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The Western Kentucky University Student Honors Research Bulletin is dedicated to scholarly involvement and student research. These papers are representative of the quality work done by students from throughout the University.
FOREWORD

We present the 1990-91 edition of the Student Honors Research Bulletin with pleasure and pride. As in previous years, the papers represent a broad spectrum of Western student concerns. We hope that you will find these papers interesting and informative.

The papers submitted for the Bulletin were reviewed by Dr. Walker Rutledge and myself. We have chosen to publish fewer student papers this year than previously. This decision was made in part to allow us to publish for the first time a representative senior honors essay, which is somewhat longer than papers usually written for undergraduate classes.

We commend the authors of these papers for their dedication to quality research and writing. We hope that the selection of their papers for the Bulletin will encourage them to continue to develop their research and writing skills and to write for other publication outlets as well. We hope that the publication of the Bulletin will inspire other students to aspire to high quality in their own research and writing. We look forward to receiving many good papers for consideration for the 1991-1992 Bulletin.

Sam McFarland, Director
University Honors Program
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The corrupt Somoza dynasty which held Nicaragua in a tight grip of power from 1936 to 1979 was a government which was supported economically and politically by the United States. Although Somoza's rule seemed too antidemocratic for the North Americans, it was only the last in a long series of regimes supported by the U.S. In the year 1855, the American William Walker declared himself Nicaraguan President. He ruled for only one year before he was sent into exile. He returned twice to grapple for power but was caught and executed by the Honduran military. Another instance of U.S. intervention occurred in 1912 when the U.S. Marines came to Nicaragua and rallied in support of the Conservative Party, trying to keep it in power. Marines remained in the country from the year 1912 to 1925 and again from 1926 to 1933. Opposition developed, however, and gathered around the anti-imperialist leader Augusto Cesar Sandino (Barry 271-272).

Unable to defeat this small band fighting for national sovereignty, the Marines left the country, but the United States was not content to leave the future of the country in the hands of its citizens. In order to keep a strong pro-American force in Nicaragua, the U.S. instituted what was soon to become the power tool of the Somoza dynasty, the Guardia Nacional (Millet 251). Anastasio Somoza Garcia, the first leader of this national army, won the backing of his men shortly after he had assumed the jefe (chief) position in 1933 and launched his dictatorship in 1936, a dynasty which would stand for the next forty-three years. With American assistance and the strong arm of the Guardia behind the family, the Somozas soon became one of the richest families in Latin America. After the Sandinistas defeated Anastasio Somoza Debyale, the last dictator and the youngest son of the family, the United States Intelligence Bureau estimated his worth at nine million dollars (Blum, 251). In 1978, the United States finally realized its mistake, but it was too late. The government had helped three dictators to remain in power while they drained the country of its resources, ruined the economic infrastructure, committed gross civil rights violations, and accumulated huge amounts of personal wealth.

Anastasio Somoza Garcia developed a keen interest in politics — especially North American politics. During the years that the Marines were stationed in Nicaragua, Somoza, who had been educated in the U.S., ingratiated himself with the American officers, impressing them with his “fantastically incorrect and fluent” English (Selser 180). When the U.S. Marines pulled out of the country, Anastasio Somoza Garcia was appointed Jefe Director of the Guardia Nacional, the top position in the military hierarchy. As the leader of the strong military body, Somoza immediately began to gain the loyalty of his troops through graft, promotions, and outright gifts of money. According to Father Miguel D’escoito, an outspoken figure in current Nicaraguan politics, many of the civilians were opposed to the Guardia Nacional and the power of Somoza. They were afraid of the total control which the North American force held and knew that there would be no way to oust the army if it became corrupt (Yarborough 95-96).

One Nicaraguan in particular came forth opposed to “Yankee intervention” and the oppression of the common worker. His name was Augusto Cesar Sandino. He suffered an American campaign of personal defamation which was unequal to that suffered by any other Latin American leader. He was the illegitimate son of a servant and her employer, born May 18, 1895. Although not neglected by his father, he was raised by his mother from whom he took the name Augusto Calderon. A few years later, he moved in with his father, taking the name Augusto C. Sandino. Soon the C. would be changed to Cesar (Macaulay 49).

In 1921 Sandino engaged in a fight which killed a man and would radically change his life. The reasons for the fight are still unclear, but many speculate between two causes. The fight was either started over an insult given to Sandino’s mother or it was a political disagreement (Selser 63). Because of the fight, Sandino was forced to leave the country. He travelled for a few years, first fleeing to Honduras and then to Guatemala. He finally made his home in Tampico, Mexico. While Sandino was living and working in Mexico, he witnessed growing labor problems and the increasing misery of his fellow workers. He saw a need for labor reforms, but American intervention in the country was high, and political reforms could not be completed. This awareness marked the beginning of his anti-imperialist career, a campaign waged mainly against North American intervention (Selser 64-65).

In May 1926, Sandino, after becoming thoroughly involved in nationalist politics, was summoned home by his father. Upon his arrival, he was enraged by the Marine intervention in his country; in 1927, he formed a small band of peasants which began fighting for nationalism (Macaulay 54). These guerrilla peasants became known as Sandinistas and were primarily interested in a slow, methodical spread of the revolution, securing one spot before moving to another (Macaulay 10). Although these men were not at first successful, their methodical attacks lasted for six years with a surprising success rate. Nicaraguan public opinion was gathering behind the nationalist hero Sandino.

The current President of Nicaragua, Juan Bautista
Sacasa was scared of the growing nationalist sentiment and started to suppress the Sandinista movements. One morning in January 1933, Sandino reported that he woke with a bad feeling. He was afraid that if peace were not reached with the Sacasa government, he would die. Sacasa was very pleased to hear of the possibility of a peace settlement, arranging terms on February 2, 1933, for Sandino to consider. Pleased by the January 2nd American withdrawal of troops, Sandino agreed to sign the treaty and end the destructive guerrilla warfare which had been waged in order to rid the country of the American Marines (Macaulay 245-246). Sacasa, willing to pursue further negotiations, called Sandino into the city of Managua for a banquet and open talks with the Sandinista leaders. The banquet progressed well but later that same evening tragedy struck.

Augusto César Sandino, along with two of his rebel leaders, was assassinated. His brother, Socrates, was murdered in a field outside of town that same night. The assassination was successful because it killed both the leader and the strong Sandinista movement that had gained such strong public force (Macaulay 256).

Somoza, the leader of the Guardia Nacional, publicly denied any link to the assassination; however, he began spreading rumors through the Guardia and through his press organ, La Prensa, that he was responsible for the murder and that the order had come directly from Washington. Actually, the order to execute Sandino was not directly from Washington, although American Ambassador Lane had told Somoza that the elimination of Sandino was supported and recommended by the U.S. because they considered him a disturbance to the peace. Somoza, convinced of U.S. support, then signed with some of his generals a pact entitled “The Death of César.” This pact insured that none of the men would be tempted to confess, making them all accomplices to the murder of Sandino. Sacasa was enraged. He feared that his administration would be blamed for a crime which it had not committed. Three months after Sandino’s murder, Somoza openly provoked President Sacasa by admitting to the murder of Sandino. Making the situation even worse, he commended everyone who had been involved with the assassination and asked the National Congress to grant them all amnesty for the crime. Congress acceded to his wishes, Sacasa vetoed the act, and Congress once again showed the growing power of Somoza by overruling the presidential veto (Crawley 87-88).

Sacasa’s power was now dwindling, but he suspected that the United States was supporting Somoza and did nothing to stop the man who opposed him. Although he was nonchalant, his wife Maria was acting in quite a different way. For many years she had been watching Somoza gain power and saw him as a real threat to her husband’s presidency. In an attempt to stop Somoza’s quest for power, she went to Washington for assistance. She was unsuccessful, being told that because of Roosevelt's Good Neighbor Policy, the U.S. could not intervene (Crawley 91). When Sacasa made feeble cries of foul play in the Nicaraguan government, he was advised to swallow “la pildora del Somocismo” and resign from the presidency (Sacasa 347). In 1936, Maria was ultimately defeated when General Anastasio Somoza García ousted Juan Batista Sacasa from the presidency. Sacasa did step down but on May 31, he pleaded with Somoza not to resort to bloodshed to solve the country’s political problems (Sacasa 351). The United States quickly recognized the new government, pleased with the potential of having Somoza as a supporting force in Latin America. This forced takeover marked the beginning of the longest dynasty ever to rule in Latin America.

In order to remain the strongest man in the country, Somoza retained his position as Jefe over the Guardia Nacional. His soldiers were kept away from the general public in order to keep them loyal. They enjoyed a special government subsidy for food and clothing and were not subject to the same duties and taxes as the civilians. They also were rarely tried in civil courts for crimes committed against citizens. These men in the Guardia prospered under Somoza’s rule while the average Nicaraguan suffered (Millet 253).

In office, Somoza García immediately began to strengthen his country’s position and to increase his personal wealth by welcoming U.S. investment and making himself into a staunch U.S. ally. He denounced communism and retained strong diplomatic ties with the United States, which allowed Nicaragua to be used as a stabilizing front against communist influence in Central America (Curtis 138). Once the ally was gained, American funding for all programs increased, and Somoza showed himself to be a shrewd businessman by using the funds in his best interest (Eitchison 40-41). He took over valuable lands by persuading occupants to sell them at half price or merely donate them to the government. After these lands had been acquired, he used government funding to build roads and lay telegraph and telephone lines throughout the country. These new lines of communication opened up his land and nearly doubled the worth of his property. Soon Somoza owned the nation’s shipping lines, the national airline, textile factories, sugar mills, and about one-fourth of the country’s arable lands (Crawley 142). In addition to his land holdings, Somoza’s personal bank account grew rapidly. The Nicaraguan public generally had to bear the brunt of his growing fortune. An example of his greed involved his beef export tax. He charged 1.5 cents per pound on everyone else’s exported beef, money that went directly toward his herd (Crawley 97).

Although Somoza bragged that the country had more millionaires than ever and that the people should love him, Nicaraguan hatred for him grew daily (Christian 24).

After his term as President had expired, Somoza decided it would be easier to bypass the partisan effort in the upcoming election. With his loyal body of soldiers supporting him, he merely had himself appointed to the presidency to serve another term (Crawley 98).

After a mild show of reservation, the United States once again decided that it would be beneficial to have a strong pro-American force in Central America. Somoza was even invited to the White House to meet with Franklin Delano Roosevelt in 1940. When Roosevelt was asked about inviting
a dictator into the White House for a meeting, he replied, "He's a son-of-a-bitch, but he's ours." (Christian 24). During this time period, Somozas encouraged Washington to grant him a two-million-dollar loan to build a coast-to-coast road from the Pacific to the Caribbean. This new road opened up many lands which were owned mostly by him and allowed another increase in his personal wealth.

By 1941, Somosa was still searching for ways to gain international approval and therefore more international funds. In an attempt to gain this support, he made what was to be his wisest decision since he had been in power. Somozas declared his support for the allied powers fighting in World War II. This decision did not cause him to enter his men in any actual combat but greatly enhanced U.S. military funding (Crawley 100). To show his sincerity in backing the allies, Somosa seized German and Italian properties and sold them, with some of the money going to government coffers while most went directly to the Somosa family. Although riots and violence broke out among the German and Italian landowners during this seizure of land, the National Guard, as always, acted swiftly and effectively to halt disorder (Ryan 176). Using the land available to them, the United States constructed large airfields at Managua and Puerto Cabezas and a naval base at the port of Corinto. The American soldiers who were brought into the country to man these stations stimulated the economy but also caused a massive surge of inflation. The poor of the country were driven away below the poverty level as a result of the greediness of Anastasio Somoza Garcia (Christian 22).

By 1944, Somosa knew that he wanted to remain President of Nicaragua but could not run in the next election because of a constitutional ban. In a masterful show of tactical politics, he began an elaborate plan. First he had his congressmen pass an illegal constitutional amendment, lifting his ban on re-election. He then vetoed this bill in a show of political justice. His next step was to officially organize labor unions, blocking the opposition of their cries for reform and also keeping the labor movement under his wing. After this delicate web was in place, Somosa announced that he would once again run for re-election. The United States was appalled that he would expect to rule the country for another term and warned him that if he did not withdraw from the race, all of his support would be rescinded (Crawley 105).

Somoza did not immediately take his name from the ballot, but when internal uprisings also started to plague his administration, he began to search for a way to remain in control yet keep all of his support. By 1945, he was convinced that the United States support was not within his grasp. With an ulterior motive, he signed a pledge that he would publicly disavow his candidacy and also release all political prisoners (Crawley 104). The United States was satisfied, and Somoza was now able to avert his attention to his second plan—backing a puppet for President who would allow him to keep control of the country. The man Somoza chose to back as President was the aging politician Leonardo Arguello. Somozas decided to keep control of the power tool, the Guardia, but allow Arguello, who he felt would be a sycophant, to assume the position of President (Crawley 102-104).

On May 1, 1947, the election took place. The voters were lined up at the polls in two separate lines. The first line was only constituents who would cast their vote for Arguello, while the second line supported the opposition. Arguellos line progressed smoothly all day long, while the opposition's lines ran into many difficulties. Their line was kept from moving by problems such as improper identification and many mechanical problems. By the end of the day, the opposition's line still barely moving, was disseminated because the polls had closed at the hour the election was to be completed. In this questionable election, Arguello had taken control of the presidency (Crawley 106-107). Somozas had kept his power and U.S. support.

Although Tacho Somosa felt that he was in total control, the situation soon changed. Arguello did not continue to be the malleable pawn which he was originally perceived to be. He tried at first to change the command in the Guardia, sending ardent Somosa supporters to outlying posts in an attempt to weaken the loyalty of the army. He next announced his appointees for cabinet, and they included eight of Somozas's opposition. Finally he enraged Somoza by countermanding many of his orders—an unheard of offense (Diederich 27-29). After Arguello had gained some support, he issued orders for Somoza to leave the country. Although he had no intention of leaving, on May 23, 1947, Somozas made public a plan which said that he would leave the country (Diederich 29). Very quickly, Somoza arranged a military takeover and had Arguello declared mentally incompetent. First Arguello only was imprisoned in a basement chamber of the President's house, but soon he, like Sacasa, was sent into exile in Mexico (Crawley 108).

A designate was quickly appointed to the presidency. This politician immediately showed that he was not strong enough and another was appointed. This second man was Victor Roman y Reyes who ironically was the uncle of Anastasio Somoza Garcia. Since the leader of the country had been changed three times within a few weeks, the opposition (anti-Somoza liberals) saw a split in the party and planned a revolt. Somoza met and crushed this attack with the Guardia Nacional. This military victory further strengthened the political position of Somoza Garcia and convinced him that he should run against his incumbent uncle for President during the next election. This campaign never had to be run because before the next election date, Victor Roman y Reyes died of a heart attack. Somoza was appointed to Roman y Reyes position for the remaining three weeks. At the next election, more fraudulent practices were utilized, and Somoza won the presidency by a comfortable amount (Crawley 107-108).

Although Somoza held a tight grip over Nicaraguan politics, he was a leader who was not known for his widespread brutality but instead for his selective cruelty. Unlike most other oppressive dictators, he would capture only the leaders of his opposition. The leaders would then be tortured for many weeks but would usually be released from prison
in about two years (Christian 24). One of the favorite torture methods used by Somoza and his men was dubbed *la maquinita*, or the little machine. This device was used to persuade prisoners into leaking information. It consisted of a small electric wire which was wrapped around a prisoner's scrotum; then if a compromise was not reached, the voltage was released. When Somoza was asked about the device by a reporter, he merely replied that he knew it didn’t hurt because he had tried the machine on his hand once (Diederich 35). Although cruelty was used during Somoza’s reign, the torture was limited to very small numbers of people. The reason that the repression was not more widespread was due in part to the fact that the *Guardia* was always present in the villages, constantly watching the people; therefore, the opposition parties remained small, and Somoza was left to concentrate almost solely on his personal wealth. By 1950, the Somoza family was the largest landholder in Nicaragua (Barry 272).

In 1953, a new organization could be seen working in Nicaragua—the Central Intelligence Agency of the United States. Jose Figueres, The Costa Rican President, accused Somoza of backing the C.I.A. in its attempt to remove him from office (Christian 21). Later that same year, to once again show his support for the U.S., Somoza let the CIA use his country as an airstrip and training post for the U.S. government’s battle against communism in Guatemala. These two operations were the first two blatant maneuvers to be undertaken in Latin America by the C.I.A.—an organization which would later play a large role in Nicaraguan politics (Blum 81, 91).

In a final show of alliance to the United States, Anastasio Somoza Garcia signed the treaty of Friendship, Commerce and Navigation, and Protocol between Nicaragua and the United States. This treaty was signed June 21, 1956, and made public to the other Latin American countries as well as to the rest of the world that Nicaragua would support the intentions of the United States. (Ryan 188). Once again Somoza had made an intelligent decision. He had appeased the United States by showing his support but did not have to make a sacrifice in doing so.

By fall of 1956, Somoza’s luck ran out. Public sentiment against him was growing because of his increasing wealth in the face of a poverty-stricken nation. September 29, 1956, Rigoberto Lopez Perez assassinated Anastasio Somoza Garcia. Although many thought that Lopez was a member of a party which had been conspiring against Somoza, Lopez revealed through a letter to his mother that the assassination had been a lone act of desperation against a despised man for the sake of his country. Lopez also stated that he knew he would lose his life in the attempt, but to remove Somoza would be worth the price (Crawley 116-117).

Lopez’s assassination attempt did not prove to be as successful as he had hoped. Although Somoza Garcia had been killed, the Somoza family remained in power for another twenty-two years. Somoza had three sons, one of whom was illegitimate. The illegitimate son was placed in the *Guardia* and was quickly elevated to a position of status. The other two sons were sent to North America in order to gain an education that would help them to lead the country after their father’s demise. The oldest son, Luis Somoza Debyate, was groomed to be the President while his younger brother, Tachito, was sent to West Point Military Academy so that he could gain control of the *Guardia Nacional* (Christia 25).

After the death of Tacho Somoza, Somoza’s sons used the excuse of punishing their father’s murderers as a way to consolidate power. A wide scale crackdown was issued as members of opposition parties were harassed by the *Guardia*. Soon the nation calmed as the two sons assumed the positions in government for which they had been trained. Luis began to serve as president while his brother assumed the *Jefe* position over the *Guardia*. As Luis’ presidency began, he proved to be a more peaceful leader than his father had been. He was excellent with people, and as a political spokesperson, he easily manipulated Congress. An agricultural major in college, he had not had the strong military training that his brother had and spoke much less frankly (Diederich 55).

In an attempt to bring peace to the dissatisfied people, Luis drafted an amendment for constitutional approval stating that neither he nor his brothers would run for President in the next Nicaraguan election. In fact, it stipulated that anyone related to him by blood up to the “fourth degree” could not succeed him. This amendment was an attempt to quiet the growing opposition to the Somoza name. Luis still had every intention of the family retaining its powerful hand in the country, but he felt that it would be safer to maintain the power if they didn’t continue to hold the presidency (Diederich 55-56). Even though the new amendment was a popular idea in Nicaragua, Luis still had major political problems. The plight of the lower classes was worsening. Because the cotton and the livestock industries boomed, the large *haciendas* grew even larger, pushing the subsistence farmers off their land. These peasants were usually forced to work on the *hacienda* for very meager wages (Crawley 121). Luis saw this growing disparity among the peasants and knew that he needed support to strengthen his regime in order to quell any uprisings. Once again, Nicaragua turned toward the United States for support. Luis announced that Nicaragua would become a “bridge of democracy.” Moderate reform laws were passed, the constitutional ban on re-election was instated, and a few political prisoners were released. The United States once again began to look favorably on Nicaragua and her attempts at reforms (Crawley 125).

While Luis was trying to bring peace to the country, his brother was fighting him and trying to overshadow his power. After 1960, Luis suspended civil liberties and dealt harshly with all opposition. Many claim that this sudden political change was made because of pressure imposed on him by Tachito. Cuban communism had become a threatening problem for the U.S., and Tachito felt that in order to maintain United States support, communism must be fought against openly (Barry 36). He advocated a strong hold to the presidency in his country, the opposite of Luis’s ideology. Luis continued making decisions with Tachito, the
harsher and the stronger of the two, always over his shoulder trying to influence him.

After serving a term in office, Luis followed the constitutional amendment that his father had originated and then he passed it through office; he did not run for re-election. In his place the family chose a man who they felt would act as a “puppet.” His name was Rene Schlick, but after he gained the office of President in 1963, he was not the faithful pawn that he had been for years as Tacho’s legal secretary and Luis’s advisor. During his time as President, he released detainees, gave freedom to the press, and forced the Guardia to reduce imprisonment of detainees. (Diederich 130). After several showdowns with Schick, Tachito let the public know that in 1967, he would take power. He began taking this power by grooming loyal forces (131). Although Schick caused a problem for Tachito and his family, the problem was short lived. Schick soon died. Immediately, Tachito arranged an election in which he employed his Guardia to watch over the voting stations. In this fraudulent election Tachito gained seventy percent of the vote and realized his dream of becoming Nicaragua’s President, but in the process, he had his first of several showdowns with the opposition politician Fernando Aguero (Crawley 20).

Meanwhile, as Somoza Debayle was courting the United States, knowing that the friendship would secure his power over the people, Fernando Aguero was rallying the people. During the 1963 election, he had asked that the Organization of American States supervise the voting, but Somoza with his Guardia Nacional would not allow it. Somoza publicly denounced this attempted vigilant act as an insult to the country’s national sovereignty (Etchison 36). Enraged, the Traditional Conservatives and Independent Liberals boycotted the election; the consequence was that the remaining voters and those who were related to the Guardia insured Shick’s overwhelming victory.

Undaunted by his failed attempt in 1963, Aguero tried again in 1967 to have Nicaraguan elections supervised. He asked only that the Organization of American States insure that the voting processes were fair and that the Guardia were kept away from the actual polling stations. His request was denied, but this time the reasoning differed. The O.A.S. responded that if the U.S. permitted the supervision of the elections, the request would be granted. Aguero, elated, petitioned the U.S. to ask its allowance for the measure, but he was disappointed with the reply; the government had already given its support to Tachito Somoza and saw no need for the O.A.S. to stand guard over the elective process (Etchison 37). Somoza was elected.

Growing up in Nicaragua, Tachito was an intelligent boy. At the age of ten, he was sent to the United States, where he would spend the next ten years of his life trying to gain an education superior to the one offered in his country. He was often harassed and ridiculed during his school days because of his Latin roots but this ridicule ceased when Tachito’s father came to the United States to meet with Franklin Delano Roosevelt. He finished his education at West Point and was given the Guardia upon his graduation. Many teased that Somoza was the first student from West Point to receive an army upon his graduation (Diederich 83).

As Tachito Somoza Debayle took over the reins of his country in February of 1967, he ruled in a way that was very similar to the way his father ruled. At first he stepped back into his position as jefe supremo of the National Guard. He soon tried to make the people believe that there was an equal distribution of wealth in the country, while in reality, he was trying to expand his own financial holdings and allow as many relatives as possible to hold government positions (Millet 232). Only a few days after he had entered the office of President, Tachito showed his strong will by closing down the opposition radio station, claiming that it was a communist threat (Crawley 141). On April 8th, 1967, unhappy with his brother’s recent rise to president, Luis had a massive coronary. He was treated by the best doctors, but died five days later. Tachito was not only now free from his brother’s more moderate opinions, but also became the major inheritor of his father’s huge estate (Diederich 83). After the first few months, an opposing force, the Frente Sandinista Liberacion Nacional, began to give Tachito more and more problems, but he repeatedly reported that the communists had been crushed (67).

This same year, the faction which would continue to haunt Somoza until his downfall emerged—the Frente Sandinista Liberacion Nacional. August 1967, at the mountain peak of Pancasan, a small group of revolutionaries who had taken their name from the former nationalist hero, Sandino, reappeared. They fought and were defeated. Silvio Mayorga, a leader of the group, was killed in combat (Booth 140). While Tachito was jubilant about this defeat, the Sandinistas (FSLN) were just beginning their long build-up to a victory, and by the end of 1967, they numbered approximately fifty men and women who were willing to die for the revolution (Diederich 84-85).

The ploy of labeling the opposition’s movement as a communist threat became a tactic that Somoza would employ many more times in the future. He knew that if he posed as one man battling the communist world that the United States, as well as other capitalist nations, would support him through donations of arms and possibly gifts of money. Somoza was correct in this assumption, partly because he knew that the proximity of his country to the Panama Canal made the area particularly susceptible to the communist threat. The United States was terrified that Russia would recognize the importance of the East-West link to the Pacific and try to take Nicaragua as a first step in securing the canal (Sulzberger 192).

Somoza was no doubt an excellent politician and used his power as President of Nicaragua to gain financial allies. An excellent example of his political scheming was his attempt to gain even more funding from North America than his father had received. In previous years Somoza had been known to intervene in United States electoral races in hopes of assisting sympathetic politicians who would someday hold power. In the election of 1968 this tactic proved a goldmine for Tachito Somoza. He contributed to Richard Nixon’s campaign through a mutual friend, Bebe Rebozo. When
Nixon was elected President, Somoza’s hopes soared (Crawley 146); the new President was giving a lot of attention to Latin America, although most of the attention was unfavorable, but Somoza Debyale saw in Nixon a chance to gain more U.S. support (Sulzberger 96).

Somoza’s aid to the Presidential campaign did ultimately prove fruitful as Nixon offered the hand of foreign aid to the poverty-stricken land of Nicaragua. Although this gesture seemed very humanitarian, Nixon had ulterior motives. His plan for the country was to use the land as an American stronghold in order to keep hostile movements, such as Fidel Castro’s communist movement and the threat of other insurgency, away from the American continent (Sulzberger 73). In the Nicaraguan-American alliance, it seemed that no one had any concern that the natives were crying out for national sovereignty while trying to escape from under the hands of their oppressive dictator. Making the situation even worse, the new American Ambassador, Turner B. Shelton, was an ardent Somoza fan and would frequently avoid portraying the true Nicaraguan situation to Washington. President Nixon and U.S. Ambassador Shelton worked together to strengthen Nicaragua and help keep Somoza in power against the will of the native citizens (Millet 235). Historians will argue that supporting Somoza while ignoring the citizens of the country created even more support among the people for the left wing parties, which would ultimately take control of the country (“Nicaragua: Guns for Somoza” 255).

The years following the election were not peaceful years in Nicaragua. By the end of the 1960’s, public outcry had risen against the regime to such a pitch that Somoza could no longer avoid the cries of his citizenry. With his shrewd political calculations, he seized upon the reform elements which had been advocated by the opposition but enacted them to a lesser degree than had originally been proposed. This action temporarily served not only to appease the public but also to fragment his opposition, bringing the faction of the opposition that was happy with the maneuvers back to the Partido Liberación Nacional, (PLN), Somoza’s party (Ryan 177).

In 1969, the Frente once again rose up against Somoza. They attacked banks and commercial enterprises in attempts to raise money to buy arms. Trying to stop these robberies, Somoza ordered a small attack which killed five and captured two of the guerrillas. Tachito once again announced that he had wiped out the Communists, but part of the group merely escaped by fleeing to exile to Costa Rica (Diederich 87-88). In 1970, another attack was launched by Santinistas. This campaign was labeled the Zinica campaign and was ultimately successful because it was the first attack to win the sympathy and support of the civilians (Booth 40).

It soon became obvious that the reforms had been too little, too late. Nicaraguans were still furious with Somoza’s wealth in the face of a toppling economy. Somoza Debyale was forced to take a step which was larger than he had originally intended. First, he offered Aguero, his former enemy, more representation in government. He offered to give his party three of the seven seats on the Supreme Court, one seat on each of the courts of appeal, two representatives on the board of each autonomous government agency, an advisor in each Ministry, the Director of Planning, the Attorney General’s office and other positions. Then, in early 1972, Tachito handed over his power as President to a new triumvirate: Aguero, Rober Martinez-Lacayo, and Alfonso Lopez Cordero. The last two represented the power of the PLN, while Aguero held the power of Somoza’s opposition. Turner B. Shelton, The United States Ambassador to Nicaragua, was very pleased with the changes and arranged for Somoza to be invited to the White House for a visit with Nixon. Although the relinquishment of power impressed many, including natives the core of the opposition felt that they had been betrayed by Aguero. The election, regardless of the number of vote cast, would place sixty of the one hundred seats in Congress in the hands of Somoza’s party, the liberal nationalist (Crawley 146). They knew that without a majority in power it would be very difficult to make the changes in government that they wished and impossible to remove Somoza from power. The arrangement of the triumvirate, therefore, was a compromise which appeared neither party but would no stand for more than a year.

December 23, 1972, disaster struck Nicaragua. A series of earthquakes virtually destroyed the capital city of Managua, killing thousands of people. Anarchy dominated the country and the newly formed triumvirate was not yet strong enough to maintain its powers. The Guardia Nacional virtually disintegrated. Along with most of the people of Managua, the Guardsmen went into a panic. For most of them, finding their families became an immediate priority. Some were also seen in the streets looting the stores (Diederich 94). U.S. Ambassador Shelton tried to convince Somoza that a seizure of political power was necessary in order to bring a semblance of democracy back into the country (“A Secret War for Nicaragua” 42-43). Somoza assured of United States support, forced himself back into power. Acting as Je to the Guardia Nacional, Somoza formed a reconstruction agency to help rebuild Managua. Next, he granted unlimited power to the head of the bureau so that the triumvirate could not politically block any move which was made by the head of the organization. By 1974 Somoza had appointed himself to the head position of the new reconstruction agency, and using his omnipotent powers, declared himself a presidential candidate. He was re-elected, and the reins of the country were again in the hands of a member of the Somoza dynasty (Etchison 39).

As Nicaragua was trying to rebuild its devastated capital, she received help from many different countries. The most charitable of these countries was the United States sending over twenty-seven million dollars in aid (Etchison 39). Although this amount seemed as if it would be very beneficial, much of the money did not reach the victims Somoza used large amounts of the aid to rebuild his own businesses destroyed by the quake, adding to the amount of his fortune. He also paid large sums of money to the officers and the soldiers in the Guardia Nacional in order to keep the force loyal to himself. Critics of U.S. aid
Nicaragua seized upon this incident, claiming that the money not only bolstered Somoza’s right wing dictatorship but also fed money into programs which were so badly managed that the aid fell right back into the hands of the dictator, hurting the victims more than it ever helped. (Curtis 137). Regardless of criticism, the power was back in the hands of Somoza as he continued to lead his country with the same moneylegging style as he had in the past.

The year 1973 was basically eventless because the country was still shocked by the quake, but 1974 brought with it many problems. The dissension began when a party was thrown in honor of American ambassador Shelton. An attempted coup by the growing Sandinista faction was launched during the party to show growing disapproval of U.S. intervention. Due to a discrepancy of time, the group was not successful with their goal of catching Somoza and Ambassador Shelton in the house, but they did find a number of family members. In exchange for these family members, the Sandinistas demanded that political prisoners be released, a revolutionary broadcast be made to the people, a large ransom given to the perpetrators and safe release guaranteed. (Diederich 92).

The coup enraged Somoza. He was jilted out of his complacency and warned of impending doom. Instantly, he instituted the first serious wave of country-wide repression against the left wing forces. This reign of terror included press censorship, military tribunals trying civilians without fair representation, and incidents such as the mass slaughter of 109 civilians who were found bullet ridden in three mass graves. The Guardia was roaming through the city streets terrorizing the people (Crawley 152). The warfare was also conducted in the countryside and small villages. Peasants who were suspected subversives were dragged out of their homes and openly shot as examples for others who might think of joining the left-wing party (Walker 57-61). Church sources reported 400 deaths after the December 27th coup, but Amnesty International statistics were much higher (Crawley 152). As the people were warring against their government, Tachito and Managua’s archbishop, Obando y Bravo, were also having disagreements, and a new split occurred between the government and the Catholic Church (Millet 236). The church, adopting the new ideas of liberation theology, began to sever its ties with the Nicaraguan strongman who was persecuting his own people. Throughout this entire period of terror and censorship, although there were many witnesses, there was an absence of official records. Most of the court martials by military tribunals was not recorded, and none of the brutality and cruelty toward the peasants or campesinos by the Guardia was documented (Walker 100).

Opposition to Somoza’s tyrannical rule was growing decisively. One of the most threatening groups of the opposition was the FSLN. The faction had been started by three men: Carlos Fonseca Amador, Silvio Mayorga, and Tomas Borge. They named the group the Frente Sandinista Liberacion Nacional, robbed a few banks to start their treasury, and disappeared into the safety of Honduras to train. In 1961, 1963, and 1967, the guerrillas ventured out of Honduras but were crushed by the National Guard every time that they appeared. Still, they pledged to continue to build their forces and attack until they had brought down Somoza (Booth 138-139). After several years of little organization, in 1970 the Sandinistas made a change. Their forces grew larger and better supported by the peasants in the area. The National Guard tried to counter this growing support by repression of people in the areas which were suspected to be loyal to the Sandinistas. These hard tactics backfired, causing hatred of the Guardia among the civilians (Booth 141).

By 1975, the Sandinistas were so numerous that the party was able to withstand a split into three factions; Terceristas—a group emphasizing rural and urban insurrection, Proletarios—the faction which urged the use of propaganda in factories and poor neighborhoods, and the adherents of the prolonged people’s war (GPP)—the men who wanted to continue a slow methodical build up of the war. Although these three factions were very diverse, encompassing both a democratic faction and a Marxist faction, the party would later unify in order to fight Somoza, the common enemy (Gleijeses 127-128).

During these years of repression, tangible and intangible tokens of U.S. support continued until it incensed the population most affected by Somoza’s dictatorship, the lower and even middle classes. The growing left wing felt that all their attempts to topple the long-standing dictatorship were futile because of the strong American hand supporting Somoza’s regime (Kirkpatrick 34). For example, in 1976 the U.S. State Department approved a sale of arms to Somoza (“Nicaragua: Guns for Somoza” 255). The Nicaraguan people realized that these guns would be used against them by the Guardia to suppress their voices against Somoza. A change in American foreign policy was absolutely necessary if the public was to accept continued American intervention in the country of Nicaragua.

A change, though very small, was just what Nicaragua saw in 1976. As the United States President, Jimmy Carter, took office, foreign policy slowly began to change. In place of earlier American foreign policies of containment, Carter’s central concern was that of modernization for the third world countries (Kirkpatrick 39). He felt that labor unions could help the workers of the country to rise from their own poverty. The Carter administration did utilize the C.I.A. in Nicaragua, but these agents were employed to support the democratic structure in Nicaragua by organizing and rallying labor unions (“A Secret War for Nicaragua” 44). The Carter administration also had a belief that the toppling of the Somoza autocracy was inevitable, desirable, and in the American interest. For this reason, Carter did not fear the left movement or label it as a communist threat that needed to be crushed. He saw it as a rational step in the civilian movement toward toppling a dictator.

Although Carter was not alarmed by the Sandinista movement, American public opinion and congressional sentiment were still against the group, fearing communist roots and trying to avoid another “Cuba.” As late as June 23, 1977, the U.S. House approved a foreign assistance
appropriation bill that authorized 3.1 million dollars in military assistance to the Nicaraguan government. The American public was naive about the human rights violations which Carter had targeted and was trying to purge from the country ("Nicaragua: Guns for Somoza" 255).

On January 10, 1978, a catalyst for public opinion occurred. A leading member of the opposition, Pedro Joaquín Chamorro, was ambushed and shot by a gang of hired killers. Tachito immediately claimed that he was not involved with the assassination and hunted down and prosecuted the killers. They confessed instantly but were very vague about who had paid them to commit the crime. Suspicion of Somoza’s involvement was widespread (Crawley 163). The assassination of the public figure Chamorro was the final act. Because he had been shot in the street where everyone could see, the public outcry was overwhelming. The majority of the population of Nicaragua would now back any movement to remove who they thought was a cold-blooded murderer from office.

A change in United States public sentiment did not occur until June 20, 1978. The American people were incensed when the Guardia Nacional, during one of its regular raids, killed an American television newsman (Historic Documents of 1979 581). The ABC reporter, Bill Stewart, had been on the scene in Managua filming with a group of other newsmen. When he saw a battle on the streets, he approached with his press card held high. Upon encountering agroundsman, he was ordered to his knees, told to lie down on the ground, put his hands behind his head, and was shot. The rest of the crew had filmed the incident, and they barely escaped with their evidence and their lives (Deiderich 271). Finally, the United States government had decided to watch Somoza more closely but was not ready to give up total control of the country. Congress decided to try to support the Guardia in hopes that a competent leader might emerge that would continue to favor the United States (Walker 58). The C.I.A. also helped by searching for a more moderate leader among the labor unions with which they were involved (Blum 331). Together, Congress and the C.I.A. sought for Somoza an alternative who was not deeply involved with the Sandinista regime—a believed Marxist contingent.

This continued covert action by the C.I.A. frightened Somoza, causing him to further tighten his strings on the media (Van Pulley 208). The repression across the countryside became even harsher as the Sandinistas grew in number. Estimates of the students against the government were striking. The opposition paper La Prensa estimated 70% Marxist and 25% social cristianos with the remaining 5% indifferent (Crawley 150). Ironically, in 1978, in the midst of public dissension, when political prisoners were being tortured and killed, Jimmy Carter thought that Somoza was trying to improve his horrendous record of human rights violations. He wrote a letter congratulating him on his strides toward correcting the problems in his country (Crawley 163). This letter was Somoza’s last bestowal of political approval by the U.S., for the dynasty was coming into a time of great danger, facing insurmountable odds.

On August 22, 1978, the revolution began. Twenty-five Sandinists struck in Managua and marched unopposed into the Palacio Nacional, the seat of Congress, and a number of government agencies, taking fifteen hundred hostages. This attack was led by Eden Pastora, who was referred to as commandante Cero. He was the only guerrilla involved in the attack who had ever been inside the Palacio Nacional and that was only as a child (Diederich 179). The Sandinista inside the building asked for Arch-bishop Obando y Bravo and two other bishops to negotiate with them. The ambassadors of Costa Rica also served as mediators (180). After the situation calmed, they demanded a release of fifty-nine political prisoners, a ransom of ten million dollars, the broadcast of a revolutionary communiqué, and a safe departure from the country. The Sandinistas received all of their demands except the complete amount of the ransom (Crawley 163).

This small group of Sandinistas had been hiding in the mountains, training, growing, and propagandizing since 1961. Renewed nationalistic sentiment was beginning to enhance the public opinion of the Sandinistas. For the remainder of 1978, small guerrilla attacks were repeatedly made on the countryside. The earlier philosophy of a slow methodic revolution carried out in isolated villages was still prevalent.

On December 20, 1978, Cyrus R. Vance called an emergency meeting in Washington of the Organization of American States to consider five resolutions: the Nicaraguan people must bring their own peace; the Somoza regime must be removed; a democratic government must be installed; guarantee of rights for all Nicaraguans must be ensured; and free elections must take place in order to elect the next leader of the country. (Historic Documents of 1979 582). Although some of the Latin American countries were not in favor of the proposals, they nonetheless passed and were presented to Somoza for his acceptance. In early 1979, when Somoza did not agree to the O.A.S. recommendations, the Carter administration made the first in a series of steps to distance itself from a regime the U.S. had supported for almost forty-two years (American Foreign Policy Basic Document 1977-1980 1317).

During the first three months of 1979, the Sandinistas continued their infrequent guerrilla actions (Christian 92-93). Hundreds of bombs were set off in the cities, while advance continued on more rural areas. On April 7, 1979, a full scale offensive was launched. Between two hundred and three hundred rebel soldiers descended from the mountain claiming control of the city of Esteli (Christian 93). Whe the Guardia was summoned to the city, the rebels retreated, slipping untouched through the Guardia lines. Somoza’s army was now forced to retake the city because of the resistance which had remained, causing a loud public outcry against Somoza and his men.

Other Latin American nations, by this time, were ardent supporting the Sandinistas, and although none of the actions were decisive, their policies combined to weaken the Somozan regime and help insurgents. Some aid came fro
Costa Rica, bitter from her continuing schisms with Nicaragua, became a supporter of the FSLN. They gave the guerrillas sanctuary and bases within their country. By 1978 and 1979, the Costa Rican government allowed the FSLN to campaign openly in the streets, stringing propaganda throughout the country. When Somoza finally fell in 1979, Costa Rica immediately offered recognition to the new government (Booth 131). Other governments in favor of the Sandinistas included Cuba, Venezuela, Panama, and Mexico. This strong band of groups supporting the Sandinistas placed an incredible burden on the Somoza regime (Booth 134).

Although the Sandinistas were victorious in the north, the Guardia was still winning battles in the south. Undaunted by April's northern failure, in June of 1979, the organization remained loyal and at its maximum enrollment of ten thousand men. The Guardia maintained this level of loyalty until Somoza resigned his position as President, but virtually all other sectors of society were opposed to Somoza and backed the opposition groups (Christian 104).

Cutting American ties with the Somoza dynasty began with a reduction of arms shipments which the U.S. had previously appropriated, and later, with a termination of the entire military assistance program; however, Somoza merely purchased black-market weapons from Israel, South Africa, and the Bahamas (Christian 91). Next, the American Embassy government officials were reduced, and the funding for humanitarian organizations was stopped: the Peace Corps was ordered to leave, and the Agency for International Development was not allowed additional funding to begin new programs (American Foreign Policy and Basic Documents 1317).

Basic

The United States finally realized that the dynasty she had supported for so many years was corrupt. Now America desperately sought in the Guardia a replacement for Somoza who would also prove beneficial to the interests of the U.S. (United States Department of State 4). This successor was never found. Since Somoza was terribly afraid of strong leaders, paranoid that they would take his power, Crawley feels that no competent successor was able to emerge from Somoza's Guardia (168). In June of 1979, in a last effort to keep the Sandinistas from taking power, the United States suggested a government of reconciliation, combining all "democratic sectors" including the PLN and the National Guard but excluding the FSLN. The Sandinistas responded with an immediate rejection to the proposal (Booth 177-178).

The rebel-backed Sandinistas took power over Nicaragua on July 19, 1979. At this time, the Red Cross estimated a loss of ten thousand lives between September 1978 and July 1979. With Nicaragua in such an utter state of turmoil, the U.S. decided to facilitate the government's transition. She offered to receive Somoza and allow him the protection of U.S. law (American Foreign Policy and Basic Documents 1320). Somoza reluctantly decided that leaving the country would be in his best interest, and on July 13th, he left Managua unannounced, resigning his presidency (Christian 110). Somoza had realized his prophecy, "If I have to go, I'll go over a mountain of bloody corpses" (Selser 205). Directly prior to fleeing the country, he ruined the economic infrastructure (Walker 59), plundering the National Bank and leaving less than four million dollars in the national treasury to cover a debt of almost two billion dollars (Barry 284). When he arrived in Miami, a U.S. Intelligence report placed his worth at nine million dollars (Christian 331).

With the Somoza family as well as most of the Guardia exiled from the country, the Sandinistas took control of the government—to American dismay. Earlier in 1977 and 1978, the U.S. State Department report on human rights was very negative toward the leftist party, accusing them of continual human rights violations ("Dictatorships and Double Standards" 38). Then, when the Somoza dynasty fell, the United States expected the worst, fearing that there would be mass executions of the Guardia personnel as well as country-wide sieges to ensure that Somoza supporters were suppressed, but these actions never took place. There was no mass murder of the officials under Somoza and very little violence (Walker 60).

Pleased by the absence of a repressive action and hoping for a democratic government, the U.S. sent emergency food and medical aid and also promised economic assistance to the country (Rosati 137). The Department of State proclaimed that they would try to build a relationship of "mutual respect" with the people and the government of Nicaragua. The Sandinistas responded by enacting many reforms, such as a 1980 literacy campaign, in order to raise the level of poverty to which Nicaraguan citizens had fallen.

After the original takeover, the Sandinistas began to establish their own government. As the United States government changed hands and the Republican President Ronald Reagan took power, the Sandinistas were branded Marxist by Washington, and slowly U.S. support decreased. Turned down by the United States, the Sandinistas were forced to buy guns from the Soviet Union. America turned completely against the regime out of fear that a communist government had been established in Nicaragua (Van Pulley 208). United States aggression began and many of the reform programs had to be temporarily halted so that the regime could concentrate on the forces waged against them. The United States-supported contras, or "freedom fighters," who launched continual guerrilla attacks in hopes that the Sandinista government would topple and a new government resembling the Somoza one would emerge. By the late 1980's, this support was essentially cut and the Contras were funded only by private sources. In 1990, a democratic election was held in Nicaragua and the FSLN lost the popular vote. It is still to be seen if the group will cede power to the President elect Violetta Barrios de Chamorro, but the signs seem to indicate the FSLN will step down.

The Somoza dynasty which had been in control for forty-three years finally toppled, but tragically the United States
continued trying to reinstate a government which was run by the Somocistas. The old regime repressed the people for the entire length of the dynasty with approval as well as aid from the United States. The original leader, Anastasio Somoza García, was the first to gain the support of the U.S. This support strengthened his main power tool the Guardia, helping to hold his tight grip over the country. Coupled with holding the dictator comfortably in control, America began to send aid to the country which Somoza routed to his own bank accounts. Soon, he had amassed a huge personal fortune for himself and his family, while the natives in his country were left in a terrible state of poverty. After Somoza García had been assassinated, both of his sons stepped into power. Luis was a much calmer leader than his father or his brother but ruled for only one term. Next, Tachito stepped into office and began his ruthless reign, which was also supported by the U.S. Nicaragua became a Latin American pawn for the United States to use as an anti-communist stronghold in exchange for military aid and other donations to the country, making Somoza the richest man in Central America. He used the Guardia in the same oppressive way that his father had, trying unsuccessfully to break the growing left-wing party. In 1979, the Sandinistas launched and won a revolution. The revolutionaries had triumphed over a dictator who had controlled the country for over forty years; sadly though, they had not really triumphed and were forced to continue to fight the U.S. funded Contras who were ultimately striving to reinstate a Somoza type government.
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ABORTION AND THE MORAL STATUS OF THE FETUS

Michelle Clark

Society has always been faced with issues of life and death, but because of recent medical advances and social changes, the issues have become more complicated and more pressing than ever before. Abortion has always been an option for women who, for one reason or another, did not choose to carry a fetus to term, but today, it is safer for the mother, more successful and readily available. Though these factors certainly are significant in the great numbers of abortions being performed in the United States, surely individual and societal acceptance of the practice of abortion have been the reasons for its frequency of occurrence.

Considering that abortion is the killing of an organism which may be a human being, it becomes of paramount importance for individuals to decide when a human life begins. Acceptance should be based on a decision derived from valid reasoning. This paper will present several of the more popular decisions of when life begins and explain reasoning for and against each.

The most conservative view, and a widely held one, is that the fetus is a person from conception. The basic reasons behind this view are as follows: the fetus is biologically determined by its DNA, of which it has just acquired a full set; this is the only clear point of radical change in development, and is followed thereafter by gradual development; the probability of survival of the entity(s) involved (sperm, egg, or fertilized egg) is drastically increased after fertilization.

Paul Ramsey states his view about the blueprint nature of the fetus at conception:

Thus it might be said that in all essential respects the individual is who-ever he is going to become from the moment of impregnation. He is already this while not knowing this or anything else. Therefore, his subsequent development cannot be described as becoming something he is not now. Genetics teaches us that we were from the beginning what we essentially still are in every generally human attribute and in every individual attribute. (1)

The DNA in an individual fetus are what is primarily responsible for guiding the development of the individual. The uniqueness of the resulting organism is phenomenal, given that twenty three pairs of chromosomes from each parent result in (at the very minimum) two to the forty sixth power genetic possibilities. (2)

This creation of a set of genes which determines an individual is a moment of drastic change such as will not be seen again, according to conservatives, throughout the life of the individual. From this point on there is a continuity in the development of structures and capacities. Even the ability to reason and to survive independently increase gradually.

Many people have attempted to argue that from conception the fetus is a ‘potential’ human being. Any potential thing is not the actual thing in question. Though this does not preclude the possibility that abortion on those grounds may still be wrong, it removes it from the realm of this “personhood” discussion. However, there is an interesting variation, summarized here by Baruch Brody:

...the fetus is a living human from the moment of conception because it has, from that moment, the potentiality of engaging in typically human activities, and it has that potentiality because of the probability consideration... (3)

This defines a human being as one which can potentially engage in human activities, a definition which serves fairly well for adults. However, when this same definition is used for fetuses it suggests some things which naturally seem to conflict with reason. For instance, can a fetus which, as yet, has no brain be said to have the potential to think?

This “probability consideration” mentioned by Brody refers to the difference in the likelihood of a given sperm or egg surviving to become a clear-cut human and the likelihood of a given fertilized egg’s similar survival. Whereas only one in several million sperm will survive, a fertilized egg has one in three chance of surviving to birth. (4)

There are strong opposing arguments for each of these points, starting with Charles A. Gardner, who states, “In fact there does not seem to be any blueprint for embryonic development. Each step toward greater complexity depends instead upon the pattern of cells and molecules just reached in the preceding step. The information required to make an eye or a finger does not exist in the fertilized egg. It exists in the positions and interactions of cells and molecules that will be formed only at a later time.” (5) He claims that many variations of the individual may occur during prenatal development, pointing to the example of fingerprints which are obviously not in the genetic code since the fingerprints of twins are different, so much so that the individual may not be said to be predetermined. His proposal hinges on the question of how great changes must be in order to decide that the individual is no longer the original one. He suggests that the differences resulting from the gradual development
of the fetus may be great. Individuals change throughout prenatal development and, indeed, throughout their lifetimes, but, does the particular route they, by chance, travel determine not just variations of the same individual but also determine a different individual? Does amputation of limbs or brain damage "make" an individual? Would the person have been someone else if they did not experience amputation or brain damage. All aspects of a person which can be altered before birth may also be altered afterwards: physical, emotional, mental. The one thing which does remain the same is the genetic code, which has belonged to the individual since conception. The commonplace experience of seeing individuals very much like their parents in appearance and other aspects, and the extraordinary similarity of twins provides little support for his theory of the extent to which the DNA is or is not a blueprint.

The sanctity of the earliest stage of the embryo, at least according to traditional thinking, certainly seems to be threatened by some genetic phenomenon. Without considering fertilized eggs which simply do not survive, the ratio of these new embryos to eventual persons is not one to one. The most common exceptions are twins and other multiple births. In this case, one fertilized egg becomes more than one person. It is also possible, very early in cell divisions, for two fertilized eggs to fuse to form one human being. "If the two original embryos were determined to become particular individuals, such a thing could not happen."(6)

The most extreme conservative and the most extreme liberal views are, strangely enough, based on a similar concept. Both sides hold that the process of fetal development is a gradual one, except for one point which they chose as the moment the fetus acquires human moral status. The liberals discern this point to be birth (this will be further discussed later), the conservatives say it is conception. The opposition for the later tends to go as follows. The fertilized egg is not significantly different from a separated sperm and egg pair. The development in them is just one step further along. This is backed by the arguments that support that a fertilized egg is not a predetermined individual as mentioned previously. "If a collection of ova and a collection of sperm are taken jointly not to constitute a collection of actuals of moral importance, neither should the early conception."(7) It appears that a great many people do not recognize any moral significance of individual sperm and egg, judging from the extensive use of contraceptives which destroy them. And certainly, it would be a rare individual who would attempt to continue the existence of every sperm or egg cell possible, as, of course, this could only be achieved through procuration for the purpose of saving gametes.

There is a significant difference between individual sperm and egg cells and the fertilized egg cell: probability that the entity will eventually become an easily recognizable human being. Some consider this difference alone enough reason to give the later human moral status. However, likelihood of survival does not seem a reasonable criterion for deciding whether or not an organism is a person. Are hostages, who are likely to die, not still human?

The view in diametrical opposition to the previous one involves naming birth as the moment that a human life begins. This argument attempts to support itself by the lack of independence of the fetus until birth. Though the fetus is capable of this independence from viability, it is not yet actually independent. The infant is also capable, after birth, of interaction with other humans, which could be considered a criterion of humanity. Brody says that this is a weak argument. It assumes that because one entity is inside another, it is merely part of that entity. Jonah in the whale was not a part of the whale.(8) Addressing the dependence of the fetus on the mother, one could consider the case of any other "parasitic" life form. Though a tape worm lives inside an animal and is dependent on it, the tape worm is an individual entity, not a part of the host animal. As for interaction, this increases gradually from kicking inside the womb to crying in the crib.

Some who have considered the question of when a human life begins, who have opted for a time early in development and have been unable to overcome the problem of multiple births, have chosen to support the time of segmentation as their answer, because this is the point at which it becomes physically impossible for more than one human being to develop from the single fertilized egg. There is no obvious reason for concluding from this that the embryo is now a person unless you assume that one human being may not become two. There is no absolute reason to believe this is true. Amoebas divide; why not people?(9)

An obvious place to draw the line for many is viability that is, the time after which a fetus could survive outside the womb. This is very much a factor of current medical technology, and is complicated by the fact that the chance of a fetus's survival is more a factor of its weight than time after conception.(10) Using viability as the determining factor is stressing the importance of some degree of independence. Many problems arise from this approach when one considers how many (almost) undisputed human beings are partially or completely reliant on the care of others. The elderly, infants, and to some degree nearly everyone depending on others for survival. For those who believe that the category of 'human being' is not merely a creation of others but an objective reality, the thought of altering this category to match current technology is abhorrent. If it were not for this constant change in the time of viability, then would be a certain appeal to the idea of preventing the killing of a fetus whose care could be transferred from the mother to another.

Today, one of the most popular and well justified answer to the question, "When does a human life begin?", is one based on a capacity which has long been recognized as the trait that differentiates man from lower order animals; conscious, rational thought. In its fullest sense, such development cannot be said to occur for anyone until well after birth, but in a more primitive state the organ that will be responsible for them, "the brain, whose qualities ultimately distinguish us as human beings,"(11) has begun to function by the eighth week. At this time, the first electrical impulses in the brain may be recorded by an electroencephalogram. However, this primitive activity may no
be enough. Gardner states, "In the cerebrum, the mature brain cell pattern is not seen until the sixth or seventh month... The higher faculties must develop very late. Thoughts and feelings must arise very gradually. Thus, an embryo may have fingers, hands, a nose and eyes, even reflex movements, but still have no mind." Gardner implies that the fetus does not have human moral status until it has an actively functioning mind.

Insight may be gained by looking at the other end of the life cycle as Callahan explains:

...it is very rare, for instance, to find a discussion of when life ends (pertinent to euthanasia and the artificial prolongation of life). Yet both problems turn on what is meant by human life, and the illumination we gain in dealing with one of the problems will be useful when we deal with the other. Similarly, there is much to be said for trying to work out some consistent standards regarding the use of empirical data.(12)

The definition of death now depends primarily on the absence of brain activity. Negative results of tests, including a flat EEG, which determine if the brain is alive, allow declaration of death even when a person bodiely functions may be maintained for an extended period of time with a respirator. (As long as the respirator is attached and the heart receives oxygen, it will beat spontaneously.) Sometimes, such patients are removed from the respirators. Sometimes, after a declaration of death, circulation and respiration are maintained in a body which is 'dead' for the sake of organ transplants. The body of a person in this type of an irreversible comatose state, though it may be fully functioning otherwise, is considered dead because it lacks what is considered a necessary criterion of a human being: brain activity. This shows a recognition of the difference in human biological life and the life of a person.(13) The parallel argument requires that life not begin until this same condition may be satisfied: there must be the presence of brain activity. Why mere brain activity might be enough is not clear. Many animals possess a degree of intelligence that they do not have for a considerable time after birth.

so, the fetus or infant does not receive his moral status from his present ability to reason.(14) This is actually another argument for potential, which produces hurdles on both sides. Firstly, younger fetuses which have not developed any capacity for thought are only a step behind those whose brains have begun to function but do not yet do the crucial reasoning which would make them a clear-cut human being. Also, as I have just alluded to, older fetuses, indeed even infants and small children and other whose mental capacities are lacking might lose the status of person, if actual ability, not potential, became the criterion.

In summary, there are certain main categories of opinions; arguments for genetic descent and individuality (including conception and segmentation); arguments for developmental points (viability and brain activity), which usually include some new structure or ability; arguments of probability and potential, which only vaguely deal with the question of personhood; and arguments of independence, which fail quickly under scrutiny. The best of these are supported by defensible concepts that make the decision difficult. They all start with what Roger Wertheimer calls the 'Standard Belief': "a human being has human status in virtue of being a human being."(15) Human status is what gives an organism its individual right to life. Donald X. Burt discusses the importance in deciding who will possess human rights:

Obviously, the factual status of fetal rights is crucial in the solution of cases. If the fetus is simply a piece of property or if it is a being with less than human rights, there is some reason for arguing that its right to life should give way to the convenience of others who created or maintain it. If, however, the fetus has rights equal to those of any other human being, it is difficult if not impossible to see why its life must give way to the convenience of others or why the right of privacy of one deciding to abort a fetus should override the right of the fetus to protection from being killed. However, asserting full human rights does not require that it always be the winner in conflict of rights situations. It does require that it be given equal consideration with the other humans in the case.(16)

This is where the agreement ends. The question then becomes "When does the embryo/fetus/infant become a human being?" Those who believe in genetic descent and individuality tend to feel as William E. May does, "For those, on the contrary, who oppose what could be called an ethic of abortion, being human is not primarily a matter of achievement; rather, it is a gift, an endowment that one has not because he has already done something worthwhile but simply because he is and is present (even if hidden in the womb) to his fellow men."(17) They essentially believe that any human organism has human moral status. The arguments for development believe that there is an essential and sufficient trait which the fetus acquires during development. The most common view now is that fetal brain activity is that necessary trait. The extent of the acceptance of this view is witnessed by the case of anencephalic infants. These infants grow and function minimally without most of their brain. Left usually with only a brain stem, they have never had the capacity for thought and never survive more than a couple of weeks, though they occasionally breathe on their own. Anencephalics are now declared dead and used for organ donors while their hearts and lungs function with the aid of a respirator. They are understood to have never been alive in the sense of being a person.(18) Those who support the positions of viability and birth believe that certain degrees of independence are necessary traits for persons. The probability arguments are usually interpreted to mean that anything with the potential to become a person is a person, which is nonsensical. A variation is that anything likely to later do human activities already is a person.

It is possible that 'personhood' is only a term created by society for a class they arbitrarily define. It is possible that there is such a thing as a class of organisms which,
in truth, are persons, deserving, as such, to have their rights recognized. One thing is certain. Society will determine who it will recognize as a person and should have considered all the possibilities so that, in daily decisions of life and death, just decisions will be made.

END NOTES

(6) Gardner, p. 558.
(8) Brody, p. 84.
(9) Gardner, p. 559.
(11) Biggers, p. 48, 49.
(12) Callahan, p. 387.
(13) Ibid., p. 334
(14) Ibid., p. 389.
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BIBLICAL IMAGERY AND SYMBOLS IN “EL ÁRBOL DE ORO”

Brian L. McMurtry

Spain is a country whose literary world has been, for the most part, dominated by men. The names of Cervantes, Unamuno, and Machado are well known, but until the twentieth century few female writers achieved fame, except perhaps Pardo Bazán. It is possible that Ana María Matute has helped to break the chains that previously had prevented females from writing. In her biography, Janet Diaz says that Matute is “[o]ne of Spain’s most important novelists of the Post-Civil War period. Critics are nearly unanimous in considering her the leading woman novelist in Spain today” (Diaz 7). Ana María Matute is, according to literary critics, a writer whose works reflect her exposure to the Castilian countryside, the Spanish Civil War, and experiences from her youth. (Diaz 8). It is also said that “El Árbol de Oro” is a celebration of youth, but in another level one can interpret it as a religious work through the use of tropes and other literary devices. Therefore, the aim of this paper is to show that “El Árbol de Oro” is a religious work through the use of symbols, parables, biblical characters, and allegory.

Ana María Ausejo was born in Barcelona on the 26th of July, 1926. She was the second of five children of a Catalan industrialist (Diaz 13, 18). Matute was a sickly child, suffering from extended illnesses at the ages of four, eight, and nine (Diaz 18). She spent her childhood years traveling from Madrid in the winter to the country (Mansilla de la Sierra) in the summer (Diaz 15). Her experiences in the country affected her writings (Diaz 81), which contain autobiographical aspects (Diaz 8). At the age of eight, her parents sent her to a boarding school which was run by French nuns, who were very strict, conservative, and cruel (Diaz 24). She won the premio Nadal for Primera Memoria in 1960. In 1961 she wrote “El Arbol de Oro,” which is included in Historias de la Artamila. Artamila is a region which, in the book, represents Mansilla de la Sierra (Jones 26). Rafael Bosch says this about the stories of ámila: “En este libro continúa la autora acercándose a una consideración social y realista de la vida española” (Bosch 157), but in the end says, “Ana María Matute esta, sin duda, entre las novelistas mas interesantes por su adopción de técnicas de la novela no realista” (Bosch 92).

Firstly, one can appreciate that “El Árbol de Oro” is a religious work through the use of many symbols. Ivo, the only one who could enter in the torreccita, had a key. To the authoress, the narrator, the torreccita seems like a type of heaven into which only the “chosen one” can enter. The key reminds one of the Bible when Christ gave the keys to the kingdom to Saint Peter (Matthew 16:19). Throughout the work, one can see that one of the biblical themes is the faith of a child. The narrator at times seems like a child; for example, she says, “vacié mi hucha.” The use of the word “hucha” (piggybank) implies that it is a childhood toy. It also symbolizes “forsaking all for Christ.” In this sense, the money that the narrator gave to Mateo is a symbolic way of abandoning all, including money (Luke 5:27).

The story says,

...me vino a la memoriya... y pensé < <es un árbol de oro. > > Busqué al pie del arbol, y no tard
con una crucesilla de hierro negro, mohosa por la lluvia.

Here two symbols are seen: the golden tree and the cross. The cross appears undorned, simple, like the tomb of Christ (Matthew 27:60). It is well known that the golden tree has been interpreted in many ways. In this study I will suggest something different; the golden tree represents God the Father, for three reasons. First, the tree is pure gold. Many times in the Bible God and gold are compared; “...[God is] more to be desired than gold, yea, than fine gold” (Psalms 19:10). In the Bible, gold is considered as the criteria to which all is measured. “And I will...refine them as one refines silver, and test them as gold is tested” (Zechariah 13:9). Almost all the things, as it is written in Revelation (Revelation 4:4, 5:8, 21:21), in heaven are made of pure gold. Therefore, one can see that the golden tree is symbolic of God the Father.

Another type of symbol in “El Árbol de Oro” is the use of symbolic and religious names. Ivo is a teutonic name which means a “tree that is always green” (Love 236). Mateo Heredia has a double importance. Of course, Matthew is the name of one of the apostles. It is ironic and interesting that in the Bible, Matthew (also called Levi) was the one who forsook all to follow Christ. One can see that there is a relation between the narrator and Mateo. The narrator was the one who forsook all and Mateo, instead of forsaking all, gained all. This makes one consider his surname, Heredia. Heredia can mean “an inheritor,” since he received the money of the narrator. In the Bible, there is a woman whose name was Herodias, who ordered that John the Baptist be beheaded (Matthew 14:1-8). Seeing this, one can see that Mateo Heredia is portrayed as a boy who causes trouble for the religious, like Herodias in the Bible. Leocadia, the profesora, is a very complex name. Here also one remembers that Leocadia was a Catholic saint. One can interpret the name of Leocadia in diverse ways, but it is better to separate it to its roots. Leo, in Latin, means “one
who has authority” (Love 251,252) (because she is a teacher). But “cada” resembles “caida,” the fallen one. Her enthusiasm of teaching has died, (much like the skin on her bunions!) and is not interested in her profession. Matute has said this of the country teachers:

(I)...was affected...by the bitterness of the village schoolmasters who would arrive with high ideals but slowly became brutalized by the poverty and scorn (Diaz 23).

One can also see that “El Arbol de Oro” is a religious work because of the use of parables. This is not the meaning of parables that is traditionally used, but that the story uses figurative images from the Bible. The story says this about Ivo:

Era un muchacho delgado, de ojos azules, que bizequeaba ligeramente... Todos los muchachos y muchachas de la escuela admiraban y envidiaban... a Ivo, por el don que poseía de atraer la atención sobre sí....

This description makes one remember of when Christ, at the age of twelve, was in the temple, teaching the older ones (Luke 2:47). One can see a relation between Ivo and Christ in that the two were wise and this produced attraction by the elders. Ivo was in the habit of squinting, and this caused mystery about himself. When he spoke to the teacher’s ear, no one understood or knew what he was saying. Afterwards, this dialogue occurs between the narrator and Ivo:

— Que le has dicho a la maestra?
Ivo me miro de través y vi relampaguear ojos azules.
— Le hablé del arbol de oro.
Sentí una gran curiosidad.
— Arbol?
Si no se lo cuentas a nadie....

This incident resembles the dialogue between Christ and his disciples after he spoke in parables in Matthew 13:18-51. In line 120 of the story, the narrator speaks of the “crucés caídas.” These crosses have fallen to the foot of the golden tree. If the tree represents God the Father and if the cross of Ivo represents Christ, then the fallen crosses represent those who have died in Christ. It is a reference to the passage in the Bible that says, “...At the name of Jesus every knee shall bow, and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father” (Philippians 2:10).

A third point to consider is how the characters in the story resemble certain people in the Bible. Leocadia seems to symbolize the religious authority; in the Bible, the one who represents authority is the chief priest of the Jews. It seems that she doesn’t want authority, and that she has to favor Ivo because of his charm over the others. Mateo Heredia resembles Judas Iscariot. He is Ivo’s adversary in that he doesn’t want open rebellion against Ivo, but that he only wants his place. When Mateo takes money from the narrator for the key, he has become a traitor, like when Judas sold Christ for thirty pieces of silver (Matthew 26:47-49). The narrator symbolizes the fickle Saint Peter. As Peter in the Bible, the narrator doesn’t understand Christ (Ivo) until his death and begins to follow him like a child. She forsook all that she had in order to see God (the tree when it was in the torrecita). Like Peter, the narrator turned away for a while, but returned: “Olvidé de la llave y el arbol de oro.” When she finally saw the golden tree, she could understand Ivo and all that he represented, and like Peter, was finally a faithful convert.

Obviously, Ivo represents Christ. Matute is known for her use of Christ figures (Bergmann 148). During their lives, no one understood the importance of the lives and deaths of Ivo and Christ. The eyes that squinted at the public but opened to his disciple are like the wisdom that Christ possessed. Their visions of a better world (for Ivo, the fact that he saw a golden tree on dry, barren ground) are similar. Christ died so that the world might have access to God the Father. Similarly, Ivo died so that all might have access to the golden tree, a more hopeful way of living than the poverty in which the peasants lived.

Finally, “El Arbol de Oro” is a religious allegory. Universally, the life of Ivo is like the life of Christ. The story is harmoniously united through parables, through religious symbols, and through Biblical characters in order to portray the life, the mission, and the love of Christ. In order to understand the allegory of “El Arbol de Oro,” one must know the themes of the Bible and the New Testament. In the Old Testament, the common man couldn’t enter into the presence of God, which, according to Jewish tradition, lived in the most holy place of the temple in the ark of the covenant (Exodus 25:10-22). Only once per year, the high priest could enter this holy place (Leviticus 16). When Christ died, the veil that divided the common person and the most holy place was torn by the angels, permitting access to God the Father through Jesus Christ the son (Mark 15:37-38). This was characterized by the outpouring of the Holy Spirit in Acts 2:4. One can see that this story is an allegory of the arrival of the Holy Spirit. Ivo had access to the torrecita (the most holy place), and the golden tree (the ark of the covenant, God the Father). The other children (the common man) could not enter into the torrecita. Ivo played the role of a Christ figure through his actions. When Ivo died, the golden tree was no longer in the torrecita because “the angels had rent the veil in two.” Finally, all could enter into the presence of the golden tree (God the Father) through Ivo (Jesus Christ).

In conclusion, one can see that “El Arbol de Oro” is a religious work through the use of symbols, parables, biblical characters, and allegory. If it is read as a celebration of youth, then it can be enjoyed, but if it is read as a religious work, a deeper sense of meaning and emotion is derived. For example, upon understanding that Ivo is a Christ figure who dies in order to give hope to believers, one can see that the story ascends to a level where it imparts to the reader a message of universal hope for all. Matute has demonstrated that literature can have double and triple interpretations, and can still be enjoyable at the literal level.
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THE MAKING OF A SERIAL KILLER

Kristy Lee Garrett

"What’s one less person on the face of the earth anyway?" -Ted Bundy

Like a deadly plague, serial killers sweep across our nation stealing the lives of innocent people of all ages, races, and sexes. The epidemic of serial murders within the last three centuries has sparked a great deal of research into the motives behind the madness of the killers (Starr 100). According to Elliott Leyton.

We can only bear (human suffering and degradation) in mind if we remind ourselves that the eradication of a disease requires the intensive study of all of the disorder’s pus and blood and deformed tissue. So far, the only reliable cure we have discovered is Madame guillotine. Regrettably, while her use may provide us with some arcane satisfaction, she can do little of her own to staunch the outbreak of the most modern and virulent of social epidemics. (13-14)

Just as medical researchers strive to find the cause of a disease in order to cure the disease, murder researchers strive to find the causes of murders. In other words, why do killers kill? This question isn’t easily answered because of the many different backgrounds of serial murderers. However, one common link exists among most of them: abusive and unstable childhoods. Whether the murderer was abused by his parents, by strangers, or by society itself, he chose victims who represented, to him, that abuse (Leyton 23). Examination of the childhoods of two of our nation’s most prolific murderers—Edmund Kemper and Ted Bundy—gives insight into some of the possible reasons these men killed.

Of the North American multiple murderers with known origins, most were either adopted, born illegitimately, had divorced parents, or were institutionalized as children (Leyton 292). Any of these traumatic experiences could cause a child to lack an “identity” (Leyton 292). Children with unstable lives often grow up never having found a niche in society, so they try to create one for themselves. Obviously, many people have traumatic childhoods and don’t become murderers. Such people are able to overcome the abuse they experienced and lead normal, productive lives. For a few individuals, however, the “emotional deprivation and inadequate nurturing” they were victims of as children causes a lack of development of a conscience which allows them to murder other people without feeling guilty (Danto 12). While as many as sixty-seven percent of murderers were either victims of or witnesses of abuse as children (Danto 5), seventy percent of them have inadequate consciences, or super egos, disabling them from realizing that violence is wrong and that life is sacred (Danto 7). Danto also says that the lack of a conscience is a direct result of the lack of care and love given to the murderer by others (7).

Born in California in 1948 to a “shrilly belittling mother,” Edmund Emil Kemper III began his bizarre romance with death at an early age (Leyton 36). While most other children his age were playing hide-and-go-seek or pretending to be superheroes, Kemper enjoyed playing “execution” more than any other game (Lunde 54). According to his sister, Kemper loved to be blindfolded and led to an imaginary gas chamber where he would convulse and pretend to die when she pulled the imaginary switch (Leyton 36). Kemper’s sister also pulled a switch of a different kind within him—a mental switch that turned on jealousy and anger. Having been preferentially treated by their mother, Kemper’s sister represented to him all the “things he didn’t have” (Leyton 37). He often took her dolls and cut off their heads and hands, just as he was to do to his human victims later (Lunde 54).

Even as a child, Kemper fantasized of killing his neighbors, his sister, and especially his mother (Leyton 37). At first he vented his hate on inanimate objects such as his sister’s dolls. Before turning to human victims, he projected his murder fantasies onto other living things—namely cats—a common phenomenon among serial killers (Starr 105). Kemper mutilated his mother’s cat, perhaps as a substitute for his mother. His first living victim was buried alive, then dug up and decapitated; Kemper placed the cat’s head on a spindle to keep (Leyton 37). In the next few years, he supposedly killed other neighborhood pets, also. At thirteen, Kemper killed another family cat. This cat was particularly annoying to Kemper because, like his mother, it was especially partial to his sister (Leyton 38). The cat made Kemper feel rejected in much the same way his mother did. The anger Kemper felt for his mother was manifested in the cat, and Kemper mutilated the cat with a machete (Leyton 38).

Edmund Kemper murdered in response to the rejection of which he had always been a victim. Neither of his parents showed him attention and love; Kemper’s mother constantly belittled him because of his “social failures” (Leyton 36). When Edmund was seven, his parents separated, and he moved to Montana with his mother (Lunde 53). He wanted to see his father and was very bitter toward his mother for causing him not to (Lunde 54). Feeling sorry for him because he had no father figure in his life, Kemper’s mother said that she tried to make it up to him; however, according to Kemper, what she did was “... punish and ridicule him in order to make him a man” (Lunde 54). When Edmund was thirteen, he ran away to his father, who promptly
sent him straight back to his mother (Lunde 55). Completely against his will, Edmund was then sent by his mother to live with his paternal grandparents; they were his first human victims (Lunde 55). His anger over being rejected had first been expressed in his mutilation of his sister’s dolls, then in his killing of animals, and now, in the murders of his own grandparents. In his warped, young mind, Kemper felt he had “avenged the rejection of both his mother and father” in the insane, compulsive murder of his grandparents (Lunde 55).

Kemper spent the four years after his grandparents’ murders in a maximum security mental institution (Leyton 39). Upon his release in 1969, he was turned over to his mother which, considering his anger for her, was the worst possible situation for him (Lunde 55):

They paroled me right back to mama. Well, my mother and I started right in on the horrendous battles, just horrible battles, violent and vicious. I’ve never been in such a vicious verbal battle with anyone. It wouldn’t go to fists with a man, but this was my mother and I couldn’t stand the thought of my mother and I doing these things. (Leyton 55)

The arguments Kemper had with his mother again caused him to fantasize about killing her, and again he began to murder others as substitutes for her: this time he chose to murder “college girls” (Lunde 55). Conveniently, Kemper’s mother was an administrator at the University of California at Santa Cruz, and her position made it easy for him to gain access to his victims (Lunde 56). During the next year, Kemper claimed six more lives—all women—until finally the substitution ended and Kemper killed his real target: his mother (Leyton 72). He decapitated her, then he cut out her larynx and threw it in the garbage—a perfectly logical thing to do, according to him, because of the way “she’d bitched and screamed and yelled at me over the years” (Lunde 56). Not feeling completely gratified, Kemper still needed one more victim. His mother’s best friend, Sally Hallet, had received all of the attention and care from his mother that he’d been denied, so she became his last victim (Leyton 44). Soon afterwards, “... having created his identity and his niche, it went without saying that his ‘purpose was gone’ ” (Leyton 72), and he turned himself in to the authorities.

Ted Bundy, like Edmund Kemper, murdered to avenge his mistreatment. While Kemper’s tormentors were his family members, Bundy felt he’d been victimized by society itself (Leyton 102). According to Bundy, society robbed him of his past and stripped away his identity (Leyton 104). Ted Bundy was born illegitimately to Louise Bundy on November 24, 1946, in the Elizabeth Lund Home for Unwed Mothers in Burlington Vermont (Leyton 101). He was executed for murder in Florida in January of 1989 (Dirk A1). In the forty-three years between his birth and death, Ted Bundy carved a deep, ugly scar on the face of our nation by killing as many as one-hundred or more young women (Nichols 54). Bundy, who had a bachelor’s degree in psychology (Leyton 82), offered many excuses for his deranged behavior. He gave the blame to pornography, sexual violence in the media, alcohol, and everything in between (Nichols 54). But the one thing in Bundy’s life that seems to have inspired his desire to murder was his poor, illegitimate birth (Leyton 82). Even as a young child, he was “deeply class-conscious” (Leyton 97), and he felt that the life into which he was born just wasn’t good enough for him. Bundy’s mother said that when she took him shopping, “little Teddy” always went straight to the highest priced clothes in the stores (Leyton 98). As young as ten years of age, Bundy was ashamed to be seen in the less-than-acceptable cars his step-father drove, and he absolutely abhorred his poor, socially incompetent relatives except for one cultured uncle who was a music teacher (Leyton 97). Practically from birth, Bundy was determined to climb the social ladder and claim his rightful place in society, no matter what he had to do.

Never having found his niche in society because of his shameful birth, Bundy frequently disguised himself and pretended—to be someone else (Leyton 102). In fact, he described his entire life as a “Walter Mitty kind of thing” (Leyton 102). Bundy always preferred to live in college towns and involved himself in politics because he felt these environments were socially mobile and one could rise despite his social class (Leyton 100). Bundy felt driven to educate himself as a way to escape his past and rise in society. Seen by his mother and family as their only hope for ever having a better life, Bundy dreamed of becoming a lawyer (Leyton 90). He was an excellent student about whom his teachers and peers raved (Leyton 82); ironically, he was even compared to a Kennedy by some (Leyton 90). He had a strange and contradictory relationship with society; those who knew him thought he had a deep concern about social issues (Leyton 90), but he really hated society for the miserable life it gave him. Bundy worked for a Crisis Clinic in Seattle counseling people with problems (Leyton 83), and he even wrote a pamphlet on rape prevention for women the same year he began his murders (Nordheimer A1). While it seemed Bundy had forgiven society for torturing him with his reproachful life, “society would pay dearly for its malfunction” (Leyton 104).

Found psychologically normal by nearly all who tested him, Bundy didn’t fit perfectly into any known category of psychopathic personalities (Leyton 85). But, like Kemper, he murdered people as substitutes for his abuser; Bundy murdered to get even with society. He wanted things from life badly, and when he couldn’t have them, he took life itself from others. Beautiful, desirable women seemed unreachable to him, but in killing them he made them his possessions (Leyton 99). Sorority girls were his most frequent victims because they symbolized so well to him that which he’d never have (Leyton 99). Bundy was like a spoiled child whose parents warned him not to do something but who purposefully did it anyway. He would not accept “no” for an answer from society. Dr. David Abrahamsen, a New York psychiatrist, said that Bundy’s deviant, horrible deeds showed that he had a great deal of hate for women and that to Bundy, those he murdered were substitutes for his real
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Even as a child, Kemper fantasized of killing his neighbors, his sister, and especially his mother (Leyton 37). At first he vented his hate on inanimate objects such as his sister’s dolls. Before turning to human victims, he projected his murder fantasies onto other living things—namely cats—a common phenomenon among serial killers (Starr 105). Kemper mutilated his mother’s cat, perhaps as a substitute for his mother. His first living victim was buried alive, then dug up and decapitated; Kemper placed the cat’s head on a spindle to keep (Leyton 37). In the next few years, he supposedly killed other neighborhood pets, also. At thirteen, Kemper killed another family cat. This cat was particularly annoying to Kemper because, like his mother, it was especially partial to his sister (Leyton 38). The cat made Kemper feel rejected in much the same way his mother did. The anger Kemper felt for his mother was manifested in the cat, and Kemper mutilated the cat with a machete (Leyton 38).

Edmund Kemper murdered in response to the rejection of which he had always been a victim. Neither of his parents showed him attention and love; Kemper’s mother constantly belittled him because of his “social failures” (Leyton 36). When Edmund was seven, his parents separated, and he moved to Montana with his mother (Lunde 53). He wanted to see his father and was very bitter toward his mother for causing him not to (Lunde 54). Feeling sorry for him because he had no father figure in his life, Kemper’s mother said that she tried to make it up to him; however, according to Kemper, what she did was “. . . punish and ridicule him in order to make him a man” (Lunde 54). When Edmund was thirteen, he ran away to his father, who promptly
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sent him straight back to his mother (Lunde 55). Completely against his will, Edmund was then sent by his mother to live with his paternal grandparents; they were his first human victims (Lunde 55). His anger over being rejected had first been expressed in his mutilation of his sister’s dolls, then in his killing of animals, and now, in the murders of his own grandparents. In his warped, young mind, Kemper felt he had “avenged the rejection of both his mother and father” in the insane, compulsive murder of his grandparents (Lunde 55).

Kemper spent the four years after his grandparents’ murders in a maximum security mental institution (Leyton 39). Upon his release in 1969, he was turned over to his mother which, considering his anger for her, was the worst possible situation for him (Lunde 55):

They paroled me right back to mama. Well, my mother and I started right in on the horrendous battles, just horrible battles, violent and vicious. I’ve never been in such a vicious verbal battle with anyone. It wouldn’t go to fists with a man, but this was my mother and I couldn’t stand the thought of my mother and I doing these things. (Leyton 55)

The arguments Kemper had with his mother again caused him to fantasize about killing her, and again he began to murder others as substitutes for her: this time he chose to murder “college girls” (Lunde 55). Conveniently, Kemper’s mother was an administrator at the University of California at Santa Cruz, and her position made it easy for him to gain access to his victims (Lunde 56). During the next year, Kemper claimed six more lives—all women—until finally the substitution ended and Kemper killed his real target: his mother (Leyton 72). He decapitated her, then he cut out her larynx and threw it in the garbage—a perfectly logical thing to do, according to him, because of the way “she’d bitched and screamed and yelled at me over the years” (Lunde 56). Not feeling completely gratified, Kemper still needed one more victim. His mother’s best friend, Sally Hallet, had received all of the attention and care from his mother that he’d been denied, so she became his last victim (Leyton 44). Soon afterwards, “. . . having created his identity and his niche, it went without saying that his ‘purpose was gone’ ” (Leyton 72), and he turned himself in to the authorities.

Ted Bundy, like Edmund Kemper, murdered to avenge his mistreatment. While Kemper’s tormentors were his family members, Bundy felt he’d been victimized by society itself (Leyton 102). According to Bundy, society robbed him of his past and stripped away his identity (Leyton 104). Ted Bundy was born illegitimately to Louise Bundy on November 24, 1946, in the Elizabeth Lund Home for Unwed Mothers in Burlington Vermont (Leyton 101). He was executed for murder in Florida in January of 1989 (Dirk A1).

In the forty-three years between his birth and death, Ted Bundy carved a deep, ugly scar on the face of our nation by killing as many as one-hundred or more young women (Nichols 54). Bundy, who had a bachelor’s degree in psychology (Leyton 82), offered many excuses for his deranged behavior. He gave the blame to pornography, sexual violence in the media, alcohol, and everything in between (Nichols 54). But the one thing in Bundy’s life that seems to have inspired his desire to murder was his poor, illegitimate birth (Leyton 82). Even as a young child, he was “deeply class-conscious” (Leyton 97), and he felt that the life into which he was born just wasn’t good enough for him. Bundy’s mother said that when she took him shopping, “little Teddy” always went straight to the highest priced clothes in the stores (Leyton 98). As young as ten years of age, Bundy was ashamed to be seen in the less-than-acceptable cars his step-father drove, and he absolutely abhorred his poor, socially incompetent relatives except for one cultured uncle who was a music teacher (Leyton 97). Practically from birth, Bundy was determined to climb the social ladder and claim his rightful place in society, no matter what he had to do.

Never having found his niche in society because of his shameful birth, Bundy frequently disguised himself and pretended—to be someone else (Leyton 102). In fact, he described his entire life as a “Walter Mitty kind of thing” (Leyton 102). Bundy always preferred to live in college towns and involved himself in politics because he felt these environments were socially mobile and one could rise despite his social class (Leyton 100). Bundy felt driven to educate himself as a way to escape his past and rise in society. Seen by his mother and family as their only hope for ever having a better life, Bundy dreamed of becoming a lawyer (Leyton 90). He was an excellent student about whom his teachers and peers raved (Leyton 82); ironically, he was even compared to a Kennedy by some (Leyton 90). He had a strange and contradictory relationship with society; those who knew him thought he had a deep concern about social issues (Leyton 90), but he really hated society for the miserable life it gave him. Bundy worked for a Crisis Clinic in Seattle counseling people with problems (Leyton 83), and he even wrote a pamphlet on rape prevention for women the same year he began his murders (Nordheimer A1). While it seemed Bundy had forgiven society for torturing him with his reproachful life, “society would pay dearly for its malfunction” (Leyton 104).

Found psychologically normal by nearly all who tested him, Bundy didn’t fit perfectly into any known category of psychopathic personalities (Leyton 85). But, like Kemper, he murdered people as substitutes for his abuser; Bundy murdered to get even with society. He wanted things from life badly, and when he couldn’t have them, he took life itself from others. Beautiful, desirable women seemed unreachable to him, but in killing them he made them his possessions (Leyton 99). Sorority girls were his most frequent victims because they symbolized so well to him that which he’d never have (Leyton 99). Bundy was like a spoiled child whose parents warned him not to do something but who purposefully did it anyway. He would not accept “no” for an answer from society. Dr. David Abrahamsen, a New York psychiatrist, said that Bundy’s deviant, horrible deeds showed that he had a great deal of hate for women and that to Bundy, those he murdered were substitutes for his real
"target" (Nordheimer A1). In his quest for vengeance, Bundy took from society some of its most valuable members just as society had taken his dignity and his identity from him.

Bundy's mother came from a "deeply religious lower middle class... family" that was terribly ashamed when she gave birth to an illegitimate son (Leyton 102). According to Bundy, his mother once told him she was his sister rather than his mother, but he told many differing stories as well (Leyton 103). Regardless of how he discovered it, his illegitimate birth caused him to feel as though he were a visitor who knocked on life's door but was never allowed to enter (Leyton 103). He felt he was denied of his life's meaning and his place in society, and, like many other serial killers, he seemed to lack a conscience (Starr 104). Bundy said he was remorseful after his first murder, but he kept killing and eventually he overcame the guilt and could kill without even a second thought ("Bundy Told Dobson" 3).

When his killing spree was over and he was caught, Bundy was finally able to satisfy his hunger for attention from society: "Denied recognition for so long, he can suddenly strut at center stage" (Starr 106). He had always wanted to be a lawyer, and, ironically, his dream was realized at his own murder trial where he represented himself legally (Starr 106). This conscienceless man who was so tormented by his illegitimate birth and poor childhood was taught his final lesson from society when, in January of 1989, he was executed for murder in a Florida state penitentiary (Nichols 54).

The goal in studying the lives of these two men is not to glorify them or to justify their actions in any way. Instead, the goal is to understand why they killed and to help prevent others from doing so. Police investigators have begun to employ psychological descriptions to track down murderers (Starr 100). In a new FBI crime analysis program, the characteristics of murderers, the methods used by them, and the types of victims they kill are used to draw a psychological "profile" of the murderers; this program has been tremendously successful in helping police find many serial killers (Starr 106). Robert Ressler, an FBI profiler, compares his analysis of a murder scene to an art connoisseur's observance of a painting: "to understand the mind of an 'artist,' you have to be totally familiar with his work" (Starr 106). Through understanding the deviant behaviors of killers and knowing the stages through which most of them progressed, perhaps we can recognize the symptoms of this mental disease in others before they kill:

Prevention efforts must be directed toward the young. Early counseling is needed for preschoolers and elementary school children—especially those in high crime areas. Special counseling should be provided for those young persons who manifest poor social adjustment. Assistance must be given before negative behavior patterns become fixed. (Danto 29)

People who have dealt with and extensively researched serial killers agree that for most killers, the incidents causing them to one day murder occur in their childhoods (Starr 104). This is not to say that the killers' parents are at fault nor is it to say that society itself is at fault. No one factor can be isolated that creates these violent killers. Both Bundy and Kemper killed the same type of people but for entirely different reasons. Their childhoods were dissimilar yet similar; both were unhappy and unstable as children. The number of serial killers who had traumatic and unfortunate childhoods is too great to merely attribute the correlation to coincidence. Most researchers will agree that...impaired development of attachments in early life..." can lead to the development of a serial killer (Prentky 887).

Society must improve its care for its children and must teach parents to give much more love and attention to them. To prevent murders, improvements need to be made in the environment as well as in our nation's housing, education, and health care systems (Danto 30). Children give back exactly what they were given; the more care and love they will get from us, the more care and love they will give back to us, just as the more hate and violence we show them, the more hate and violence they will give back to us.
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THE CAMPFIRE, THE HEARTH, AND THE HEATER:
SYMBOLS OF CHANGE IN GO DOWN, MOSES

Jean E. Nehm

Since the publication in 1942 of William Faulkner's Go Down, Moses, readers have been struggling with its labyrinthine plot, complex family relationships, challenging style, prodigious themes, and its alleged lack of unity. If readers would set aside the genealogy chart and the chronology in order to take a less myopic view of the novel, they may notice a subtle flame of illumination glowing from each chapter.

As images in Go Down, Moses, the campfire is a symbol of the pristine wilderness of ancient times, the hearth of the agricultural and plantation era, and the heater of the modern industrial age. Together, the three images provide a moral notice as well as the close communion of human nature. And several other companions returned to the wilderness each fall for their annual hunt. The hunters typically gathered around the "smoky blazing of piled wood" (Faulkner 192); thus the open-air campfire symbolizes the nature of the wilderness itself as well as the close communion of men with the wilderness and their corresponding relationship with each other.

The author's eloquent language in these two chapters reflects his reverence for the virgin wilderness. The hunting stories are "handled by Faulkner with such lyric power and sympathy that the style itself approaches a mode of incantation, particularly as it describes the lore of camp life in the wilderness..." (Thomason 88). The wilderness is often described with multiple rhythmic objectives, which tend to enhance nature's grandeur: "profound, sentient, gigantic and brooding" (175); "tremendous, attentive, impartial and omniscient" (181); and the "wilderness soared, musing, inattentive, myriad, eternal, green" (322). The ancient forests are not only "bigger and older than any recorded document" (191), but are also eternal, as in "the immemorial darkness of the woods" (206) and "timeless woods" (200). Animals, too, are described in fittingly majestic language. Ike's first buck came into sight "looking not like a ghost but as if all light were condensed in him and he were the source of it, not only moving in it but disseminating it, already running, seen first as you always see the deer, in that split second after he has already seen you, already slanting away in that first soaring bound..." (163). When Ike shot at it, the buck "sprang, forever immortal" (178). The second great buck, which was not hunted, was "moving with that winged and effortless ease with which deer move, passing within twenty feet of them, its head high and the eye not proud and not haughty but just full and wild and unafraid..." (184). When Ike shot at it, the buck "sprang, forever immortal" (178). The second great buck, which was not hunted, was "moving with that winged and effortless ease with which deer move, passing within twenty feet of them, its head high and the eye not proud and not haughty but just full and wild and unafraid..." (184). Of course, the wilderness was home for the legendary bear whose "shaggy tremendous shape" (193) was "dimensionless against the dappled obscurity" (209) and which was "not even a mortal beast but an anachronism indomitable and invincible out of the old dead time, a phantom, epitome and apotheosis of the old wild life..." (193). William O'Connor suggests that the concept of the immortality of the bear and the wilderness is reinforced by Faulkner's rhetoric, "words that evoke an older morality and recall an older order" (343).

Compared with such an awesome wilderness, human beings, Faulkner writes, are "dwarfed by that perspective into an almost ridiculous diminishment" (195). Although the wilderness opens momentarily to accept Ike and then closes again behind him, he clearly has a "sense of his own fragility and impotence against the timeless woods" (200). Lee Jenkins notes that in "the woods man is alone against the great overarching swell of nature. In the woods he recognizes both his bond with nature and his uniqueness as a human being" (233). As a youth, Ike felt that bond and also a oneness with others who had been there before, especially those who "had merely passed without altering it, leaving no mark or scar..." (202).

Just as the wilderness is idealized in the novel, so too are the human relationships in "The Old People and "The Bear." Time-honored hunting codes and rituals, including stories "of the old hunts and the hunts to come" (175) told around the evening campfire, link the present hunting party with their predecessors. Idealized ancestral hunters held
the earth mutual and intact in the communal anonymity of brotherhood” (257). The distinctions of race are nonexistent in the wilderness; “it was of the men, not white nor black nor red but men, hunters, with the will and hardihood to endure and the humility and skill to survive ...” (191). As John Lydenberg points out, during the ritual hunt, “the established social relations dissolve; the artificial ranks of Jefferson give way to more natural relations as Sam Fathers is automatically given the lead” (283). In the perfect, untouched wilderness, men too were to transcend their differences, forming a “community of men in honorable and equitable relationship among themselves and with nature” (Jenkins 234).

On the first page of Go Down, Moses and again on a page near the end of the book, forming a frame around the novel, are statements that “the earth was no man’s but all men’s ...” (3). “It belonged to all; they had only to use it well, humbly and with pride” (354). Lamentably, some did not respect it nor use it well. Over the years, the tremendous wall of wilderness, once described as impenetrable, was “being gnawed at by men with plows and axes who feared it because it was wilderness, men myriad and nameless even to one another ...” (193). The magnificent wilderness gave way to an “unthread land warped and wrung to mathematical squares of rank cotton ...” (354); and with the arrival of agriculture and plantation society, the idealized brotherhood of man was also destroyed.

The Hearth

With the destruction of the wilderness, the locus of the flame changed from the open-air campfire to the indoor hearth. Although the hearth and fireplace are constructed from natural materials, they are physically and psychologically distanced from the ideal communion with nature. Humans’ relationship to the land began to change when the mighty wilderness that once belonged to all was replaced by measured acres owned by a select few. Those few lost the spiritual closeness with the land experienced by taking with humility only what was needed for survival; rather, they planted enormous acreages and exploited the land by means of slavery. The result, therefore, was a fundamental estrangement in the races’ relationships with each other, as exemplified by the representative of plantation aristocracy, Old Carothers McCaslin. In sharp contrast to the wilderness where men experienced no class distinction, Old Carothers was contemptuous “of all blood black, white, yellow or red, including his own” (118). Go Down, Moses, Lyall H. Powers states, “is redolent of Faulkner’s vision of a society as guilty of agricultural as of social abuse” (166).

The hearth is a traditional symbol of love and human warmth within the home, but changes in society make it also a symbol of transition. The progression away from the idea is manifested in the first three stories in Go Down, Moses, all of which have hearth scenes.

The first image of the hearth, in “Was,” is completely chaotic. Several dogs and a fox are coursing through Uncle Buddy and Uncle Buck’s house until the fox is treed behind the mantle clock. Sticks of firewood are hurled at the animals, and breakfast food falls into the ashes. The chaotic hearth scene is an apt symbol for the unrest experienced in 1859, the time of this story. The system of land being cultivated with slave labor was about to undergo further change in the impending Civil War. Human relations experience similar modification. Theophilus and Amodeus McCaslin are not the arrogant, abusing slave owners their father was, and there is a generous amount of humor in the story of their semi-annual hunt for Tomey’s Turl, who runs off to the Beauchamp plantation to be with Tennie. But under the comic surface lies the dehumanizing reality of slavery, where white men talk of buying and selling fellow humans and even use a slave as part of a wager in a poker game. Only later in the book does the reader discover the grave irony that the twins and Tomey’s Turl are, in fact, descendents of the same father.

Far more tranquil hearth scenes pervade the next chapter, “The Fire and the Hearth.” The primary image is that of Lucas Beauchamp’s hearth, where he keeps “alive on the hearth the fire he had lit there on their wedding day and which had burned ever since ...” (46). The fire was intended to be a symbol of coherence and permanence for it “was to burn on the hearth until neither he nor Molly were left to feed it ...” (47). The fire was indeed kept alive by Lucas, even during the long and difficult months of Molly’s absence in Zack Edmons’s house while she nursed both the white infant Roth and her own son, Henry.

The hearth also suggests the theme of continuity in a brief but significant scene when Lucas is preparing to confront Zack in regard to his wife. Before leaving his home before dawn, Lucas carefully lifts a brick from a corner of the fireplace; the brick possessed a “slow, deep solidity of heat ... a condensation not of fire but of time ...” (51). Under the brick is concealed a small metal box originally owned by Lucas’s white grandfather, Old Carothers McCaslin. Lucas quietly removes the old coins contained therein, “some of which dated back almost to Carothers McCaslin’s time,” (52) and places them in his wife’s shoe. In this way, Lucas resolves, should anything happen to him in the confrontation with Zack, to use money from the past to provide for his wife’s future.

Slavery has been abolished by the time of “The Fire and the Hearth,” but sharecropping was its successor, resulting, of course, in inequality between the landowners and the farmers. Beneath the tranquil hearth scenes of this chapter is the ever-present racial tension, as shown in parallel flashbacks of Lucas and Zack’s youth as well as Henry and Roth’s childhood. Lucas and Zack are said to have “lived until they were both grown almost as brothers lived” (55). Their childhood innocence recalls the ideal community of men in the days of the wilderness. Nearly inseparable, they even “slept under the same blanket before a fire in the woods” (55). Their sons, too, “accept, as did their parents in their childhood, the interchangeability of homes, beds, kitchens, and even parents” (Vickery 129). But one day when Roth was only seven, “the old curse of his fathers, the haughty ancestral pride . . . stemmed not from
courage and honor but from wrong and shame, descended on him” (111). Having displayed racial superiority toward Henry, the bond between the boys is broken, and Roth finds himself eating alone at Henry’s hearth. Once a symbol of love, the hearth becomes a symbol of increasing estrangement during the agricultural years.

“The Fire and the Hearth” closes with two hearth images representing the separation of the races. When Roth visits Lucas and Molly in their home one evening, he sees them both touched and highlighted by a firelight from their hearth. It is a glowing scene, from which, though he is attempting to reconcile their marital problem, Roth is excluded. In a scene reminiscent of the earlier image of young Roth eating alone at Henry’s hearth, the adult Roth is last seen eating his “solitary meal” before “a little fire” (130).

“Pantaloon in Black” presents a final hearth scene in this section of the novel. The fire, which the young couple lit on their wedding day in imitation of Lucas and Molly, has gone out after Rider’s beloved wife of only six months suddenly died. The cold hearth in this story is symbolic of even further alienation between man and the land and between the races. With tragic irony, Faulkner writes of a protagonist who is not a hunter nor a farmer, but a logger. For a “bright cascade of silver dollars” (138), Rider is contributing to the destruction of the wilderness. A complete rift in human relations is apparent after Rider, in his intense grief, kills a white man and is subsequently lynched. The sheriff shows a total lack of compassion and understanding when he tells his wife, "Them damn niggers...ain’t human...when it comes to the normal human feelings and sentiments of human beings, they might just as well be a damn herd of wild buffaloes..." (154). As Dorothy Denniston writes, “One thing is certain: there is no fire burning on the hearth of the sheriff’s home” (40).

The stories in Go Down, Moses “chart the shifts and changes in the life of a culture. As the wilderness steadily retreats before the slow pressure of roads and neatly fenced farms, the plantation world also begins to crumble” (Vickery 125). The changes are felt intensely and personally by Isaac McCaslin who was once initiated into the wilderness and who later reacts to the plantation society. As a young boy, Isaac thought of reading the family ledgers to learn of his ancestry and “of the land which they had all held and used in common and fed from and on and would continue to use in common without regard to color or titular ownership...” (268). The perspective of the young boy was, of course, naive. When he was older, he did, in fact, read the ledgers in the commissary, and the truth about color and ownership became increasingly clear. He is so horrified to learn of the abuses of slavery, especially his own grandfather’s miscegenation and incest, that he completely repudiates “the tamed land” (254). Ike continues to be a central character as the saga of the continuing destruction of the land and of human relationships continues in “Delta Autumn.”

The Heater

Michael Oriard writes, Faulkner’s “South was a society in transition...a region where the agrarian values of an earlier period were uneasily and reluctantly giving way to those of a new industrial order” (172). By the present time of “Delta Autumn,” about 1940, the source of heat and light is a sheet-iron heater. The manufactured heater is an apt symbol of the industrial age and all the changes it entails. Firewood is now added to the heater’s “iron maw” (352); the heater may radiate physical warmth, but all connotations of beauty and human warmth are absent, far removed from the ideal.

The genesis of this story was an actual hunting trip William Faulkner took in November of 1940. A nearly fatal medical emergency left the already frustrated author depressed. “Delta Autumn,” the next story he wrote, “embodies the pessimism he felt then about the world, the United States, his writing, and himself” (Grimwood 95).

The characters in “Delta Autumn” have lost all intimate contact with nature, which is not surprising since the wilderness is so physically far removed from their daily lives. For their annual hunting trip, the hunters, who once loaded supplies in a wagon to go a short distance from Jefferson, must now drive in cars two hundred miles to find any wilderness left. Isaac is now an old man who compares the disappearing wilderness to his own life: “the territory in which game still existed drawing yearly inward as his life was drawing inward...” (335). Scenes along the highway reveal regrettable changes from the wilderness ideal. The once towering wilderness is now open land producing “cotton for the world’s looms” (340); “paths made by deer and bear became roads and then highways” (340); “neon flashed past them from countless towns and countless shining this-year’s automobiles sped past them on the broad plumb-ruled highways” (340); and “there came now no screams of panther but instead the long hooting of locomotives” (341). The members of the hunting party are so caught up in the contemporary world that they cannot put aside their concerns even temporarily: “As the story opens, the landscape itself seems to be dissolving away under the November rain, and the conversation of the hunters is soured by memories of the depression and thoughts of Hitler and approaching war” (Early 20). Ike feels that the younger men are tainted by “the corruption of steel and oiled moving parts” (342). Indeed, they are so far removed from the ideal, respect for and communion with nature, that they even kill a doe with a shotgun, in arrogant opposition to traditional hunting codes. Michael Grimwood feels that the “killing of the doe... epitomizes not only Ike’s failure to transmit the old values, but the general absence of those values from twentieth-century civilization” (96).

In the industrial age, the characters experience even further alienation from each other. No longer does Ike feel a camaraderie with his hunting companions; he is merely an old man who “no longer had any business making such expeditions” (336), traveling with the sons and grandsons of his former hunting peers. His own kinsman, Roth Edmonds, seems remote, even hostile. And of course, Ike has no son of his own to pass on the spirit of the wilderness as Sam Fathers had done for him.
The ultimate irony occurs when the granddaughter of Tennie’s Jim, carrying Roth’s child, appears in the camp. It is clear that Roth has repeated the crime of his grandfather and has similarly sought to use money for retribution rather than to face his responsibilities. Even though he carelessly broke the hunting code, he feels bound by the social code against interracial marriage. Ike’s rejection of the girl is just as cruel when he says, “You’re a nigger!... Can’t nobody do nothing for you!... Go back North. Marry: a man in your own race” (363). Ike is now so far distanced from basic human compassion that the girl is compelled to ask, “Old man, have you lived so long and forgotten so much that you don’t remember anything you ever knew or felt or even heard about love?” (363). Tragically, Ike has “tamed out of himself the emotions that nourished him in the forest” (Selzer 91).

“Delta Autumn” “mournfully broods on the shrinkage of the Mississippi wilderness...” (Matthews 212), and the gulf of misunderstanding between the races seems nearly unbridgeable. Faulkner’s “gloom over his physical mortality, over the uncertain fate of his life’s work, and over the violent course of human history” (Grimwood 94) pervades this story. Total despair, however, is not inevitable; the author displays some ambivalence in the final chapter.

“Go Down, Moses”

The increasingly pessimistic view of the world from the destruction of the ideal wilderness and its concurrent eroding of human relationships seems to take a final plunge at the beginning of “Go Down, Moses.” The story is the only one in the novel that takes place entirely in Jefferson, totally removed from the wilderness and even the farmland. Mollie’s grandson has committed a murder even further away, in the North, in the metropolis of Chicago. The murder and his subsequent execution parallel and reinforce the seemingly hopeless rift in racial relations portrayed earlier in Rider’s murder and lynching.

Before a tone of total despair emanates from his work, Faulkner introduces a new character, Miss Worsham, whose grandfather had owned Mollie in the days before emancipation. Miss Worsham and Mollie were born in the same month, and, contrary to young Henry and Roth who grew apart because of the racial code, the girls “grew up together as sisters would” (375). When Owin Stevens is unable to comprehend Mollie’s grief-stricken litany about the selling of her grandson in Egypt, Miss Worsham is able to “transcend the racial code” (Selzer 92), empathize with Mollie, and tell Mr. Stevens, “It’s all right. It’s our grief” (381). Significantly, in Miss Worsham’s house was a “brick hearth on which the ancient symbol of human coherence and solidarity smoldered” (380). The final image of the hearth, then, is not burned out, not pessimistic, but instead glowing with hope. Thadious Davis notes that while all problems are not resolved, “there is an uneasy truce at the end, a recognition that the individuals of the community cannot strip themselves of their collective guilt or interdependency, but they can act according to the old verities of the heart... they can undertake mutually beneficial cooperative enterprises” (243).

A brief look at William Faulkner’s biography helps to explain his changing vision of his world. The author, burdened with failing health, increasing debts on his property at Rowan Oak, and declining creative energy, was in his mid-forties at the time of the creation of Go Down, Moses. Having seen enormous changes in the land and economy during those years, he may have felt a sense of alienation and perhaps nostalgia for the more romantic past. His assessment of the potential for interracial harmony, however, does not seem to be as pessimistic. The death in 1940 of Caroline Barr, the Mammie to whom Faulkner so fondly dedicates this book, may have had an impact on his more optimistic feeling toward race relations: “In 1940, out of his own personal experience, Faulkner would have vigorously affirmed that trusting and affectionate relationships could and did exist between whites and Negroes in the South” (Pilkington 286). The tone of futurity, personified by Miss Worsham in the final chapter of Go Down, Moses, suggests a harbinger of the Nobel Prize winner’s faith that man will prevail because of his “spirit capable of compassion and sacrifice and endurance” (Faulkner Speech 171).

Conclusion

The campfire, the hearth, and the heater have been shown to be symbols of change in Faulkner’s world. Yet the symbols embody a sense of continuity as well, for each is kindled by logs, logs which by nature represent the endless cycle of life. During a hunting trip in “The Bear,” young Isaac came across the gutted log where he had first seen the mighty bear’s unique paw print. The log was “almost completely crumbled now, healing with unbelievable speed, a passionate and almost visible relinquishment, back into the earth from which the tree had grown” (205).

Just as the logs used in the campfire, the hearth, and the heater ultimately return to the earth and replenish the earth, so too is man’s past inexorable linked with his present and future. The reader of Go Down, Moses intuitively senses this link as he becomes entwined in another kind of tree, the McCaslin family tree. Having been thus reminded of the “courage and honor and hope and pride and compassion and pity and sacrifice which have been the glory of his past” (Faulkner Speech 171), the reader’s faith in the future is renewed, a future where healing of the exploited land and healing of the estrangement between men may be accomplished.
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IS ENVIRONMENTAL RECOVERY POSSIBLE IN PRINCE WILLIAM SOUND FOLLOWING THE ALASKAN OIL SPILL?

M. Elizabeth Lilley

On March 23, 1989, the Exxon Valdez tanker was loaded with 1.2 million barrels of Prudhoe crude oil. The Valdez began its journey through the cold waters of Prince William Sound in order to reach the open sea. California was the final destination for the Valdez, but it did not make it that far. At 12:04 a.m. on March 24th, the Exxon Valdez ran square into a reef after completing only 25 miles of its trip. “The rocks at Bligh Island tore five huge gashes in the hull, one of them 6 feet wide by 20 feet long, creating the worse oil spill in U.S. waters” (Marshall, 1989, p. 20).

What was to follow was to be a nightmare for the environmentalists, as well as the fishermen, oil companies, and the wildlife of Prince William Sound. Unfortunately, they would all realize that this was not a dream, but rather an ecological disaster. New York Supreme Court Justice Kenneth Rohl stated, “We have a man-made destruction that probably has not been equaled since Hiroshima” (Hackett, Hager, Drew, & Wright, 1989, p. 18). The magnitude of this spill may never be equalled, at least the environmentalists hope that to be the case.

The initial response to the oil spill was slow in starting. The Coast Guard was not notified by the ship until 27 minutes after the hour. At that point, the Valdez had lost 150,000 barrels of crude, making the oil spill already too big for the local crews to control. (Marshall, 1989). According to Coast Guard dispatch, nearly all of the 11 million gallons of crude oil was released in the first 12 hours following the spill (Marshall, 1989, p. 20).

Environmental effects

“Crude oils differ, but in general they contain hundreds, even thousands of different compounds. Some are straight hydrocarbons and other hydrocarbons have branched chains with a wide range of carbon members. Aromatic compounds such as benzene, toluene, and polynuclear hydrocarbons are substantially present. Other constituents include waxes and complex, high molecular weight asphaltenes. When ingested, most of the compounds are nontoxic. Notable exceptions are some of the aromatic compounds, including benzene and toluene” (Abelson, 1989, p. 629).

“After crude oil is spilled in a marine environment, many processes follow. The crude’s combining with winds, wave, and current actions leads to spreading, which is particularly rapid during the first 24 hours. During that period most of the components having boiling points below 200°C volatilize. As a result some of the toxic chemicals such as benzene are removed. About a day after the spill, depending on temperature and wave action, an emulsification of oil and sea water occurs, leading to formation of a highly viscous material that contains about 70% water. The material is very sticky, and it adheres to almost all objects that it encounters, including birds and sea otters” (Abelson, 1989, p. 629).

Because the sound was protected from the open sea, the slick was slow to dissipate. The oil biodegraded less rapidly in the subarctic sound than it would have in warmer waters (Cowley, Wright, 1989, p. 7).

One method of breaking up an oil slick is the use of chemical dispersants. This is a controversial method of treating a spill since the chemicals can be as toxic as oil in shallow waters. However, while adding dispersants to the oil may deliver shock to marine life immediately, not treating it might be worse over the long term (Marshall, 1989, p. 21).

The Coast Guard reported that an early test of chemical dispersants on the 25th of March gave “less than satisfactory results . . . due to lack of wave action.” After a few partially successful test runs, the dispersants and burning attempts were abandoned because oil had emulsified into thick ribbons by Monday, March 27 (Marshall, 1989, p. 21).

“By Friday, a week after the spill, the slick had spread nearly 900 square miles. Hundreds of miles of shoreline were covered with oil, in places as much as 6 inches deep. Thousands of oiled sea birds were found, both dead and alive. The sea otter deaths were difficult to gauge, though many more were in danger. The oil spill was heading towards Orca Bay, home to more than half of the region’s 10,000 or more otters. Once covered with oil, sea otters are unable to regulate their temperature and will perish” (Roberts, 1989, p. 22).

By the end of the week, the oil had formed a continuous slick without breaks in Prince William Sound. David Kennedy, scientific support coordinator for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration’s (NOAA) team, stated that as a result of this continuous slick, “volatile compounds that would normally have evaporated were trapped beneath the slick, where they seemed certain to enter the food chain” (Roberts, 1989, p. 22). It seemed inevitable that life outside the marine ecosystem was to be seriously harmed.

The Cleanup

The cleanup that followed the spill was long, and in the opinion of many, a “waste of time” (Satchell, & Carpenter, 1989, p. 60). One Idaho worker’s response to the sticky, gooey brown layer of oil was, “They’ll never get it all, it’s too far down. You pick up rock after rock and it’s (the oil) spilled down to the layers below” (Hacket, Wright,
Abramson, & Wang, 1989, p. 25).

Esson’s assertion that most of the oil had harmlessly evaporated or been broken down by the sea was doubted by many. Environmentalists say Esson underestimated the amount of oil that washed up on shore or sunk to the ocean floor, where it will probably continue to do ecological damage for years to come (Hackett, Wright, Abramson, & Wang, 1989, p. 25).

Exxon recited statistics on what it had accomplished. They claimed to have recovered 60,000 barrels of oil, and said that all 1,087 miles of oiled beaches were rendered “environmentally stable” (Satchell, & Carpenter, 1989, p. 61). The state has filed a lawsuit against the company for damages caused by the spill. The state claims that “the company is cutting and running with work unfinished” (Satchell, & Carpenter, 1989, p. 61). Alaska insists that less than 30,000 barrels were picked up, and that only 118 miles of beach are fit for wildlife or vegetation (Satchell, & Carpenter, 1989, p. 61).

Robert Howarth, a marine ecologist at Cornell University commented that once oil is in fine-grained sediments, it is persistent, more so in cold water. Howarth commented, “In those kinds of waters, I would be guessing, but I’d say it would probably be longer than 20 years (for recovery)” (Roberts, 1989, p. 22).

Some beaches were cleaned repeatedly to remove oil that percolated back up from beach gravel where it soaked in when it first washed ashore. Many on-site biologists believed that once most of the oil had congealed on the shoreline, Exxon should have halted cleanup. In fact, Esson’s industrial-strength technique to scour oil off the beaches with high-pressure blasts of hot water scalds some of the fragile marine organisms that thrive in the zone between the high and low-tide lines, and may drive oil deep into sediment (Satchell, & Carpenter, 1989, p. 62). “The cleaning methods that do the least harm, such as flooding the beach with low-pressure hoses, also do the least good” (Cowley, & Wright, 1989, p. 70).

Image Vs. Reality

Despite the oily assault on Prince William Sound, the sublime beachescapes remain startlingly beautiful. Prince William Sound is no longer an ecological disaster zone. Initially there was heavy mortality rates among sea birds and otters—about 33,000 birds and 1,000 mammals either were found dead or died in rehabilitation centers. Of the 13,000 otters that lived in the path of the slick, 993 were killed and many more are presumed dead (Satchell, & Carpenter, 1989, p. 63).

Eagles and other birds of prey that ate on dead and dying sea birds were hit by the spill, though not hard enough to threaten the state’s population of eagles. At least 138 eagles were confirmed dead, and researchers who surveyed eagle nests reported that many adult pairs did not produce young this year. Even a trace of oil on a fertilized egg can poison the embryo inside. Researchers speculate that the increased activity in the sound may have contributed to some adult eagles abandoning their nests (Satchell, & Carpenter, 1989, p. 64).

Salmon appeared to be unharmed. It is believed that salmon returning to spawn did not ingest any of the oil, since they usually do not feed in their journey to the streams. The effect of the oil spill on the young fish may never be known. Prior to heading out to sea, young salmon feed on plankton in shallow water off beaches. Researchers speculate that there is the possibility of these salmon developing cancers or reproductive disorders if they ingested oil during their migration to the open sea (Satchell, & Carpenter, 1989, p. 67). Also, the oil may have affected the salmon’s growth, as well as inhibiting their ability to smell their way to their spawning grounds (Cowley, & Wright, p. 70).

Predictions For The Sound’s Future

“Despite a number of well-publicized spills in recent years, surprisingly little is known about their long-term effects. The subarctic conditions in Prince William Sound will slowly recover. Both photochemical and microbial degradation occur more slowly in cold water with diminished light” (Roberts, 1989, p. 22).

It is agreed upon by many of the researchers that “the duration of the effects will depend, to a large extent, on how much oil settles in the fine, muddy sediments, as well as the geographic distribution of such sediments” (Roberts, 1989, p. 24).

Oil accumulation in the sediments will possibly bring a shift in species composition as benthic fauna are killed off and are replaced by species that can survive the pollution. Since benthic plants and animals form the basis of the food chain, a change in the composition could ultimately effect the fish that feed on them (Roberts, 1989, p. 24).

The actual damage done to the environment of Prince William Sound “may not be fully measured for years” (Bonfante, Postman, & Witterman, 1989, p. 58). The sound is on its way to environmental recovery. The blue-green water is clear again. Gone are the devastating scenes of oil-slicked otters drowning, or sea birds struggling to fly. The delicate life cycle of the intertidal communities are rebounding. One might happen upon snails that have eaten oil, leaving gray traits behind as they chomp their way across the blackened rocks, a subtle reminder of the tragedy gone by. These snails may not be in the best of health, but they are on the road to recovery, as slow as it may be (Satchell, & Carpenter, 1989, p. 64).

The question at hand is as follows: “Is environmental recovery possible in Prince William Sound following the Alaskan oil spill?” From the evidence presented, this author predicts that environmental recovery is indeed possible in the sound. Jay Hair, president of the National Wildlife Federation stated, “It’s probably fair to say that in our lifetime we will never see the sound the way it was on March 23, 1989” (Cowley, & Wright, 1989, p. 70). However, “all agree that the rich ecosystem of Prince William Sound will eventually recover. The only question is ‘when?’” (Roberts, 1989, p. 24).
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In the last two centuries, the population of the earth and the human activities have been increased tremendously. As a result, the effect of the human activities on the earth have become very evident. One of the most apparent human influences on the globe is the modification of the climate in the city. The huge buildings, the construction of the factories, the roads, and other factors play a very clear role in modifying the temperature in the city. Furthermore, they play roles in the city’s precipitation patterns (Lowry, 1967). Several studies have been made comparing urban and rural participation, and the surveys have concluded that the amount of precipitation over a city is about ten percent greater than over the nearby countryside (Lutgens and Tarbuck, 1986).

In the last 25 years, there has been an increase in the number of urban climate studies. These studies include many aspects of the climate. One of the most important aspects of the climate of the city is the impact of the city structures on the temperature. Mitchell (1962) has reviewed the temperature differences between the cities and rural areas and discussed the existence of the so-called “heat island” (Mather, 1974). Some of these studies used computer-enhanced, thermal, infrared satellite images such as the study about the St. Louis urban heat island on July 28, 1977 (Lutgens, 1986); however, what is the extent of the urban heat island? In other words, is the urban heat island to be found in each city or just in the large cities? The author thinks that the urban heat island can be found only in the large cities where the human activities and the city structures are strong enough to modify the temperature of the city. Therefore, the hypothesis of this project is that there is no urban heat island in Bowling Green, Kentucky. To test this hypothesis, the temperature of various locations in the downtown of Bowling Green and the surrounding area will be recorded and mapped. The data will be analyzed to find if there is an urban heat island in Bowling Green.

**What is Urban Heat Island and What Causes It?**

The urban area of the city usually has temperatures higher than the surrounding area or the rural area. Frederick K. Lutgens identified the term “urban heat island” saying, “The term simply refers to the fact that the temperatures within the cities are generally higher than in rural areas.” It was found by many researchers that the downtown area of cities have temperatures relatively higher than the temperatures of the surrounding areas. For example, Landsberg in 1950 in a survey of temperature during an August afternoon and evening in Washington, D.C., identified four landscape features which exerted strong influence on the microclimate of the city” (Mather, 1974).

The question now is how the temperature difference between the city’s downtown and the surrounding area occurs? According to Oliver and Hidore (1984):

- Concrete, asphalt, and glass replace natural vegetation.
- Structures of vertical extent replace a largely horizontal interface.
- Large amounts of energy are imported and combusted.
- Combustion of fossil fuels create pollution.

These factors and related factors modify the climate of the city. The city surface has a lower albedo than non-urban areas and greater heat conduction and more heat storage. The energy flows which are modified by the city buildings, walls, roofs, and streets present a much more varied surface to solar radiation than the natural environment of the undeveloped area. Also, the different surfaces found in the city modify energy availability by changing the water balance because precipitation in an urban area opposed to the non-urban area is deposited quite differently. Therefore, the evaporation and transportation amounts are decreased in the city. As a result, the solar energy available for this process provides additional surface heating.

Cities are high consumers of energy which means much “waste” heat passed to the atmosphere to add to the warmth of the city.

Air pollution over the city reduces the loss of long-wave energy from space.

The result of these processes and related processes is that the cities tend to be warmer than the surrounding, non-urban environment.

**Methodology**

1. As an approach to finding if there is an urban heat island in Bowling Green, Kentucky, the following points were covered:
   - the temperature along two routes crossing each other in the city’s downtown were recorded.
   - The two routes were perpendicular as much as possible even though the street system in Bowling Green makes this goal difficult. However, this is not expected to affect the results of the study.
   - The routes: The first route began at the intersection of
Campbell Lane and Scottsville Road and ended at a point on Main Street about two miles beyond the city's downtown. The second route began at the intersection of Russellville Road and Campbell Lane, crossing the downtown area, and ended at a point on Louisville Road which is two miles from the city's downtown (see Figure 2).

-The temperatures were measured at equal points, approximately one-half mile, along each line.
- The data were collected on five days which had relatively the same weather conditions; and the readings were taken from the same locations on each of the five days.
- The measurements of the temperatures were taken within 60-80 minutes each day at the 20 points, at 9:15 - 10:30 p.m. each day. This serves two purposes: First, to avoid creating a traffic problem; second, the time selected is the time when the urban heat in effect manifests itself (four and a half hours after sunset) (Lowry, 1967).
- The thermometer was in the same position for each of the 100 measurement points, it was not affected by other factors in order to avoid misleading readings of the temperatures, such as car heat. Furthermore, the hand did not touch the thermometer as it was fastened to a stake.

2. After collecting the 100 temperature readings at the 20 locations, the following analysis was made:
- The five readings at each location were summed and divided by five to get the average of the temperature in the location which was taken between 9:15 - 10:30 p.m. This average was recorded on a map of Bowling Green at the position relative to the measurement location.
- After recording the 20 averages, isotherms were drawn to connect the equal averages. These isotherms show the trend of the temperature in the Bowling Green area including the downtown and the surrounding area. In other words, the line patterns determine whether or not there is an urban heat island in Bowling Green.
- Graphs were made for the two routes showing the relationship between the temperature and the distance from the downtown area.

Analysis

The measurement of the 20 locations along the two routes were taken on five nights between 23 to 29 of November, 1989. These nights are 23, 26, 27, 28 and 29 of November, 1989.

The five days' temperature measurements in each of the 20 locations are shown in Table 1. These five days' measurements of each route summed and divided by five yielded the average of the five days in each location. The results are displayed in Table 2 and Figure 1. By the table and the figure, we can see the following:
- The lowest temperature in Route No. 1 is 43.3 degrees fahrenheit, taken from the first point of measurement; and the highest is 45.3 degrees fahrenheit, recorded in Bowling Green's downtown. This indicates the range between the downtown and the surrounding area of two degrees fahrenheit and that there is a difference between the downtown temperature and the surrounding area temperature.
- By looking to Figure 1 and Table 2, we can note the temperature increases smoothly along Route No. 1 to the downtown area and decreases smoothly away from the downtown area. There is no abrupt increase or decrease in the temperature. This temperature trend along this route could have occurred because there are no tall buildings along this route. Point No. 1's temperature is one degree lower than the last point on this route.
- When we look at the same table and the graph, the lowest temperature average along Route No. 2 is 42.9. This location is not the first point in Route No. 2 but the third. The highest average along this route is 44.8 and is located in the downtown area. Therefore, the range between the downtown area and the surrounding area is 1.9 degrees fahrenheit. Along this route the temperature trend is not systematic. In other words, the temperature trend is decreasing from Station 1 to Station 3; then it increases, reaching its peak in the downtown area. Afterward the temperature decreases abruptly.

When the two route averages are compared, the following conclusions can be made:
- Route No. 2 has lower averages. This could be a result of the difference in the recording times along these two routes, and the difference in recording time between similar points on both routes (for example: point #2 on both routes) is about 35 - 40 minutes each day; however, this difference cannot be considered as bias in the data recording which affects the possible results that we seek in this analysis. The bias is reduced because each day at each point (station) the temperature recordings were at approximately the same time. Furthermore, the difference in temperature between the downtown area and the surrounding area along these two routes are almost the same (2 degrees fahrenheit and 1.9 degrees fahrenheit) which proves that the difference in recording time between the two routes is not bias as long as we keep this difference constant.

Third, the difference between the downtown temperature and the surrounding area, as it existed is not high, only 2 degrees fahrenheit.

Fourth, the lowest average along the 20 points is not on the edge of these two routes; but it is in the third point in the second route, and this point is not the furthest point from the downtown and there are six points further as can be seen in Figure 2. Even though the isotherm map (Figure 2) has only 0.5 degrees fahrenheit intervals, it shows the weak heat island in the downtown area. The strongest steepness in this isotherm is in the northwest of the town and the least is in the southeast of the town.

Results and Conclusion

After measuring 100 temperatures, in five days, at 20 locations across Bowling Green and surrounding area and analyzing the obtained data, it was found that there is a 2-degree fahrenheit range between downtown Bowling Green
and the surrounding area. This difference did not exist by chance because it is the result of averaged measurements. The averages imply that there is a heat island in Bowling Green. However, the heat island does not manifest itself strongly. The findings of the analysis in this paper disproves the hypothesis of this paper which states that there is no heat island in Bowling.

Table 1: The record of the temperatures (in degrees Fahrenheit) at the 20 locations in five days

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day No. 1</th>
<th>Day No. 2</th>
<th>Day No. 3</th>
<th>Day No. 4</th>
<th>Day No. 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date: 11-23-1989</td>
<td>Date: 11-26-1989</td>
<td>Date: 11-27-1989</td>
<td>Date: 11-28-1989</td>
<td>Date: 11-29-1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday night</td>
<td>Sunday night</td>
<td>Monday night</td>
<td>Tuesday night</td>
<td>Wednesday night</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Point</th>
<th>P.M.</th>
<th>Temp.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9:15</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9:18</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9:20</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9:23</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9:30</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>9:33</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>9:37</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9:41</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9:46</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>9:48</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>9:57</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>10:01</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>10:05</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>10:14</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>10:17</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>10:19</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>10:25</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>10:25</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From 1-10 = Route No. 1, and from 11-20 = Route No. 2

Table 2

The Five-Day Averages for the Two Route Locations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route No. 1</th>
<th>Route No. 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Station 1</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 2</td>
<td>43.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 3</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 4</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 5</td>
<td>44.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 6</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 7</td>
<td>45.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 8</td>
<td>45.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 9</td>
<td>44.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 10</td>
<td>44.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: Five-day temperature averages for the stations along the routes.

- - - - Route No. 1
- - - - Route No. 2
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Figure 2: Isotherm map of the 20 locations for the five day averages, 0.5°F interval.
JOHN GRIMES'S ABANDONING OF RELIGION IN JAMES BALDWIN'S
GO TELL IT ON THE MOUNTAIN

John Chatting

When American author James Baldwin (1924-1987) was fourteen he climbed to the pulpit of a fiery, store-front Pentecostal church in Harlem to appease his demanding, puritanical step-father. "I was so afraid of everything else that I ended up with the Devil I knew, but I couldn't have said it then," Baldwin stated in the film James Baldwin, The Price Of The Ticket, directed by Karen Thorsen. In his first novel, Go Tell It On The Mountain, 1953, Baldwin creates John Grimes, a character reflecting the author's childhood struggles with religion, family and heritage. John, like Baldwin, is fourteen--"Not until the morning of his fourteenth birthday did he really begin to think about it, and by then it was already too late (Baldwin 11)"--and struggling with a religion that keeps his Harlem neighbors strapped to the same religious traditions of the slaves, and is preached by one such as his step-father who daily marks John, because of his illegitimacy, as the Devil's son. John is confused by the religion that has surrounded him all his life. He is confused by the ambiguity of the Gospel as it is written and the Gospel as it is preached and practiced in his environment. In the final section of the novel, John seems to finally come under the power of the religion in a revelation as he writhes on the threshing-floor of his step-father's church, the Temple of the Fire Baptized. He seems to become one of the flock, but he is actually being freed from the ignorance of the religion. Louis H. Bratt, in his work James Baldwin, describes Go Tell It On The Mountain as "a quest that ends in futility for all of the characters except John Grimes because they are unable to achieve two Baldwinian prerequisites for self-discovery; the understanding necessary for an acceptance of the past and the ability to establish genuine interpersonal relationships among humanity (51)." John succeeds because he examines the flaws in the religion of his environment and realizes to protect his own identity he must discard the belief system, although he may still believe in facets of it. However, totally discarding the pretenses of the religion is unrealistic for John in relation to the pressures from his step-father and community, so in a hypocritical stand of his own, he establishes a revelation to free himself from the religious eye of the community. John has come around to the environment's method of thinking, but only to shield himself from its attack against his true identity as an intelligent individual not subject to the indignities and hypocrisies of an archaic religion. John is left with no other choice than to discard his religion because of his experiences with the hypocrisies of the Bible's message as applied to his black heritage, the messenger of the Bible exemplified through his step-father and the relationship of the Bible to all of society.

C.W.E. Bigsby, in The Second Black Renaissance, Essays in Black Literature, describes Baldwin's characters as "highly self-conscious, reflecting not only upon their social situation, but on the nature of their consciousness itself (107)." In Go Tell It On The Mountain, very little of this self-consciousness emerges in characters' actions, except in John, who yearns to connect, and console, his physical reality with his spiritual reality. Because he is consumed by this desire of self-fulfillment, he distances himself from the other characters--such as his step-father, mother, aunt and other members of the church--who leave their reflections hidden in the shadows of their prayers, as in Part Two: The Prayers of The Saints. "There had never been a time when John had not sat watching the saints rejoice with terror in his heart, and wonder (Baldwin 14). "He did not feel it himself, the joy they felt, yet he could not doubt that it was, for them, the very bread of life (Baldwin 15)." John finds no help in his dilemma with religion because he does not understand the religion's worshipers. "And why did they come here, night after night after night, calling out to a God who cared nothing for them--if above this flaking ceiling, there was any God at all? (Baldwin 81)." John, afraid of his own courageous examination of the religion amid others who blindly follow, construes himself, with full support from his father, as a devil. "The darkness of his sin was in the hard heartedness with which he resisted God's power: in the scorn that was often his while he listened to the crying, breaking voices, and watched the black skin glisten while they lifted up their arms and fell on their faces before the Lord (Baldwin 19)." The phrasing "fell on their faces" is a strong judgment from John, who, as pointed out by critic Kenneth Kinnamon, "in his intelligence...has discovered an almost magical power, a way to salvation that the others do not have (125)." John discards what he sees as a doctrine of blindness in religion, a blindness which does not allow the Harlem congregation to see the ambivalent relationship between blacks and the Bible. The congregation ignores the tale of Noah and Ham in Genesis 9:20-25, which Carolyn Wedin Sylvander, in James Baldwin, says has long been used, despite its brevity, to justify the enslavement of blacks. John confronts this story in examining The Bible, as well as when he, like Ham, looks at his (step-) father's nude body. John makes a connection between physical and spiritual life that the worshipers of the church have ignored. John is incorporating social experience into The Bible, thus he casts off the earthly ignorance of religion. John realizes that ignorance grossly transforms The Bible and it would be better to destroy it all together than to construe it so hideously because of ignorance. The worshipers "project
their own evil natures on the Divinity, recreate God in their own images, and reduce Him to human terms (Pratt 57-58).” Pratt continues, “thus, becoming one of God’s anointed serves the dual and simultaneous purpose of protection of one’s own life and the destruction of one’s adversaries (58).” Sylvander says the characters rely on “the protection and survival mechanism of religion as a way of life and a denial of life (37).” John realizes that religion has lost most meaning for the worshipers and has become a crutch forged from tradition, a crutch that can be cast aside by one who is intelligent and introspective such as he.

John’s relationship with his step-father, Gabriel, is crucial in John’s struggle with his religious freedom, because Gabriel has played a direct part in showing the inadequacies of religion in a thinking man’s life. “His father could never be entirely the victor, for John cherished something that his father could not reach. It was his hatred and his intelligence that he cherished, the one feeding the other (Baldwin 20-21).” “Gabriel’s behavior functions best as a symbol. Like the white man, he cannot look his own evil full in the face. In order to safeguard this good opinion of himself, he keeps his wickedness at a distance and repudiates it by attributing it to others (Kinnamon 130).” Gabriel symbolizes the ignorance of the entire church. He is an ignorance transforming into a travesty of the intent of religion. Gabriel’s contrary behavior as a man of God, but also as a very bitter man grappling with his past, gives John a justifiable desire to kill, in his heart, the roots of his stepfather’s religion as he would like to kill his step-father. John believes if his step-father is the messenger of God, then the message of God will always be kept from him, because of Gabriel’s hatred for him. John also feels superior to his stepfather, which alleviates his subservient role in the scheme of the religion. John cannot succumb to religion, because he has no need to succumb to his step-father. “John’s heart was hardened against the Lord. His father was God’s minister, the ambassador of the King of Heaven, and John could not bow before the throne of grace without first kneeling to his father (Baldwin 21).” Gabriel becomes the epitome of John’s disdain for religion and to cast off memories of his step-father, it is only right John discard what is supposed to be the life-blood of his father, religion. John longs for “a world where people did not live in the darkness of his father’s house, did not pray to Jesus in the darkness of his father’s church (Baldwin 19).” and this world is free from the oppression of Gabriel and his religion.

John believes that worshiping his father’s religion is illogical when it does nothing but keep people blind to the rest of society.

Although society’s racism may be the underlying tone throughout Go Tell It On The Mountain (Sylvander 39), John still believes there are opportunities in society as a whole and they can only be realized when the hold of religion like that of his step-father’s is vanquished. John wants to shatter the bonds of ignorance and religion like a female fatale he sees in a film has. “She had fallen from that high estate which God had intended for men and women, and she made her fall glorious because it was so complete (Baldwin 39).” To fall from the religion as preached by his step-father, is to fall from the chains of ignorance. The failure of religion is, as John’s brother, Roy, puts it, that only choices between jails and churches are seen, with no middle ground (Baldwin 25).” Worshipers who believe this use the Bible to escape from society and, unfortunately, also escape from any fulfillment that society might have to offer them. Elisha, one of the saved, summarizes John’s fear when he says, “when the Lord saves you He burns out all the old Adam, He gives you a new mind and a new heart, and then you don’t find no pleasure in the world, you get all your joy in walking and talking with Jesus every day (Baldwin 54).” For John, without joy there is no participation in life.

He believes religion offers only ignorance to society without guaranteeing personal morality.

As for the effects of their religion on their lives, these are, in human terms, usually repellent. One may admire the pride and utter devotion to their faith of the devoted characters; but scarcely the cruelties to themselves and others to which their beliefs command them. To meet the ‘sinners’ (as Ether, Royal, Frank or Richard) would certainly be more endearing (Gibson 123).

John realizes the repulsive nature of the religious worshipers and runs to the “sinners,” who are in touch with society.

In discarding the controlling religious beliefs in his life, John becomes embroiled in his own hypocritical stance of seeming to be locked into a religious fervor. Because he has examined the inconsistencies of the religion, he is destined to one day cast off his mantle of holiness and his entire experience on the threshing-floor. “He would weep again, his heart insisted, for now his weeping had begun; he would rage again, said the shuffling air, for the lions of rage had been unloosed, he would be in darkness again, in fire again, now that he had seen the fire and the darkness (Baldwin 217).” Although John has seemed to grasp the hand of God in the final portion of the novel, as he walks home with his family and Elisha, he has actually mentally cast off the pretenses of his religion and realized the Gospels hold people in ignorance through their message, their messengers, such as his step-father, and their relationship to social life. “As he moved among them...something began to knock in that listening, astonished, newborn, and fragile heart of his; something recalling the terrors of the night, which were not finished, his heart seemed to say; which, in this company, were now to begin (Baldwin 206).” John’s journey with religion is like the ambulance which races through the streets.
in the final part of *Go Tell It On The Mountain*, carrying someone to healing or death (Baldwin 211). Death arrives through ignoring the proper paths for enlightenment and prosperity, where healing comes through knowledge and self-examination. The only path left for John, as an intelligent individual with a future, is to abandon the constraints of religion because of the erratic and impractical nature of its message, messenger and blind followers.
ADOPT-A-HORSE-OR-BURRO PROGRAM:
SUCCESS OR FAILURE?

Wendy C. Mussaug

The wild horses of the American west have roamed our magnificent prairies and grasslands for nearly five hundred years and have survived numerous threats to their existence. The mustangs are descendants of purebred Spanish stock brought to the Americas by the Spanish in the sixteenth century and domesticated horses that escaped or were set free by Indians and ranchers (Cunningham 33). The ancestry of these animals is almost as mixed as the descriptions given by individuals of their appearance. For instance, the mustang has been described as a scrappy, pathetic beast whose sole purpose for existing on the face of the earth is to feed cats and dogs (Gorman 46). In contrast, Rufus Steele, a mustanger, admiringly describes the wild horses and their habitats in the following manner:

...they have the fine head, the slim legs, and the flowing mane and tail characteristic of the Arabian stock. They are bays, albinos, chestnuts, red and blue roans, pintos, sorrels, buckskins, and milk-whites. The mares average eight hundred pounds in weight, and the stallions frequently weigh three hundred pounds more than that; they stand thirteen to fourteen hands high. Their endurance is phenomenal, and as for agility, the marks of their unshod hoofs are found at the summits of monumented boulder-piles which even a mountain goat might reasonably be expected to cut out of his itinerary. They keep to an elevation of from six to nine thousand feet, descending to the plains hardly at all. The water-holes are from twenty to fifty miles apart ... Bunch-grass is their sustenance in summer; then the first frosts cure the white sage, and that becomes palatable; they paw through the snow to reach it, and keep fat throughout the winter ... (Wyman 138).

Similarly, J. Frank Dobie, a noted expert on wild horses, once described the mustangs as "the most beautiful, the most spirited, and the most inspiring creature ever to set foot on the grasses of America" (Ryder 24). Indeed, most people picture a wild horse as a proud and mighty black beast standing on a cliff with its mane and tail blowing in the fierce wind - oblivious to the dangers and reality of the world surrounding it. Unfortunately, the world would not ignore the mustang.

Richard Symanski stated in "America's Wild Horses" that the population of America's mustangs reached its peak of two million around 1850 (22). However, the population rapidly decreased as the horses suddenly became nuisances and the ranchers became killers. Wild horses were slaughtered by ranchers because they supposedly polluted water, quickened erosion, and displaced native range and mountain animals such as antelope and bighorn sheep (Cunningham 34). The animals were also accused of eating too much range forage and drinking too large a quantity of water (Symanski 22). The attitude that mustangs were simply pests and had no place on the western range quickly gave rise to the sport of hunting wild horses. By 1924, only 150,000 wild horses still remained of the original two million and yet the slaughter continued (Ryder 22). Charles B. Roth once wrote, "The mustang can hold his own with natural enemies, but let the entire white race ally itself against him and he's doomed, just as his one-time neighbor of the plains, the American bison, was doomed" (Wyman 253). Roth's statement is quite true. The buffalo population, which experienced a more devastating slaughter than the wild horses, was reduced from sixty million to a mere few hundred (Harbary 156). Therefore, programs to save the bison and the wild horses from extermination were initiated before annihilation was complete. The law which saved the mustangs from extermination was passed in 1971 and is known as the Wild Free-Roaming Horse and Burro Act or Public Law 92-195.

Two important government legislations which preceded the passage of Public Law 92-195 (P.L. 92-195) and ultimately the initiation of the Adopt-A-Horse-Or-Burro program were the Taylor Grazing Act and the Baring Bill. The Taylor Grazing Act of 1934 basically permitted the removal of any wild horse from public lands if any individual considered the animal a nuisance (Wyman 322). The act stipulated that the federal government could issue permits that allowed ranchers to graze their cattle on public lands (Hall 6). Cattle and mustangs had been competing for the limited amount of forage present on the range for over half a century. However, the increase in the performance of the cattle market and the passage of the Taylor Grazing Act raised the competition to a fevered pitch and forced the labeling of mustangs as pests. Once labeled, any wild horse or burro encountered could legally be destroyed by the rancher. As a result, the wild horse population continued to decrease, and as of 1965, only 17,000 mustangs remained (Ryden 23). Then, in the late 1960's, Congress passed the Baring Bill which forbade any individual from chasing, harassing, or capturing wild horses or burros on public lands through the use of motorized vehicles (Goodine 43). Unfortunately, this bill had two weaknesses, as Guy Goodine pointed out in his article "The Wild Ones." First, the bill did not afford the wild horse a legal status, such as that given to the bald eagle, which protected the mustang from harm. Second, the bill did not provide for an effective management bureau to watch over and care for the animals (43).
Consequently, the wild horse population continued to be assaulted. The American public, which had historically stood passively by as the animals were exterminated, took a stand and forced Congress to take positive action. The result of the public outcry was the passage of P.L. 92-195.

Public Law 92-195, which is also known as the Wild Free-Roaming Horse and Burro Act, was passed by Congress in December of 1971 (United States n.p.). The law stated the following:

Wild and free-roaming horses and burros are living symbols of the historic and pioneer spirit of the West ... they contribute to the diversity of life ... and enrich the lives of the American people ... and are fast disappearing from the American scene. It is the policy of congress that (they) are to be protected from capture, branding, harassment, or death. (Hall 71)

In order to protect the wild horses as directed by P.L. 92-195, the Bureau of Land Management or BLM was founded. The first action by the BLM was to establish areas and sanctuaries in ten western states on which 25,000 to 30,000 wild horses and burros could be safely kept (United States n.p.). As of April 1976, the ten states and the animal population distribution in each was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Horses</th>
<th>Burros</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>10,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>3,828</td>
<td>3,409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>7,757</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>21,174</td>
<td>1,013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>5,480</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>1,045</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>4,434</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45,207</td>
<td>14,646</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Goodine, 52)

In 1976, the Bureau of Land Management began the Adopt-A-Horse-Or-Burro program, which was launched nationwide in 1976, offered potential adopters up to four wild horses or burros per year at a cost of $125 and $50 respectively (Worthington 19). Unfortunately, as the wild horse population continued to increase beyond the capacity of the adoption program to distribute the animals, the BLM was forced to initiate a supplemental program. The new program, which was begun in 1984, offered the wild horses and burros at no charge to the adopter if more than 100 animals were adopted (Worthington 19). It is in this mass-adoption, free-waiver program that the majority of the abuses of wild horses and burros occurred. Historically, captured mustangs were sold by the BLM to the government for use on war fronts, to meat-packing plants for use as dog and cat food, to rodeos, and they were occasionally kept by ranchers for ranch use (Symanski 22). Undoubtedly, the most horrifying abuse of these animals was their sale to numerous meat-packing plants. The following table, taken from Walker Wyman’s book The Wild Horse of the West, illustrates the enormous quantity of horsemeat canned for cat and dog food between the years of 1923 and 1937:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Pounds Canned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>149,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td>457,858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td>673,922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>4,065,232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>22,932,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>29,610,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>20,889,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>9,171,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>14,432,577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>2,849,157     (207)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Year)

However, horsemeat was not the only use for wild horses. When the demand for horsemeat began to decrease, plants opened which specialized in the production of glue, soap, and fertilizer from mustang carcasses while other plants produced baseball gloves, shoes, buttons, and ladies' coats from the hides of wild horses (Wyman 208). The abuses of mustangs unfortunately did not end with the passage of P.L. 92-195. In fact, the law led to an increase in the number of cases of abuse and neglect of mustangs, as the law resulted in the initiation of the mass-adoption, free-waiver program. Hundreds of cases were reported each year in which mustangs were adopted and then left to starve or were sent to meat packing plants. Fortunately, the government, which did not realize the amount of abuse to which the mustangs were being subjected before the investigation of the neglect cases, halted the mass-adoption program (Nack 28).

Although the mass-adoption program has been halted, the original Adopt-A-Horse-Or-Burro program, in which an individual may adopt up to four horses a year, is still in use. However, the requirements for adoption are no longer as lenient as they once were. For instance, a potential adopter must satisfy the following conditions before adoption is even considered: (1) he/she must be of 18 years of age or older; (2) he/she must have no previous violations of adoption regulations or convictions of inhumane treatment of animals; (3) he/she must not have adopted more than four animals in the past year; and (4) he/she must have adequate facilities for the proper care of the adopted animals (United States 2). The adequate facilities referred to in condition
number four above are very specific. The adopted animal(s) must be kept in either a stall or corral (United States 4). If the animal is kept in a shelter or stall space, then the stall must be a minimum of 12-by-12 feet per animal kept therein (United States 4). A corral, on the other hand, must be at least 20-by-20 feet for each animal contained therein and be a minimum of 6 feet high for horses or 4½ to 5 feet tall for burros (United States 4). According to the government regulations on adoption stated in So You'd Like to Adopt A Wild Horse... Or Burro?, the fencing material for a corral must be of material harmless to the animals, such as rounded pipes, wooden planks, or small-mesh woven wire with a wooden board along the top (4). However, once the adopted animal has been gentled, then it may be kept in pastures with normal fencing and height (United States 4).

In addition to satisfying the conditions previously mentioned, a potential adopter must sign a contract which guarantees the BLM that the animal will be well cared for not only in its transportation to its new home but also for the duration of the horse's life after adoption is complete (Buckley 1).

Although the adoption program is worthwhile, it is very costly. In the past nine years alone, the Bureau of Land Management has spent over $92 million on the Adopt-A-Horse-Or-Burro program (Nack 28). The money has been spent on salaries for workers, costs of rounding up the animals, daily care of the horses and burros, transportation costs, and veterinary bills, to name a few expenses. The adoption fee also covers the cost of having each animal freeze marked with liquid nitrogen on the left side of its neck to identify the animal as a wild horse or burro (United States 11). The adoption fee charged to adopters partially reimburses the BLM for the expenses incorporated into the management of the adoption program (United States 2). If an individual were to adopt a wild horse today, he/she would pay $125. On the other hand, if he/she wished to adopt a burro, the fee would be $75 (United States 1). Once the adoption has been approved, the adopter receives the chosen animal and a health certificate certifying that the animal is of sound health (United States 7). In most cases, an individual may adopt a horse or burro on the spot. The adopter must simply bring adequate transportation, the adoption fee, and a love for animals.

The Adopt-A-Horse-Or-Burro program has had many successes in its duration. First, since the program was begun, early 70,000 animals have been adopted (United States n.p.). The success of the adoption program in this sense has increasingly brought the number of wild horses and burros roaming public lands to an appropriate population level. The burro population, for instance, is completely under control. This fact is easily seen in the low numbers of burros offered for adoption each spring. The wild horse population, on the other hand, has been slightly more difficult to control. Wild horses multiply at a rate of approximately 20 percent a year (Hall 8). Since the horses number in the tens of thousands already, the 20 percent increase each year forces the BLM to round up the wild horses more frequently than the burros and in greater numbers in an attempt to stabilize the population. Second, the initiation of the adoption program has resulted in the creation of several jobs. For instance, each adoption center requires owners, managers, work hands, and administrative personnel. Finally, the adoption program has provided some western correctional institutions with an excellent rehabilitation program for inmates. The convicts who are chosen to participate in the program must be at the end of their prison terms and not pose a security threat since the corrals are off the prison grounds (Showdown 58). According to James Willwerth in "These Cowboys Are Convicts," the inmates are taught how to groom and care for horses as well as how to interact with and train horses (20). The convict program has many benefits for every convict involved. First, after working in the program, the convicts are qualified to obtain jobs as veterinarians' assistants or possibly as hot-walkers and groomers at racetracks and at thoroughbred farms (Willwerth 20). Second, working with the mustangs allows the inmates as well as the horses to relieve some of their hostility and frustration (Willwerth 5). Finally, as James Willwerth states, the program benefits the convicts in that they learn important lessons that will help them readjust to society (1). For instance, the convicts must learn patience and responsibility in order to work with the horses since brute force on the part of the convict will be answered with brute strength on the part of the horse. The amount of training that a wild horse receives in the convict program varies with each correctional institution involved. Some facilities consider a mustang tame when it will accept a halter, allow itself to be led, lift its hooves for cleaning, and willingly accept a rider (Buckley 1). Most facilities, however, consider an animal tame when it will wear a halter willingly.

In addition to the benefits reaped by the convicts, the program also aids the BLM because tame horses are much more likely to be adopted than wild ones (Buckley 1).

Overall, the BLM's Adopt-A-Horse-Or-Burro program has been successful at maintaining animal populations in a given management area while providing jobs and an effective rehabilitation program for convicts. Although the adoption program initially resulted in abuse and neglect of the adopted animals, it has overcome these obstacles and proceeded to carry out its purpose victoriously. Since the program's beginning, the wild horse and burro populations roaming the public lands of the west have gradually attained an appropriate level for the lands on which they dwell. In addition, the adoption program has created government jobs and, thus, influenced the unemployment rate of this country. Finally, the adoption program has given many convicts in western correctional facilities a second chance at life. Through the convict program, the convicts have acquired characteristics and learned lessons which will aid in their reentrance into society. Therefore, society as a whole has benefited from the Adopt-A-Horse-Or-Burro program.
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