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Editor’s Note:

In my years, I have learned that there are few constants in life. Always the continuous motion remains. Although we may get stuck in a moment, as it is human nature to do so, life moves on. The here and now is only temporary, and tomorrow we will move on. We are all sojourners.

Reading Area Community College (RACC) is a respectable meeting ground for sojourners who seek to improve their stay through education. Through research and collaboration, these students learn to appreciate the sojourners of the past who inspire them to leave their own legacy. Students only take a brief stay at RACC before they advance on to an undergraduate school or into the career of choice.

Legacy Volume 5 is about the expedition; it is about the opportunity. These pages capture some of the voices that represent RACC’s unique body of sojourners. Whether their subject is laughter or the profile of a forgotten hero, the articles herein illustrate the momentous achievements that can be made during a short stay. We hope you enjoy the journey.

- Elizabeth Shepley

Philosophy

The vision and philosophy of Legacy’s student staff is to inspire excellence and creativity in writing and original thinking by presenting student academic work that reflects the various disciplines in a publication that honors the principles of RACC: excellence, equality, diversity, creativity and community.
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"Two roads diverged in the woods
And I, I took the one less traveled by,
And that has made all the difference."
   So said Robert Frost
Of intricate reasons inexplicable
   That determine human life.
The road less traveled? And which is that?
   For the divergence of two roads in not happenstance,
And coincidence does not exist,
And who can tell which is less-traveled
   Or for what reason?
Perhaps it is less traveled
   Merely because those who chose it walked softly
And left no mark upon their world.
   But that would not make sense.

Because the ones who choose the less-traveled path are the
movers and shakers
Who lead and do not follow
   And change the course of the tide of humanity
That flows after them.

Perhaps Frost meant what he could not explain
And the more difficult road
   Was not a road at all
Merely a choice
Of one who could see both the forest
   And the trees
And forged his own path
As we all must do;
   We who would be the movers and shakers
To leave our imprint upon the world
   As we march to the beat of a drum
That beats only for ourselves
And establish a beat
That will be enhanced by the variations of those who come after
And forge their own path
As we march for humanity
And for the common goal
Of peace
If not on this earth
Then in the next.

And as the paths we forge
Cross
(For cross they will
   For a man is not an island
      In a sea of isolation)
The crossing shall result in a crossroads
   And who can say whose path is greater
      Than the other’s
For each has obstacles tailor-made
   For the one who treads it and he only.

And because of the meeting, two strangers may become friends;
   For what is a stranger than one who would become a friend
      if given time?
And perhaps two shall become one
   And forge one path together from their meeting.

And this life is merely a journey
For a road implies a journey

And we are all sojourners.

By Courtney Eidle

Lou Zmroczek
What is time? Why is “when” an important factor? In literature or chemistry, the time that something happens is often as important as what actually happens. Society has a reliance on time, and it is strong enough that time becomes a challenge to define. As St. Augustine stated, “What, then, is time? I know well enough what it is, provided that nobody asks me; but if I am asked what it is and try to explain, I am baffled” (qtd. in Cullhed 3). Time is difficult to explain because the answer is essentially subjective. The way that time is measured varies throughout history and cultures. The question of time is so immensely intriguing because human nature is dependent on structure, and structure has become dependent on the technology which has been created to measure time.

Past, present, and future are often mistaken as divisions of time. However, much discussion of the philosophy of time states that “only present time can exist” (Highland 94). According to St. Augustine, this notion of time only existing in the present is further explained in relation to individual events, i.e. memories and expectations, and it is that extension of the notion of present time that explains the past and the future, making time essentially “durationless” (Highland 94). A measure of this particular idea of time is apparent in the calendar and chronology. These deal as instruments to keep track of time, but they achieve only to devalue what is real time. On a calendar or in chronological outlines, time is assigned dates: “Our dates are like the numbers on city houses; they stand for something other than a stretch of street or of time” (Shotwell 198). The numbers assigned to time then serve only as markers for the happenings within it (Shotwell 198). The past, then, is assigned a date to mark a memory and, apparently, a piece of time. The future can be an expectation of a given date. What then accounts for future that is not expected? The terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, were not expected by America; yet on September 10, 2001, they were, indeed, part of the American future.
Essentially the idea of keeping time is absurd because if time is ultimately of the present, then by the instant that there is a grasp of it, it is time no longer.

Does that mean that future is a thread through all humanity as a measure of anyone’s expectation of any time, but the past is a measure of both large scale memories and individual memories? How can one person’s future be the same as another’s future, but each person’s past is unique to his/her memory? At what point does the future become only definable through hindsight? Does that necessarily change, then, the future factor in the time equation?

Another influential tool in keeping time has come to be the watch or the clock. The clock indicates the time through the use of several hands that keep count of the seconds, minutes, and hours within a day. All of this, the seconds, minutes, hours, and days, and even the dates on the calendar, is a measure of linear time. Linear time is the idea that time is like a string of moments. Each one is connected to and leading into the next. With that in mind, a watch or clock has been designed to give structure to time. “A watch may be made to keep time; if we ask why it keeps time, we are not satisfied by saying because it was made for that purpose by a watchmaker, but we are satisfied by knowing its structure” (Woodbridge, “Structure” 680).

The idea of structure stems from the human need to define things. The watch pacifies the human need to define time. Essentially the idea of keeping time is absurd because if time is ultimately of the present, then by the instant that there is a grasp of it, it is time no longer. “The sense of Time is really a sense of times, and that is not a sense at all, but the slow product of developing intelligence,” (Shotwell 197). Within developing that intelligence, there can be a resolve from keeping time. “Any time span could mean only an amount of knowledge or of synthesis of a whole which, as a whole, is timeless . . . Such statements appear to be intelligible only if we regard the mind’s relation to reality as a sort of temporal approach to a timeless whole” (Woodbridge, “Problem of Time” 410).

Obviously, the numerical value assigned to time does not actually define it. Instead it seems that time is individual, and time is experience. Time is temporal, and time is timeless. “Time is a promise and a threat: The stream we breast holds in solution our hopes and our fears” (McGilvary 121). The old Indian cultures held
to the concept of cyclical time (Cullhed 5). Cyclical time was represented as the Great Year, or Magnus Annus, by Pythagoras. He defined the Great Year as dealing with the transmigration of the soul and “a cycle in which events recur and history repeats itself” (Philip 75). Cyclical time allows transcendence from time because the fate of an eternal recurrence encourages more emphasis on living outside the restraint of time. Instead of time as a measure of what can be done, time is more of an opportunity to do.

The question of time brings a new meaning to Socrates’ epiphany of knowing nothing. The next time the question is asked, “What time is it?” how enlightening would it be to answer “I don’t know” without looking at a bare wrist or attempting to recall the last glimpse of a clock? What freedom would come from the absolute release of measuring time? If time is like a river, then it is constantly changing, and therein is the difficulty of defining it. Henry David Thoreau even states, “Time is but the stream I go a-fishing in” (Cohen 530). However, the fundamental question of time remains because humankind requires a kind of structure. “If time made no difference, if experience could be described as well without it, then we should have one eternal moment of reality with a timeless scale of values” (Boodin 368).

About the Author:
Elizabeth Shepley, a second-year student, chose this topic because she would like to be “free of time.”
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Dawn

Breathing in violet air
Leaking off
Mountain peaks
Sun shyly showing
Her glorious face
Timidly peeking over
Hulking majestic shoulder
Hesitating
Birds catch her glance
Taking up their chorus
Encouraging, nudging
Suddenly
Glorious golden globe
Showering scattering shadows
Resounding radiant rays

By Leah Rampolla

Progression of Time

dawn
brilliance, purity
awakening, beginning, refreshing
new, light-dark, old
slowing, relaxing, reposing
sleepily, sedately
dusk
still, quiet
gloaming, dimming, obscuring
twilight, tranquility-ascent, inception
singing, blooming, warbling
powerfully, majestically
dawn

By Leah Rampolla
As The Wind

Awake but asleep
Tears falling down like rain
My pencil is gone
My poems wrote in vain.

No more verses,
For you my darling
No more words
From me, my dear
Hugs and kisses left
Gone as the wind.

Every moment of love
Now is considered past
Every dream, every hope
Today is forgotten
Today is gone.

*By Ámbar Balbuen*
Como El Viento

Despierta pero dormida
Lágrimas cayendo como lluvia
Mi lápiz perdido
Mis poemas en vano escritos.

No más versos
Para tí, cariño mío
No más palabras
De mí, querido
Abrazos y besos se fueron
Como el viento, perdidos.

Cada momento de amor
Ahora considerado pasado
Cada sueño, cada esperanza
Hoy está perdida
Hoy está olvidada.

By Ámbar Balbuen
UNUSUAL ANOMALIES

Unusual
Anomalies
add spice to life
they make us change our ways
they make us laugh
they make us cry
they make us go insane
but what we don’t see
we don’t conceive
the anomalies we are

By Leah Rampolla

Pencil

Kristin Brady
A young woman sits on a barstool. She and her friends chatter about the latest gossip, poke fun at themselves, make catty remarks behind each others’ backs, and laugh as if to say that nothing really matters. Later, as she drives home, tears washing tracks through her make-up, she wonders why she feels so alone and so empty.

A young woman walks through the green summer grass with her daughter and her boyfriend. The couple discusses their daughter’s latest accomplishments, their goals, and their dreams. They laugh as if to proclaim that they have discovered the things that truly matter in life. As the woman walks along with her family, tears like jewels threaten to spill from her eyes because she knows exactly why she feels so loved and why her heart is so full.

Both of these scenarios describe laughing young women, but the reasons for their laughter are vastly different. If laughter is considered to always be an expression of a positive emotion, then why is one woman glowing with happiness and the other sinking into depression? Exploring the dual nature of laughter provides a more complete understanding of human nature.

Human beings have been laughing for approximately 100,000 years. After all of those years, people have come to directly associate laughter with happiness. Yet almost every human being has experienced laughter in connection with some negative emotion, whether it be fear, anxiety, or ridicule. In fact, in their article “Laughter and Stress in Daily Life: Relation to Positive and Negative Affect,” Nicholas A. Kuiper and Rod A. Martin assert that laughter has a “multidimensional nature” (151). Human experience supports this idea. People often use laughter to denigrate themselves or others. In spite of this, many researchers have found that the negative components of laughter and their effects have been largely ignored, due to the widely held belief that laughter is always a positive expression (Kuiper et al. 138; Tragesser and Lippman 255). Many different dimensions of
laughter and humor have been identified, however; and according to Kuiper et al. in “Humor Is Not Always the Best Medicine: Specific Components of Sense of Humor and Psychological Well-being,” these dimensions can be divided into two main groups: negative or “maladaptive” humor and positive or “adaptive” humor (135).

Negative humor occurs constantly in today’s society. Very few people can honestly claim that they have never laughed at another’s social blunder or chuckled over a juicy piece of gossip. Television’s situation comedies thrive on the public’s fascination with lewd jokes, self-deprecation, and the discomfort of others. When the inspiration for laughter can be found only by demeaning oneself or others, it becomes impossible to consider such humor positive or to believe that individuals who engage in such behavior have a positive self-concept. Studies supporting this theory, conducted by Gillian A. Kirsh and Nicholas A. Kuiper, have found that people who favor the use of negative humor styles tend to be either aggressive and unconcerned with the well-being of others or to be over-concerned with others’ opinions and to use self-defeating humor to gain acceptance (54).

Aggressive humor manifests itself in a number of ways “including teasing, ridicule, sarcasm, and disparagement to denigrate and put down others” (Kuiper et al. 141). This derision may occur in the presence of the humor’s object (teasing) or in the object’s absence (malicious gossip). As far as teasing is concerned, Sarah L. Tragesser and Louis G. Lippman believe that perpetrators of this type of humor are mainly concerned with building up their own feelings of self-worth at the expense of others (264). According to Kirsh and Kuiper, many individuals who make use of aggressive humor have a tendency to set unrealistically high standards for themselves and to judge themselves harshly if those standards are not met (54). By shifting the focus to the shortcomings, errors, or oddities of someone else, users of aggressive humor may feel that they are preventing their own deficiencies from being discovered. Kuiper et al. believe that these individuals may also be resorting to such damaging aggressive tactics because
they feel unable to handle relationships or solve problems with other people (160). A pattern of inconsistent beliefs emerges upon examination of the motives of people with these personality traits. Individuals who use aggressive humor are engaged in an internal struggle. They have high opinions of their own worth, but they constantly fail to reach the excessively high standards they have set for themselves. These individuals wish for the approval of and camaraderie with others, but doubt their skills in interpersonal relationships. They must find a release for the stress caused by this internal conflict; therefore, it is not surprising that such people lash out at others with acerbic, sarcastic and derogatory humor. They laugh at others in order to protect themselves. By doing so, these individuals may feel that they are enhancing their relationships; but according to research conducted by Tragesser and Lippman, these behaviors often cause the subjects to feel estranged from and resentful towards the perpetrators (264-5).

Not all users of negative humor direct their efforts at others; there are individuals who make themselves the focus of derogatory and demeaning remarks. Kuiper et al. maintain that these individuals use such personally damaging humor in an effort to form stronger relationships with others (140). They seem to believe that other people will find them more attractive and approachable if they present the world with a less attractive view of themselves. This convoluted logic stems from negative associations prevalent in society. Beautiful people are automatically conceited; people with wealth are automatically snobbish or greedy; intelligent people are nerds. Beauty, wealth and intelligence are all traits that any person should be proud to possess, yet society has propagated the notion that these traits, and many others besides, have negative implications. Growing up under this influence, a person may easily come to believe that the acceptance of others is not to be gained by exhibiting pride in one's virtues, but rather by laughing at one's own deficiencies. Unfortunately for these individuals, Kuiper et al. have found that those who aim negative humor at themselves are prone to decreased self-esteem and increased depression (161-2).

Descriptions of individuals who use negative humor include many negative characteristics, such as aggression, lack of empathy, depression, and poor self-
When a stressful situation occurs, being able find something to laugh about related to that situation gives a person a sense of control.

esteem. Quite the opposite is true of those individuals who favor the use of positive humor. These individuals can be described as sensitive, loving, and optimistic. In fact, Kuiper et al. state that users of positive humor display high levels of self-esteem and low levels of depression (161). P.S. Fry confirms the belief that humor and self-esteem are linked (par. 37). Furthermore, according to Kirsh and Kuiper, the ability to use positive humor in social situations and in coping with different types of stress is an important part of an individual's self-perception (45). This suggests that positive humor is more effective than negative in procuring the desired results in these areas.

In contrast to those who use humor to berate themselves or others, individuals with high self-esteem use humor to relate to others and to share their own happiness and sense of well-being with those around them. When these individuals receive positive feedback from their use of humor, it reinforces their belief that they have a great deal of value and worth. This may cause them to incorporate more humor, and thus, more laughter, into their lives. Kuiper and Martin have discovered a great deal of support for the idea that there is a positive correlation between high self-esteem, use of a positive humor technique, and an increased frequency of laughter (134).

Laughter and positive humor are effective not only in dealing with others, but also in dealing with stress as well. It is a long held belief by both the public and a significant number of professionals that "optimism and humor permit one to cope better with the aversive experiences of life" (Fry, par. 70). When a stressful situation occurs, being able find something to laugh about related to that situation gives a person a sense of control. Kuiper and Martin find that “individuals with greater laughter responsiveness may be invigorated by the potentially stressful events they experience, viewing these events as more of a positive challenge than a personal threat” (134). People with high levels of humor and self-esteem do not feel that stressful events affect who they are, nor do they allow these events to change their manner of viewing life.
When people with high self-esteem laugh, they do so as an expression of joy and a celebration of life. This is the type of laughter that people associate with feelings of happiness and the kind that they seek to experience. Those who laugh for negative reasons do so in an attempt to capture these positive emotions, but they will always fail. Joyous laughter is the direct result of a sense of one’s own value and a sense of satisfaction with one’s environment. There is no substitute for that feeling.

People laugh for numerous reasons, some good and some bad. But there is always a reason behind the laughter. Dr. Madan Kataria “encourag[es] people to laugh for no reason” in order to feel better about themselves (qtd. in Perry, par.2). But his advice goes against the discovery made by Diana L. Mahoney, W. Jeffrey Burroughs, and Louis G. Lippman that it is positive laughter that is associated as being beneficial (179). Furthermore, people who follow his advice are missing an opportunity to examine the motives for their laughter. For those individuals whose laughter stems from negative drives, identification of the exact cause of their laughter offers them a chance to reevaluate their sense of themselves. By eliminating self-demeaning and aggressive humor and laughter from their lives, and by searching for positive qualities within themselves and the world, it is possible for them to achieve higher self-esteem and to finally laugh with joy.

The first young woman in the opening scenarios did just that. She looked at her life and decided she was unhappy with the direction she was heading. She examined the causes of her laughter and found that most of the reasons motivating her laughter were hurtful either to her or to others. She decided to change. Through honest self-evaluation and a commitment to eliminating negative humor from her life, over time, she was able to evolve into the second young woman. I know this because I am that woman. It was because I examined my laughter that I was able to understand why I felt so empty and also the reason why I was able to drastically improve my life. I notice the difference in the way I feel when I laugh now. Now, instead of feeling sorrow, I feel a deep, resonating joy.
About the Author:
Heather Schriever is a full-time, first-year student studying to be an English or theater teacher. She wrote this essay because “people...automatically assume that laughter is always a good thing.” Having experience with situations in which laughter can make a person feel worse, Heather wanted to “explore the reasons a person might not use laughter in a positive way.”

Works Cited


BUS RIDE

COLD SKELETAL FINGERS
SCRAPING INDIFFERENTLY AGAINST
BLACK SKIES
ERASING COMFORTING WARMTH
THAT LINGERS.
WATCHING FROZEN SCENERY
STREAM BY
ICY RAIN SLICING PATHS
DOWN
GRIME CAKED WINDOWS
HOT TEARS SLICING PATHS
DOWN
GRIME CAKED CHEEKS.

By Leah Rampolla
REFLECTIONS ON A FLAG

On my walk
To school, there is
A battered flag
Symbolic of a nation
That has seen better days.

Frayed and torn,
How we are like
That flag--
Disagreements,
Uprisings
In word and deed.
Torn apart,
What once was together.

An end will come to
That flag one day,
Hopefully with dignity,
Maybe disgracefully;
How will we end?
How long do we have?

By Megan Joy Domanski
ost World War II America was the land of opportunity. GIs were returning from war and entering the workplace, women had found their own voice working outside the home, and everyone had money to spend. Between the urban housing boom and the GI bill, industry was thriving. There was an unprecedented demand for goods and services after the Great Depression, and in the midst of it all stood Willy Loman. Cast as the main character in Arthur Miller's play, Death of a Salesman, Willy represents the driving pursuit of the great American Dream, a tragic character trying to survive within societal constraints. In succumbing to socially-driven desires, Willy becomes the victim of a progressive, industrialized America that offers no room in its fast-paced recklessness for an aged salesman. “In the character of Willy Loman, Arthur Miller has established a metonymic representation of the contradictory beliefs and value systems that were the heart of American business culture in the decade after World War II” (Murphy 1). His own instability and inabilities to change with the times become woven into the fabric of his life and ultimately his death. Willy Loman is a man willing to sell his soul to succeed.

Willy Loman was created in the mind of Arthur Miller, who grew up living comfortably in Manhattan, surrounded by maids and a chauffer. However, Miller’s father lost everything in the Stock Market crash of 1929, and the family never recovered. Subsequently, the family moved to Brooklyn and slowly drifted into poverty. As Jeffrey Meyers states, “This was the crucial experience of Arthur’s life—the Depression, the ugly side of capitalism made manifest—which devastated the lives of his family and friends, but inspired his poignant portrayal of Willy Loman” (420).

There are many contradictions within the mind and heart of Willy Loman. He desperately wants to succeed, but refuses to
change in order to succeed. After his wife, Linda, thought he would like something different to eat, American cheese instead of Swiss, Willy refuses to conform to society, stating, “I don’t want a change! I want Swiss cheese. Why am I always being contradicted?” (Miller 1938). He feels confined by society, trapped between “Bricks and windows. Windows and bricks” (1938). The world is closing in on Willy Loman. Arthur Miller has said of Willy, “He cannot bear reality, and since he can’t do much to change it, he keeps changing his ideas of it” (qtd. in Bigsby 6). His pursuit of the American dream fuels his driving ambition to be successful.

In a lifetime of selling, Willy has determined that the only way to be successful in the business world is to be well liked. As he puts it, “The man who makes an appearance in the business world, the man who creates personal interest, is the man who gets ahead” (Miller 1947). He also tells his sons, “Be liked and you will never want” (1947). However, throughout his life, Willy has struggled in the sales world and has not flourished. Willy and Linda Loman are not living the American dream—they are “living on the edge, struggling from payment to payment on the car, the house, the insurance” (Griffin 53). His beliefs contradict reality. In “Understanding Arthur Miller,” Alice Griffin writes, “Willy’s many contradictions reflect his inability to distinguish between the dream of success and the world around him” (43), in addition stating, “Not only is Willy shaped by a society that believed in the myth of success,…but he has become the agent and the representative of that society” (45). Willy has sold out to the beliefs fostered by society, striving to become what is acceptable. He has abandoned what he really liked to do (work with his hands) in order to fit in, to appease society and the expectations of others.

Although Willy “performs” as expected in his daily life, he is truly unhappy. Discontent runs through his every vein, and in order to compensate for his disappointment, in his mind he travels to happier times. In this regression into the past, Willy is successful—he mattered then. He was respected and well liked by his sons and somewhat of a selling sensation as he “knocked ‘em cold in Providence [and] slaughtered ‘em in Boston” (Miller 1947).
Everyone then had a bright future. His oldest son, Biff, was assured a scholarship to college playing sports; his youngest son was popular; and they were both “built like Adonises” (1947). Sadly, past and present day collide, and, as Bigsby concludes:

The jump from reconstructed past to anxious present serves to underscore the extent to which hopes have been frustrated and ambitions blunted. The resulting gap breeds irony, regret, guilt disillusionment. Hope and disappointment coexist, and the wild oscillation between the two brings [Willy] close to breakdown. (16)

Willy exists in an industrialized world very unfamiliar to him and his ideas of what a salesman should be.

The finishing blow that is struck to the fragile ego of Willy Loman is when his boss, Howard Wagner, fires him. After 35 faithful years with the company and working to the point of exhaustion, the boy Loman named at birth throws him away, an item Howard is no longer interested in, a man that society no longer needs. When Willy reminds him of the job promised at a Christmas Party, “Remember, Christmas time, when you had the party here? You said you’d try to think of some spot for me here in town,” Howard replies with a stunning statement, “Well, I couldn’t think of anything for you, Willy” (Miller 1971). Even after Willy pleads for just a mere forty dollars a week, Howard derides him further, telling him to “[s]it down, take five minutes, and pull yourself together, and then go home, will ya? I need the office, Willy” (1974). Willy’s devastation sends him to his only real friend, Charley, who offers him money and a job. As the voice of realism in a capitalist society, he enlightens Willy to his tragic flaw:

Willy, when’re you going to realize that them things don’t mean anything?

You named him Howard, but you can’t sell that.
The only thing you got in this world is what you can sell.
And the funny thing is you’re a salesman, and you don’t know that. (1981)

Willy is heartbroken. His dreams of grandeur have slipped away, and he comments, “Funny, y’know? After all the highways and the trains, and the appointments, and the years, you end up worth more dead than alive” (Miller 1982). The only things Willy thinks he has left are the dreams and success of his sons, especially Biff. His hopes and dreams live within his boys, who he feels are
accepted and loved by society. His mind oftentimes flows back to Biff’s high school days on the way to the championship game at Ebbet’s Field, when his son was immensely popular: “My God! Remember how they used to follow him around in high school? When he smiled at one of them their faces lit up. When he walked down the street...” (1938).

As Willy’s mind descends further into the past at Frank’s Chop House, his sons abandon him. He sees for the last time how insignificant and unimportant he really has become. As Christopher Bigsby concludes, “Death of A Salesman is not an attack on American values. It is, however, an explanation of the betrayal of those values and the cost of this in human terms” (23). Willy decides to do something he loves for the last time, and upon returning home, plants seeds by flashlight. This planting by flashlight is representative of the futility of Willy’s life—everything he “plants” as a salesman never comes to fruition. It is also symbolic of Willy’s attempt to “regrow” his life and his family doing something that he loved—working with his hands—but that society didn’t find acceptable as a respectable job. Ultimately, the promise of the afterlife where “it’s dark...but full of diamonds” (Miller 2002) helps the choice Willy makes more attractive.

In his suicide, Willy makes the ultimate “sale” selling the only thing he has left of any value, himself. Willy’s longtime friend Charley sums it up saying, “Willy was a salesman.... He’s a man way out there in the blue, riding on a smile and a shoeshine.... And when they start not smiling back, that’s an earthquake” (Miller 2004). That earthquake finally takes Willy Loman. His sacrifice is an honorable one. No one can lambaste or ignore him any more, and in death he will be paid “attention” to for eternity. The business world has broken its promise, and society can no longer control him. For the first time he is truly free. He is a salesman who sold his soul for the elusive and unattainable American Dream.
About the Author:
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Works Cited
TRIBULATIONS OF THE PAST

When one is naked, the only thing they are wearing
   is their ego and pride;
   The tribulations of life all coincide.
   Nothing is finite until you are bare.
   We all know that life is forever unfair.
   When least expected life will be gone,
   And you will be judged for all that you have done.
   Ashes to ashes and dust to dust
   Will the afterlife be good to us?

We ask all these questions, but none will be fair.
   The answers are unjust, but we are unaware.
   Will fate condemn us
   To an afterlife of pain?
   Or will we lay at rest in a blissful terrain?
Many questions have been asked; few doubts have been made.
   The mistakes of the past just won’t go away.
   When our bodies are withered and mind goes astray.
   The day will come when we will be slain.

By Ronald DiBenedetto
well-removed from our collective consciousness are the early eighteenth century horror stories of cruel child labor practices and deadly working conditions. Though far from utopian, our modern factories and industries are comparatively clean, safe and carefully regulated by one or more branches of the government. This progress has been wrought in large part due to the influence of the American Labor Movement. Ironically, Labor’s successes have contributed to its own evolution from a grass roots entity that championed individual workers’ rights into a neo-socialist organization that seeks dramatic cultural change through political influence. This shift in philosophy has created a union-sponsored political machine with vast resources at its disposal. Although the direct use of members’ dues to support political activity is illegal, the practice is pervasive throughout the labor movement. This behavior breeds questionable accounting and reporting practices, robs union members of their rights and creates an environment where the abuse of workers is perpetrated not by company bosses but by union leadership. In order to best serve the workers they purport to represent, local union leaders must summon the courage to address this troubling issue head on and refocus union resources towards the principal purpose of benefiting the members.

Unionism has wielded impressive power throughout the history of our great nation. Its ancestry can be traced back to early colonial alliances between craftsmen of similar trades who formed guilds to
Union Dues and Politics

The red flags begin to fly, however, when we scrutinize the activity of the union which is seldom tallied and reported to the Federal Elections Commission.

protect against unskilled competition and create uniform quality standards. (Brody, para. 1) In the early twentieth century, the Industrial Revolution caused widespread worker exploitation by unscrupulous employers, which in turn led to exponential growth within Union Organizations. Smaller organizations fused together creating an imposing force with which employers everywhere now had to reckon. Uniting under one banner with common goals and lofty ideals afforded the individual worker a voice with his employer which he formerly could only dream about. Members of local unions paid dues through mandatory deductions from their paychecks each week. These fees were used to fund the union in exchange for the tireless efforts of union leaders to negotiate for improved working conditions, better benefits and wage increases (Crampton et al., 2002, para. 5).

Egregious abuses existed on both sides of the bargaining table. Employers bent on subverting the worker’s right to unite and unions employing strong-arm tactics to increase membership both inevitably attracted the attention of the government. The Wagner Act of 1935 granted formal protection to individuals seeking to organize, and twelve years later The Taft-Hartley Act fashioned a fragile balance of power between labor and management. In section 304 of Taft-Hartley, the use of union dues for political purposes was expressly prohibited ("The Federal Election," para. 3). In reality, these laws merely launched the union dues ship on her maiden voyage across a legislative ocean frothing with volatility.

How have these two laws, not to mention the litany of measures passed between 1947 and the present, contributed to the problem? They have added fuel to the fire through the creation of loopholes and poorly defined reporting requirements. For instance, in 1971 the Federal Election Campaign Act effectively undermined section
304 of Taft-Hartley by sanctioning the creation of Political Action Committees by individual labor unions (The Federal Election). This legislation paved the way for the close alliances that exist today between labor unions and politicians. On the surface, the funding for these PACs must be carefully documented as to its source and scope and accounted for in quarterly reports. Certainly, there is nothing amiss when a private organization exercises its legal right to support a candidate in the perceived best interests of its members. This is not where the trouble lies. The red flags begin to fly, however, when we scrutinize the activity of the union which is seldom tallied and reported to the Federal Elections Commission. This “backdoor” funding raises billions of dollars and a few eyebrows to boot. Several “watchdog” agencies have arisen in the past few decades, dedicated to exposing the often hidden activities of unions which are in conflict with federal laws prohibiting the direct use of members’ dues for political purposes. One such group, The Smith Center (2005), a think tank from California State University, illustrates the fraud inherent within the reporting system as it currently exists. According to the center, unions across America engage in “soft money” donations and “in-kind” political behavior that is not required to be reported to the FEC. Especially true during an election year, unions routinely recruit staff to man phone banks, mail politically slanted propaganda, and make campaign endorsements all while being paid from the union coffers, not the PAC fund. Questionable activities such as these continue for months on end. When the cost of printing and disseminating politically “educational” materials is added to the dedicated man hours, it becomes easy to see that the unreported political spending which is directly supported by members’ dues significantly outweighs the officially documented figures. This behavior subverts the law and exploits the workers with a new twist—their own dues funding political campaigns which many individuals personally do not support or agree with. If this weren’t enough, the destination of these monies, whether seen or unseen, is clearly slanted in one particular political
Although it may buck the current system, the leaders of local unions throughout the country must provide employees access to accurate information concerning their rights.

direction. According to The Evergreen Freedom Foundation, “Despite a politically diverse membership, organized labor overwhelmingly supports a single political party” (Sorrell, 2005). According to the actual FEC documents filed by union organizations, 86 percent of officially reported PAC spending was directed to the Democratic Party and 13 percent found its way into Republican treasuries. That translates into roughly $46 million for the Democrats versus $7 million for the Republicans (PAC, 2005). Perhaps if the political affiliation of union membership came even remotely close to these percentage breakdowns, this would not be so troubling. According to an email from Union Free America, 2004 polling data from Zogby report the political affiliation of people claiming to be union members as follows: Democrats—59 percent, Republicans—25 percent, Independents—13 percent, and other—4 percent. With an error factor of +/- 5 percent, these numbers demand consideration when discussing the disparity in the political contributions of labor organizations. Bearing in mind the degree to which these reported figures may well be understated, it is clear that this imbalance is not a fair representation of the interests of the membership. Rather, it more accurately represents the interests of those who are in positions of power high up in the Labor Movement’s chain of command. These costly political entanglements have caused the soul of unionism to become stained in a quest for political clout.

The cure for this scourge can be found in the very history of unionism itself: The bold, decisive action of individuals at the local level will be the only saving grace for the future of the Labor Movement. Although it is often a daunting task, a few determined individuals have posed legal challenges against the union hierarchy and prevailed.
In the most notorious case, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled in favor of Harry Beck when he sued his union in 1998 for the right to be excluded from involuntary political contributions. The High Court found that 79 percent of the dues collected from Harry Beck did not meet the standards which define the nature of activities considered to be legitimate uses for the dues of members. Briefly, the criteria are twofold: “(1) the activity must be relevant to collective bargaining and (2) it must be justified by the government’s interest in promoting labor union services” (Crampton et.al 2002). As a result of this decision, Harry Beck was awarded a refund for all but 21 percent of the dues he had formerly paid. In addition, unions were required by a 1991 Bush administration executive order to post information regarding what have come to be known as “Beck’s Rights” in the workplace. This order was rescinded by President Clinton one month into his first term (Fact and Fallacy 1999). Thus, many union workers are not even aware that they have choices available pertaining to this issue. Although it may buck the current system, the leaders of local unions throughout the country must provide employees access to accurate information concerning their rights. This one brave move alone will go a long way toward correcting the unjust actions of the past.

We may yet see the integrity and ideals of the Labor Movement restored to that of its founders. For this to transpire, however, we are going to need more Harry Becks. The encouraging news is that they already exist. Many of America’s 15 million union members have begun to speak out against the conventional wisdom and demand tangible changes in current union structure. In 2003, a grass roots reform movement took shape. Five major unions began to collaborate in an attempt to recast the vision of the Labor Movement. After two years of wrangling and conflict, two of the largest of these five unions were joined by several others and in a show of dissension voted to disaffiliate themselves from the AFL-CIO (“Change to Win,” 2005). This
split occurred on the eve of the 50th Anniversary Convention of the AFL-CIO and created quite a stir. Rightfully so, since these separatists represented over a third of the AFL-CIO’s total membership and took with them approximately $20 million in annual dues (“Newsline,” 2005). Calling this new body the Change to Win Coalition (2005), they drafted a platform that does not exclude political action, but instead places it into proper perspective along with its other primary goals. UFCW president Joseph Hansen summarized these goals in his speech at the Change to Win Convention: “Those principles rest on the foundation of core industry organizing, coordinated bargaining, and political action aligned with the strategic interests of UFCW members.” Although fraught with contention, this radical step may be just what the shop steward ordered to refill Labor’s flagging sails.

On one hand, there appears to be no turning back from the course charted by some of unions’ most influential leaders. Joe Sweeney (2005), president of the AFL-CIO, made this bold statement at the 50th Anniversary Constitutional Convention in July, 2005: “We will substantially increase the resources we are putting into mobilizing our members for political and legislative action, and we will transform the way we do both. It is clear to me that we must build a year-round, year-in, year-out grassroots membership mobilization for legislation and politics.” Sweeney clearly believes that the escalation of political activity is a key solution to the Labor Movement’s woes. Many disagree with that assessment and feel strongly that it is the very source of many of its problems. The rising tide of unrest among the rank and file members in union halls across the country has resulted in a reform movement that holds the potential to rectify the abuses of political activism gone awry. As others follow the examples set by men like Harry Beck and the Change to Win Coalition group, hopefully union leaders from the ground level up will take advantage of the opportunity to redefine their agenda and revive the primary purpose for which they were designed—to improve the working conditions of employees everywhere.
About the Author:
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BREAK DOWN

Her very foundation
Crumbles
Pieces of her psyche
Falling into
Your churning sea
Satisfaction in
Reduction
Just rewards
to those
who try
to
Live.

By Leah Rampolla
"You Know Me:"

Ring Lardner’s Baseball Fiction and Its World

By Elizabeth Studenroth
American History: 1865-Present and American Literature II – Winter 06

It was the golden age of baseball, and the national pastime had an unsurpassed grip on the national psyche. Baseball players were exalted as near-gods or villainized as ultimate slackers. Teams wore baggy flannel uniforms and traveled in Pullman cars. Babe Ruth and Ty Cobb lived and played in the present. Controversy raged over games on Sundays and the sale of alcoholic beverages. Tickets were barely affordable at twenty-five or fifty cents. Baseball was used to assimilate the new immigrants and to solidify cultural loyalties, to hang onto the values of the past and to progress into the future, as a democratic leveler and as a racist barrier. It appeared in songs, in poems, in fiction, in pulp novels for boys, comic stories, and the daily paper. "Out of this mostly unexceptional mass of writing emerged the first important creator of baseball fiction, Ring Lardner" (Dawidoff 8).

Ring Lardner’s baseball fiction let its progressive-era readers inside their baseball teams, and its baseball teams let modern readers into the progressive era. Lardner depicted athletes who were humans, not idols. The fictional characters spoke real American dialects, interacted with real baseball players and managers, and demonstrated real human weaknesses. Lardner’s style changed sportswriting, his quality changed baseball fiction, and his treatment of American speech changed American literature in general.

Lardner could give plenty of insider details from his own experience as a sportswriter, which included traveling with the Chicago White Sox (Topping par. 2). He started sportswriting in 1905 at the age of twenty and covered the Cubs and the White Sox for three Chicago newspapers. He spent three months in 1910 as a managing editor for the St. Louis Sporting News. There he authored a humorous column about professional baseball called “Pullman Pastimes,” describing train travel with the ball teams. Lardner became a household name when he took over the popular daily column “In the Wake Of The News” in The Chicago Tribune (Bembrey). In 1914 he wrote his first fictional baseball story about Jack Keefe, “the Busher,” for The Saturday Evening Post (Geismar xvii), and by the end of the year had published nine installments about the obnoxious right-handed pitcher (Bruccoli ix), six of which were published as the 1916 book You Know Me Al. He wrote a total of twenty-five Busher stories and produced a “You Know Me Al” comic strip (Bruccoli x). He also wrote baseball stories about other characters, and in 1915 he began to create fiction about other topics. In totality he wrote 130 short stories, 34 of them about baseball (Bruccoli, x-xi).

Lardner’s fiction was innovative because his characters spoke in authentic slang and dialect. Some claim that Lardner was the first American writer to successfully capture American speech (Yardley par. 4-5). He began practicing in his “In The Wake Of The News” column, where he even published letters, written by himself, pretending to be from semi-literate ball players. His stories, which are epistolary, such as Jack Keefe’s letters to Al or the love correspondence of Danny and Jessie, include characteristic misspellings as well as characteristic grammar and idiom. Some use this to explain his appeal: “What made him so popular was his use of slang and the vernacular of the baseball players. This is why characters like Jack Keefe and Alibi Ike were so popular with the people—they spoke like the real baseball players of the time” (Bembrey para 7).

Another way Lardner made his stories seem real was populating them with real people. Jack Keefe is Lardner’s creation; but he is found by actual scout Jack Doyle, hired by the White Sox’s actual owner, Comiskey; and every few pages he has a run-in with the real manager, Kid Gleason. Actual White Sox catcher Bill Sullivan tries to help him out with advice, and he competes with the real White Sox pitcher Ed Walsh. In later stories he even pitches against Babe Ruth. All the Busher stories, and many of the other stories, bristle with real managers, owners, and players. Lardner also used “actual games, real train schedules, and even existing saloons” (Hilton 24).

Lardner’s stories appeared in sharp contrast to the other baseball literature of the era, “most of which was hero worship stuff written for boys” (Bruccoli ix). Popular baseball fiction was mostly formulaic youth pulp novels, such as the series about Frank Merriwell and Baseball Joe (Reiss 17). “Merriwell was an all-around superstar at Yale, who stood up for the right of the weak, led a virtuous life, was always an honorable sportsman, and invariably led his team to victory with an extraordinary play in the bottom of the ninth or the last minute of the fourth quarter” (Reiss 25). The stories teach their readers to emulate such heroes and traits especially to avoid smoking and drinking. “According to conventional wisdom, baseball was a panacea for the problems of American youths” (Reiss 27) Professional baseball and professional baseball players were supposed to be a positive influence as well (Reiss 25).

Idealizing baseball’s worth for children appeared in a broader context of idealizing baseball for society. “It was set apart as the ‘national pastime,’ an institu-
tion occupying a niche just below belief in God and respect for motherhood” (Seymour 274). Those who profited from professional baseball launched public relations campaigns to argue playing ball was not a waste of time but a benefit to society (Reiss 19). It was argued that baseball was a safety valve for tension, an expression of masculinity, a morale booster in wartime, a path of upward mobility, and a source of virtue and character development (23-24). Watching and playing baseball was supposed to develop an almost endless list of good traits, including quick thinking, sacrifice, teamwork, equality, accepting authority, good health, sound morals, fair play, order, modesty, hard work, thrift, and pluck (22-25). Baseball was equated with old-stock American values, which were threatened by a changing world, and presented a tangible hope that they were relevant to modernity (30). It was an assimilator which were threatened by a changing world, and presented a tangible hope that they were relevant to modernity (30). It was an assimilator of newcomers into “the dominant WASP culture” (7). It was described as a paragon of honesty that all business should emulate, and even attributed with keeping political stability, preventing tyranny, and even warding off anarchic revolution (22).

In reality, baseball was, of course, not quite the source of all good. Despite half-hearted attempts to clamp down on it, betting and gambling grew with baseball. Whenever the authorities tightened up on the race tracks, the gamblers moved over to the ball fields. Anyone anywhere could buy a ten cent ticket to a baseball pool, some of which were enormous operations (Seymour 278-280). Professional ball players were not always paragons of virtue, and some were not even respectable. Many were heavy drinkers, spent time in jail, and failed to pay debts. Various players were sued by their wives for non-support or abandonment; some were shot in drunken brawls. Many had venereal diseases, which the newspapers would call “malaria” or “rheumatism” (Seymour 102-107).

Others were upright men. Some studied professions during the off-season and later became doctors and lawyers (Reiss 203). Christy Matthewson lived up to the moral ideals of the fictional heroes, and often gave lectures for youth organizations. Baseball was used by YMCAs, schools, and settlement houses in the cities to help urban youth and aid immigrants in fitting into America, but playing baseball promoted ethnic solidarity as much as it promoted assimilation, because often teams were formed by language and nationality (Reiss 29-30). As one success story, Cleveland pitcher Stanley Koveleski did escape the coal mines via baseball. “There was nothing strange in those days about a twelve-year-old Polish kid in the mines for 72 hours a week at a nickel an hour,” he said. “What was strange was that I ever got out of there” (qtd. in Ritter 110). However, Poles—and Italians and Jews—were underrepresented in the major leagues, due perhaps to crowded urban living conditions, lack of daylight free time and cultural and family disapprobation, as well as prejudice. There were more Native Americans and Cubans playing in the minors than new immigrants, but no African-Americans or Asians (Reiss 189-194).

Where was Lardner’s work between the romance and the reality, and what is his place in literature? There are many opinions of his most well-known and beloved character, Jack Keefe. Keefe is called “a major figure in American [humor]” (Hilton 7), “a remarkable figure of folk poetry” (Geismar xvii), a “singularly nonheroic personality” (Hilton 7), and “a marvelous example of what some esoteric critics have called ‘primitive virtue’ but which they would never recognize on the local baseball diamond.” He is “an amusing antidote to the stereotypes of the day” (Seymour 98)—who himself “became an American stereotype” (Brucoli x). He is “a character utterly oblivious to his own personality” (Hilton 7). One scholar explains:

He is the smart wisecracker—who answers the bantering of others with the threat of a punch in the jaw; the unbeatable pitcher—who cannot win regularly; the irresistible lover—who cannot get along with his wife. He is Jack Keefe, able and all-knowing, for whom life is forever going wrong. ‘You know me Al’ he boasts, and the words, which run like a refrain through the stories, form an ironic assertion of what he is not (Webb 437).

Although he seemed more realistic than Frank Merriwell and Baseball Joe, Keefe came from Lardner’s imagination. Most baseball players were not as ignorant as “the busher” was (Seymour 98). “The sportswriter Ring Lardner caricatured the less urbane players in such popular tales as You Know Me Al, but his characters were atypical,” said historian Stephen Reiss (169). Hilton agrees:

Ring drew the character from ballplayers whom he knew and liked. In one sense, he did them a disservice, for although Keefe was widely taken to be representative of the players Lardner knew, the actual players who populate the Keefe stories typically treat the hero with amusement bordering on contempt, and frequently look upon him as a behavior problem on the team. (8)
The protagonists of Lardner’s other baseball fiction inhabit the individual short stories he wrote. Most have one exaggerated idiosyncrasy that drives the comedy. “Sick ‘Em” is about two lazy pitchers who only play well when competing to outdo each other and whose teammates must keep them riled at one another to win the series; “The Yellow Kid” is about a young pitcher who is terrified of all women but needs to marry to escape the draft. In “Harmony,” a player’s sole passion is to keep a quartet on the team at any cost, so he gets a youth hired because he can sing tenor and accidentally discovers a marvelous talent who was being kept a secret. The most popular story, “Alibi Ike,” is about a player who has to make excuses for everything he does: “It took him half an hour longer’n us to eat because he had to excuse himself every time he lifted his fork.....I bet he excuses himself to the razor when he gets ready to shave” (Lardner “Alibi Ike” 296-297). Finally, in “My Roomy,” the protagonist is a psychopath.

Baseball is a key to the culture of the era, and Lardner’s fiction is a key to the world of baseball. Now his works open a window to the worldview and customs of that culture. Men were the majority of those attending games, and, apparently, resented female spectators because they did not understand the game and wore enormous view-obstructing hats. But owners sought to attract women to games, thinking they would be a calming influence in the crowd and bring more male ticket-buyers as escorts, so they provided special seating, stairs, restrooms, and prices for women. Many teams had “ladies’ days” once a week, when a woman was admitted free if accompanied by a paying man (Reiss 34-35) This custom appears in Lardner’s story “The Yellow Kid,” where the players tease their new young pitcher, who is terrified of females, and tell him he will pitch Friday because he is handsome:

“The reason for it,” says Childs, “is because Friday is Lady’s Day at our park. The womenfolks all comes in free and the boxes and stand is always full o’ them. And the old man wants to get ‘em well pleased with the club right from the jump. He figures that if they see you once they’ll make their husbands and sweethearts bring ‘em every time you pitch.” (435)

Poor young Crosby suddenly remembers he has a sore arm.

However, Poles—and Italians and Jews—were underrepresented in the major leagues, due perhaps to crowded urban living conditions, lack of daylight free time and cultural and family disapproval, as well as prejudice.

Alcohol was a hotly contested issue in Lardner’s time, preceding and following Prohibition. “At a time when it was impossible to write openly about athletes and alcoholism, Lardner conveyed the impression that his characters were familiar with saloons and the contents of the bottles therein” (Brucoli x). This was in contrast to the tone of the boys’ series, such as this typical quote from Frank Merriwell at Yale:

Now, Frank Merriwell was no less generous than Jack Diamond, but he would not drink liquor of any kind—he would not touch beer. It did not take him long to discover that this peculiarity caused many of the students to regard him with scorn. He was called the Good Templar and was often derisively addressed as Worthy Chief. (Standish 50)

Jack Keefe hides from his troubles with a night of drinking or shows up unfit for work after a night of celebrating with his wife and her relatives, and even runs into pre-Prohibition ordinances as he travels around:

Well, Al, we left Chi last night and first thing Kid Gleason come through the car and asked everybody if they had any bottle goods hid in their grips as he says they are getting strick and if they catch a bird carrying anything in to dry territory they send you to Siberia or somewheres. So when he come along to me he said “Well you big Busher I don’t half to ask you if you are bringing anything along with you as my nose knows but is any of it in bottles?” So I said “No all I have got with me they would half to operate to find it.” (“The Battle of Texas” 163)

But the real Giants catcher Fred Snodgrass said, when interviewed by historian Lawrence Ritter, “Other than Bugs Raymond, I can’t name a single player that I ever saw under the influence of drink. A lot of those boys were rough and tough, but they weren’t heavy drinkers. A few beers now and then, that was about it” (Ritter 90).

Lardner’s stories ran into World War I. He revealed the impact of the war in Europe on American thinking before the country joined it in his 1915 story for The Saturday Evening Post entitled “Where Do You Get That Noise?” Hawley, the know-it-all, presents his unique explanations for everything, while his fellow-players egg him on to laugh at how he wriggles out of contradicting himself. While they blame the drop in attendance at games on the war hurting business, Hawley says it has nothing to do with money:

“No matter what a man says about he bein’ neutral,” says Hawley, “you can bet that down in his heart he’s either for the Dutchmen or the Alleys; I don’t care if he’s Woodruff Wilson or Bill Klem. We all got our favorites... Well then, you can’t expect people that’s for the Alleys to come out to the ballpark and pull for a club that’s mostly Dutchmen, and you can’t expect Dutchmen to patronise a club that’s got a lot o’ fellas with English and French names.” (“Where Do You Get That Noise?” 355)

Hawley claims people’s ethnic and political allegiances for the war in Europe are
stronger than their team loyalties, so a German fan will not even want his team to win if an English player hits the decisive home run. Hawley's solution is "a club made up 'o fellas from countries that ain't got nothin' to do with the war—Norwegians, Danes, Chinks, Mongrels and them fellas." His friends conclude, "'A guy'd have a whole lot of trouble findin' that kind of a club,' I says. 'He'd have a whole lot more trouble,' says Carey, 'findin' a club they could beat'" ("Where'd You Get That Noise?" 356).

Presented by Hawley, a ridiculous character, the theory is obviously not intended to be taken seriously, but the conversation is indicative of how many people were on both sides of the war at that point. In the same year, 1915, a chain letter was sent to the chairman of the National Commission asking for donations to help suffering in Germany (Seymour 244-45).

In the later story "Call For Mr. Keefe!," published in 1918, Jack Keefe is drafted (Lardner even follows him to the war and back, but those stories are not included in anthologies of his baseball fiction since they are not about the game). Many real ball players were drafted like Keefe. In 1918 the government issued "the work-or-fight order," offering the choice of either necessary work by a deadline or the draft. The leagues tried to get baseball players recognized as doing essential work, as actors were, but were not successful (Seymour 248-59). In typical fashion, Keefe does everything he can to get out of the draft; and when at last he fails, he boasts about the patriotism of his enlistment. He concludes that he will not play in the World Series against New York "but how about the real world's serious Al? Won't I be in that? I'll say so" ("Call For Mr. Keefe!" 145).

Ring Lardner's baseball fiction presented an insider's view of the ball player different from the distant hero-worship of other contemporary writings. Usually humorous, sometimes bitter, occasionally tragic, his stories interacted with the culture of the day, including slang, idealism, alcohol, gender relations, ignorance, corruption, and a war. They dealt in themes of the individual trapped in himself and the country boy adapting, or failing to adapt, both to the major leagues and to a changing America. Most of all, they are about a symbol and a revelation of being American: baseball itself.
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FAR AWAY FROM HOME

A soldier hears
The call to war
The enemy leers
A distant shore
“Don’t think, don’t feel”
“Do what you’re told”
A man of steel
Warm heart gone cold
Across the sea
His lady waits
The lady’s me
I curse cruel fate
My angst and pain
They fill the days
The sun is rain
Its lightless rays
A ghostly kiss
Recalled embrace
Familiar lips
A stranger’s face
Eternal fear
Now eats away
The world unclear
At this sad day
A soldier hears
The call to war
The enemy leers
A distant shore

By Leah Rampolla
“I have a dream that my four little children will one day live in a nation where they will not be judged by the color of their skin, but by the content of their character.” On August 28, 1963, Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr. preached these powerful words in his *I Have a Dream* speech before 250,000 Americans in Washington, D.C. (qtd. in Darby 83). A little over 42 years have passed since that monumental day. Has American society joined King on his “mountaintop” and realized his “dream . . . that the brotherhood of man . . . become a reality” (Darby 122)? Sadly, many still do not see eye to eye with King’s dream. For myriad reasons, racism, hatred, and segregation against the African American have perpetuated throughout American history. Refusal by government leaders to enact or enforce equality laws, rulings in favor of segregation by the justice system, continuation of the Jim Crow stereotype, and a general resistance toward change all contributed to keeping the black population in second-class citizenship. By the time the 1950s rolled around, tensions were high and the environment was ripe for change—but this would not happen without violence.

In the words of Pearl S. Buck, “If you want to understand today, you have to search yesterday.” Throughout the past two centuries, many Americans, both black and white, have protested, pleaded, and preached in an optimistic attempt to achieve equality.
From the days of slavery through the Reconstruction period to the Civil Rights rulings of the late 1800s, 1950s, and 1960s and right up to the present, African Americans have endured discrimination and massive acts of violence because their skin is black. History reveals a discernible trail delineating the unequal treatment of an entire race. Dating back to 1776, Thomas Jefferson, “a slaveholder who saw no possibility that blacks and whites could ever live together as equals. . . warned that Americans would one day pay bitterly for having brought the black man to this continent in chains. . . ” (Archer 2-3). Americans did indeed pay a substantial price for their lack of foresight. But just how did the history of race relations progress since the days of the Civil War?

While Abraham Lincoln’s Emancipation Proclamation of 1863 may have been a step in the right direction, it actually did little to relieve black suffering. In _They Had a Dream_, Jules Archer states that the proclamation can be viewed as a “war strategy . . . [which] freed slaves in the Confederacy, in the hope that they would desert southern plantations for Union lines” (9). It took an additional three years and the passage of the 13th Amendment to constitutionally abolish slavery. But does this mean that blacks achieved equality? Sadly, the answer is no. Even with the passage of the 13th Amendment, blacks were not truly free. According to W.E.B. DuBois (a founding member of the NAACP), freedmen experienced what was merely a prolongation of the vain search for freedom, the boon that seemed ever barely to elude their grasp,—like a tantalizing will-o’-the-wisp, maddening and misleading the headless host. The holocaust of war, the terrors of the Ku-Klux-Klan, the lies of carpet-baggers, the disorganization of industry, and the contradictory advice of friends and foes, left the bewildered serf with no new watchword beyond the old cry for freedom. (11)

Slavery may have been outlawed, but it was replaced by demeaning Black Codes which the Freedmen’s Bureau attempted to combat. While the Civil Rights Act of 1866 endeavored to secure citizenship rights for blacks, during the same year the Ku
Klux Klan (KKK) was formed by Nathan Bedford Forrest, an ex-Confederate general from Tennessee. The purpose of the KKK was to “intimidate black citizens. . . . Disguised in white hoods and gowns, Klansmen conducted their business by burning black people’s homes, beating black citizens, and even murdering blacks and whites who helped and sympathized with them” (Tackach 17-18).

These continual acts of violence could not go unchecked. And according to Archer, “In angry reply to southern violence, Congress passed the Fourteenth Amendment guaranteeing full citizenship to all persons born in the United States. . . . [Subsequently,] the Fifteenth Amendment [strengthened] black suffrage” (11). But without enforcement these laws and regulations meant absolutely nothing. And apparently enforcement was sporadic at best.

In The Civil Rights Movement, Sanford Wexler states, “Improvement in black Americans’ civil status during Reconstruction was in reality more impressive in federal law books than in daily life” (4). Government favor and action seems to have wavered between desires for change and demands for complacency—and at times it appears as if there was absolute apathy. “In reality, black Americans would not begin to enjoy the rights and freedoms guaranteed by the Thirteenth, Fourteenth, and Fifteenth Amendments . . . for almost another century” (Tackach 17). Rather, segregation would rule in the black man’s realm.

During this time period and continuing into the 1960s, Jim Crow was the law of the land, especially in southern states. James Tackach states, “The Jim Crow era would continue in the South until the middle of the twentieth century” (18). But what exactly were Jim Crow laws? According to PBS, Jim Crow laws kept the African American in line by dictating what they could and could not do when interacting with whites (“Unwritten”). But a
question which remains is who was Jim Crow? This derogatory term originated in the early 19th century when Thomas Dartmouth “Daddy” Rice introduced the “black face” character of Jim Crow in his minstrel shows. He devised the stereotypical image of a silly, sloppily dressed black character which became a “fundamental component of white popular culture” (“Teachers”).

This stereotype, along with degradation and inferiority, contributed to the inner strife felt by African Americans. In the words of Justice John Marshall Harlan, “it stigmatized blacks . . . with a ‘badge of inferiority’” (qtd. in Patterson 11). Jim Crow laws deprived the black man of his constitutional rights—especially when it came to voting. Wexler notes that Southern states attempted to prevent blacks from voting by adopting restrictive conditions such as poll taxes and literacy tests. And, as Jim Crow became prevalent throughout the South, “white” and “colored” signs appeared. Sadly, many did not comprehend the downside of enforcing Jim Crow laws until much later. But some individuals were more intuitive. William Pickens, NAACP Field Secretary, emphasized,

There is no such thing as a fair and just Jim Crow system with “equal accommodations,” and in every human nature there will never be. The inspiration of Jim Crow is a feeling of caste and a desire to “keep in its place,” that is, to degrade, the weaker group. For there is no more reason for a Jim Crow car in public travel than there would be for a Jim Crow path in the public streets (qtd. in Wexler 25-26).

Indeed it was segregation of railroad cars which led to the landmark Supreme Court ruling in 1896 which would allow, and justify, segregation for the next 60 years. Known as Plessy v. Ferguson, this ruling “established the constitutionality of separate-but-equal racial segregation” (Patterson 18). When writing about the Court’s majority opinion, Justice Henry Billings Brown noted:

The object of the [14th] amendment was undoubtedly to enforce the absolute equality of the two races before the law, but in the nature of things it could not have been intended to abolish distinctions based upon color, or to enforce social, as
distinguished from political equality, or a commingling of the two races upon terms unsatisfactory to either. (qtd. in Wexler 22)

In contrast, the lone dissenter, Justice Harlan countered, “Our constitution is color-blind, and neither knows nor tolerates classes among citizens. In respect of civil rights, all citizens are equal before the law. The humblest is the peer of the most powerful” (qtd. in Wexler 22). In actuality Plessy v. Ferguson ensured that the African American remained inferior. It also set the tone for what would come to pass 60 years into the future when the battle for integration heated up. As stated by novelist James Baldwin in 1953, “There is not a Negro alive who does not have rage in his blood” (qtd. in Patterson 8).

The U.S. Supreme Court warranted “separate but equal”; however, there was no enforcement to ensure equality. In PBS’s *The Rise and Fall of Jim Crow*, Joseph Holloway tells his tale of traveling from Los Angeles to Louisiana. While driving through Texas, the family tried to get gas but “several gas stations refused to sell [them] gas because they did not ‘sell gas to niggers.’” When they finally arrived at a gas station which would serve them, they also needed to use the restroom. They discovered large, clean facilities but were prevented from entering by the gas station owner who stated, “Nigger, can’t you read the sign? It says ‘Whites Only’.” The “colored” restroom was a shabby, smelly outhouse with a partially ajar door through which passersby could see inside. This example undoubtedly shows that the restrooms were separate but certainly not equal. Once again the country attempted to stop the black man from obtaining equality.

Sadly by the time the 1950s arrived, the hostility between those in favor of black rights and those who did not want their current way of life disturbed was strongly entrenched in American culture. But, blacks were weary of their second-class citizenship treatment and this country was sitting on a powder keg waiting for a catalyst to light the fuse. One such catalyst was the inequality in segregated schools. According to James Patterson in *Brown v. Board of Education*, in 1940 there was a difference in southern states’ public spending for black students versus white students of more than fifty percent. While there was an attempt to rectify
the situation in 1954 (mainly to avoid challenges to segregation) the amount spent on public education for African Americans still represented only sixty percent of that spent on white students (xvi-xvii). Such inequality had a direct influence on how African American children felt about themselves. According to Thurgood Marshall, “The Negro child is made to go to an inferior school; he is branded in his own mind as inferior. . . . This sets up a roadblock in his mind which prevents his ever feeling he is equal. You can teach such a child the Constitution, anthropology, and citizenship, but he knows it isn’t true” (qtd. in Tackach 48).

The time had arrived to challenge the separate but equal ruling. And the man who would do this was Thurgood Marshall. But “Marshal . . . had struggled long enough against racial discrimination to know that [the] Brown [v. Board of Education case] would arouse furious controversy” (Patterson xiv). And he was right. According to DuBois, “the South believed an educated Negro to be a dangerous Negro. And the South was not wholly wrong; for education among all kinds of men always has had, and always will have, an element of danger and revolution, of dissatisfaction and discontent” (29). Would whites willingly send their children to school with blacks? Opponents of segregation felt “bringing blacks and whites together in schools . . . would weaken hateful stereotypes and promote interracial understanding among young—and in time among society at large” (Patterson xviii). But that did not reflect the white southerners’ view of integration.

A battle ensued and desegregation emerged victorious—at least superficially. “On May 17, 1954, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled unanimously that racial segregation in public schools violated the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution” (“Brown”). In words that echoed the prior thoughts of Marshall, Chief Justice Earl Warren stated:

Segregation of white and colored children in public schools has a detrimental effect upon the colored children. The impact is greater when it has the sanction of the law, for the policy of

But, blacks were weary of their second-class citizenship treatment and this country was sitting on a powder keg waiting for a catalyst to light the fuse.
separating the races is usually interpreted as denoting the inferiority of the Negro group. A sense of inferiority affects the motivation of a child to learn. Segregation with the sanction of law, therefore, has a tendency to [retard] the educational and mental development of Negro children and to deprive them of some of the benefits they would receive in a racially integrated school system. . . . We conclude that, in the field of public education, the doctrine of “separate but equal” has no place. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal. (qtd. in “Brown”)

Finally, the United States Supreme Court offered encouragement for African Americans. How would the South respond?

When the Supreme Court favored desegregation of schools, rioting, intimidation, and economic defiance arose. Southern states were not prepared to send their white children to school with those of “inferior” blacks. After all, the U.S. Supreme Court had allowed segregation to perpetuate for almost seventy years. Reaction was immediate and consisted of an increase in KKK violence along with political and economic pressures. “Ten years after the end of World War II, many whites in the Delta felt that Mississippi was now in another war to protect its way of life” (Hampton 2).

One example of the escalation in violence is illustrated by the brutal and senseless slaying of Emmett Till along with the subsequent murder trial. Lynchings were rampant in the South, and Till became an easy target. “On August 20, 1955, Emmett Till, a fourteen-year-old from Chicago’s South Side, almost missed the train that would carry him to a summer visit with relatives in the Mississippi Delta” (Hampton 1). If only Till had missed that train. Rather, his tragic vacation served to increase tensions and heighten awareness of the brutalities which were being inflicted. Till had never been in the South and apparently could not grasp the concept of segregation. In Getting Away With Murder, Chris Crowe states that “[t]he nature of the crime itself, a fourteen-year-old boy brutally murdered by two men, made it news, but the reason for the kidnapping and killing—Emmett had allegedly whistled at and made ‘ugly remarks’ to a white woman—turned it into big news” (22). And big news
it became. When Till’s body was recovered, the severity of the torture inflicted upon him caused a stir throughout the nation, particularly when Jet magazine published pictures of this young African American boy in his coffin (Crowe 18). So the tides slowly began to turn. In an unprecedented act, murder indictments were brought against Roy Milam and J.W. Bryant. This was quite possibly the first time that white men would stand trial for the killing of an African American. And hope swelled among African Americans that perhaps equal rights were on the way. But for “southern segregationists, the trial confirmed the fear that had begun with the Supreme Court’s Brown v. Board of Education ruling: The white-dominated Southern way of life was in jeopardy (Crowe 22). Sadly, Till’s killers were not brought to justice. Rather the all-white jury returned a verdict of not guilty after deliberating less than one hour (Crowe 18). But change was in the air.

The 1960s proved to be a tumultuous time for race relations. While Martin Luther King, Jr. sought a peaceful resolution, Malcolm X emerged as the “uncompromising teller of unpleasant truths [and] an incorruptible symbol of black pride” (Hampton 241). Marches against segregation and discrimination sprang up across the country along with violent race riots in places such as Harlem and Watts (a section of Los Angeles). In fact, during the summer of 1967 the nation “witness[ed] disorders in almost 150 American communities” (Hampton 375). Even Detroit was not immune. According to Hampton and Fayer, Detroit was viewed as an enlightened city which was working. After all, it was the “only city in the country to send more than one black to the House of Representatives.” But in reality, there were many contradictions including wealthy black neighborhoods bordering “the nastiest street[s] in town.” And, “the tensions were not always black versus white; they were sometimes black versus black, and contributed to the growing frustrations” (Hampton 374-375). So what exactly sparked the Detroit riot—an unrest which has been recorded as “the worst in
twentieth-century America in terms of what [it] cost in lives and in destruction” (Hampton 375)? The riot commenced after police raided a “blind-pig” (a bar which stayed open after closing hours)—not an unusual activity in Detroit (or any American city). But in this case, as John Nichols, Deputy Superintendent of Police states, “People just got tired, people just got tired of it. And it just exploded” (qtd. in Hampton 376).

The historical trail of race relations leads to the present day. Some might say the situation is fine: government leaders have enacted and appear to enforce equality laws; segregation was officially dismantled; and the Jim Crow stereotype seems to have faded over time. Perhaps all that remains is resistance to change. However, underneath the surface I believe the scars of unfair treatment, brutality, and violence remain. And racism still exists. According to The White Power Movement, “A hate wave has been rising steadily in the United States” (Landau 21). Consider the formation and popularity of groups such as the Skin Heads, Neo-Nazis, and the Aryan Nation. Sadly, hate remains.

Former President Jimmy Carter offers that “[w]e become not a melting pot but a beautiful mosaic. Different people, different beliefs, different yearnings, different hopes, different dreams” (“Jimmy”). Like Martin Luther King and all the courageous individuals who bravely sought equality, I too have a dream for an America which disregards the color of an individual’s skin but looks into a person’s heart and soul. That is who we are and where we carry our character and integrity. Everything else is superficial. Will society reach the peak of King’s mountaintop? Was Jefferson correct when he indicated the black man never should have been brought to this country? Can we overcome the past and create a brighter future? I suggest this can happen if people truly listen to the words of Pearl S. Buck and learn from yesterday.
About the Author:
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Familiar Walls

A place you see everyday.
This place is set in stone.
The knowledge it feeds you--
Never enough for a way home.
The trees surround the walls;
The cars settle as we scatter.
One room to the next.
Everyday is out of a text.
One book or two?
We prepare to go on to the next step;
A step one must take.
Leaving the walls seems easy--
Sometimes, more difficult.
The people you meet.
The seat you choose.
It all leads to your next move.
These walls I see everyday.
These walls I need to continue on.
Sojourners move ahead.
Never look back.
Just keep it with you;
Stay on the right path.
The next road down
Is just straight ahead.
That wall you're looking for.

By Janel Spiegel
Throughout history, there have been people, places, information, and events lost from the collective memory of the mainstream. While much of this is unintentional, as the significance of each of these things varies within the context and culture of the history being studied, every once in a while a “hole” is discovered where a piece of important history was removed. It has been said that those who win the wars write the history books, and hegemony certainly factors into the interests of the historical record and its relevance to the regime. Could some people and their actions or ideas have been so powerful and such a threat to the power structures that the only way to suppress their legacy would be to hope they fade into obscurity?

Some of the most prominent collections of historical fixtures are those determined to be the intellectuals responsible for popular foundations of Western political economy. Modern political, economic, and historical texts are filled with analyses of the contributions of these thinkers. These analyses continually seek to link these figures to the overall understanding of the events and structures created in each of their respective areas. This includes classical political economists such as Adam Smith and David Ricardo, who contributed to the development of what we understand to be free market capitalism, and Karl Marx, who advanced an alternative model that developed into the concepts of communism and socialism. These two opposing forces have since evolved into one of the most clashing dichotomies of Western culture, and as such are a dominant source of attention in our frame of orientation in political, economic, and historical perspectives.

It seems that capitalism and communism form a useful dynamic to explain the everlasting global struggle over power and resources. In a sense, the dominant world view of capitalist “good” needs an opposing model such as communism/socialism that regularly fails as a reason to continue upholding its position as the system of choice. Examinations of ideas—old and new—are generally evaluated along a “capitalism versus communism/socialism” continuum, and as such are often viewed primarily by their compatibility with one model or the other. For those on both sides, the other is seen as the problem and their approach is the logical solution.

But what if a “third way” existed, one that reconciled the best features of both capitalism and communism/socialism? What if this alternative model offered both a rational moral imperative and a practical implementation framework?

To Henry George, whose work was ignored throughout the 20th century yet still holds a promise of peace and prosperity for all in the 21st century.
What if such an idea was not just developed and promoted by a charismatic and ambitious individual but recognized by some of the most notable people in history such as Leo Tolstoy, Winston Churchill, Albert Einstein, Martin Luther King, Jr., Mark Twain, and Milton Friedman? What if such a leader—the third most popular figure in America behind Thomas Edison and Mark Twain during his time—and his model made several significant contributions to American society (de Mille)? Would such a man and his ideas, with the potential to radically alter the foundations of modern political and economic systems, seem like an attractive and important addition to our political, economic, and historical texts, the resulting framework of orientation and debate, and perhaps even a solution to some of our most pressing problems?

This man was Henry George. Born to a working class family in Philadelphia in September, 1839, George left school early and worked for several years as a seaman on a trading vessel that traveled around the world (Bender). He then ended up in California, spending a short time in unsuccessful gold expeditions before settling in San Francisco, where he met and married his wife and began to raise a family (Bender). Though a hard worker that always sought out an honest job, George struggled personally several times with urban poverty, something he’d come to understand in detail.

Besides laboring during the day, George was a diligent self-learner and budding journalist and began publishing opinion pieces, honing his interests and writing skills (George 240). Endowed with a natural ability for authorship, he quickly worked his way up the ranks of a local paper as a printer, reporter, and managing editor (George 240). On the side he continued to write freelance and produced articles for several magazines (George 241).

Successful as he was, a major personal and professional shift took place for George in the late 1860s during a trip to New York City (George 241). Viewed as the central symbol of American progress and prosperity, he was disturbed by growing poverty that existed among the rapidly expanding wealth there (George 241). Calling it the “Great Enigma of our Times,” George became determined to discover the root cause of such contradictory conditions.

For the next decade, he slowly developed an inquiry into this paradox. Some of his early work in this area focused on injustices
To solve this dilemma, George believed, was to solve the very root of social and economic despair:

This association of poverty with progress is the great enigma of our times. It is the central fact from which spring industrial, social, and political difficulties that perplex the world, and with which statesmanship and philanthropy and education grapple in vain. From it come the clouds that overhang the future of the most progressive and self-reliant nations. It is the riddle that the Sphinx of Fate puts to our civilization, which not to answer is to be destroyed. So long as all the increased wealth which modern progress brings goes but to build up great fortunes, to increase luxury and make sharper the contrast between the House of Have and the House of Want, progress is not real and cannot be permanent. (George 5)

To proceed, he looked to the laws of both political economy and the natural world, which he believed to be in harmony with
each other and that by correctly defining and understanding would provide the correct answer. Nature, George explained, is plentiful for the needs of humankind, and the laws of political economy, such as the meanings of the factors of production (land, labor, and capital), when clearly defined, would identify the source of this distortion:

It must be within the province of Political Economy to give such an answer. For Political Economy is not a set of dogmas. It is the explanation of a certain set of facts. It is the science that seeks, in the sequence of certain phenomena, to trace mutual relations and to identify cause and effect, just as the physical sciences seek to do in other sets of phenomena. It lays its foundations upon firm ground. The premises from which it makes its deductions are truths that have the highest sanction; they are axioms that we all recognize; upon them we safely base the reasoning and actions of everyday life and they may be reduced to the metaphysical expression of the physical law that motion seeks the line of least resistance - namely, that men seek to gratify their desires with the least exertion. Proceeding from a basis thus assured, its processes, which consist simply in identification and separation, have the same certainty. In this sense it is as exact a science as geometry, which, from similar truths relative to space, obtains its conclusions by similar means, and its conclusions when valid should be as self-apparent. And although in the domain of Political Economy we cannot test our theories by artificially produced combinations or conditions, as may be done in some of the other sciences, yet we can apply tests no less conclusive, by comparing societies in which different conditions exist, or in imagination by separating, combining, adding or eliminating forces or factors of known direction. (George 6)

George's central thesis in the book is that the massive problems of poverty are rooted in the unjust private ownership of land. Land, he argues, is the natural source of wealth and is converted into capital by the application of human labor. It is not possible for an individual to “own” land, only to acquire it through purchasing and holding title to it or otherwise laying claim to it (often by force), either which is only valid if recognized and enforced by
society at large. When land is owned and controlled privately, it misallocates returns on the means of production, keeping wages paid to labor at a minimum, reducing interest paid for capital outlay, and funneling excess revenues into the payment of rent to the land owners, who essentially live off of the work of others.

To correct this economic malady, George believes it necessary to return the ownership of all land to society. However, instead of the often violent socialization of wealth resulting from Marxist revolutions, he proposes simply taxing away the value of land while untaxing the value of improvements to land such as buildings and crops, allowing it to stay in private ownership but diverting all value indirectly created by society’s activity into public finance, where it can be used for the further good of all (George 140). Once this land value tax is applied, all other forms of taxation on production and commerce, such as income, business, and sales taxes, would be eliminated. George views such wealth as true private property, and confiscating and socializing it is not only immoral but counterproductive to economic development. Together, these ideas formed the basis of the Single Tax movement, with activists promoting these reforms in the U.S., Europe, and elsewhere.

After him and his ideas began to gain major support, George moved to New York City, where he spent much of his time lecturing both locally and abroad (Bender). Seeing the potential for significant political momentum, he decided to run for mayor of New York City in 1886, polling second behind Abram S. Hewitt but gaining more votes than the young Theodore Roosevelt (George 243). Ten years later he launched a second campaign, but unfortunately died four days before the election due to exhaustion from constantly attempting to spread his message (George 243). A true American hero, Henry George gave his life for his fervent belief in social and economic justice.
It is not possible for an individual to “own” land, only to acquire it through purchasing and holding title to it or otherwise laying claim to it (often by force), either which is only valid if recognized and enforced by society at large.

Even more tragic than his death is the near disappearance of his legacy. Few political, economic, and historical texts mention his life and work, and those that do often treat him as a footnote to the past or a radical idealist whose short time has come and gone. After Progress and Poverty, he went on to write several other important texts, including The Science of Political Economy, Social Problems, and the classic Protection or Free Trade. The absence of his principles are especially lacking in the modern study of neoclassical economics, where much of the original classical models of Smith, Ricardo, and Mill have been distorted to conform to the dominant models of corporate imperialism, global mercantilism, and unequal free trade. Encouragingly, new models are quietly being developed by remaining Georgist economists. In his book Economic Democracy, which uncovers the fallacies of neo-classical economics, the modern implementation of corporate imperialism and neo-feudalism, and the long history of suppression of alternative political and economic models such as Georgism, J. W. Smith uses George’s principles as a basis for an entirely new global economic model: “Henry George’s conversion of exclusive title to nature’s wealth to conditional titles restores those original commons [i.e. land, money, technology, and information] in modern form and is the answer for full and equal rights with a quality of life for all” (Smith 14).

George’s principles of conditional title to land and methods of sustainable public finance have incredible potential in modern applications. Unknown to most people, many municipalities in Pennsylvania utilize a variation of the original land value tax in what is called the two-tier property tax, where land values are taxed at higher rates than the buildings and other improvements that exist on the land. Such a method is an effective way to combat the related problems of urban blight and suburban sprawl and is vital to restoring cities such as Reading. Another promising application is the Green tax, which taxes consumption of natural resources such as water, wood, petroleum, minerals, and other...
substances from nature. Like land, such natural resources are the common ownership of society, who should be fairly compensated for the use of these materials. This would properly penalize exploitation of resources as carried out through modern corporate imperialism (especially in the Third World) and force human social and economic activity to be done in equitable and sustainable manners. A third benefit from Georgist economics is the distribution of a “guaranteed income” in the form of a per-capita citizens’ dividend from surplus revenues to all citizens. Alaska already has a rudimentary program similar to this that pays every citizen an annual dividend from state oil revenues.

If these proper socialization programs were carried out, the global economy would become incredibly efficient, trade would become truly fair, poverty could be eliminated, the Third World could properly develop, and the constant conflict and wars resulting from the struggle over resources could be prevented.

Although Henry George has been largely forgotten for the past century, his ideas are more relevant than ever in the modern age. The reasons behind George’s obscurity appear obvious once their potential for change become evident. As Leo Tolstoy explains: “The chief weapon against the teaching of Henry George was that which is always used against irrefutable and self-evident truths. This method, which is still being applied in relation to George, was that of hushing up.... People do not argue with the teaching of George; they simply do not know it.” (de Mille). His story is a perfect example of the need to not only learn about the past but to patch holes in the historical record that prevent us from learning what we need to know for the future. The story deserves to be restored to its rightful prominence in history.
About the Author:
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The Forest God

He is Cernunnos in my eyes
The great forest demi-god
Ancient protector of old
Whose arms are strong as oak branches
That lift the birds to sing in the sky
He glides down emerald lit paths
Reflecting hues of green in his eyes
Life he sees as rings of beauty
Harbored in trunks of strength
If I cross his path suddenly
I cannot help but freeze in his presence
To my knees I drop honoring his grace
He looks upon me with infinite wisdom
These times the world seems distant to me.

By Jessica Jolly
he United States of America is populated by 300 million individuals. We are independent and self-reliant. We are unique, special, and separate from each other. It is essentially the concept of individualism this country was founded upon, and we as a people have become quite cozy with our individuality. I am not to be confused with you, and you are not to be confused with them. This rule of thumb has not passed by unnoticed in the ubiquitous mass media. Advertisers and conglomerates in the media take the opportunity to increase profit by tapping into our individual cores. Three hundred million Americans become 70 different demographic groups, which then sprawls into hundreds of subcategories of very special people.

The Great Divide: Narrowcasting in the Mass Media

(Swire, 2004, para. 20). This phenomenon, called narrowcasting or market segmentation, targets a product or media content to a very specific segment of a population.

Successful narrowcasting is achieved by psychographic profiling and data mining for consumer records. An example of this is Toyota, which in 1997 abandoned broadcasting their new car, the Prius, to wide audiences. Instead, they opted to introduce it via the Internet to a select group of people based on their income, values, and design and image consciousness (Yankelovich, 2006, para. 46). Toyota tapped into the consumer’s emotional receptivity of the environmentally friendly values the car represented and the image the consumer desired to achieve from the Prius. That year, the Prius had easily met its profit goal (Yankelovich, 2006, para. 46).

Narrowcasting would appear to be a winning situation for both the consumer and the company or media outlet. Advertisements targeting a particular consumer based on his/her unique aspects
re-affirms a sense of individuality. Along with the product, the consumer gains an additional feeling of emotional fulfillment and self-importance. In a personal survey, twenty-nine of fifty people said they would purchase a product whose advertisement campaign appealed to their personal interests. Due to the fact that there are 300 million individuals in America, narrowcasting maintains an efficient and diverse market and mass media. As technology advances in the generation of TiVo, iPods, and Internet users, so does the practicality and prevalence of market segmentation. However, as segmentation increases and Americans become more and more distinctly individual, several serious issues become apparent.

The Problem

There are pitfalls to everything that brings convenience and efficiency, and the narrowcasting of America is no exception. There are three main problems that arise as market segmentation becomes more prevalent in society: Invasion of privacy, the disuniting and separation of groups in America, and as Joseph Turow, author of *Breaking up America: Advertisers and the New Media World*, says, “[T]he ‘Us’ will lose out to the ‘Me’” (as cited in Rothenberg, 1997, para. 6).

Narrowcasting works because there are public records of every single person living in the United States. Immense data farms, such as Acxiom Corporation, Claritas, ESRI, and Experian collect public records and buy consumer information from other businesses. The largest of these data farms, Acxiom Corporation, re-assembles the information, analyzes it, and splits consumers into seventy main categories. The profiles they come up with are then sold to businesses looking for potential targets. Peter Swire, a law professor at Ohio State University, describes the depth of information Acxiom collects on consumers in a 2004 Frontline interview:

…[I]t can be very detailed, in part depending on what the individual has done. If you buy a house, the amount of the house sale goes on to the public record. Your pilot’s license, the fact that you’ve bought a particular car or the fact you’ve been sued in court, any sort of thing that you’ve been involved in that made its way into the public domain.… (para. 4)
Coupled with a psychological analysis, the information in consumer records is extremely helpful in market segmentation. However, the selling of this information could be an invasion of privacy, not to mention being intrusive. There are no regulations restricting a company from selling consumer information to another company. The big concern lies in this prospect: As technology increases, especially the vast reaches of the Internet, monitoring behavior becomes easier as well. At what point will these data farms start tracking down the websites we visit in order to split us into even more distinct, segmented consumer groups?

A second issue lies in the role narrowcasting in advertising and the media has on disuniting the public. Thirty-nine of the fifty people I surveyed think that market segmentation in the mass media divides and/or isolates the public. When these people were asked to what extent they believed it divides/isolates, on a scale from one to five (with one as the least significant and five, the most significant), the average came to 3.8. This shows that most people are indeed feeling the fragmented and isolated effects of narrowcasting. As advertising has become more customized to specific niches within the population, so has the splintering and fragmenting of the mass media, which is traditionally the cultural forum of the public (Lavidge, 1999, para. 28). Efficient narrowcasting ultimately calls for the disuniting of the population by pigeonholing us into many, many separate groups. When all we are being exposed to are products and content that are tailored to our lifestyles and values, our beliefs are not being challenged. We no longer have to confront the “other side” (Swire, 2004, para. 35). We are living in a world where narrowcasting only reinforces our differences and separates us further from each other as subcategories of consumers splinter out into hundreds more. This is by no means good news, especially in our state of international conflict.

The disuniting of the American population leads right into the takeover of selfish values from selfless ones in our society. Narrowcasting often plays on the consumer’s desire to feel important and special by utilizing the consumer’s profile. In order to win my heart and money, advertisers
and media outlets cater to my own personal desires while telling me repeatedly that I am unique. I stand out from the bunch, and they cite the reasons why (meanwhile, though marketed differently, they are telling precisely the same thing to somebody else). The result? We each live in our own universe; we are socially divided. This personalized reality created by narrowcasting contributes to ignorance or apathy of our surroundings and a limited range of awareness of current issues, and perhaps even hostility to different views. Rick Stoff (2004), in “Where has the Public Gone?,” illustrates this point by describing a friend who only watches media tailored for his conservative values:

His political opinion seemed to me to reflect a low degree of factual awareness of current events…. With some smugness, he made it clear that he knows better than to believe the lies people like me find in our newspapers, magazines, and public radio programs. In his view, only conservative media are unibiased. (p. 5)

Because of the ubiquity of narrowcasting in the media, the line between our role as consumers and our role as citizens has blurred. As mentioned previously, “the ‘Us’ loses out to the ‘Me.’” Instead of viewing current issues and politics objectively, we have skewed views of what is important. Political candidates have started to tap into market segmentation based on personal beliefs and value systems.

Everything else has been personalized; why not our presidents? In my survey, thirty-two out of the fifty people said they would be more likely to vote for a presidential candidate whose platform appeals to personal interests (which included sports, arts, technology, and film) than one who does not. Is this fair? In being partial to a president that appeals to us personally, have we abandoned taking into account what would be best for everybody?

The Diagnosis

How did it come to be like this? The problem lies in the very birth of this country and the nature of its economy. Narrowcasting
is a successful marketing tool, and it is the direct result of our growing competitive market. Considering the size and diversity of our options for the same type of products or media contents, businesses have to fight for profit. A natural solution would be market segmentation. Why broadcast a general message to the general public when it could be narrowcasted to a specific segment of the public? Americans, having grown up in a culture with emphasis on individualistic values ever since its conception, are receptive to personalized products in the media.

The dynamics of capitalism also led to increased ownership of media outlets by large conglomerates. Rather than acting as a highway of unbiased information, the mass media are acting like a business that is trying to entice consumers with personalization (just like Toyota did in 1997 with the Prius). Television programs have become the ultimate form of market segmentation. Instead of objective news shows, we may pick news that covers topics with a personal pull on us, hosted by pundits who reflect our values.

Another contributing factor to the issue is the rapid increase of technology in our culture. As technology advances, the practicality of mass broadcasting diminishes. Robert J. Lavelidge (1999), in his article “Mass Customization is not an Oxy-moron,” asserts:

Technology is making it possible for you to come closer and closer to designing your own computer, your own car, your clothes, and even your food.... Technological developments are also coming closer and closer to making mass customization of advertising practical. This will require the information needed to reach individuals, rather than the masses, a segment, or even a niche with advertising that impacts them and moves them. (para. 30)

Solutions, Implementations, Evaluations

Since problems that arise in narrowcasting seem to be a natural progression in the nature of the economy, it is difficult to find a cure-all solution. The most effective solution is also the least feasible: a social revolution. In order to reverse the disunity and splintering of society into smaller and smaller fragments, the citizens of the United States could revolt and do away with our
current economic system, stressing a difference between “business” and “media.” There would be a replacement of the emphasis on the individual with an emphasis on the group. Narrowcasting would be completely ineffective in a society that was not attracted to the idea of being one of a kind. This is a good, effective idea in theory, but so is Communism. Even if this idea came into reality, there would be a whole new set of problems in the absence of narrowcasting in the mass media.

Another possible solution would be increased governmental regulation of advertisers and conglomerates. In light of a reporter looking up all the movies that 1987 Supreme Court Nominee Robert Bork had rented from a local video store, Congress passed a law prohibiting video stores from giving information concerning what people were renting (Swire, 2004, para. 14-15). The government obviously has the ability to restrict the information that is being released. Perhaps Congress could take the video store law a step further and place restrictions on the types of information gathered by data mining corporations, and how the information that they do gather may be used. However, it would not be easy to implement this law. Most of the records gathered by these corporations are public. Placing such restrictions would also infringe upon the free market and the capitalistic spirit that runs America.

A final solution may be increasing media literacy education in schools. If students are taught about narrowcasting and market segmentation at early ages, they will be aware of the nature of the diversity that surrounds them. The long reach of marketing in our culture is blatantly clear as this phenomenon creates such a division in the public. While it is often efficient and helpful in purchasing personal products, narrowcasting is also harmful to the consumer and the culture. Although media literacy education does not put an end to narrowcasting, it decreases its effectiveness in fragmenting society. If we know marketers in the media pigeonhole us into a certain segment of the population, we will be less likely to let that happen. In this sense, media literacy education is the most effective solution in preventing social division caused by market segmentation.
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