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Why Do I Stutter?
[abridged]
by Bailey Levis

Introduction

Stuttering is a complex disorder defined in the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-III-R) as "involuntary repetitions or prolongations of sounds with blocking or other spasmodic interruptions in the rhythmical flow of speech [that] may include blinking, other facial tics, tremors of the lips and jaw, or gasping." Stuttering usually develops in children between the ages of 2 and 7\(^1\) with 98% of stutterers developing the condition before 10 years of age.\(^2\)

I developed stuttering somewhere between the ages of 4 and 6. My mother recalls it being very hard to understand me as a young child around preschool age. It was as though I had marbles in my mouth. People couldn’t understand what I was saying, so she translated. She said that I was not stuttering then, but I did have a speech impediment. I don’t remember those years. My father recalls me developing the stuttering at around the age of six. I had a bad experience in kindergarten, and was transferred to a new school for the first grade. I have been a stutterer ever since, even though, at the time, changing schools was one of the best things that had ever happened to me.

I have always been fascinated by the phenomenon of stuttering. I think it is so weird that sometimes my mouth and voice just won’t work. It’s as if they have a mind of their own with agendas different from my real mind. It wasn’t until after I had begun studying chemistry at the age of twenty-three that I became more interested in what is different about the chemistry in my brain, or the brains of stutterers, from the chemistry in the brains of nearly everyone else. This is a topic that I have discovered to be huge and complex. My interest in the area of neurological biochemistry has led to this brief literature review of drug therapy for stuttering and some of the regions of the brain that show deviant behaviors in stutterers.

A substantial amount of research has been conducted in these areas, more than can be included here, but it also leaves many questions unanswered. This is only the...
beginning of my quest to understand stuttering, its etiology, neurological mechanisms, and the development of an eventual cure—the "magic bullet" that stutterers have long dreamed about.

History

Stuttering has been around as long as speech itself. In ancient Greek and Roman times, such people as Aristotle and Hippocrates thought it stemmed from the speaker "thinking of fresh things before he has expressed what was already in his thoughts." This is still a commonly held misconception. In fact, although it may appear similar, stuttering is not getting tripped up over words during a flustered moment, something that almost everyone has experienced. During those ancient times, the medical viewpoint was that stuttering stemmed from "an arid tongue," for which the treatment was blistering or wrapping the tongue in little moist towels soaked in lettuce juice. Others recommended "gargling with concoctions of pennyroyal, hyssop, and thyme; chewing mustard, garlic, and onions (as stimulants); rubbing the tongue with lazerwort; and (to help relax the articulators) massaging the head, neck, mouth, and chin. As the therapeutic coup de grace, the patient was 'to immerse his head in cold water, eat horseradish, and vomit.'" The list goes on with various, now absurd-sounding, treatments—concoctions to gargle, methods of humidifying or dehumidifying the tongue, vocal cords, or brain—as well as surgery and prayer.

Slightly more recent treatments of the twentieth century have included "electroshock therapy, biofeedback, hypnosis, operant conditioning, faith healing, psychoanalysis, and drug therapy." All of these have met with varying degrees of success. This is one of the common problems surrounding the treatment of stuttering. One form of therapy may prove extremely helpful for one individual and not another, and relapses are common. Needless to say, this makes finding a cure most difficult, as stuttering appears to be extremely individualized. Current therapy programs need to be tailored to suit the specific needs of each person. It appears that so far the most successful forms of treatment have been a combination of drug therapy, speech therapy, and/or psychotherapy.
Since most speech language pathologists (SLPs) do not specialize in dealing with the psychological aspects of stuttering and most psychotherapists do not specialize in speech pathology, it has been suggested that either working with two therapists or finding someone who has enough knowledge to approach both aspects would be most beneficial. SLPs generally believe that problems with speech are due to deviant behaviors in the vocal mechanism and focus on treating that aspect. A psychotherapist might generally classify stuttering as relating to an emotional imbalance or disturbance, with the imbalance either causing or stemming from the stutter. A psychiatrist or neurologist might believe that the underlying cause of stuttering is due to neurological or neurochemical factors and could be corrected with drug therapy. I would have to agree with all of these viewpoints. From my own personal experience I could certainly say that if my vocal mechanism were working properly, I would have fluent speech. I have most certainly encountered emotional distress because of my stuttering. I must agree with those who believe that there is a genetic predisposition to the development of stuttering, which can be brought on by a traumatic childhood experience. I also have to share in another popular belief, which states that stuttering is a learned behavior, much as any behavior can be learned by the system of struggle and reward. In stuttering the struggle is the stutter itself and the reward is finally being able to say the word; hence stutterers have taught themselves to speak the way they do. Lastly, I am also convinced that there is something in my brain and the brains of stutterers that is different from the brains of those who do not stutter. This is the aspect of stuttering that is most intriguing to me.

There has been quite a bit of research, especially in the past ten years, addressing the various aspects of what is going on in the brain of a stutterer that is different from what is happening in the brain of a non-stutterer. Research has shown differences in regional glucose metabolism and regional cerebral blood flow, showing "atypical lateralization of speech and language functions in stuttering individuals." Other research has also observed excessive dopamine activity in the brains of stutterers. There have been varying degrees of success with drug therapy using a number of drugs from several different classes. Letters to scientific publications have been published on findings of drug-induced stuttering. There
have also been possible genetic correlations between polymorphisms of three different dopaminergic genes and stuttering.\(^{19}\)

Stuttering has long been known to be an inheritable trait, with many stutterers having a family history of the disorder. Dennis Drayna and colleagues are currently performing research at the NIH looking for the "stuttering gene." They are looking at DNA samples from families that have multiple generations of stutterers, attempting to identify the gene that may be associated with the genetic predisposition to this disorder.\(^{20}\) Not everyone with this predisposition will develop the disorder though, and this is where outside influences such as stressful childhood experiences can come into play. Many stutterers report having traumatic experiences around the age at which they developed stuttering. Often it can be moving to a new city, changing schools, domineering parents, etc.\(^3\)

Another genetic aspect of stuttering, although not directly linked to stuttering alone, has a link through patients with Tourette’s syndrome (TS), who show a number of secondary behaviors, with stuttering being one of the most common.\(^{19}\) The study carried out by David Commings and others investigated a linear relationship to polymorphisms of three dopaminergic genes—DRD2 (dopamine 2 receptor protein), DBH, (enzyme involved in the metabolism of dopamine), and DAT1 (dopamine transporter)—and the observed secondary behaviors associated with TS. They found that the D2A1 allele for the receptor protein had the greatest relationship to stuttering. This is of particular interest because excessive dopamine activity has been observed in the brains of stutterers,\(^8\) and haloperidol, the one drug that has seen the greatest promise of increasing the fluency of stutterers, has a significantly greater binding specificity for the D2 receptor over any of the other dopamine receptors.

These findings raise many questions. If there are multiple alleles for the D2 receptor protein, each causing only a minor change in the active site, could that lead to some of the differences observed in the effectiveness of drug therapy? If all of the drugs have the capacity for D2 binding, but with slightly different functional groups involved in the binding, could that explain the varying degrees of success with drug therapy? I am unaware if answers to these questions already exist; they likely need to be researched further. I am also interested to learn if these various drugs are even
involved in D2 binding at all? This will be addressed later in the paper. Do these pharmacological agents help to increase the metabolism of glucose? This is a valuable question, which is unfortunately beyond the scope of this paper. What are the similarities between the various drugs used for stuttering? Unfortunately, little is known about the precise mechanisms of action of these drugs. However, nearly all of them show CNS activity with the sites of action believed to be known. There has been success with calcium channel blockers, anti-anxiety drugs, anti-psychotics, acetylcholine (Ach) analogs, and acetylcholinesterase-inhibiting agents. Are Ach, dopamine activity, glucose metabolism and calcium channel regulation related? Does the stuttering cause the observed changes in brain chemistry/function or do the differences in brain chemistry/function cause the stuttering? Has the learned behavior, over time, caused the change in brain function? Has there been an inborn error in the development of the speech processing areas of the brains of stutterers? The answers to some of these questions still elude us, some already have answers, and others need further research. For example, because the exact mechanisms of action of many of these pharmaceuticals are not yet known, further research still needs to be done on this topic. All of the processes in our bodies are intricately linked and related. It can often be tough to separate one process from another, especially when, as we will see shortly, many of these drugs have very similar binding preferences for dopamine, serotonin, cholinergic and/or adrenergic receptors. Some of these drugs have only slightly improved the fluency of some stutterers, while others have had a greater success. Some have also caused an increase in the dysfluency of stutterers and non-stutterers. In general, all the drugs within any class tend to have very similar actions. It becomes easy to recognize the complexity of neurological disorders, particularly when there are many other underlying aspects, as in stuttering. The path to a more complete understanding of this disorder and to finding a cure has been and will continue to be arduous.

**Dopamine and Stuttering**

The dopamine hypothesis of stuttering has become increasingly popular. As previously mentioned, researchers have observed excessive dopamine activity in the
brains of stutterers, specifically in the medial prefrontal cortex, deep orbital cortex, insular cortex, extended amygdala, auditory cortex, and caudate tail. Most notably, the hyperactivity observed in ventral limbic cortical and subcortical regions (regions involved in verbalization) agrees with the overactive presynaptic dopamine system in stutterers. Some of these regions are indeed near to or part of the caudate region of the brain, an area which has been observed to have lowered glucose metabolism among stutterers when compared to non-stutterers. To further support the dopamine theory, the most successful pharmacological treatments have been with drugs that have strong affinities for the D2 receptors (e.g. the antipsychotics haloperidol and risperidone). Success has also been reported with other classes of drugs, and because of this, more research, both literature and laboratory, needs to be conducted involving the relationships between dopamine, acetylcholine, calcium channel regulation and glucose metabolism. One neuropharmacology book discusses the biochemical effects of stimulation of D2 receptors (Cooper et al. 1996). In the substantia nigra and ventral tegmental area (regions in the brain where lowered glucose metabolism has been observed in stutterers) the stimulation inhibits dopamine cell firing; in the cholinergic interneurons of the striatum, Ach release is inhibited. D2 stimulation also inhibits Ca\(^{2+}\) entry through voltage-sensitive calcium channels and decreases the concentration of cAMP through the inhibition of adenylate cyclase, the enzyme catalyzing the cyclization of ATP to cAMP.

**Pharmacology**

There have been a number of pharmacological agents that have had varying degrees of success in improving fluency in stutterers, whether it has been with great success among a small population or with small success among a large population. Just to complicate matters, some of these drugs have both improved fluency in stutterers and caused stuttering in patients who do not normally stutter. In all cases, whether the stuttering was improved or induced, the patients returned to their normal conditions when the drug therapy was discontinued.

[eight page review of specific drugs omitted; see conclusion for summary, p. 9]
Brain Differences

The previous section on the pharmacology of stuttering discussed aspects of some individual drugs that have had an effect on stuttering. To my eyes, important considerations about the places of action of these pharmacological agents must be made. When available, I have mentioned the regions of the brain where these drugs are believed to act, and in all cases which neurotransmitter receptors are targeted. These receptors are found in specific areas of the brain, and it is important to understand the neurotransmitter pathways and their relationships with the regions of the brain that are involved in aspects of speech, language, and motor control, especially the regions that have been observed to show deviant behavior among stutterers. Some of these regions have been observed to function “normally” under fluent speaking states, while others show the deviant behavior whether during stuttering or not. Only a brief summary of these regions of the brain is within the scope of this paper. Learning more about the functioning and malfunctioning of these specific regions, however, is extremely important in the understanding of this complex disorder.

One of the main differences in the brains of stutterers, whether when speaking fluently or during stuttered speech, is lowered glucose metabolism in the left caudate. Other regions with noticeable differences in glucose metabolism include “reversible metabolic hypoactivity in the left language circuit (Broca’s area and Wernicke’s area), and higher order association areas (superior frontal cortex).” The authors theorize that this may be involved in a “state dependant circuit that can be increased to normal function during induced fluent states.” There was “an increase to supranormal levels of substantia nigra/ventral tegmental area neuronal firing in the midbrain during the induced fluent state.” There was observed lowered activity in the right cerebellum as timing element/comparator corrector during stuttered speech as compared to induced fluency among stutterers, which was at normal levels when compared to the control group. Lastly, the limbic system, the emotional modulator, has increased activity when the stutterer is speaking fluently.
In a report written about two groups of researchers—Peter Fox and Roger Ingham, and Christy Ludlow and Allan Braun—Marcia Baringa discusses their findings of significant differences between stutterers and non-stutterers in the areas of the brain associated with speech and language production. In the areas associated with motor control and auditory language, brain activation was higher on the left side than on the right side for normal individuals, whereas in stutterers it was observed to be shared more equally between both sides. This difference persisted whether the stutterers were in a fluent or stuttering state:

During chorus reading [induced fluent state] the differences in the motor areas were less pronounced, but didn’t go away. In the auditory areas the difference between the stutterers and normal subjects was the same during chorus and solo reading: the stutterers’ left auditory speech areas were nearly silent, while those of the controls were highly active. . . . During chorus reading, the stutterers, like the controls, showed activation of their right auditory cortex in response to the recorded reading, which was piped into their left ears.29

According to Fox, stutterers are “not moving [the information] over to the left hemisphere,” where speech related auditory processing normally occurs.29

These findings support three different theories of stuttering. The increased activity in the right motor area supports the theory that stuttering is a motor problem, while the silence of the left auditory language area supports the theory that stuttering is also related to deficiencies in auditory feedback during speech. Thirdly, that stuttering arises from a failure to develop proper left hemisphere dominance for language is seen in the activation of right hemispheric speech generation. Christy Ludlow and Allan Braun have found similar results, and also believe that stuttering is apparently more than just a motor control problem; it is more an issue of the “system interface between language and speech.”29

Conclusion

There are some definite differences between the brain functions of stutterers and non-stutterers. Aside from differences in regions of the brain used in the generation and monitoring of speech, there has been observed hyperactivity of
dopamine at the D2 receptors. There have also been various successes with drug therapy, which unfortunately have not led to any concrete biochemical mechanisms of stuttering. Most of these drugs have CNS activity and often affect similar neurotransmitter pathways.

In summary, pharmacological agents with D2 blocking abilities have had the most success in the treatment of stuttering. Haloperidol blocks postsynaptic D2 receptors in the mesolimbic area, and also blocks D2 receptors in the nigrostriatal region. Risperidone may block cortical serotonin receptors and limbic dopamine receptors. Sertraline has an effect on dopamine systems in the substantia nigra through an SSRI mechanism. Phenothiazines are believed to block postsynaptic D2 receptors, but only a small number of studies have been conducted with this class of compounds. Phenelzine, an MAOI, has also not seen many clinical trials for use in stuttering therapy, but is believed to work through its antianxiety effects. Other antianxiety agents, such as alprazolam, have also contributed to successful drug therapy. Citalopram, which needs to be studied further for stuttering therapy, works by inhibiting serotonin reuptake. It is interesting that this drug has had some apparent success in treating stuttering, whereas other SSRIs have not. Clomiprimine has a fairly high selectivity for serotonergic reuptake inhibition, as well as having a high affinity for dopamine receptors. Bethanechol is an acetylcholine analog and has seen minor success in treating stuttering, even though it is not considered to be CNS active. Some acetylcholinesterase inhibitors have also had minor success, and although I have not pursued this avenue of drug therapy in this paper, it is worth being aware of.

At least two drugs with calcium channel blocking abilities have been used in stuttering therapy: haloperidol and verapamil. The mechanisms of calcium channel blocking would be interesting to pursue further, especially with its relationship to D2 stimulation. Conflicting ideas on the role of glutamic acid, the main inhibitory neurotransmitter, have been presented in the literature. Two articles report that glutamic acid was used successfully for stuttering, while another reports noticeable increases of glutamic acid in the plasma of stutterers. These two findings seem to contradict one another, and present another area that could benefit from further research.
It is apparent that there is still a great deal of work to be done in the area of biochemical mechanisms of stuttering and possible pharmacological treatment. Even with all that is known about stuttering, it is not enough to find a cure for it. We have been searching for cures for more than 2500 years, and although we have made considerable progress, we need to make considerably more.

Further Research

There are many questions that remain unanswered for me in my quest to understand why some people stutter. Some of these questions will be answered as I continue my education and others will require more laboratory research. I want to know what, if any, the relationships are, either directly or indirectly, between acetylcholine, dopamine and glucose metabolism. All of these have played a role, in some way or another, in either the mechanism of stuttering or pharmacological treatment of stuttering. Questions arise from the role of dopamine receptors, and the popular “hyperactive dopamine” theory of stuttering. Activation of D2 receptors decreases cAMP concentration; therefore, blocking those receptors would not have any net effect on cAMP concentration, so might increasing the concentration of cAMP improve fluency? Stimulation of D1 receptors increases cAMP concentration. How would D1 agonists affect stuttering? The left caudate region of the brain in stutterers appears to have a permanently decreased rate of glucose metabolism. Are there dopamine relationships to this? According to the article published by Nora Volkow (1997) on the effects of methylphenidate (Ritalin), increased metabolic rates were correlated to an increased number of D2 receptors.

Is there a lower density of D2 receptors in the left caudate of stutterers, thus causing a decrease in glucose metabolism? How could fewer D2 receptors show hyperactive dopamine activity and how do D2 blockers normalize that? If there are fewer D2 receptors present, it seems like there would be less D2 activity. Is there a relationship to D2 hyperactivity and glucose metabolism? I propose that such a relationship does exist. If there is excess dopamine activity, which lowers the concentration of cAMP by the inhibition of adenylate cyclase, which catalyzes the conversion of ATP to cAMP, one might expect to have a slightly higher concentration of ATP present. If excess ATP were present,
less energy would need to be produced in the brain by way of glucose metabolism. If this proposition is correct then one might expect to observe lower rates of glucose metabolism, as has been observed in stutterers. As has been pointed out, there are certainly regions of overlap where both dopamine hyperactivity and lowered glucose metabolism have been observed. Without a doubt more research needs to be conducted to further understand the relationships between D2 activity, glucose metabolism, and stuttering.

All of the questions I have posed throughout this paper are leading me towards areas of future study. I am interested in learning more about neurology, specifically the biochemical and pharmacological aspects. I want to learn more about the interactions between the various neurotransmitter pathways. Some of the pharmacological agents mentioned in this paper seem to affect presynaptic uptake while others affect postsynaptic. What are the different consequences of pre- and postsynaptic reuptake or activity?

I think it would be interesting to investigate Quantitative Structural Analysis Relationship (QSAR) properties between the pharmacological agents used in stuttering, comparing drugs that have improved fluency and those that have induced speech dysfluency. Are there relationships between drugs in different classes? Are there relationships to D2 binding? SSRI action? Adrenergic action? Activity of acetylcholine analogs?

Although a great deal is known about the various aspects of stuttering, and interactions of drugs and the brain, so much so that many important findings and discussions have been left out of this paper, we still have only scratched the surface on the topic. We have undeniably come a long way from theories of “arid tongues” and possession by evil spirits. Even though there are many theories that are more acceptable by today’s standards, we still do not know why people stutter, what its causes are, and how it can be cured. It has become my quest to help answer these three fundamental questions. With enough people in the world working towards understanding all the components of stuttering, we will one day be able to put the pieces together and have a complete understanding of the disorder. Until then... “th-th-that’s all folks!”
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Alice in Feminism

by Amber Myers

Most novels that are geared toward girls have plots centered on the traditional female roles of home, family, and harmony. Novels such as Heidi and Pollyanna are perfect examples of the traditional female role in action. The female is expected to be the harbinger of peace as well as the peacekeeper who establishes a loving home that had not existed previous to her arrival (Nodelman 74). The novel Alice in Wonderland by Lewis Carroll, however, is a different type of novel. None of the traditional roles apply to Alice, as she is interested in neither a home, a family, nor harmony. Her story, instead, can be seen as one of feminism, where the female casts off the traditional expectations and roles, and instead forges forward in her own adventure, seeking her own identity.

Although perhaps it could be considered a novel for girls, Alice in Wonderland strays away from the classic characteristics of a traditional girls’ novel. At each turn the story contradicts the traditional feminine caretaker role, and instead sets out in its own more feminist direction. According to the essay “Progressive Utopia: Or, How to Grow Up Without Growing Up,” by Perry Nodleman, in a traditional girls’ novel “Our heroine’s major talent is the ability to restore the past—to return grown-ups to the happiness they felt in their youth” (75). Alice, instead of restoring another character to his or her youth, restores herself. At the end of the novel when Alice is in the courtroom and is about to be beheaded, she causes herself to grow larger and confronts the deck of cards: “‘Who cares for you?’ said Alice (she had grown to her full size by this time). ‘You are nothing but a pack of cards!’” (97). In this scene Alice essentially “grows up” when she begins to get larger. Through “growing up” and confronting the reality that the intimidating Queen and guards were only a pack of cards, Alice restores herself to her natural state of being a child again in the real world. It is after this scene that Alice wakes up and realizes that Wonderland was all a dream, so instead of restoring a separate character to his or her childhood happiness, Alice restores herself to the happiness of reality. This example can be seen as one of feminism because in the traditional novel for girls, the main characters are always in
the female role of the caretaker. Although such a task may seem noble and altruistic, it is also the traditional task of women. By concentrating on her own situation and reality, Alice breaks away from the traditional role of the female caretaker, becoming the bold feminist.

The caretaker role is fairly common in novels written for girls. The difference in novels written for boys is startling, and includes the whole plot structure. According to Nodelman:

The classic novels for boys always start with their heroes leaving home, and describe their exciting confrontations with hardship and evil in wild, uncomfortable places, until they finally come home again... In boys' books, things start badly and get worse, almost until the very end. In these girls' books, things start well and get better almost until the very end. (78)

*Alice in Wonderland* breaks away from the traditional norm and dares to stray into the realm of the masculine. Alice's experiences in Wonderland follow the pattern of the plot in a novel written for boys. Alice, the heroine, begins by leaving home and venturing into Wonderland, where she experiences "exciting confrontations with hardship and evil in wild uncomfortable places..." Wonderland can definitely be considered a wild and uncomfortable place, and Alice's confrontations with various characters such as the Queen qualify as confronting evil. The ending, like that of a boys' novel, occurs when Alice returns home safely but with an adventure to tell.

The obvious plot connections to a novel written for boys make the feminist view of *Alice in Wonderland* stronger. In addition, all of the women in the novel are strong characters, and although they may seem to fill roles typical for women, upon closer examination it can be seen that they actually possess some of the traditional qualities assigned to men. The Duchess and the Cook, for example, seem to have the traditional roles of females. The Duchess is first seen caring for a baby, while the Cook is seen doing the traditional female chore of cooking (Carroll 47). Although taking care of a baby may seem very womanly and feminine, the Duchess can actually be associated with the male role because the baby turns into a pig. The care of the pig can be seen as both lowering her class status and as taking part in a chore that can be considered masculine. As a Duchess, it is highly unlikely that she would be caring for
livestock, since if she possessed any there would most likely be male servants assigned to the job. Her care of the pig both reinforces and demonstrates the feminist idea that a woman is capable of accomplishing anything that a man can accomplish. The Cook, on the other hand, is much more blatant about breaking the traditional female norm. She is violent “and at once set to work throwing everything within her reach at the Duchess and the baby…” (48). The Cook with her violent personality is by no means the image of the meek woman in the kitchen. Instead her feminism peers out from behind the image of a crone standing over a cauldron. The image of the Cook as a crone presents an image of female magic and power, rather than meekness and submission. The image of the potentially dangerous woman in charge is substituted for that of the male.

Alice’s cat Dinah is another example of the female characters breaking the gender roles of a female-oriented novel and stepping into the world of the masculine. A traditional girls’ novel would depict Dinah, a female cat, as something soft, fluffy, and sweet. In the beginning Alice does try to deliver the image of Dinah as a sweet kitten but always manages instead to portray her as a predator. While describing Dinah to a mouse Alice says, “She is such a dear thing… and she’s such a capital one for catching mice” (18). Instead of the image of the sweet girl kitten, we are suddenly presented with a more masculine image of a cat that hunts and catches mice. The image of the kitten as the huntress is a very feminist one. Again, it presents the idea that a female is capable of whatever feat a man is capable of accomplishing. The image of Dinah as a huntress is also more suited to a novel written for a male audience because it portrays that sense of wild adventure that a dainty, gentle, white kitten does not.

The Queen is also a very strong female character. She exercises her power over the King and also over all of the subjects. The Queen makes all of the decisions, including decisions on capital punishment. The wielding of the Queen’s power over the King can be seen as very feminist because she is a female ruler who claims to have more authority than the King. The shift of power between the King and the Queen is an example of the shifting of gender roles both in the world of feminism and in the novel itself. In the novel the King is portrayed as a hen-pecked husband who very
seldom has the opportunity to exercise any real power. The idea of the hen-pecked male can be seen throughout the novel in many of the male characters. The Queen, for example, treads on the White Rabbit not just because she has authority, but also because she uses that authority for purposes of intimidation. In the story only women ever stand up to the Queen. The Duchess is imprisoned because she does not leap to do the Queen’s bidding and is late to the croquet game, and Alice herself stands up to the Queen at the end of the novel when she declares that they are all just cards. So we can see that in the novel women possess positions of power, while the men have the positions of servitude.

Alice also has a position of power that relates to feminism. Alice doesn’t let herself be forced into the classic roles of either woman or child. She begins her own adventure by following the White Rabbit down the rabbit hole and taking the initiative to discover something new. She also is able to escape bad situations on her own without needing to be rescued, especially by a male. Her initiative to seek out adventure as well as her ability to rescue herself from bad situations can in some ways be equated to women in the executive work force, a very feminist issue. Like women in the executive work force, Alice takes her own aggressive steps towards success. She seeks out her job (following the White Rabbit) and sticks to her goal no matter what gets in the way (her size, her companions). Like women executives Alice is able to think her way out of tense situations just as any male could. She is not afraid to voice her opinion, and just as women executives have broken out of the role of secretary, Alice has broken out of the classic role of “children are to be seen and not heard.” Such a role could also be applied to secretaries, and like the women executives, who refuse to be ignored, Alice does not hesitate to voice her opinion or ask questions.

Alice takes the initiative and refuses to be stuck in the role of the meek female. She asks the question, “was I the same when I got up this morning? . . . Who in the world am I?” (15). With these questions Alice dares to think that she could be someone different; she dares to consider the possibilities. Just by considering those possibilities she is breaking away from the classic female image and daring to imagine something greater. Alice in Wonderland cannot be considered a classic novel for girls.
Instead it is a novel for girls who would dare to walk into the traditional male world, both through the structure of the story and the feminist ideas that permeate it. By reading about Alice's adventures, both girls and boys alike are asked to consider the very questions that Alice put to herself: "Was I the same when I got up this morning? Who in the world am I?" (15).
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The Great and Powerful Master of Evil and his Funnier, Weaker Apprentice—The Pretty-Bad Guy
by Julia Day

Here is the scene: a sinister and unhappy soldier is angered by the promotion of the General’s right-hand man. He feels that he is consistently under-appreciated and is infuriated by the lack of respect he believes lurks beneath everyone’s attitude towards him. The General, who he feels is unworthy of the position, and with whom he is disgusted, mainly for his popularity among the people, is the source of much of the soldier’s unhappiness. The General has kept him in a position of servitude while basking selfishly in undeserved glory. In other words, the soldier feels the General is the primary obstacle to his own happiness. He decides the best way to undo the General, and to punish those others who have helped to keep him from rising to the prestige he knows he deserves, is to destroy those around the General, and by weakening the foundation, topple the entire structure from which the General reigns. He undertakes a deceptive plot that will disturb the peace, chiefly through means of inciting jealousy and rashness, and create a situation of mistrust and mayhem, where those who were once friends and allies now are suspicious and hateful towards each other. In doing so, he brings down the reputation of an innocent woman, who is killed by the malicious lies this man speaks against her. However, the soldier’s plot is discovered and the General learns he has been deceived. He is filled with anger at being so deceived and remorse about the actions he has taken because of this false information, and he vows to punish the man severely.

The question here is, which Shakespeare play is this synopsis describing, *Othello* or *Much Ado about Nothing*? The answer depends on a few key details. If the girl is really dead, and the last line of the summary is, “The General kills himself, unable to live with his rash actions,” then this play is *Othello*. If, instead, the girl is not dead, but only reported dead, and the last line is, “The girl’s honor is restored, the intended marriage proceeds, all friendships are repaired in light of the truth,” then this play is *Much Ado About Nothing*. Strangely, these two seemingly very different plays,
one a comedy and one a tragedy, are remarkably similar in plot, especially concerning the malcontented villain who drives the plot in each of them. Don John from *Much Ado* and Iago from *Othello* are two of Shakespeare's most purely evil and spiteful malcontented villains.

Shakespeare's writing is marked by his inability (or unwillingness) to adhere completely to one genre of writing; his comedies include serious and disturbing violations of the rules of the comic world, and his tragedies are peppered with situations that, apart from their outcome, are very similar to the confusion, irony and humor that characterize a typical comedy. The characters of Don John and Iago are prime examples of this meshing of genres. Their characterizations, motives, deceptions, victims, and fates are strikingly similar; however, a few subtle details that do separate them change everything, and make the final outcome of one play a comedy, and the other a tragedy. The main factors that separate Don John and Iago are their style and skill at villainy and deception, the world that they operate within, and their positioning in the play and the resulting relationship they have to the audience.

Although the similarities between these two villains are much more extensive than their differences, the most interesting aspects of their characters (and results of their actions) lie in their differences. Therefore, I will briefly summarize their similarities to begin, and then move on to discuss their differences. The characterizations of Don John and Iago are identical in many aspects. Both are in the company of soldiers centered around a general. They are both jealous of the general's position as beloved, popular, and successful leader, and feel his power and his preference for another soldier have robbed them of their rightful position of power and prestige. Both have a direct source of their feelings of inferiority: Don John is a bastard whose legitimate brother gets all the power; Iago is a white man who watches as the most powerful position, and all its benefits, is won by a man who he believes is culturally and racially inferior. They impose on themselves a sort of outcast status, making them unable to participate in the joys and successes of those around them. As Don John says, "I had rather be a canker in a hedge than a rose in his grace" (*Much Ado* i.iii.25-26). Their only happiness lies in bringing about the destruction of all of
those who have stood in their way, and most importantly, the General himself. There
is also a hint in both of them of wanting to be emotionally closer to the man in power
and to be accepted as his right-hand man and confidant; the sense of rejection they feel
at not having this position causes them to lash out. It is a sort of stalker mentality: "If
I can’t be your number one man, no one else can either.” They are unhappy with the
order as it is, and so seek to destroy that order. In choosing their victims, they aim for
the support system of the General, and so attack those right-hand men they feel have
usurped their positions and indirectly also attack the General. Both know what they
are doing is bad, and rather than feel any guilt about it, revel in and enjoy their
deception and the chaos it produces. Don John states, “Any bar, any cross, any
impediment will be medicinal to me” (Much Ado II.ii. 4-5). Iago, after planning the
fight that undoes Cassio, speaks of his enjoyment, saying, “By the mass, ’tis morning!
/ Pleasure and action make the hours seem short” (Othello II.iii.365-366).

When it comes down to it, in a Battle of Villains—a test to see who is more
cunningly, deeply, truly evil—Iago would win, hands down. In comparing their style
of and skill at deception and evil, it is clear that Iago’s skill and style shift the mood of
Othello to a much more sinister and tragic one than that of Much Ado. Don John
begins his villainy on a small scale—he tells Claudio that the prince has wooed for
himself. When that fails to pan out, he looks for larger mischief. His plot is aimed at
general destruction, and not at some specific goal for himself. He is not a charmer and
does not care how others view him: “...it better fits my blood to be disdained by all
than to fashion a carriage to rob love from any” (Much Ado I.iii.26-27). He relies on
simple visual tricks and deceptions for his plots. Further, it is his followers who spur
him to action, not his own initiative. When he is complaining of his situation to one of
his men, the man asks in response, “Can you make no use of your discontent?” (Much
Ado I.iii.35). It is also his follower Borachio who uncovers the information they use,
and who devises and carries out the scheme, which is merely supported and paid for
by Don John. The plot relies mostly on visual “proof” of the adultery and is more
initially deceptive than Iago’s, in the sense that he uses believable evidence that is
completely false but designed to beguile. Don John’s intentions are not entirely
without conscience—he does not want to be the direct cause of the death of anyone,
just the indirect author of their destruction. In the end, it is the blundering and foolish watchmen who uncover the plot and turn them in, adding the comic aspect of the silly fools outwitting the crafty villains. In the end, he is cowardly and runs when he learns the plot is discovered.

Don John is hardly the defiant and brilliant Master of Evil that Iago is. Iago works from the inside, carefully maintaining his position of respect and trust while carrying out his evil plot; he is much more deceptive because of this. He explains his position to Roderigo, saying, "In following him I follow but myself. / Heaven is my judge, not I for love and duty, / But seeming so, for my peculiar end ..." (Othello I.i.57-59). Rather than relying on visual tricks, Iago’s deception relies on his brilliant understanding of the human mind and its weaknesses. He is not cowardly; he carries out his own schemes whenever possible. He also doesn’t need to pay any of the people he uses as pawns in his plot, but is able to incite them to perform his will using their own emotions and desires. He most often uses Roderigo and his lust for Desdemona in this way. Iago even gets him to attempt to kill Cassio for him, saying of Othello, "...he goes into Mauritania and taketh away with him the fair Desdemona, unless his abode be lingered here by some accident; wherein none can be so determinate as the removing of Cassio" (Othello IV.ii.224-227). He is clever enough to stand face to face with Othello and plant the seeds of his destruction, while all the time painting himself as the loyal hero. Iago tempers his jealousy-inciting words by constantly halting and undercutting himself and causing Othello to take the bait even more, saying things like, "...but I am much to blame. / I humbly do beseech your pardon / For too much loving you" (Othello III.iii.211-213). His deception latches on to the weaknesses of those he wants to destroy, in effect causing them to destroy themselves. Iago’s plots are calculated and exact, and aimed at benefiting himself, monetarily and in position and power. He does not waste a plan of destruction just for the sake of destruction, but finds ways to gain from all that he destroys. For example, after convincing Othello of Desdemona’s unfaithfulness, Othello tells him, "I will withdraw / to furnish me with some swift means of death / for the fair devil. Now art thou my lieutenant" (Othello III.iii.476-479). He is also much more serious and
murderous in his intentions and involvement than Don John is. Iago is willing to murder to achieve his goals, as he explains to us about Roderigo:

Now whether he kill Cassio,
Or Cassio him, or each do kill the other,
Every way makes my gain. Live Roderigo,
He calls me to a restitution large
Of gold and jewels that I bobbed from him
As gifts to Desdemona.
It must not be. If Cassio do remain,
He hath a daily beauty in his life
That makes me ugly; and besides, the Moor
May unfold me to him; there stand I in much peril.
No, he must die. (Othello V.i.12-22).

In the end, he is discovered, but only after his plan has been successfully carried out. His discovery is also only possible through the brave sacrificial move of his wife, who learns the truth when she realizes her involvement in the plan. Only someone from the inside could have cracked through and seen the nearly imperceptible trail, so careful was he to cover his tracks.

The worlds that these two villains operate in, though containing only subtle differences, result in some of the biggest differences between them. The chiefly comic element that separates Much Ado from Othello is that, from the outset, the order that exists in that world is accepted and secure. The order is disturbed by a villain, but restored at the end, a fact that makes everyone happy. Conversely, in Othello the play opens with a natural order that includes severely unjust elements. The world is unstable and not everyone is contented with it. Othello’s “inferiority” is accepted only because he is needed desperately to fight the wars going on, and his marriage to Desdemona is only begrudgingly tolerated. In the end, when order is restored, it doesn’t have a reassuring sense of being an order that is either stable or desirable. The audience is left feeling unsure as to whether evil has been vanquished, especially considering that the racial problem was never dealt with, only removed.
Another difference in these two worlds is the level of separation between good and evil. While both of the villains are very clearly evil, in Much Ado there is a very definite split between the “good guys” and the “bad guys.” Don John and his men are bad, the rest of the characters are good and fall victim to the bad guys. The character flaws that are revealed by the deceptions, such as Claudio’s rash and cruel shaming of Hero, are easily forgiven in the world of the play as merely being the result of someone else’s villainous action. As the waiting woman tells Beatrice, “It is proved my Lady, Hero hath been falsely accused, the Prince and Claudio mightily abused, and Don John is the author of all, who is fled and gone” (Much Ado V.ii.87-89). In Othello, Othello himself is neither clearly good nor bad. We initially see him as a hero who must battle social prejudice but has enough heroic qualities to make him triumph in spite of these obstacles. However, he is very easily led from his noble characteristics and quickly turns to a cruel, rash, and jealous barbarian. When Desdemona discusses Othello’s strange behavior with Emilia, she says she has done nothing to incite his jealousy, to which Emilia replies, “But jealous souls will not be answered so; / They are not ever jealous for the cause. / But jealous for they’re jealous. It is a monster / Begot upon itself, born on itself” (Othello III.iv.158-161). In this world, faults revealed by a deceiver are not so easily forgiven. In Much Ado, Hero dies of grief; in Othello, we have a direct murderer of Desdemona. This blurring of the lines of good and evil makes the end more tragic; we are sorry that things turned out as they did, but cannot entirely blame Iago the way we can entirely blame Don John.

Another of the distinct differences between Iago and Don John is their positioning within the play and their resulting relationship to the audience. In Othello, Iago is the main protagonist throughout the first half of the play. We, the audience, see much of the action unfold through his eyes, and hear, through monologues, his private thoughts and feelings. Iago builds intimacy through these monologues, in which he analyzes himself and his unhappiness with many specific reasons, from his belief that Othello may have slept with his wife, to the promotion of Cassio. He has no confidant other than the audience, and stands as a lone villain, describing his plans only to us. Don John, on the other hand, has a whole band of conspirators, whom he
confides in and plans with. There is not nearly the level of intimacy created between Don John and the audience that Iago has. Also, Don John is a catalyst for almost all of the action in Much Ado, but is a minor character, with few lines and scant stage time. We never hear a specific single cause of Don John’s injury, but rather glean a general idea of his attitudes thorough ambiguous speeches about his unhappiness. This difference creates a vastly different perception on the part of the audience; the dramatic irony is much more intense when the audience is so acutely aware of Iago’s deception and the cruel and remorseless ways in which his mind works.

In Much Ado, we know about the plans of Don John, while the rest of the characters don’t, creating some level of dramatic irony. Still, they know that he has been newly reconciled with his brother, after having rebelled, and is viewed with suspicion and knowledge of his potential for evil. He has been constrained by his brother and is not free to act out directly against him, a fact that is also known to everyone. And so he must resort to deceptive plots rather than straightforward rebellion. However, in Othello, not only do the other characters not know about Iago’s plotting, they are also completely unaware that Iago is a villain. He is everyone’s most trusted confidant, friend, and advisor. He is the one they call for help with the problems they are having, unaware that he is the same one who orchestrated those problems. This produces a much more tragic situation, when the characters trust Iago completely and then come to learn that not only were they deceived and played upon, but that it was done by someone whom they believed to be honest and trustworthy.

Their subtle differences aside, is the true separation between these two plays merely a plot twist? If Emilia had come in a few moments earlier and talked with Othello, would the truth have been uncovered, the murder stopped, order restored, and a jolly feast shared by all except the outcast villain? If, by a twist of plot, Hero had actually died, would Much Ado be a bitter tragedy, in which Benedick kills Claudio, and Leonato kills himself? The answer is yes and no. It is impossible to speculate on what plot twists Shakespeare could have included to change the nature of a play. It is true that his comedies are often only a few steps away from tragedy and vice versa. This adds to the depth and intrigue of all of his plays. But each of these plays is
carefully constructed to include characterization, details, and plot structure that make a play’s fate as comedy or tragedy inevitable. In *Much Ado*, the complications that ensue from the jealous, nondescript, and inept villainy of Don John are all based on deceptions that people see, or think they see, which are organized by Don John. They then act on what they believe they saw, making them do cruel things they would not otherwise have done. When they are informed of their incorrect perceptions, all of the blame shifts to the villain, amends are made, and happiness is restored. In this world, comedy reigns at last. *Othello*, on the other hand, begins with a setting of strife, which Iago feeds off of, seeking out ways to make people suffer for his suffering while raising his own position in society. He zeroes in on people’s weaknesses, and deceives them, not with things they see, but rather with things he incites them to feel and imagine. This deception is much more sinister, because although Iago plants the seeds, it is the deceived persons who nourish the seeds and make them grow. Their weaknesses are harvested and Iago turns them loose upon themselves and each other, to destroy themselves with the weapons he has handed them. This makes the situation much more complex and tragic. Each character that falls does have a tragic flaw; Iago just brings it out. Even when the deception is uncovered, the blame for what has happened, though rooted in Iago, still falls on many heads. A semblance of order is restored, but order was not a happy, stable thing to begin with. An unsettling sense of human weakness, prejudice, and suffering pervades in the end. This play is tragic from the first to the last.
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Beloved Is Memory
by Ida Logan

Slave narratives deal with the memory and past lives of former slaves. Traumatized by slavery, many chose to forget the horrific events that befell them, keeping these memories hidden from future generations. However, forgetting the past is to shut off part of your identity. In the novel Beloved, Sethe, a runaway slave mother, chooses to forget the memory of her slave days and the pains associated with it. When Sethe suppresses her memories, her daughter Denver never gets a chance to find her identity because she doesn’t know her ancestral heritage. Paul D, a former slave and runaway convict, also decides to lock his memories away. Together at 124 Bluestone Rd., Sethe, Paul D, and Denver all try to move on into the future, but cannot because past memories haunt them. The arrival of Beloved, an ambiguous character who seems “otherworldly,” serves as the “rememory” of the other characters as well as the reader.

Beloved, the mysterious woman with no past, new skin, and no lines on her hands, affects everyone she encounters, making some feel uneasy and some at ease. Beloved forces Paul D to confront a past marked by dehumanizing treatment. Paul D doesn’t want to remember being seen as inferior to Mister, the old rooster at Sweet Home; he doesn’t want to remember the sexual molestation rampant in the prison in Georgia; he doesn’t want to remember running away just to be free. Paul D locks up his memories in the tin box that replaces his heart in an attempt to feel secure in calling himself a man as well as beginning his life anew:

It was some time before he could put Alfred, Georgia, Sixo, schoolteacher, Halle, his brothers, Sethe, Mister, the taste of iron, the sight of butter, the smell of hickory, notebook paper, one by one, into the tobacco tin lodged in his chest. By the time he got to 124 nothing in this world could pry it open. (113)
Paul D feels that if he can keep these feelings locked up, he might control one thing: the way others view him as being less than a man. Then Beloved arrives. With her presence, Beloved calls forth Paul D's memories and his insecurities, the same memories and insecurities he thought he had locked up forever:

She moved closer with a footfall he didn't hear and he didn't hear the whisper that the flakes of rust made either as they fell away from the seams of his tobacco tin. So when the lid gave he didn't know it. (117)

With every one of her actions, Beloved slowly chips away at his tin box until finally the box opens and all of Paul D's memories and fears spill out. Faced with these memories and fears, Paul D reverts to running away from them. But Paul D can't run and he sure can't hide. Paul D needs to open the tin box, to face his fears, so he can move into the future with the little bit of manhood, or humanity, left for him by Sethe and found by Beloved. Only then can Paul D "put his story next to Sethe's" (273). By confronting the past, Paul D creates the possibility for a normal life with Sethe.

Unlike Paul D, Denver is in love the moment Beloved arrives. Finally there is someone for her. Every other visitor to the house is for Sethe, if there is a visitor. Denver has always been alone. Her older sister was slain, her brothers ran away, and she knew nothing of her past, except of her birth, all because of Sethe's reluctance to remember her own traumas. Sethe warns Denver about remembering the past:

The picture is still there and what's more, if you go there—you who never was there—if you go there and stand in that place where it was, it will happen again; it will be there for you, waiting for you. So, Denver, you can't never go there. Never. (36)

Denver feels she doesn't have a connection to anything. Everyone knows something of her and of her family except her. Beloved is Denver's link to her past and ultimately her identity. With every story that Beloved asks Sethe to retell, Denver learns more about her mother as well as more about herself. As a result, Denver wants Beloved for herself. She feels that Beloved is what she's been missing all her life: a connection to the past, to her history. However when it becomes apparent that Beloved is not there for her company, but for the company of Sethe, Denver finds herself feeling alone. What Denver fails to realize is that she knew about herself all
along. In Denver's mind, Baby Suggs, her deceased grandmother, encourages her to seek the past through self-knowledge:

"You mean I never told you nothing about Carolina? About your daddy? You don't remember nothing about how come I walk the way I do and about your mother's feet, not to speak of her back? I never told you all that?"

"But you said there was no defense."

"There ain't."

"Then what do I do?"

"Know it..." (244)

This is a new feeling, for Denver to look out for and preserve self (252). Denver is finally able to feel that she does have a link in the world and if she can't save herself, there won't be any Denver to speak of.

In contrast to the past-seeking Denver, Sethe suppresses her memories because all they do is bring pain. Her past is associated with loss; the loss of her own mother, her husband, her mother-in-law, her daughter, and her two sons. The Misery, the name given to the brutal murder of Sethe's older daughter by her own hand, is Sethe's worst memory. Sethe's greatest fear is facing the past and dealing with white people who could "dirty you so bad," you had no recollection of who you were (251). Sethe lives an isolated life for eighteen years before the arrival of the mysterious woman who calls herself Beloved. She feels very comfortable around Beloved, almost like she is one of her own. As she did with Paul D, Beloved makes Sethe remember, and when Sethe begins to remember, she realizes that Beloved is the daughter she killed. Remembering reverts Sethe into the past. She becomes desperate, afraid that Beloved is going to leave for good before Sethe can tell Beloved the reasons she "dragged the teeth of the hand saw across her throat," taking her life. Sethe's main reason for killing Beloved at the time is that

...anybody white could take your whole self for anything that came to mind...Dirty you so bad you couldn't like yourself anymore. Dirty you so bad you forgot who you were and couldn't think it up. And though she and others had lived through and got over it, she could never let it happen to her own.

(251)
Sethe, however, cannot come to terms with the past. She is unable to move, consumed by her memories and fears. When Beloved leaves, Sethe feels that white people finally get her best thing, her life. Sethe decides to just lie down and die.

Beloved also affects the reader. She may make some feel uneasy or at ease. For the reader, Beloved represents the missing piece of history that slave narratives try to fill: the voyage from Africa to America, also called the Middle Passage. Morrison uses Beloved to tell the story of a slave traveling across the Middle Passage. Beloved remembers being in a crouching position with no room to move, people dying on top of others, starvation, sea burials, and suicides on a massive scale (210-213). This is a significant piece of history that America attempts to suppress. This memory of the Middle Passage not only affects those with African ancestry but the rest of America as well. The events of the Middle Passage are not only part of American history, but also part of America's identity. Other countries enslaved humans from other lands as well as their own for an economic advantage. However, the memory of the Middle Passage and the enslavement of blacks in America set the precedent for the demand for human rights.

Beloved is memory in human form. She is Paul D’s memory, Denver’s identity, Sethe’s fear of the past, as well as the reader’s missing piece of history and identity. Paul D realizes that although many may attempt to take away his manhood and succeed, Sethe always gives it back to him. Denver realizes that she knows more about her life than she remembers. When she decides to leave the house for the first time in a long time, she finds her own identity. Although Sethe is trapped in her memories, Paul D will be there to help her confront them. When Paul D, Denver, and Sethe come to terms with their memories, or lack thereof, Beloved disappears. She is no longer needed for the characters to move on into the future. She will not, however, disappear for the reader because not everyone has come to terms with the historical memories of America. These missing pieces of history not only directly affected the slaves and slave traders during that time, but also affect later generations indirectly. Until America can admit and acknowledge these missing pieces of history, many more slave narratives will be written, published, and read.
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Don’t Touch My Pancakes: The Evolution of the American Weekend
by Antonia Oakley

To understand the week’s end, we must first examine the week’s beginnings. Not based on the moon, as is a month, or the sun, as is a day, the week is a creation born of necessity: a way to break down the passage of time between the day and the month, an organizational tool to help us harried mortals collect our thoughts and organize our actions. The seven-day span of a week, used early by Romans and Jews, sprang up sometime around the birth of Christ. Seven was a mythic number, representing seven animated celestial bodies, and allowing those of Jewish faith to observe the biblical rite of a seventh-day Sabbath of rest and consecration (Rybczynski 39). This mythic seven-day cycle still reigns today, observed and entertained in a different light, but revered just as strongly as it is in Genesis. To the idea of the common week, we contemporary timekeepers have added a new concept, that of Saturday and Sunday—the weekend. Fiercely guarded and fraught with cultural significance, the weekend stands today as a seminal force in human life—a time to work, a time to relax, and most of all, a time to define ourselves.

The evolution of the weekend phenomenon has paraded on since the eighteenth century. The Reformation and Puritanism called for a split from the many Catholic holy days, and Sunday became a day off from work, a day reserved for Christian worship (43). What Sunday became, a day of fraternization in both pew and pub, was inevitable. Free time led to high times, and post-payday fun needed another day to continue. Thus, “keeping Saint Monday” came into vogue, as workers took Mondays off for fun and festival (43). Around 1850, the popularity of leisure weekends soared, and in England a Saturday “half-holiday” began to gain supporters (44). In America, this half-day evolved to a whole day, in order to let a growing number of Jewish immigrant workers stay home and observe their Saturday Sabbath.

As leisure time became a more normalized, weekly occurrence in Western society, so too did the leisure industry. Says author Witold Rybczynski, “the modern
idea of personal leisure emerged at the same time as the business of leisure. The first
could not have happened without the second” (44). Nothing could be truer. Festivals,
sporting events, widely read books, and magazines all contributed to the thirst for
leisure time, as well as to the ability of leisure activities to be profitable in the business
sector. Interestingly, it was not an increase in per capita wealth but a decrease that
finally cemented the Saturday/Sunday weekend into the foundation of American life.
This happened as a result of the Great Depression of the 1930s—job sharing and
shorter hours made a weekly weekend necessary to preserve as many jobs as
possible (46).

As the U.S. economy recovered and grew, so too grew the U.S leisure
economy and fan base. As work hours increase, a desire for the “freedom” of leisure
time increases also. Leisure is expensive: as Rybczynski notes, “in 1989 Americans
spent more than $13 billion on sports clothing,” and ski passes, summerhouses, and
golf clubs don’t come cheaply either. It is an ironic cycle today’s workers are cast
into—working more hours to make more money to spend on the decreasing hours they
have free. A strange race has begun to fit every desired leisure activity into an
overnight bag decreasing in size. “Time is money” rings too true. Says Rybczynski,
“The freedom to do nothing has become an obligation to do something” (50). Not just
the inescapable weekend chores, not reading or taking a nap, but something more,
something different, something to tell of one’s self around Monday’s water cooler.

This “weekend warrior” mentality, this middle-class desire for excitement and
personal gain, has its roots deep in the soil of the oft-bruised American psyche. Since
the Industrial Revolution, Americans have looked toward leisure time for a connection
to their own bodies and to their own sense of time—connections absent in mechanized
labor. Rybczynski points out that this disconnection has only grown, as computers
take the personal connection and memory out of many middle-class jobs (50).
Perhaps the most sought-after product of the middle-class weekend, however, is a
sense of personal accomplishment and definition. A bored store clerk becomes a
black-diamond skier, a burnt-out administrator becomes a master woodworker, and a
tollbooth operator becomes a soccer mom.
As more and more cultures, personalities, and religions are added to the American melting pot, the Sabbath bent of the weekend may dwindle, but the lust for leisure certainly will not. This world is a rough place, the weeks filled with market watches and traffic jams. The weekend hamper fills higher and higher, the dishes need washing, and the tires need air. But don’t touch my Saturday pancakes, we say, don’t block my Sunday hike. I’ll do the grocery shopping, I’ll write the essay, I might even go to church—but I’ll do all this on my own time. The weekend may not be a birthright. It is not void of work or commercialism. It may someday disappear, but for now Saturday and Sunday belong to the great middle classes of the greater western world. The week and weekend form the true circle of American life, a cycle of work and play that makes homes hospitable and lives livable. Let the circle remain unbroken—at least for a few hundred more years.
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