John Kennedy Toole
Tulane University
March 4, 1955
Mr. Foote

"The Fly": An Interpretation

There is, no doubt, a great deal of personal glory to be realized by finding "hidden meanings" and symbols through literary criticism. Quite often it is the case that the author intended his work to be allegorical, but frequently another thing happens: an overly zealous critic cries "Eureka!" when he is handed a new novel or short story and proceeds to find an infinite variety of imagined symbols and baseless allegorical guesses which cause the general public to feel its inability to find and imagine such things is a sign of mental inferiority and, probably, creates anguish in the mind of the author himself.

To me, Katherine Mansfield has concocted an excellently written story that revolves around the familiar cliche, "Time heals all wounds." Equating one character with another was both logical and acceptable in "A Passion in the Desert" and "Young Goodman Brown." But in "The Fly" it seems unreasonable to say fly=boss=Mr. Woodifield=the boy=etc., etc.

It is clear that Miss Mansfield simply wanted to show, through her fine literary style, that all grief passes with time. It <u>must</u>, or we develop into whining neurotics whom people shun. The reader must not turn against the boss for forgetting the torture of his son's death. There

should be, rather, a feeling of praise for his adjustment to normality.

At this point, I could say that the story was written as an inspiration to the English people after the first great war in an attempt to show them that they must forget their losses and go forward bravely and optimistically in building a new, well-adjusted, strong England. Perhaps this would be eagerly accepted in literary circles, for, after all, it is an interesting supposition.

But I have digressed from my topic. To return, I will say that, at face value, the story is very acceptable. It pertains to all in that it shows only the progressive, normal, non-neurotic individual survives in modern civilization.

- - -

May 11, 1956
Mr. Ward

Thou Art Indeed Just, Lord

Gerard Manley Hopkins

This poem is one of the finest examples of environment reflecting itself in artistic product. It is somewhat similar to No Worst, There Is None in that the appeal is to the religious, the divine.

Hopkins was writing in an age when the most profound scientific discoveries were exploding in the face of the religious world. As one

whose life had been dedicated to the Church, it seems natural that this period may have been extremely painful for him to bear.

And, in addition to the tumult outside the monastery walls, Hopkins was subject to inner torment. Had his own countryman, Darwin, not been successful in proving certain evolutionary points, Hopkins would still have felt acute melancholia. For all that we know, Hopkins might have known nothing of such men as Darwin and such findings as were bursting in the biological world.

It was rather this keen inner depression and feelings of futility which seem to have affected Hopkins. These semtiments probably would have preyed upon him even in the security of the Middle Ages. This keen, yet guilty, feeling of doubt gives rise to the universal: "send me a sign."

The Biblical inspiration of the poem sets its note. It is reminiscent of the Jews of the Old Testament crying to God across a blistering desert. It is a faint challenge to the Creator, faint because of an innate fear of His power.

The opening argument is simple and logical. Why do sinners' ways prosper? One can only imagine the frequency with which this cry has been voiced since man has believed in Jehovah.

Obviously Hopkins feels himself a failure, particularly in saying:

. . . why must?

Disappointment all I endeavor end?"

But, he continues, assuming God to be his friend, saying that were the Lord his enemy how much worse he would be defeated and thwarted.

Lust thrives more than does he who is dedicated to the cause of

Christianity. This is one phrase which strikes a predominant theme in the poem. Hopkins is viewing the physical world from his spiritual position, and, naturally, the satisfactions found in either of these worlds are radically different in both cause and effect. A person in one of these worlds can not hope to satisfy himself in the other.

There follows a nature image which could imply that the poem was created when the physical world was in its most obvious phase--spring.

> See, banks and brakes
>
> Now, heaved how thick! laced they are again . . . .

Now and again imply that this was not always constant, implying again that it is spring.

He uses the plant "chervil" probably because it is an aromatic herb with a tendency to grow wildly about rural areas--a symbol of vitality and appeal to the senses.

> . . . birds build--but not I build; no, but strain,
>
> Time's eunuch, and not breed one work that wakes.

Here again is the physical world contrasted to his own. The birds are overt builders. But he, using the form of spiritual construction, has done nothing that is obvious to the physical eye.

The reference to the word "eunuch" implies his physical sterility --a sterility in practice, if not a definite medical sterility. It also suggests his inability, because of religious and wocial laws, to perform sexual exercises resulting in reproduction and life.

In referring to works that "wake," he sees his failure to produce

anything living, or even concrete.

Continuing in the nature image is his asking:

. . . send my roots rain.

Here he asks for the force to continue his life. Feeling barren, he asks for nourishment to produce in him a more settled and complacent mental state. The rain, no doubt, could be the symbol for "grace," a form of spiritual nourishment.

The poem is the cry of a spiritual man in the midst of a physical world, who can see the results of physical labor and activity, whereas his labor and activity result in invisible and impractical works which can't satisfy him in his physical surroundings.

- - -

October 27, 1955
Dr. Fogle

War in Childe Harold's Pilgrimage

Byron's treatment of war in Childe Harold's Pilgrimage is similar to that which might be expected from the pen of an astute historian, a viewer whose scope of understanding covers the broad story of man and his civilization. A thoroughly impersonal discussion of the subject is not, however, offered by Byron. Byron is not the true historian who would tend

more toward fact than opinion. As might be expected, the Byronic trait of highly personal reference and conclusion is thoroughly evident.

Were the historian to go so far as to personally analyze the battles discussed in Childe Harold's Pilgrimage, he might understandably agree with Byron that if such battles as Waterloo were fought to improve mankind, they were essentially futile.

It must not, however, be concluded by the reader of Byron that he is opposed to all war, that he is at all a pacifist. He believes most sincerely, or at least we are led to believe so, in any uprising which espouses, in his opinion, an essentially worthwhile cause.

In lines 178-180 of Canto III his feelings about "just" battle are clear:

> . . . all that most endears
> Glory, is when the myrtle wreathes a sword
> Such as Harmodius drew on Athens' tyrant lord.

These lines are excellent in leading to an understanding of Byron's attitude. The praise here for necessary combat against tyranny is echoed later in stanza LXIV in which he glorifies the victories at Morat and Marathon:

> They were true glory's stainless victories
> Won by the unambitious heart and hand . . .
> All unbought champions in no princely cause
> Of vice-entailed corruption.

War of tyrant against tyrant or war which only serves to further implement tyranny is detested by Byron. In stanza XIX he asks the

disturbing question:

> Gaul may champ the bit
> And foam in fetters;--but is Earth more free?
> Did nations combat to make one submit;
> Or league to teach all kings true sovereignty?

This quoted question refers to Waterloo, to Byron the epitome of futile warfare--a battle of power against power for power, a "king-making victory."

However deep his conviction that such warfare is a regrettable adjunct to civilization, he directs no guilty-by-association toward the soldiers forced to fight on either side. Realizing that such service is unavoidable, he pities the soldiers forced to defend an ignoble cause and admires their valor and vigor, however misguided it might be.

Byron's ability to express compassion has never been so universally recognized as has been his incomparable artistry in the fields of criticism and satire. Yet, from stanzas XXVII to XXXVI of Canto I his treatment of those sacrificed at Waterloo demonstrates an ability to comprehend the pitiable aftermath of war, even though his sentiments appear somewhat formal and contrived in satisfying the requirements of Spenserian verse. Those who would consider the Byronic discussion of war's victims superficial or verbose must realize that the literary style, and particularly that of poetry, was radically different in the early nineteenth century. Although the modern reader can clearly sympathize with and pity such a character as Harry Morgan in Hemingway's To Have and Have Not, it is doubtful whether the reader of Byron in 1818 would react similarly to

the prose of "Papa." Accordingly, we can only say that a true sympathy on the part of Byron for the sacrificed youth would seem to follow from his concept of the futility of the battle.

Although Canto IV deals largely with the relation of Italy to its ancient history, Byronic war attitudes are apparent in several sections, such as stanza XCVI:

> Can tyrants but by tyrants conquered be,
> And freedom find no champion and no child
> Such as Columbia saw arise when she
> Sprung forth a Pallas, armed and undefiled?

Connected to the discussion of the sacrifice of youth in Canto III is Byron's use of Nature. He also employs fire-and-clay imagery, but to a much lesser degree than in Manfred.

The allusions to Nature in Canto III in connection with the war dead emphasize the permanancy of Nature in contrast to the expendability of man. Byron mentions that " . . . the red rain hath made the harvest grow." His unwritten answer to the question that follows--"And is this all the world has gained by . . . King-making Victory?"--is,undoubtedly, affirmative.

In a particularly notable and effective passage he speaks of the grass's growing one day beneath the fallen men and the next day above. In the death created by war man loses his identity as man and becomes, rather, Nature itself. Man's "clay," a term of which Byron is particularly fond, combines with Nature to perpetuate Nature. Therefore, why are men and Nature separate entities?

When man is solely clay, as has been stated, he is Nature. To Byron, it has resulted from the loss of "fire." He refers to the "fiery mass of valor," and the meaning is much more particular than might appear to the casual reader. The importance of man's "fire" in both this poem and Manfred is obvious. When the clay which encloses it alone exists, "man" is no more. What right, feels Byron, has tyranny to deprive man of his "fire" in furthering its desires--and empires?

Byron assumes the right to decide which wars have been justified. But, isn't art usually distinguished by its interpretation of facts? We can only imagine how much less effective would have been Childe Harold's Pilgrimage had it been simply a narrative of historical events.

Although Byron's interpretations of these battles are often overly emotional from the standpoint of modern literature's apparent fear of appearing melodramatic or ridiculous, his underlying ideas are thoughtful and acceptable to any believer in man's struggle for "freedom."

(The only reference used in preparing this paper was the text, Bernbaum's Anthology.)

- - -

December 20, 1956
Dr. Fogle

A Comparison of Shelley's Alastor and

Byron's Manfred

One striking similarity between Alastor and Manfred forms the basis for a comparison of the two. A quick survey of both immediately brings into

focus different treatments of a basic theme. Without taking into consideration apparent aberrations from the theme at the hands of the two poets, it may be generally concluded that the idea of a human who has realized the superhuman was the inspiration for both Shelley and Byron. The contrasts lie in the development of the theme, certain characteristic additions, varying philosophical approaches, and, most obviously, length and form. Unlike, too, are the characters of the poet and Manfred.

The element of Byronic drama and color exists in the lyrical drama form which Byron has used to tell the story. There is the probable influence of the Gothic novels in Manfred, the setting a curiously morbid Poe-like castle in central Europe. Manfred himself is a sort of literary revival of the Doctor Faustus who first trod the boards of theatrical literature in the sixteenth century. The dark and sinister story of Marlowe and Goethe is echoed at least in essence,if not so much in actual form. While Byron has created a vehicle which would probably defy coherent theatrical presentation, he has nevertheless retained the romantic and necromantic aspects of the Faustian legend. Manfred's powers have been gained primarily from a knowledge of black art leading to and being derived from an impressive gallery of negatively motivated spirits.

It is here that a great contradiction becomes apparent, and it is a contradiction involving the bases of the poem: the superhuman element. As has been stated, Manfred's superhuman contacts have endowed him with necromatic powers which, in themselves, imply a connection with the nether world. On the other hand, the superhuman in Alastor has been achieved primarily through the beauty of natural forms, an essentially Wordsworthian

concept, and it would not be particularly original to note the esteem in which Byron held Wordsworth: "'Tis poetry--at least by his assertion"--Don Juan. As a result, the element (in Alastor) of actual evil is in no manner connected with the poet's "too exquisite . . . perception." Manfred's necromantic superhumanism and the poet's "ideal beauty" essentially differ. It is notable, however, that both are alike in that they fail to suffice in human "life": "The tree of knowledge is not that of life." (Manfred) This is reflected in Alastor in the poet's basic inability to associate with the "chariot-followers."

Both Manfred and the poet seek death, although their reasons for wanting it are dissimilar. In connection with the intimations of incest, the "half-maddening sin" discernible upon consideration of possible autobiographical elements, Manfred seeks forgetfulness through oblivion. Forgetfulness seems a rather empty and indefinite goal for a dying man to seek, and death may very well impose an unpleasant justice upon Manfred. To the poet of Alastor, however, death is the key to an eternal life in which he will find the "ideal beauty," incompatible with life, and the embodiment of his episyche. As a result of this, the death motif in Alastor is an essentially positive one and lends to the poet the hope which Manfred lacks.

The problem of the episyche appears in both poems. The term "episyche" is appropriate if it is to be used in reference to Astarte in Manfred, for "she was like me (Manfred) in lineaments . . . . " Biographically, this element is of greater importance because it helps to explain the abhorrent sin in terms of Byron's incestuous relationship with his half-sister (a reasonable approximation of an episyche). Opposed to this is the episyche of the poet in Alastor. Connected to the poet's fantasy of his episyche

is the "ideal beauty" which he has sought and the "human love" which he has neglected. He has never encountered her in a human or physical setting necessary for definite violation or regrettable sin.

This treatment of the episyche is an excellent example of another major point of difference between the two poems: the extent of the "human" element. While Alastor is clearly allegorical and abstract so far as definite setting, time, and concrete characters (with the possible exception of the poet and the Arab maiden) are concerned, Manfred is potentially a piece of theatrical art which, although it may be as allegorical as the late Medieval Everyman, still demands some recognizable plot and character development. As a result of this, the poet's character is never deeply analyzed by Shelley, and we only know him as a sort of universal representation of the idealistic seeker. Manfred, on the other hand, is an ungovernable human, a forceful, decided, and definitely dynamic personality. It is, however, the poet in Alastor who, although less vividly drawn, is more likely to find favor with the reader than is the defiant Manfred. This may be due, in part, to Shelley's empathic treatment of him.

The negative superhuman aspects of Manfred, particularly the dealings with the spirits, may be in part explained by Byron's concept of the purpose of the Almighty as being mysterious and perhaps sinister because of the obviously miserable condition of mankind. Shelley considers the superhuman the true eternity, the source of the "ideal beauty" lacking in the human.

(References for this paper were Bernbaum's Anthology and his companion buide volume.)

- - -

Similarity of Tone in Shelley's Hymn to Intellectual Beauty and Keats' Ode on a Grecian Urn

Both Shelley and Keats felt that the ultimate truth visited the world with "inconstant glance." This was not, however, the truth of the everyday world. It was not the truth of appearance, for that might often be misleading, and what humans thought to be the apparent truth might actually be false. Although neither was a believer in organized Christianity per se, both presented in their poetry a concept of an "ideal realm" which does not necessarily imply a relation to the Christian "Heaven." While Heaven might manifest itself to the Christian in the form of an occasional miracle, the ideal residence of all truth manifested itself to Shelley and Keats in terms of beauty. This applies to Keats more than it does to Shelley; but to both, as with the Christian and his miracles, beauty is only a manifestation, an image of the eternally true.

To Keats especially, something is true only if its beauty develops from a disclosure of, or is related to, its essential nature. But the concepts of both Shelley and Keats are to some degree related to the ideas of Plate, for it was he who felt that an object's beauty was a reflection of its inner spirit. Beauty is to these poets the manifestation of that eternal spirit which hovers over man's world in a cloud of the ultimate truth. It is not so much the spirit of the individual object or phenomenon as it is a spirit pervasive in nature--and Nature, also.

In Hymn to Intellectual Beauty, the spirit of BEAUTY visits the world only on rare occasions. When it does appear, it is a force, as Shley adresses it:

> . . . that dost consecrate
> With thine own hues all thou dost shine upon
> Of human thought or form . . . .

It is like a sun that pervades the world of man, sometimes breaking through a cloud to directly "consecrate" an object and lend to it the quality of beauty. The object then becomes a sort of mirror, reflecting the beautiful light of ideal truth that shines upon it. But to emphasize the inconstancy of its "wing," Shelley likens it to the "summer winds that creep from flower to flower."

Shelley clearly links this beauty to truth by saying:

> Thy light alone . . .
> Gives grace and truth to life's unquiet dream.

In order to compensate for this lack of truth, ultimate truth in terms of the eternal, man has had to rely upon his inventiveness, and from such human inventions have come the terms "Demon, Ghost, and Heaven." But Shelley is never so explicit in openly listing the manifestations of this spirit, mentioning, for example that the "light . . . gives . . . truth" like "moonlight on a midnight stream." This could be one of the spirit's images.

Keats, however, is less ambiguous on this point. While Shelley's moonlight image is certainly a beauteous one, it is neither conclusive nor is it permanent, although it is in keeping with his "inconstant wing" motif.

In Ode on a Grecian Urn Keats has found a manifestation of this beauty-truth that defies the mortality of either Nature or man. Its timelessness is emphasized by the phrases "for ever piping songs," "for ever wilt thou love," "for ever warm," "for ever panting and for ever young." Not only is it a permanent reflection of BEAUTY. It is also a direct and visible proof that this spirit may be manifested in objects which man may come to know, understand, and appreciate.

In his description of this visual image of BEAUTY, Keats included a phrase which, whether or not he intended it to, has become his most famous:

> Beauty is truth, truth beauty.

Actually, it would seem that it could be explained by a simple logical system.

If all things evil were to be painted black, then black would immediately equal evil. Similarly, if all things true are to be represented by beauty, beauty will equal truth.

And "that is all ye know on earth, and all ye need to know."

- - -

February 25, 1957
Tulane University
Dr. Adams

A Literary Convention As Used in Hemingway's

A Farewell to Arms

In A Farewell to Arms Ernest Hemingway has created two characters whose prototypes have existed through literary tradition. This is the

"star-crossed lovers" convention of which Shakespeare's Romeo and Juliet is the historic example. A clear analogy between Shakespeare's representative early tragedy and this memorable Hemingway novel cannot be made, however. One must first realize the twentieth century modifications of the theme.

The love affair of Frederic Henry and Catherine Barkley is played against the broad background of the First World War and the Italian Campaign in particular. This is notable for several reasons. One is that Italy has always been, in literature and in life, a refuge for the Anglo-Saxon hounded by convention. Both Catherine Barkley and Frederic Henry are Anglo-Saxon, the former by birth, the latter by ancestry. This notion of the sense of fulfillment of the Italianate Englishman, emphasized particularly by the Romantics, is modified by Hemingway, whose lovers are led from Italy to Switzerland. In attempting to construct a Hemingway-Shakespeare analogy, it may be noted that both stories occur in Italy and that both pairs of lovers are essentially Anglo-Saxon, for it must be remembered that Shakespeare's characters are not intended to realistically correspond to their geographical situations. Romeo and Juliet are upper-class Elizabethans. Carrying the analogy further, both love stories are woven into a tapestry of conflict, one a traditional feud, the other a war of international consequence.

The theme of growing maturity on the part of the protagonist becomes a sort of dual theme in A Farewell to Arms if we are to consider the lovers separately as protagonists. Certainly Henry is not the sole protagonist as the book progresses. He and Miss Barkley progressively function

as a unit, or as "separate but equal" entities, depending upon one's interpretation. It seems that the fates of both can be described adequately by a passage that occurs in the book itself:

> The world breaks every one and afterward many are strong at the broken places. But those that will not break it kills.

Although the theme of war per se is definitely of importance in A Farewell to Arms, its function appears to be that of creating the tragic balance. Tragedy must balance on one hand the evil of the world which is capable of destroying man and on the other hand the protagonist or protagonists and their innate nobility. Certainly this is apparent in the structure of this novel. Not only must Henry and Miss Barkley face life. They must face it at a time of major war. This particular type of nobility, it if may qualify as being noble, is an intense and sincere love. Hemingway's achievement lies in the turning of lust, which is the impetus for the Barkley-Henry union, into a broader concept of love and affection.

These elements are present in Romeo and Juliet--the growing maturity of both Romeo and Juliet, the outer world of conflict and evil, and the intense love (although Shakespeare's interpretation is opposed to Hemingway's in its elaborate romanticism). The diversity of conclusion between the two works is not so great as might appear at first glance. In a literal sense both of Shakespeare's lovers die while only one of Hemingway's does. But, figuratively, part of Frederic Henry dies with the death of his and Catherine Barkley's issue. A biological mind might also pursue this on a literal plane. In both cases, however, there is present the ill-fated lovers convention of the world's literature.

April 17, 1957
Dr. Adams

The Development of the Babbitt-American

George F. Babbitt was not a literary character who somehow miraculously developed in the mind of Sinclair Lewis. He was not a figure of mere creative and artistic imagination on the part of Mr. Lewis. George F. Babbitt, rather, represents America at the end of World War I. Babbitt is not the America of the intellectuals. Neither is he the America of the liberals. Babbitt is the symbol of the results of social Darwinism, the New Industrial Revolution, pragmatism, and the early twentieth-century Republican Party upon the bourgeois American mentality. Babbitt is America in 1922.

Many social, philosophical, economic, and political innovations had determined the character of the Babbitt-American. Darwin's scientific theories of evolution were adapted by the late nineteenth-century mind into the form of social theories of evolution. "Survival of the fittest" acquired a materialistic and capitalistic connotation. The "struggle for existence" implied a struggle to supersede one's fellow human financially. Eagerly, and perhaps a bit too rashly, these terms were accepted as the "Stations of the Cross" for capitalists making the devout pilgrimate to wealth. Coupled with the New Industrial Revolution after the Civil War, this Social Darwinism spawned the Gilded Age of cut-throat competition, trusts, acquisitiveness, and a general denial of whatever slight spiritual and cultural values America had previously possessed.

By the middle of the 1890's the United States had become so oppressive to the sensitive and artistic mentality that Europe assumed the role

of a sort of spa for the tender American, as lucidly illustrated not only in the person of Henry James, but also in his writings. James' brother, Williams, however, proved worthy to the task of incorporating this turn-of-the-century America into a philosophical system: pragmatism, a philosophy emphasizing the results of things, the utilitarian aspect of actions. Needless to say, America had found a national philosophy. It looked toward ends rather than means, and that was all that the larger capitalists and their guardian, the pre-Great Depression Republican Party, could ask of a nation's philosophers.

This was George F. Babbitt's heritage. Therefore, George F. Babbitt was a product of his environment, of those elements of his environment which were becoming reactionary even in 1922. The spiritual and cultural vacuum in which George F. Babbitt lived was not of his own creating. Neither was it a figurative literary device of Sinclair Lewis'. Social satire, to be effective, must be based upon realistic aspects of the society being satirized. This Lewis did clinically, astutely, and perhaps a bit mercilessly. Only in Babbitt's affection for his friend Paul Reisling do we see some sort of redemption, some sort of assurance that this post-World War I America was not past salvation from its deadening materialism and standardization.

The 1920's were the culmination of the symbol of the Babbitt-American. Later in the decade the "war wound" would expand into the general disillusionment descriptive of that era. But the final defeat of the Babbitt-American came in October, 1929.

Perhaps an outstanding contemporary novel is needed to satirize the new generation which contains Babbitt-American influences, which would clothe the "booster" of Zenith in a gray flannel suit.

- - -

Puritanism

Man tends to behave in cycles. The great sociological phenomenon of action and reaction is really quite unassailable. The Roman excesses dissolved into the humility and denial of early Christianity. Soon Christianity itself became a top-heavy and gouty machine like that which it had been trying originally to counteract. As an antidote the humanism and learning of the Renaissance developed. Puritanism was a reaction against this final movement, and, in the English-speaking world, has had perhaps a greater psychological effect than any previous movement.

Puritanism appealed to the bourgeois classes which developed after the Middle Ages because, for one thing, it allied financial success with spiritual success. The maxim that "God helps those who help themselves" was to Puritanism what the Cult of the Virgin was to the Medieval Church. And any religion which can relate the devine to the monetary is destined for acceptance, particularly in an age when, for the first time, commerce and individual enterprise were really beginning to have some definitive meaning.

The British Puritans were unquestionably bourbeois. Those who remained in England became the wealthy merchants who were later knighted and returned to the Anglican fold when they were unquestionable respectable. Their brothers who came to the United States developed the caricatures of Yankee thrift and shrewdness.

But this is only one facet of Puritanism. It is one of the most important because it was the greatest aid in spreading the ideology of the faith. The other facets of Puritanism require psychological rather than

historical or sociological study. Ostensibly, they, too are financial in their bases. Church attendance rather than theatre-going or entertaining is certainly financially wise, for instance. But the importance and hor= ror os sin assumed unnaturally large proportions in Puritanism. The old Catholic concept of Original Sin was and is an integral part of the Roman religion. But the quick and formal Catholic infant baptism removes this trauma from the mind. To the Puritan, however, this was an almost permanent trauma. If it were not Original Sin the Puritan was worrying about, it was some personally conceived sin. But the concept of sin constantly plagued the Puritan, culminating in a chronic frustration which relieved itself in the hysteria of events like the Salem witch trials in America, or, in England, the wild intensity of anti-Popery as outlined in Dickens' Barnaby Rudge.

When Norman Vincent Peale says prosperity is directly proportional to spirituality or some state passes a new dry law or a revival meeting in Mississippi degenerates into hysterical rioting, the truth about the current existence of Puritanism in America emerges. But these are just examples of the sort of refinement of Puritanism which is, in some cases, even more severe than the Puritanism of the seventeenth century. Those early American Puritans had emerged ultimately from the color of Elizabethan England. Many of their customs were really more Elizabethan than Puritan. Only in the isolation of New England did Puritanism really crystallize. Later forces had even more strength in implementing this ideology.

One of these forces was romanticism. It lent a sort of aesthetic gloss to Puritanism, a polish which allowed Puritanism to enter the drawing

room in the form of another force, Victorianism. Hawthorne entered the American scene at a period when these three forces, Puritanism, Romanticism, and Victorianism, were beginning to form their strange but effective alliance.

Each of these forces was, in itself, a movement away from reality. Each, also, developed its own set of unreal conventions. From an artistic standpoint, romanticism was the most worthwhile. It added a new dimension to literature and emphasized an imaginative quality which had been missing from the neo-classicism of eighteenth century models. But from a social standpoint, the value of each of these forces is questionable. Each was socially stifling because each denied, in some degree, man's more natural self. When the three of these join, moreover, the result is a rather false social state.

Whatever else he may be, the writer is a mirror of the temper of his time. If he does not capture his age in directly writing of it, he captures the mood of the period. No ambitious American writer today would attempt to create a serious novel in which the cast of characters included vague, beautiful, and consumptive nineteenth century prototypes of women with heart-shaped faces any more than the nineteenth century writer would write of sex with the realism of Hemingway or the almost pornographic glee of Algren.

Writers like Hemingway and Algren reflect an American scene which is trying to revolt against the bourgeois Puritanism in which it was reared. Even today, many Americans feel that incest and rape and perversion can exist "only in books." Many Americans are still living in their self-constructed shell of social vestiges from the nineteenth century, putting

down writers who come too close to reality and grabbing the latest issue of Good Housekeeping.

Hawthorne, however, was living in a period when conscious revolt against Puritanism had not begun. Rather, Romanticism and Victorianism were helping to make Puritanism more socially acceptable than it had ever been before. As a writer of such a period, Hawthorne wrote what he thought would be acceptable and, ultimately, successful. His "Custom House" prologue to The Scarlet Letter shows that Hawthorne was always cognizant of the sales of his works, and his output reflects this even more.

Particularly representative of his time is Hawthorne's sexual attitude. However basically moral it may be, The Scarlet Letter has a basis that is potentially "sexy." It is closely related to such Biblical stories as David and Bathsheba, which teach a moral, but succeed in stimulating the audience at the same time. Where the Biblical story and The Scarlet Letter differ, however, is in the characters of the lovers. Hester Prynne and Dimmesdale are two of the most sexless literary characters ever created. At times the reader wonders how they ever got through the mechanics of conceiving Pearl. Here Hawthorne has taken the loaded subject of promiscuity and adultery and made it into a symbolically effectuve but sexually neuter novel. Very few writers could probably handle the basic story so inoffensively.

This sexlessness is one of Hawthorne's predominant characteristics. The sexless facet of Puritanism is one that American Puritanism refined and which Romanticism strengthened. The Romantic concept of "ideal love" and a sort of worship-from-afar rather than sex per se tied in perfectly

with the development of the American Puritan bias against sex. This was the climate in which Hawthorne developed his art and the climate which he represented. In "The Artist of the Beautiful" Owen Warland's affection for Annie is completely lacking in any suggestion of the carnal. Warland is, in many respects, a prototype of the artist, but Hawthorne seems to go so far as to make him appear almost effeminate, particularly in the suggestion of his "diminutive frame" and, again, in the "marvellous smallness and delicate powers of his fingers."

In "Rappaccini's Daughter" the suggestion of Eden and Adam and Eve is particularly strong, and with it the suggestion of sin as linked with sensuality. One senses the sensual in Beatrice and the lushness of the garden. But here we see that both are poisonous, and Baglioni, the "father figure," saves Giovanni from Beatrice. This leads to another important element in Hawthorne which seems related to Puritanism. The "father figure" is crucially important in Hawthorne, but exactly what does it represent? Might it not be the Puritanical conscience which was part of Hawthorne's heredity <u>and</u> environment? It seems to function as such in the stories in which it appears. This is particularly suggestive in "Rappaccini's Daughter."

What Hawthorne couldn't overtly present in his stories because of the social pressure which he seemed to feel more than his readers possibly ever would, he seems to have found a chance for expressing through a system of some of the most marvellous symbolism ever conceived. The symbolic quality of a story like "The Maypole of Merry Mount" is particularly high. Here Hawthorne seems to be criticizing the Puritanical atmosphere which he himself was forced to breathe. The meaning implicit in the symbol of the maypole is clear to anyone with a knowledge of ancient fertility rites, and

Hawthorne juxtaposes this tellingly with the denial of Puritanism.

Again, in "Young Goodman Brown" Hawthorne is forced to revert to symbolism to say what social and literary convention prevented. No symbol has more meaning than the symbol of the hollowed rock filled with red liquid:

> Herein did the shape of evil dip his hand and prepare to lay the mark of baptism upon their foreheads, that they might be partakers of the mystery of sin, more conscious of the secret guilt of others, both in deed and thought, than they could now be of their own. The husband cast one look at his pale wife, and Faith at him.

In the context of Faith and Goodman Brown this passage becomes important. Having been relatively recently married, they "had still hoped that virtue were not all a dream. The symbol of the rock suggests strongly the consummation of the marriage vividly and boldly in the most candid physical sense. No nineteenth century writer could be more eloquently sexual than Hawthorne has been in this symbol: no one could suspect that the physical reality of initial intercourse would be presented in such bare (yet symbolic) terms.

Beneath this Puritan-Romantic surface which Hawthorne cultivated there lay an intensity which, and this is the only really applicable term, Hawthorne "sublimated" in an intricate system of symbols destined to escape the average reader. Because the Puritan-Romantic (and ultimately Victorian) social system was not (and is not) in touch with reality, Hawthorne had to escape <u>to</u> a reality which he could only present symbolically. The

reality of Puritanism and the social system which he felt emerged symbolically as the "father figure" of his stories. The literary and social conventions which forced him to create sexless characters ultimately forced him to seek to create the reality of sex symbolically.

It can be said that Poe retreated into the Gothic, into that curious literary tradition of darkness, horror, and, often, degeneracy. The unreal of the Gothic tradition went surprisingly well with the unreal of the Puritan-Romantic tradition. But Hawthorne's retreat was not so marked and overtly dramatic. It was more refined, more subtle. Certainly it was a retreat through the imagination as was Poe's, but through the imagination and imaginative symbolism Hawthorne achieved that touch with reality while Poe's stories tend to remain on the level of the supernatural.

It is strange that reality is achieved through imagination. When, however, it is impossible for the artist to be overtly realistic, he must find some other basis for relating his work to life. To Hawthorne the only outlet was imaginative symbols which presented the sensual and the secret of life in a manner which would not be generally offensive. The Puritan-Romantic tradition forms the surface of Hawthorne's work.

- - -

Note:

The mental climate of the period in which Hawthorne wrote still exists in its same force in many sections of the United States. The conscious revolt against this climate so evident in modern American literature is not nearly so evident in Hawthorne's time--principally because the

reaction against Puritanism-Romanticism-Victorianism had not yet begun. Vestiges of these movements linger strongly in the United States in society, if not in literature.

Therefore, Hawthorne's period is not really too remote from out own; yet Hawthorne research is often conducted as if he had lived in Medieval times. This has, in turn, tended to create an archaic atmosphere in Hawthorne scholarship culminating in a number of forced and unconvincing publications, many attempting to link Hawthorne to certain European traditions when such a link does not really exist in the majority of cases.

Certainly, Hawthorne reflects the influence of the romantic movement. Basically, however, he reflects the atmosphere of nineteenth century America. Superficially, this atmosphere has changed. But it appears to be fundamentally similar. National characteristics do not change radically in the course of one hundred years.

Taking this into consideration, I have attempted some original work in the field of Hawthorne. It is an attempt to find Hawthorne's representation of the reality he might not have found apparent in his society, a reality from which Americans might be hiding even today.

John Kennedy Toole
Tulane University
Examinations

- - -

Mr. A. Foote
May 18, 1955

The theme of these two poems ("The Tiger" by William Blake and "The Force That Through the Green Fuse Drives the Flower" by Dylan Thomas) can be logically compared and, strangely enough, can be contrasted, too.

In both of these poems , the idea of some omnipotent force of creation seems to loom as the central theme. But, there is a variation of the same theme in both. The two poets have interpreted the fuling power, whatever it is, in different manners.

In comparing these two, the first thing noticed is the poet's almost complete submission to the "force," although neither admits the existence of God, as we know him. Blake, in referring to this power, personifies it to an extent, but he doesn't employ the standard form by not capitalizing the word "he." Therefore, I only take that to mean that he doesn't want to give his poem the "religious" tone that pervaded many English works of his time.

Thomas, being of a more modern era that enjoys almost complete intellectual freedom in some areas, lets his "power" be known only as the "force."

Both poets respect the guiding power in the universe, but Blake seems

not so submissive as Thomas. He asks the tiger is the one who made him were the same one who made the lamb, and, so, demonstrates a mildly questioning attitude.

Thomas, on the other hand, realizes that the mystery of creation is too involved and obscure a one for him to try to fathom, so he readily admits that he is unable to give any explanation to the "force" about him. Thomas seems to echo the pessimism of a modern age that believes existentialistically that the only sure and explainable element in life is death.

Both poets admit their perplexity over the "force" that has created the universe, but neither tries to explain it in terms of God and theology.

It is amazing that two such accepted poets should undertake the task of trying to explain creation. And it is interesting to see the results. It is reflected in Blake that he has not lost complete faith--mainly by the slight degree to which he personifies the "force." In his era, the world had been subjected to only one of what Freud calls the "three wounds." That was the cosmological wound in which the Christian world learned that the earth was not the center of the universe.

But Thomas writes in an era when all three "wounds" have been inflicted upon society. One was the biological, through Darwin's theory of evolution. The third and final wound has been the psychological wound inflicted by Freud himself. He has shown that man is not only a subordinate in the universe and on earth, but that he is a subordinate to himself.

We may compare the attitudes of submission and unknowing shared by the themes of these two poems.

But in contrasting them, we note the reflection of the intellectual

conditions of the times in which they were written.

While Blake emphasizes the positive power of creation to make such seemingly unrelated creatures as the tiger and the lamb, Thomas emphasizes what might be called the negative power of creation, or the power to destroy. He reflects an attitude that feels that positive creation only leads, sooner or later, to negative creation, or destruction.

- - -

February 22, 1956
Dr. Raines
History 208

1. There were many factors favoring the creation of federal types of government in Latin America in the early 19th century.

In the first place, the wars for independence had been largely federal--that is, they were not closely organized wars but were rather widespread encounters depending upon much personal initiative.

Geographically, the new nations were not at all centralized. Settlements were usually small and fairly well isolated. The great influx toward the cities had not begun in a very great degree.

Because of the lack of roads and quick transportation it was far from practical to attempt to rule solely from the capitals.

Because some countries, especially Brazil, were almost feudal in their physical-sociological setup, great landholders in the backlands had

acquired amazing power over their particular regions.

Then, too, the constitutions (early) of Latin America were much more ideal than the constitution of the United States. And, to a newly independent people, federalism seemed the ideal form of government.

The mestizas, the silent majority, had little or no voice in the framing of these constitutions, so it was largely the work of the whites. And these whites, usually rich and powerful, were fearful of forming any government which might deprive them of their accustomed privileges.

For these reasons, the early constitutions of Latin America were federal in essence.

2. The policy of the United States, France and Spain was in part determined by time.

The United States began recognition in Latin America by recognizing Gran Colombia. Naturally, the other countries followed as soon as they had won their independence.

Of course, in all cases, the details of tradings were great factors in determining recognition. Latin America wanted recognition, so it usually was willing to give a fairly good deal so far as trading was concerned.

France was eager to recognize Latin America. Not only was it pleasant to realize the economic benefits of trade, but France had been eyeing Argentine, for example, with the idea of perhaps annexing it.

Spain was not, of course, too eager to extend recognition, but upon the death of Ferdinand, the countries were gradually recognized. The United States was glad to see a European power leave America, so its recognition

was quite prompt.

But, generally, as time passed and the countries had realized their independence and could offer suitable trade agreements, they were recognized by all.

3. President Diaz attempted to solve Mexico's basic problems by what may be called compromise. One great problem of his time was the controversy over the clergy. Diaz, a 33 degree Mason and nominal Catholic, swayed between both factions. To the delight of the intellectuals and anti-clericals, he enforced the reform laws sporadically, but, on the other hand, had his wife work as a peacemaker with the Church and often formed new congregations (orders) when others were disbanded.

It is not the part of the dictator to have much contact with foreign governments, but Diaz relied heavily upon foreign capital to improve the lagging economy of his own country.

The sale of Church lands by liberals was done with the intention of helping the landless masses. But, as it turned out, the lands were bought by already wealthy land-holders.

Diaz was closely allied with these landholders because they seemed at least to represent security and stability. But the voices of the Indians and mestizas, the great majority in Mexico, were not heard.

It has been said that the reign of Diaz was fairly iron-fisted. At any rate, there are no memorials to him in Mexico except in his home town of Oaxaca.

5. a. caudielo--the "boss," a name that has stood, in many cases,

for oppression and tyranny. A caudielo is a political "chief" in the governmental setup of Latin America.

b. Benito Juarez--the man of Indian ancestry who rose to become president of Mexico in the later 19th century. A fairly just, kind man, his leanings were more or less liberal.

c. Facundo Quiroga--the perfect example of an ignorant, crude, cruel caudielo. Under Rosas of Argentine, he will always be remembered for his irrationality and barbarism.

d. centralism--the form of government which places the bulk of power in the hands of the central government. In Latin America centralism has usually been easy prey for dictators.

f. Santa Anna--professional soldier and deceiver. The alleged "protector of Mexico," he sold his country short many times while winning over the populace by his theatrical manner and ability to "soft-soap."

- - -

March 9, 1956
Dr. Karnes
History 208

A. 1. Juan Vincente Gomez--the Venezuelan dictator who, although harsh, was an economic aid to his country with such realistic laws as the Petroleum one of 1920. He did not have the pomp of his predecessors.

2. War of the Pacific--the skirmish along the Pacific coast between Peru and Chile in which Chile got the greater part of the land over

which they were fighting.

3. Garcia Moreno--the "Christian Hercules" who reduced the position of Ecuador to a theocracy. Violently Catholic, he allowed religion to creep into almost all governmental activities.

4. Aprista-- a member of the APRA in Peru which appeared to be a somewhat "leftist" group. Haya de la Tove, of "asylum" fame, was connected with them.

6. Diplomatic asylum--the provision under which a political refugee may fine safety (temporary, more or less) in the embassy of a foreign country. His pursuers must respect his safety.

B. 1. At the current time, the economic and social prospects of Bolivia are far from being bright.

Economically, Bolivia is greatly dependent upon tin. But the price has dropped in recent years to a point where it is claimed that the cost of production is greater than the price the consumers are paying. Furthermore, when the government placed "commissars" at the mines, many of the skilled technicians left, mad at the absolute governmental domination.

As a result of this economic factor, social conditions will and are being affected. The Bolivians of rural areas are still years behind the times, even to the point of dealing with men who are no more than "witch doctors" for medical needs. Also, it seems that the unpleasant climate affects fecundity.

In general, it seems true that Bolivia may be called "sick," a land with insecure prospects.

3. The relationship between Latin American dictatorship and foreigners may depend upon both the type of dictatorship and the type of foreigner. In general, dictatorship has proved economically beneficial for

foreigners. Dictatorships produce stability, and that is what foreign investors are searching for. But at home before the people who fall under its authority, dictatorship usually preaches loudly its distrust and even hatred of foreigners, and "capitalists" in particular. In spite of this, foreigners (investors) seem to find it easier to deal with one man than to deal with a nation. Because the relationship is largely economic, it seems to be a fairly cordial one. Foreigners want dictatorship.

In relation to the Indians, dictatorship is rarely of any economic benefit. But the role of the dictator is only that of a glorified caudillo, and, is therefore familiar to the Indians. The Indians comprise the large voiceless mass which is helpful to the clever dictator if he ever wishes to use it.

But, generally, the relationship between the dictator and the Indians is slight. They are usually removed from the centers of political activity and free thought.

4. The political significance of land concentration is that it also concentrates power in the hands of a few.

These few, these reigning families, quite often steer the destiny of the nation. Therefore, the dictators usually speak of dividing the land, but almost never do it. This also causes the average dictator to neglect the remote stretches of his country.

Often the mestijas and other rural people are represented by their bosses, and not by people of their own class. Therefore, although countries have passed legislation outlawing many of the abuses of latifundia, they are rarely enforced. Because these wealthy land owners possess much of the wealth,

it is advantageous for men planning coups to side with them for help in the form of planes, etc.

This land concentration has also been the basis for the Conservative parties in most countries. Fatifundia and Conservatism are almost synonymous.

- - -

March 28, 1956
Dr. Karnes
History 208

1. The major reasons for the lack of large scale immigration to Latin America were:

1) People knew very little about Latin America
2) The United States seemed far more inviting
3) Latin America wanted English-speaking people if possible
4) Political conditions in Latin America were often insecure
5) The United States was closer to Europe
6) Although the Latin Americans offered inducements, those of the United States seemed better
7) Often farmers only were wanted.

2. The role of the elite in Haiti has been a role similar to that of the Conservatives in white Latin countries.

Imitating French models of speech, dress, and behavior, this group, traditional in essence, has dominated the voodoo-worshipping majority that dominates the island. It has favored all the aspects of government and society usually attributed to traditionals and conservatives.

3. In solving the Indian problem the significance of Manuel Prada's opinion that every white is a Pizarro is that every white is a destroyer of the Indian.

The comparison with Pizarro implies that the white has taken over the Indians' rights and position and has reduced him to the class of what could almost be called a slave.

This was particularly true in the Peru of Prada'a day in which the Indian lived in subjugation and humiliation for the most part.

It implies that the Indian has a right to live free from the hand of the white.

4. The especial value of Irish immigrants to 19th century Argentina is that they formed a highly important middle class group that was useful in industry and urban life. Then, too, the concentration of Latins in Argentina was high, and these Anglo-Saxon (physically) people offered some mixture.

. . . . . .

6. Costa Rica differs from the rest of Central America in that it is a relatively peaceful land. Government has become a fairly democratic procedure--at least more democratic than the government of its neighbors.

The people of Costa Rica have a greater predominance of white, European blood than do the people of the remainder of Latin America, also.

Then, too, Costa Rica has been a relatively efficient, progressive land.

7. The contributions to Paraguay of the two dictators Lopez were not generally beneficial.

They left the nation in a state of almost complete exhaustion. A depleted treasury and heavy losses of life were two of their contributions.

Their "hierarchy" included boys' being appointed to responsible positions. The end of their regime was welcome.

. . . . . .

9. Basically, Latin America's Indian problem means an economic problem.

Because the Indian does not produce much, he does not buy much. Therefore, he occupies the peculiar position of being almost non-existent, so far as economics goes.

Naturally, any large number of people who live in a country but take almost no part in its commercial life constitutes a major problem.

- - -

History 208
Tulane University
Dr. Karnes
April 25, 1956

I. B. The factors tending to keep Central America from uniting are as follows.

Since the break-up into the separate states of today there have been several factors keeping the states from re-uniting.

One has been the desire for a perfect government, one for which the people are not ready--one which they probably could not support.

Another has been the trend toward increasing nationalism in each of the republics. Nationalist feelings are gaining in importance. The, historic-

ally, unity does not seem likely. From the historical record it is obvious that unity is neither easy nor likely.

It has also been said that foreign interests have played a role in keeping the republic separate.

C. Chile's Portales era is an important one in that country's history. It was, quite obviously, a highly centralized form of, actually, dictatorship.

Portales was a man who maintained the natural supremacy of certain people over others.

This was reflected in part of his regime which soon became a strongly centralized government. Though only a nominal Catholic, Portales supported the Church and the aristocrats.

He took several steps which increased Chile's national pride and helped to raise her a bit from her lowly position.

Portales left Chile with, at least, the sense that she had become a nation, but the majority of the people were illiterate and could not and did not take any part in the government.

The Constitution, however, was a very long-lasting document.

D. The causes of the overthrow of the Brazilian Empire seemed to come from all sides.

The abolition of slavery caused the wealthy landowners to turn against Pedro. So, in pleasing the abolitionists, he had alienated the wealthy and powerful.

Then, Pedro's action against two of the clergy angered the Church and

made the Freemasons feel it was not strong enough.

There were, also, people who clamored for a republic, not thinking whether or not the people were ready for it, but only thinking in terms of "the ideal."

And, too, the army was not completely satisfied, a very important problem in Latin America.

Classes were still, usually, divided strictly between the rich and the poor, the majority of the people being poor.

E. The role of the emperor in the Brazilian Empire was that of "chief citizen," so to speak.

The Emperor had what amounted to complete control. The only people who maintained their positions were those who maintained that the Emperor's wishes were always correct.

The Emperor could, and did, dismiss assemblies, ministers, etc., whenever he wished. He was on the order of Queen Victoria of the time--but his power was absolute, as opposed to hers. He had no Disraeli.

In spite of his complete authority, Pedro governed with these ideas in mind:

> His decisions, he said, were governed by public opinion.
>
> He used the pattern of the British parliamentary system.
>
> But the Emperor could pass or veto anything, raise an army, declare war, etc.

II. A. Pan-Hispanism--the movement, somewhat anti-Yankee, which tries to link Latin America to Spain. It was strongest, perhaps, after the Spanish-American

War when popular sentiment was on the side of Spain.

B. The Pastry War occurred in Mexico in the 19th Century. A French baker had supposedly been molested. France collected a settlement from Mexico.

C. Mosquito Kingdom--the "kingdom" of the Mosquito Indians set up by the British in Honduras. By treating the Indians "nicely," the British gained in the mahogany trade.

. . . . . .

E. Bidlack-Madorino--the treaty between the U.S. and Colombia in which the U.S. guaranteed to "protect" Panama in return for the privilege of being chief contestant whenever a canal should be built there.

F. Deodora--the "troublemaker" who, in the government, was a blot on the record, but who was always around to bother and forment.

- - -

History 342B
Tulane University
Dr. Waldron
April 16, 1957

1. Toward the end of the nineteenth century "Scientific" Darwinism had developed a somewhat obscure branch optimistically, and a bit rashly, called "Social" Darwinism. Previously, we have traced its effects here in the United

States. But it left a taste in the American mouth that was a bit more lasting than was to be expected.

With this Social Darwinism in the backs of their minds, men looked around the world and noted the contemporary power and influence of the Anglo-Saxon man. It appeared, therefore, that he was the fittest, the one destined to survive. From this conception grew a whole line of racists in England and America. A popular conception became the notion of what we may call the Aryan-Teutonic-Nordic-Anglo-Saxon supremacy. At first glance, it is fairly obvious that these "supreme" "races" (really nationalities) were those which generally "subdued passion by reason."

Here in the U.S. the immigration late in the 19th century tended to support such notions and men like Herbert Baxter Adams and John Fiske found support readily. The large numbers of eastern and southern Europeans entering the U.S. caused a national reaction against the seeming menace to the Anglo-Saxon nature of the U.S. (note the Know-Nothing political party.)

From this there grew an external policy of imperialistic tendencies, particularly before and during the administrations of Theodore Roosevelt. Indeed, Teddy Roosevelt had studied under the racist Burgess at Columbia Law School. Because we were essentially a Teutonic nation, it became apparent that our policy externally must require our assuming the role of the leader.

During this period we struck at the closest bulwark of "passionate" humanity: Latin America. Our exploits in the Spanish-American War, "aid" to revolting Panama, capture of the Philippine Islands, and annexation of Hawaii are traceable to the racist mentality. Therefore, racism encouraged imperialism.

It was, naturally, a time during which we were quite close with England

and the echoes of Josiah Strong echoed familiar old British attitudes of paternalism and salvation toward natives as an excuse for capturing their lands. Strong was also anti-Catholic, which is to be expected from the relative non-Catholicism of the Teutonic peoples. For good measure, he was also anti-Mormon.

So, founded on a racist influence, American imperialism moved forward. Europe, at the time was also turning colonialism into imperialism, so we were, in a sense, in step with the times.

Any movement creates a corresponding reaction. This happened in the case of imperialism and racism. Upon entering World War I, we discovered that Germany had a similarly racist point of view. The natural reaction against Germany and things German led to a reappraisal of our own racism and tended to negate it. It hung on, however, in the 1920's in the form of such unsophisticated and bourgeois organizations as the Ku Klux Klan and the American Legion.

Now, there.

4. "Philosophy bakes no bread." William James read the line, used it, and decided upon a philosophy that, if it didn't bake bread, at least got the dough to rise a little. As we speak of the "Great American" Novel, James fostered what might be called the "Great American Philosophy."

Santayana once said that James Ø was not a "true" Ø, but in pragmatic terms it most certainly was. It was "true" for America, "true" in its emphasis upon <u>result</u> more than <u>motivating principle</u>. James was reacting against the rational and slightly esthetic philosophy being offered in American universities. He moved more toward the empirical, a reaction similar to

Turner's reaction against the "germ theory" of American history. Notable is the fact that both James and Turner reflected America's new emergence as a primary power in their "Monroe Doctrine" philosophy and history.

America, and particularly with industrialization, had become a nation which judged phenomena and trivia by their results. James' philosophy does the same. Lewis Mumford calls this the "pragmatic acquiescence," and calls pragmatism a "paralysis" and a simple result of the Gilded Age.

But what is this pragmatism? Its derivation from the Greek word for "action" gives a clue. It was a movement away from old philosophies that ight have been pleasant and edifying, but were essentially inactive and led to pleasant rationalizing without considering the result of such rationalizing. Although still looking at the means, pragmatism stressed the ends.

Dewer, a disciple of James, labeled his branch of pragmatism "instrumentalism," and became an important influence in America, particularly in the field of education, creating "Progressive" schools which trained children more usefully than pedantically. Observing the results of certain forms of education, it was decided that certain curricula were not particularly useful. Although the commercial schools, etc., had been in existence before Dewey to a slight degree, his philosophy gave them an added impetus as it did other forms of vocational training.

Obviously, the philosophy of James and Dewey is utilitarian and somewhat materialistic. But, was this not the attitude of America?

These two men have been called nihilistic and postivistic, particularly by Mortimer Adler, whose writings are Thomistic in nature and pro-religious in attitude.

Selsam, reflecting Marxist attitudes finds the philosophy reactionary and not observant of the basic class struggles in the U.S. So, we can see that criticism came from both the religionists and the Marxists.

- - -

Tulane University
April, 1958

I. 2. Before considering Moll's morality, it is necessary to consider Moll as a figure of the period. Moll appears a fine representative of a certain (and perhaps very general) type of Englishman of the type. Her mentality and social outlook is grounded in bourgeois terms. This is not to say that Moll is completely bourgeoise. She has a tendency to prefer elegant speech and manners, however superficial this preference might be.

But almost everything Moll does is based upon her own peculiar interpretation of the position of the individual living in a society dedicated to the principles of laissez-faire capitalism. In such a society morality is often little more than a justification for somewhat illegal acts. The principles of Christianity must necessarily create certain contradictions with a life guided by a free-for-all capitalistic structure. At other times, the principles of religion are molded to fit very particular applications, i.e., "God helps those who help themselves."

This may well be the fundamental maxim in Moll's religious dogma. It is not her fault entirely that she subscribes to such social interpretations of Christian principles. As a member of her own society, she seems to

accept such interpretations as naturally as one would expect of her.

But implicit in this idea is the concept of helping oneself. And this Moll does. Sometimes she is marvelously unaware of the sufferings and sensibilities of her fellow human beings. She is always self-centered. (With, of course, such instances as her love for Jenny. Love, however, is something over which neither Moll nor anyone else has control, and we may believe that, had Moll the power to control her love, she might well have done so.) To use a more popular term, Moll seems almost permanently to be on the lookout for "number one."

In such a society as the one in which Moll existed, it is fairly apparent that, to be a success, morality and Golden Rule-like convictions must necessarily be enjoyed only as a sort of hobby. True morality is a sort of luxury that, in England of that day, would be indulged in as rarely as is motoring in the England of today.

But it is hard to determine whether Moll is a conscious hypocrite. Her actions often fall short of her moral comments. Apparently, this was common at the time (as, of course, it is today and probably always will be). In living in her society, Moll seems only to be accepting the general Ø of the age. As a living being, which she very often appears to be, we might have difficulty in deciding whether Moll is truly sincere, simply representative of the age, or truly hypocritical. But, we must consider whether Defoe was aiming to show the discrepancy between Moll's comments and Moll's movements.

Naturally, Moll falls short of her own spoken moral ideals. But, how deeply and how profoundly does Moll herself feel this? Her conversion, as in most of her other moral dicta, is not completely satisfactory. Most

apparently, it has the temporary and superficial aspect of most evangelically-inspired conversions. Also, there is the idea of its being brought about because it will aid Moll. At the expense of being cliche-ridden, Moll has found that "crime does not (necessarily) pay." But, again, how deeply does she feel even this. Structurally, of course, her conversion plays an important part in making the book popular to the general public and also serves to make the book (superficially) a sort of "example" literature. But, even as a representative of exempla, Moll Flanders is not particularly convincing.

As a human being, however, Moll is both compelling and real. And, after all, that is all we can ask of both her and Defoe. A true morality might well have destroyed her realness--certainly, she would not be placed before readers today had she been completely moral and, unfortunately, unreal.

II. 1 Book III has been criticized as lacking in unity. But, before the Marjorie Nicholsons, etc., tear into it at too great a length, there should be a "definition of terms." What sort of unity is Swift using in book III? There are many possible sorts of unity, and Swift does unify Book III. Critics have obviously come upon the variety of situations and locations of Book III and have made hasty decisions. But, as Moll unifies Moll Flanders, a very particular atmosphere and satiric direction seem to unify Book III.

In no other part of Gulliverhas Swift spent more time in satirizing the esoteric, the avant-garde, and the falsity and obscurity in certain phases of learning than he does in Book III. In the other books Swift directs his satire primarily at a lower or social level.

However, here Swift turns toward the superfluous and meaningless and

false and impractical elements in over-civilized groups. First, there is the vague and theoretical atmosphere of the Laputian court. The academy, aside from being hilarious, is, on a more serious level, an indictment against a sort of uncontrolled idealism and enthusiasm of easily misled dabblers in the scientific method.

It might be said that the Book is primarily, from the floating island to the struldburgs, an attack upon people and institutions and social phenomena which have their "heads in the clouds." It is equally a plea for good, plain common sense and a plea for people who choose to be "projectors" or enthusiasts to remember to keep at least one foot on the ground.

The unifying principle of Book III is a strong and highly consistent satire upon people and philosophies which ignore common sense and which forget that they are ultimately bound to the society of humanity. In this Book Swift does not satirize general flaws of humanity, but rather, and very particularly, the flaws of those special groups and philosophies in the world hich forgethumanity. Thus, with its consistent satire, Book III qualifies as being unified.

III. Battle of the Books is a military campaign against modern literary upstarts who would overthrow the power and position of the ancients. Swift very clearly demonstrates that he is on the side of the ancients.

Swift might have written an impetuous pamphlet attacking the moderns. Instead, and quite wisely, he employs a literary method which enables him to make his points cleverly and facetiously. Pitting the ancients versus the moderns in a mock epic fashion, Swift is able to make his point and amuse at

the same time. The setting of the library is consistent and forms a fine battleground. The appearance of Criticism, a sort ofpseudo-allegorical figure, adds to the "literary" atmosphere of the work.

What Swift has done in this contribution to the ancient-modern debate really forms a comic yet meaningful masterpiece of sorts. Swift had the happy gift of being able to couch his concepts and ideas, however serious, in a literary style and device which would entertain and instruct. The weakness of the moderns in battle and the particularly noble and heroic qualities of the ancients is clearly drawn. Of course, the ancient books are victorious after an amusing and detailed battle that is also very meaningful.

- - -

English 624
Tulane University

I. 2. Gualdi Cinthio was an Italian writer of tales, incorporated into his Hecatomithii, and was a sort of latter-day Boccaccio. Shakespeare used one of his tales (7th in the 3rd decade) as the basis for Othello. The basis for Measure for Measure is also Cinthio who often patterned his tales upon current news events.

3. Osric is in Hamlet a sort of fop. As a human being, his value is debatable, but he adds a sort of pastel humor by simply being around. As both a human being and a dramatic character, he is a "water-fly."

4. If we are to symbolize the characters in Othello, as Othello a sort

of Everyman, Desdemona love, etc., we may label Roderigo a simple carry-over of a stock theatrical comic character, much in the tradition of such other characters as Sir Toby Belch. Quite correctly, he is listed in the Dramatic Personae as a "gulled gentleman." Today, he would probably be called a "nebbish."

5. The mutability theme is important in Hamlet in, particularly, the graveyard scene, because it makes Hamlet realize the temporary and changing aspect of life. Earlier, in his "To be, or not to be . . . " soliloquy, we see a Hamlet who values life to a greater degree than should an avenger. When he finally realizes, surrounded by skulls (Yorick's, in particular), the evanescence of life, and, correspondingly, gains the strength to consummate his task.

6. Equivocation was a literary and dramatic form of dialogue highly entertaining to Elizabethans. It may be described as the taking of words and phrases in one of two possible senses, usually the one which is out of context with the material in which it occurs. This is particularly notable in the graveyard scene in Hamlet's conversation with the gravedigger. Here, the misunderstanding almost purposefully, of the mention of the grave, etc., leads to a sort of vaudevillian humor found today in certain forms of comedy. The gravediggers are ingratiating comic characters.

II. The role of the tragic hero in Hamlet and Othello is open to both contrast and comparison. Both are people of "high estate." But this was common in tragedy from the days of Greece to those of Elizabeth.

Spiritually, Hamlet and Othello seem to go in different directions, the former ascending, the latter descending. Hamlet is tragically a sort of

experiment. Hamlet himself does not follow the old de Casibus Virorum Illustrium pattern of ancient drama as does Othello almost pedantically. Hamlet has a knowledge of the evil he is fighting, or, at least, he has clues leading to the proof. From the moment he receives his impetus from the Ghost, he knows his task, although he often makes mistakes on the way to accomplishing it.

Othello, on the other hand, follows a dramatic pattern set long before Shakespeare was born into the light ot theatrical London. Actually, he is a mingling of two traditional theatrical conventions. One is the already mentioned de Casibus theme which developed in such plays as Oedipus Rex and was given firm implementation in Medieval minds by literary adaptations of the philosophy of Boethius. The other tradition is the old native English, and Western European, tradition of the late Middle Ages which emerged in the production of the Everyman plays, the religious allegories of man's fall. Clearly, these two traditions are, in their functions, one.

Othello is the tragic hero patterned after Brutus, to a degree, and Oedipus. He is the man who does not realize evil for what it is, cannot recognize it and its effects which will lead to his downfall. In the tradition of Everyman, Othello accepts evil, embraces it, as the unaware human is likely to do. His personal nobility and position link him with the heroes of Greek drama. He incorporates both native and classic traditions. His Hamartia is the Hamartia of man who mistakenly embraces evil. The Katharsis is achieved by his expiation which, in turn, depends upon his awareness of his sin and, also, his death. Thus, he is a sort of extension of Brutus, having added depth in his greater realization of his sin. The punishment of Iago also builds the Katharsis and aids in negating the evil.

But Hamlet is a more positive hero. His sin, that of avenging his father by the murder of Claudius, is almost a necessity. He is a hero who has an awareness that evil is present and that he must conquer it. The murder of Claudius is a sin, no doubt, but it leads to a spiritual victory. His sin has been, if it may becalled such, an almost necessary one. In dying, of course, he expiates this sin.

Also, in Hamlet, there is no flagrant tragic flaw as contrasted with the "human" flaw of Othello, and the flaw of such a tragic hero as Titus Andronicus. Hamlet moves upward on the spiritual ladder, conquering his passion, becoming stoic and "clear-headed," and finally accomplishing what the sense of the play makes necessary. Hamlet triumphs over evil without succumbing to it so terribly as does Othello.

The role of the avenger is much different from the role of the man overcome by evil. The avenger must almost necessarily commit evil to overcome it. The de Casibus tradition, however, presents a man who falls into the clutches of evil because he cannot distinguish values of good and evil. This is Othello's flaw, a flaw which Hamlet does not flagrantly possess.

- - -

Tulane University
No Date

I. There is almost immediate recognition of Chillingworth for anyone familiar with some of the basic tenets of Hawthorne's literary formulae. Chillingworth reveals himself as a character, a typc particularly connected with Hawthorne's fiction.

Fundamentally, Chillingworth is a father-figure to Dimmesdale. This, however, does not preclude his being a father-figure to Hester, also. Although it is upon Dimmesdale that his effect is most marked, he is a reminder to Hester of the authority-conscience figure of Hawthorne. It is, though, to Dimmesdale that his being, existing is of greatest importance.

While he functions as a sort of catalyst in getting Dimmesdale's conscience to really operate and realize, he also serves as a brand of devil, because he wishes to see Dimmesdale's conscience work in a direction that will ultimately mean damnation or destruction for Dimmesdale.

This, basically, increases the notion of his being a father-figure, because the devil (as, to an extent in "Goodman Brown") is, as validly as God, a father-figure.

In the context in which he functions in the book, Chillingworth is the father-figure to Hester <u>and</u> Dimmesdale, the conscience returned to these lovers--though it is obvious his greatest and most notable effect is upon Dimmesdale. In the same context, he is the devil-father-figure bent upon eating into the heart of Dimmesdale.

II. The fact that Ishmael survives the sinking of the <u>Pequod</u> seems to underline the fact that Ishmael has "matured" in the sense common to modern American fiction. A most basic instance of this sort of maturity, of growth, is <u>Huckleberry Finn</u>--or, even more recently, <u>The Catcher in the Rye</u>.

This genre of fiction suggests withdrawal from society and, in the process, the acquiring of a broader view which enables the protagonist to return to society a more mature and even more worthwhile individual.

This seems to be the pattern of Ishmael's being, too. Leaving land

for the escape to the sea, with all its inherent abilities as a sort of womb-subconscious figure, this pattern suggests death (and the final re-birth) and a great maturing along the way.

This broader vision which Ishmael gains is what saves him from destruction. At first, he is carried away superficially by the hysteria of the crew to find Moby Dick. But, as he begins maturing, he can no longer see the black and white dichotomy between evil and good which is characteristic of Ahab.

Ishmael gains that particularly valuable insight which enables him to see good in evil. The whole, the symbol of life in the universe, seems perhaps to the immature mentality, a cruel, evil force. But the mature mentality, as personified by Ishmael, can see the divinity of the force of life along with its apparent evils. He has become the mature individual.

III. Hawthorne's style seems to reflect his life with notable fidelity. The land-bound, educated, and refined man, his writings are superficially unoffensive and conform to the requirements of 19th century prose--also superficially.

But in his great fund of symbolic usage Hawthorne transcends the requirements of 19th century American literature. This, too, is the characteristic of Melville in that he escapes into the world of symbolism and allegory to place his greatest meanings <u>there</u> rather than in superficial contexts.

But, because his work (particularly his novels) deals with the sea--that medium traditionally free from land-bound authority, his prose seems freer, less organized, less socially influenced than is Hawthorne's.

Melville's prose reflects his career on the sea--the distance from

the petty, bourgeois requirements of everyday life. It is a free prose, an individual prose.

What links Hawthorne and Melville is the wealth of their symbolism, their escape into symbolic existence from a world of superficial existence.

IV. If we must choose a protagonist for The Scarlet Letter, it appears that the choice must fall upon Dimmesdale.

It is he who most greatly seems to be proof of the moral of the book: "be true, be true, etc.--we must not be hypocrites." For, during the course of the book Dimmesdale functions in a context in which he must eventually turn to "live out" this moral.

Particularly notable in Hawthorne is the fact that the father-figure usually functions in relation to the protagonist of the book (note "Rappaccini's Daughter," etc.). Although Chillingworth is, to an extent, this sort of figure for Hester, he does this naturally--by simply existing as a sort of reminder to her. It is upon Dimmesdale, however, that Chillingworth lavishes his attention--the devil and father working upon the protagonist at the same time.

The whole action, mood, and sentiment of the book work toward the moment when Dimmesdale will acknowledge and reveal his sin in public. The situation of Hester, Pearl, and Chillingworth are all fairly static, for we know that the catalyst in making their situations change will be Dimmesdale's admission.

Hawthorne centers his attention upon Dimmesdale--will he finally mature to the point where he can avoid being a hypocrite? This Dimmesdale does. He matures to the point of admission, and in doing so, dies. It is in doing this

that he saves himself--a salvation through maturing.

V. The catalogical chapters in Moby Dick are much more functional than might commonly be believed.

They lend to the book an atmosphere of authenticity which is particularly valuable in a novel dealing with so unusual a theme (superficially) as whale hunting. These catelogical chapters help to bring the bizarre of whaling to the reader trapped in a bourgeois existence while at the same time they increase our faith in Ishmael-Melville as a valid commentator.

More than this, the catelogical chapters begin relatively early in the book to build up reader interest in the coming of Moby Dick. The descriptions of the various whales and the flora and fauna of whaling are almost like dramatic forewhadowing and, what is common in most dramatists, the preparing of the stage for the arrival of what will be an especially colorful or important character. The cetalogical chapters prepare the stage for the entrance of Moby Dick.

Melville wisely added this to the general scheme of the book for, as we have seen, two reasons.

But, on a structural level, they help to relieve what might have been to many readers the tedium of the voyage to Moby Dick. In using the catelogical chapters Melville strengthened the value and significance of his book.

- - -

Tulane University
No Date

In the first half of the nineteenth century the United States was

marked, as was England, by a period of social reform. The austerity and reactionism of Hamilton ended with the eighteenth century and so, in a way, ended an era and introduced a new one. It might be said that Shay's Rebellion was a significant indication of the direction in which the wind was blowing.

By 1800, Jefferson and his ideas of freehold farming had overthrown the intensely conservative and reactionary Federalist power. "The great beast" was just beginning to awaken. Supremacy was passing slowly to the agrarian interests--a political event which reflected the sympathy of the population as a whole, for the population was slowly turning toward a much more democratic and "leveling" course.

True, in the still somewhat Royalist strongholds of the northeast the atmosphere was still almost pre-Revolutionary. But the agrarian-coastal battle was joined, the former to be the winner. And the agrarian optimism was felt throughout the land. The Louisiana purchase moved political power into more western channels.

Throughout the first half of the century, the American maintained his optimism, his intense belief in democracy, his general lack of polish (so detested by Dickens in his Martin Chuzzlewit), and his eagerness to follow new prophets and reformers.

While Jefferson began faintly to whisper of a more liberal government, it was Jackson who brought liberalism into effect. In electing Jackson president, the common man demonstrated his victory over the capitalistic strongholds of the northeast. The "Jacksonisn Renaissance" was important in that it demonstrated the ultimate victory of those who had previously been the major agitators for the War of 1812, the law tariff, expansionists of the

rural areas.

Webster represented the reactionary New Englanders, and it is important to note that Calhoun, representing the planting South, early spoke as a sectionalist in advocating state nullification--and/or even stronger measures.

But the somewhat anarchistic reforms of Jackson were echoed by an intellectual faction. Emerson, in his dedication to intuition and transcendentalism, emphasized the ability of each individual to have "knowledge," although he might be lacking in learning. This was a sign of the Romantic revolution, which, after having developed in Europe, came to the United States as a counterbalance for the rationalistic eighteenth century atmosphere.

In an age of reform, there were many reformers, and, in the climate of American optimism they had fertile soil in which to take root. The writings of Harriet Beecher Stowe helped to kindle the spark for future disunity. Utopias were formed as a reflection of the ultimate in optimistic thought, and the ever Savior-searching masses were easily led by new prophets in the forms of Joseph Smith, Miller and Campbell. As a reaction to this, the Unitarian Church was established as a symbol of the lengths to which intellectualism may be fused with religion.

The gradually improving economy gave culture a chance to flourish, for the arts are perhaps more closely dependent upon prosperity and support than is any other factor. A national literature grew, aided by Longfellow, Melville, Whittier, and many others. The establishment of a lyceum in every major city demonstrated the growing desire to the cultured, and even the prosperous bucolic ladies were thumbing through Godey's Ladies Book.

But it was still the Jacksonisn atmosphere which the majority of the population breathed, and this population breathed, and this population was not

confined to the country. In the big cities which were developing to complement the rise of industrialism, a new and important class was developing: the mechanics. This was the birth of labor and the labor movements. Suppressed by long working hours and low wages, the laborers began the famous "strike" which the capitalists could not at first prove illegal. Gradually labor was growing in power in the northeast, unhappiness and famines in Europe adding hundreds of thousands of immigrants to its ranks.

With labor came the need for new reforms in the big cities, and one of these was the campaign for temperance which gradually developed,or, rather degenerated, into a campaign for complete prohibition. And there were always clever people, such as Gough, who capitalized upon this.

The rise of the common man also began and effected an almost universal suffrage--with one great exception: women did not have the vote. Such notable feminists as Amelia Bloomer and Susan B. Anthony were very vociferously around to champion woman's rights.

And with the rise of the average there came, too, a need for public education.

By the middle of the century the power had swung strongly to the north as the result of the railroads and industrialization, for one thing. This section was ready to join hands against an enemy in the near future.

- - -

Tulane University
No Date

I. 1. Bad Quarto is the name given a publication (in Quarto form) of Shakespeare which is a sort of mongrelized version of his work which might