is entitled “Woman Suffrage” and it explains how both Cox and Roosevelt supported the Nineteenth amendment, but attributed its ratification to President Wilson. The ad does not acknowledge women political organizers who fought for suffrage, despite the fact that the ad was aimed at women voters. Every piece of Cox’s platform discussed in the ad was lifted word for word from the official Democratic Party National Platform. The visuals contained in the ad focused on the family and aimed to paint both Cox and Roosevelt as men with traditional upper-and middle-class families. Both Mrs. Cox and Mrs. Roosevelt are pictured holding children and are only presented as wives and mothers. Both men pictured with their large families harkens back to the Victorian ideal.

The Republican ad for Warren Harding and Calvin Coolidge, the Republican ticket, took a different approach by focusing on only the two men rather than including their families. The text focused on both Harding and Coolidge’s achievements and particularly focused on Harding’s masculinity. The largest text of the ad reads, “Here’s What HARDING did for you: your home and your country.” The ad painted Harding as a father or husband figure who “fought against Treaty commitments ... fought for the safety of your sons and the peace of your home ... worked for the good of your breadwinners” and who “personally assisted” in the ratification of the Nineteenth amendment in several states. The ad declared “He is Harding, the man (sic).” When the ad discussed the political positions of Harding and Coolidge, they did not make it seem like opinions formulated by the Republican Party. Instead, they made it seem as if Harding had come to hold these opinions on his own and had already acted upon those opinions. The positions listed do line up with the official 1920 Republican platform, but the ad does not give the details of the positions. On the other hand, the Democratic Party ad detailed parts of the Democratic Party platform and included the descriptions of positions straight from their official party platform. Perhaps the Republican Party sought to simplify their political positions in hopes that it would appeal to women voters. But Harding was also known to have “hazily defined” positions on public issues, one being the League of Nations which he kept quiet about through the length of his campaign. The ad made Harding seem like a man of action and did not feminize him in any way.

Coolidge was painted as compatible to Harding. The ad read, “His simplicity, his Americanism, strength of character and of purpose, his faith in the Republic are Harding-like.” Coolidge was also applauded as “a man, when the hour demanded, [who] forgot politics and enforced the principles of law and order that the home might be protected.” This was a reference to Coolidge’s decision, as governor of Massachusetts, to fire striking policemen in 1919. Making mention of this labor strike revealed the labor tension that also existed in the 1920s and that Coolidge was willing to use force against strikers. The fact that such an ad would be published in a woman’s magazine showed that women too poten-
tially feared the changing social and political climate in the country. Harding won the 1920 presidential election, with over sixty percent of the voting population casting their ballot for him. Throughout the 1920s, women voters made little difference in the outcomes of federal elections. Women voted less frequently than men and when they did vote they typically voted the same as their husbands or fathers. Harding’s campaign had focused on and promised “a return to normalcy,” and his victory spoke to the American population’s general uneasiness with the changes that were occurring in American society. Both political parties pushed middle-and upper class values by placing focus on family and masculine political power, but the Republican Party placed a particular emphasis on men’s political control.

Not only were women pushing political and social boundaries, the youth in the 1920s changed the dynamics between men and women in both a social and romantic sense, which caused great concern among the older generations. For middle-class white youth, dating patterns shifted away from chaperoned interactions between men and women. The domestic and public spheres began to overlap resulting in more young men and women causally interacting and dating without supervision. One place where young people from all class backgrounds challenged Victorian values were in dance halls where jazz was played. In an article from the August 1921 issue of *Ladies Home Journal* entitled *Does Jazz Put the Sin in Syncopation*, Anne Shaw Faulkner argued that jazz music and the emotions and actions it inspired caused the unprecedented immoral conditions of the youth. Faulkner wrote, “Jazz disorganizes all regular laws and order; it stimulates to extreme deeds, to a breaking away from all rules and conventions; it is harmful and dangerous, and its influence wholly bad.” Those laws that were being broken were the upper-and middle-class expectation that sex, or any sort of intimacy, would be reserved for marriage. Instead, the “boys and girls of good families” publicly danced to jazz music together, went into “corset check rooms” alone, and left the dance hall in between dances to possibly engage in some sort of “immoral behavior.”

Young people in the 1920s did engage in greater sexual exploration than previous generations; fifty percent of women who came of age in the 1920s engaged in intercourse before marriage while only fourteen percent of women born before 1900 had engaged in premarital sex. The youth of the 1920s experienced a new sense of independence that had not existed for the youth of previous generations. That new-found independence was in part the result of discussions the women’s movement had brought about and the push for social change after the end of World War I. Both men and women from the older generations sought to put an end to the perceived immorality of the youth by attempting to reinstitute traditional morality into both the public and domestic spheres. Even women involved in social women’s clubs, like Anne Shaw Faulkner who was part of the General Federation of Women’s clubs, disapproved of the changing social and sexual dynamics between young men and women.

Another reason why jazz and the culture surrounding jazz was believed to cause immoral behavior was because it was African American music. Faulkner claimed that jazz was first used in Voodoo practices: “Jazz originally was the accompaniment of the voodoo dancer, stimulating the half-crazed barbarian to the vilest deeds.” She went on to write, “The weird chant, accompanied by syncopated rhythm of the voodoo invokers, has also been employed by other barbaric people to stimulate brutality and sensuality.” The “barbaric people” she referred to were almost certainly African Americans who were the creators of jazz music. It is clear that jazz not only posed a threat to upper-and middle-class sexual morality but also posed a threat to white racial attitudes and the sexual attitudes linked to race.
In conclusion, many Americans in the early 1920s yearned for a return to the political, social, and cultural norms that had existed before World War I. Dominant society wished to put an end to the changes brought on by the war and the women’s movement and feared the perceived immorality of the youth, who took advantage of this changing society. Both the overt and concealed conservative opinions that existed in women’s magazines, like *The Ladies Home Journal*, and the results of the 1920 presidential election make it clear that both upper-and-middle-class white men and a significant portion of upper-and-middle-class white women were uneasy with women’s new place in society and the growing independence of youth and the threat both groups posed to the Victorian family. Warren Harding was presented as a man of force who could stabilize and restore “normalcy” to a society in political, cultural, and social adjustment.\(^28\) The political conservatism and social attempts to re-exert Victorian ideals are clearly linked to dominate society’s fears over the changes brought by younger generations, particularly young women.
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In *Political Tribes*, Amy Chua offers a take on America’s political environment in which she claims that the nation is uniquely blind to politically tribal behaviors present in other countries and thus Americans are unaware of their own tribal behaviors. These tribe-like behaviors tend to revolve around certain group identities such as race or religion, causing people to divide those who share similar beliefs from those who do not, and in turn isolating and discrediting the other. When these groups are in opposition to one another, clashing identities typically rupture into intense conflict. Said disruptions are believed to be present particularly in other countries, but not notoriously in the United States. Chua describes that in the United States, conflicts are typically believed to result from competing overarching conceptual beliefs about the state of the nation, thus the population tends to be oblivious to the political conflicts occurring at the identity level. These identity level conflicts include divisions that occur along lines of self-identification and group classification like race, religion and sex. These types of conflicts are believed to occur in other countries more frequently than within the United States. Americans do not recognize tribal conflicts that occur outside the boundaries of the United States, and therefore cannot recognize their own similar internal struggles. American’s blindness, Chua argues, results from the United States’ reluctance to accept our internal fractions, based on conflicting identities as most insist that these identities are transcended by one’s overarching identity as an American.

Chua argues that America is a super-group, one that does not require individuals to suppress their identities but allows them, as members of subgroups, to live amongst one another under their common identity and bond as Americans. While Chua recognizes that America was not always a super-group given its racist and elitist background, she does believe that Americans have grown in ways that are conducive to an inclusive environment for all within its boundaries. However, with recent political climate changes, she does believe that America is in a position for possible loss of identity. Chua describes that, with the development of more exclusionary subgroups, there is less room for overall group cohesion that is believed to come with the unifying American national identity. One’s sacred Americanness is at stake.

These subgroups are becoming increasingly exclusionary, allowing people with specific qualities to identify as a member of an intersectional community. A prime example discussed in *Political Tribes* is how after the first Women’s March in 2016 following the inauguration of Donald Trump, the movement was bashed for lacking representation of women of color. While this march was intended to empower all women in the country, it was faulted for failing to emphasize the intersectionality of womanhood, specifically what it means to experience the world as a person of color while also experiencing it as a woman (185). In the critiques of the Women’s March, there was a clear line drawn between white female
feminists and female feminists of color who believe white women are fighting for a cause that black women have long been pushing for. Rather than the Women’s March becoming a symbol of unification for women, groups of women were pitted against each other because of divisive subgroups. While they clung to their separate identities, or as Chua would argue, tribes, the movement fell short of its purpose of unification. Here, Chua argues that when people cling to their tribe rather than succumb to the overall betterment of a people, political tribalism begins. This behavior, which is becoming more prominent in recent years, is the cause of rising tensions in the United States, contributing to the lack of productive discourse.

The common remedy to hostility between groups is believed to be mere exposure to members of the opposing group. Chua, however, rejects this solution while suggesting a remedy that seems plausible only given specific circumstances that I will later define. Furthermore, Chua ironically does not believe that the nation is truly in any danger of losing its unique identity. Instead, she feels that the very Americanness that’s at stake is the solution to the crumbling division within the nation. The key to bonding members of the country is to remind them of their unique super-group status as an American. This seems sufficient enough to Chua and thus she provides no other remedy besides concluding her book with patriotic sentiments, perhaps in a last-ditch effort to spark a sense of pride within its reader for the country.

Fortunately, Chua’s diagnosis of the division in the country is clear and provides insight to the level of political tribalism that is at play in the United States. However, her definition as to whom the nation deems acceptable to adopt the identity of “American” is relatively opaque. Chua’s sentimental outlook on the healing power of patriotism provides its reader with a new-found pride of their country if they are from the United States, yet it fails to recognize the ways in which the country deliberately excludes people from adopting said identity for relatively arbitrary means. Prominent members of the excluded class of individuals are those who are not granted citizenship, such as undocumented or non-naturalized immigrants and convicted criminals. These two groups are prohibited from basic rights and protections, they are effectively excluded from society, and openly bashed in political rhetoric. However, they are members of the United States in that they contribute to its economy and engage with citizens and yet still are not considered to be true Americans. Further, as heated debate around who qualifies as an acceptable member of American society still occurs, it seems untimely to establish a cure to the country’s divisions as there are no clear expectations as to who can be American. Thus, if one prescribes the identity of “American” to the individuals in the United States who are also accepted as citizens, there is a class of individuals for whom her recommendation is not applicable, as they are restricted from truly adopting her prized American super-group identity. In sum, if we are unable to define who is allowed in the “American group”, we cannot expect that what will bring the United States’ members together is the embodiment of said American identity.

While her book leaves its reader with an ensured sense of patriotism, her overall solution is difficult to accept given the lack of definition as to who can adopt the identity of “American.” Thus, for her solution to become more widely acceptable, she must define who an American can be, by identifying, why certain members are believed to have deserved their status as an American and why some seemingly have not. Overall, the book was well worth the read. It presented a refreshingly positive look on a possible direction the country could take. If one were interested in gaining a better understanding on the shortsightedness of America’s foreign policy and its effects on the American people, this book is the perfect place to start.
“All things are subject to interpretation: whichever interpretation prevails at a given time is a function of power and not truth.” – Friedrich Nietzsche

This is the quote Bernardine Evaristo uses to preface her satirical novel, *Blonde Roots*, and it summarizes well not only the purpose of the book but the manner in which the world we inhabit functions. In this novel, Evaristo flips the history of racial discrimination on its head; she creates a world where African Americans are the dominant race and white Europeans are enslaved. Evaristo ingeniously fuses an 1800s setting with contemporary references: having derogatory names for white people being “wiggers” or “Barbees” and mentioning “twerking” as a popular dance style. Through this work of fiction she examines the potential ways the privileged race would have justified their cruel behavior towards a marginalized group of people and what cultural norms—such as clothing, food, language and slang—would have originated from this historical change.

*Blonde Roots* is divided into three parts. A map is included in the beginning of the book to explain how the continents occupy space in this world, which is important because it assists the reader in imagining how this fictitious world could actually exist. The first book introduces our narrator and protagonist for this tale, a European woman named Doris Scagglethorpe, or Omorenomwara, her slave name. Doris comes from a long heritage of cabbage farmers, and one day while she is outside playing hide and seek with her siblings she is captured by an Ambossan slave trader. The story alternates between flashbacks of her childhood in slavery and the present moment of freedom. We are thrust into Evaristo’s vision as we try to get acclimated with the unfamiliar lingo and customs.

Book two is an example of a pamphlet written by Chief Kaga Konata Katamba I (Chief KKK). The pamphlet mimics literary works like Nellie Norton’s “Southern Slavery and the Bible” or “The Negro’s Place in Nature” by James Hunt; they were readings circulated during the 1800s that were in opposition to abolitionist works. Chief KKK justifies slavery with his personal accounts and his interactions with Europeans.

In book three, the reader is much more familiar with the culture and language of this universe, and so we shift back to Doris’ perspective. Now, we follow her on her journey as she struggles in her attempts to reach freedom—just as many African American slaves did during the 1800s in our country’s history.

Initially, *Blonde Roots* is hard to wrap your head around; the jargon, allusions, and new titles or names for things are confusing when one is programmed to understand a society where Caucasian is the dominant race. For some readers, it may also be hard to
sympathize with an English woman’s trauma of slavery since we are aware that these racial tensions are anything but accurate to white America’s ancestral histories. Although this novel is not very recently published (almost a decade ago), the concepts behind this satire are extremely relevant for the current time period, especially when considering Otterbein University’s recent choice for Common Books, including titles Just Mercy by Bryan Stevenson and The Underground Railroad by Colson Whitehead. Evaristo masterfully reinvents the horrors seen in the enslavement of people based on insignificant aspects such as race and ethnicity.
Reproduction plays a pivotal role in society as it is a process that bears a child. Children encompass the world of tomorrow, that includes all their parent’s hopes and dreams. However, Andrew Solomon’s *Far from the Tree: Parents, Children, and the Search for Identity* begins his opening statement with “there is no such thing as reproduction” (1). Good health, able bodies, and longevity are preconceived desires that parents have historically always wanted for their children as it would make living easier; this wish is not always a reality for everyone.

Interspersed with first hand experiences, interviews, statistics, quotes, poetry, and more allow Solomon to elaborate the concepts of “vertical identities” vs “horizontal identities” to an erratic degree. Vertical identities consist of traits we so often think of when we think of family: shared cultural norms, attributes, passed down values, DNA, language, religion, and even hair color. However, Solomon drives his research and storytelling efforts towards horizontal identity traits, which are often the traits which are uncommon or ostracize an individual from their family and society: recessive genes, prenatal influences, new values, physical disability, gayness, and much more. Solomon starts by introducing his own personal experience with his horizontal identity: homosexuality. Despite his personal experience with his horizontal identity, Solomon became interested in the research project that is this novel when he was on a writing assignment for the *New York Times* where he had the opportunity to work with deaf people.

Through his interaction in The Lexington Center for the Deaf in Queens, New York, Solomon shares his first experience and the thought process which constituted his attitude and beliefs on deafness and the deaf community. Like many others Solomon believed being deaf was a pernicious illness and nothing more. Through the people he encounters Solomon finds himself acknowledging that deaf refers to a culture—and deafness is a cure to all if not most, as they wouldn’t have it any other way. Solomon’s firsthand experience of proximity led to that of many more, where his enthrallment for the differences in people’s identity lead to the formation of different chapters throughout *Far from the Tree*.

Although narration is dictated through Andrew Solomon, he humbly does an excellent job of not overly inserting or crediting himself. When Solomon interviews many of the people who helped in the making of this book, he goes out of his way to make sure they consent to sharing their story. Solomon accredits the friendships and bonds which allowed for grit, generosity, wisdom, and honesty. The amount of research within this read extends to the beginning of where said identities or circumstances originate, which makes it an excellent
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resource or outline for those studying any of the given topics. *Far from the Tree* would be a great primary source, as it is reflective of a decade’s worth of research and personal interviews ranging from 1994 and 2012.

At the end of his final chapter Solomon leaves a capturing thought as an individual who started his research with no child, to concluding his study and finally becoming a father. His beliefs are a testament to the growth that could only be achieved through proximity with the unfamiliar. Tragedies with happy endings are an outcome of diversity. Diversity that Solomon found with each new individual which he inquired about. On the last page, Solomon leaves us with his greatest realization:

> Children ensnared me the moment I connected fatherhood with loss, but I am not sure I would have noticed that if I hadn’t been immersed in this research. Encountering so much strange love, I fell into its bewitching patterns and saw how splendor can illuminate even the most abject vulnerabilities. I had witnessed and learned the terrifying joy of unbearable responsibility, recognized how it conquers everything else. Sometimes, I had thought the heroic parents in this book were fools, enslaving themselves to a life’s journey with their alien children, trying to breed identity out of misery. I was startled to learn that my research had built me a plank, and that I was ready to join them on their ship (702).

Although this is a scholarly read, it’s also able to gravitate to a broader audience than just parents and students. It gravitates to all who have a horizontal identity trait and wish to be more self-reflective of themselves or for those who are willing to put forth effort to being culturally adept on what a horizontal identity consist of for others. I also challenge readers who struggle with self-acceptance, family acceptance, and social acceptance to read this novel. This read is enough to make any reader quickly captivated with empathetic embrace for others and oneself from the first page onward.
Marjorie J. Spruill’s *Divided We Stand: The Battle Over Women’s Rights and Family Values That Polarized American Politics* focuses on the feminist movement of the 1960s and 1970s and the conservative backlash to it under the guise of the protection of “family values.” Spruill places particular focus on the National Women’s Conference of 1977 and the events that surrounded it. Spruill argues that historians in the past have not paid enough attention to the role that women and women’s issues have played in the extreme polarization of American politics which began in the 1970s. In her book, Spruill aims to change this by focusing on the rise of the feminist “establishment” in the 1970s, the conservative backlash to feminism, and the competition between the two for political influence which continues to impact politics and society today (2).

Between the early 1960s and late 1970s, the women’s movement made significant gains including the doubling of the number of women in public office, popular public support, and even widespread support from both Democrat and Republican politicians (14-15). The popular support of both parties for the Equal Rights Amendment (ERA), which would guarantee equal legal rights for all American citizens regardless of sex, in the 1970s was an indicator of just how accepted the belief in women’s equality had become (30-31). Feminists came to be seen as a part of the “political establishment” with the creation of federally funded women’s commissions and conferences. These conferences were designed to allow women and men to develop action plans on women’s issues to present to Congress (54-55). One such conference was the National Women’s Conference which was held in November 1977 in Huston, Texas.

Over 20,000 people attended the National Women’s Conference. Spruill describes the event as “more diverse than any political gathering in American history in terms of race, ethnicity, class, age, occupation, and level of political experience” (3). Both Democrats and Republicans enthusiastically attended and participated in the event. The conference diversified and united the women’s rights movement, ended conflicts that had been present in the movement since the 1960s, inspired more women to get involved in politics, and demonstrated the wide support of feminist issues. The event also inspired backlash from a conservative women’s movement led by Phyllis Schlafly. Schlafly and her supporters attacked the federal funding of the National Women’s Conference and argued that the women at the conference did not represent all American women. The conservative women’s movement advocated for the protection of family values and attracted supporters from religious groups and conservative Republican political groups who also did not agree with federal support for
social change. The conservatives felt threatened by the expansion of women’s rights, rights for racial minorities, gay rights, the legalization of abortion, and requests for federal support to defend those rights (314-315).

As the National Women’s Conference went on, Phyllis Schlafly and other conservatives organized an alternative event called the Pro-Family Rally, which was also held in Huston. The Pro-Family Rally also attracted a large audience and the speakers spoke out against the ERA, abortion, gay rights, and federally funded child care. The crowd at the Pro-Family Rally was much less diverse than the crowd at the National Women’s Conference. The conservatives advocated for the protection of the traditional family (260). After Gerald Ford’s presidency, the Republican Party moved from a moderate position to a more extreme right-winged conservatism. With the rise of politicians like Ronald Reagan, Republicans stopped supporting the moderate/liberal women’s movement and moved to push pro-family values rhetoric. With women like Schlafly openly attacking feminism and receiving support for her attacks, “many politicians felt liberated from the earlier perception that they must cater to women’s rights advocates” (305). The debate over women’s issues and women’s place in society has not ended. The debate has only harmed the fight for greater women’s equality in politics and society. The fight still continues to pass the Equal Rights Amendment.

Marjorie J. Spruill makes interesting and strong connections between the political climate of the 1970s and the political climate of today. Spruill examines the shift to a higher sense of polarization in American politics and the greater sense of conservatism in the Republican party. It is crucial to examine the role women and women’s issues played in that political shift. But it is important to keep in mind that women’s issues were not the only reason for this political shift. One must also keep in mind broader cultural shifts and economic shifts. In order to get a more well-rounded understanding of the political landscape of the 1970s and how it shaped our current world, one should also read books that examine other aspects of the 1970s such as Jefferson Cowie’s Stayin Alive: The 1970s and the Last Days of the Working Class. I would recommend Divided We Stand to anyone interested in modern American history, American feminism, or those who would like to better understand our current political climate.
Forty years ago, on November 18, 1978, the unspeakable occurred in the remote jungles of the small South American nation, Guyana. The world would get news that over 900 Americans were dead by the order of their leader, a man who helped many come out of their lowest points in life, who was viewed as a God to some. The world wondered how something like this could have happened. Who was this man who held such an authority that he could convince so many to drink poison? Author Jeff Guinn, an award-winning investigative journalist, answers these questions and gets the inside look into Peoples Temple in his biography, *The Road to Jonestown: Jim Jones and Peoples Temple*.

Jones grew up in rural Indiana and was seen as an odd child to others. He had a fascination with religion after being taken to church by a neighbor, and this fascination would follow into his adult life. Jones eventually became a student pastor, and afterwards began his own church. He wanted to make an impact and having an integrated congregation, especially in 1950s Indiana, would emphasize his messages on equality.

Jones offered members help with their needs and made sure that they knew if they followed him, their needs would be met. The help he gave emphasized the differences between him and black church leaders; he would show results. One of Jones’ first acts of help was to a woman in the audience who had trouble with the electric company. They would continue to make the woman pay her bills, but her power was broken, and they would not send help. Jones wrote a letter to the company and the entire audience signed it. The electric company then sent someone to the woman’s house. Jones responded, saying, “See? When you come to this church, you get something now” (Guinn 69).

Jones’ following continued to grow in numbers, as did his paranoia. He began to expect everyone’s attendance for service and church activities every week. He wanted loyalty, and he would do whatever it took to keep people loyal.

Followers of Jones’ seemed to view him as a magical being. He performed healings where he rid people of diseases, even cancer. These healings would help with his growing following, though many would realize eventually that the healings were acted out and fake. This did not change opinions that loyal followers had of Jones, so when he began to speak out of paranoia that Indianapolis would be hit in the case of a nuclear attack, they believed him.

Jones’ paranoia led him to venture out to discover other locations to house the Temple. After unsuccessful trips around the world, he decided on Eureka, California. Followers grew as he attracted many who seemed lost in their life, or those who needed help. Jones offered shelter, food, and direction, and his messages attracted many to the Temple. If you followed Jones, there was no denying you would get something beneficial in return,
though the following came with consequences, such as lack of sleep from working long hours throughout the week. After some time in Redwood Valley, Jones decided to move the group again, this time, to San Francisco.

In San Francisco, the public’s curiosity about the Temple grew. The group was active in politics, and even aided in the election of Mayor George Moscone. The public’s curiosity would eventually ruin Jones’ reputation when, in 1977, a reporter from the San Francisco Chronicle released a story exposing Jones, using ex-follower accounts of sexual assaults, abuse, and more in the church. Jones fled to Guyana the same night.

When Temple members followed Jones to Guyana suddenly, many in the states were worried. Family members reached out to officials for help, and Leo Ryan, a democratic congressman from California, made an arrangement to visit and seek out what was actually happening in Jonestown. During his visit, Ryan enjoyed Jonestown and complemented the home that the group had made for themselves. All was going well until a few members told the visiting group that they would like to leave Jonestown, and that they were being forced to stay. Tensions continued to rise when someone attempted to kill Ryan. Jones knew his town would only gain more press now that this was all happening. Once the group who accompanied Ryan had reached the airstrip, Jones’ followers followed and shot at the group, killing Ryan and 4 others. At the compound, Jones ordered his followers to drink a beverage laced with cyanide. If they did not comply, the drink was forced down or injected. At the end of November 18, 918 people were dead.

In the eyes of many, Jonestown before November 18 was a success. The group had built an entire town in the middle of the jungle, which is impressive. If Jones had decided to take a different route on that day, perhaps it would still be active and successful. After reading Guinn’s inside accounts of Jones’ life, it seems that Jones had the right intentions with what he wanted in the world: equality and help for the less fortunate. Jones did accomplish a lot in his short career and was able to do things that many spiritual leaders are unable to do in their lifetime. Despite his success, Jones went about his intentions in the worst way and let power influence him. Adding his alleged drug abuse to the fire, Jones became unstable and his abuse toward his congregation showed his incapability to run a temple. He used his influence on others to convince them to appease his needs, and when others did not respond in the way he wanted, or challenged him, he used his powers to do his worst. The story of the Peoples Temple shows how something beautiful can turn ugly if mixed with the wrong intentions.

When Jones’ son, Jim Jones Jr. was reflecting on Jonestown, he said, “What I’d say about Peoples Temple is, we failed, but damn, we tried” (Guinn 468).
Surviving and Thriving with Mental Illness:  
A Graphic Visualization of One Crazy Artist’s Journey

Comics are most commonly associated with classic superheroes like Batman and Spiderman taking on the biggest baddies, but within the last three decades have come to be the venue for deep, inquisitive exploration of the self. Art Spiegelman’s Maus was the groundbreaking comic which launched a new sub-genre of comics known as graphic memoir. It depicted Spiegelman’s parents’ journeys as Holocaust survivors and dealt with the trans-generational trauma Spiegelman experienced. Although tacking the topic of mental illness, Ellen Forney’s Marbles is a direct descendant of Maus. Her illustrations perfectly track her journey from undiagnosed and clearly suffering to medicated and surviving, a great visualization of the struggles of overcoming and learning to live with mental illness.

In Marbles, young adult Forney begins by explaining what her life has been like from her childhood to young adulthood – a series of high highs (mania) and low lows (depression). Her symptoms are very clearly that of bipolar I disorder (BPD), and she is diagnosed early on. Manic episodes can include: inflated self-esteem; decreased need for sleep; racing thoughts; distractibility; and an increase in goal-directed activity (17-8). Depressive episodes, on the other hand, can include: depressed mood most of the day, every day; markedly diminished pleasure in all, or most, activities nearly every day; fluctuations in weight and appetite; insomnia or hypersomnia; diminished ability to think or concentrate nearly every day; and recurrent suicidal thoughts (86). What distinguishes BPD is the cyclical nature, meaning a person will spend a few months in a manic episode and then a period in a depressive episode, going back and forth repetitively.

Her diagnosis causes her much stress because she is extremely against taking medicine; she fears it will kill her creativity. As a graphic artist and cartoonist, it is paramount that she can create and produce comics art on a fairly regular basis in order to sustain herself, especially since her job is almost guaranteed to be freelance. However, her mood swings and depressive episodes are detrimental to her productivity, and make her depressed and unproductive. During one manic episode, she develops and writes down many ideas which she believes are simple enough to complete when not manic – although she expresses that she feels the idea of ever being low again seemed impossible to her at that moment. To no one’s surprise, she cannot complete them, because her manic self either romanticizes her depression or doesn’t fully recognize just how draining it is.
For much of the work, Forney heavily self-identifies with the “crazy artist” perception, or what she calls “Club Van Gogh” (22). Getting her official bipolar diagnosis is, for her, indoctrination into the club. Forney sees tortured artists, like Van Gogh, Plath, Woolf, Michelangelo, and more, and believes that their craziness (or rather, mental health problems) were intimately tied with their creativity, and if she chooses to take medicine to combat her symptoms, she will lose her creativity.

Forney plays brilliantly with panels and panel structure in order to depict her struggles with mania and depression. In a traditional comic, scenes are broken up by panels, the physical lines an artist draws to border each moment, with gutters (aka the empty space) in between them. During her manic episodes, Forney often forgoes these panel lines and instead uses the page like a canvas, painting bold, thick strokes to emphasize how on top of the world she feels at a given time. Skipping the gutter makes her ideas flow more organically and the story move more authentically. Times of depression and her frequent therapy sessions with her psychiatrist, Karen, are usually shown in simple panels with thin lines that aren’t often broken or interrupted. They are a physical safe space for her to depict reality and what was actually happening in those sessions, making them feel more grounded and down-to-earth, whereas her common full page spreads which lack panels are often attempts to put down on paper the mess of what is going on inside her brain. In her spreads, she also draws lots of spirals or squiggles, harsh erratic lines that are meant to be emblematic of the confusion she feels and the overwhelming nature of her condition at different times (92). Her blend of rigid panel structure and a more free-flowing ease of lines is the perfect venue for depicting her two disparate mindsets.

By the end of the novel, Forney reflects on how she no longer agrees with the “crazy artist” mentality of her younger self and even depicts conversations between her current and younger selves. Her current self is happy and finally feels okay — maybe not perfect, but okay, learning to live with her mental illness. Her visual journey truly peaks in this moment with the messy and less-put-together early version of Forney blatantly refusing to believe that the quieter, calmer Forney in front of her could ever be doing okay and being creative while medicated. But her visual, mental, and physical journey has changed her, and she no longer feels guilt or fear for taking medicine. She continues to create new works while collaborating with Karen to find the right mix of medicine to bring her to equilibrium.

The most powerful message of the novel is Forney’s realization that taking medication has not killed her creativity, but has rather leveled out the Forney of old and made it easier to focus. During her manic episodes, she always felt that the ideas that she came up with at that time were “brilliant, but they weren’t particularly better” than those ideas she would come up with outside of her mania (217). Marbles is a powerful visualization of one artist’s journey from diagnosis to treatment; Forney learns to accept herself and embraces that living with medicated mental illness does not make her any less of a stunning artist.
“Churchill helped give us the liberty we enjoy now. Orwell’s writing about liberty affects how we think about it now. Their lives and their works are worth better understanding in that context. In turn, we will better understand the world we live in today, and perhaps be better prepared to deal with it, as they dealt so well with theirs” (5).

The incredibly detailed Churchill & Orwell: The Fight for Freedom by Thomas E. Ricks examines and argues the parallels between the Prime Minister who led Britain through World War II and the novelist who brought readers such works as Animal Farm and 1984. Ricks Introduces readers to an essential question: How deep do these parallels run? Upon first thought, likely not much deeper than the British heritage they share, but Ricks shows the reader the true depth of their similarities. Ricks opens his book with the story of the near death of Winston Churchill in 1931, having been struck and dragged by an automobile on New York’s Fifth Avenue. “Had he died,” Ricks states, “he would be remembered today by a few historians specializing in early twentieth-century British history” (1). Continuing on, the account of George Orwell’s near death immediately follows. Serving as a soldier on the front lines of the Spanish Civil War in 1937, at this point the author of a few mediocre novels, Orwell was shot through the neck by a 7mm bullet. Again, Ricks notes that “Had he expired then, he would not be remembered today except perhaps by a few literary specialists in minor mid-twentieth-century English novelists” (2).

Ricks is well aware of the breadth of the argument he trying to make in his book, acknowledging that “On the surface, the two men were quite different” (2). However, his argument comes in the following sentences, that “in their key overlapping years in the middle of the century, the two men grappled with the same questions—Hitler and fascism, Stalin and communism, America and its preemption of Britain,” (2). The common cause of these two seemingly incredibly different men, Ricks argues, is “their dominant priority, a commitment to human freedom,” (3) even through their vastly different life paths.

The immense detail used by Ricks begins in the second chapter of Churchill & Orwell and continues until its close. This book is suitable for a general audience, but could realistically be three separate books, based on the amount of detail devoted to each topic addressed. By chopping the text, Ricks could have a book discussing Winston Churchill’s rise to power and time as Prime Minister during World War II, another discussing George Orwell’s path to prominence as an author, and still yet a third discussing the parallels between the two subjects. While the in depth looks at the lives of the subjects and of the war can be seen as supportive of his argument, Ricks’ book could benefit from more concision. Nonetheless,
Ricks packs all of this into a reasonable 270 pages, and—even more impressively—doesn’t lose the interest of the reader throughout. Although readers may find some of the detail (especially that of the war itself) overwhelming, they will not be disappointed by the totality of the book.

All being said, Ricks does a wonderful job of showing the parallels that exist between these two seemingly unrelated men. By examining political stances, decisions, and actions of Churchill alongside the writings—published and private—of Orwell, one can see the apparent similarities in their beliefs. Both men in the early stages of their lives voluntarily joined oppressive institutions, Churchill as a member of the Imperialist British military, and Orwell as an officer of the Imperial Police. From these experiences, Ricks explains, both Churchill and Orwell learned of the horrors of oppression and most importantly, “how the exercise of power can corrupt a person,” (30). Churchill decided to pursue power, but in attempt to use this power to challenge totalitarian rule. Orwell, on the other hand, was compelled to fight against oppression in the Spanish Civil War. It was in his time here, where he was inches away from death, that the strongly left leaning Orwell came to the conclusion that “a communist and a fascist are somewhat nearer to one another than either is to a democrat” (78). Orwell began to question everything that he read, searching for the facts among widespread political bias. Churchill would, throughout his career, hold a similar view of the truth. Churchill vehemently opposed the British policy of appeasement, believing that to fight oppression and totalitarian rule, you must actively fight it. Ricks clearly identifies and sufficiently supports the parallel belief of both Churchill and Orwell that totalitarian rule must be actively fought if it is ever to end, which both believed it must.

Ricks concludes his book with the examination of the influence that both men have had on the way one views and appreciates freedom. He draws one more parallel, this time from the sentiments of Churchill and Orwell to Martin Luther King Jr. and commends their strength in his own words, “To refuse to run with the herd is generally harder than it looks. To break with the most powerful among that herd requires unusual depth of character and clarity of mind. But it is a path we should all strive for if we are to preserve the right to think, speak, and act independently, heeding the dictates not of the state or of fashionable thought but of our own consciences” (269). By running against the herd, Winston Churchill and George Orwell both gave and shaped the meaning of liberty as it is known.
"Culture is always on the move" (17).

Imagine the classic map of the fifty United States that make up America. The map on the walls of almost every American history classroom, the map plastered on all the major news platforms on election nights, and perhaps the map that many Americans spent hours memorizing for those traditional tests over the fifty states. Now, take that classic map and redraw it. Forget the seemingly random state lines and the distinct borders. These borders do not matter to Colin Woodard, author of *American Nations: A History of the Eleven Rival Regional Cultures of North America*. An award-winning journalist and historian, Woodard’s work has appeared in the *Washington Post*, *The New York Times*, *The San Francisco Chronicle*, *Political Magazine*, and *Smithsonian*. Named “Journalist of the Year” in 2014 by the Maine Press Association and one of the “Best State Capitol Reporters in America” by the *Washington Post*, Woodard brings a unique perspective to *American Nations*. He explains, “...boundaries are marked by those of their constituent states in complete disregard for the continent’s actual settlement history and sectional rivalries” (5). A stimulating and fresh read, *American Nations* will have readers grappling with the question of how to situate vastly different cultures under one United States of America.

While it seems odd to simply throw away the notion of statehood which has seemingly defined America since its birth, Woodard hails a convincing point: It is not statehood that draws people together, but rather shared cultural values, beliefs, and heritage that cross any man-made state lines and borders (2-3). As extreme a claim as this may seem to some, Woodard admits, “I’m not the first person to have recognized the importance of these regional cultures to North American history, politics, and governance” (14). Expanding on the ideas of Kevin Phillips, Joel Garreau, David Hackett Fischer, Russell Shorto, and Jim Webb (all published authors with backgrounds in political science and/or history), Woodard argues that there are eleven regional cultures that occupy North America, bound together by their rich histories, noteworthy personalities, and unshakeable beliefs. *American Nations* explores these regions in four parts, divided chronologically and ranging from 1590-2010, a stretch of 420 years of American history that seems overwhelming to fathom.

Covering such a long stretch of history in 322 pages means that basic background knowledge of significant American historical events (such as the Revolutionary War and the Civil War) and political patterns (such as the typical political “swing” states and voting results) is helpful to readers. However, while the amount of content seems daunting, it is an easier read than one might expect. Woodard approaches these events simplistically, leaving room to focus on the origins, alliances, wars, and cultural clashes of the eleven regions without
overwhelming the reader. Drawing on typical patterns of behavior, such as voting, and typical ideologies of each region (for example, a shared sense of the value in education), Woodard describes the culture of each of the eleven regions and uses examples of how these eleven regions have acted at various points in history based on their cultural values. Whether one is well-versed in history or not, American Nations is appropriate for a general audience seeking to explore American history outside boundaries.

Perhaps the most fascinating concept to readers is the deep-rooted conflict that appears between rival nations, threatening to eventually divide the United States beyond repair. Woodard explains that even before the beginning of the nation, divisions between the regions have remained an obstacle to complete unity. “The United States had Founding Fathers, to be sure, but they were the grandfathers, great-grandfathers, or great-great-grandfathers of the men who met to sign the Declaration of Independence and to draft our first two constitutions. Our true Founders didn’t have an ‘original intent’ we can refer back to in challenging times; they had original intents” (2-3). Two of these regions that seem to have consistently juxtaposed one another since their first presence in North America include the Yankeedom and Deep South regions. Stretching across Maine, New York, New Hampshire, Vermont, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, some northern regions of Ohio and Pennsylvania, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and across small portions of northern Illinois and Iowa, Yankeedom is one of the larger regions Woodard describes. Its size, however, is not the only important characteristic. Yankeedom has had and continues to have a significant impact on the United States. The Deep South rivals Yankeedom in size, covering the majority of Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, Alabama, Louisiana (minus the New Orleans area), Mississippi, western Tennessee, and the eastern part of Texas. Vastly different from Yankeedom, and infamous for its dependence on slave systems, the Deep South has left its mark on the United States.

Well known for its emphasis on the value of education, Yankeedom’s roots can be traced back to some of the richest European populations. But surprisingly, the original settlers of Yankeedom did not adhere to the typical pattern of social class that one might expect. “From the beginning Yankeedom was opposed to the creation of a landed aristocracy and suspicious of inherited privilege and the conspicuous display of wealth” (59). It was this suspicion that led Yankeedom to have a strong belief in government as an establishment by and for the people, themes that have been thought to characterize United States’ government (60). With such strong beliefs, however, Yankeedom is often quick to make enemies. Woodard explains that, “…what would cause Yankeedom eventually to be so loathed by the other nations was its desire—indeed, its mission—to impose its ways on everyone else” (61). This was especially true for the Deep South. “From the outset, Deep Southern culture was based on radical disparities in wealth and power, with a tiny elite commanding total obedience and enforcing it with state-sponsored terror. Its expansionist ambitions would put it on a collision course with its Yankee rivals, triggering military, social, and political conflicts that continue to plague the United States to this day” (82). Ruled by a system of elites who used brutal slave systems to maintain control of their land and wealth, the Deep South stood for everything that Yankeedom resisted: arrogance, ascendency, and complete dependence on wealth. “‘The Barbadians,’ the philosopher John Locke warned, ‘endeavor to rule all’” (83). This complete opposition of beliefs makes it hard to believe that any kind of union could exist between the two regions, yet as fundamentally different as they are, these differences have
provided a foundation for a government that still exists. “In the end, the U.S. Constitution was the product of a messy compromise among the rival nations. From the gentry of...the Deep South, we received a strong president to be selected by an ‘electoral college,’ rather than elected by ordinary people...The Yankees ensured that small states would have an equal say in the Senate...” (148-149).

*American Nations* is alluring and challenging to audiences, forcing them to think about how the past and present are intertwined, while leaving the possibilities for the future of the United States wide open. Exploring the history of the United States through the use of historical primary sources, secondary sources, and election data to characterize cultural differences between the eleven regions, Woodard encourages readers to question just how “united” the United States appears to be. How has the United States managed to remain one entity since its birth? And, with so many cultural divisions and constant fluctuation, how much longer can the United States last? Woodard’s take is one that readers won’t want to miss.