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SPECTRUM is now in its eleventh year of publication. Once again we celebrate a group of highly accomplished student writers, two first-place winners and six students who merit honorable mention. Their work was written for courses from a variety of academic disciplines, ranging from Mathematics to English Composition to Sociology. All of these writers exemplify Saint Mary's College's commitment to the "liberation of the mind, which is the essence of the liberal arts tradition" and which "requires that students in all disciplines develop the habits of looking twice, of asking why, of seeking not only facts but fundamental principles."
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PRIZE-WINNING ESSAYS

MAIL CALL
Amador Alviz
Written for The Art of the Personal Essay (Rosemary Graham)

PAPA JI
Shafali Jain
Written for The Art of the Personal Essay (Rosemary Graham)

HONORABLE MENTION

YOU DON'T BRING ME FLOWERS ANYMORE
Brad Campbell
Written for Self-Made Men and Ruined Women (Rosemary Graham)

WHAT IS MATHEMATICS?
Michelle Kopacz
Written for The Science of Patterns (Keith Devlin)

THE MEANING BEHIND THE WORDS
Jennifer Garcia
Written for English Composition (Brenda Hillman)

COACHING AND SPORTS ADMINISTRATION: A RIGGED GAME
Aubrey Eubanks
Written for Introduction to Women's Studies (Denise Witzig)

WHY DOESN'T SHE JUST LEAVE?
Kristi Pierson
Written for Introduction to Women's Studies (Denise Witzig)

POLITICS, THE PAST, AND THE SOCIAL SCIENCES: ETHNIC NATIONALISM IN WESTERN EUROPEAN COUNTRIES
Dana Herrera
Written for Race and Ethnicity (Phyllis Martinelli)
ON June 13, 1989, two days after my high school graduation ceremony, I left my comfortable existence of intimacy and familiarity. I entered the Marine Corps with the narcissistic belief that I was connected to my surroundings and my community of people and places. I left Guam with a list of names and places, believing that it was enough to sustain in me that parochial optimism of a secluded island. I had names like Robby Call, a young man who I had come to love as a brother. I once had a crush on Vivian Conlu, so I included her name also; until today, I still write to her. In Guam, we all had an affinity for water, so I included pictures of John Cruz hiking with me to Tarzan falls—both of us carrying machetes. I kept pictures of Ceti Bay, where I once hiked down the cliffside and along the river with the JFK running club. At the center of my montage was Leah Tamondong, a young woman who inspired in me a love for poetry and that adolescent fear of rejection. I wrote down Wilson Ng, a pseudo-hippie whose motto was, "I have no ego." I included the name of Kyung Han, a beautiful Korean girl that had the unfortunate luck of inheriting her older sister’s nickname, "Buffalo Butt." Mrs. San Gil somehow made into my list. She was devout Catholic who made it her business to take the kids in my community to church if our parents couldn’t or wouldn’t. Being the consummate Catholic, Mrs. San Gil would hold yearly rosaries and novenas at her house and lure the children with promises of goodies afterwards. To my list I added my sister, Angeline, who loved me despite our constant arguing. I added my over-passionate, controlling mother and my ambivalent but circumspect father.
Leaving Guam had a tang of finality that was dulled by a desire for independence. In many ways I was Paul Morel from *Sons and Lovers* by DH Lawrence. Leaving our controlling mothers in our wake and assured by the certainty of change, we both ran towards an unknown but promising darkness.

Flying away from Guam, I was physically struck by a formidable geographical separation, the Pacific Ocean. Flying into a blue and white sky, seeing my island diminish into a green blur, the assurance of my previous existence rested in the promise hearing "Dear Amador...." Three years would pass before my first and only visit. My only lasting connection to Guam would be my letters.

My first letter was a stowaway. Quickly folded and tucked away in my running shoes were two pages of scribbled pink ink on plain white paper. My sister’s first letter to me read, "Dear Am," as she would call me, "Hey, so you’re probably off Guam already...thank you for putting up with me....You know I'll probably (joke) miss you." She continues later, "Bud, you better write, please. I should at least hold some importance or love with that Butt-head of yours....Love you always, Angeline." I carried it folded in my wallet for the four years I was in the Marine Corps. The letter, with its worn pages and fading pink ink, still remains close to me.

In Boot Camp, I was introduced to "Mail Call." The platoon would assemble in the entrance of the squad bay, forming the "classroom" as the drill instructor emerged from DI Hut with a bundle of letters and occasionally, a box. We had several drill instructors, Sergeants Myers, Farmer, Currier, and Bunker. Although Sergeant Currier had the name of an ideal messenger, it was often Sergeant Myers, the senior DI, who distributed the mail. He would yell out our names or the nicknames that he thought was more fitting. Private Dziwanowski was "Alphabet!" And that is how they said it, with an exclamation mark. Private Zazoya was shortened to Private "Z." Some Privates had the luxury of two names. Private Fidelibus, a Greek kid from Nevada, was either called Private Pious Pio Fidelibus or Semper Fidelibus. For those in the platoon that had jobs, their job title soon replaced their names. Private Del Valle, a Filipino from Michigan, was in charge of keeping platoon records, so his name became "Scribe." The two privates who cleaned the DI Hut eventually became the "S-4’s."

As the Drill Instructor read our names out loud, he would flick his wrist, throwing our mail towards us. If the writing had a hint of femininity, the DI would pass the envelope beneath his nose, take a deep breath and say something sarcastic with a smile. Sometimes he would say,"A letter from Suzie!"

Suzie was short for Suzie-Rotten-Crotch, the Marine Corps given name to every recruit’s girlfriend. If he was feeling lazy he would drop it, letting us pass it on. The letter would make its way through various hands, pausing to have the return address read, pausing as someone took a quick sniff of the envelope.
Physically, Mail Call was the easiest part of the day. Emotionally, it was a moment of risk. You were at risk of not receiving a letter, and if you did receive a letter, you were still at risk. There were two types of letters you didn’t want to receive. "Return to sender" letters had the effect of holding you in a perpetual state of panic as you awaited the new address. Sometimes you might never get a new address. "Dear John letters," for the uninitiated, were those letters to inform you that "Suzie" doesn't want to date you anymore. Private Smith received a Dear John letter while we were in rifle training, and because we were shooting everyday and ammunition was accessible, the privates on guard duty were instructed to watch him at night.

In Boot Camp, you write in search of balance between ambivalence and obsession. You try to write enough letters and say enough, so much that you’ll get something in return. You try not to write too much because you are afraid of appearing obsessive. The entire platoon was required to write at least one letter a week home, this was to avoid any anxious parent calling their congressional representative, wondering if their son had died in some training accident. This was done because many of us ignored our parents and wrote to our girlfriends, pseudo-girlfriends, and friends.

I remember writing to Leah everyday for a week. For three months I wrote to Leah and Vivian at least three times a week. I did so, because I wanted some form of contact that was less masculine, less brutally frank, less commanding, more tender and comfortable, and possibly more familiar than the Marine Corps. In writing those letters, I erected a shrine dedicated to self-delusion. With every word I wrote, I slipped deeper into the belief that I was telling the truth. I was convinced that each time Leah ended her letter with "Love, Leah," she really meant it. I wrote for the same reasons we all did. I wrote to recreate and cling to a past that helped me cope with the present. We wrote with the sentimental selfishness of Isaac Bashevis Singer. We wrote hoping that like Arele, we would return home to find Shosha, just as we left her.

As Boot Camp wore on and the third month approached, the outside world was transformed into thoughts on paper. The only reminder that I had been somewhere else, done other things, were my memories and my letters from home. The platoon had achieved what military experts call "unit cohesiveness." We began to confided in each other those things we only wrote about. Private Caldwell, my bunkmate from a little town in Texas, would share his letters with me, reading the parts that he felt were the most salient. He included pictures of his mother and father and a description of his dream-girl. Private Bobo, whose name caused him more trouble than anything else, would show us pictures of his uncle, a Marine who died in Vietnam, won the Congressional Medal of Honor, and eventually had a hall named after him in Washington, DC. Other privates shared intimate details of home grown erotica. Private Daleo, an Italian from New Jersey, would often receive letters with pictures of young women enclosed...pictures that he would eventually pin up on the "hog board."

No one had it harder than the married recruits. Private Chavez received weekly updates of his pregnant wife's status. Before leaving Boot Camp, he asked Sergeant
Bunker if he could still have sex with his six-month pregnant wife. Private Pea also got letters from his wife, as well as his daughter. He was much older and more mature than the rest of the platoon. As a result, we often sought his advice on many things. And, I cannot leave out Private Granger who slept across the squad bay from me and always asked me if he could marry my younger sister.

As abruptly as it started, Boot Camp ended. Three months of training ended with a parade and followed with two weeks of mess duty and another month of Marine Combat Training. In all, we would spend nearly five months with the same recruits. Mess duty passed quickly only because you were too tired to think of anything else. Marine Combat Training was all spent in the woods and was so much fun that you rarely had time to write home.

In a little over a year, I found myself, again, dependent on a lifeline of letters. My unit was deployed into the Persian Gulf, and I was sent on the advanced party. Alone in the late August desert with several of my fellow Marines, we waited nearly a month for those first letters. The letters arrived wrinkled and weathered from their journey, some even censored by the Saudi Government. If your letters had Christmas stamps on them, they were usually marked out with a marker. Often our issues of Time, People, or Newsweek had pages cut out of them or blacked out. And if you were waiting for your subscription to Playboy to catch up with you, you had a long wait.

Reading letters became a ritual of resurrection. A part of us had disappeared, but with each new letter it returned. Individually, we would seek solitude to read our letters. Corporal Woofter would walk into the distance and sit on the sand to read letters from his pregnant wife. Corporal Woofter’s wife gave birth to a boy in his absence. Lance Corporal LeBlanc would sneak off behind the tent and underneath the camouflage netting before reading his letters. Corporal Marvin Gaye Medlock preferred to reread his letters in his underwear and had the peculiar habit of always carrying a tooth brush and a letter. The exception would be Lieutenant Bellinger, who read his letters out loud and paused and chuckled at his wife’s jokes. Her letters included cut-outs from Victoria’s Secret catalogs with little notes saying “Wouldn’t I look great in this?” and an order form with all the sizes filled out.

As August turned into September and the mail became increasingly regular, our unit became larger and slowly made its way North towards the Kuwait Border. Being some distance from the Dhalvan, a four to six hour drive, it became necessary to have our mail flown via the courier helicopter. Call it serendipity, but I was in charge of meeting the helo at the landing zone. Overnight, I became the anxious postman who could not stop thinking about his own letters. Every stop I made was greeted with loud "Ooorahs" and "Devil Dog!" The men, tired and dirty, were reborn and energized as they awaited news from home. They became generous, giddy. They smiled upon receiving their envelopes and care packages.
We wrote with uncomfortable, voluminous passions that were brought on by a tangible force of urgency. Our little cardboard mailbox would have to be emptied twice a day. Because we needn't stamps, we wrote everyday about everything that we did: "Dear Vivian, I don't know why I write, I just do.... We had another chemical attack alert. We were at MOPP level four for quite a while...." "Dear Angeline, I am tired of taking these pills; one pill everyday, another pill every 6 hours, and another pill every several days...." I once wrote a detailed, complaining letter to Robby about having to bum shit in diesel fuel for several hours.

We wrote so much that when we ran out of paper we used the boxes of C-rations for postcards: Chicken a la King, Corned Beef Hash, Chicken and Rice.

We wrote to maintain something within us that was struggling to remain unjaded because despite all of our fancy equipment and technology we were still afraid of dying. I wrote to the men and women in my life to retain some tenderness and to force reality into what I often spoke of accomplishing when I returned. I wrote because I was afraid of being forgotten, afraid that I would have to use my Atropine and 2Pam-Chloride injections (antidotes for chemical agents). It wasn't enough that we had each other. Our packs were filled extra uniforms, socks, foot powder, extra magazines, chemical suits, gas masks, etc. Nothing was "ours." The only possessions that could be traced unmistakably to each of us were our letters and the few pictures that came with them. We held them close to us because they revealed more about our identity than our dog tags. But holding something so close was dangerous in a time and place that required physical and mental focus.

Eventually, I burned every letter I received while I was in the Gulf. To bum those letters was to clutch them closer to yourself. To bum those letters was to remove another layer of vulnerability, to make them inaccessible to everyone else but your memories.

It is now 1997 and the letters have ceased to arrive. I now await the casual thoughts and the impersonal script of electronic mail.
WHEN he got old my grandfather grew more active and insisted on walking to work every day instead of taking the bus. My grandmother often recounted how he, Papa ji, woke up at six o’clock every morning and made bed-tea for my grandmother before his daily morning walk. By the time he returned, my grandmother, Chai ji, would be up making breakfast and he would get ready for work. While having breakfast he insisted on simultaneously reading the newspaper. My grandmother, who never attended a school in her life, didn’t know English at all, but spoke Hindi and Punjabi fluently. So, Papa ji would relate the day’s news to her but I doubt she ever paid any attention. Her main concern was running the household and making sure that her husband was well fed. After breakfast, Papa ji washed his hands, did his prayers, and left for work. He worked at the same store his father and grandfather opened and every morning he walked two miles to get there. I never heard him complain even once about walking. He loved it.

I was here in the United States, a place of such opportunity that India and everyone in it, particularly relations, were almost diminished. I missed growing up in my grandparents’ house and hearing stories of the old days when my father was known to be a mischievous boy who grew up but failed to take responsibility and had no name in business. Papa ji maintained that if my father gave it his best he could be somebody in America and make a name for himself.
When Papa ji passed away at the age of seventy-five, my father returned to India to perform the funeral duties as the eldest son. I stayed here with my mother and brother and kept my Kusum Aunty, my father’s sister, company. When my father returned from India, I learned more about my grandfather than when he was alive. After years of trying to quit cold-turkey and dealing with the efforts my brother and I made to persuade him to quit, Papa ji finally quit smoking two months before his demise with the help of one of our religious spiritual leader. My brother and I were even more happy to hear that our father followed in his father’s footsteps and quit smoking also.

I learned that Papa ji had a big heart. He could never raise his voice or scold anyone—not even a child as mischievous as my father. I knew somewhat of his generous spirit but I didn’t know how far reached. Everyone agreed that his magnanimity could not be matched by anyone else in the family. For instance, Papa ji was always very patient with adults as well as children. His clam-like demeanor and composure were virtues admired by all, except for those who found the opportunity to take advantage of these qualities. Some people learned about his tendency to be lenient and used it against him to sway him in their direction. According to the Indian justice system, as the eldest of his four half-brothers, Papa ji was entitled to half of his father’s estate while the rest of this half brothers divided equally the other 50 percent of the estate. Nevertheless, he was easily made to feel guilty by them and instructed the lawyer to divide the entire inheritance equally amongst all five brothers. Such was the great heart of my grandfather—a big one. He could never say no to anyone.

I remember very clearly when I was in India, before we moved permanently to the U.S., how Papa ji could never deny me anything within reason. I loved orange popsicles. My grandmother would scream and scold me if she ever saw me eating one. She said that those popsicles would definitely give me a sore throat and if ever that did happen, “Don’t come crying to me” (She, of course, said it in Hindi). But, I still wanted one. Papa ji would buy me the orange popsicle—sometimes by making excuses to my grandmother or by sneaking me out. He knew that once in a while a popsicle wasn’t going to hurt me. He didn’t trust in the old beliefs of my grandmother, which maintained that having cold foods or beverages, especially ice-cream, would initiate a cold.

Papa ji changed many of his beliefs when he started to read. As an avid reader of numerous English newspapers and magazines like Time, Life, and Readers’ Digest, Papa ji learned more about the world and was always striving to increase his knowledge as much as he could. After close observation of his desire to learn and apply what he learned, I can honestly say that he believed that knowledge is power.

Returning from the funeral in India, Daddy brought along with him the last letter Papa ji wrote to me which had not been completed. In his long and heart-filled letters, he often discussed his business, sometimes current matters of the world, the weather, and many other things. He once explained to me the whole Indian Parliamentary government system. Furthermore, seeing as how I missed the first wedding of my generation in our family, Papa ji described all the rituals of an Indian wedding ceremony and their
significance. He also talked about how much he and my grandmother missed me, how proud he was to hear of my achievements in school, and how he hoped that Almighty God would always bless me with success.

As a learned man himself, Papa ji always encouraged me to go further in my education and make the family proud. I can still remember my astonishment when I discovered that he was fluent in four languages. He wrote to my mother’s father in Urdu, to his brothers and sisters in Hindi, to me in English, and spoke to Chaiji in Punjabi. I guess you could say that left me speechless. I understand all these languages but I can only read, write, and speak English. I can also speak Hindi. Papa ji saw my interest in learning other languages and urged me to start with Hindi. With a little push from Papa ji, my mother taught me some basics of Hindi one summer and I immediately wrote my first letter to him. He was amazed at how quickly I was beginning to write letters. My lessons ceased when school commenced. Then I took up French which impressed him even more.

Papa ji did not believe in standing in any student’s way if he saw potential in that student. He especially didn’t allow austere customs to interfere in the scholastic development of a child. When I wanted to go to Sly Park with my sixth-grade classmates, my parents had already refused to send me, fearing that there would be no strict supervision over the boys and girls. Papa ji, however, who was visiting us at that time, vetoed their decision and gave me permission. He claimed that this would be a great learning experience for me and a great chance to see another part of America. I guess you could say that he was a bit liberal. As soon as I returned from the trip he had a million questions ready for me and was fascinated to learn about all the activities in which I participated. His first question was whether or not I ate properly. After explaining how I lived through five days of salad and bread, he continued his questions— “Did you have fun? What did you do? What did you learn? How was camping? Explain everything in detail.” There was never a dull moment between us. His interest in the American school system, especially all the extracurricular activities provided, always found us in great conversation. I was always happy to explain America, its customs and culture to him.

In my senior year of high school I was applying to colleges and chose Saint Mary’s. My desire to live in the dormitory nearly gave my parents a heart attack. They refused to allow their only daughter to live away from home and consulted Papa ji about my “ridiculous” plan. I rebutted with a letter to him describing how living in the dorms while attending college is not uncommon. I explained that living on campus would provide me with easy access to all the resources that my college has to offer and that this experience would allow me to become a more responsible person. I further assured that I would be living with other girls, not boys. Papa ji again vetoed my parents’ decision. He believed that the best way to get the most out of a college education was to have the whole experience.

I saw Papa ji again when we visited India in the summer of 1988. At the young age of thirteen I caught on to the rising love for coffee that had taken over America and became an addict. Whenever I made some for myself, I always asked everyone else. Only
Papa ji tried it and liked it. Soon we became coffee-buddies. Every evening we would sit in the living-room sipping our coffee while he entertained me with stories of my father as a child. He reminisced about my father’s rebellion against attending school and about how he longed for the dismissal bell to ring so he could run back to the shop and help his father run the business. One of the most important things my father learned from Papa ji was to write in proper British English.

I myself learned a little about writing from him. He taught me the correct way to address the elderly, like himself, in a letter. I always wrote “Dear Papa ji” when writing to him. He explained that it should me “Respected Papa ji” instead. His English demonstrated a person of culture and class. I’ve wanted to write like him since the first time I read his letters. Once he wrote to my parents and myself about one of his distant relative who had passed away (I can’t recall his name). Papa ji wrote: “I am dispirited to convey the message that Mr. X has expired.” The first thought that crossed my mind was, “Was this man a medicine that he expired?!?” My father explained that expired meant “died” or “passed away.” Papa ji’s euphemistic style of writing inspired me. I’ll admit I tried many times to imitate his style but I always ended up back to own style because what I wrote usually sounded very stupid. My feigned attempts were only worth a good laugh. Papa ji, however, never criticized my efforts, he only spurred me to continue and not be discouraged by others.

Although our culture and customs did not allow me to leave home until I marry, Papa ji could not allow them to interfere in my education. Even though keeping with tradition was very important to him, he agreed that going for an education was not against our culture. With his blessings and good wishes he told me to follow my dreams and I became the first person in our family to leave home for a college education. I know why I admired him so much. I believed then, as I do now that he was a person of greater inner, rather than outer, strength.
What Is Mathematics?

Michelle Kopacz

ASK a child to define mathematics and he will probably tell you it has to do with numbers. Pose the same question to a high school student, and she will probably start explaining some algebraic method she is currently trying to understand. In fact most people will probably say the answer definitely has something to do with numbers. Webster’s Dictionary defines it as “the group of sciences (including arithmetic, geometry, algebra, calculus, etc.) dealing with quantities, magnitudes, and forms, and their relationships, attributes, etc., by the use of numbers and symbols.” However the word mathematics comes from the Greek word, mathematikos, which means inclined to learn. These definitions of mathematics are far too limiting. Mathematics encompasses a wide spectrum of things most people do not consider. It is really the study of patterns. Patterns in numbers, but in other things as well: Patterns in the movement of the planets in the solar system, in the petals on a flower, in the hidden rhythms of the weather; there are even patterns in strands of DNA that describe a person’s genetic makeup precisely. To say that mathematics deals with numbers is like saying that a musician deals with sound. He also must consider rhythm, beat, placement of notes, lyrics, etc. Numbers are really only the tip of the iceberg.

The study of mathematics began more than 2500 years ago with Pythagoras. From the connection between whole numbers, and a vibrating string, to the fundamental utility of the relationship among the sides of a triangle, Pythagoras viewed mathematics as both an art form and an applied science. Indeed, to Pythagoras and his followers, mathematics
was the language of nature. Since the beginnings of its study with Pythagoras, mathematics has encompassed all three: the pure abstract art form, which reveals an elegant network of truths expressed uniquely by the human mind; the applied science, which allows us to understand nature in her own language; and the pedagogy, which ensures mathematical skill and beauty will continue and be enhanced. Although different in character, the abstract, applied, and pedagogical are the same in essence, one continually enriching the other.

Mathematics helps us to study underlying patterns, abstract patterns that may seem hidden. Mathematics is a tool to help us study the patterns and to make sense of them. We live in a universe of patterns: Snowflakes with six-fold symmetry, seasons of the year, animals’ stripes or spots, and even the shapes in sand dunes in the desert are all patterns in nature; there are patterns of form, and of movement, too. Understanding these patterns leads to understanding the rules that govern natural processes.

Mathematics enables us to describe the patterns that are discovered as well as to explain why they happen at all. Consider Kepler’s famous discovery of the shape of planetary orbits. By performing a mathematical analysis, Kepler realized that planets move in ellipses. Until then it was assumed that the planets moved in circles. With this new information people became excited to find out what this could mean for all sorts of other astronomical phenomena. By exposing a pattern, and understanding it, scientists learned how to predict planetary motion, among other things. Being able to predict nature has always been desirable, that kind of information has practical applications. With mathematics, we are able to tell what the weather will probably be like tomorrow, or when the tide will come in, or when the next solar eclipse is going to occur.

Mathematics is simply one of the best tools we have for understanding the world we live in. It is a system of reasoning that allows us to recognize and understand patterns, wherever they are. For example, consider the spiral shell of a snail. The spiral shape itself is easily observed as a pattern; however, you need mathematics to describe that shape precisely. What is more, the question of how the development of the snail produces the pattern can only be answered by using mathematics to understand the effects of the chemical changes that occur. Mathematics allows us to not just understand the pattern, but to understand why it happens the way it does.

The qualities that most people tend to associate with mathematics are things like precision, accuracy, and logic. Therefore mathematics is closely related to ‘clear’ thinking. Mathematics teaches students to think, to follow a path, and to search for hidden paths yet undiscovered. It is not a set of functions, or rules, or numbers. It is a way of interpreting our world. It is a way of understanding, explaining, and ultimately expressing the abstract patterns that we may see, but have difficulty naming.

Implicit in western cultural heritage is the idea that nature is governed by mathematical laws. The doctrine of Determinism states that if we could only know nature’s mathematical laws, we would just need to plug in the relevant numbers or
measurements in order to predict the future. This sounds so simple. However, we do not live in such a simple, perfect world. In nature, the triangles, circles, and other Euclidean figures that we observe, are not perfect. Our perception may be that a sand dollar forms a circle, but if it were actually measured, we would see that it is not a true circle.

Galileo said, "Mathematics is the language with which God wrote the Universe." Therefore, an understanding of mathematics is a prerequisite to understanding and appreciating nature. Well, God may have written the universe in mathematics, but it is getting pretty evident that he did not use the equations and formulas studied in school mathematics when he did it. The mathematics studied in school is like learning the grammar of a language. You don’t need to know all the rules to speak or to make sense. The more you know, the better you will be understood, and the more enjoyment you will get from the language. But drilling students on the rules for conjugating a verb in the subjunctive tense gets rather dull. High school math often teaches only manipulation, leaving out the big, broad picture. These equations and formulas imply that natural phenomena obey some mathematical ingrained function or another. Applied mathematicians have known for some time that mathematics does not dictate nature, but rather imperfectly attempts to describe it. Recent discoveries have buried classic determinism very deeply. Albert Einstein would have agreed, "As far as the laws of mathematics refer to reality, they are not certain. And as far as they are certain, they do not refer to reality." Werner Heisenberg says the same thing when he writes, "What we observe is not nature itself, but nature exposed to our method of questioning."

Sometimes the patterns are easily distinguishable, as in the case of written music. In a written score, the patterns are visible to the naked, untrained eye, even if they are not understood. Unless a person is trained to read music, all she will see is a collection of symbols on a page that makes no sense whatsoever. But a trained musician may look at the same piece of paper and see a song. Or better yet, she may actually hear a song in her head. It is easy to compare music to mathematics and see the relation. Other times the connection is not quite so obvious.

Art, for example exhibits many mathematical influences, some of which are quite hidden. Consider the golden section, a proportionate division of lengths considered since ancient times to be aesthetically pleasing to the human eye. The Greeks used this measurement in the construction of their pyramids. It is still used in architecture today. It also appears in art, in the placement of subjects on the canvas. Many artists use a type of grid as their background to determine the layout of a project. The grid is never visible in the finished product, but the mathematics lies beneath.

Patterns often exist where you may feel certain that none do. This is chaos theory, and a good example can be found in clouds. Clouds are formless, and shapeless, yet they do have a very distinctive pattern, a kind of symmetry. It is impossible to tell the size of a cloud by looking at it. A large cloud seen from far away, and a smaller cloud seen close up could be mistaken for each other. Clouds are fractals, geometric shapes that repeat their structure on ever finer scales. The dynamic process that causes fractals, such
as clouds, is known as chaos, an apparent randomness whose origins are entirely
deterministic. If you dig deep enough, you will find that even chaos has some rules. The
patterns are there to be found, if only we take time to look.

Mathematics is the ultimate abstraction, the ultimate way of accessing our world.
While numbers lie at the heart of mathematics, they comprise only a small part of the
whole picture. The complicated equations that come to mind when most people think of
mathematics are only one technical aspect of the whole subject. They are merely symbols
for an explanation of a process. The patterns found in nature can tell us so much about
our whole world, and mathematics is simply the best tool we have for examining those
patterns. Often the path from nature's laws to the resulting behavior is not obvious. In
fact sometimes it can only be understood with mathematical calculations. Therefore, we
need mathematics to understand our world. The intrinsic beauty of earth is unlocked
through the study of mathematics. This elegance was found by mathematicians as they
sought to better understand nature. Mathematical systems and concepts, like all
knowledge, have an intrinsic beauty of their own, which makes them worthy of study for
their own sake. No further justification is required, and no liberal education could be
considered complete without it.
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The Meaning Behind The Words

Jennifer Garcia

Is the soul of the poet revealed in his works? In poetry, the careful selection of words and the structure of sentences are key tools of expression for the poet. Because the language of poetry is compressed, a brevity of words can convey an immense amount of information. The poet's emotions, opinions, and the state of the world can all be expressed in a matter of just a few lines or stanzas. In choosing the right words, the poet can reveal a world in conflict or peace, a world of fear or hope, and a world of suffering or joy. The poet's style and use of sentence structure is equally as important as his choice of words. Use of symbolism, imagery, and rhyme are some of the techniques that provide deeper insight into the message the poet wishes to convey. "California Spring" by Charles Wright and "Bookbuying in the Tenderloin" by Robert Hass are two poems that illustrate how the precise choice of words and the style of expression evoke emotion and lend insight into the poets' subject matter--life and hope in California.

One technique that sets the tone and gives the reader a deeper insight into a poem is the narrative form adopted by the poet. Use of first, second, or third person lends different qualities to poetry and opens up a poem to different interpretations by the reader. A first person narrative brings with it a sense of authority. The poet is at the scene. He is witnessing the event or participating in the activity. By interpreting the words of the poet, the reader can also gain insight into the author's own personality. The reader knows exactly how the poet feels, what emotions the poet is experiencing, and what the poet thinks about the situation. The poem clearly tells how the poet views the world.
In contrast, use of the third person narrative brings more of a generalization to the poem. It is not one person’s opinion or interpretation of a situation. Rather, it is as if the poet is stating fact. In essence, by using the third person in describing people, places, and events, the author is implying that his opinions are to be taken as truth. The poet is stating what he believes to be fact, and it is as if there is no other interpretation or opinion that the reader can deduce.

The first person narrative is used effectively and cleverly in “Bookbuying in the Tenderloin.” Initially, it seems that the poet is writing in the third person. As the reader travels with the poet through the Tenderloin, the sights and sounds of the area are inescapable and cannot be disputed. These are indeed the facts—St. Boniface Church, the winos, the Longshoreman’s Hall, the whores. They are concrete and real. As the poem progresses, however, the reader finds the poet’s personality and opinions beginning to emerge. The Longshoreman’s Hall stirs memories in the poet of “manic Trotskyite screwballs.” Hass expresses his opinion of what unions have accomplished in managing “funds for the workingman’s cartel.” He speaks of Comte and Fourier. These references tell about the author and his passion for social reform. The reader is not only gaining information about the Tenderloin, but about the poet, as well. The poem develops from generalizations into personal opinions. Finally, at the end of the poem, Hass speaks in the first person with the line, “In the places that I haunt...” This technique is highly effective. By not speaking in the first person until the end of the poem, Hass is providing the reader with factual information about the Tenderloin to support his personal opinion of the fate that awaits not only this hopeless district of the city, but possibly the state and the country.

In contrast, “California Spring” is written entirely in the third person. Information is stated matter-of-factly. There is no room for feelings or emotion. The poet is making simple observations that are not subject to debate. Wherein Hass describes a specific locale to support his opinions, Wright generalizes. He is not claiming to be at one particular scene or event; rather, he is speaking in a much broader sense. His message, like his observations, becomes more of a statement of fact than of opinion. For Wright, the reality of life is that “Nothing forgives.” The reader is not given the opportunity to analyze events or to explore the personality of the poet. The poem is impersonal and rigid.

There is no more effective technique of expressing feeling, emotion, and opinion than in an poet’s calculated choice of words. Word length, sentence structure, alliteration, personification, metric rhythm, and rhyming are but a few techniques that can be incorporated in a poet’s work to make the poem unique and to convey a message. “California Spring” and “Bookbuying in the Tenderloin” are perfect examples of the varied techniques of the poets. Wright and Hass take their poems to opposite extremes and utilize distinctive styles both in the selection of words and in sentence structure to express their views.

“California Spring” reinforces its matter-of-fact tone by using one-syllable words in short, succinct sentences. “At dawn the dove croons” and “How cold the wind is” are
examples of Wright's style throughout the piece. The poem is not flowing or rhythmical. It is choppy and abrupt, giving the poem its bleak, negative undertones. Descriptive adjectives are used to a minimum. Like the use of third person, this device eliminates any margin for debate. The dove is not softly feathered or silvery white. The ice plant is not succulent or prickly. Such descriptions would only serve to interject the opinion of the poet and leave the poem open to question. Wright's choice of verbs contributes to the tone and mood of the poem. Such verbs as croon, hangs, shrink, drooped, dangles, and creak convey the poet's message of despair. In the beginning, several of the verbs provide a moment of hope. "Lights come on," noises "are starting up," and dewdrops "begin to shrink." Yet, Wright abruptly changes the tone with the announcement, "How sad the morning is." There is no hope that summer will come and that conditions will improve. While spring should be a time of rebirth and new life that follows the harsh winter, all here seems hopeless. While Wright's words convey a definite message of despair, they do not delve into the cause of the hopelessness or into the feelings of the poet.

Hass' choice of words in "Bookbuying in the Tenderloin" contrast dramatically with Wright's. Where Wright's words are simple and abrupt, Hass' words are elaborate, descriptive, and flowing. The richness of his words are in themselves a contrast to the content of the poem. "Empurpled Irish winos" and "ruby port in the storm of muscatel-made images of hell" and "the city spews at their shuffling feet" are a few examples of how Hass achieves images of despair through an eloquence of words. The poet creates images of hopelessness through the use of color. The words "bleed," "empurpled," "ruby," "black," and "brown" reveal the dark, dreary existence on the streets of the Tenderloin. These words clearly stress the blight of the situation. Amidst the decay of the district and its people, the reader can see the hope that exists on the outside with "the unions minting coin" and managing "funds for the workingman's cartel." Even books on the streets of the Tenderloin relay a sense of hope, utopia, and social reform. Yet, they remain untouched by the habitants of this devastating place. There is no hope for these people. As in "California Spring," the final line tells of the hopelessness of the situation with the "dying of the West." Hass' words enlighten the reader of both the conditions in California and the emotions of the poet.

A final point of contrast between the two poems are the subjects the poets utilize to convey their message. Wright's poem deals strictly with objects in nature. Plants and animals, the wind and the sun are used to express his ideas and are often given human qualities like the liquid amber with "its hundred hands." The poet is looking for forgiveness in nature, but it remains unrelenting. Hass' technique is easier to relate to because he states his point of view through humans rather than nature. The winos, the literary authors, the union leader, and the whores, are the subjects that tell the story of the Tenderloin. In so doing, the reader can clearly see the reality of the situation. These people are genuine. They are not metaphors or symbols of something else. They serve to shock the reader into seeing the honesty of the poet and the horror of the situation.

"California Spring" and "Bookbuying in the Tenderloin" illustrate how one idea can be approached through use of completely opposite techniques and styles of writing.
The poets have chosen their words carefully, and in so doing, they have successfully conveyed to the reader an emotional message of hopelessness and despair. Their techniques, however, set these poets apart. The rigidity of Wright’s poem prevents the reader from delving into his innermost thoughts and from feeling any real connection to the poem. Hass, on the other hand, has opened up his soul to the reader and stirred in the reader his feelings of hopelessness.
Coaching and the Sports Administration: 
A Rigged Game

Aubrey Eubanks

IN the early 1970s, 90% of women's athletic programs in America were led by women. Today, less than 16% of women's programs have women directors. The number of women coaches has also suffered an astonishing decline, reported at less than 25% of the total coaching population in 1990 (Lopiano 1). The numbers of sports offered, and women participating in collegiate athletics, however, both rose dramatically over the past thirty years. These facts indicate an obvious trend: the number of female athletes at the collegiate level is increasing while the number of female role models, as coaches and administrators, has suffered a drastic and dramatic decline. What accounts for these trends? The answer lies in the investigation of specific, defined gender roles in athletics which lead to the discrimination and exclusion of women in coaching and athletic administrative positions putting both male and female athletes at a disadvantage. During a time in which society would like to believe women enjoy "ever-increasing opportunity," (Killy 25) economics and stereotypical forces, as well as administration processes, and the media all contribute to sustain the same powerful matrix of money, men, and tradition that has led to the oppression of women throughout history.

Like many social problems, the discrimination of women from role model positions in sports can be traced back to economic roots. Prior to Title IX of the 1972 Education Amendments Act, the money necessary to hire paid coaches or women's athletic program directors did not exist. Typically, women coached women's teams on a volunteer basis out of a love for the sport, despite financial drawbacks. Then came Title IX, which not
only required school receiving federal funding to fund women's and men's sports equally, but destroyed admissions and educational access barriers against women. Women were no longer limited to the teaching and nursing professions but gained access to a number of fields formerly dominated by men. Many women decided leave their volunteer coaching positions to pursue a career and explore new alternatives. Women who stayed were often fired as men's and women's athletic departments merged and men's athletic department administrators began to "rebuild" women's programs. By 1990, 84.1% of the new combined athletic departments women's programs were led by men (Nelson 159). At the same time, men rushed to fill the new higher paying coaching positions and male administrators eagerly hired them. Coaching women's athletics could now provide an adequate salary and as men followed the money women were pushed out of today's coaching and athletic administration fields.

Title IX was aimed at opening the doors of opportunity to women in sports, however, laws cannot destroy stereotypes. To understand how stereotypes, or assumed gender identities of men and women, affect the hierarchy of the athletic world, it is important to define traits associated with each sex. In K.F. Dyer's Sociology of Sex and Difference, feminine traits include being "emotional, submissive, and passive." Masculine traits include "aggressive, dominating, and active" (Dyer 100). Whether or not readers agree with these terms they undoubtedly exist as stereotypes in society. If asked to identify traits of a good coach many administrators, as well as athletes, also refer to traits like aggression and domination, stereotypically linked to males. Tara VanDerveer of Stanford University, the most well-known women's basketball coach today, faces these stereotypes every day. When asked how people usually respond to her, her assistant said, "people wonder about her...because she's not really a dynamic outgoing person to people on the outside" (Creedon 334). In other words, she does not fit the preconceived idea of what a coach should be like, she does not fit the male-based stereotypes, she does not act like a man. Until society can make an ideological change as to what a coach should be, women will suffer exclusion and discrimination that legal remedies cannot cure.

Athletic directors hire coaches. Based on the recent adoption of Proposition 209, the majority of voters in California apparently believe that current hiring practices are free of sexist and racist bias. In truth however, the fact that women occupy only 16% of athletic administrative positions at the collegiate level helps to explain why only 25% of collegiate teams are coached by women. Research shows that female athletic directors hire twice as many women coaches as male directors (Nelson 173). When confronted with these alarming statistics colleges often attribute the gap to a lack of women applicants. Considering that search committees for coaching applicants consist of athletic administrators (84% male), and that employers have a natural tendency to select employees that mirror themselves, it is understandable that the employment pool for coaching positions is limited. Even when women do apply, employers turn to friends and colleagues (men) for recommendations. As the hiring process proceeds the gender bias of search committees, athletic administrators, and references, all help filter women out of the employment pool, and as a result men get hired.
The portrayal of women administrators, athletes and coaches in the media also helps explain why society continues to exclude women from the sports world. During the 1988 Olympic Games, Florence Griffith Joyner appeared on the covers of *Sports Illustrated* and *Time*. In both pictures, Joyner's intricately painted fingernails were clearly represented. At the same time, Jackie Joyner Kersee broke the heptathlon record and achieved unprecedented success in track and field. Kersee did not, however, flaunt any obvious signs of femininity, and never received the type of media exposure Joyner did (Creedon 33). Eight years later, Avon featured Kersee in a television commercial—viewers see Kersee running along the beach while her voice is in the background telling of her amazing athletic success. In the last line Kersee says, "...and I have red toenails."

How could the color of her toenails have any importance? Both incidents illustrate society's need to link female athletes to their "appropriate" roles as females, not athletes.

Susan Faludi addresses this overwhelming effort to "push women back into 'acceptable' roles" (Faludi xxii) in her book, *Backlash: The Undeclared War Against American Women*. Faludi notes that the backlash succeeds “to the degree that it appears ‘not to be political’...and not to be a struggle at all” (xxii). She notes that, like these ads, it materializes in subtle ways. In a recent article on women athletic administrators, lines like, “during the past 20 years, the number of women in athletic administration has skyrocketed,” and “increased opportunity to compete at a very high intercollegiate level in intercollegiate athletics has opened doors for women” (Killy 25) prove the existence of the backlash leading women to believe that a lack of female coaches and administrators does not exist. Women subject to discrimination in athletics are unfairly convinced that “the pressure is all in [her] head (Faludi xxii).

An investigation of economics, stereotypes, administration, and the media all help explain why women have been excluded from the sports arena, but why does society desperately need to reverse this trend?

Think of an outstanding female athlete. Chances are that she has a male coach. The best U.S. women's soccer team, the University of North Carolina, has a male coach, as do the top four women's college volleyball teams in the nation. Sports fans cannot deny that women athletes and male coaches have achieved considerable success in the last twenty years. Although the search for outstanding women's coaches may seem more difficult, one must remember how few women coaches exist in comparison with their male counterpart. There is no evidence proving women are incapable of coaching at a highly competitive level, they just have not been given the chance. In fact, the win-loss record of women and men is virtually identical (Nelson 166).

Biases against women have kept the coaching and administrative professions primarily a boy's club, but the gender bias also exists among young male and female athletes. Parkhouse and Williams first examined athletes' attitudes towards hypothetical male and female basketball coaches in 1986. They discovered that, based on ability to motivate, achieve success, and knowledge of the sport, both male and female athletes
preferred male coaches by 89% and 71% respectively. Eight years later, Mednechuk and Crossman conducted another experiment addressing the gender bias of swimmers toward coaches. They concluded that athletes prefer coaches of their same sex. males preferred male coaches by 78%, while women preferred female coaches by 63%. although both studies involved less than 50 athletes, these results indicate that bias toward male coaches had decreased, at least among young women athletes, over time. Of course, more athletes and sports must be studied before drawing any concrete, precise conclusions.

Many of the athletes in these studies and theorists on gender bias in sport believe that, although women may have different coaching styles than men (just like two men may have different coaching styles), they also offer qualities that men generally lack. Bob Kersee, one of the most famous women's track and field coaches says, “male coaches hold women back. Their egos are threatened” (Nelson 164). many athletes agree that women are naturally better communicators and understand an athlete’s feelings better. Women tend to value “athletes first and winning second” (Nelson168) and show more care for their players. It has also been said that women have a better concept of teamwork because they are the central figure in many families. Statistics show that women college coaches are, in fact, more likely to have played a college sport than men. Coaching styles, backgrounds, and values differ in every case, but athletes, administrators, and society as a whole must learn to accept and praise the differences between any tow coaches, regardless of gender.

The gender basis of society, leading to the discrimination and exclusion of women in athletics, must come to an end. Young male athletes need to see women role models play a larger part of their experiences in sports. For women, female coaches and administrators provide a role model closer to themselves and it is, therefore, easier for women athletes to realize their own potential. Coaches continually encourage athletes to be leaders on the court but female athletes need to see that they will not exercise the same gender bias that has excluded women from sports today. It is also important for female athletes to be encouraged to pursue careers in the sports world. Women in athletics at the present, and women to come, deserve the equal pay and opportunity for upward mobility that men have received. Networks to recruit women must be established and open and fair employment practices must be conducted. Regardless of the cause for the gap between men and women in sports (media, economics, administration, and stereotypes), the basic truth remains: sex discrimination, in any profession, is a social injustice that hurts not only the excluded victims but all of society. Society has succeeded in creating opportunities for female athletes, but the race is not over until the number of women coaches and administrators also increases.
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You Don’t Bring Me Flowers Anymore

Brad Campbell

AMERICA. In its short but illustrious history there have been few decades with as much color and vivacity as the 1920s. If, as Matthew Arnold observes, the greatest epochs in history are characterized by an atmosphere of fresh thought, social change, and bursts of creative genius, then this era surely qualifies as such with the important strides it sees being made toward greater social and political liberty, and the literature which it produces. Coming off of the first World War, this decade witnesses, among other things, the prime of the Jazz Age and the first widespread recognition, appreciation and celebration of black artists. It also sees the expressions of a new-found independence for women, following changes in social atmosphere and the ratification of the long-in-coming 19th Amendment. "An old order [has] ended," and there is an "hilarious spirit" in the air (Norton 939). Years of stagnate repression give way to greater personal freedom and social permissiveness, and a sort of sexual revolution occurs, bringing with it a "relaxation of sexual mores...increased freedom for women and increased openness of sexual behavior" (Norton 940-1).

On the underside of all this progress, however, lurks an all-too prevalent strain of Traditionalism. Based on "a model of white, Protestant, small-town virtues," this sort of thinking emphasizes "social conformity" and "duty," and works to counter the shifts in culture and morals happening in the 1920s (Norton 940). While we usually consider the 1920s to be an era of liberation, it is important to recognize that there were forces working against progress at this time. Some who insisted on self-expression and
individualism for one group of people did not always extend their ideas of freedom to others.

Enter F. Scott Fitzgerald and William Faulkner. Fitzgerald, writing *The Great Gatsby* in 1925, and Faulkner, writing *Sanctuary* in 1931, witnessed the many changes that occured in the 1920s, and responded to them in their novels. We gain insight into where they stand on all of this when we look at the way they depict their lead female characters in these works.

Both Daisy Buchannan and Temple Drake seem to embody the traits of the "New Woman" of the 1920s insofar as they are sexually conscious, sometimes assertive women. They each have a certain degree of independence, but Fitzgerald and Faulkner respond to these expressions with, as Leslie Fiedler puts it, "nausea" (Fiedler 313). In other words, their ultimate depictions of and reactions to these female characters are enough to make one sick, as they belie a remarkably negative attitude toward women's independence. What we eventually see is that, for both authors, the independent woman is necessarily the ruined woman.

Fitzgerald and Faulkner portray their lead female characters as the sort of New Women they see around them. I should preface this by saying that I do not intend to paint Daisy or Temple as feminists, per se, but rather as products of the liberating era in which they live. Neither is perfectly independent, but they are certainly not the old, mythical "Southern Flowers" either, whose "fresh femininity," wide-eyed innocence, and happy obedience was the subject of much celebration in previous eras (Norton 941). They are, in one way or another, New. Of the two, Daisy most accurately embodies the "wise-cracking, free-wheeling, independent 'flapper' of the Jazz Age" (Norton 941). The language which Fitzgerald uses to describe her is itself important: throughout the novel, she "compels," "demands," "insists," "thrills," and "excites." Moreover, she is not afraid to say what she thinks. She refuses to be subordinate to her husband, Tom, and often challenges, mocks and teases him. We see this sort of attitude from the beginning, when Nick first visits the Buchannans on East Egg. At one point, her husband cautions, "I hate that word hulking, even in kidding," to which Daisy boldly replies, "Hulking" (16). Here, Daisy resists Tom's patronizing warning and challenges any authority he might think he has over her. Immediately following this scene we see Daisy mock Tom's intelligence. He rants and raves about a bunch of "scientific stuff" he has read, and Daisy responds with biting wit, "Tom's getting very profound. He reads deep books with longwords in them" (17). Always the "wise-cracking" flapper, Daisy is not the least bit afraid to speak what she feels, even if it means making her racist husband look silly in front of their guests.

Daisy further asserts her independence by refusing to let others dictate her life. The resistance we see in the above examples culminates in a more significant defiance of both Tom and Gatsby toward the end of the novel. For instance, when Tom demands, "Come on, Daisy," trying to force her into the car, she "move[s] out from the circle of his arm," walks close to Gatsby, "touching his coat with her hand," and tells Tom, "You take Nick and Jordan. We'll follow you in the coupe" (128). She not only refuses to do as
Tom tells her, but rubs it in by showing an allegiance to Gatsby. Still, not even the great Gatsby can force Daisy to do what he wants. During the climax scene in the hotel room, when Gatsby commands, "Just tell him the truth—that you never loved him" (139), Daisy, though she lapses for a moment, finally responds, "Oh, you want too much!...I did love him once" (140). Daisy refuses to lie for Gatsby's sake and refuses to buy into his impossible dream.

Fitzgerald also depicts Daisy as a New Woman in that she is sexually aware. She is quite sensual, with "bright eyes" (14) and a "passionate mouth" (15). She is also boldly flirtatious, as we see when, in front of her own husband, she tells Gatsby, "...you look so cool...You always look so cool" (125). But sexual awareness means more than just sensuality; it also means being aware of the relationship between the sexes. Daisy shows a keen, almost poignant awareness of this when she tells Nick that she wept when she found out her baby was a girl, adding that she hopes "...she'll be a fool—that's the best thing a girl can be in this world, a beautiful little fool" (21). This, of course, implies that Daisy knows all too well what it's like not to be a fool, to be a resisting, free speaking New Woman in a world where not everyone is ready for New.

Faulkner also depicts his lead female character, Temple Drake, as a sort of New Woman, albeit to a lesser degree than Fitzgerald does Daisy. Faulkner introduces us to her with an emphasis on her physical features, describing her "bold painted mouth" and her "cool, predatory, discreet" look (29). His language here is key: she has a bold mouth and a predatory look. This word "predatory" is a particularly interesting choice: it suggests a sort of animalism in Temple's behavior and indicates an untamed, aggressive personality. She is, at times, boldly flirtatious, as we see in the way she smiles at Popeye with "taut, toothed coquetry" (48), and we later learn that Temple does have a sort of sexual reputation, however exaggerated it may be: her name is written on the lavatory wall! (38) This is Temple's "...final degradation" as Leslie Fiedler facetiously puts it (312). Though the reason for writing Temple's name on that wall is probably unfounded, the point is that it tells us men think about her sexually, and she is conscious of this.

Temple also exercises a good deal of independence throughout the novel. At one point, we see her jump off of a train (defying the conductor), and run off with Gowan, eventually missing the baseball game that her father expects her to attend (37). Later, Temple (if we are to read this controversial passage as spoken by Temple) recalls a time when she planned to run off with her boyfriend, Frank, against her father's and brothers' will. Courageously rebelling against their rule, she breaks out of the house in which they have locked her, and steps in front of a loaded shotgun to protect Frank (58). In both of these instances, we see Temple essentially refusing to be subordinate to male rule.

This sort of independent attitude persists as the novel progresses. At Miss Reba's, for instance, Temple leaves the "house" against Popeye's orders (230). More importantly, after Popeye catches her, she fearlessly taunts and teases him, saying, "You're scared of [Red]...He's a better man than you are...You're not even a man!" (231), an instance which
becomes all the more significant when we realize that Temple is the only person in this novel who isn't afraid to stand up to this gangster.

As I mentioned earlier, Daisy and Temple are not feminist ideals, but they do embody the traits of the New Woman which Fitzgerald and Faulkner ultimately condemn. Fitzgerald does not want to leave us with a positive impression of Daisy. He wants us to interpret Daisy's assertiveness and expressions of independence as his narrator does, as selfish and "careless" (187). He wants us to agree with Nick that Daisy is part of a "rotten crowd" (162), and see her as the "foul dust" which floats in the wake of Gatsby's immaculate dream (6). Of course, nowhere does Fitzgerald call Gatsby's selfishness into question, or expose the absurdity of his dream, a dream which we are to feel Daisy should have lived up to at all costs. Because she does not, however, we must attribute it to selfishness. Everything she does, everything she is what brings about the tragic events at the end of the novel. She alone bears the weight of an awful burden.

Then again, it is no secret that Fitzgerald "interpreted the 'New Woman' as an ominous sign of social breakdown" (Norton 941). We see this in the way he eventually depicts Daisy as a failure. He wants us to see that she, on one level, fails Gatsby by not living up to his impossible dream, and on a more extraordinary level, fails American society by not living up to the masculine ideal of femininity. Judith Fetterley, in The Resisting Reader, points out this uncanny link between Daisy and America, showing us the similarities between Daisy's failure of Gatsby and the failure of America to live up to those "Dutch sailor's" (189) expectations Fitzgerald speaks of at the end of the novel (Fetterley 73). It was once a "flowered" country, Nick notes (189), but is now full of only the "grotesque roses" that Gatsby sees right before his death (169). "The golden girl is revealed to be a common weed" (Fetterley 73)--there are no real roses anymore, according to Fitzgerald, only common flowers, like daisies. In short, the impression Fitzgerald leaves us with is that because of the rise of the New Woman, America will no longer be the "old warm world" it once was (169), but a new, grotesque and flowerless word.

Faulkner's ultimate depiction of Temple is no less discouraging. What Faulkner shows us as the effects of assertiveness and expressions of independence reflect his disapproval of the New Woman. Fiedler agrees that Faulkner is "fully aware that he is not dealing with a mere change in social mores but with the desecration of a cult object" (312). In other words, the emergence of the New Woman is for Faulkner, as it is for Fitzgerald, the death of some old, mythical idea of femininity, the "denial of the archetype of the ethereal virgin" (Fiedler 312). He does not approve of the new sexual openness he sees around him, and this is apparent in his treatment of Temple. What does flirting, a "bold painted mouth" and "cool, predatory, discreet" looks get a woman? Well, according to Faulkner, raped. He would seem to have us construe Temple's flirtatiousness the same way the men at the Old Frenchman place do: as "an open invitation" to what befalls her (Vickery 130); as if the toothed coquetry she displays in front of Popeye somehow solicits what he does to her.
Faulkner goes further with his "queasy male image of the flapper" (Fiedler 313). As Fiedler points out, Temple isn't completely ruined for Faulkner until the end of the novel, when she expresses her desire for Red. She makes a significant point when she interprets this scene as evidence of Faulkner's belief that while such sexual yearning in a man is "poetry, the equal and opposite yearning of the female is horror—a desecration and a travesty" (313). Faulkner can't just leave Temple's desire as it is, he must pervert it into pathetic nymphomania: "Please. Please. Please," Temple begs Red. "Don't make me wait. I'm burning up...You're a man. You're a man" (239).

The final impression of a character with which an author leaves us is usually very telling. Let us consider Faulkner's closing descriptions of Temple. At the end of the novel, sitting in the courtroom, the once assertive, independent Temple now gazes listlessly, with an attitude of "childish immobility" (289; my emphasis). The woman who once rebelled against her father and brothers is, in the end, consumed by them, as they circle around her on the way out of the courtroom (289). In short, she is, as the judge so accurately puts it, a "ruined, defenseless child" (288). For Faulkner, then, the woman who exercises a little assertiveness and independence, in the end, necessarily comes to ruin by virtue of her own fault.

Ironically, though Fitzgerald pushed for freedom and liberation on many fronts (he even went to Europe to live in a more permissive society), we see that he did not extend his ideas of freedom to everyone. Likewise, though Faulkner is considered a Modernist in literary terms, we see he is a Traditionalist at heart. The 1920's was, indeed, a decade which ultimately saw a lot of progress made in the area of civil rights. We have seen, however, that it was also a decade where old habits die very hard, and where many could not let go of the myth of the Southern Flower.
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Why Doesn't She Just Leave?
The Myth of the Abused Woman

Kristi Pierson

ONCE again, the murder of Nicole Brown Simpson is front page news. We hear her ex-husband deny that he ever abused his wife. At the same time, we are stunned by the horrifying photographs of her beaten face. We hear the fear in her voice when she calls for help and we are told the truth through her diaries. Her murder has brought domestic violence, or more accurately, violence against women, into full view of the world. We can no longer deny the reality that abuse is encountered by women every minute of every day. The violence is widespread and occurs among all socio-economic groups. Many people who have never been involved in a domestic violence situation believe that the answer is elementary: Why doesn't she just leave? Unfortunately, the answer is not so simple. And why isn't the more obvious question asked: Why does the man beat her? Why has society colluded with men to absolve them of responsibility for their criminal behavior? "There is still so much emphasis on the woman's complicity in domestic violence, and so little on the men with the fists, the knife or the gun" (Douglas 15).

To understand the complexities of this issue, we must consider the cultural background of our society and the myths that continue to perpetuate the stereotypical image of the abused woman.

Wife abuse was introduced as a feminist issue—that is, an issue that demonstrated the secondary status of women in American society. Wife
abuse, in the feminist view, as the result of the patriarchy and sexist attitudes that degraded and oppressed women. It was a deeply imbedded social problem that had to be redressed with social change—change that brought greater equality and improved the status of women in general. Battered women needed not only care and emotional support, but also awareness of the social circumstances of their abuse. They needed ultimately to be empowered—that is, mobilized to challenge their subjection and take charge of their lives. (Gondolf 1)

Noted feminist Nancy Chodorow states that “women’s oppression is social, not psychological. It is concerned with wage inequality, job segregation, rape, wife abuse, the unequal sexual division of labor in the home, men’s power over women” (Chodorow 167). It is interesting to further note Lenore Walker’s observation that “only in periods in which feminist ideology is taken seriously and equality between men and women is a goal is there any attempt to eradicate violence against women” (Walker, Abused, 214).

Violence Against women has occurred for countless generations, beginning with the notion that women were viewed as chattel or property. “For centuries it was so normative that no sanctions existed against it” (Hansen vii). Males striving for control and dominance, along with a need to demonstrate power, is the root of violence against women. Adrienne Rich explains the power of the patriarchy from the feminist perspective:

Patriarchy is the power of the fathers: a familial-social, ideological political system in which men—by force, direct pressure, tradition, law and language, customs, etiquette, education, and the division of labor, determine what part women shall not play, and in which the female is everywhere subsumed under the male. (Eisenstein 5)

A number of institutional forces have routinely erected barriers that prevent battered women from obtaining sufficient help. Patriarchal practices within society, the church, and the criminal justice system have created a gender imbalance and removed power from the hands of women (Barnett 45).

Sigmund Freud also played a significant role in reflecting the pervasive societal attitudes about abused women that are still accepted today. He believed that masochism was a normal aspect of femininity and that women stayed in abusive relationships because they enjoyed it. He believed that women actually experienced fantasies of being beaten (Young-Breul 32). This theory has been evoked for generations to support the assumption that women are biologically preprogrammed to be masochistic and therefore abused. Freud’s theories are still very much a part of our culture. We read, even today, that women involved in pornography or violent marriages “want” to be beaten, and Freud’s theories of beating fantasies are still used to support their positions (Steinhem 30).

In 1920 Freud’s theory of masochism was disproved and was generally disregarded as an explanation for domestic abuse. Then, during the 1980s, theory was revived, in part by a psychologist named Robin Norwood. In her book, Women Who Love Too Much, Norwood tells women that the reason they are in abusive situations is because they choose to be. She told women that they suffered from the disease of
codependency and she encouraged women to be submissive. She even created a "rest cure," not unlike the isolation cure Charlotte Perkins Gilman described in *The Yellow Wallpaper*.

Women in therapy groups were told that they were the cause of abusive relationships: it was all their fault. One woman in therapy said, "See, the thing I learned in this group is, it really isn't his fault. I allowed it to happen." Norwood would later be discredited for inventing case histories, but not before thousands of women fell back into the masochistic mode. The man bore no responsibility in the abuse situation, only the woman.

At the same time as Norwood's book was making such an impact on American women, the American Psychological Association decided to include masochistic personality disorder in the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders*, the bible of American psychiatry. This would officially mark the "return to treating battered women as masochists who court domestic violence (Faludi 358). Once again under the backlash, attention was deflected from the causes of that 'counterattack': male anger over women's increasing demands and male fear over women's growing autonomy. At the meeting, Lenore Walker explained to the panel that personality traits do not cause domestic violence, but, in fact these traits are produced as a result of abuse. She feared that the masochistic label would lead to misdiagnoses and allow the justice system to identify spousal violence as a personality disorder of the woman. She further stated that the reason that women often do not fight back, is not because they are masochists, but they have learned that such a response will only serve to further enrage the batterer. "these women often remain with their abuser, too, not because they enjoy the torment, but because they realistically fear worse violence if they walk out; the majority of battered women are slain by their abusers after they leave home" (360). In the end, the views of the feminist psychologists were disregarded by the APA and the masochistic personality disorder became part of the *DSM* (356-362).

Many battered women's coping techniques, acquired to protect them from further violence, have been viewed as evidence of severe personality disorders. These women suffered from situationally imposed emotional problems caused by their victimization. They did not choose to be battered because of some personality defect; they developed behavioral disturbances because they lived in violence (Walker, *Battered* 18).

No human being enjoys being beaten or harassed. women generally stay in abusive relationships because they are economically dependent on the batterer, because they are ashamed to tell anyone, because they have nowhere to go for help and feel their situation is hopeless, or because they are afraid of retaliation by the batterer if they take action. "Battered women do not appear to be victim-prone. Women contribute to violence only in the fact that they are female" (Gondolf 19). Noted psychologist Edward Gondolf goes on to say that numerous studies have shown that male violence is, for the most part, indiscriminate and unpredictable. He credits Gloria Steinem for likening the idea that women are in some way responsible for their abuse to victims of the Holocaust. Would anyone ask "What in your background led you to a concentration camp?" (qtd.19). Indeed, many women react to battering in the same manner as hostage who is tormented
and isolated. In an interview in Ms., Ann Jones stated that she doesn’t believe in the term ‘battered woman syndrome.’ “I would call it a post-traumatic stress disorder. What happens is not peculiar to battered women. It’s a consequence of severe and prolonged battery; it’s not something women are naturally afflicted with.” (Jacobs 60).

There are many obstacles to overcome on the road to ending violence against women. Why doesn’t she just leave? The truth is that more than 50% of women do leave abusive relationships; however, the decision to leave is not easy. Battered women who leave their homes are frequently threatened by increased violence or death. Indeed, the most serious demonstrations of violence generally occur after the woman has left the home (National Victim Center 4).

Our judicial system must take these cases more seriously and prosecute offenders more vehemently. We must have more funding to provide shelter, education, job training and counseling and parenting skills for women. We have to teach women to understand the warning signals and deal with their own emotional problems and belief systems.

Many battered women’s coping techniques, acquired to protect them from further violence, have been viewed as evidence of severe personality deficits. Yet, the social and legal system of patriarchy prevents a woman from leaving an abusive situation because there is not a system for helping these women toward independence. More than half of homeless women and children are victims of violence. If we can build shelter and systems for helping these women, the chances are excellent that they will be able to cope outside of the relationship because once they are out, the traits associated with battered women’s syndrome generally cease to exist. With proper support services these women can begin anew and recover successfully from their experiences.

Battered women suffer from situationally imposed emotional problems caused by their victimization. They do not choose to be battered because of some personality defect, they develop behavioral disturbances because they live in violence. (Walker, Battered 39)

In order to understand and attempt to end violence against women out culture must reject the philosophy of blaming the victim for personality disturbances and instead concentrate on the personality disturbances of the abuser. As a society we must understand that it is batterer and not the victim who suffers from negative personality traits. By perpetuating the belief that it is rational to blame the victim, we ultimately excuse men for the crime (Walker 15). Ann Jones observed that “we haven’t put an end to violence in the home because society accepts that women are going to be battered, that they serve as an example of what awaits all women who don’t behave (Jacobs 56). This idea parallels the theory that Susan Brownmiller contends is the core reason for rape, as she stated in her groundbreaking book, Against Our Will: Men, Women, and Rape. (Schneir 272).

Lenore Walker summarizes the core problem and the reality of our hopes for eliminating violence against women in our society:
The violence will only cease when every person, man or women, stops defensively rationalizing and begins to understand just how such acts come about in our culture and why they continue. (Walker Battered 5).

Perhaps we should stop asking the question, "Why doesn't she just leave?" and start asking "Why doesn't he just leave her alone?"
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Politics, the Past, and the Social Sciences: Ethnic Nationalism in Western European Countries

Dana Ramos Herrera

ARCHAEOLOGY (and other social sciences such as anthropology) have often been used to elucidate history. With each excavation and every artifact uncovered, another piece of the mosaic which symbolizes the changes of human culture and society falls into place. The study of the Roman empire, for example, has benefited from various archaeological studies; the evidence uncovered at sites has enabled researchers to clarify in detail the development of Rome’s supply system, in which oil, wine, and even grain were transported by ship from all over the Mediterranean area, primarily from areas outside Italy. (Randsborg: 168)

Although the social sciences can certainly be used for positive purposes, anthropology and archaeology are not free from corruption; these disciplines are susceptible to the influences of the very environment they choose to study. The government and politics of a country often have a bearing upon how research is conducted, the interpretations which are derived from the evidence, as well as the way the information will be put to use. Efforts to promote ethnic nationalism, a sense of solidarity and pride in one’s country, is often the most influential upon the social sciences since language, places, objects, and persons have all been used to evoke antiquity and authenticity in the construction of traditions of communal identity for regions, nations, and supranational entities. (Dietler: 597)

Anthropology and archaeology study the very aspects of culture and society which are ideal to support ethnic nationalism.
The use of ethnic nationalism for political purposes has occurred throughout history; for example, during the French Revolution of 1789.

Celtic identity was used both to oppose the nobility in a revolution represented as a racial conflict, and subsequently, as a unifying theme in the new process of popular nationalism by which the nation was defined as a community. (Dietler: 587)

For the rebels, the reconstruction of their Celtic background became a rallying point which they used to unify their group. In some politically motivated reconstructions of history, the information is accurate and derived from reliable sources; in reality, however, many past events have been purposely misconstrued by a dictatorship, an elected government, or other group in an attempt to construct a history which will endear people to their ideology as well as provide a history with which the masses can identify. As Michael Dietler examines in his article "Our Ancestors the Gauls': Archaeology, Ethnic Nationalism, and the Manipulation of Celtic Identity in Modern Europe" the social sciences as well as government have often been intertwined:

"The most effective expression of ethnicity requires an anchor to a particular geography," and archaeology provides that anchor by tying sites to ancient events and people. It is largely for this reason that nation states take an interest in archaeology. "What makes a nation is the past, what justifies one nation against another is the past". Hence the state is concerned to finance excavations, designate and preserve "national sites," and sponsor museums and exhibits that display the "national heritage"...it is hardly surprising that the pattern of support for archaeological excavation and museum displays has been conditioned by national mythologies of identity. (Dietler: 597)

Governments (in many instances) take a particular interest in examining, and perhaps funding, the research of archaeologists in the hopes that it will support the political ideologies. Thus, politics, the past, and the social sciences often form a triumvirate which is at the center of a constructed national identity.

In Europe today with the unification of Germany, the collapse of the Soviet Union, and the war within former Yugoslavia, the question of identity has become especially important:

An exploration of the relationship between archaeology and the construction of identity in modern communities is of considerable importance in Europe today, where attempts to establish a new supranational community are matched by a resurgence of xenophobia nationalism; where tensions based in emotionally charged appeals to ethnic heritage are currently erupting in violence in many areas; where the bonds holding many national politics are fragmenting and reforming around smaller ethnic identities; and where archaeology has been conscripted frequently to establish and validate cultural borders and ancestry, often in the service of dangerous racist and nationalist mythologies. (Dietler: 584-585)

Differences in ethnicity and identity are often at center of conflicts as people begin to separate and categorize themselves accordingly. Thus, determining what differentiates one ethnic group ("Us") from the other ("Them") becomes of utmost importance. In determining the criteria of one's group, history becomes crucial. Often, one aspect of a culture history is emphasized while another aspect is ignored or suppressed in an attempt to make a strong association to the past and generate a viable ethnic identity. Historically, however, other European countries have also resorted to an extreme manipulation or deliberate fabrication of facts in order to assure a connection to the past. "The [use of] archaeological findings to boost national pride is nothing new" (Mangi: 217). The infamous Piltdown Hoax, for example, was meant to ordain England as the birthplace of humanity-- a distinction which would designate English land (rather than any other place in the world) as the origin of the progenitor of modern women and men. The conspirators of the Piltdown forgery attempted to instill national pride through the use of archaeology, similar to what Nazi Germany would try to do almost three decades later for their followers. While not irreproachable, however, those who orchestrated the Piltdown fraud lacked the sinister motivations of the Nazi propagandist. Archaeology became the justification for German horrors as Adolf Hitler and Heinrich Himmler distorted and falsified history to further their demented cause. The exploitation of the social sciences to promote ethnic nationalism, are the focus of this study.
Prior to 1911, England did not claim that any fossilized hominid remains had been unearthed on English soil; discoveries of neandertals and other archaic humans, however, were found in areas like Germany, Belgium, France and Indonesia. The lack of evidence proving that hominids were first present in England was regarded with sorrow since it seems that all political systems, including communism, take pride in the fossil hominids found within their country's borders. The fossils of our early ancestors, no matter where they are found, seem to be regarded as the heritage of all peoples. (Sigmon: 137)

The fossils of ancient hominids are often attributed to the country where they are discovered in an attempt to raise national pride; the area which can claim that it was home to the earliest men and women can in turn be honored as the soil which nurtured the seed of humanity.

The following time line will focus on the hominid fossils uncovered in various countries; although numerous other ideas and discoveries contributed to the development of the sciences of archaeology, geology, paleoanthropology, etc., these dates will be restricted to represent the historical context in which the conspirators of the Piltdown hoax felt compelled to produce the remains of the earliest known European man. Ironically, there was evidence of two hominid remains found on English soil in 1888 and 1911 which would have established that English soil was home to at least some hominids during the prehistoric era.

1774, Germany: Johann Friedrich Esper denies that the human remains found at Gaylenreuth Cave in Germany were “contemporaneous with the animal fossils among which they were found” (Tattersall: 8).

1804, Belgium: Philippe-Charles Schmerling excavates the cave of Engis on the River Meuse near Liège in Belgium. There, he discovers two modern looking human skulls (Tattersall: 9).

1833, Belgium: Upper Pleistocene hominid remains found in Engis (Spencer: 10).

1848, Gibraltar: Ignored until 1863, the Gibraltar skull was discovered during work on military fortifications (Tattersall: 9, Spencer: 10).

1852, France: In France at Aurignac, a large number of burials in association with an extinct fauna and stone tools is unearthed (Tattersall: 25).

1856, Germany: A small cave in the steep side of the Neander Valley yields a Neandertal skeleton (Tattersall: 13, Spencer: 10).

1868, France: Edouard Lartet and Henry Christy excavate a small rock shelter in Les Eyzines de Tayac. At this site, dubbed Cro-Magnon, workmen had discovered some human skeletons which were associated with stone tools as well as the remains of extinct animals (Tattersall: 25).

1886, Belgium: Two archaic human skeletons are discovered at the site of Spy, near Goyet, in the Belgium province of Namur (Tattersall: 24, Spencer: 10).

1889-1905, Yugoslavia: Neandertal remains excavated in the cave of Krapina in Yugoslavia (Tattersall: 45).

1890, Java: A fossilized human skull is found in a rockshelter at Wadjak and a fragment of a lower jaw is found at a site called Kedug Brubus by Eugene Dubois (Tattersall: 34).

1891, Java: A hominid molar tooth, skullcap was excavated at Java by Eugene Dubois (Tattersall: 35).

1892, Java: Near the village of Trinil, on the banks of the Solo River in central Java, a femur is exposed after the floods of the rainy season; it is discovered by Eugene Dubois (Tattersall: 35).

1908, Germany: A fragmentary braincase is found at the German site of Ehringsdorf, as well as a lower jaw found in a sand quarry at Mauer near Heidelberg (Tattersall: 47).

1908-1911, France: The French cave sites of La Chapelle-aux-Saints, Le Moustier, La Ferrassie, and La Quina all yielded complete or multiple skeletons of Neandertals (Tattersall: 45).

Although many of these finds were neglected or put into storage upon discovery, their importance to the study of paleoanthropology was generally recognized by the time the Piltdown
hoax was perpetrated; interest in fossil hominids had increased and the origins of man were studied extensively. Interestingly, the two sites of Chapel Hill and East Anglia in England provided evidence that anatomically modern Homo sapiens had once lived in those areas. At the Chapel Hill site, a modern-looking human skeleton was discovered in “deposits of [the] early Pleistocene age” in 1888 (Tattersall: 48). In 1911, East Anglia yielded a “near complete, but anatomically modern human skeleton” which the scientists of the era believed to date to sometime between the Lower and Middle Pleistocene (Tattersall: 26). For reasons unknown, however, these discoveries were not sufficient to warrant celebration and most scientists continued to consider English soil barren of any significant finds. This lack of fossil evidence may also have been the motivation behind the hoax but as discussed in the section entitled “Why Piltdown?: General Motives,” there were many factors which contributed to the implementation of the Piltdown Forgery.

The Piltdown Hoax

In 1908, workers digging in a gravel pit at Piltdown in Sussex (later discovered to really be a shallow pit near Barkham Manor) discovered fragments of a human cranium; these pieces were handed to Charles Dawson, a local lawyer and amateur paleontologist. Later, in 1912, Arthur Smith Woodward (the Keeper of Geology at the British Museum), mystic Pierre Teilhard de Chardin (who later became a professional paleontologist), and Dawson explored the gravel pit thoroughly (Tobias: 245). The trio discovered more cranium pieces as well as the right half of an apelike jaw with two molar teeth. Apparently found in the same stratum as the hominid pieces were “isolate teeth of a mastodon, a stegodon, a beaver, and a hippopotamus, and flint and bone implements” (Tobias: 245). Because of the assumption that artifacts found in the same strata are from the same time period (relative chronology), scientists declared an early Pleistocene or a late Pliocene age for the site. At a meeting for the Geological Society of London on December 18, 1912, Woodward declared that the cranium he had reconstructed from the discovered pieces were a new hominid genus and species which he designated *Eoanthropus dawsoni* (“the dawn of the man of Dawson”) [Tobias: 245].

By late 1913, Dawson had recovered a pair of fragmentary nasal bones and nasal conchae at Piltdown while de Chardin uncovered a canine tooth which was believed to be part of *Eoanthropus dawsoni*. In 1915, at a site presumed to be Sheffield Park, a second *Eoanthropus dawsoni* dubbed Piltdown II was discovered; this find was composed of a brain case, a mandibular molar tooth, as well as the tooth of an archaic rhinoceros.

For some paleoanthropologists... the doubts they had entertained that the cranium and jaw of Piltdown I belonged to the same species and individual were lessened if not entirely dispelled by this discovery. (Tobias: 245) Because of the scientific importance of these finds, a monument commemorating Dawson’s discoveries were erected in the grounds of Barkham Manor, Piltdown. For the next forty years, Piltdown Man remained a valid scientific artifact which supported the idea that the oldest ancestor of man had lived in England.

On November 21, 1953, Joseph Weiner (physical anthropologist), Sir Wilfrid Edward LeGros Clark (head of the department at Oxford), and Kenneth Oakley (anthropologist) declared that Piltdown man was a hoax (Spencer: 132-134). After viewing the Piltdown remains earlier that summer, the three men became suspicious and began to examine the artifacts more closely. With remarkable speed, Oakley’s chemical analyses exposed the whole fraud. Not a single bone or artifact from Piltdown was authentic. Many had been stained with potassium dichromate to make them look older, but also so that they might resemble remains from another Pleistocene site. By June 30, 1954, both Piltdown I and Piltdown II were confirmed forgeries. The jaw was taken from an orangutan, the cranium was modern, and the canine discovered by de Chardin was thought to have come from a modern ape. The various other artifacts, such as the elephant tooth were genuine, but collected from other prehistoric archaeological sites. The gravel beds where Piltdown I and II were found were apparently seeded with the other artifacts to establish the supposed Pleistocene or a late Pliocene age. Once the forgery was exposed, questions arose as to the identity of the conspirator(s). (Although countless books and articles have been written examining...
the Piltdown Hoax [Smith, 1922; Woodward, 1948; Vere, 1955; Halstead, 1978; Linderman, 1986; Lewin, 1987; Willis, 1989; Spencer, 1990; Tattersall, 1995] I will refer to the Langhams-
Spenser theory presented in Frank Spencer's Piltdown: A Scientific Forgery and Phillip V. Tobias' "Piltdown: An Appraisal of the Case Against Sir Arthur Keith" when discussing the
identity of the conspirators.)

There has been much speculation as to who perpetrated the fraud, with suspects ranging from
William Ruskin Butterfield, curator of the Hasting Museum, to Sir Arthur Conan Doyle (the
novelist whose created the legendary literary character Sherlock Holmes) [Tobias: 249]. Although
it is generally accepted that Charles Dawson orchestrated the conspiracy, the identity of his
accomplice has been long debated. The Langham-Spenser hypothesis (developed by Dr. Frank
Spencer and the late Dr. Ian Langham) attempts to end the controversy by arguing that Sir Arthur
Keith was Dawson's associate.

Joseph S. Winer argues in his book The Piltdown Forgery that Charles Dawson was almost
certainly involved with the Piltdown Hoax since "from beginning to end, Dawson had been a
pivotal figure" (Spencer: 153). Dawson had the means and opportunity by which to commit such
a fantastic fraud.

He could easily have obtained all the forged specimens; he had been observed chemically
treating bones; as the Steward of Barkham Manor he had free access and every opportunity
to salt the gravel beds; and he was the only person present on every occasion when
specimens were found. Moreover, nothing more was found after he died. (Lukas: 198)

In addition, Dawson's motives were sufficient to convince him to assume the risk involved with
such a scheme. As an English scientist, the greatest honor which could have been bestowed upon
him was an induction into the Royal Society of London, one of the world's oldest and most
prestigious scientific associations; discovering Piltdown, the first hominin, would have assured
Dawson membership.

[Dawson's] motive was tied primarily to his ambition to become a Fellow of the Royal
Society, an honour that was marked the pinnacle of scientific achievement. Achieving this
accolade was not an easy matter, but it is evident from his later correspondence that he had
seen Piltdown as a possible route ... there is every reason to suppose that, had he lived, he
would have been duly elected-- an eventuality that would have been based almost entirely on
his achievements at Piltdown. (Spencer: 199)

While Dawson was certainly motivated as well as capable, the fact that many details of the forgery
were so intricate and elaborate leads some scholars to believe that "involvement of the brain and
eye of a specialist" was necessary (Tobias: 247). As the Langham-Spenser hypothesis proposes,
Arthur Keith was the second perpetrator, the very specialist needed to complete the deception.

Arthur Keith was an anatomist and leading supporter of Tertiary Man in Britain; prior to his
appointment as conservator of the Hunterian Museum of the Royal College of Surgeons, Keith had
served as demonstrator of anatomy at the London Hospital (Spencer: xxii). After *Eoanthropus
dawsoni* was unveiled, Keith appeared to be very much impressed with the skull constructed by
Woodward and regarded it as (in his own words) "the missing form-- the link which early
followers of Darwin had searched for-- had really been discovered" (Tobias: 258). Yet his
enthusiasm for the discovery was perhaps fueled by other motives. Phillip V. Tobias submits the
Langham-Spenser theory, as well as his own evidence, to support the conclusion that Keith was in
league with Dawson to perpetrate the hoax. As Tobias proposes in his article "Piltdown: An
Appraisal of the Case Against Sir Arthur Keith,"

Keith undoubtedly commanded the wide and profound knowledge and evolutionary
perspective which the intricacies of the hoax demanded. Keith had ready access to the
materials that were prepared and planted. In his laboratory, Keith had the opportunity to salt
the gravel beds of the Piltdown area. Preemminently, as a man of driving ambition and one
with a very firm held concept of how hominin evolution had occurred despite the lack of any
fossils to support that concept, Keith had motives. (Tobias: 259)
Keith’s support of the Piltdown men were not surprising, considering that he himself helped to produce them and wanted the “hominids” to be accepted as real. His ability and ambition to help orchestrate such a plan speaks of personal desires which he simply could not ignore.

Like Dawson, Keith yearned for fellowship of the Royal society; yet he also had other goals he apparently thought Piltdown would assure that he attain. Keith strove to publish his novel as well as become knighted by the queen. After Piltdown, he attained his goals: “Keith’s F.R.S. came in the spring of 1913, his Antiquity of Man was to appear in 1915, and his knighthood was to be attained in 1921” (Tobias: 259). His foremost goal, however, of supporting a find which would force England from the annals of archaeological/fossil hominid obscurity was surely a symptom of the larger, general desire to find the earliest ancestor in England.

One of Keith’s major motives, on this scenario, was to establish the case for a particular kind of human ancestor, as conceived by him, but also a fossil man whose provenance and morphology showed that it was earlier and therefore more important than any other fossil hominid then known, at least in Europe. (Tobias: 258)

Why Piltdown?: General Motives

As previously mentioned, the discoveries at Chapel Hill and East Anglia provided evidence which would support the theory that some early hominids had been present in England; yet the scientific community was not satisfied with such a description since half a dozen other countries could make the same boast. A truly spectacular find would have to be attributed to England if they were to make history—a requirement Piltdown conveniently filled.

France and Belgium had long boasted their Neandertal skeletons; from Germany there had come the original Neandertal cranium and the Mauer mandible. England, however, had been barren of fossil men, and much sadness there had been over this lack. The Piltdown Skull laid bare at that meeting of the Geological Society was hailed as England’s first great and historic find in paleoanthropology and as the world’s earliest man. (Tobias: 244)

As Dawson and Keith realized, finding the supposed missing link between man and apes would launch their careers as well as their beloved country to international prominence. “The only certain thing is that the perpetrator(s) understood the British paleoanthropological establishment well enough to know what its members would accept relatively uncritically” (Tattersall: 50). During this era scientists suspected that humans and apes had diverged at some point. Thus, by presenting Eoanthropus dawsoni, Dawson and Keith could provide the evidence which would prove that Darwin’s (and all the other scientists that had come after him) theories on evolution and natural selection were indeed correct. The government as well as British society was predictably pleased as

the discovery of a large skull and primitive jaw of the Piltdown Man in England in 1912 confirmed the expectations of the day, and considerable pride was attached to the notion of humanity arising in the British Empire. (Willis: 23)

Indeed, the reaction of the scientific community itself was also demonstrative of how the desire to forge a new identity for the Crown as the birthplace of humanity forced the acceptance the Piltdown skull far too quickly.

Regardless of how much the archaeologists and paleoanthropologists of the era debated, it was generally agreed upon that the discovery of the Piltdown skull was of great importance to the science of hominid evolution. Yet, as Dr. Robert Lewin asks,

How is it that trained men, the greatest experts of their day, could look at a set of modern human bones— the cranial fragments— and “see” a clear simian signature in them; and “see” in an ape’s jaw the unmistakable signs of humanity? (Lewin: 61)

The answer can only lie in the fact that these men wanted the Piltdown skull to be representative of the truth. The scientists of this era were desperate to find the “missing link” and the fact that the hoax went undetected for forty years indicates the need people had to have this mystery of life solved. Their desire to make England famous, as well as provide the answer to a decades old question influenced their judgment. “The answers, inevitably, have to do with the scientists’ expectations and their effects on the interpretation of data” (Lewin: 61). Ironically, if there every
was any discord among the scholars, it had to do with interpretation, rather than the existence of
the remains themselves.

One of the reasons the forgery was so successful was that there were so many internal
inconsistencies; scientists spent more time arguing over the interpretation of details than they
did on validating the whole matter. (Lukas: 198).

That the finds were genuine went undisputed by the academics since to question the validity of the
Piltdown skull was to threaten the newly acquired status of England as home to the oldest
hominid. Rather, the attention was focused on the assessment of those finds. An error in
evaluation could be challenged and corrected but if the artifacts were fake, the loss of England
status would be irreparable.

The Effects

Piltdown, undeniably, had several effects on science as well as on attitudes towards evolution.
For instance, Piltdown man became accepted as evidence of the hominid ancestor which eventually
led to the appearance of modern humans.

And with it the popularity grew of the “presapiens” theory, which held that at some remote
point, probably in the Pliocene, a split had occurred in the human lineage. One branch had
given rise to the early appearance of modern humans, via Piltdown. The other branch had
led to the doomed Neanderthals. (Tattersall: 50)

In the evolutionary tree, *Eoanthropus dawsoni* became the forbearer of *Homo sapien*. In fact,
when *Australopithecus* was discovered in 1924 in Africa, it was vehemently opposed and
denounced by Keith and other supporters of Piltdown because to accept the discovery of the Taung
skull (as the *Australopithecus* was named) was to admit that Piltdown could not have existed.

“If Taung and *Australopithecus* proved to be correctly appraised as early hominids or aspiranthominids, Piltdown could not have been an ancestor and its *bona fides* would have been suspect”
(Tobias: 260). Until the revelation of the forgery in the early 1950’s, the study of
paleoanthropology was, in effect, rendered stagnant.

After discovery of the forgery, another effect of the Piltdown hoax referred to the argument
between creationists and evolutionists. In another polemic concerning the theories of evolution,
those who were staunch believers in creationism (the idea that the universe as well as humanity
was created by an all powerful god) used the Piltdown hoax as evidence that scientific methods
were often perverted to prove the heretical theory of evolution. Piltdown served as an excuse to
denounce science. Yet as Tobias points out, those

who have used the Piltdown story to bolster their case against “experts” seldom if ever
follow up their gleeful discussion of Piltdown with the fair comment that it was the rigour of
scientific method that uncovered the hoax. (Tobias: 280)

Thankfully, although science can be in error, it can also be self correcting, as Piltdown
demonstrated.

In the rush to declare the most incredible scientific discovery of the generation and provide
England with the needed image as the source of humanity, Dawson and Keith ignored the ethics
and scientific methods which must guide the sciences. They attempted to enhance their career as
well as accomplish other goals by manipulating science in a self serving action which had enduring
consequences. Although this manipulation of evidence is hardly surprising, its application can
have horrendous effects, as seen in Nazi Germany.

Nazi Germany

Adolf Hitler’s rise to power in 1933 signaled the beginning of Aryan Germans securing their
rightful place as the Master Race by reclaiming their lost lands, purging their social and cultural
landscape of the Jewish influence, and restoring Germany as the most powerful and influential
superpower-- or so the propaganda claimed. Under the guidance of propaganda minister Joseph
Goebbels, Nazi Germany was extolled as the ideal country/ government with Hitler as the brilliant
head of state. The press, radio, and films (especially those by Leni Riefenstahl)
played a vital role as an agent of political socialization—taking the lead in transmitting and instilling official ideology. When necessary, it churned out propaganda aimed at mobilizing the masses and channelling their activities in the interest of the government or the party. (Bankier: 20)

With a deft manipulation of facts, complete fabrication of events, and inventive presentation, the Nazis were successful in justifying their activities, as well as promoting their ideologies, to the masses.

The SS Ahnenerbe

Although there was much interest in archaeology for political purposes “there was no real respect for the past or its remains” (Arnold: 36). Most artifacts uncovered were not studied objectively nor placed in their proper context. Each find was seen simply as a link to a greater German glory. As one advertisement in a popular journal exclaimed, “Every single find is important because it represents a document of our ancestors” (Arnold: 33).

Unfortunately, the archaeology of Germany was largely neglected until Hitler’s rise to power in 1933 [which] made the appropriation of the past for propaganda that much easier. Whenever an artifact of a type designated a ‘Germanic’ was found, the land was declared to be ancient Germanic territory. Applied to prehistoric archaeology, this perspective resulted in the neglect or distortion of data that did not directly apply to Germanic peoples. (Arnold: 31-32)

Because people were generally ignorant of the true history of their culture area, it was easy to subscribe to the interpretations offered by the Third Reich and believe, for example, that various lands truly belonged to the government. Understanding that archaeological “evidence” helped to persuade the masses, Himmler established the Ahnenerbe. “To obtain scientific (or pseudo-scientific) support for his theories, Himmler founded the SS Ahnenerbe (Ancestral Inheritance) in July 1935, with Hermann Wirth as its first president” (McCann: 79). The Ahnenerbe supervised research in several fields such as medicine, humanities, mathematics, physics, mythology (such as the search for the Holy Grail and the lost city of Atlantis), anthropology, and archaeology. The work they did, however, was neither ethical, nor done for the sake of learning. “All Ahnenerbe archaeological work had ulterior political or propagandistic motives, but some of their archaeological activities can only be described as looting” (McCann: 83). Nothing was spared against the diseased touch of the Nazis.

The archaeology of Germany did not, at this time, resemble a true scientific discipline. Structured, careful excavations and a rigorous examination of the artifacts were underutilized techniques. Looting, a blatant disregard for scientific procedure, as well as the site destruction was the norm. For example, the site at Biskupin in Poland was “one of the best preserved Early Iron Age (600-400 B.P.) sites in all of central Europe” (Arnold: 36). Yet the Nazi troops were ordered to destroy the site after the Ahnenerbe had finished their “research.” Nazi research methods were a further mockery of the scientific process; rather than making educated hypotheses based on all the evidence, for example, Himmler and those beneath him forced the artifacts to fit their interpretations and the “archaeological evidence that did not conform to Nazi dogma was ignored or suppressed” (Arnold: 34). As W.J. McCann wrote in “Volk und Germanentum”: the Presentation of the past in Nazi Germany,” Himmler had no time for the pedantic precision of traditional science: he began not with hypotheses based on the evaluation of evidence but rather with axioms for which the evidence had to be found. (McCann: 79)

Rather than revising or changing a hypothesis once contradictory evidence emerged, the evidence was ignored or forced to conform to the theory. The entire context of archaeological research was changed for the worse as the study of the past became dictated by politics and madmen’s dreams.

Archaeologists of this period were so influenced by the government that they became divided into three categories of people, most of whom were content to abide by Himmler’s methodology:
those who were either true believers or self-serving opportunists; those (the vast majority) who accepted without criticism the appropriation and distortion of prehistoric archaeology; and those who openly opposed these practices. (Arnold: 37)

These archaeologists who collaborated with the Third Reich to bring greater glory to the German fatherland willfully perverted the study of the past as a service to the State. Because of their actions, the Nazi’s version of Germanic prehistory became a ridiculous mockery of accepted fact. Thus, historians, archaeologists, anthropologists, and other scientists became an asset since their research would become fodder for the Third Reich’s propaganda machine. As Heinrich Himmler, chief of the German police, is quoted as saying:

The one and only thing that matters to us, and the thing these people are paid for by the State, is to have ideas of history that strengthen our people in their necessary national pride. In all this troublesome business we are only interested in one thing—to project into the dim and distant past the picture of our nation as we envisage it for the future. (Arnold: 33)

Himmler bought the history behind the ideology, a lie which people paid for with their lives. Although many archaeologists may not have been completely loyal to the Nazis, many of them still provided the great Nazi propaganda machine with ammunition, as in the question of their rights to the Polish territories. By their talk about East Germanic tribes like the Goths and Vandals living in the Polish lands, the archaeologists offered expansionist plans an alibi. (Martens: 61)

Consequently, as a result of their usefulness, the social sciences (especially archaeology) were regulated by the state so that most of the research done could be used for Himmler’s propaganda.

**Historical Manipulation to Induce Pride in Germany**

Restoring pride to the German people as well as instilling a greater sense of patriotism was another goal of the propagandists as they distorted and rewrote history with an obvious bias for the Nazi Party. They “integrated history at all levels, to the extent that even minor local periods of historical societies were turned into pamphlets of National Socialism” (Martens: 61). By 1935, the Germans had renamed the prehistoric and historic periods:

- The Bronze and pre-Roman Iron Ages became the ‘Early Germanic period,’
- the Roman Iron Age the ‘Climax Germanic period,’
- the Migration period the ‘Late Germanic period,’ and
- everything from the Carolingians to the thirteenth century the ‘German Middle Ages’.

(Arnold: 37)

By designating the various eras as belonging to the Germanic people, the Nazis implied that the Germans were solely responsible for the cultural and technological developments of those time periods. The result was an ideology constructed of history or falsified events which lauded Germans and their culture as the origins of Western civilization. “According to Nazi doctrine, the Germanic culture of northern Europe was responsible for virtually all major intellectual and technological achievements of Western civilization” (Arnold: 32). The Third Reich chose to ignore the contributions of different cultures such as that of the Egyptians although archaeologist Howard Carter had discovered the tomb of King Tutankhamen by 1922.

**Subject to Seizure: the Conquest of Land**

It was deemed vital to produce evidence which justified foreign expansion if the borders of Germany were to be extended. Archaeologists in particular were employed by the State since their research provided the information necessary to rationalize conquest of other lands. The chronological dating of various areas and determining who occupied the territories during prehistory could be used to a great advantage; ideas that lands were “previously inhabited only by a few nomadic Slavonic savages, or that previous settlement had been that of Untermenschen, inferior to the incoming Germans” would support claims that large geographical regions were part of the German fatherland and subject to seizure (McCann: 84). By taking the knowledge (or falsifying history to prove so) that ancient German tribes invaded or settled in countries like Poland, propagandists could claim that various lands rightfully belonged to modern Germans, and thus, the Nazi Party.
The summit of the Heiligenberg in Heidelberg, for instance, was thoroughly examined (using atrocious techniques) by the Ahnenerbe. Although there is no evidence of permanent settlement in this area, people did visit the territory infrequently during the Neolithic period. Later on in history, it was densely settled during the Late Bronze Age (1200-750 B.C.) and a double wall-and-ditch system was built there in the Late Iron Age (200 B.C. to the Roman occupation), when it was a hillfort settlement. Two provincial Roman watchtowers, as well as several Roman dedicatory inscriptions, statue bases, and votive stones, have been found at the site. (Arnold: 35)

Although there was evidence of Roman occupation, artifacts bearing a German influence were not discovered. Initially, this site could not be granted the status of Thingstätte since "evidence of significant Germanic occupation of the site had to be documented" (Arnold: 34). However, once archaeologists concocted documentation of German occupation of the land, Heiligenberg was granted Thingstätte standing "on the basis of fabricated evidence in the published excavation reports" (Arnold: 36). By claiming these sites were originally inhabited by Germans, the Nazis could claim through their propaganda that the land was rightfully theirs and should be expropriated.

Aryan Superiority and Race as Justification for Murder

The Ahnenerbe exploited archaeological artifacts to justify genocide; for example, the famous Venus figures from prehistoric eras were used to substantiate Aryan superiority. The Venus figurines of Willendorf (Austria) and Vestonice (Czechoslovakia) were subject to analysis by the Ahnenerbe as possible proof of German racial dominance.

In their attempt to use archaeological and anthropological material to support the myth of Germanic racial superiority, some of the Ahnenerbe staff went to extremely fanciful lengths. (McCann: 85)

These figurines date to what is now termed the Upper Paleolithic, a period which some archaeologists view as the beginning of men’s and women’s expression in an artistic manner (cave paintings, petroglyphs, and Venus figurines). The 4 and 3/8 inch Venus of Willendorf dates to around 32,000-28,000 B.C. and was sculpted from limestone with traces of red coloring (Figure 1); the hair is ornamented, the breasts are heavy, and the belly distended (Sandars: 41, Torbrügge:19). The woman sculpture from Dolní Vestonice, for example, was formed out of baked clay 23,000 years ago (Figure 2); the 4 and 1/2 inch sculpture concentrated attention on the breasts and belly (Sandars: 48, Torbrügge:15). These statues were created for a purpose yet the symbolism or meaning behind these forms are unknown. Archaeologist Jean Pierre Duhard commented in 1993, “The women depicted display every variation and accurately reproduce the forms encountered among living people” (Duhard: 87). Earlier, in 1981, Patricia Rice, also an archaeologist, claimed that these figures were in fact made to depict women of all ages, shapes, and states of fertility (Rice: 402-414). Yet when Himmler saw pictures of the figures earlier in 1941, he used the opportunity to interpret their existence in a manner which would support Nazi doctrine.

Himmler began by asking the Ahnenerbe to chart the existence of Venus figures in the lands of the prehistoric era. Assuming them to be to some extent realistic, he was struck by the similarity of their apparent steatopygic development with that of "some tribes of savage people" such as the Hottentots, and asked the Ahnenerbe to produce a distribution map for the figures, as well as to see if there was any evidence that people "like the Hottentots" had then lived in those areas, or if those people and the Hottentots were of similar descent, and whether these people had been driven out or made extinct either by a change in climate or by the Cro-Magnon or later Nordic peoples. (McCann: 85)

Steatopygia, a "pronounced, localized accumulation of fat or fatty-fibrous tissue on the upper part of the buttocks, a condition common among Khoikhoi (Hottentot)," was connected by Himmler to the famous Venus figures (Singer: 1). His interest in discovering if the Venus sculptures were carved by native people who may have been conquered or killed was indicative of his hope that the information could be used as proof of German superiority.
Himmler's reasoning was clear: if these primitive races were similar to the Hottentots, and if they had been destroyed by the Germanic invaders in the struggle for existence, then the racial superiority of the Germanic tribes not only to the Willendorf culture but also to black Africa would be proven in an incontrovertibly Darwinian way. (McCann: 85)

This notion of racial superiority was of great use to Himmler for his propaganda. By promoting the notion that German Aryans were racially superior to all other people, it became easier to justify the elimination of the socially inferior. For example, the concentration camps and the deaths of six million Jews as well as large numbers of Poles, Russians, Gypsies, are the Nazi's most horrifying legacy. To accomplish the decimation of entire groups of people, Hitler and Goebbels realized that propaganda would have to “mobilize the public to the highest pitch of consent” and thus, they began their efforts to prejudice public opinion against the Jews (Bankier: 146). Included in their propaganda was the idea that Germans were the Master Race and others, including the Jews, were less than human. Their efforts were so effective that “historians have argued that the remarkable success of propaganda in depersonalizing the Jews was a decisive enabling factor in the Nazi regime’s murderous policy” (Bankier: 139).

As the death of millions of people, the destruction of whole cities and landscapes, and the other Nazi atrocities demonstrate, archaeological research can be distorted, promoted, and then accepted as truth. The menace of these actions are obvious yet the consequences of keeping silence are as harmful:

dangerous abuses and distortions of the archaeological record promulgated in Nazi Germany to justify territorial expansion and genocide are a warning of the potential consequences of a failure to refute certain interpretations as seriously wrong. (Dietler: 599)

By blindly accepting the truth and never questioning reality, the Third Reich was given free reign by those beneath them to enact their demented schemes.

Conclusion

Archeology can often be exploited as a means to instill national pride as well as provide justification for various political agendas. Unfortunately, many archaeologists, like other academics, fail to recognize how intimately archeology is linked with economic and political aspects of society. (Durrans: 66)

Often, politics and the social sciences which study the past are interlocked as political groups use the research of various disciplines to construct an ideology which has a basis in historical fact, or provide a new national image which can be easily identify with. As seen in the cases of Nazi Germany and England’s Piltdown Hoax, the sciences can be perverted in an attempt to accomplish various goals.

Ironically, the Nazi crimes have become “a legacy of evil in a class by themselves, irreparably burdening any concept of German nationhood” (qtd in Meyer: 27). For all the attempts of the Ahnenerbe to designate various lands and artifacts as “Germanic” to restore pride in Germany, one of the Third Reich’s final legacies is the blemish their actions have placed upon the history of Germany. Although innocent citizens of Germany today are not responsible for the crimes of an insane Führer, their country’s modern history is dominated by the actions of the Nazis. These horrors, their campaigns of genocide and conquest, were in part so successful due to the propaganda which was supported by the archeological evidence of the Ahnenerbe. “I believe that if we are able to draw one lesson from the German example, it is that archeology is not an appropriate medium for the contemporary debate and foundation of ethnic and national interests” (Veit: 52). That which the Nazis could not prove was supported by falsified artifacts and the evidence which could harm their cause was suppressed and ignored. Archeology was perverted to serve the dreams of madmen.

Also in western Europe, the Piltdown Hoax served to present the world with evidence of modern men and women emerging from England. Two supposed men of science, Dawson and
Keith, manipulated and falsified scientific evidence for their own selfish needs while the desire for a phenomenal prehistoric find maintained the lie for forty years.

Writing on the famous Piltdown forgery, [J.] Reader ventures to suggest that one of the factors that may have led to the successful perpetration of the hoax may have been nationalist zeal to find the skeleton of the earliest man on British soil. (Mangi: 217)

The belief that a “missing link” had to be discovered on English soil was the overriding motive in the orchestration and perpetuation of the Piltdown Forgery. Paleoanthropology and archaeology was used to support a false scientific find in an attempt to boost the esteem one nation.

Yet the question remains: what is the proper way to deal with the knowledge of these perversions? Some would argue that to erase the past is the best solution but to do that would also make us guilty of reconstructing history to suit our own agenda. To repeat a cliche, some claim that to learn from history is the only way keep from perpetuating it. However, as Stephen L. Dyson, President of the Archaeological Institute of America writes, “is that our best service to the past?” (Dyson: 6). The pursuit of knowledge and the histories which emerge because of that search must be tempered with respect and honesty. To corrupt the process of learning and the quest for the reality-truth is to damn ourselves to a cycle of repeating mistakes and increased sorrows.
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