

# *Roughneck Review*

VOLUME 2, ISSUE 1

SPRING 2013

---



# Table of Contents

## History

"From the Pyrenees to the Sierras: Basques in California"  
Riley Hewes.....6

## Literary Criticism

"1984: Winston's Inspiration"  
Wayne Roberts.....15

"Narcissus"  
Torrey Soland.....18

"The Faux and the Hound"  
Paul Georgi.....22

## Personal Essay

"My Story"  
April Banuelos.....26

"Narrative: In Bloom"  
Daniel Flores.....29

"Losing Grace"  
Anonymous.....32

"Never Settle"  
Sarah Dase.....37

## Art

"Monet's Waterlilies"  
Shelby Steele.....41

## Politics and Social Comment

"A Replacement for Unethical Animal Circuses"	
Jayleen Sanchez.....	44
"The Power of the Word "Can't""	
Joey Sharette.....	51
"Don't Eat That!"	
Johnna Sprayberry.....	55
"Nuclear Power: A Practical Solution"	
Kennedy Thomas.....	63

## *Featured Works*

### Finalists for Philosophy Department Student Colloquium

"Moody Behavior"	
Elias Torres.....	70
"Sickness and Disease in Socrates"	
Taylor Bogar.....	76

### Winner: 2013 David Arthur Memorial Scholarship Prize

"Morals Without Reason"	
Rachel Lanier.....	81

# Writing Center Creative Writing Competition

*At various times during the semester, the Bakersfield College Writing Center produces a prompt to elicit creative writing work from students. The winners and runners-up of these contests are published in Roughneck Review. Each issue will include the most recent choices, along with all runners-up. This informal, personal form of expression is too often overlooked in today's academic climate, so it is our pleasure and our honor to showcase these works.*

## **Winner: Creative Writing Contest**

"Amour en Fleurs (Love in Bloom)"

Beaumont Curtis Byron.....86

## **Runner-up: Creative Writing Contest**

"The Prayer"

Sara Marquez.....87

## **Second Runner-up: Creative Writing Contest**

"I Have Many Names But You Can Call Me Death"

Varden Frias.....88

# History

# From the Pyrenees to the Sierras: Basques in California

**Riley Hewes**

*This paper was nominated by Professor Paul Beckworth.*

For thousands of years, the Basque people have lived in ambiguity as an autonomous community between France and Spain. Their ancient rural villages, nestled amongst the ominous Pyrenees Mountains to the east, and the Bay of Biscay to the west, have evolved into bustling tourist destinations and industrial outposts. The area known as the Basque country is divided into seven provinces of France and Spain. *Euskal Herria*, the Spanish Basque region, consists of Vizcaya, Guipúzcoa, Alava, and Navarra. Labourd, Soule, and Basse Navarre belong to France and are collectively known as *Iparralde* (Paquette xi). To this day, anthropologists have yet to explain the origins of the Basques. Whatever their origins may be, most scientists now agree that they were most likely the “first Europeans,” a reputation the Basques are very proud of (Kurlansky 26). They may be forever hailed as a, “mystery race,” but their presence in global affairs since the dawn of the Roman Empire leaves no mystery about their character.

When John Adams visited the Guipúzcoan city of Bilbao during the late 1770s, he expressed his admiration and respect for this enigmatic people: “While their neighbors have long since resigned all their pretensions into the hands of Kings and priests, this extraordinary people have preserved their ancient language, genius, laws, government and manners, without innovation, longer than any other nation in Europe.” (Kurlansky 5). To this day, a statue of John Adams still stands in downtown Bilbao to commemorate his visit, but also to commemorate the union of Basque and American values. Despite occupying a region of approximately only one hundred miles in all directions, the Basques have made a lasting footprint on the history of the Americas, primarily in California (Shostak). Their contributions to Californian culture, industry, and discovery shaped the history of the Golden State, and the heritage of California has become greatly enhanced by the few brave Basque men and women who left the Fatherland to make a name for themselves in the American West (Paquette xv).

The history of the Basques in Europe is hard to piece together. First of all, they didn't write anything down until the near end of the Middle Ages. Also, the Basque language, *Euskera*, being unrelated to any Latin or Indo-European language, was nearly impossible for ancient and medieval travelers to understand (Douglass 10). However, the evidence that remains sheds light on why this small minority was so successful in California, and why they found the United States appealing. One of the most unique characteristics of pre-Christian Basques was their independence. In 1112, the Canon of Santiago de Compostela stated that the Basques were a

“race speaking a strange language; real savages, as blood-thirsty and ferocious as the wild beasts with whom they live.” More likely, the Canon simply had mistaken their freedom for “savagery” (Irigary 10). The Basques have a saying, “*Gora Euzkadi Askatuta.*” Long live the free Basque Country. No one knows exactly when the Basques began using this motto, but that war cry has remained the same throughout their history (11).

Much like any other small country in ancient times, the Basque region was visited by its’ share of foreign invaders. However, there was a distinction among the Basques when it came to foreign rule. They never fully assimilated into another society, and they never allowed a foreign king to abolish their freedoms or ancient customs. The first large power to occupy the Basque region was the Carthaginians, who arrived in the third century B.C., and almost immediately after, came the Romans. For the first time, the Basques began to realize global opportunities. They realized they could do business with these invaders. Both Carthaginians and Romans compensated Basque soldiers for military service. Later on, the Basque whaling industry earned them a small fortune in the Roman Empire. Basque men and women were not subjected to a Roman code of law, and they were not required to pay tribute (Kurlansky 33). Rural Basque communities lived in peace under Roman rule, and there is no evidence of any violent confrontations between the Romans and the Basques.

After the Romans, came the Goths, the Franks, and the Moors. The Goths failed to conquer Iberia for a significant amount of time, and the Moors were overthrown by Spanish- Basque warlords in the old Roman port of Pamplona in 778. Seeing an opportunity, Charlemagne marched to Pamplona and offered the Basque warlords protection from the Moors in exchange for their oaths of loyalty. The warlords agreed. Unfortunately, Charlemagne did not keep his truce. Almost immediately after, Charlemagne leveled the city of Pamplona. On his way to the Pyrenees, along the Roncesvalles Pass, Charlemagne’s army was ferociously attacked by Basque guerilla warriors and their allies. From this battle, comes the legend of the Frankish hero, Roland, who was killed that day (Douglass 40-41). Charlemagne never retaliated, and Franks learned not to underestimate Basque militarism. After Charlemagne, the Franks were eager to appease the Basques, and they rarely fought with one another. Frankish kings eventually earned their trust and appointed French noblemen to be the dukes of Vasconia. Under French rule, the Basques were left to themselves, while the Spanish Basques warlords readily served the Spanish Empire. The Basques of Spain became extremely devout Catholics and played active roles in the Reconquista, while French Basques didn’t become fully Christianized until much later on (43).

The Spanish Reconquista and the Age of Exploration, gave the Basques from Spain a global advantage over the French-Basques. In fact, some of the first Europeans to see the Americas

were Basques from Vizcaya and Guipúzcoa, sailing on Christopher Columbus' ships in 1492. The Basques were talented whalers, shipbuilders, and fishermen, and were recruited by the Spanish Empire to build the *Nina*, *Pinta*, and the *Santa Maria*. Spanish historian, José Manuel Azcona Pastor, described the Basque sailors as unruly and individualistic during the voyage, and upon reaching the New World, they, "defied the established powers through their leading roles in desertion, rebellions, mutinies, and various conspiracies." One story states that they threatened to throw Columbus overboard when they didn't reach land on schedule (Bass, *Basques in the Americas*). Over a century later came Sebastian Vizcaino, or Sebastian the Basque, who found Monterey and gave California cities many of their present day names (Kurlansky 61).

The Basque generals and administrators in Spanish California are too numerous to name. In Mexican and Spanish California, five Basques became governors: Jose Joaquin de Arillaga (1792-1794), Diego de Borica y Retegui (1794-1799), Pablo Vincent de Sola (1815-1822), Jose Maria de Echeandia (1825-1833), and Manuel Micheltorena (1842-1845) (Bass, *Basques in Early California and Kern County* 3). Innumerable Basques were also Jesuit missionaries in Alta California. The founder of the Jesuit order, Saint Ignatius de Loyola, after all, was a Basque from Gúipuzcoa. After Mexico gained its' independence from Spain, Spanish Basques continued to flourish in California. However, many of them did not stay, and often retired in Spain. When California became part of the United States, more Basques left the Americas (Douglass 45). Still, the California Gold Rush of 1849 would soon beckon the Basques back to California. The first Basques to make their way to California were from Chile, since their route proved to be the quickest. After the Chilean Basques, came the French Basques, in astoundingly large numbers. This time around, the Spanish-Basques were far out-numbered by their French compatriots. Most of the Basques in California came from Aldudes or Urepel, parallel French-Basque villages (Paquette 13).

Numerous factors led to the influx of French-Basque immigration in California. Their history has made it apparent that they were opportunists, capitalists, and industrialists. Not only was there gold in California, but there was thousands of acres of cheap farmland. Also, there were already French settlers in California during the early 1800s, so the Basques did not feel so far away from home. Spanish Basques also came to California to try their hand at gold mining, and many stayed. Yet, many of them migrated to Idaho, Nevada, and Oregon, or returned home. The majority of Basques in California continued to be from *Iparralde* (Paquette *xiii*). Many Basques did have "gold fever," but few of them were successful. When the gold rush began to wane, Basque men and women sought farmland and business opportunities. The Miller and Lux empire, operating north of the San Joaquin River, attracted many Basque immigrants during the 1860s and 1870s. Several Basques worked for the company until they earned their own plot of

land and were able to acquire sheep (Echevarria & Etulain 66). Other families opened and operated Basque boarding houses, restaurants, and hotels.

No one can confidently declare who the first Basque settler in California was, but there were a few trailblazers who made a name for themselves and opened doors to many Basque immigrants for years to come. The first Basque communities in California were in San Francisco and Los Angeles. In Los Angeles, there were nearly 2,000 Basques by 1850 and two newspapers printed in *Euskera: Escualdun Gazeta* and *California'ko Eskual Herria* (Douglass 336). The French-Basque artist, Paul de Longpre, got his start in Los Angeles in 1899 and became a famous painter (Drake). From Los Angeles, they migrated to the San Joaquin Valley. The clan mentality of the Basques allowed hundreds of Basques to successfully settle in California. A young son would come to California, and if he found work, he would send for his brothers and sisters. From there, their family, friends, and neighbors would follow. Families that owned hotels and boardinghouses made Basques in California more likely to flourish. Basque families such as the Echeverry's and Saldubehere's in Kern County, and the Oyharzabal's in San Francisco, employed many Basque men and women through their boarding houses and hotels (358).

In the San Francisco region, the most successful Basque enterprise were the *ostatuak*, or Basque boardinghouses. On the frontier, times were often tough, and Basques longed for a piece of home. Lonely shepherders and miners who turned out penniless, found solace in the boarding houses. To this day, the *ostatuak* are embedded into Basque-American culture (Echevarria 246). Beginning in the 1860s, the Basque hotels and boardinghouses that sprung up in San Francisco, then in Kern County, Nevada, and beyond, catered exclusively to Basques. There, they could speak their ancient language and reminisce about the Old Country (Oizarbal 5). The first Basque hotel in Kern County was the Iberia Hotel, opened by Faustino Noriega and Fernando Etcheverry in 1893. The hotel was a booming success, and Noriega and his wife, Louise Inda-Noriega, retired to a comfortable new home on Baker Street. Their house still stands at the Kern County Museum (Paquette 87).

Perhaps nowhere else in California was Basque business so successful than in Kern County. After the Iberia Hotel, came many French-Basque bakeries, butcheries, restaurants, and sheep camps. Many Basque women worked in the hotels, and Basque men looked for work as shopkeepers, butchers, and farmhands. Basque families would work in what is now East Bakersfield, save money, and eventually retire to the mountains, primarily in Caliente and Tehachapi (Paquette 47). In Tehachapi and Caliente, they could maintain sheep by the hundreds. In the Basque Country, they usually only had a few sheep per household. The first Basque to arrive in Tehachapi was Michael Errecart, who found work in the Barbarossa Mine. He

then sent for his brother and his sisters, who settled and intermarried with other Basque couples. Many Basques were drawn to Tehachapi and Caliente because the mountains in the distance and the green pastures reminded them of home (48).

A more somber aspect of Basque life in California, is that the sheepherding business was a cold, hard, and lonely occupation. Basque sheepherders have been heralded as the “lonely sentinels of the American West” (Laxalt 12). The voices of these lonely herders can still be heard in the tree carvings of Eastern California, and parts of Nevada and Oregon. Just above the San Joaquin Valley, all the way up past Truckee Lake, Basque “arborglyphs” are intricately etched into the tall trees. The carvings consist of everything from naked women, solemn proverbs, names, self-portraits, and religious symbols. From the beginnings of Basque sheepherding, to the presidency of Nixon, tree carvings are apparent. In 1950 one herder wrote in *Euskera*, “Long live the sheepherders and those who have the guts to live here” (Mallea-Olaetxe 81). Many bear the old war cry, “Long live the free Basque Country,” and also, a recurring quote, “Long live the United States.” Another one states in 1939, “The war has been declared, poor France” (77). Obviously a reference to President John F. Kennedy, one says, “Do not ask what the country can do for you” (56). In the hundreds of arborglyphs that appear, the attitude of the Basque sheepherder is clear. They had guts and they had heart. Even through the times of loneliness, they kept on going. They loved their country, as well as the country their fathers and forefathers came from.

Today, the average Californian does not come in contact with Basque culture very often, if ever. In Kern County, local patrons of Basque restaurants can get a taste of Basque food and dining. In San Francisco, the Basque boardinghouses have been lost to time, but the Basques in San Francisco have not forgotten their heritage. The local Basque club hosts banquets, festivals, and dance productions (Zubiri 197). In Fresno, Basques can still visit the Basque Hotel and play on the old handball court (147). In the Sacramento Valley, local Basque chefs come together annually for the chorizo contest (225). In Susanville, the local Basque grocery market offers the public choice meats from local Basque farmers and herdsmen (233). No matter where one may be in California, they are never far from Basque culture.

An ancient Basque proverb states, “*Denbora badoa eta gu harekin.*” Meaning, “time goes by, and we go with it” (Aske 6). Indeed, the Basques have stood the test of time. Basque Americans have shown that they are capable of being patriotic towards their host country, without compromising their patriotism towards the Fatherland (Totoricagüena). From Sebastian Vizcaino in the sixteenth century, to the Basque Argonauts that came from South America in the nineteenth century, to the 20,868 patriotic Basque individuals existing in California today, the Basque presence in California has always left a mark on the Golden State’s history, and always

will (Shorter). Their success in the American West can be attributed to the character of the Basque family unit: a strong work ethic, conservatism, self-sufficiency, and unabashed patriotism. The Basque idea of “preserving the house while pursuing the world,” has been the ultimate key in their success and will secure their unique ethnic identity for centuries to come (Kurlansky 7). Mark Kurlansky states perfectly in *The Basque History of the World*, “There may not be a France or Spain in 1,000 years or even 500 years, but there will still be Basques” (8).

## Works Cited

- Aske, Jon. "Basque Proverbs (Esaera Zahharak)." 29 November 1994. Web Retrieved 14 October 2012. <<http://www.buber.net/Basque/Euskara/PDFs/proverbs.pdf>>.
- Bass, Stephen T. "Basques in Early California and Kern County." *Historic Kern* 2008: 1-4.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Basques in the Americas: 1492-1592*. 31 January 2010. Web Retrieved 15 October 2012. <<http://euskalkazeta.com/ek/?p=3884>>.
- Drake, Cedric. *Boarding Houses and Handball Courts: The Fleeting Stories of Los Angeles' French Town*. 4 April 2012. Web Retrieved 11 October 2012. <<http://www.kcet.org/socal/departures/landofsunshine/history/the-fleeting-story-of-los-angeles-french-town.html>>.
- Echeverria, Jeronima. *A History of Basque Boardinghouses: Home Away From Home*. Reno, Nevada: University of Nevada Press, 1999.
- Echeverria, Jeronima and Richard W. Etulain. *Portraits of Basques in the New World*. Reno, Nevada: University of Nevada Press, 1999.
- Irigary, Louis. *A Shepherd Watches, a Shepherd Sings*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1977.
- Kurlansky, Mark. *The Basque History of the World*. New York, New York: Penguin Group Inc., 1999.
- Laxalt, Robert. *Sweet Promised Land*. Reno, Nevada: University of Nevada Press, 1957.
- Mallea-Olaetxe, J.K. *Speaking through the Aspens: Basque Tree Carvings in California and Nevada*. Reno, Nevada: University of Nevada Press, 2000.
- Oiarzabal, Pedro J. *Gardeners of Identity: Basques in the San Francisco Bay Area*. Reno, Nevada: Center for Basque Studies, 2009.
- Paquette, Mary Grace. *Basques to Bakersfield*. Bakersfield, California: Kern County Historical Society, 1982.
- Shorter, Daniel. *Ipar Ameriketako Euskal Elkarteak*. 2000. 9 October 2012. <[http://www.nabasque.org/NABO/zenbat\\_gara.htm](http://www.nabasque.org/NABO/zenbat_gara.htm)>.

Shostak, Elizabeth. *Countries and their Cultures*. 2012. 4 October 2012. <<http://www.everyculture.com/multi/A-Br/Basque-Americans.html>>.

Totoricagüena, Gloria Pilar. *Basques Around the World: Generic Immigrants or Diaspora?* 2000. 9 October 2012. <<http://www.euskonews.com/0072zbk/gaia7201es.html>>.

Douglass, William A. *Amerikanuak: Basques in the New World*. Reno, Nevada: University of Nevada Press, 2005.

Zubiri, Mary. *A Travel Guide to Basque America*. Reno, Nevada: University of Nevada Press, 2006.

# Literary Criticism

## 1984: Winston's Inspiration

### Wayne Roberts

*This paper was nominated by Professor Laura Peet.*

It is often the smallest of things in which people can find true inspiration, such as a kind word or act of generosity. Though such things seem small and inconsequential they can spark truly great inspiration and can help to empower people in the pursuit of something better. It is easy to stand back and look at the world around us and know that it is in need of a change, but the hardest of tasks is to be part of making that change. In the novel *1984* by George Orwell, the main protagonist, Winston, finds himself empowered and inspired to be a part of the change in the world that surrounds him. It is not grand gestures that inspire Winston into action, however. It is things that to some might seem small, but to Winston represent hope; one of these objects is a small piece of coral incased in glass.

The world that Winston lives in is an ugly one. The buildings are old and dilapidated; they are slowly crumbling to little more than dust. Those that still stand are covered in banners of propaganda for Big Brother. The streets are filled with foul smells which have slowly worked their way into the dwellings, making it impossible to truly escape the stench. The roads are filled with rubble caused from the constant bombs dropped within the city. Even the uniforms of the party are drab and dull. This is a world devoid of anything beautiful. Time and the party have stripped it all away and left an ugly husk in its wake. Perhaps this was part of the party's plan all along. After all, what good do pretty things serve? They are merely a distraction, a menace, something that serves only to take the attention off of the party itself and perhaps in some extreme cases even inspire individualism. The focus must be on the party, and serving as a loyal member of the party. People must not become distracted by things that hold no meaning. The problem with this thought is that when everything is taken away, it makes even the most seemingly insignificant of objects hold meaning and importance. This is the case for Winston when he finds the glass orb in Mister Charrington's shop. As Winston sees the glass orb and then takes it in his hands, his simple reaction is to say "It's a beautiful thing" (Orwell 214). It is a simple object, one that even Winston knows can serve no purpose. Perhaps it was a paperweight at some point, Winston thinks. But it does not matter to Winston that this small globe serves no real practical purpose. For him, it is enough that it is beautiful. Such beauty in a world so devoid of the very thing stirs within him feelings that he had long since forgotten. Winston does not hesitate to pay Mr. Charrington the four dollars he asks for it. He knows that he must have it, that he must possess this beauty for himself. Finding this orb stirs thoughts in Winston that he might not have ever felt if it were not for this simple paperweight. He began to think that if he could still find something beautiful in such a simple object that perhaps not all of the beauty had been

taken from this world. Perhaps, like the orb, it was just hidden and hard to find. That did not mean beauty did not exist; it just meant that more effort must be made to find it.

Though the paperweight started out merely as an object of beauty, it begins to hold more meaning to Winston. As he begins to stare into the glass orb, he starts to imagine it as a world. The glass is the sky and he is represented by the small piece of coral. It helps him to start looking inward and reflecting on his own past. As Winston does this, he begins to slowly recollect memories that for so long had eluded him. He remembers his mother and his sister. He remembers the awful way he had acted towards them and how he had ended up alone. He begins to remember small details of life before the party. He was very young and his memories were vague, but he was beginning to remember more than he ever had before.

As Winston's relationship with Julia begins to hold more meaning and he realizes his deep love for her, this is represented in how he begins to view the glass orb. One day, as he was lying on the bed with Julia asleep beside him, he was staring at the globe and thought "the paperweight was the room he was in and the coral was Julia's life and his own, fixed in a sort of eternity at the heart of the crystal"(Orwell 322). What had started out as simply an object purchased for its beauty and then a representation of his world had become something so much more. It now represented not only his world, but that of the woman he had grown to love. They were linked, the fate of one tied to the fate of the other, bound by their love and rebellion against the party. It can be seen how the paperweight had become tied to Winston and Julia's world when they are finally captured by the thought police. As they are being arrested and their world is crumbling around them "someone had picked up the glass paperweight from the table and smashed it to pieces on the hearthstone"(Orwell 481). As their worlds are torn to pieces so is the glass orb shattered.

The paperweight had started out as a simple object that held no value outside of its own beauty, but throughout the story begins to represent so much more. It first helps Winston to begin looking inward, to dredge up memories so long forgotten. It begins to represent his world. Through time he finds himself with a deep love for Julia as their fates become tied together. As such, Winston begins to see the orb not only has his own world but his and Julia's. As they are captured, the orb is shattered and along with it the life that they had made with each other.

## Work Cited

Orwell, George. *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. 1st ed. New York: Martin Secker & Warburg, 2008. PDF file.

# Narcissus

**Torrey Soland**

*This paper was nominated by Professor Rae Ann Kumelos.*

## Part I

There are many different beliefs as to what the true function of a myth is, but no matter the purpose, a myth is a story. Some exist to explain the creation of the universe, some to teach a lesson, and others just for pure literary enjoyment. The myth of Narcissus has two main functions: on its surface it is a story that explains the origin of an object in nature—a flower— but it also explores vanity and the anguish of unrequited love. Because Narcissus's pride leads to his death, there is an implicit message to the audience that pride and vanity are, at their extremes, destructive qualities. Because the myth's intent is to instill a set of values in the listeners, its function is best described, in Joseph Campbell's words, as "psychological." Myths such as this endure because they are relatable; they address a part of human nature and echo the "common strains of a single symphony of the soul." (Campbell, 149.) Vanity, pride, and unrequited love are human experiences, and when reading or hearing the story of Narcissus, one may feel on some level that they are hearing a story of themselves, and so this story remains in the collective conscience even in present day.

To illustrate its message, the story personifies beauty in the form of Narcissus, whose extreme pride and arrogance exemplifies the shadow side of beauty and ultimately leads to his downfall. According to myth, when Narcissus was a baby, his caring mother asks a sage about his future and receives the answer that, "'If e'er he knows himself he surely dies'" (Ovid, Book the Third). What the sage essentially means is that if Narcissus were ever to discover the extent of his beauty, he would die before reaching an old age. Though Narcissus must grow up without "knowing" himself, others are not so restricted; men and women fall in love with Narcissus as soon as they see him, and the attention goes to his head. He becomes a beautiful young heartbreaker, cruelly rejecting all those who dare to make advances. One young woman, Echo, who has lost the power of original speech and can only repeat the words of others, is so hurt by Narcissus's rejection that she wastes away until she is nothing but a voice. Finally, a spurned lover turns to the gods for help, begging that Narcissus experience the same pain he inflicts on others. In some retellings, the prayers are answered by Rhamnusia, and in others, by the goddess Nemesis (Frye, 303), but in either case, Narcissus is forced to pay for his cruelty.

While in the woods, Narcissus discovers a fountain, and as he takes a drink he sees his reflection. Narcissus does not realize at first that it is his own reflection, and, believing it to be another person, he falls madly in love. After a very long time staring into the water and a large amount of frustration at being unable to reach the one he so desperately desires, Narcissus realizes that he sees only himself and his love can never be returned. Like so many of the people Narcissus rejected, he cannot cope with the loss of his own love and, like Echo, he dies of sadness. As he bids the world goodbye, Echo shares a final moment with him, repeating back the words he cries out. Once Narcissus passes, he is transformed into a flower that characteristically bends towards its own reflection so that he can continue to stare at his lost love for all eternity.

## Part II

I, Narcissus, am truly the most stunning man to have ever walked the earth. I have never been so glad to hunt as today, since I have found a place in the woods where I have complete solitude from the swooning ladies and delusional boys from the village. Honestly, I cannot imagine what makes them think that I would want to waste my time playing them in sport, when I am clearly so much stronger and so much more skilled than them. I would best them every time and it would be literally no challenge for me. What could they hope to gain? I suppose they think that if they stand close enough to me, some of my abundant talent and beauty will rub off onto them. Unlikely.

And the women! They can hardly contain themselves around me, I mean really. It has become something of a game for me to turn down their affections, since it is almost an hourly occurrence for one to declare their undying love for me. While it is understandable that they should admire me, these women cannot possibly believe that they are good enough for me. They should not be so surprised when they are denied. I mean, their angst would truly be heartbreaking if it were not so absurd. Just today, one especially plain girl tried to catch my eye. When I rejected her, her reaction was ridiculously dramatic. She actually called out to the gods, begging them to make me feel as miserable as her. She said something along the lines of, "May he love in vain." As if I would ever find someone who would turn me down, assuming I deemed them worthy of my affection in the first place. I had to laugh.

In fact, I am laughing right now thinking about it. It has made it difficult for me to catch my breath, since today is very hot and I have been running through the woods for hours. I should get myself a drink. I cannot let myself get dehydrated and risk chapping my full, red lips. That would be a greater tragedy than anything even Sophocles could have dreamed up.

I thought I heard running water a few minutes ago; indeed, there is a fountain. How there came to be a fountain in this part of the forest, seemingly untouched by either animal or man, I do not know. I also do not care. I am thirsty. I will drink from this mysterious fountain and return to my hunt.

But oh! Here in the fountain is a creature finally worthy of my love! What gorgeous, flowing hair and rippling muscles and expressive eyes! He moves as I move. We are so perfect for each other that we are as one. As I grasp at him, he also grasps at me, and yet I cannot reach him. I can only stare at him, and he back at me, for what could be years; I have no concept of time. I do not eat, for his presence fills me like food, and I do not sleep for fear of him leaving me as I rest. It is so frustrating that we cannot touch, though I so long to. I can see it on his face that he does, too. I watch my lover's face for so long I can see it aging, and finally I can take it no more. I yell out to the empty forest in anger, and at the exact same moment, the beauty in the water does the same. And then, I understand.

The person in the water is I! How could I be so stupid? It is my own reflection that I have fallen in love with. The worst part is that now my love will remain unrequited forever. I want to die—after all, what purpose is there in living anymore? I cry out my farewells to the earth, hearing my voice call back to me as it resonates through the trees. Funny, the voice that calls back reminds me of a girl I once rejected. She was not much of a conversationalist. What strange thoughts to have as I die.

I wither, bent over the water, and I watch myself transform into a flower with its head forever bowed. At least now I never have to part from my glorious reflection.

## Works Cited

- Campbell, Joseph. "The Four Functions of Mythology." *Dreams and Inward Journeys*, Eighth Edition. p. 147-151.
- Frye, Northrop, and Jay, Macpherson. "Biblical and Classical Myths: The Mythological Framework of Western Culture." Toronto.: University of Toronto Press, 2004. eBook Academic Collection (EBSCOhost). Web. 6 Mar. 2013.
- Ovid. Stevenson, Daniel C. "Metamorphoses." *The Internet Classics Archive*. Web Atomics. 2009. Web. 6 Mar. 2013.
- Upright, Morgan. "Narcissus." *Encyclopedia Mythica*. Revision 2. 2004. Web. 6 Mar. 2013.

# The Faux and the Hound

**Paul Georgi**

*This work was nominated by Professor Laura Peet.*

Never is the human spirit more enduring than when its endurance is suppressed. This basic truth is explored in Ray Bradbury's iconic novel, *Fahrenheit 451*. In it, aspiring Renaissance man Guy Montag learns of man's basic need for the full human experience in a world that glorifies shallow banter and mindless distractions as a form of high art. Bradbury uses the character of The Mechanical Hound as a metaphor for the destructive nature of a life void of mindfulness.

From our first glimpse of The Hound, Bradbury makes clear his allegory. "The Mechanical Hound slept but did not sleep, lived but did not live" (21). First, note that The Hound is written as a proper noun, as a name or title. This begins the process of personification in the reader's mind. Next, consider the description, "lived but did not live." This is the first description given of The Hound just as it could have been the first description of Montag, his wife or his boss. It's the first and most relevant fact of most everyone living in their society. Therefore, we can infer that any further description of this beast is also Bradbury's attempt of describing these characters' thoughtless world, deprived of any introspection.

Bradbury also describes The Hound as "the dead beast, the living beast" (22). Here again, there is a paradox of life and death. Montag has discovered that to stay alive he must live in a manner that's tantamount to death. Bradbury is asserting, by use of The Hound, that the act of breathing oxygen, pumping blood and being mobile is not the same as being alive. After all, although mechanical, his beast has many of the same biological processes of the human body. He can remember and perform tasks that have been assigned to him through programming. In this way he really is just as "human" as the vast majority of characters in the novel. The rest of this society simply regurgitate facts and statistics like the Jeopardy super computer and has no use for analysis or emotional introspection or empathy. So if one can do everything another can do, but no more, we say they are equal. They are the same. Using the transitive property, we now know that all Bradbury's descriptions of the hound can be used for those among us who act without thinking.

Beatty, Montag's boss and very much a mechanical hound himself, describes the creature thusly: "It doesn't like or dislike. It just functions. It's like a lesson in ballistics. It has a trajectory we decide on for it" (24). This relates to the description of learning styles preferred in the schools in the novel, and, unfortunately, often in our own schools as well. The running theme is

that the children learn what to think, not how to think. They learn statistics but not logistics, practical data but not practical application. In effect, they can do absolutely everything a computer can do but absolutely nothing more. And this downgrade from person to machine is too much for many to bear. Even without the capacity to understand what is missing on a conscious level, they know intrinsically that something is indeed missing - something vital. This accounts for the exponentially rising suicide rate among the seemingly "happy" people.

There is, of course, another major problem with being incapable of deciphering and filtering what you are taught. This issue is summed up eloquently in an exchange between Beatty and Montag about The Mechanical Hound. Beatty says, "It doesn't think anything we don't want it to think." Montag replies, "That's sad...because all we put into it is hunting and finding and killing. What a shame if that's all it can ever know" (25). Here Bradbury illustrates the shame, both for The Hound and for those like The Hound. We live in a world full of tragedy. Everybody we love, no matter how loved or deserving of life, will die. Likewise, we will die, perhaps after a particularly long a painful struggle with disease. Our best-case scenario is that we grow old and watch our beauty and relevance fade as our loved ones die around us. Without the ability to see the beauty in this world, to experience warm clothes from the dryer, with their sweet smell and warm hug, or the nose-kiss of a cat, or the sound of a gull on the pier as you inhale the essence of ocean, without these things life would be impossible to endure at all. It's mindfulness, the act of taking time to experience every aspect of the world around you, that not only makes up for those unbearable times, but gives meaningful perspective and poetic understanding to the melancholy of those times. It makes us aware that those pains we suffer are part of our humanity. It makes us grateful for that humanity and, therefore, grateful for the bad times too. It's this appreciation that is missing from the society in Bradbury's dystopia.

One of the last descriptions Bradbury gives of The Mechanical Hound is probably the most telling. He writes, "The Hound did not touch the world. It carried its silence with it" (130). Once you understand that Bradbury is speaking of anyone who is incapable of reflection, the significance of this line becomes clear. Those who do not exist for the world do not exist in the world. Those who run from one situation to the next never touch the world. More importantly, the world never touches them. They sat through the entire symphony of life with their iPods blaring in their ears. And when they leave empty-handed, there won't be any sign that they were ever here. They will have left no footprint. They will have carried their silence with them.

It's easy to dismiss Bradbury's work as Sci-fi filler or just another in a long line of alarmist cautionary tales. But one needs only to look out the window to see a Mechanical Hound. One needs only to turn on the television to see the easily digestible chow that a Mechanical Hound

feeds on. And truth be told, if one cannot find a window or the television, it's likely that any reflective surface will do.

# Personal Essay

# My Story

## April Banuelos

*This paper was nominated by Professor Rae Ann Kumelos.*

One of my favorite sayings is, "What's done is done and nothing can be changed. It's in the past and the past is left behind, but you can change yourself for the best." In my life I have had several occasions where I have found myself in difficult positions and it was hard to figure out what to do. Throughout my childhood I was bullied non-stop, and at first I would ignore it. I wouldn't pay attention to it or talk about it. With time, I started paying more attention to the fact that I was made fun of, or as its known today, the bullying. As I grew up I let it all go. Thankfully, I have learned to mature and accept that I can't change everything at the same time, but I can make a difference one step at a time.

Ever since I can remember I have always been physically different from the rest. I never really fit in with the other little girls because I didn't look like them. The little boys would never pass me the, 'Do you like me?' note. I never had a valentine growing up. I just didn't fit in, period. The childhood of a person can really affect who they will become in the years to come. And if your childhood was a little like mine, then you probably had very low self-esteem. I know this all began when I was about five years old, not being able to fit into the school skirts and having to use bigger girl clothes. Yet, I had the most important thing in the world: a family who loved me no matter what size, shape, or weight I was. I remember as a seven year old going to Edison Elementary School, the first school I would ever attend. Of course I had gone to pre-school but this would be something different. This was the first place where the knowledge given to me would affect my life. It is here where I remember wanting to sit next to my little crush, but would get pushed away. He, of course, would go over to the skinny girl. When it came to recess I was always alone. I was always ignored, neglected, and forgotten. My conflict was not only me versus other kids; it was me against a whole small society that was raised on judging by appearance. The kids that would judge me would not only do it between them but they would do it in public. They would name-call me, push me around, make noises. One thing that I do remember in detail was when I was eight, a fifth grader; the teacher had begun to tell the class that when we got to Middle School we would have to be in a physical education class. So she started training us to what it would be like. Obviously, I wasn't the fastest and I wasn't the most flexible. One day as we were running around our little field, I recall the 'popular pretty girls and boys group' walking close by. I was terrified of passing them because I knew the name-calling would start coming. But I did it anyways. This time I didn't hear any names which was a shocker. Instead, I heard very loud laughter. As I turned around, I saw a boy named Anthony inflate his

face with air and as I took a step, he would pretend that my steps were an earthquake. This was just the climax. I couldn't take it anymore. That day I went home and told my mom. My wonderful mother got furious and insisted on talking to the principal. We did and Mr. Wilcox told us that he couldn't go and punish the whole class. This wasn't good news all. The new nickname for me after that was 'the snitching earthquake'. Just how in "The Ones Who Walk Away From Omelas", the whole city would feed of the sacrifice of only one person, not caring how it made the child felt or that they had to be cruel, I feel as though these children would feed off my suffering and sadness to have a fun time. It all really didn't matter at the end of the day because my parents always wiped my tears and brought my self-esteem back up. The solution for this conflict was when Elementary school ended and I moved cities. This was great because I was to go to a new place with a new beginning and new people. A fresh start, new city, new house, new school. There would be nobody to bring back those horrible experiences. It was what I had been waiting for. What I didn't know is what was to be waiting for me in middle school.

Marshall Middle School was said to be a wonderful new place with many new experiences, but it was a little hard for me getting used to the six classes in one day, and, not to mention, I was the new kid on the block. I came from a different place and these kids had grown up with each other. Still, I kept my faith up that this would be different, I was wrong. Again, I was the ugly duckling. Nobody would talk to me. I would be left alone. I had to figure it all by myself with no one's help. When I figured out the usual routine, I started to really notice the kids. I now noticed that all the girls had boyfriends, they wore make-up. They got fixed up. They were all very close. One day I saw myself in a mirror and noticed, I was still a child. I didn't wear the tight jeans and low cut shirts. I didn't do my make-up, I didn't use purses. I was very different. As I paid more and more attention I noticed the way that I was alone and how everybody would tease me without me noticing. This reminds me of how Andrew Pham in the article, "Viet- Kieu," came to a foreign place and got judged on appearance and name called him just because he wasn't physically like the people from here. When I sat at the front they would say things the kids would say things like, 'Hey, can you move ? Cause I can't see around you.'" This was just the beginning. P.E class was the worst class! The fact that we had to change in front of each other, run with each other just made everything worse. The fact that I had no friends would be one of the many reasons to make fun of me. The only friends that I did have were people like the staff, teachers, custodians, librarian, and the ladies from the front desk. When I was in the cafeteria, that was a bad thing. The way I dressed was a problem for many and of course there was constant name calling. When I began to tell my mom about all of this again she accompanied me to talk to the principal. And this time the principal at the time, Ms. Villa, actually did listen to me and helped me. She pulled aside each and every single one of the people who made fun of me. It turned out that the same girls that would bother me bothered many other people. She

helped me out with a group meeting and she somewhat stopped the abuse. The year after that my sister went to the same school. And I had someone to be with, which was the most amazing thing in my life.

When I graduated from middle school it was the best thing that happened to me. Again, it was to go to a new school and I absolutely loved it. I met new people and I met the people who have been with me through all this time. This was the change of my life. I grew up and I matured quickly. I learned to leave everything behind. The final solution to my endless problem was the fact that I matured and learned how to forget. I left it all behind me and forgave. It was in my past and there was nothing to do about it. I still had classes with the same people, but it didn't bother me at all. I knew after that class I would have my friends waiting for me. My freshman year was one of the most memorable for me. When I would come across someone who tried to put me through the same internal pain, I put a stop to it by finally standing up for myself. My father was so upset by this that he actually gave me advice. He told me that I had to stand up for myself sooner or later, that I couldn't let people step over me my whole entire life. I listened to him with the ear of a child and absorbed everything he was telling me. I knew that he meant if I had to use violence to defend myself I should use it. And so I did. In the classes that I had with the same people, some of the same comments started again. For example, again they would say that they couldn't see around me, and I would respond "If you don't like it, then get up and look because I'm not moving." Simple things like this showed that I had found my limit. I not once missed middle school, and every time I get asked how my experience there was, I say it how it is: not adding or subtracting. Not changing or modifying. I tell the story how it was because at the end of the day, it made me who I am now, a strong independent young woman who is ready to face her future and begin her journey without any fear.

This was a very internal conflict between me and learning how to stand up for myself. I also had to face a society who was against me from the start. Even though the odds were against me, I overcame all of that. I consider myself as an example, that no matter how tough and dark the situation seems, there's always light at the end of the tunnel and we have to keep moving forward. We can look back and reminisce, but we can't live it again. This was a difficult stage of my life and I got over it. Now I have become a better person with myself and with others. Like many people, I'm shy at first and once I open up I show my true colors. Not everything was given to me. I had to learn what courage was, and how to use it. It took time, but when my turn came around to experience the many wonders, like true love and friendship, that is when I learned to really value what I have. This life isn't easy, but we're all in it together and we might as well enjoy it and love it. We can all make a change one step at a time. I'm happily being myself and living life.! <3 ( :

## Narrative: In Bloom

### Daniel Flores

*Daniel Flores is a Bakersfield College student majoring in radiology. He wrote the narrative "In Bloom" for a class assignment given to him by his English B50 instructor, Professor Hubble. Daniel wrote "In Bloom" as a cheerful and sweet story to remind readers of their past when facing Mother Nature's cruel joke. This paper was nominated by Professor Cynthia Hubble.*

I had finished my lunch and approached the exit with the taste of lasagna still in my mouth, haunting my taste buds with the refined hint of garlic. I stepped outside and the smell of tree blossoms and the valley air penetrated my nostrils. Bees buzzed around collecting pollen from the nearby trees and bushes. The sound of children laughing and chatting could be heard in the distance. I approached my group of friends gathered under the cool shade of a bulky young tree.

"What are you guys up to?" I asked. "Nothing just talking", said Agustin. Agustin's face looked different till I looked at the right corner of his forehead. A pimple the size of a pepperoni slice drew my attention; the pus ready to burst out from his skin like an over-filled water balloon. I laughed and pointed at his blemish. "What the hell is that!?" I yelled. He was shocked that I noticed his zit; his hands scramble to cover it with his hair, but his attempts were useless. "Shut up man, you're going to get them too one day," said Agustin. He gently punches my arm and we began to laugh. Elias interrupted our amusement. "Have you guys seen the new girl?" We all shook our heads no. "Is she hot?" I asked. A stupid smile spanning ear to ear appeared on his face "Oh yeah, hotter than your mom." I gave him a shove and asked "Where is she at right now?" before he was able to point her out, the bell rings making everybody disperse like cockroaches in the light.

On my way to my class room I wonder about this girl; I wonder if she is pretty as Elias said. I opened the door to my classroom and the stench of pizza flavored Hot Pockets and stale air bursted through the door as if a smelly ghost just ran past me to freedom. Gray pale walls surrounded me. Math posters covered the windows, small beams of sunlight passed through the cracks of the paper shields. The white board was tainted with math problems of the last class. I took my seat in the back and pondered how the new girl may look while the class filled with my usual classmates.

Mrs. Jeffries, a portly elderly lady with lenses the size of bottle caps and more wrinkles than a raisin, had a tomato sauce stain on her brightly flowered blouse. My thoughts of the new girl still running through my mind transformed Mrs. Jeffries' frog-like voice to a muffled trombone.

A jangling door knob caught everyone's attention as if that noise was able to stop time. All eyes focused on the slowly opening door, light illuminated the door way as a figure stands in this heavenly glow. I asked myself "Can this be her?" The door closed and to my surprise it was. All the boys' jaws dropped as if it were choreographed.

Her hair black as night, skin brown as milky chocolate, eyes deeper than the darkest cave; if heaven was missing an angel this was her. "What's your name?" Mrs. Jeffries asked with her frog voice. "Alexis, I'm the new girl," said the stunning angel with a sweet voice. "Okay, take any empty seat you want" said Mrs. Jeffries. No one sat in the seat next to me in so long it had collected dust and cob webs. Every boy followed her steps hoping she would choose the desk next to him, or the person near him would blow up so she could occupy the chair. Out of all the seats, she chose the one next to me. My heart filled with content, my eyes focused on her every movement. I stared till my eyes left an image of her underneath my eyelids and her perfume filled my nose and expelled the greasy Hot Pocket smell out my nose.

"DANIEL!" I jumped in my seat like a pop corn kernel. My heart no longer filled with content but with fear. "Solve for X," said Mrs. Jeffries. The students turned in their seats to look at the possible train wreck behind them. My heart began to pound in my chest like bongo drums being played by a mad man. My body got warmer; sweat began to drip down my forehead like a frozen popsicle. I studied the problem, but it looked like hieroglyphics written by a weird alien race. I decided to guess "four?" My voice cracked, for the love of god my voice cracked!

I coughed and attempted to respond to the equation once more, "FOUR!" my voice cracked even louder. The class laughed making my humiliation grow even more. I looked to my left, and it shattered my heart; Alexis was laughing at my situation along with the others. The girl who walked in an angel was now a demon in my eyes. The class clown imitated my crackly voice; my face turned redder than a tomato. Mrs. Jeffries glaring stare was burning a hole in my soul with her bottle cap glasses and she said, "No it's ten, you would have known if you weren't so busy giving Alexis googly eyes. Eyes on the board not your neighbor." Oh how I wish I had self-destructed at the moment she called me. The laughter dissipated along with my redness but not my shame.

The bell rang. As I got up, my legs trembled like a baby calf from such awkwardness. I went to biology class and soaked in a pool of my own sorrow. I answered no questions and stayed quiet. I refused to use my voice for the rest of the day to avoid any bodily malfunctions. The bell rang bringing relief that I could go home to my mom and bed. I headed towards the giant Twinkie with wheels and windows. As I enter, the children were crammed like sardines in a can and eager to go home. The conductor struggled to calm everybody's anticipation to be taken

home. Paper balls flew across like artillery shells hitting innocent bystanders. Two chubby kids press me against the pane of glass flattening my face like a flapjack. My eyes catch Alexis standing near a blossoming tree as a gentle breeze moves her hair. The door squeaks shut and my eyes still focused on her; her image getting smaller and distant.

# Losing Grace

## Anonymous

*This paper submitted by Professor Rae Ann Kumelos from her ENGL B50 class. The student has asked to remain anonymous at this time.*

“Why did she have to say goodbye?” This is a lyric I wrote to a well-known song after we lost our unborn baby of twelve to thirteen weeks. When we lose a loved one through death, especially unexpectedly, it often stirs up the question, why did they die? Why now? Why them? Or in my case; why her? Being a strong believer in Jesus of the Christian faith and miracles, and believing God had shown us we were going to have a baby girl, made this even harder to take. Why would God give us a gift and then take her away?

Grace was always her name. Years before we even tried for children, my wife and I had already named her. When we talked about having children, my wife and I would talk about little Grace. As I am sometimes forgetful and known for misplacing things, my wife would tease, “Will you be the same with little Grace?” Then she would pretend to be me and say, “Now where did I leave Grace?” So when my wife had a picture, or vision as some might call it, of a little girl being absorbed into her belly in a church meeting and then a week later found out she was pregnant, we just knew it was Grace. She was on her way!

But then everything changed in a moment. After a visit to the hospital we found that our baby’s heart wasn’t beating. Now as supernatural believing Christians our response was not that of grief at first, yes there were some tears, but we knew our God healed and did miracles. We had witnessed some and heard many reliable testimonies of people being healed. Some testimonies were of babies who had died in or out of the womb, but through a prayer of faith had come back. Now our doctor was also a believer and knowing our stance on the situation gave us a week to pray for a miracle. So we prayed. We held on to promises and people’s prayers and believed for the impossible. But sadly it didn’t happen, and on a grey cloudy day in December, there was no longer any more hope, as Grace had to be delivered. She wasn’t coming back.

Why? This is what my wife and I wrestled with and in some ways still are. Why couldn’t we have a miracle like others had? Yet it was nothing new under the sun. We hear and see it all the time. One person is healed while another isn’t. Two people in a car crash and one dies while the other lives. And why did my wife have that picture of a little girl just before we found out she was pregnant? What did this all mean? How do we make sense of it all? Had God given us a gift

and now decided to take her back? This is all hard to understand. Just as this tragedy has come to many others, it now came to us.

To be truthful, I am not sure what to think. Did God decide to take her back to himself or was something else going on? But the question still remains, why did God not answer our prayers? For this I could choose to be mad at God. I understand bad things sometimes happen, but why didn't she come back when we prayed? It's at this point I find I have two choices. I could choose anger and bitterness towards my maker, or I can decide that God is good and had no evil part in this.

The way I have come to know God is that He is as real as you and me. I see him all around us, and here I can somewhat relate to the author, Jane Goodall, as she writes about her time in the Forest of Gombe observing chimpanzees. Goodall describes how she became "lost in the awe and beauty around her" (qtd. in Ford, 84). She talks of a spiritual power she felt in the forest that was so real to her. When I observe or watch anything in the natural world I often feel that same awe, a divine power at work and on display. So the question, is God real, is already decided. What remains is my conflict. The conflict comes in the form of questions which arise within me. "Can I trust God to be good? Can I trust in prayer again?" Living life with these conflicts, left unresolved, would have me going back and to between faith and doubt, like a ship lost at sea in a storm, tossed to and fro by the wind of every circumstance that comes my way. A life I wish not to live.

Now did God take her, was it the devil, or was it just a result of an imperfect world? If God took her then surely it was for good. Wasn't it? But then why be pregnant at all? Can the same God that made people with the ability to love, laugh and experience pleasure also take a loved one's baby from them before they set eyes on her? If this is so, it would appear cruel. It certainly is tempting to think that way when it seems everyone you know is having babies or expecting. You want to feel happy for them and share their joy, but instead it just reminds you of what you lost and the hole in your heart. If it was the devil or an accident, why did God allow it? Did God create this evil or was it born, born in the heart of something once good? Or, have goodness and evil always coexisted, to be locked in battle till the end of time?

However if God isn't good, what hope is there for this world where evil is evident in every nation? For me to believe that God isn't good is to travel down a dark road. All that we love and is good in this world is because of Him. Could it be that it's the goodness of God and those who share in his goodness is what stops evil from engulfing the Earth? When we look at a great painting we praise the painting and the painter. For me it is the same with nature. When I look at it I can't help but marvel and I have to praise its creator.

Hence, though we have to accept bad and evil things happen here in this world, I can't contribute them to God. So I have to eliminate any sinister act on his part in my situation. Isn't this then just a matter of faith, just a choice to believe in God no matter what? In short, yes. For me to reject God because of what happened would be like divorcing my wife because something happened in my life I didn't understand, even though she might have nothing to do with it. But it is more than that. My faith also helps me deal with my conflict. I can relate to Ursula Le Guin, in her story "The Ones Who Walk Away From Omelas." She alludes to our world in contrast to the utopia world she has created. In this, she conflicts two ways many people look at life. In our world, she explains, "happiness as something rather stupid. Only pain is intellectual, only evil is interesting." How true, how often do the media focus on the bad news going on in the world, and people focus on the bad things in others and society. I like what Le Guin says shortly after, "But to praise despair is to condemn delight, to embrace violence is to lose hold of everything else." I can relate to this. When we focus on the negatives, like our despair and pain, we forget how to be happy and at peace. This is how my faith helps me. The apostle Paul writes, "Rejoice in the Lord always...Do not be anxious about anything, but in every situation, by prayer and with thanksgiving, present your requests to God. And the peace of God that transcends all understanding will guard your hearts and your minds...." (NIV, Phil. 4. 5, 7). After telling us what not to dwell on, things that would lead to anxiety and distress, he then tells us what to dwell on instead, whatever is noble, pure, right, excellent or praise worthy.

These verses reveal how I somewhat come to terms and overcome my conflict. I can't embrace evil as part of God or His will. I can't stay anxious and focus on my despair. This verse that Paul wrote reminds me to meditate on whatever is noble, whatever is right, whatever is pure, whatever is excellent or praiseworthy. This can be a healing, empowering, and a very proactive exercise. Sometimes you have to get out, get alone, and/or get away from what pulls you back. This verse again reminds me of the experience Jane Goodall wrote about when she was in the Forests of Gombe observing chimpanzees. Goodall, far away from the hustle and bustle of life, seeks healing after the loss of her husband. She writes, "I was grieving, suffering, and angry. Angry at God, at fate-the unjustness of it all" (qtd. Ford, 82). She would observe the chimpanzees for hours, all to the beautiful back drop of mountains and trees, watching the changing sky; looking on what is excellent, pure and praiseworthy. She finds a source of strength from which she could draw when life seemed harsh, ugly or desperate. Here, she experiences "the peace that passeth understanding" (qtd. Ford, 87). Similarly, I find my peace in God when I look upon His goodness.

Finally, I have to tell how I was prompted to remember, by Jane Goodall, of the phenomenon that good can often come from tragedy, like a phoenix rising from the ashes. Goodall tells a story in an appearance on "The Daily Show" of Oscar, a baby chimpanzee that is orphaned in

tragic circumstances. If that wasn't bad enough, he is also rejected by all the other mothers nursing their infants. This would usually spell the end for the little chimp, yet for an unexpected intervention from the leader of the chimpanzee family, Freddy. Freddy remarkably does something very rarely seen in the chimp world and takes Oscar as his own. He is so into looking after Oscar, he forgets his responsibilities as leader. I have heard of similar stories, of good coming out of tragedy. So in this there is hope, maybe even good can come from my own heartbreak.

Well, we said goodbye to our baby girl and buried her near her Papa. We grieve our loss but take comfort in knowing that she is in a real place with the Creator. Even though she didn't come back to us, we believe one day we will go to be with her. But as life goes on here, I begin to work through my conflict. I have reconciled that God is still good and from that foundation I can move forward. In Him I still trust, but I still have my questions, my whys, like the meaning of my wife's vision. Why some prayers are answered and some are not. Maybe one day I will get some answers, but for now I realize I don't know and understand everything, there is only One who does.

## Works Cited

Ford, Marjorie. *Dreams and Inward Journeys: A Rhetoric and Reader for Writers*, Eighth Edition. New Jersey: Pearson Education, Inc., 2012. Print.

# Never Settle

**Sarah Dase**

*This paper was nominated by Professor Brad Stiles.*

When I was just a teenager, maybe 15 years old, my mother said to me, "Never settle." I was an extremely inquisitive child growing up, more than most and definitely more than my three siblings. My mother did her best to answer all of my questions, but some she just did not have the answers to. How do you know if God exists? What happens after you die? Her inability to answer these difficult questions didn't stop me from asking them. On this particular day she politely changed the subject and began to tell me about a few of her travels.

When my mother, Julie, graduated from high school, she did what her parents expected of her and went to college. After completing a little over two years at California Polytechnic State University, also known as Cal Poly, she made the decision to go a different direction with her life. Undecided in what to major in, she dropped out of college to seek adventure in the unknown. After a brief stay in San Francisco, she found herself moving overseas. First she lived in Copenhagen, Denmark and then she moved to The Canaries, a small cluster of Spanish islands located just off the African coast south of Spain. I was amazed. My mother picked up everything to move to a country where she knew no one? That couldn't be possible; not my mother. She was busying raising four children on her own while working full-time. I began to interrogate her. How long did you live there? What was it like? What did you do while you were there? Is that where you met my father? As I rattled off questions, she answered all of them, ending with these two little words, "Never settle."

I have tried to get those two words out of my head over the last 20 years, but have been unsuccessful. They are a part of me. They are words that I have lived by for so long, that forgetting them would be like losing an arm or leg. I could manage to survive without them, but would never feel complete again. After that conversation and upon graduating high school all I could think about was exploring the world around me, but at the time I didn't have the means to do so. I had no driver's license, no job and no money. Traveling overseas was unattainable at the moment, so instead I decided to set a smaller goal for myself and move out of town.

I headed north to San Jose with my friend, Kristie, to attend college and failed miserably. I had no job, which meant I had no means of supporting myself and I had to depend on my friend to drive me to and from school. I was eighteen, thought I knew everything and in reality I had no clue what it took to survive on my own. Defeated, I returned home, tail between my legs with the intention of trying again. Completely focused and determined to succeed, I found a job,

earned my driver's license and saved enough money until I was able to purchase a car. Finally, freedom! I moved out of my mothers' house and into my own place. It was just a room I rented in a three bedroom house nicely situated on the lake, but it was my room. I paid the rent and a portion of the utilities. I embraced my new found independence by having friends over for barbecues in the backyard and to watch football games on lazy Sunday afternoons. I was even finally able to have my boyfriend spend the night in my room. I was becoming a responsible member of society and beginning to feel like an actual adult. Sadly, it was not enough to satisfy me. I became bored. I felt that I was settling. I needed adventure and different surroundings. It was at that moment I decided to plot my escape to San Diego.

After three years, I felt that I had gained enough work experience and saved enough money to leave San Luis Obispo, the small town where I had spent a majority of my life. I guess it would be safe to say that the relationship with my boyfriend was a serious one. I always knew he wouldn't make the journey out of town with me. Although sad, a part of me was happy that he decided to stay. I had already made the choice in my mind to leave with or without him. I was moving to the big city and didn't need a constant reminder of the small town that I came from lurking around me. No matter how in love we were, there was no way I was going to settle with my first serious boyfriend. I asked myself, was there another individual out there for me with similar thoughts and aspirations? So, I said my goodbyes and left. *C'est la vie!*

As the years continued to pass, I had opportunities to visit many states such as Texas, Missouri, Oklahoma, Illinois, and New York. Living in close proximity to the border of Mexico also afforded me the opportunity to escape city life for the beautiful beaches of Ensenada and Cabo San Lucas. I even made it as far as Jamaica, but only for a week. I enjoyed communing with locals and trying to assimilate into their culture. The more trips I made out of town, the more I realized that I would be settling if I stayed in San Diego. I had already explored every nook and cranny of this city and was bored yet again. I sought more adventure and needed new surroundings to explore.

Of course during this time I found myself in another relationship and this time he wanted it all; marriage, kids and a mortgage. I felt trapped. I felt the onset of claustrophobia nearing every time he approached me to discuss our future. Those two words, never settle were the stock symbol on the S&P 500 index, which ran on the ticker screen in my head. I didn't want the stock to crash ultimately disappointing my mother. She wanted the wealth of life experience for me that travel would bring. In her eyes, I could not attain that living state side.

I began to notice a pattern in the types of relationships I chose to be in. They were all locals from the cities I resided. They served as tour guides, companions navigating me through the

city. These men would never leave the safety of their town, their family and their friends. They were content staying right where they began, never trying anything new. I was their adventure. I was an out-of-towner, with a new face amidst a sea of familiar ones. Sure they would amuse me from time to time and join me out of town for a few days, but I could see that all they wanted was to be home again. Familiarity has a funny way of breeding content. They longed to be back in the comfort of their conventional milieus. I on the other hand never wanted to return, but I always did. Maybe I chose these types of men because I was scared to leave for good. I failed once before and I did not want to fail again. Maybe I used them as an excuse to stay local and not leave the safety of the United States.

I do not see myself as a victim of the words, "Never settle." To me, they are my hero and source of inspiration. They push me to strive for my long term goal of living overseas. These words are with me always, encouraging me, a constant reminder of where I am heading. They rescued me and gave me courage to leave my small town. At times, I wonder if these words could possibly be my enemy. Could they be responsible for destroying past relationships and causing the occasional regret about those relationships that I feel? Today, the memory of my mother's words again leads me to a new city, Bakersfield, where I start the process all over. As I settle into a new job and new school I begin to familiarize myself with the people and culture of life here. I have made a few new friends and am also in a new relationship with a local guy.

The memory of my mother's stories about her travels and hearing her speak the words, "Never settle" have greatly influenced the way I make decisions in my life. They give me encouragement today to finish school and obtain a job which will all me the chance to move off this continent and on to another that I may explore. New surroundings feed my creativity and breathe life into my existence. The memory is my north star guiding me through my life choices.

I find humor in that fact that I've allowed these two words to have such control over my life. Some might see me as helpless "victim" of this memory, but I choose to think the opposite. I have set goals for myself and will continue to work hard towards them. I now realize what she meant when she said those two words to me. It is the journey of life and the effort of trying. At times it will be challenging, but if I don't take a chance then in theory I have settled. I have given up. I will never allow that to happen to me. I will never settle.

# Art

# Monet's Waterlilies

## Shelby Steele

*Shelby Steele is a 27 year old single mother who has been a Bakersfield College student since 2005, pursuing two majors in Art and Psychology. She is currently working to finish her general education so she can transfer to a University. She expects to receive a liberal arts degree from Bakersfield College after completion of the Fall semester. This piece was done as an assignment in Professor Nancy Magner's Art Appreciation class.*

View more of Shelby's work at her blog: [www.goodstewardship.weebly.com](http://www.goodstewardship.weebly.com).

Title: Monet's Waterlilies (Study)

Media: Mixed Media (collage, ribbon, cotton fabric, acrylic)

Size: 10" x 12"

Year: 2012



# **Politics and Social Comment**

# A Replacement for Unethical Animal Circuses

**Jayleen Sanchez**

*This paper was nominated by Professor Rebecca Monks.*

Almost every American has been to the circus at some point in his or her life. They are full of lights, music, excitement, and laughter. During a circus show acrobats fly in the air, clowns act out comic skits, humans show off amazing and unusual talents, and most of all wild animals march around and perform tricks. The main reason Americans go to circuses is because they want to leave the repetitiveness of their daily life and experience something extraordinary. At first glance, circuses appear to be friendly and fun, but on closer inspection they are very demanding and disrespectful of animals. In discussion of circus animals, one controversial issue has been whether it is moral to capture wild animals and train them to perform. On the one hand, circus owners argue that the animals are able to exercise natural behavior and are not treated with cruelty. On the other hand, scientists and animal lovers contend that animals have a wide range of emotions and are smart enough to want liberty. Others even maintain that all animals should be freed from captivity, even those that are kept as personal pets. Circuses are great ways to entertain and fascinate the human mind; however, entertainment should not come at the cost of an animal's happiness. Animal circuses are unethical and should be converted into all human circuses because they violate the animal's happiness, force animals to perform unnatural acts, and can result in fatal escapes. Enough research has been conducted to make it impossible to successfully justify the surrender of animals to circuses.

Circuses have been a thriving form of entertainment for many generations. In her book, *The Circus Age: Culture and Society Under the American Big Top*, Janet M. Davis points out that circuses have evolved a great amount as the years have passed. Forms of circuses existed in ancient India, China, Mexico, Russia, Eastern Europe, and Southeast Asia; in ancient Rome they consisted of gory gladiator brawls and chariot races (Davis xii). Circuses were also present in the United States even before the revolution had taken place, although they consisted mostly of individual acrobats, clowns, and animal trainers who displayed their talents at small venues (Davis 15). According to Ted Friend, as he states in the *Encyclopedia of Animal Rights and Animal Welfare* circuses first started to travel in the late 1860s, and by the 1920s, they had a major increase in size and animals (107). As a result, wild animal trade into the USA began to flourish. The first tricks that circuses trained animals to do were simple and safe. Nigel Rothfels talks about one elephant in specific, named Opal, in his article "Why Look at Elephants" in the *worldviews* journal. Opal, a Ringling show elephant, was trained to stand on one leg in the 1940s and everyone was amazed at how she defied gravity (Rothfels 166). Now however simple

tricks such as standing on one foot are now seen as ordinary, and animals have been pushed to perform tricks that are more and more complex. Standing on one foot has become an addition to other tricks that serves to make them more extreme. Rothfels describes a trick where two pyramids of three elephants make a bridge over a seventh elephant that walks between them on her hind legs (168). Many individuals believe that these kinds of acts have crossed a line and have “stopped being the kind of elephants people wanted to see” (Rothfels 168). Animal lovers become uncomfortable when they see wild animals performing extreme tricks that cross over the line from being entertaining to being outrageous.

Animal trainers would certainly take issue with the argument that an animals’ happiness is violated when they are forced to perform. Many believe that animals do not have the capacity to feel emotions such as sadness and compassion. One common assumption is that since animals cannot do all the things humans can, such as speak, then they are not very smart and do not feel emotions the way humans do. Studies have shown that animals might feel more emotions than humans have been willing to accept. In his book *Wild Minds: What Animals Really Think*, Professor Marc D. Hauser gives insight into the animal mind. As an example, Hauser talks about how Psychologist Robert Miller and his colleagues ran an experiment where a rhesus monkey was given control of two strings. When pulled, one string would release food for the monkey, and the second string would generate a shock to a second monkey that was visible by the first monkey. Most of the monkeys tested showed a significant drop in the number of times they pulled the string that delivered the shock. One monkey starved himself for five days and another for twelve days by not pulling either one of the strings after witnessing the other monkey being shocked. The most astonishing discovery from this experiment was that some monkeys were willing to stop eating to avoid injury to another monkey. Also monkeys that knew each other showed more altruistic behavior than monkeys that were strangers. It was concluded that perhaps the monkeys felt empathy or compassion towards one another (qtd. in Hauser 222-23). It can also be understood from Robert Millers’ experiment that animals feel and understand pain. They are able to recognize pain that another animal is experiencing. Although we cannot know for sure if animals feel empathy and compassion because they cannot talk, experiments like these present a problem when stating that animals do not feel emotions. If Professor Marc D. Hauser is right that animals have complex mental processes and emotions, as he appears to be, then we need to reassess the popular assumption that animals are inferior and do not understand the most basic ideas. There have been no experiments proving that animals do not have emotions and people should not just assume that they do not. After all, Americans have taken pride in providing the benefit of the doubt to people accused of a crime for a long time. If we can give that courtesy to humans, why can we not give it to animals also? At least if circuses provide only all human shows, any pain or suffering experienced by the

performers will be easily noticed and performers can use their rights to stop any anguish they may experience.

Another argument that animal circuses present is whether animals are able to express their natural behaviors in modern circuses and if it is unhealthy for them not to be able to. Friend explains that elephants in a traditional traveling circus “spend 2 to 4 hours per day in a trailer while being transported 30 to 150 miles to a new lot” and are kept in a picket line where elephants spend 50% to 80% of their day with two legs chained up and enough room to move one step forward or backwards (107 - 8). Although conditions in many more modern circuses have improved over the years, they still do not compare to the natural habitat of wild animals. In the wild, animals spend most of their day searching for food, not in a trailer or cage waiting for their act to begin. Americans today tend to believe that wild animals live healthy lives under confinement. Many will even go as far as to argue that these behaviors are not necessary for animals since they are fed and taken care of but studies have shown that animals will go to great lengths, sometimes even getting hurt or killed, to be able to exercise their natural behaviors.

Ethologist Marian Dawkins and her colleagues conducted an experiment to prove that hens needed wood lining on their cages because it was their natural behavior to scratch on it. Dawkins created an enclosure with two compartments. On one side there was wood, and on the other there was not. The hens immediately went to the compartment with wood. She then added a door that was difficult to open between the compartments and placed the hens where there was no wood. As a result the hens worked hard and some injured themselves in the process of opening the door to get to the other side (qtd. in Hauser 223 -24). It has been proven that animals will work hard to “obtain more space or to gain opportunities to interact socially with members of their species” (Hauser 224). Dawkins’ experiment can be used to show that even if animals in circuses are healthy and well fed, they will still work hard to escape in hopes of acting out their natural behaviors. In the wild animals often come across members of their species and socialize by mating or playing or fighting. Circuses do not provide much social interaction for the animals other than other circus animals. If animals were content with living out their life as circus performers they would not have to be chained or caged in and they would not attempt to escape so often.

In regard to the question of whether animals have an interest in liberty, some people compare animals’ desires to those of marginal humans, such as the mentally disabled, who do not possess the same autonomy as other humans. In his article, “In Defense of Animal Sentience: A Critique of Chochrane’s Liberty Thesis,” Robert Garner mentions that ultimately it is believed that both do not have a natural interest in liberty (Garner 177). Yet it would be ridiculous to try to

convince people that it would be alright to enslave those marginal humans the way that circus animals have been. It would be ridiculous because it would be morally wrong to mistreat mentally ill humans. Even if they don't show a natural interest in liberty, both marginal humans and animals could benefit from independence. Humans have a long history of mistreating and enslaving groups of people that they feel superior to. They do the same thing with animals. In his book *Ringlingville USA: The Stupendous Story of Seven Siblings and Their Stunning Circus Success*, historian Jerry Apps mentions that twenty three zebras were shipped from Africa to the Ringling Brother Circus and that "seven of the animals arrived dead, leaving a total of sixteen to add to the four the Ringlings already owned" (170). Although he does not say so directly, it seems that animals being shipped overseas and dying along the way is a usual occurrence by the way that he casually says it and does not give it much importance.

Many people are concerned about what would happen to the wild animals that are already part of the circus system if circuses are turned into all human shows. Dr. Brij Kishor Gupta, evaluation and monitoring officer at Central Zoo Authority (CZA) and his fellow scientist, Bipul Chakraborty, state that in India in 1998, the Honorable Supreme Court passed a ban on the use of lions, tigers, leopards, bears, and monkeys: "The ban was imposed because wild animals were subjected to unnecessary pain caused during performance in circuses, lifelong imprisonment in small cages, and the stress to which they were subjected during transport from one place to another" (287). As a result of the ban the CZA was given the task of rehabilitating the animals. Zoo rehabilitation of circus animals would be a great idea in the USA because zoos already have a lot of experience with taking care of the needs of wild animals and it would not cost as much money as creating private rehabilitation centers. Also the animals would have a more stress-free life and more room to walk around. It is true that many of the current animals in circuses will probably never be able to be released back into the wild because they have become dependent of humans for food and shelter. Many will argue that there is no point in taking them out of the circus when it is all that they know. Still, removing animals from the circus could prevent future wild animals from being captured and becoming dependent; it could break the cycle.

Many animal trainers claim to maintain close loving relationships with the animals that they work with. However sanctuaries and rehabilitation areas, such as in the zoos in India, have had to be created to care for performance animals that are very often sold because they are too old or injured to continue to perform. If the circus staff shares such a close bond with the animals then it does not make sense that they would get rid of them once they cannot produce profits anymore. The least they would do was to make sure they went to a safe comfortable place instead of having other individuals and organizations work to create a safe haven for them. While it is true that domesticated pets usually enjoy human company as much as humans enjoy

theirs, it does not necessarily follow that captive wild animal performers enjoy being around people also. Some circus animal trainers really do bond with the animals they train but it is not always the case. Even if there was affection between the trainer and the animal, the animal would still have been better off being left alone in the wild where it would have lived out its life with members of its own species.

Many Americans would oppose animals being removed from circuses because it is believed that without animals the circus will no longer be fun. A great example of why this belief is incorrect is the success of many Cirque du Soleil shows. They have been so successful in the United States that people are willing to pay a lot of money to see them. In his article "Cirque Dreams Big", Steve Friess says that people pay "anywhere from \$50 to \$195 a seat for a postmodern circus that feels more like a gymnastics show performed to haunting live music" (n.pag.). Many are held in Las Vegas which calls itself the entertainment capital of the world. The Cirque du Soleil has only human performers and entertains by telling a story in a theatrical play type of approach. Cirque du Soleil is "one of the biggest brands in entertainment since Disney" and has been "tripping out audiences of all ages with geewhiz acrobatics and rainbow-colored whimsy" for nearly 20 years (Friess n.pag.). A great deal of work and commitment is put into creating Cirque du Solei shows and it can be seen in the end product.

Another good thing about the Cirque du Soleil is that it can also be considered much safer than an animal circus. Animals are often very unpredictable and strong. They can easily be startled or frightened, and a frightened animal will run or attack if it feels threatened. The animals can also be more stressed and easily frightened because they are kept in close relation to other animal species that they feel threatened by. Apps notes some incidents recorded by the Ringling brothers' circus claim adjuster in 1911 included: "Lady's arm broken," and "Horse frightened by elephant. Lady thrown out, but nothing serious" (171). He also states that more serious accidents did occur and that damage to property or injury was usual in the circus (Apps 171). Animal circuses can quickly become very dangerous if anything goes wrong. Animals have been able to escape in the past and it often ends in the animal being chased down and killed. In human circuses there is less chance of a severe injury; acrobats do not need to worry about getting stepped on by elephants or bitten by tigers.

Human circuses are great alternatives to animal circuses. Although circuses will lose the wild animals that would lure people to them, they would gain shows that do not keep animals from being happy and are safer for the performers and audience. The cessation of the capture of wild animals for our entertainment is important because disrespecting animals teaches people that it is alright to feel superior to other living things and control them. Ultimately, what is at stake here is the ethics that are being passed down to other generations. It should not be

alright to deprive animals of a happy life just because it is entertaining to watch them do tricks. There is enough evidence to put into doubt the ethics of circuses when you consider all the emotions and thoughts that animals are able to experience. Wild animals do not enjoy performing in circuses because it increases their stress, keeps them from exercising their natural behaviors and separates them from other members of the same species while forcing them to perform outrageous tricks for the entertainment of humans.

## Works Cited

- Apps, Jerold W. *Ringling USA: The Stupendous Story of Seven Siblings and Their Stunning Circus Success*. Madison: Wisconsin Historical Society P, 2005. Print.
- Davis, Janet M. *The Circus Age: Culture and Society Under the American Big Top*. U of North Carolina P: Chapel Hill & London, 2002. Print.
- Friend, Ted. "Circuses and Circus Elephants." *Encyclopedia of Animal Rights and Animal Welfare*. Ed. Bekoff, Marc. Westport: Greenwood P, 1998. Print.
- Friess, Steve, "Cirque' Dreams Big." *Newsweek* 142.2 (2003): 42 - 44. *Academic Search Premier*. EBSCO. Web. 7 Nov. 2012.
- Garner, Robert. "In Defence of Animal Sentience: A Critique of Cochrane's Liberty Thesis." *Political Studies* 59.1 (2011): 175 - 87. *Academic Search Premier*. EBSCO. Web. 30 Oct. 2012.
- Gupta, Brij Kishor, and Bipul Chakraborty. "The Role of Zoos in the Rehabilitation of Animals in the Circus." *Journal of Applied Animal Welfare Science* 8.4 (2005): 285 -94. *Academic Search Premier*. EBSCO. Web. 29 Oct. 2012.
- Hauser, Marc D. *Wild Minds: What Animals Really Think*. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 2000. Print.
- Rothfels, Nigel. "Why look at Elephants?" *Worldviews* 9.2 (2005): 166-83. EBSCOhost. Web. 1 Oct. 2012.

# The Power of the Word "Can't"

**Joey Sharette**

*This paper was nominated by Professor Ann Tatum.*

What does it mean to be imprisoned or trapped? There are many deep meanings to these words, as well as straightforward definitions. Whether it is a deeper meaning or straightforward definition, one common theme is the word, "can't." This word can bring about challenges and limitations so that if we believe too deeply, it changes the types of decisions we make and emotions we feel. This change can be for the better, but most commonly it brings us down to a level we don't want to be. When we are at this level, we develop the feeling of being trapped or even imprisoned either in our own mind or literally, and we feel we *can't* escape its grasp. Only when we realize that we *can* rise above this, can we realize our full potential.

I have persevered through my fair share of battles with can't, but the victories did not come easy. Jimmy Baca said in *A Place to Stand*, "the bars weren't there to keep us in so much as to remind us that we weren't really wanted anywhere else" (20). These words really spoke to me, and reminded me of when I had put up my own mental bars to tell myself no one wanted me. I had convinced myself that no one wanted to hear what I had to say that I just stayed quiet. I essentially kept myself imprisoned from the rest of the world for fear that I would not be accepted. My reasoning for this fear was that I was simply not smart enough to articulate any subjects well enough to take part in any discussions. All of this began to change when I discovered my love for physics, and this opened me up to the fascinating world of subjective definitions. Suddenly I began questioning my environment, my attitude, and my reasons for keeping myself imprisoned for so long. Furthermore, I began to feel like I could take part in meaningful conversations without fear of being looked down upon. Only when I met with my current girlfriend was I able to make my killing blow at *can't*.

The challenges we face force us to go in two directions: one a path of overcoming, and the other of submission. The story of my girlfriend is one of overcoming challenges, one where she didn't meet her father until the age of 22, her mother left her to be raised by her grandma, and she struggled with poverty. What fascinates me the most about her story is that she never let it stop her from accomplishing what she wanted. Her challenges with being poor did not stop her from going to CSUB and getting her BA degree in sociology, and she is now working on her masters in social work. I admired her passion for doing what it takes to accomplish her goals. However, overcoming these challenges is not the easiest thing to do. She often worried about not finding a scholarship or the means to pay for school; still she persisted in her journey

towards her goal. Witnessing this first hand is what helped deal that final blow to can't for me. In my eyes, if she could overcome the difficulties of life, then so could I and anyone else with a goal.

The path of submission can bring you down to levels you would never want to go. This is where Jimmy Baca faced his challenges but ultimately caved in to apathy. Jimmy talked about his first experience outside of jail: "To get us the hell out of the dump as quickly as we could, I called Tecolote and set up a deal. It wasn't like we were going to be big dealers or anything, it was a temporary but convenient jump start, to help us get on our feet" (57). It is true that the situation was not ideal, but Jimmy decided to head down an easy path that was "convenient." Jimmy had goals that he wanted to accomplish, but his decision to sell drugs or beat up people in prison kept him from it. Feeling like you can't overcome the challenges of life after making so many bad decisions only reinforces the power of *can't*. Once Jimmy caved into this power, he had to try harder to overcome. We like to think that this is a difficult thing to do, but sometimes it is as easy finding a passion you didn't know you had; for Jimmy it was poetry. Malcolm X also found his path to overcoming while in prison through reading and educating himself with unrelenting passion. Malcolm X stated in "Learning to Read," "As I see it today, the ability to read awake inside me some long dormant craving to be mentally alive" (217). Overcoming our past of bad decisions provides a great example to those who struggle to find their way through blinding power of *can't*.

This battle of *can't* is such a common theme in sources like the media and general word of mouth. I watch these weight loss commercials that say you *can't* do it any other way, you *can't* diet successfully. This is just foolish; every diet is a sacrifice of our daily routine. It is an all-in effort. The problem comes from the sense of apathy in us all; once we realize how difficult the path is before us, we break down. Jimmy chose the easy path because the path he saw before him was much more difficult than he thought he could handle. People underestimate the power of mindset; without the proper mindset it is hard to accomplish our goals. If we had even just one tiny bit of belief that we can do it; we can bring down the walls that imprison us. I, at times, helped my girlfriend with doubts that she had about her goal to become a social worker. At the end of the day it was really just to help reinforce her mindset that she can do it and the challenges were not as big a deal as they seemed. This mindset translates to flames of a desire to reach that goal we set for ourselves. This burning desire to push ourselves to the end helps propel us through our periods of doubts and second guessing. Malcolm X lacked the ability to speak proper English and this bothered him to the point that he drove himself to learn. This desire is what some of us lack in our will to overcome our entrapment of *can't*; someone may have told you, "you can't" but it is really you who keeps you from accomplishing that goal.

All of this brings me to believe the opposite of the saying, "Bad environments breed bad people." There is no denying that people face challenges and give in, but it does not mean that it isn't a lesson for them to learn in the future. The path of apathy and submission is a life of lessons and learning the hard way; subsequently, can be very beneficial by providing a list of things not to do. We all grow up in unfortunate conditions, but it is all just perspective and is relative to those around us. I believe the childhood of my girlfriend was unfortunate, but she has achieved many things since then. This achievement after a hard past comes from a great desire to be more than what our past wants to define us as. Malcolm X felt this desire to achieve more than he had in the streets; he found the person he wanted to become, through the image of a fellow prison mate, Bimbi. Jimmy Baca felt that once he found language, to him, "[was] what water is to a man that just crossed the desert" (563). It is only when we overcome our past that can we look back on it without the mindset of a victim. If we still believe that we are victims, then it is still just one more hurdle for us to cross on our path to accomplishment. Ultimately, the power of can, can overcome that victimization of *can't*.

## Works Cited

Baca, Jimmy Santiago. *A Place to Stand*. New York: Grove Press, 2001. Print.

Farnsworth, Elizabeth. "Interview with Jimmy Baca." *The Writer's World: Reading Strategies and Selections*. Ed. Lynne Gaetz, and Suneeti Phadke. Upper Saddle River: Pearson, 2006. 562-563. Print.

X, Malcolm. "Learning to Read." *Rereading America: Cultural Contexts for Critical Thinking and Writing*. Ed. Gary Colombo, Robert Cullen, and Bonnie Lisle. Boston: Bedford/St. Martins, 2010. 210-218. Print.

# Don't Eat That!

## Johnna Sprayberry

*This paper was nominated by Professor Ann Tatum.*

Imagine a world where the terms “malnourished” or “going hungry” were foreign to our ears, a world where starvation did not claim millions of lives each year, and all thanks to genetically modified (GM) foods which would be abundant and easily attainable regardless of a person’s geographical location. No one would be without. Now picture the future, and years after world hunger has been resolved. Unfortunately, the skyrocketing and uncontrollable death rate of countless people is the haunting epidemic now plaguing the once starving people whose bodies are consumed by cancerous disease. Proponents of GM food assert such foods are in fact safe and a realistic and moral solution for world hunger, in addition to their playing an essential role in our environment’s future. They claim the benefits of GM food offer improvements over the existing food supply which outweigh any unfounded hazards, and as such their use should be applauded. However, such beneficial claims are coupled with just as many, if not more, controversial issues ranging from evidence that proves human, animal, and environmental health hazards exist to ethical and social questions. Until the controversial concerns surrounding GM foods are addressed and remedied, the consumer availability of GM products should be suspended until further long term studies have been completed.

In order to understand what GM food is, one needs be familiar with genetically modified organisms (GMOs) which are a necessary component of GM food. The U.S. Department of Energy Genome Program’s Biological and Environmental Research Information System (BERIS) published the article “What Are Genetically Modified Foods?” It explains the scientific method behind gene modification which is the process of creating a new genetic combination. It involves the introduction of foreign DNA or artificial genes into a living thing, such as a plant, animal or bacteria, and thereby modifying the living organism’s hereditary properties; its DNA. Technically, this process is considered “biotechnology,” but it is often interchanged with the term “genetic modification” or “GM” (United States). Charles Arntzen, Susan Pitman, and Katherine Thrasher are biochemists and authors of the article “Biotechnology,” which explains how gene modification can permit food crops to be grown faster, have added nutritional value, look and taste more appealing, or have built in resistance to herbicides and pests: essentially it “is the practice of directing genetic changes in organisms that produce food in order to make a better product” (207). The use of GMOs has resulted in the development of two types of GM crops: those that are resistant or tolerant to application(s) of herbicides, and those that are engineered to produce their own toxins to fight off pests (*Genetic Roulette*).

The 1994 unveiling of the first GM food in the U.S. was the “Flavr Savr” tomato, developed and produced by the Monsanto Agricultural Company. The process of modifying the tomato seed permitted the tomato to remain firmer on the vine while ripening, and with the premise it would be easier to transport and have an extended shelf life (Morin 334). Since the introduction of the Flavr Savr, GM crop production has increased around the world. Biochemist Dr. Xenia Morin, who focuses her interests on the interaction between science, technology, and society illustrates in her article “Genetically Modified Food from Crops: Progress Pawns, and Possibilities” how the production of GM crops has begun to dominate farmlands. Following the Flavr Savr’s release, GM crops such as corn, soybeans, cotton and squash began to emerge (334). In 2007 approximately 282 million acres in 23 countries were recorded as being GM crops, and according to Morin it is the “fastest adoption of crop technology in modern farming history” (Morin 335).

I am sure at this point GM foods sound like a lifesaver...literally. They may appear beneficial and innocent of harm, but their use has been surrounded by controversial issues since their inception and these need immediate addressing before GM food is widely accepted. The academic journal *Environmental Health Perspectives* published the recent article “To Label or Not to Label,” which illustrates the growing number of national governments who have “taken steps to minimize the presence of GE (genetically engineered) food within their borders” (Dahl A359). Author of the article Richard Dahl explains that six European nations have made it unlawful to grow or bring into their country any GE products, in addition to more than 50 other worldwide nations who have mandated the labeling of GM foods. All of these restrictions have been implemented due to the potential health hazards and environmental damage caused by GM foods, and the lack of sound health and safety information currently unavailable (A359). The mere fact that so many other nations have banned the import and production of GM crops or mandated their labeling alone is enough evidence to warrant their suspension here in the United States. Yes, it is possible that 56 other nations are potentially wrong about the hazards of GM foods, but this significant number is one that is too large to disregard.

Proponents of GM crops claim biotechnology will continue to have a positive impact on our nation’s ecological system. Biochemist Dr. Morin describes how the use of GM crops requires fewer components to produce thereby reducing carbon emission (333). She claims GM crops such as corn, soy, and sugar cane are presently used in the bio-energy industry and speculation that future crops will contribute as well. Morin asserts their use is essential in helping to preserve our ecosystem which in turn “protects human health” (334).

The Union of Concerned Scientists (UCS) is a science-based organization working for a healthy environment and a safer world. Their senior scientist Dr. Margaret Mellon illustrates in her article

“Environmental Effects of Genetically Modified Food Crops—Recent Experiences” that several potential risks to the environment exists with the use of herbicides; one of which is the creation of superweeds. She stated “just as overuse of antibiotics led to antibiotic-resistant diseases in people and animals, overuse of pesticides on U.S. farms has meant that chemical after chemical has become useless as pests develop resistance. HT (herbicide tolerant) and Bt crops will likely suffer the same fate because they, too, are overused.” The immunity can spread to surrounding non-GM crops also promoting their immunity which in turn leads to even more use of herbicides and creating an unwanted ripple effect within the environment and the inability to control superweeds. The GM herbicide resistant crops are commonly referred to as “Roundup ready,” because of their supposed ability to defy the Roundup herbicide. An active ingredient in Roundup is glyphosate, but the superweed’s ability to resist it has forced some farmers to resort to using stronger chemicals such as 2, 4-D; an herbicide used in the defoliant Agent Orange, (Dahl A361) and commonly known to have been used in the Vietnam War as a form of chemical warfare. Its use resulted in countless deaths and birth defects. Author Richard Dahl exposed in his article “To Label or Not To Label” how the Dow AgroScience Corporation recently applied for permission from the USDA to begin the use of its newly developed corn which is resistant to 2, 4-D (A361). Past practice illustrates how lethal 2, 4-D is and how GM foods possibly containing any level of such chemical will be toxic and hazardous to the health of humans, animals, and the environment. It appears that proponents of GM foods, such as leading seed companies, do not advertise the types of herbicides needed to control weeds growing within GM crops, and for obvious reasons. In an effort to divert attention away from the negative and potentially deadly aspects of GM crops, they have grossly over-exaggerated their benefit(s).

In addition to the hazardous chemicals being spread throughout our environment as a result of GM crops, genetically modified pest resistant crops are also a threat to wildlife. Mellon also shared in her article that in the spring of 2000 Monarch butterflies were threatened as a result of the Bt toxin which is found in GM corn. The toxin is designed to kill corn borer pests who feed on corn. A lack of testing on the part of the manufacturer and monitoring by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) put the Monarch species at risk. The Monarchs “consume tissue from the anthers—the pollen- producing parts of the corn flower—as well as pollen from Bt corn” and the “anthers have been shown to contain considerably more toxin than pollen.” Another incidental scare occurred in Switzerland when it was discovered that Bt corn crops were adversely affecting a beneficial insect called green lacewings. These beneficial insects were feeding on non-beneficial pests called European corn borers that had been eating the Bt corn (Mellon). The high levels of the Bt toxin in the borers were killing the lacewings, and without beneficial insects there would be an even higher use of pesticides in agriculture. Fortunately, Dr. Xenia Morin recognized the need for the preservation of our environment when she explained the benefit in using bio-fuels; however, she and other proponents have failed to acknowledge

the necessity of beneficial insects in our ecosystem and the necessity in eliminating the use of such hazardous herbicides on GM crops. Both aspects require change in order for our ecosystem to survive. Having reduced carbon emissions will not even be an issue if we do not preserve our environment's flora and fauna.

GM food proponent and Department Head of the Abu Dhabi Food Control Authority Jagadeesan Premanandh is a molecular biologist and expert in the field of genetically modified organisms (GMOs). In his article "Global Consensus - Need of the Hour for Genetically Modified Organisms Labeling," Premanandh explains GM crops are an answer to meeting the needs of our globe's growing population which is expected to double within the next four decades (38). In his article, Premanandh provided a report from the United Nations Population Fund which states that "more than 800 million people remain malnourished in developing countries" and GM crops have the ability to meet this food crisis (38). Because of their genetic modification, GM crops can be grown at a faster rate than traditional crops which means they can keep up with increasing food demands for decades to come (38). He argues in his article that critics of GM food "believe that safety and environmental concerns are more important and outweigh the improved food taste and increased food production" (38); however he is wrong. Critics also want to feed malnourished countries, but feel it is just as important to provide food that is safe for consumption and food that will not destroy the environment when it is being produced.

Not only do GM crops pose a danger to the environment, but studies have proven that similar threats exist for humans. A group of biochemists published an extensive study on their key findings regarding GM soy. Their article titled "GM Soy: Sustainable? Responsible?" clearly illustrates the numerous health hazards associated with the Roundup herbicide. Roundup, conveniently manufactured by Monsanto, claims the active ingredient glyphosate is actually safe for humans and the environment (Antoniou et al. 2). The study contradicted Monsanto's claim when it explained how "Roundup causes human cell death within 24 hours," because its primary ingredients are "endocrine disruptors" (2). In addition, the chemical killed amphibians when it was applied at the manufacturer's suggested application rate, and continued to do so even when it was applied at a much lesser diluted rate. Laboratory testing illustrated the glyphosate herbicide also caused "skeletal malformations" in the fetuses of female rats, and frog and chicken embryos (2). Such findings should be alarming due to the fact experimental animals share "similar developmental mechanisms with humans," (2) and according to Professor Andres Carrasco, an Argentine government scientist, such findings "are compatible with malformations observed in humans exposed to glyphosate during pregnancy" (qtd. in Antoniou 2).

The film *Genetic Roulette: The Gamble of Our Lives* is a documentary that places responsibility on the GM food industry for a plethora of health issues that U.S. consumers are experiencing. The film includes discussions of scientific studies and interviews with several medical doctors and scientists who affirm that GM foods are being linked to many illnesses such as allergies, inflammatory diseases, infertility, and gastrointestinal disorders in people and animals. A gastroenterologist in the film reported he has seen the number of patients with gastrointestinal disorders increase since the introduction of GM foods in the 1990s, and believes the primary cause is the Bt toxin. The doctor explained the toxin causes the stomach of the insect to break open once it ingests the plant containing Bt resulting in its death. He suspects that people consuming GM foods containing the Bt toxin are exposed to the same types of dangers and feels this is why he has seen an increase in patients with such disorders. A controlled study discussed in the film showed that pregnant women who ate beef and drank milk from cows fed Bt corn had absorbed the Bt toxin which remained in their intestinal tract and continued to reproduce.

Current Chair for the program on the Regenerative Medicine Subcommittee on Bioethics and Conflict of Interest Dr. David Magnus is an expert in food security and biotechnology. He described in his article "Genetically Modified Organisms: Health and Environmental Concerns" that a protein identified as "Cry9C" (209) found in a variety of Bt corn called StarLink is difficult for a body to digest thereby exposing a person to possible allergic reaction(s). StarLink was only approved as animal feed, but because of the difficulty and lack of regulation in keeping the food supply for animals and humans separate it was discovered to have contaminated the human food supply (209).

According to Dr. Morin who discusses the same incident in her article, allergic reactions in humans did result, but it is impossible to confirm if the contamination caused it. As a result, Morin proposed that all GM food should be suitable for human and or animal consumption thereby eliminating the need for food separation and avoiding incidents such as this (335). Pediatrician Dr. Michelle Perro explains in *Genetic Roulette: The Gamble of Our Lives* how she has seen an increase in patients with many allergies, and suspects GM food is the suspect. She explained GM food particles which are difficult for the digestive system to break down permeate the intestinal walls and are then been exposed to the blood system. Perro describes the result is an "anti-body response" which creates allergies or a body's intolerance to certain foods.

A recent European scientific study has been criticized by potential supporters of genetically modified crops because of its findings which reveal the health hazards associated with GM food. Dr. Dean Butler, a biologist and author, from Europe revealed in the article "Rat Study

Sparks GM Furor” that a Monsanto herbicide resistant corn, NK603, led to scientific rats developing higher levels of cancer and larger cancerous tumors over a long-term, two year study. According to the article, Monsanto did their own study of the corn variety on the same variety of rats, but their study returned with no negative results. The European study explained Monsanto’s study only lasted for 90 days, which is considered normal, but not enough time to reveal long term affects of exposure. Monsanto criticized the European study arguing it “did not meet the minimum standards” because of the variety of rats used, but Monsanto failed to disclose that they had also used the same variety of rats in their limited 90 day trial. The European study was led by an independent molecular biologist whose purpose is to develop non- polluting alternatives for human an environmental health.

Like GM proponent Xenia Morin, who claims the production of GM crops have a positive impact on our nation’s ecological system, Department Head Jagadeesan Premanandh also failed to examine the overall picture regarding the use of genetically modified crops. Yes, GM foods may feed hungry countries, but the fact it can be done safely and without long term negative health consequences is definitely questionable. Laboratory studies are done for specific reasons, and in cases involving GM foods they have been done to ascertain if their use is safe for human consumption. Conclusions are revealing that at this point they are not.

Consumer concerns over the use of GM foods have been expressed around the world. Some countries have listened to and acknowledged the concerns, but the United States has failed to do so. Dr. Morin acknowledges in her article that public fears do exist: lack of confidence in science and government, distrust in corporations, and the increased opposition to risks (337). Opponents of GM food have asked for government to implement mandatory labeling on GM food so consumers can choose if they want it versus keeping them in the dark as to what products may or may not be genetically modified. Stacy Malkan from the pro-labeling organization states that “many scientists are saying that in the face of uncertainty, labeling is an important tool to help keep track of potential health risks” (qtd. in Dahl A360). Spokeswoman for the Coalition Against the Deceptive Food Labeling Scheme, Kathy Fairbanks, states food labeling would “only confuse and mislead consumers” and would fail to “provide any health and safety benefits” (qtd. in Dahl A360). Contrary to opponents’ beliefs, labeling would allow consumers to identify the source of the food in addition to providing some form of tracking system, especially in the medical field. Premanandh does acknowledge America’s 1906 Pure Food and Drugs Act still in use today. It was originally implemented to “prevent misleading statements on food labels,” and is the primary means of communication between producers and consumers” (38). Even though Premanandh is a big proponent of GM food, he does recognize in his article that benefits to labeling GM products exist, because it allows “the consumer to exercise freedom of choice” (38).

It appears GM foods are here to stay in addition to the controversies that surround them. Unfortunately, they pose enough threat to humans and the environment that suspension of their availability to consumers should be implemented. I understand the urgency for needing to solve world hunger, but is doing it via GM food a positive thing or is it sentencing millions of people to death?

## Works Cited

- Antoniou, Michael, et al. "GM Soy: Sustainable? Responsible?" *Earthopensource*. Earth Open Source, 2011. Web. 12 Oct. 2012.
- Arntzen, Charles J., Susan Pitman, and Katherine Thrasher. "Biotechnology." *Encyclopedia of Food and Culture*. 3 vols. 2003 ed. Print.
- Butler, Declan. "Rat Study Sparks GM Furore." *Nature*. Nature Publishing Group, 25 Sept. 2012. Web. 2 Oct. 2012.
- Dahl, Richard. "To Label or Not To Label." *Environmental Health Perspectives* 120.9 (2012): A358-A361. *Academic Search Premier*. Web. 27 Sept. 2012.
- Genetic Roulette: *The Gamble of Our Lives*. Dir. Jeffrey M. Smith. 2012. Film. Web. 11 Oct. 2012.
- Magnus, David. "Genetically Modified Organisms: Health and Environmental Concerns." *Encyclopedia of Food and Culture*. 3 vols. 2003 ed. Print.
- Mellon, Margaret, and Jane Rissler. "Environmental Effects of Genetically Modified Food Crops—Recent Experiences." *ucsusa*. Union of Concerned Scientists, 2012. Web. 3 Oct. 2012.
- Morin, Xenia. "Genetically Modified Food from Crops: Progress, Pawns, and Possibilities." *Analytical & Bioanalytical Chemistry* 392.3 (2008): 333-340. *Academic Search Premier*. Web. 18 Sept. 2012.
- Premanandh, Jagadeesan. "Global Consensus - Need of the Hour for Genetically Modified Organisms (GMO) Labeling." *Journal of Commercial Biotechnology*. 17.1 (2010): 37-44. Web. 26 Sept. 2012.
- United States. Dept. of Energy. Office of Science. "What are Genetically Modified (GM) Foods?" *Oak Ridge National Laboratory*. Dept. of Energy, May 2012. Web. 27 Sept. 2012.

# Nuclear Power: A Practical Solution

**Kennedy Thomas**

*This paper was nominated by Professor Wesley Sims.*

Nuclear Power has a long and tumultuous history, one of great promise and scientific endeavor, as well as tragedy. Nuclear plants around the globe are often met with staunch resistance by those who view the infamous nuclear meltdowns of plants at Three Mile Island, Chernobyl, and most recently, Fukushima, Japan, as clear warnings that the technology is unsafe and nuclear proliferation only invites more death and illness. Recently, however, there has been increased interest in the technology, despite its risks, as a force to combat climate change. As the world's cleanest practical and reliable energy source, nuclear power has an opportunity to make a firm, positive impact on our environment. Upon inspection, it is clear that although mechanical failures can and do happen, the majority of problems "inherent" with nuclear power in fact lay within the various regulatory agencies of the countries that oversee their operation, and with improved regulations, nuclear power could well be the world's premier source of clean energy, with minimal risks.

To understand the fear associated with nuclear power, one must know the history of its greatest failures. There are typically three incidents that come to mind concerning nuclear plant disasters: The Three Mile Island meltdown in Pennsylvania, the incident at Chernobyl, in the Ukraine, in which the entire city was evacuated, and the most recent, at Fukushima, Japan, in which an earthquake in the Pacific Ocean was the catalyst for a massive tsunami that devastated the city and caused a meltdown of their nuclear plant. All of these events have deeply marred the public perception of nuclear power, yet they also offer the world the chance to learn from these experiences, and improve safety measures and reduce risks for subsequent generations. The fact that even those closest to the disasters can retain positive opinions on the technology is a telling indicator of the promise of nuclear power.

In his book on the aftermath of the tragedy at Chernobyl, Andrey Illesh, who investigated the irradiated city within 24 hours of the plant's meltdown on April 26, 1986, sides with Valery Legasov, the head of the committee in charge of investigating the Chernobyl incident, when considering the question of whether or not nuclear power should be abandoned altogether due to its risks, presenting Legasov's conclusion that "atomic stations represent the highest achievement of the energy industry. [Setting]... the foundation for the next stage in the development of human civilization" (qtd. in Illesh 193). Illesh instead points the finger at various sources, including lax supervision and enforcement of safety regulations, and a daily routine that allowed plant workers to become complacent and less likely to properly respond to

anomalies, such as the one that caused the explosion at reactor number four in the Chernobyl plant. The very nature of the operation of a nuclear power plant on a day-to-day basis can negatively impact safety protocols, as workers spend their days simply monitoring gauges and ensuring that they all reside within acceptable measures. This environment enables those who are “disorganized” to easily fail to put forth their full attention to the proceedings (11). Long days of silence and boredom allow for dwindling attentions to detail and can prevent rapid responses to crises.

Whereas blame lies with the operators of the plant during the Chernobyl incident, the failures of the Fukushima plant can be attributed to failures in regulation. In their article, “Learning from Fukushima” for example, MIT researchers Sebastian M. Pfotenhauer and his associates describe regulatory failure over Fukushima as one in which “politics interfered with technology, leading to political biases in risk assessments and safety reports.” They state that Japan’s nuclear program was not designed for purely ecological or economic reasons, but rather to establish Japan as a dominant world power after its defeat in World War II. Anti-nuclear activists were discouraged and ignored by society at large, as nuclear power was presented as a source of national pride, a jingoistic error which was exemplified in the wake of the disasters by the lack of proper response to the crisis and denial of information to global news media. These circumstances provided an environment of lax preparation and poor cautionary design in the case of a natural disaster. In a societal environment in which little negative feedback is permitted, poor designs with little forethought were approved during the construction of the nation’s nuclear plants, which proved unable to repel the forces of nature.

Of course, as evidenced by the incident at the thankfully less catastrophic meltdown at Three Mile Island, the United States is not immune to failures in atomic power. On March 28, 1979, a mechanical failure prevented adequate cooling to the reactor in Unit 2 at the nuclear plant on Three Mile Island, in the Susquehanna River in Pennsylvania, which quickly caused it to overheat. According to the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission’s (NRC) “Backgrounder on the Three Mile Island Accident,” over half of the reactor had melted soon after the meltdown began. Luckily, although the plant had suffered “the most dangerous kind of nuclear power accident,” the reactor walls were not breached and radiation levels were much lower than is possible in a total reactor meltdown, with per-person radioactive exposure about one sixth that of a standard chest x-ray.

Although these incidents were certainly unfortunate tragedies of the utmost scale, they have allowed for the development of new techniques and procedures in order to improve upon plant operations and prevent their repetition, as scientists and governments both learn from past mistakes. In the wake of the Chernobyl meltdown, with blame lying with workers and

supervisors who failed to follow proper safety measures while running experiments on reactor turbines, the USSR immediately began drafting new safety procedures and refocused its training programs for nuclear plant employees. The necessity of intense and rigorous inspections was made clear by this disaster, and the USSR responded with the formation of the Ministry of Atomic Energy, with the specific goal of “[improving] management of atomic energy development and ... [promoting] a responsible attitude toward work in the industry” (Illesh 176).

After the meltdown at Three Mile Island in 1979, the process of post-disaster cleanup was relatively new and substantially difficult, with workers “[struggling] with the heavy rubber suits and air masks they had to wear and the state of South Carolina, which had a low-level nuclear waste repository, [which] refused to accept waste from the accident” (Tunncliffe 24). The lessons learned from this cleanup were directly put into action during the aftermath of the Fukushima disaster, and although the gravity of Fukushima’s situation is described as “ten times harder,” by Lake Barrett, who led the cleanup of the Three Mile Island incident, the techniques and technologies used to properly contain the environmental impact of the meltdown are directly derived from experience at the Pennsylvania disaster site in 1979 (qtd. in Tunncliffe 24). The NRC’s regulatory prowess was also improved after the incident, according to Jonathan S. Feinstein’s 1989 analysis of the US nuclear regulations for Stanford University, titled “The Safety Regulation of U.S. Nuclear Power Plants: Violations, Inspections, and Abnormal Occurrences,” which found “a sharp increase in detection following the Three Mile Island accident,” by the NRC, “and a positive relationship between undetected violations and future abnormal occurrences” (153).

Unfortunately government reaction to disasters such as these can also leave much to be desired. Although governments seem to be willing to quickly respond to and attempt to learn from disasters after they have occurred, there are still many examples of poor oversight and outright regulatory mistakes that can cause these plant failures, which if properly supervised can be avoided. Professor Kurt Gottfried, Chairman of the Union of Concerned Scientists, reveals in his article “Climate Change and Nuclear Power,” that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has often failed at properly detecting faulty equipment, such as the incident in the Davis-Besse plant in Ohio, which operated for months with a serious threat that would have caused a core meltdown going undetected. The NRC itself admitted to their failure to initially detect the issue in its own report of the incident, yet the NRC’s “high priority lessons learned,” meant to learn from and improve upon the mistakes of previous inspections, can in fact go ignored for years at a time. The “Design Basis Threat,” developed by the NRC, outlines the responsibility of plant owners in the case of terrorist attacks on nuclear plants, but is held back by the Department of Homeland Security’s lack of “authority or resources” to ensure its proper implementation (1017- 8).

Lack of cooperation between different government departments has become apparent not only in dealing with nuclear power, but with the problem it is most suited to address: global warming. The United States government has routinely been slow to act with regards to positive steps against climate change, taking a more cautious approach. As Gottfried points out, the US government went out of its way to “stifle government climate scientists,” going so far as to attempt to alter an Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) climate impact report in 2013, which the EPA then redacted in order to avoid the embarrassment associated with releasing a “scientifically insupportable document” (1012). Naturally, hesitance to act on behalf of politicians is to be expected, as David B. Spence acknowledges in his paper “Regulation, ‘Republican Moments,’ and Energy Policy Reform,” treating the diagnosis of global warming is a difficult proposition for politicians to make, as it will rely on the support of the populace and the understanding that increased taxes needed to initiate change will require that “their costs will fall on today's voters, while most of the benefits will accrue to future generations of Americans and to citizens of other countries” (1610). Much like the incident in Fukushima and the Japanese politics that helped to enable it, the US suffers from a crisis of political maneuvering and pandering that stifles its ability to react to new challenges and make positive strides towards a cleaner environment.

In contrast to the stalling tactics demonstrated in the US, by 2005 Britain and the European Union had already set goals for counteracting global warming, with “the target of a global mean temperature rise of no more than 1.2o C (or 2.1o F) above today's,” which Professor Gottfried explains is “a third above the current level,” specifying that in order to accomplish this feat, the industrialized world will have to lower its CO<sub>2</sub> emissions by up to 80 percent within 50 years, with carbon emissions needing to “be held at about the current level for [the] next 50 years, and thereafter be reduced further” (1013-4). Due to the imminent nature of climate change, the world's best option for accomplishing this lofty goal will require the use of current, available technologies.

The primary benefit and role of nuclear power in this context is its notable lack of “greenhouse gasses” produced during plant operation. Aside from the emissions created while mining for nuclear materials, nuclear power is a very “clean” energy source. Due to the lack of carbon emissions created when operating plants, nuclear power has the potential to be a significant contributor in the quest to improve the environment, as “nuclear power does not lead to the emission of greenhouse gasses, or to air pollutants” (Gottfried 1016-7). As opposed to other “alternative” forms of energy production such as wind or solar energy, nuclear power also has the benefit of being able to easily adapt to current worldwide energy infrastructures, as well as the ability to generate and sustain the power necessary to completely replace more traditional, polluting energy sources, such as fossil fuel plants. As Anne Winslow explains in her 2011

paper, "A Nuclear Renaissance: The Role of Nuclear Power in Mitigating Climate Change," nuclear power is the best option out of all current technologies when considering environmental impact, with "[an] emissions reduction potential... four times greater than that of hydroelectric sources, five times the magnitude of wind energy's emissions reductions and astoundingly over 25 times greater than... solar PV panels" (130). Winslow also brings attention to the notable lack of feasibility for any other non-fossil fuel energy sources on a scale necessary to fulfill modern energy needs, as it is alone in its "ability to provide [the] reliable minimum level of demand placed on a grid for 24 hours," which nuclear plants accomplish by running at a consistent 90 percent capacity, as opposed to wind and solar power, which operate beneath 25 percent (130).

As the world's only practical source of modern, clean energy that can produce an adequate amount of power to replace fossil fuel plants throughout the world, and with global warming appearing to be developing at much faster pace than originally expected (Gottfried 1016), the application for nuclear power becomes apparent, with the potential to be a serious force in the fight against climate change; however, it is currently held back by a general hesitance towards nuclear proliferation on behalf of average citizens, and subsequently the politicians that represent them, as well as poor regulatory and political measures which, if improved, would greatly increase the reliability and safety of plants throughout all nations invested in atomic energy. With the proper reforms of energy policies and oversight improvements, and acknowledgment of the technology's improved safety and reliability, nuclear power can grow to become a profitable and environmentally friendly replacement for fossil fuel power plants around the globe.

## Works Cited

- "Backgrounder on the Three Mile Island Accident." NRC.gov. 12 October 2012. Web. 20 Oct 2012.
- Feinstein, Jonathan S. "The Safety Regulation of U.S. Nuclear Power Plants: Violations, Inspections, and Abnormal Occurrences." *Journal of Political Economy* 97.1 (1989): 115. *Business Source Elite*. Web. 16 Nov. 2012.
- Gottfried, Kurt. "Climate Change and Nuclear Power." *Social Research* 73.3 (2006): 1011-1024. *Academic Search Premier*. Web. 27 Oct. 2012
- Ishell, Andrey. *Chernobyl*. New York: Richardson, 1987. Print.
- Pfotenhauer, Sebastian M. et al. "Learning From Fukushima." *Issues in Science & Technology* 28.3 (2012): 79-84. *Academic Search Premier*. Web. 27 Oct. 2012.
- Spence, David B. "Regulation, 'Republican Moments,' and Energy Policy Reform." *Brigham Young University Law Review* 2011.5 (2011): 1561-1623. *Academic Search Premier*. Web. 16 Nov. 2012.
- Tunncliffe, Helen. "Fukushima's Future: Lessons From Three Mile Island." *TCE: The Chemical Engineer* 841 (2011): 22-24. *Academic Search Premier*. Web. 27 Oct. 2012.
- Winslow, Anne. "A Nuclear Renaissance: The Role of Nuclear Power in Mitigating Climate Change." *AIP Conference Proceedings* 1342.1 (2011): 127-134. *Academic Search Premier*. Web. 16 Nov. 2012.

# Featured Works

## Moody Behavior

*Finalist for Philosophy Department Student Colloquium*

### **Elias Torres**

*Elias (Corey) Torres is a 21 year old third year student at Bakersfield College who will graduate with an AA in Philosophy. "I really enjoyed taking all the necessary classes needed for my degree and was really challenged academically," he writes, adding, "I was very fortunate to have great teachers who were each always willing to assist me when I needed help on my papers or topics in class."*

An individual's moral judgment is derived from intuition. Jonathan Haidt, who specializes in morality and intuition, states that even though this is how moral judgments are actually made, he clarifies that it is not how they "ought to be made" (3). In *The Emotional Dog and its Rational Tail: A Social Intuitionist Approach to Moral Judgment*, Haidt has comprehensibly drawn this conclusion through his model known as the Social Intuitionist Model (SIM). However, a problem regarding intuition is subtly raised. He notes that, "moral intuitions often bring about non-optimal or even disastrous consequences in matters of public policy, public health, and decision-making" (3). Furthermore, a possible cause of that "disaster" can be mood and/or emotion (For the sake of this paper, I shall be using the two terms interchangeably). They are what can drastically alter a person's intuition, moral judgment and decision-making processes. This will be validated by first, showing Haidt establishing intuition as the basis for moral judgment by thoroughly explaining intuition and the Social Intuitionist Model, and by second, showing precisely how mood effects one's intuition. Then lastly, a solution will be offered in response to the issue concerning intuition and mood.

The difference between moral reasoning and moral intuition is that reasoning is slow, requires time and involves analyzing information in order to come to a decision (6). In juxtaposition, intuition "appears suddenly and effortlessly in consciousness, without any awareness of the mental processes that led to the outcome" (6). Haidt explains his model by using an analogy.

For a rational model, in a courtroom for example, individuals are like judges in a sense that their motives are solely to find the truth (2). In a courtroom, a lawyer presents his or her own case in hopes that he or she will win the judge over by providing the judge with enough facts and reasons. The judge is mindful of the reasoning, contemplates the position being presented, and then is able to determine what is right or wrong (2). However, Haidt declares that the Social

Intuitionist Model is clearly “an anti-rationalist model” (3) and that “...moral reasoning is rarely the direct cause of moral judgment” (3).

In the Social Intuitionist Model, individuals are like lawyers in a sense that instead, their motives are the want to defend what they feel is right (2). In this courtroom, a lawyer is already aware of what he or she feels is right based off of what his or her feelings are and from where intuition led him or her to. Furthermore, with that, he or she will then proceed to provide reasoning to the judge in order to illustrate why the lawyer has that particular stand on the matter being defended.

The Social Intuitionist Model claims that individuals attain their moral judgment by their intuition (5). Intuition is a “gut-feeling” (16). Those feelings are the result of quick automatic evaluations or reactions to situations that show no signs of the utilization of reasoning (5). Again, it must be clear that reasoning is rarely the cause of individuals’ moral judgments (6). According to the model, intuition is the foundation (6).

Haidt also discusses what he refers to as “post-hoc reasoning” (7). This link in the Social Intuitionist Model further supports the claim of intuition being moral judgment’s foundation. Post-hoc reasoning can be explained by going back to the lawyer and the judge example. The lawyer already has his or her mind made up on the issue being presented to the judge. Moreover, due to that fact, the lawyer then goes into supplying reasons as to how the lawyer came about that judgment. That is what post-hoc reasoning is. It comes after the moral judgment is already made in hopes to support it (7).

The Social Intuitionist Model reveals another distinguishing difference between intuition and reasoning. “Reasoning is usually done interpersonally rather than privately” (9). This makes perfect sense because when a person is trying to come to a decision, that person is usually trying to derive reasons from outside of her or himself, perhaps by asking a friend or a family member. On the other side, moral intuition occurs privately (9). It occurs inside a person’s brain and is acquired very naturally, quickly and without any effort (9). However, there are several circumstances that allow for moral reasoning to be the more logical pursuit for making a moral judgment over depending on moral intuition. Those instances would be “when the person has adequate time and processing capacity” and “a motivation to be accurate” (12).

Haidt is brilliant in applying the Social Intuitionist Model to a metaphor: a dog (16). The body of the dog represents moral intuition. The tail represents moral reasoning. He claims that, “the tail [is] wagged by the dog” (16). Dogs use their tails very often for means of communication the same way humans “use moral reasoning so frequently for communication” (16). Moreover, when

it comes to decision-making, the dog is the primary method whereas the tail of the dog is the secondary.

An important assumption that has been made throughout so far in these examples is a presence of a sentiment. The lawyer for example cares about what he or she is defending. Haidt brings up this important factor in that in regards to disputing issues, one must have sentiment (15). If not, it does not matter if a person has all the reasoning capabilities. Haidt refers to this person as a psychopath (15). "Psychopaths can steal from their 'friends,' dismember live animals, and even murder their parents to collect insurance benefits, without showing any trace of remorse, or of shame when caught" (15). For the murdering of the parents example, even though the psychopath can recognize and know that having insurance benefits is a good thing, the fact that he or she has no care for the means of which he or she went about receiving them is considered psychotic and morally wrong.

When arguments are taking place between two individuals, specifically in regards to issues concerning morality, it is very difficult and often times impossible to convince the other person to side with the other's standpoint. That is due to the fact that both individuals came about their conceptions based on each of their moral intuitions. Their quick, automatic evaluations commenced without the need of any reasoning whatsoever. So because of that, any reason that the other presents are useless because the other already has firm ground. Haidt refers to this phenomenon as "shadow boxing matches" (13). In this, both opposing individuals are immensely trying to defeat one another with damaging strikes but come to be unsuccessful (13). Both individuals have their minds made up and have already made up their moral judgments due to their moral intuitions. But what kind of an effect can one's mood have on making those moral judgments?

Whether an individual is conscious of his or her mood or not, that individual's mood can sway and may consequently have biased moral judgments (Forgas 4). If that person is particularly happy on a given day and makes a moral judgment on something specific, it is quite possible that he or she can ultimately make an entirely different judgment if he or she is particularly sad on a different day. Again, one's given mood is important to understand how moral judgments are made (Forgas 17).

For example, Gabriel Noboa, a hiring manager at a restaurant is upset and in a bad mood from an event that occurred earlier in the day. While in an interview with a future employee candidate, due to the earlier event, the negative mood of the manager could potentially impact his judgment of the candidate that had nothing to do with the interview whatsoever (Schwarz 14). Perhaps due to his bad mood, he very well may have a short patience for the candidate and

choose to ignore why the candidate could make a good employee when asked during the interview process. This moral judgment is unfair to the candidate because he or she did not do anything wrong and his or her chances of securing the job could be severely damaged. It was an unconsciously biased interview due to the negative mood of the manager.

There may also be an effect if an individual is in too positive of a mood. One's moral judgment can be clouded negatively in this state also. For instance, everything went great for Christian today. This morning he aced his Anatomy final that he has been so stressed about as of late. That evening, his girlfriend took him to his favorite restaurant. For that, he was in a very positive and inspiring mood. He felt invincible. After dinner, as they were walking out, some other man decided to cause some trouble and insult Christian's girlfriend. Feeling the way he has been feeling, decides to stand up to him rather than doing the more logical thing such as walking away or calling the police. The end result was he got into a fight and got severely injured when the fight could have been prevented.

Now that the effect of one's mood has been established in regards to intuition and moral judgment, Jeanette Kennett and Cordelia Fine offer a resolving solution. Although they are not specifically trying to reply to Haidt's works, their ideas can be presently utilized in order to resolve Haidt's problem. Kennett and Fine propose what is called "'after-the-fact' correction" (88). In this, a person "focuses on mental undoing" when a primary moral judgment needs to be changed (88). This is done when that person's present mood is brought to his or her attention and realizes "mood as a possible source of bias" (88). He or she will recognize that that mood has corrupted his or her moral judgment (88). Consider the scenario:

"This summer my girlfriend and I were looking at the horses downtown, and this Black guy started walking toward us. Of course ... I immediately thought, here comes some homeless guy—he's going to ask us for money. But from my past experience [reflecting on the automatic assumptions he made about Black people]... I had to stop and think to myself, 'Maybe he's not homeless; maybe he's not going to ask me for money. He might not say anything to me.' I stopped and I thought about the past experience and it made me change my decision to something I probably wouldn't have made" (89).

In that scenario, that particular person had an automatic intuitive moral judgment.

Based from his moral judgment, he assumed that the man walking towards him was a beggar and was going to ask him for money. However, when applying Kennett and Fine's "after-the-fact" correction, he was able to recognize that he was wrong for making that moral judgment

due to his past experiences. He was able to stop, take a moment and thoroughly and thoughtfully consider what his intuition was telling him. With that contemplation, he was then able to change his moral judgment and able to eliminate his wrongful assumption (89).

With Kennett and Fine's "after-the-fact" correction, a method in which one's moral intuition and moral reasoning become intergraded with each other. The idea of being able to make a moral judgment based on intuition and then being able to recognize when that intuition can be misguided or even mistaken at certain times is extraordinary. With that concept, perhaps this method is capable of being a solution for potentially solving the various moral issues and arguments in the world that is currently being disputed over.

An individual having the ability to intuitively identify his or her mood upon making moral judgments is highly important. Without this ability, Haidt is right to conclude that our intuition has the potential of leading to disaster. Yet, if an individual can incorporate Kennett's correction method, intuition will be better conditioned when making future moral judgments. Ultimately, intuition can be better trusted and relied upon (Hogarth 344). Also, one must have the "controlled processing capacity" in order to have the capability to adjust moral judgment (Kennett 91). That means, if a person is able to have the capacity to think and reason, while also possessing a functional intuition and sentiment, the person will be fully adept to making moral judgments.

## Works Cited

- Forgas, J. et al. "The Pleasure of Possessions: Affective Influences and Personality in the Evaluation of Consumer Items." *European Journal of Social Psychology* 30.5 (2000): 631-49. Print.
- Haidt, J. (2001). The emotional dog and its rational tail: A social intuitionist approach to moral judgment. *Psychological Review*. 108, 814-834
- Hogarth, Robin M. "Intuition: A Challenge for Psychological Research on Decision Making." *Psychological Inquiry* (2010): 338-53. Web. 20 Oct. 2012.
- Kennett, Jeanette, and Cordelia Fine. "Will the Real Moral Judgment Please Stand Up?" *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice* 12.1 (2009): 77-96. Print.
- Schwarz, Norbert. "Feelings-as-Information Theory." *Handbook of Theories of Social Psychology* (2010): 1-32. Web. 20 Oct. 2012.

# Sickness and Disease in Socrates

*Finalist for Philosophy Department Student Colloquium*

## **Taylor Bogar**

*Taylor Bogar was born in Oakdale, CA and moved to Bakersfield his freshman year of high school. "School has always interested me and once I took my first philosophy class in college I was hooked," he writes. His first exposure to Plato was not positive, however, he writes, "Once I started taking the time to read his works in Phil B18 his works really intrigued me. The one that stood out was The Republic, and that was why I decided to take a closer look and write my criticisms."*

In the Republic, Socrates presents us with the perfect city which he will call "good and correct" (449A) and best among all other constitutions, however, this city they end with was not his initial creation. Even Socrates says "The true city, in my opinion, is the one we've described, the healthy one" (372E). If the fevered city is the true city, then it must be as close to the perfect form of a city, which would be as virtuous as can be. This city must have in it Justice, Wisdom, Moderation, and Courage if it is to be the best. And as Socrates points out it seems that the city he and his companions set up does contain all of these virtues, however, this city is founded from a "fevered" state. So the city that is created cannot be Kallipolis, the good and beautiful city.

Sickness and disease is used throughout the Republic to describe injustice and shortcomings, so to call this city "fevered" is to say that there is some flaw with it. The perfect constitution would then be of a healthy city, which Socrates creates in the beginning of book II. This "true" city is based only on necessity and the basic principle that no man is completely self-sufficient. Man needs others in order to fulfill all his needs as best as possible. This is the true and healthy city and therefore must be more "good and correct" than the city he ends with.

The "fever" sets in when Glaucon wants to add luxury to the healthy city, because of this luxury, Socrates must expand his city in order to make room for the people needed to provide for luxuries. To do this they would need more land from their neighbors. This he labels as the origin of war and the cause is "from the same desires that are most of all responsible for the bad things that happen to cities and the individuals in them," (373e). Since these desires are responsible for the bad things that happen to cities and as Socrates points out that the worst thing that can happen to a city is civil war because it brings about the fall of the constitution that is in power. It is then a possibility for these desires to cause a civil war as well as a war in this city.

Since a civil war is brought about by injustice, and these desires cause Civil War. It then follows that these desires that are placed in the creation of the city are at least one cause of injustice in a city. These luxuries can become a higher priority than maintaining justice in a city and cause the classes to meddle within one another. This is what happens when Civil War breaks out and the "iron and bronze types pull the constitution towards money making and acquisition of land" (547b). So, as is apparent with the decline of the fevered state to timocracy and oligarchy, the healthy state declines to the fevered state in the same way, by the addition of the importance of luxury. To be truly just the perfect city cannot contain injustice or the roots of injustice, as is the case with the healthy state. So the city he claims is the best cannot be because it is not truly contain virtue without justice.

Another challenge that this fevered city faces is that it is set up in a world full of unjust cities and is not fully realized. In Plato's theory of forms the goal of the sensible world is to become as much like the world of the forms. This city being the example of the form if it existed on earth would then be the form that every other city is trying to copy. Also in play is the principle of causal synonymy, in which one object makes another like itself, as hot makes cold hotter. In the same way the just city will cause the other cities to become more and more just. Ideally every city or constitution established would come to the same basic foundation of the city that Socrates and his friends have created. So, this city then, if it were the truly virtuous city, would benefit every city that takes up this form of government. Now if every city is that of the fevered city, and if the fevered city were the virtuous city, then it would mean that every city benefits. However, there is a problem with this.

As Socrates mentions earlier the fevered city, because it has out stepped its limit of necessity, must acquire land to maintain its population. So, every city being like the fevered city must acquire more land from neighbors, who also share in the same constitution. And, as the first state alone, the taking of land is beneficial to that state. This would mean that the loosing of land would have an opposite effect. Since in war one side must prevail, if it were a stalemate then the just states would be in constant war and turmoil, it would mean that one state would gain land and benefit itself while the other would loose land and hurt itself. If this is so then this constitution cannot be truly virtuous because it does not benefit all who take up this constitution. By definition justice is to attend to its own work in accordance with what everyone agrees on. With more than one city being just, all cities would also work without meddling in the other cities classes as well. But by taking land it is also impeding on the functioning of all the classes within the other city and thus acting unjustly in its actions. So if the virtuous city would benefit all cities that followed and the fevered city is followed and is not beneficial, then the fevered city is not the true virtuous city.

Also to be the best virtuous city would mean that no other city would be closer to the form than that specific city. However, if the healthy city were shown to be better, then it would follow that the fevered must be worse than it and therefore not the true city. First let's look at the composition of the healthy city in comparison. The healthy city is made from necessity, so only the minimal number of people needed for a city to prosper would make up the city. He gives a list that includes farmers for food, builders for shelters, and weavers for clothes. Next he introduces craftsman to make the tools needed and herders for the animals. Since there is no meat consumption by the people a big production of animals for food is not needed. After all this he includes traders and wage earners. These people focus only on one thing, their function that they perform best. This is the healthy city that is thought of and it only contains one class of people. Only because Glaucon wants luxury in the city does Socrates introduce the guardian class to protect the new wealth and gain land. Also the city he describes as healthy has no excess beyond what they need for themselves and others and so do not need to protect what they do not have plus Socrates mentions that they will "bear no more children than their resources allow, lest they fall into either poverty or war," (372c). Since they will not fall into war, they need no guardian class in this city. As well as no guardian class, there cannot be a ruling class because the rulers came out of the class that was educated as guardians. So based on necessity alone, the healthy state needs no rulers or guardians, and thus has only one class.

Because of the difference in composition one may ask, "how can the healthy state be better than the fevered if it does not contain these two classes, which Socrates declares the source of virtues like wisdom and courage?" This is the case, but if it can be shown that this city still contains these virtues and that it is better than the fevered, then the healthy city would be more virtuous and therefore leaving the fevered worse off. A virtuous state cannot exist if every man in the state is completely of vice. An unjust citizen cannot create justice, and so on with the other virtues. So if every citizen was unjust then the state must be unjust. This also works in the other direction that being the just state made up of all just citizens it must be just. As Socrates points out in the fevered state, not all classes partake in all virtues, and this is fine to be a virtuous state. The guardian shows courage and the citizens show moderation in agreeing on who is ruler. So, for the healthy city to be as virtuous as the fevered city, every citizen must be virtuous. In the healthy city Socrates describes every man as performing a separate function to benefit his society. To perform this function he must have knowledge of what he needs to do. This is a part of wisdom. He must also perform his function to benefit the good of society. For example the citizens know when to stop producing for the good of the state. So in order for them to function in the way described by Socrates they must already know the good and so wisdom is with every citizen. Courage is the same way since they know the good and do not fall into poverty or wealth (what needs to be feared), which cause war, they have right knowledge of what is to be feared. And so, every citizen contains within them justice, for they do not impede on each

other's function, wisdom, for they have knowledge of the good, courage, because they know what should be feared, and moderation because they know that each individual is ruled by wisdom of the good. The healthy city is just as virtuous as the fevered city. This only proves that there are at least two correct cities. So to prove the claim that the fevered city is not the true city one must show that the healthy city is better in some way.

If it is agreed that the flaws mentioned previously are true then all one would have to show is that the healthy city is better or does not contain these fatal shortcomings. One flaw that was discussed was the needing of land in a world of all fevered states. In the case of the healthy city war is not a problem because the people do not create reasons for war. Also the introduction of war came with luxury since the healthy city does not have luxury it also does not have war or any of the bad things said to happen in a city that does possess it. Because it contains no roots of injustice and war is no longer an issue it must be the case that the healthy city is better or a more correct city than the fevered city, even if this is the only way it is better.

Another way to show this is by not claiming the healthy city better, but by showing how a better city can be from the fevered city. Suppose a city is created only from the men from the golden class, this being the rules. Since Philosophy or education in itself is not required to be done separate of everything else, but as an aid, such as rulers learning the good and ruling their people. It is possible for such men to take up tasks of other such things as well. This being the case they could take up farming with the education or building, so a city of kings, who were trained as guardians and rulers. Who knows the good and what a virtuous is would be a better city than the fevered city that Socrates creates and claims to be the most correct.

So, if any of the arguments hold true then the fevered city cannot be a true virtuous state. Because to be perfect, I cannot contain any vice and must benefit all who uphold that constitutions, It cannot be the same or worse than any other city, or a city cannot be founded that is more true than the perfect city. The healthy city or city of kings, then, may not be the true city but if it is a step closer to truth that would also imply that they are better than the fevered city and thus this city is not the most "good and correct."

## Work Cited

Plato, John M. Cooper, and D. S. Hutchinson. *Complete Works*. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Pub., 1997. Print.

## Morals Without Reason

Winner: 2013 David Arthur Memorial Scholarship Prize

### Rachel Lanier

*Rachel Lanier is a former graduate of East High School, 2010. Rachel is a sophomore at Bakersfield College and majoring in Philosophy. Rachel became interested in philosophy her junior year in high school when introduced to philosophers such as Henry David Thoreau, Ralph Waldo Emerson, and Plato. Rachel plans to expand her knowledge into religious studies in an effort to better understand the primal role that various philosophies help shape culture and societies as a whole.*

David Hume says that “wherever we go, whatever we reflect on or converse about, everything still presents us with the view of human happiness or misery, and excites in our breast a sympathetic movement of pleasure or uneasiness. In our serious occupations, in our careless amusements, this principle still exerts its active energy” (Hume 44), meaning everything we do is based on sentiment/emotion rather than reason. Philosopher, Socrates, in Plato’s Euthyphro, meets Euthyphro and discusses if it is moral to persecute one’s own father and before Euthyphro leaves, Socrates states that not even the gods agree on what is to be considered moral (Plato 7e). I am convinced that if Socrates and David Hume were to meet that very same day, at that very same place that Socrates and Euthyphro met, they would have agreed with each other that our sensations rule not only the moral world of mortals but the moral world of the gods as well; In this paper I will prove that to be true. I will first explain David Hume’s argument of reason vs. sentiment, then I will briefly explain Socrates’ conversation with Euthyphro. I will continue by showing the correlation between the two and finally, I will explain why reasoning is a much better utility in terms of morality than our emotional standpoints.

David Hume’s discussion in *An Enquiry Concerning the Principles of Morals*, is focused on whether moral judgments are either being determined by reason or sentiment: “whether we attain knowledge of them by a chain of argument and induction, or by an immediate feeling and finer internal sense; whether, like all sound judgment of truth and falsehood, they should be the same to every rational intelligent being; or whether, like the perception of beauty and deformity, they be found entirely on the particular fabrics and constitution of the human species” (Hume 13). This excerpt from Hume is asking the question whether moral judgment is caused from reason or from sentiment, and then if there is a moral or an immoral, is there a universal morality to which all abide by, or does morality depend on different situations and different times. With this question now asked, the enquiry now begins reason vs. sentiment.

“Moral distinctions, it may be said, are discernible by pure reason: Else, whence the many disputes that reign in common life, as well as in philosophy, with regard to this subject...Truth is disputable; not taste: what exist in the nature of things is the standard of our judgment; what each man feels within himself is the standard of sentiment”(Hume 14). What Hume is distinguishing is the difference between reason and sentiment; Reason being a discernment that is produced from the physical attributes of a circumstance, while sentiment is the discernment that is derived from either innate or socially constructed feelings. This division between the two is essential in the process in which moral decisions are made. One without the other, for instance, reason without sentiment may result in a psychopath, for “it is not contrary to reason to kill your parents for money, unless it is also contrary to sentiment” (Haidt 15). Without sentiment there is nothing that can be deemed wrong or right. If there is a moral standard then it must necessarily follow that there is some sort of division of something that is just(right) and something that is unjust(wrong). Sentiment/intuition, being the initial reaction/feeling of something taking place, we know that something is likable to us, or if we should cast it away, and such, sentiment now becomes utility: “The eye is pleased with the prospect of corn-fields and loaded vineyards; horses grazing, and flocks pasturing; But flies the view of briars and brambles, affording shelter to wolves and serpents,” (Hume 18) for now what is likable to us is what is beneficial, and is where the division of the just and unjust are made.

Sentiment being utility may be argued then that sentiment is a form of self-preservation (41). For example, to kill another person is considered immoral because it does not benefit us, but when it is out of self-defense that we commit the act, it becomes justified and no longer immoral. Because the inconsistency in a definite defined morality, it is clear that morality is sentiment based and reason is how we reach our goal of what we want, or to justify our moral findings. For instance, as Hume discusses the idea of three worlds where the idea of justice does not exist, such as an utopian world where all is good, there is an abundance of food and shelter, and there is no division in property, there is no need for justice and morality is never distinguished (21). With this theory of different worlds, morality is made completely dependent of time and space, and moral judgments are moral because they are beneficial (pious because they are loved).

In Plato’s Euthyphro, Socrates encounters Euthyphro and engages him in conversation about why both are at court. Socrates is brought to trial over impiety, while Euthyphro is there to prosecute his own father over impiety as well, astonishing Socrates. Euthyphro claims that his father acted impiously by letting a worker die. Euthyphro explains to Socrates what had happened, leaving Socrates unconvinced Euthyphro is in the right. Socrates takes Euthyphro through conversation, criticizing what is pious and what it is to be pious and what is impious and what it is to be impious.

Euthyphro claims that what he is doing is pious, prosecuting those who commit injustice (Plato 5d), but Socrates states that Euthyphro did not explain what pious is itself, but that his actions were pious. After this Euthyphro exclaims that “what is loved by the gods is pious, and what is not loved by the gods is impious” (7a), and things being pious are the exact opposite of things that are impious. But Socrates mentions that the gods do fight, they do find different things pious and impious, and it is these differences that can make an action both loved and hated by the gods (8a). With this, they establish that what all that gods love is pious and what all the gods hate is impious, but this causes Socrates to ask “is the pious loved by the gods because it is pious? Or is it pious because it is loved?” (10a). This stumps Euthyphro and the rest of the discussion has Euthyphro contradicting himself and shows that Euthyphro does not have the wisdom of which he deems he has.

The way of which Socrates goes about his discussion with Euthyphro has Euthyphro analyzing his own claims with logic and reason rather than sentiment. What Socrates is trying to accomplish is to show that for one to obtain knowledge/wisdom of, for instance, morality, one must thoroughly criticize the idea and subject it to all possibilities (Socratic Method). In this instance with Euthyphro, Plato is dealing the Divine Command Theory of Morality, being that what is moral or pious is depicted by the gods and what they command; morally right actions are those indispensable of the gods. So the question is still, “is the pious loved by the gods because it is pious? Or is it pious because it is loved?” (10a). If it is pious because it is loved, then the problem is that morality becomes impulsive and unpredictable. This could cause things that are moral to become morally necessary. This is wrong for if something is pious, it must be good and if it was wrong it cannot be morally right, or what is pious is inconsistent. If the pious is loved by the gods because it is pious, then the problem is that this gives way to the idea that there is a true good, that by itself it is itself good, and being so, the gods become obsolete, for they are not the creators of what is moral and pious, but just the ones to whom recognize and are subjected to what is moral as well, making them no longer authoritarians (just like normal people).

What is learned from this discussion between Socrates and Euthyphro is that because things feel right does not mean we know that they are right. This is where we often find ourselves leaning not on logic but on sentiment. In both cases of Socrates and Hume, it is distinguished that moral decisions are, for the most part, based on sentiment. In the Euthyphro, Socrates shows that there are definite holes in the logic and reason in Euthyphro’s sentiment based decisions, not only that, but also not even knowing where his sentiment is coming from. There is no logic based reasoning to Euthyphro, and with Hume reasoning becomes the way to justify sentiment.

Reason and logic to the highest extent, like math, only has one solution and one truth value (2+2 always equals 4). Sensibility on the other hand holds no truth value other than something feels right. For example, I may be brought up to believe that murder is wrong and it be moral to convict ones own father of such an offense, yet when asked to explain an support myself, I have no other reason to believe that other than I have an emotion towards it, such as Euthyphro. If a person were to be presented with box and was told that it contained gold, but the person was not able to see or feel inside the box, there would be no proof and reason to support that there is actually gold in the box other than an influenced feeling that there is or that it is socially expected to believe so. If a person were to be presented with a plate with gold on it, the person would have visible and tangible support and reason to believe that there is gold one the plate. The plate holds truth using rational thinking and the box is sensible thinking, holding no definite assurance that there is truly gold inside the box. In basic terms, you can trust the plate you can see and tangibly measure more than box in which you have to have faith in. This example is one truth verses many unfolded ideas and assumptions; not knowing where sentiment comes from, how can it be trusted or considered reliable enough as to have truth value. I am positive that both Hume and Socrates would agree that even though moral judgments out of sentiment is most practiced, that moral judgment out of reason and logic should be favored. Hume in his enquiry states that "where men judge of things by their natural, unprejudiced reason, without the delusive glosses of superstition and false religion. Celibacy, fasting, penance, mortification, self-denial, humility...the whole monkish virtues; for what reason are they everywhere rejected by men of sense, but because they serve to no manner of purpose" (Hume 74). Hume is stating that peoples actions out virtues and moral acts from sentiment and not out of reason is useless. And such in the Euthyphro, Socrates uses logic and reason to question Euthyphro and divide Euthyphro from his beliefs towards piety by showing that his explanations are not based on reason but sentiment.

In this paper I have explained David Hume's argument of reason versus sentiment. I have shown how Socrates uses reason in the Euthyphro to distinguish that sentiment is unreliable if not analyzed. With these two philosophers I have shown that reason is a better utility than sentiment in making moral decision, in that reason holds a far better truth value than sentiment.

## Bibliography

Hume, David. *An Enquiry Concerning the Principles of Morals*. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 1983. Print.

Plato. "Euthyphro." *Readings in Ancient Greek Philosophy from Thales to Aristotle*. Ed. S. Marc Cohn, Patricia Curd, and C.D.C. Reeve. 3rd ed. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 2005. Print.

Haidt, J. *The Emotional Dog and its Rational Tail: A Social Intuitionist Approach to Moral Judgment*. (2001): 814-834. Print.

## Amour en Fleurs (Love in Bloom)

Winner: Writing Center Creative Writing Contest

### Beaumont Curtis Byron

Cold snow falls upon my cheek  
My nostrils dry and burning  
True love blooms beneath the ice  
Which lets my heart keep yearning

The flurry now becomes a storm  
As the time does pass  
Embracing with my lover tight  
Can this moment last

Freezing bodies cold as icicles  
Rightly can't deter  
The burning that exists in me  
The love I feel for her

As the light begins to fade  
The sun begins its slumber  
The twilight rings with violet hue  
And fills our hearts with wonder

The night descends without delay  
And passion grips us tight  
There's truly nothing like the thrill  
Of love on this saints night

The embers of our fire glow  
And shadows frolic free  
The fuel that feeds our hearts desire  
Ignites eternally

My heart it pounds a rhythmic beat  
To which our souls can dance  
It resonates off every hill  
And strengthens our romance

The things I say and do are right  
The planets all align  
Now I know that this is real  
She is my valentine

# The Prayer

*Runner-up: Writing Center Creative Writing Contest*

**Sara Marquez**

Why haven't you blessed me god,

Why hasn't your loving hand touched me?

Why is my heart still the color of a storm and my soul the raindrops,

Aren't I supposed to be free like the wind?

Yet I sit here with sorrow filled with bitter memories,

The days I was rejoiced lasted a second,

The harm to my emotions has lasted a life time,

Yet I still pray for a better day to happen,

I still kneel down to you and my eyes still search,

I search for the answer hidden in the sky,

For that fulfillment of curiosity my heart has yet to find,

Oh lord bless my soul if you're hearing this now,

Don't let me lay here with blood in my eyes,

Let me see another day, another life.

# I Have Many Names But You Can Call Me Death

*Second Runner-up Creative Writing Contest*

## **Varden Frias**

"I have many names, but you may call me Death"  
Embodied in the raven in Edgar Allen Poe's folklore,  
a dramatic presentation of my power over the  
human psyche.

Many times I have corrected God, telling Him  
how many people will die this year due to  
war, disease and famine.

Please do not stare at my unnatural ability  
to squish your best friend with a  
good row of ovarian cancer,  
or my way with natural disasters  
that can wipe out the inhabitants of  
the Gulf Coast.

Hardly do I understand when people applaud me  
when I allowed thousands of  
young and ignorant men to die in gas infested trenches,  
but in the same breath (fruitlessly, might I add)  
shriek and weep when I allowed  
a similar amount of Jews to be killed.

True to the myth,  
some like to flirt with me, at the bar on  
a lonely February's night, offering  
to buy me a little drink and perhaps a  
few at their house.

"Yes, of course," I wink. Of course, it is their  
corpse count that I am actually interested in.  
Oh yes I encounter the scientist, Thanatologists to be  
more specific, who dissect me  
bit by bit. Molecule by blackened molecule.

"Fascinating!" they cry over my mauled figure.  
Excited by their mediocre attempts to understand me,  
ready to categorize my perplexing traits and mystifying behaviors

into little glass jars peppering their laboratory  
of the macabre.

I must admit, though, there are few-very few-that dance with me.  
They have either grown calloused enough to forget to fear me, are  
obtuse beyond even my comprehension, or  
perhaps they are lonely.

The dancer carefully takes me in their arms, holding me  
and not letting go.

In complete understanding of one another,  
in a lock of both true acceptance and admiration,  
we dance.

And, yes, I encounter those that are just insane  
enough to do all of those things with me.  
Because I am Death, and I haven't many friends.