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The Shrewd One

The journey of one man has been sung and read for nearly three thousand years. *The Odyssey* is a 24-book epic poem about a king, husband, and father’s journey home after the Trojan War. The Telemachia is comprised of the first four books in the poem and describes the conflicts Odysseus’ wife and son endure in Ithaca as Athena conspires with Zeus to help him home. Suitors have tried to take his place on the throne and as the husband of Penelope. Telemachus is sick of their mistreatment so he gathers men with the help of Athena and departs on a journey to find out more about his father. The Telemachia introduces the suitors’ attempt to replace the respected, accomplished, clever hero.

Telemachus was just a boy when Odysseus left to fight in the Trojan War. Everything he knows about his father is from stories—stories of how his bravery and cleverness led him to marry Penelope, become King of Ithaca, and to defeat of the Trojans. Most people who met brave Odysseus told wild stories of how he changed their lives. When Athena pleads for Zeus to free Odysseus, he commends his offerings and says, ”He is more sensible than other humans / and makes more sacrifices to the gods” (1.65-66). For the goddess of wisdom and war strategy and the ruler of all gods to sing his praises means he is remarkable. Odysseus leaves a lasting impression on everyone he encounters: gods, immortals, warriors, and kings. The ruddy Menelaus, king of Sparta, tells Telemachus of his respect and sympathy for Odysseus: “I miss them all / but one man the most. When I remember him /
I cannot eat or sleep, since no one labored / like him—Odysseus. His destiny / was suffering, and mine that endless pain / of missing him. We do not even know / if he is still alive” (4.103-109). Like many others, Menelaus witnessed Odysseus’ cleverness in action, leading to the defeat of the Trojans. The Telemachia illustrates the positive impact the poem’s hero has had on so many.

In the absence of Odysseus, many suitors have practically moved into his and Penelope's home. They refuse to leave unless Penelope picks one of them to be her husband—and therefore king. She is still deeply in love with Odysseus and tries to stall, but her plan unravels when a maid tells the suitors that she is unweaving Laertes’ burial shroud in secret. Telemachus explains to Athena, in the guise of Mentes, that “these men are only interested in music / a life of ease. They make no contribution. / This food belongs to someone else, a man / whose white bones may be lying in the rain / or sunk beneath the waves. If they saw him / return to Ithaca, they would all pray for faster feet” (1.159-165). The suitors know they should not be in the house of a hero, but they carry on as if he was dead. Many people, and some gods, do not agree with the suitors’ actions, including Telemachus. In his mind he “[sees] his father / coming home from somewhere, scattering the suitors, / and gaining back his honor, and control / of all his property” (1.114-117). Telemachus does not want his father to come home to all these men in his house, and by the end of Book 2 he speaks his mind to the suitors before sailing to Pylos and Sparta to

Without the Telemachia, Zeus and Athena’s respect for Odysseus, Penelope’s loyalty, his son’s yearning for his return, and the tension with the suitors would not be apparent. The Telemachia adds perspective, details about characters, and foreshadows the great King Odysseus’ slaughter of the suitors for his continued reign. These four books detail the coming of age of Telemachus and also set the stage for the great homecoming of Odysseus. Thanks to
Odyssey’s shrewdness as a character and Homer’s structured storytelling, this hero’s journey will be read for another three thousand years.
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The novel *Purple Hibiscus* by Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie is about a wealthy Nigerian family with a well connected, extremely religious father, Eugene. From an external perspective, they were the perfect family, with a big house, a personal driver, and seemingly all the money in the world. Nobody seemed to know that Eugene was very abusive, both physically and emotionally. Throughout the novel instances of abuse increase in intensity. In self defense, his wife, Beatrice, poisons him. The morality of this is complex, because while she protected the rest of her family from abuse, she also took someone else’s life. Beatrice’s killing of Eugene was necessary because there was a chance that he would murder one or all of them, and there was no way for her to escape the abusive marriage.

Beatrice is not physically, socially, or economically capable of escaping her abusive marriage any other way. Eugene is physically larger than Beatrice, and it would be difficult for her to fight him. Eugene is also substantially more well known, he had a good reputation with the community and donated lots of money to those in need. In addition, Beatrice is less involved in the community and has no reputation. If Beatrice were to report Eugene to someone, such as an authority or a trusted friend, they would be less likely to believe her because he is viewed as an upstanding member of the community. In addition, Beatrice financially relies on Eugene, she would be unable to run away from him because he controls the funds. If it is out of the question
for Beatrice to physically fight him, out of the question to tell others about his abusive behavior, and it is also out of the question for her to run away from him, one fairly simple and plausible solution is to end his life.

Eugene was both emotionally and physically abusive, justifying his treatment of his family on religious grounds, making him capable of killing his family. His immense desire to be in control causes him to make extremely strict schedules for both of his children. (Chimamanda 23) These schedules were enforced by both him and the family’s chauffeur. (Chimamanda 69) Eugene was extremely religious and prayed in a nearly fanatical fashion. Eugene’s obsession with religion controlled even the smallest aspects of his family’s life, for example, when they could eat and what they could or could not wear. (Chimamanda 80) His zealotry also made him believe that his hand was the hand of God, that when he would punish his children for their “sins” it was God’s will. This turned the positivity and love of religion into a tool of oppression. He was manipulative to his children, after he hurt them, he would cry and apologize to them saying he wished he didn’t have to. (Chimamanda 195) Furthermore, he forced silence on the family; they were only supposed to speak when spoken to. (Chimamanda 120)

Eugene’s physical abuse of his family was sometimes so severe that it led to their hospitalization. (Chimamanda 210) He caused not one, but two miscarriages, a few broken ribs and internal bleeding, among many other injuries. Eugene was obsessed with having control over his family. He abused them over even the slightest “offenses” such as asking to wait in the car, or eating a bowl of cereal. For instance, when Beatrice asked to stay in the car instead of going to see Father Benedict because she was afraid she was going to vomit, Eugene beat her immensely, and she had a miscarriage. (Chimamanda 34) In another instance, Kambili was in pain and needed to take medication, to do this she needed to eat. Kambili ate a bowl of cereal before
receiving Communion, and Eugene hit her, Beatrice, and Jaja, with a belt. (Chimamanda 194) In many other instances Eugene hurt his family members, and the beatings continued to get worse. With no way of knowing when Eugene would stop, or if he would stop at all, Beatrice had to take action.

There are many oppositions to Beatrice’s behavior, but each of them can be refuted. Some may argue that Beatrice should not have poisoned Eugene in the first place, that you should never take someone else’s life. Yet, had Beatrice not stopped him, he may have come very close to killing all three of them. One may point out that if Beatrice was going to poison Eugene, she should have used a faster acting poison, since it is more torturous to kill someone over time. However, it provided Beatrice a distance from his murder, and using a milder poison would avoid accidentally killing her children, since they were also drinking out of his tea cup. Another argument is that Beatrice should have tried to help Eugene overcome his historical abuse before simply killing him. Though trying to help Eugene may have made things worse. There is also a possibility that Eugene did not want to heal, or that he wanted to have an excuse for his behavior.

According to an article written by the Saprea editorial team, “In her book Predators, Anna C. Salter talks about how most men convicted of child sexual abuse will simply say that they were abused as children because it affords them more sympathy. In reality, fewer than 10% of them actually were.” (Saprea) While Eugene may have actually been abused, it does not necessarily mean that it is the reason for his abusive behavior, nor is it an excuse for said abusive behavior. (Chimamanda 196) Although Eugene's historic abuse was not sexual, it was surrounding sexual behavior.

Another reason for Beatrice’s actions is that she may have reached her breaking point with the abuse and it pushed her to murder, her own physical abuse was one thing, but when it
came to the life of her unborn child, it was unbearable. Although some may argue that Eugene causing Beatrice’s miscarriage was not as serious as murder of an already living human being. This argument is weak because Eugene is a Catholic and is most likely anti-abortion. According to Catholic teaching, a fetus is no less human than a grown man. Additionally, Beatrice had been trying to have a child for a very long time, and miscarriages can take a very large mental toll on many people. This is especially true if having children had been a point of stress in the past. In an article by Annete Kersting and Birgit Wagner, it shows that grief after a miscarriage can increase tension in a relationship, “Studies have revealed that men and women show different patterns of grief, potentially exacerbating decline in a relationship.”(Kersting and Wagner) Since there is already a great deal of stress between Eugene and Beatrice, the miscarriage could only make it worse, possibly pushing Beatrice to her breaking point. She had put up with the abuse of herself and her children for quite a long time, this particular instance may have been what pushed her to the point where she would consider murder. Though perhaps this incident wasn’t what pushed her over the edge, maybe it was the second miscarriage Eugene caused. (Chimamanda 29)

Had Beatrice not killed her husband, much more danger would have come to the whole family. Even with the moral arguments that it is inappropriate to take a life under any circumstance, and that two wrongs don’t make a right, Beatrice was put in a position with no option other than to kill Eugene in self defense. The remaining Achikes were happier and, most importantly, safer after his death. It freed them from something that could have easily been fatal.
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Melancholy and Masked

In the novel *Passing* by Nella Larsen, Clare Kendry, one of the main characters, choses to pass for white woman and marry a wealthy white man who is unaware of her race. For Clare, this is not only dangerous, but detrimental to her mental health because she has lost an extremely important piece of her identity and is struggling to find a way to reconnect herself with her past. While many African-Americans chose to pass like Clare, those who didn’t pass for white could also find themselves concealing pieces of their lives like their emotions. Authors like Nella Larsen and Paul Laurence Dunbar explore these forms of passing in their literature and share the common theme of Black Americans hiding aspects of their lives to present a certain image to those around them. Through Nella Larsen’s use of masked imagery, she joins Paul Lawrence Dunbar in exploring hidden Black identities.

Literature from the Harlem Renaissance is incredibly important to the understanding of the lives of Black Americans during the early 1900s. Around 1910, new job opportunities in the North along with segregation and Jim Crow laws in the South led to The Great Migration in which African-Americans fled the South seeking economic opportunities and a safer environment. Harlem, a New York neighborhood in North Manhattan, became a place for African-Americans to share and develop their artistic styles and ideas. During this time, music, performing arts, and visual arts flourished in the Harlem neighborhood, and artists and authors like Langston Hughes created famous literary works that are still praised today. Perhaps the most
important thing about the Harlem Renaissance was that these authors were able to present the African-American narrative to the world and make way for the Civil Rights Movement. Before these new forms of creative expression were explored in the Harlem Renaissance, authors like Paul Lawrence Dunbar brought light to the Black American experience.

Paul Laurence Dunbar, who inspired many writers during the 1920s, wrote about the concept of passing in his poem, *We Wear the Mask*, and presents the idea that Black Americans were passing for being content despite the subservient position in which they had been placed. While Dunbar wrote before the Harlem Renaissance, he largely inspired the works that followed his and paved the way for the Renaissance. In one of Dunbar’s poems, *We Wear the Mask*, he portrays a narrative of the Black experience in which African-Americans wear a figurative mask to cover their “tortured souls” and “bleeding hearts” from the world that is unaware of their suffering. He wrote, “We wear the mask that grins and lies,/It hides our cheeks and shades our eyes—” (Dunbar). He goes on to explain that White Americans don’t make the effort to see past these masks and see the hardships and mistreatment of Black Americans, saying, ”We sing, but oh the clay is vile/Beneath our feet, and long the mile;/But let the world dream otherwise,/We wear the mask!” (Dunbar). He presents the idea that the rest of the world has a false “dream” of the Black experience because they do not look beyond their masked faces. One of the Black authors that Dunbar influenced was Nella Larsen, who references Dunbar’s figurative mask with her own imagery and word choice.

In *Passing*, like Dunbar, Nella Larsen mentions the figurative masks that people in the Black community in Harlem wore during this time. Nella Larsen often used the term “ivory mask” to describe how Clare chose to live her life as a white woman, but still felt a deep connection to the Black community in which she grew up. After the death of Clare’s father when
she was fifteen, Clare decided to pass as a white woman in order to access the wealth and opportunities that she didn't have during her childhood. Years later, when she ran into Irene, her childhood friend, she found herself being invited to Idlewild, a Black resort in Michigan where Irene was planning to spend the weekend with the people she and Clare grew up with. After Clare left to get married, rumors about her marrying a white man had circulated and Irene knew that questions about Clare’s life and marriage would arise if she came to Idlewild. However, when Clare decided to refuse this offer, Irene “had an offended feeling that behind what was now only an ivory mask lurked a scornful amusement” (Larsen 25). This scene references multiple layers of passing, including passing to be polite. Both Clare and Irene knew that if Clare had come to Idlewild, the trip would have been disrupted by her presence. Clare saw right through Irene’s offer and knew that Irene didn’t want her to be there and that she had only asked her to come out of politeness. Irene, knowing that Clare had discovered her motives, guessed that Clare was trying to hide her “scornful amusement” at her own ability to uncover what Irene was truly thinking. While Clare discovered Irene’s insincerity right away, Irene was left to guess how Clare felt and couldn’t quite uncover her skillful masking.

For Clare, making the decision to pass not only detached her from her roots, but made it difficult for her to return to them. Idlewild would have been a chance for her to reconnect with some of her old friends in the Black community, but her choice to pass made these opportunities more complicated and hard to come by. Clare sacrificed her connections with friends and family to gain wealth with her “ivory mask” and her decision to pass for white. Nella Larsen used similar imagery to express this idea many times in Passing, including when Clare attended a tea party that Irene had planned. Irene did not invite Clare, but when she came, Irene thought her “ivory face was what it always was, beautiful and caressing. Or maybe today a little masked.
Unrevealing” (Larsen 95). This imagery adds to Clare’s mysterious personality and how she allows her face to reveal nothing, but lets her beautiful ivory mask conceal her identity.

While Nella Larsen and Paul Laurence Dunbar mention two different kinds of masks, they both write about the same unhappiness that comes with passing or the need to pass. Clare felt a constant and unattainable longing for her roots, and Dunbar expressed the building up of pain and suffering that comes with suppressing your emotions. In the movie, *Passing*, which was inspired by the book, Irene says, “We’re all of us passing for something” (Bates). And this is true. Whether you put on “the mask” on occasion, or you never take it off, countless people have a proclivity to hide pieces of themselves from the world. What we have to think about is the impact this will have on ourselves and others. Will we regret concealing the truth like Clare? Are we being forced to put on a smile like in Dunbar’s poem? To whatever extent or for whatever reason we are passing, it can be difficult to weigh the benefits and the losses. It can be tough not to lose sight of ourselves when we are busy trying to fit the mold. In a perfect world, we wouldn’t have to put on these masks or hide ourselves, but as Nella Larsen and Paul Lawrence Dunbar show us, sometimes we are compelled to leave the truth hidden.
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A Passing Resemblance

Although two people can seem very different at first, there can often be many commonalities between anyone if one looks deep enough. Throughout the novel *Passing*, Irene tries to distance herself from Clare because of her manipulative and selfish behavior, and does not think of them alike in any way. Indeed, they outwardly appear very different: Irene is a fairly plain, practical woman, and Clare is glamorous and wealthy. However, over the course of the book, Clare proves to be very similar to Irene at a deeper level, and she personifies many of Irene’s own attitudes and character flaws: her self-centered personality, her controlling tendencies, and her propensity to create problems for herself.

Irene is often hostile towards Clare because of her self-centered personality, but, in spite of her observation of the irritating nature of the quality, it is also one of Irene’s major flaws. As Clare herself admits, she will do anything to get what she wants: “‘But it's true, ‘Rene. Can't you realize that I'm not like you a bit? Why, to get the things I want badly enough, I'd do anything, hurt anybody, throw anything away. Really, ‘Rene, I'm not safe.’ Her voice as well as the look on her face had a beseeching earnestness that made Irene vaguely uncomfortable.” (83) Clare admits her selfish desires, and also acknowledges the difference between herself and Irene: Clare’s selfishness leads to danger, while Irene prioritizes safety. Despite Clare’s flattery, she still manages to frequently put Irene at the receiving end of her ruthless attempts to get what she desires. However, Irene often behaves selfishly herself, protecting her own interests above all
others, as she demonstrates when considering her predicament with Clare’s apparent overfondness for Brian:

She drew a quick, sharp breath. And for a long time sat staring down at the hands in her lap. Strange, she had not before realized how easily she could put Clare out of her life! She had only to tell John Bellew that his wife—No. Not that! But if he should somehow learn of these Harlem visits—Why should she hesitate? Why spare Clare? (101)

Just like Clare, Irene proves that she is dangerous and willing to put herself above anybody; as Irene plots ways to get Clare out of her life, she comes up with a solution that involves endangering Clare through conflict with her extremely racist husband. She further puts Clare in jeopardy when, after she is seen “passing” by Bellew, she does not tell Clare that her secret may be in danger. Both passages reveal not only great priority of self-preservation and personal benefit in the two women, but a deeper self-centeredness to the point of cruelty—Clare admits that she will hurt anyone to get what she wants, and Irene considers revealing Clare’s secret to Bellew, an event that would destroy Clare’s whole life. Clare and Irene’s shared selfishness causes much tragedy in the end. After Irene begins to suspect that Clare is having an affair with Brian, she takes the first opportunity to remove Clare from her life: she pushes her out a window to fall to her death. Each are undone by their selfishness: Irene, by her failure to notice Clare's interest in Brian until it was too late and by being too involved in her own worries, and Clare by her lack of understanding of Irene's true resentment towards her, a result of her assumption that everyone is enthralled with her. Irene and Clare’s selfish behaviors, while often straining their friendship, are one of their defining shared characteristics.

Both Irene and Clare also have controlling tendencies. Irene tries to control Brian’s life, while Clare frequently manipulates Irene into doing what she wants by presenting an image of
helplessness and distress: “And in the look [Clare] gave Irene, there was something groping, and hopeless, and yet so absolutely determined that it was like an image of the futile searching and the firm resolution in Irene’s own soul, and increased the feeling of doubt and compunction that had been growing within her about Clare Kendry. She gave in.” (73) Irene gives into Clare because she clearly sees parts of herself in Clare—her “futile searching” for stability and her “firm resolution” in all matters. Clare takes advantage of Irene’s weakness to get what she wants from her: Clare’s primary motivation in her manipulation is to gain access to the Black cultural circle that she left behind when she decided to pass as white. She is perpetually unsatisfied, always wanting more, and she sees Irene as her gateway into something new and exciting; Irene, although holding a certain fascination for Clare as something different, is no more than a tool to enter into this world.

Irene’s motives differ greatly in her desire to control Brian. She wants to prevent him moving to Brazil to avoid racism, an action she sees as extreme and unnecessary:

Irene, watching [Brian], was thinking: “It isn't fair, it isn't fair.” After all these years still to blame her like this. Hadn’t his success proved that she'd been right in insisting that he stick to his profession right there in New York? Couldn't he see, even now, that it had been best? Not for her, oh no, not for her—she had never really considered herself—but for him and the boys. (57)

Irene ignores Brian’s desire to move to Brazil simply because she does not want to give up her American identity—although, considering the way most of America behaved towards her race, it seems like more of an excuse to avoid change than true loyalty to her country. She is unable to see things Brian’s way, a result of her ability to pass and thereby avoid much racism. Due to this lack of understanding and desire to understand, she is unwilling to listen to his plan and decides
that she knows what is best for him. She tries to make decisions for Brian as if he were one of their children, her vision clouded by her own selfishness and obstinacy. Irene’s perception is so skewed that she seems no longer to even care about Brian as much as the stability that she provides for her. Although in different situations, Irene and Clare still have similar motives for their actions: they exert control over others to improve their quality of life. Clare wants to make her life more exciting, while Irene hopes to gain security in her family. Clare and Irene make a regular practice of trying to control others’ lives, further demonstrating their similarities and their mutual disregard for others.

Clare and Irene’s final important similarity is their shared tendency to create problems in their lives through their own actions. Although Irene often dismisses Clare’s complaints about the troubles in her wealthy life that she made for herself, Irene also has her own grievances about her failing relationship with Brian caused by her unwillingness to compromise. This mutual proclivity for complaint highlights Clare and Irene’s pettiness and the advantage they take of their privileged lives. Clare constantly bemoans her fate of being married to a racist and living life on the edge of disaster, even though it is the path she chose for herself:

Clare moaned. The black eyes filled with tears that ran down her cheeks and spilled into her lap, ruining the priceless velvet of her dress. Her long hands were a little uplifted and clasped tightly together. Her effort to speak moderately was obvious, but not successful.

“How could you know? How could you? You're free. You're happy. And,” with faint derision, “safe.” (68)

There is a sharp contrast between Clare’s wealth, represented by “the priceless velvet of her dress,” and the self-pitying “tears that ran down her cheeks” that ruin the dress. She has everything she wants, but the consequences of her deception are finally catching up with her and
she feels that she cannot escape the inevitable discovery of her passing by John. Irene is impatient with this and Clare’s constant hints that Irene has an easy life. However, Irene is equally guilty of creating problems in her life for herself with Brian:

Was she ever to be free of it, that fear which crouched, always, deep down within her, stealing away the sense of security, the feeling of permanence, from the life which she had so admirably arranged for them all, and desired so ardently to have remain as it was?

That strange, and to her fantastic, notion of Brian’s own going off to Brazil, which though unmentioned, yet lived within him; how it frightened her, and–yes, angered her!

(57)

Irene is tormented by the prospect of Brian leaving her for Brazil, even though she is perfectly capable of accompanying him. She has no apparent ties to America and could leave if she wanted, but chooses not to, thus creating her problem. Rather than try to think of any reasonable solution, her first reaction is anger that Brian would wish for a different life. Both Clare and Irene are unflinching in their stubbornness and refusal to accept blame for their own actions; according to Clare, it is John’s fault that she is in danger (although she made the decision to pass as white and marry him), and Irene blames Brian for his desire to leave (although she could be equally blamed by Brian for wanting to stay). Despite attempts to blame others, Irene and Clare are the authors of much of the strife in their own lives.

Irene tries to separate herself from Clare throughout the novel because of Clare’s frustrating tendencies, but she is always drawn back, a result of the similarities that Irene tries to deny. And ultimately, their shared flaws are the most easily recognizable similarities, as they are the most prominent features in the two women. These flaws are only magnified as Clare and Irene interact more. Pressure from Clare’s constant prying into her life causes Irene to project her
anger onto Brian, the result being increasing resemblance to Clare. Irene’s deflection of Clare's
treatment of her onto Brian leads to her increasing her selfish behavior, attempting to control
Brian, and refusing to compromise in any way in her tumultuous home life. Clare represents all
that is wrong with Irene and stokes her negative traits, departing the world without having done
an ounce of good for anyone but herself in the end. As with Clare and Irene, the similarities
between us are often closer than we like to admit. We are all human, and there is an inevitable
connection between all of us. And, also as with Clare and Irene, adversity often reveals these
similarities, showing one’s true nature. Only through trials do people really show their true
colors.
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Our planet is dying and we can only blame ourselves. The over-exploitation of resources and the pollution we release into the environment have come back to harm us in many ways, such as sea level rise, increased natural disasters, and unbreathable air. Bangkok, Thailand, is one of many cities affected by these problems, and we, as a global people, need to combat climate change to save these people's lives.

Bangkok, Thailand, is located on the delta of the Chao Phraya River, about 25 miles (40 km) from the Gulf of Thailand (Sternstein). Due to Bangkok's geological makeup, sea level rise/flooding will be a major problem in the future. Another problem in Bangkok is deforestation, which not only harms biodiversity through habitat loss but also contributes to job loss (Mulhern). The Thai people, such as fishermen, shrimp farmers, and charcoal producers, benefit from these forests and need them to continue their livelihood. Also, Thai people’s access to clean water is decreasing at an alarming rate, due to runoff from agriculture, increased need for water in rice fields, and increased industrial development (“Environment and Natural Resources”). Thailand’s government has become very aware of the current situation in Bangkok and has attempted to enact policies and regulations to help deter these problems. Thailand’s 7th National Economic and Social Development Plan included a review of conservation policies and regulations with a focus on environmental sustainability. According to this plan, environmental conservation is a priority. It was in line with the creation of the National Environmental Quality Act and the
Enhancement and Conservation Act. This legislation aimed to change how Thailand manages its natural resources and protects the environment. The Thai government's main premise was through decentralized management procedures overseen by local authorities and based on the "polluter pays" premise (“Environment and Natural Resources”). Another strategy the Thai government is pursuing is the 4.0 strategy, overseen by Prime Minister General Prayut Chan-o-cha, to create a living society with a climate change-adaptive economic structure and a low-carbon society. This means that the Thai government is trying to create an economic structure that will thrive with our changing climate, and at the same time, Thailand wants to use this policy to advance its pursuit of high-income status. This means Thailand has to double its present GDP per capita from US $6,357 per year to US $12,236 per year by adopting socioeconomic growth strategies that don't deplete the country's natural resources (“Environment and Natural Resources”). The relevant ethical principles are justice and beneficence. The citizens should have access to clean water and a place to live, and they deserve protection from the harmful effects of climate change.

The current climate in Bangkok, Thailand, is one in need of immediate action. The lack of access to clean water, the destruction of forests, and the rising sea level will have catastrophic effects on the people if nothing is done to fix this. Nearly every citizen and all the wildlife are negatively impacted. An ethical question that should be asked, is should the government do more to help create more clean water for the people who live in Bangkok, Thailand?
The above figure shows the internal, renewable water resources per capita depleting while the population is increasing. Access to clean water is getting progressively difficult in Thailand. The creation of irrigation systems, which has been crucial to the growth of Thailand's domestic and export agricultural industries to offer job opportunities for Thai nationals, has played a significant role in this transition. However, Thailand only stores on average 30% of its annual precipitation, with shortages frequently occurring when agricultural demand is at its peak, creating a serious problem that continues to worsen (“Environment and Natural Resources”). By 2030, the Office of National Water Resources has put plans in place to provide clean drinkable water “to over 75,000 villages in 66 areas covering 5.5 million hectares by building more than
541,000 small dams to restore watershed areas at risk due to flood and drought” (Manorom).

This is one of the major actions taking place to reverse this problem. A key scientific question is what can we do to counteract the potential flooding in Thailand.


The above figure shows the mild to extreme flooding that could occur in Thailand by the year 2100 if we don’t do anything to prevent sea level rise. 11 million people, 96% of the population, will be affected by the rise in sea level, which will create a massive refugee crisis—leading to even more distress in these communities. The most obvious way to counteract this problem is globally finding a solution, but in this case, there are strategies the Dutch are pursuing called “De
Zandmotor” or “sand motor.” They are creating huge peninsulas made of sand to help keep the sea at bay and away from coastlines and local cities (Banergee and Ramachandran).

At this point in time, there aren't many viable solutions to this problem, but anything is better than nothing in terms of taking action. It's important to know which laws exist to mitigate climate crises in Thailand. In 2021 Thailand demonstrated its commitment to the Conference of the Parties to the 26th UN Climate Change Convention by declaring a new National Energy Plan to reach carbon neutrality “in the energy and transportation sectors by 2070.” The country plans to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 20-25% annually till the year 2030. Some steps that are being taken to achieve this goal are “increasing ratios of renewable and clean energies of new electricity plants; promoting electric vehicles; being a Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) hub; and promoting production and use of renewable energy” (McKenzie).

Climate change is endangering the nation of Thailand, specifically Bangkok and the 11 million people who live there. Due to the rising sea levels, the loss of their forests, and the lack of drinkable water, decisions need to be made. The issue that needs to be addressed immediately is the lack of drinkable water. Luckily, the Office of National Water Resources has implemented plans to provide clean, drinkable water to the people of Bangkok. I believe that this is the most pressing issue because sea level rise and job loss, while still problematic, are not as pressing as the need to drink water.

The Thai government and other countries around the world need to wake up and collectively come together to make a change because it's not going to fix itself. We are too far gone, and without a huge commitment from everyone, nothing is going to improve. The fact that 11 million people are struggling to find drinking water in just one city is tragic, not to mention
the 2 billion people worldwide that don’t have access to drinkable water (“Global Wash Fast Facts”). Access to drinkable water is an unalienable right.

The ethical principle of justice claims that we have an obligation to provide others with whatever they are owed or deserve. In public life, we have an obligation to treat all people equally, fairly, and impartially, and impose no unfair burdens. We are obligated to work for the benefit of those who are unfairly treated. If we were to ignore this devastation, these people would die of dehydration and be displaced from their communities. While we may like to sit idly by and say that these people need to figure this out on their own, it is the job of their governing powers and the ethical duty of other countries with means to do so to help these citizens.
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DEIB IS NOT JUST A BUZZWORD
By: Heavyn King

Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) in schools are not just trendy buzzwords. They are critical components of quality education that prepare students for the real world. Over the past few years, there has been a call to action for many civil rights organizations, which bleeds into hallways across the country. According to Nancy Aebersold, founder and executive director of the Higher Education Recruitment Consortium (HERC), Public and private schools that have recently started implementing DEI positions and programming understand that "Diverse representation and inclusive learning environments provide inspiration and aspiration." It's about more than just ensuring a diverse student body in the classroom; DEI is about creating an environment where every student feels valued and supported.

DEIB was implemented at Carolina Day in March of 2021. Elizabeth Garland attended Carolina Day and decided to take on the position. This role’s responsibilities include working with faculty and staff to develop an inclusive curriculum and promote a more diverse and welcoming school environment. Garland further explains, “[I] definitely want[ed] to meet with people to look at the big picture, [allowing them to] envisio[n] and [be] creative, and then also collaborating with not only internal departments and people and teachers but also external, so different schools.”

The DEIB coordinator role at Carolina Day School is a collaborative effort that involves fostering the contributions and creativity of all members of the school community. One of the role's key responsibilities is to raise awareness about different cultures and promote
understanding and appreciation among students, faculty, and staff. This requires a multifaceted approach that involves working closely with others to develop and implement initiatives that support diversity, equity, inclusion, and belonging at the school. It is evident that Garland’s position as the Director of DEIB was a significant and necessary position for students at the Upper School. So, when Garland decided to step down in February of 2022, for many, it was surprising news to hear, and it started to raise questions such as who would be the new leader and whether Garland could help in finding her replacement. Halfway through the summer, it was announced that an Upper School English teacher, Margee Huseman, would be stepping in as the new DEIB leader. Husemann explains, “I am told that process was a conversation between Ms. Whitney, Mr. Cogburn, and Ms. Moses about who could help to coordinate DEIB work in the Upper School. And my name was mentioned because this is a field I feel passionate about.”

With Husemann assuming the role of DEIB director, changes were bound to occur. Husemann is not only the new director of DEIB; she is also the new leader of You Belong.

In addition to being an English teacher, saying yes to this position could bring on more stress. “It is a lot of pressure. And I think one of the things I'm highly aware of as a person in this role is how I am a straight, middle-class white woman. All the research, all the reading, all the kind of stuff that I want to do, I can do doesn't help me overcome that barrier. So the best I can do is reach out to other people who have a lived experience and get them involved in the decision-making and planning.” said Husemann, DEIB is usually a role that someone of color holds. Although Husemann may not be, she is still open to anyone helping improve this position at CDS.
Despite Husemann’s best efforts to be flexible, it is clear that changes are taking place, and many high school students feel the impacts of these shifts. Husemann realizes the limitations of being a white woman in a DEIB role, sharing, “[I'm] trying to find ways to empower students of color whenever they ask for something and to build confidence and trust. So that if there is a problem, they can come to talk to me, and I can help work on their behalf. Or if there's something that they need in the school, I am also trying to educate myself to anticipate needs so that students of color don't have to ask for the things they need.” Although Husemann may not have the same impact the way Garland had with students of color does not mean these students aren’t welcome to come to her. Students may have a connection with Husemann on a teacher level, but those may be unrelated now that she is also the DEIB director of the Upper School.

As we approach the end of this semester, we have observed some minor changes in this program. The pertinent question is: how have these changes affected the students? As schools and universities nationwide struggle with issues of diversity, equity, inclusion, and belonging (DEIB), many students applaud recent changes to these programs. However, some highlight the importance of having a person of color in a leadership role to truly effect meaningful change and create a more inclusive environment on campus. While students are enjoying the changes to DEIB programming, they say that true progress will come only when underrepresented voices are fully represented at the highest levels. Junior Eden Mosley states, “It's more relatable since we go through so much, and sometimes we're not aware of it. [For example] racial trauma, we can connect and relate, even though our situations might not be the same, since I'm black and they might be Indigenous or Hispanic, but the stories and the upbringing are similar. So we can connect. I feel it is very important because I cannot connect with Dr. Husemann from a racial
standpoint because she's a white woman.” Racial trauma refers to how the experience of racism can impact an individual’s mental and physical well-being. Racial trauma is all too familiar to many people of color, who are forced to confront the damaging effects of discrimination and prejudice daily. In a community that may lack diversity, a sense of belonging takes on even greater importance. When people feel like they belong, they feel accepted, valued, and supported by those around them. However, true belonging cannot be achieved unless they feel represented.

Junior Emmily Zavala, who attended SDLC in the fall, expresses that she would like CDS to “try to incorporate more diversity into the school. [While at SDLC], it felt like I could connect to [others], which is something that's really important. Sometimes I feel like there's a connection that I can't get here, but I still love it here.”

Not only are students aware of the importance of representation, but teachers are as well. Husemann states, “I think ultimately, it should go to someone who has expertise in this field, and who has more of an understanding of the experience of being a student of color, or sort of any marginalized identity. I've certainly experienced sexism, but I don't think that that's something I can abstract more broadly to other forms of discrimination. I think that we definitely need somebody who has a deeper understanding of what's needed. So that we can move forward as a school.” Representation is an area within the DEIB program that could be improved over time. By doing so, a more just and equitable society where everyone feels like they belong could be created.
In 1987, the school, formally known as Asheville Country Day, became Carolina Day, with renovations taking place at the Upper School. Three years later, the Americans With Disabilities Act (ADA) was passed; the challenge with the building being three years before ADA laws were passed is that accessibility wasn't originally at the forefront in designing the building. The CDS community's primary goal is to include all, no matter their differences, checking in on the accessibility of our facilities and campus to meet law requirements and make our disabled members feel seen and heard.

Millions of people with disabilities face misunderstandings of their daily challenges among their peers and struggle to find understanding from their teachers, despite them being the primary adults in their lives for support.

Kelly Douglass, a blogger with Cerebral Palsy, shared this in an article, "fifteen years after my teacher singled out my disability in front of my entire class, I am still struggling to cope with the lasting emotional effects of
that painful day." Douglass, diagnosed with cerebral palsy at a young age, experienced her teacher outing her as disabled in front of her third-grade class. The class was going to Adaptive PE that morning, and her teacher had written out the schedule on a board with a thank you specifically to Kelly. This could have been handled in many ways besides sharing with Kelly's class that she was the reason they now had this event. School systems worldwide would not have to have adaptive Physical Education if PE classes were made more accessible to include all. Educating the world on when it's an appropriate time to share others' disabilities is a larger concept that sometimes cannot be taught, as it is more opinion based. Making buildings and activities accessible so disabilities simply become a part of a person and not an inclusion factor is something society can work toward. Carolina Day School is taking steps toward greater accessibility on its campus, but there is still work to ensure that all community members can access the school's facilities and programs.

In the early years of education, one of the large aspects of development is playing with peers on the playground. But what happens when that playground is inaccessible? Katherine Green, a parent of a Lower School child at Carolina Day with mobility struggles, says, "The only situation we have had was maybe recess. Sometimes recess was hard to go out; it was in the Woodlands. The teachers would stay with her and do things with her, but it wasn't quite the same as playing with her peers." With The Woodlands being what it sounds like, a natural playground where kids can use their imagination and jump from rock to rock or make positions out of mulch, there is a struggle on how to incorporate access to all in the woods, but this left Green's daughter to stay inside on some days unable to play with her friends, again, feeding into the mental struggle of wanting to play but being unable to because of her recess education environment. This access conflict continues in middle and high school and the campus advertising at Carolina Day School.

Having accessibility and knowing that it is available go hand and hand. Often places will have accessibility, but they could be hidden or hard to find. This adds an extra layer of stress, as Meredith Daniels, Admission Director, explains, "the middle school building is hard to access, so we now ask if anyone visiting needs
accommodations with parking, etc. We don't want anyone to be upset or feel anything but graciously welcomed to CDS." Frequently, people search websites for information on accessible routes to navigate physical spaces. Carolina Day could make it easier not only for wildcat family members by having accessible routes on their website but also for themselves. If someone were to inquire about campus accessibility, a single designated location could provide all the necessary information in one place. While Carolina Day has made efforts to improve accessibility, there is room for improvement in shifting the mindset surrounding disabilities.

While discussing the topic of accessibility on campus, a community member shared, "When we've had our assembly in front of the Upper School, and you need help up and down stairs. I cringe every time because maybe we could have found a better way to do that."

"Cringe" is sometimes a common word when describing the disabled community. Along with "pitiful and suffering." The reality is that this is untrue. Those are all stigmas placed on the disabled community because of misunderstanding. When stating that someone cringes at how someone has adapted to their environment, this simply proves that we must change the world we live in and the mentality towards the community as a whole. Rather than pity, we should educate and move towards asking community members what we can do better. Ask what we can do now. Many different ideas can be found within our community to help with debunking these ideals.

Green spoke of one way she thinks the community can implement more understanding, "a campus-wide meeting, so that if you run into that student, or just in general so that, our students have a working knowledge of that when they go out, you know, where they meet other people." A meeting could be held to explain disabilities on campus, including the stigma associated with being disabled. It's not just a way of existing but rather another way of living. A similar program is already happening with great success called Inclusion Matters, which is a project created to educate younger kids in a short program during the school day. With
assistance, the kids realize disabled kids are "normal" like anyone else. The final step of the process is to review
with the kids their experience and explain further why disabled people live fulfilling lives. Including diverse
individuals would enhance Carolina Day's community allowing individuals to feel more comfortable being in
settings where people are unlike them, which is a possibility in the near future.
It was an overcast summer day, with storm clouds on the horizon, when people across America took to the streets, some overjoyed, others outraged. The two groups faced off: one side chanting, “Abortion is murder!” and the other retaliating with, “My body, my choice!”

A long history of controversy regarding women’s reproductive rights continues to shape and divide America today. The opposing beliefs of those involved in the pro-choice and pro-life movements result in tension that is evident whenever abortion is mentioned. According to an NPR poll, 64% of Americans did not support the overturning of Roe v. Wade. This change raises questions about how the overturning will affect life in America.

An anonymous high school student who is a part of the pro-choice movement in Asheville finds it scary that abortion has been banned in North Carolina after twenty weeks, especially following a pregnancy scare.

“My period didn’t come at all. I wasn’t on any birth control at the time, so I was scared. I took a test, and it was negative, and that was good. My sister had to have an abortion during her junior year. It was so hard on her, and it was hard to watch her go through that.”

As reported by NCBI, over half of young women have experienced pregnancy scares, while 3 in 10 women under the age of twenty get pregnant at least once, and 31% of teenage girls get
abortions. The student goes on to say that if someone doesn’t want an abortion, they shouldn’t get one, but forcing that belief on others isn’t right.

On the other hand, those who are a part of the pro-life movement believe that women decide to have a baby when they agree to have sex.

Alice and Rick Roberson are both members of the pro-life movement and believe that abortion is a matter that should be in the hands of the states, which is what the overturning of Roe v. Wade resulted in. Rick Roberson believes that abortion should be granted up until a heartbeat is detected. In contrast, Alice Roberson feels that life starts at conception.

“I know that there are little fingernails, lips, eyelashes, earbuds, and little nostrils, and that is a human being. You see that little fetus in there moving around, and you see how they do the abortions. I mean, it’s just morally, religiously, spiritually, and everything against what I believe in.”

According to Pew Research Center, 79% of people who are religious are against abortions in most cases. Alice and Rick Roberson both feel that abortions should be granted for rape, incest or if there is a medical reason.

All interviewees also agreed that Roe v. Wade being overturned would most affect women of color of lower socioeconomic status.
A retired OB-GYN, Dr. Richard Taft, gave his thoughts on who would be the most impacted by Roe v. Wade being overturned.

“The Latino community and African American community and people with fewer resources don't tolerate unplanned pregnancies well.”

Guttmacher Institute states that 59% of women who get abortions in America are Hispanic or African American. Lawyer Philip Roth adds that women who don’t have the finances to drive to a state where abortion is legal will be the most impacted by the overturning of Roe v. Wade.

Supreme Court cases have always affected the American people greatly, starting with its establishment in 1789.

Roth explains that Supreme Court cases that have been overturned in the past and the impact those rulings have had on America.

“I’m glad sometimes that [some Supreme Court cases are overturned] because Plessy v. Ferguson is the number one example of where a super terrible decision was handed down and perpetuated segregation for the next seven years. I'm glad Brown versus Board of Education overturned that and ended segregation. You can see that there are good reasons to overturn something that egregious, but it is very rare.”
Since the Supreme Court’s creation, only 146 of the 25,500 cases have been overturned, which is less than 0.5% of all Supreme Court cases, according to History.com. Roth mentions past Supreme Court cases to demonstrate that overturning certain cases is beneficial. He goes on to say that for those who support abortion, Roe v. Wade being overturned is the “biggest disaster of all time,” and for those who are pro-life, it’s “another Plessy V. Ferguson.”

Dr. Taft discusses the historical aspect of Roe v. Wade, sharing his experience as a resident at Chapel Hill before and during 1973, when Roe v. Wade was enacted, explaining the dangers of illegal abortions.

“We did some abortions [when] we were residents, and at the time, there wasn’t really much push from pro-life people to stop doing them because it just started, so it was well respected. Right before Roe v. Wade in 1973, we saw a couple of girls that came into our clinics, hospitals, [and] emergency rooms [who] were extremely sick and had severe infections, and occasionally one of them would die.”

Abortion was generally illegal in most states before 1973, including North Carolina, only a few states, such as California, made abortion legal. Those who performed abortions in states where it was illegal prior to 1973 were prosecuted as criminals, such as in Hoover V. State.

Now, experts worry about the ripple effect the overturning of Roe v. Wade could have on other implied rights.
Roth thinks that Roe v. Wade could set a precedent for overturning cases regarding implied rights.

“The SCOTUS decision has threatened the viability of cases that are based on implied rights, one being the right to privacy, [which] are the underpinnings of important decisions like same-sex marriage, [interracial marriage], or a right to contraception.”

Roth goes on to state that there are lawyers who could dig up cases regarding implied rights, start at the trial court, and work their way up to the Supreme Court, allowing SCOTUS to overturn those cases.

Not only will the overturning of Roe v. Wade affect matters in court, but also in the medical field. Dr. Taft gives his opinion on how illegalizing abortion could adversely impact the number of medical students who desire to specialize as OB-GYNs.

“OB-GYN professionals deliver babies, take care of women when ill, and [when they have] gynecologic problems. If the number of people going into that specialty begins to drop off, that's going to be a problem for women everywhere. [OB-GYNs] are going to select areas where they're not threatened by this law. So it could be the states that say it's illegal to have an abortion [that] theoretically, could have no OB-GYN providers.”

In an ABC article, medical student Sarah Kelly states that she wanted to be an OB-GYN; but with Roe v. Wade being overturned, she is rethinking the medical field she plans to go into.
Additionally, planned parenthood reports that Roe v. Wade being overturned will put doctors in a position to choose between breaking the law or breaking their oath to their patients. Dr. Taft claims some doctors might “be strong enough to do abortions in the face of the law” but that most “are not going to do that.”

With the future of women’s reproductive health and implied rights hanging in the balance, voting is more important than ever. How you vote could change the future direction of America, determining if this country takes a left or right turn.
Contrasting Marx’s Conception of Human Nature with State of Nature Thinkers

Elise Waters

Unlike State of Nature thinkers such as Hobbes, Locke, and Rousseau, Marx believed that man has no inherent human nature, our perception of the nature of man merely being a reflection of our society and the process of production.

Marx concluded that one’s ultimate goal is always to meet their needs so as to guarantee survival. In order to achieve this goal we shape ourselves and our society around the process of production and labor, which becomes our “nature,” until a new economic system is formed. Marx wrote, “The mode of production of material life conditions the general process of social, political and intellectual life. It is not the consciousness of men that determines their existence, but their social existence that determines their consciousness.”¹ By saying this, he means that the process of production determines every way in which society works and thinks. Men are shaped by who they are in society, since that establishes what they must do to take care of their needs and desires. Because the process of production changes with each new economic system, Marx’s conception of human nature ceases to become “nature,” and instead becomes nurture. There is no true human nature, because everything that was once perceived as “human nature,” will adapt into something different as soon as the process of production changes. Marx wrote, “The bourgeoisie cannot exist without constantly revolutionizing the instruments of production, and thereby the relations of production, and with them the whole relations of society.”² This confirms that society is entirely

based around the process of production, and if that process is transformed, society will adjust accordingly. Man’s way of life is shaped entirely by the way he will best be able to meet his needs.

Unlike Marx, state of nature thinkers such as Hobbes, Locke, and Rousseau believed that man has an inherent nature. Hobbes wrote, “the state of men without civil society (which state we may properly call the state of nature) is nothing else but a mere war of all against all.” He believed men without society to be inherently selfish and inequal, only feeling jealous and threatened by their peers. Locke, however, thought men would (at least at first) be more civil, writing, “The state of Nature has a Law of Nature to govern it, which obliges every one: and reason, which is that law, teaches all mankind, who will but consult it, that being all equal and independent, no one ought to harm another in his life, health, liberty, or possessions.” This describes man as being equal, and having an instinctive Law of Nature which stops them from harming their peers. Rousseau had a different conception of the state of nature, writing, “now savage man, being destitute of every species of intelligence…is wholly wrapped up in the feeling of its present existence, without any idea of the future, however near at hand; while his projects, as limited as his views, hardly extend to the close of day.” He envisioned man being unintelligent and content in the present moment, without any long term plans for himself. Marx completely contradicts these thinkers, since in his view it is impossible to have a state of nature, since everything perceived about human nature is entirely based on a system that society has created.

---

In conclusion, Marx and the state of nature thinker’s conceptions of human nature are fundamentally different. While Marx believed that the process of production shapes human “nature”, Hobbes, Locke, and Rousseau believed that human nature was established before society and the process of production existed.
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The Illusory Reality of the “American Dream”

The 1920’s was a period of promise for America in which the “American Dream” became “achievable”. The “American Dream” revolved around acquiring power and money, specifically from those of a lower status. Considering this obsession by many individuals to gain wealth and power, during the 1920’s, the stock market became very prevalent as a way for those who received an income to earn more money without having to work for it. However, in 1929, the stock market crashed and the Great Depression began, demonstrating that the reliance on institutions provided no guarantee of prosperity. This failure in economic prosperity could be representative of the failure of the “American Dream.” Though it may sound appealing, is the “American Dream” actually achievable? Francis Scott Fitzgerald wrote *The Great Gatsby* exploring this concept of the “American Dream.” Fitzgerald had a typical ambiguity toward American life, something that appeared to him to be vulgar yet promising. He received an education at Princeton University, which demonstrates the extreme wealth and privilege he experienced as a child. This is something that might have influenced Fitzgerald’s decision to write on the relationship between power and money and the influences they both have on our everyday lives. In July of 1918, Fitzgerald met the love of his life Zelda Sayre, an American writer and artist. Much like Gatsby’s love interest, Daisy, Zelda was hesitant to marry Fitzgerald until his future seemed promising. Zelda sought to marry into a wealthy family—an ambition very common amongst women in the 1920’s. In the novel *The Great Gatsby*, James Gatz
reinvents himself into the self-made millionaire, Jay Gatsby in an effort to win over the love of
his life, Daisy Buchanan. Despite being the embodiment of the “American Dream,” Gatsby’s
ultimate feelings of desolation and discontent reveal that material success does not guarantee
happiness. Though one hundred years have passed, material success was just as hollow at the
beginning of the American age of consumption as it is now.

Though there are multiple different ways to interpret the words “American Dream,” the
concept that Fitzgerald explores in The Great Gatsby is the desire to rise beyond one’s
circumstances; the notion that people of lesser social position have the capability to rise to
greater power. Power and wealth have always been crucial factors in how American society
operates. In The Great Gatsby, the character James Gatz grows up in a poorer family and finds
himself constantly longing for money. “To the young Gatz, resting on his oars and looking up at
the railed deck, the yacht represented all the beauty and glamour in the world.” (Fitzgerald 108)
Through illustrating James Gatz’s ideal life, Fitzgerald demonstrates the main reason why the
“American Dream” was so desirable: the widespread belief that money is the solution to
happiness. From an outsider’s perspective, money allows for a life of leisure and relaxation. A
life where success is simple to come by. A powerful and fulfilled existence. In a review
published in The New York Times entitled Abroad At Home; The Great Gatsby, Anthony Lewis
affirms, “That was Gatsby’s vision: happiness through wealth. How he made his money was not
important; means did not matter. The point was to make it.” (Lewis 27) James Gatz’s
transformation to Jay Gatsby was both praised and idolized by many people, mostly of the lower
class. Fitzgerald conveniently depicts Gatsby from an outsider’s perspective by using outside
character, Nick Carraway, as the narrator. Nick frequently discussed his, as well as others’,
admiration for Gatsby’s wealth and his extravagant and allegedly rewarding lifestyle. It is
difficult to notice the flaws in such a glamorous lifestyle when one is surrounded by its glory. However, as Nick and Gatsby become closer, Gatsby’s truth behind all of his wealth is revealed.

As the novel progresses, the repercussions of money are exposed. When Jay Gatsby finally achieved the life that had always seemed so perfect, he soon realized that money and happiness didn’t correlate as much as he had always perceived them to. As the book concludes, Nick Carraway shares his final thoughts,

And as I sat there brooding on the old, unknown world, I thought of Gatsby’s wonder when he first picked out the green light at the end of Daisy’s dock. He had come a long way to this blue lawn, and his dream must have seemed so close that he could hardly fail to grasp it. (Fitzgerald 194).

Gatsby discovers that his desire for Daisy, symbolized by the green light, is something that he will never be able to achieve, regardless of how much money he makes. Fitzgerald makes a suggestion that, despite appearing less glamorous and comfortable, a simple rural lifestyle would perhaps be a better choice. “He did not know that it was already behind him, somewhere back in that vast obscurity beyond the city, where the dark fields of the republic rolled on under the night.” (Fitzgerald 194) Gatsby’s ultimate fantasy was to escape with Daisy back to their hometown and lead a simpler, less luxurious lifestyle. Although Gatsby’s fortune wasn’t what would give him the life he desired, because of its visual appeal, money frequently serves as a mask for contentment and satisfaction. Anthony Lewis later states that,

In Gatsby and the rich around him, Meckne said, Fitzgerald had painted a devastating picture of what America was becoming in the 1920’s: a society corrupted by money, attracted to ‘glittering swishness.’ Another critic, John Henry Raleigh, said Jay Gatsby ‘represents the corruption of the American dream. (Lewis 27)
In American society, luxuries and obtaining respect and admiration from others as a result of one’s wealth have become obsessions for many individuals. Many people who succeed financially find, nevertheless, that it doesn’t make them any happier than they were before. More and more people began investing their money in the stock market in the 1920’s as a means of achieving more wealth quickly and with less work in an effort to realize their aspirations of “being something” (someone with power and money). However, the 1929 stock market crash could be used as a metaphor for the collapse of the “American Dream.” A crash of the widespread belief that money was the answer to all troubles in life. People who were thought to have achieved the “American Dream” eventually discovered that it produced hollowness and vacuity.

Fitzgerald touches on the idea that money is meaningless on its own. Money may be able to buy “stuff,” but it is incapable of buying relationships—platonic or romantic—which are regarded as the most valuable things one can have. Fitzgerald hints at Gatsby’s emptiness without Daisy as Nick talks about Gatsby’s parties from his perspective

At high tide in the afternoon I watched his guests diving from the tower of his raft, or taking in the sun on the hot sand of his beach while his two motor boats slit the waters of the Sound, drawing aquaplanes over cataracts of foam. On week-ends his Rolls-Royce became omnibus, bearing parties to and from the city between nine in the morning and long past midnight, while his station wagon scampered like a brisk yellow bug to meet all the trains. (Fitzgerald 44)

Though Gatsby was constantly throwing parties, the guests never engaged with him but rather took advantage of his good riches. His wealth, not himself, was what attracted them. As a result, Gatsby never felt fulfilled at his parties no matter how big they were or how many guests showed
up, and he eventually withered away beneath the weight of his wealth. Though the wealthy may seem content, holding a position of power in society isn’t as glamorous as it might appear to many individuals like the guests at Gatsby’s parties.

Almost exactly 100 years later, this concept that money can buy happiness is still apparent in our everyday lives. Even today, rich people have more “things” than those of a lower class and more “stuff” is still perceived to make people happier. These theories however, can still be disproven today, just as they were in *The Great Gatsby*. For example, Leo Robinson writes an interesting review that suggests that former president Donald Trump and Jay Gatsby would make a reasonable analogy. “Will called Donald Trump ‘a Gatsby for our time’, shrewdly acknowledging what Fitzgerald obscured – the hollowness beneath the grandeur.” (41) Many of the authority figures we see today whose sole desire was to obtain money have found themselves in a state of emptiness and ongoing discontent with their lives. Another thing to think about is the significance of power in American society and the lessons that can be learned from *The Great Gatsby* in regards to that. In an article titled *An Archetypal Approach Towards The Great Gatsby: The transformational American Dream Through Meta-meme in The Great Gatsby*, Hacer Gozen and others wrote about how Gatsby can have an influence on everyone.

Gatsby cannot be limited to a liminal period since the connotations that his existence stands for are creating an everlasting effect on any human society. That is to say, the meta-meme—which Gatsby ‘radiates’ or reflects—is the matter humankind has craved for since they existed: a power issue. (59)

American society has always been built around power, and it has long been thought that having power is the key to happiness since it allows people with it to obtain more of their desires. But as *The Great Gatsby* shows, it’s not always possible to get everything you want which can result in
an unfulfilling and discontent life. Perhaps there is no amount of money that can produce satisfaction because people tend to constantly crave what they don’t have.

Therefore, maybe our conception of the “American Dream” is unachievable. Money may be able to produce a glamorous lifestyle, but it will never produce happiness. However, this idea can be hard to wrap one's head around considering the benefits that money provides. For most, money relieves more of the stresses in life and allows for leisure and relaxation which can form a certain kind of happiness. However, as Fitzgerald proves, true happiness comes through the relationships that one has with others, not the amount of money or “stuff” one has. This passionate love present in *The Great Gatsby* is something that is present in Fitzgerald's life with his wife Zelda and was something that he valued deeply.

And for the next decade they blended brilliantly as Scott and Zelda—perhaps the only literary couple known by their first names—burned their way through life on two continents until alcoholism and madness snuffed their partnership, but not their devotion. "Even in the darkest times," says Eleanor Lanahan, 48, one of their three grandchildren, "Scott still loved her and still believed that they were one person. (EBSCO; People 1)

This relationship that Fitzgerald has with Zelda demonstrates the contrast of the importance of money with the importance of love. Though the common perception that money means happiness may not be true, maybe the concept of the “American Dream” can take on a different meaning. If defined as the life, liberty, pursuit of happiness that America prides itself on, maybe, producing a better end result and greater ultimate satisfaction, the “American Dream” can actually be achieved.
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Dorothy Parker: Getting a Seat at the Table

An active writer for the *New Yorker* and a founding member of the Algonquin Round Table, or “Vicious Circle,” Dorothy Parker was well-known in the Roarin’ 20s for her poetry, short stories, and reviews. Her popularity came from her sharp wit and ability to speak her mind. In her works, she wasn’t afraid to push the boundaries of what was acceptable at the time. Her first poem was sold to *Vanity Fair* when she was only 21, and she held an editorial position at *Vogue* at 22. In 1926, Parker’s first poem collection, *Enough Rope*, was published, followed shortly after by *Sunset Gun* in 1928 and *Death and Taxes* in 1931 (“About Dorothy Parker”). Her collections were bestsellers, and almost all styles of Parker’s works were critically acclaimed, including an Academy Award nomination for her original screenplay *A Star Is Born* (“Dorothy Parker Biography”). Her works were something to be admired because of her honesty and clever wit.

Parker’s style of poetry is unique due to her solid voice and tone. Her confident expression is evident despite the time they were published. It wasn’t common for a woman to write so bluntly about her life and personal experiences. She used verbal irony and misdirection to elicit humor in most of her famous poems—misleading the reader until the very last line. Additionally, her poems incorporate a rhyme scheme that allows for specific word choices to enhance the comedy. She often used an abab rhyme scheme to guide her poems. However, she also wrote many poems in couplets, which make for a quick and witty read. Her word choice
-spanned long, multi-syllabic, and melodic words to short, sharp, and monosyllabic words. Her subject matter typically comprised women in the 20s, particularly the undermining of women at that time. She often wrote about thumbing her nose at society and men alike, but she’d also write about being proud of who she was. Parker wasn’t afraid to push the envelope of what was deemed acceptable for women in her time.

Dorothy Parker’s poem “Men” is an example of how she critiqued men and society. Her typical subject matter and themes are prominent in this poem—starting with the title, “Men,” which implies this poem can be applied to all men. It’s not a specific instance that Parker will be writing about, but a generalization or universal truth. While the title seems general, it emphasizes the way men act and regard women. The poem starts by detailing that men will put women up on a pedestal, praise them, and love them, but then when women are “theirs,” they become much more controlling and want to change everything about the woman they love. Parker opens the poem with a simile, saying that men see women as their “morning star.” As beautiful as it sounds, it’s a way of conveying that men see women as objects from the get-go. As the poem progresses, the “morning star” isn’t what men want anymore, and so they change everything about her until the woman is unrecognizable, even to herself. Although the speaker’s tone is negative, there is still an underlying tone of wit. It comes at the end of the poem with the last line: “They make me sick, they make me tired.” The speaker is critiquing men’s actions unfavorably, but that last line has a humorous punch because, after all the horrible things these men are doing, the speaker is simply tired—not angry, not hurt, just tired. It’s an unexpected emotion. The speaker’s exhaustion is a perfect way to end the poem because it’s relatable. This leads to the “Comedy is truth and pain” philosophy: the idea that the best comedy comes from something being true and relatable and also a place of hurt. Parker uses that method in her poem.
All women can relate to this poem because it’s unfortunately true and it hurts. That last line can also be read as an “amen” of sorts. This poem calls attention to what women are constantly enduring and calls out men who continue to act and treat women this way. Parker was never afraid to speak her mind, especially on issues that are pressing to her, and this poem is no exception.

I admire Dorothy Parker because she didn’t hesitate. She didn’t let the pressure and norms of society in the 20s, 30s, and 40s stop her from speaking her mind. I love her quick wit and use of misdirection. To see a woman who wasn’t afraid of her thoughts and wasn’t worried about what society might think inspires my writing and how I think about comedy. I typically find myself overthinking what my jokes are saying and how they might impact those around me, but Parker had things to say, so she said them. That’s a good message for me to keep in mind as I continue to write and grow. In my poem, I showcase Parker’s ability to call men and society out for things that are normalized and cleverly criticize them. I used misdirection and an abab rhyme scheme. I believe I did her style justice.

A Meeting

If I may,

It seems to me that your eyes won’t meet mine

I don’t know why they seem to sway.

You see, my eyes tend to shine

And so do yours.

I find them to be the finest part of a face.

Or maybe it’s the smile, it never bores.
It adds a nice feeling of grace.

A smile will push the eyes up with a crease

It allows the whole visage to light up.

The whole face is filled with joy as one piece.

So please, lift your chin up.

Because I feel my eyes, face, and smile

Is where I’m at my best.

And if you want this greeting to last a while,

You’d get your eyes off my chest.
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Sustainable Agriculture to Combat Climate Change in Haiti

Haiti is a small country in the Caribbean Sea, measuring 10,714 square miles with a population of 11.4 million\(^1\) (Ferguson). Roughly 60% of its population lives in dense coastal cities such as Port-au-Prince (USAID). Haitians are geographically situated on a fault line between two major tectonic plates, the North American and Caribbean plates, as well as in the middle of the hurricane belt, putting them at an increased risk for intense storms and earthquakes (Diaz). They are also the poorest country in the Western Hemisphere—with more than half its population living well below the international poverty line set by the world bank. Their struggling development can be attributed to the debt they accrued when gaining independence from France in 1804: an amount that would today be 22 billion dollars. For roughly the next 120 years, the majority of Haiti’s revenue went toward paying off this debt, leaving little monetary room for plans to develop (Labrador et al.). To pay off their debt, Haiti turned to exports of timber and refined sugarcane. As a result of this, as well as a need for cheap fuel sources, rates of deforestation skyrocketed, and, in turn, their soil quality was drastically depleted.

Haiti still relies on agriculture for exports and to sustain the nutritional needs of its growing population. Currently, its countryside is only 3% forested (Bargout and Raizada). With the combination of frequent, extreme, natural disasters, a geographically mountainous terrain,

\(^1\) For reference, North Carolina is 53,819 miles squared with a population of 10.39 million. (“North Carolina”)
and widespread deforestation, Haiti is at a disproportionate risk for erosion and mudslides, which have been known to destroy full years' worth of families’ crops. Their susceptibility to erosion has also worsened the effects of the hurricanes and storms they experience, which are predicted to increase in frequency and intensity in the coming years as a result of the rising temperatures of climate change (UN News). Haiti’s reliance on agriculture, specifically plantation farming, has been severely impacted by storms and hurricanes. Monoculture is known to be unsustainable, and in an area that needs soil stability to combat the increasing intensity of its storm seasons, this method of agriculture has had major consequences. Another factor that has led to increased erosion is Haiti’s bimodal rain pattern. They experience two rainy seasons with periods of drought in between (Bargout and Raizada), and rising average temperatures have led to more intense drought seasons and, therefore, worse soil quality (CCKP).

Various organizations and research projects aim to develop more sustainable agricultural practices for the people of Haiti, and the general consensus is that the plantation and monoculture system that is so relied on is not sustainable, especially with the ongoing effects of climate change. The main sustainable practice that could be implemented is committing to polyculture farming, which would include the planting of cover crops to support soil structure, as well as terracing on steeper hills (McClintock). This is also known as creating diversion ditches, which create paths for rainwater to flow without disrupting crops too much. Polyculture, when done properly, can have higher yields than monoculture farming, which is an important factor for Haitians who experience large amounts of food insecurity. The difficulties that could arise from changing practices are primarily financial. In the short term, monoculture is cheaper by only buying a few kinds of seeds in bulk rather than a diverse amount in smaller quantities. The training and extra manual labor that goes into learning practices such as terracing are also
concerns. The Haitian government has a branch dedicated to managing agricultural practices, MARNDR. While this branch is supposed to give training to new farmers, a review in 2008 showed that only 3% of farming families had ever received training. For these new practices to be implemented successfully, training is necessary (Bargout and Raizada). Should it be up to MARNDR to provide this training? Or some non-governmental organization? Would Haitians be able to sustain themselves nutritionally or financially in the time it takes to change practices?

Switching from agriculture that has been practiced for decades if not centuries to new and very different practices takes time—time that Haitians may not have.

The change in farming practices, in the long run, could benefit all of Haiti, but it’s specifically the smaller communities that are at risk in the meantime, those rural communities with less access to land for farming and money for beginning such practices. If yields fall below what these communities are used to, it could be catastrophic to have nothing to fall back on financially or nutritionally. Food insecurity and the fear surrounding it plays a large role in the community’s willingness to change their practices. The Haitian government is also a large stakeholder in these changes, especially financially. If crop yields fluctuate at the time when practices are switching, their fragile economy could be impacted, which in turn could impact the whole country. But if things were to go smoothly, and the practices do help erosion as hoped, it could save the country hundreds of thousands of dollars in money spent on damage caused by mudslides and lost crops. The stakes for the impacts of climate change on this community are getting higher and higher. Should the Haitian government, specifically MARNDR, pass legislation that requires farmers to use sustainable practices? It could help move the process along faster, but without adequate support for the project, including financial support, it could end poorly. But is the government stable enough to see through such a large country-wide
project? The Haitian government has been unstable due to constant power changes and poor leadership, and MARNDR has struggled in the past to fulfill its duties of overseeing soil enhancement missions. A large project such as this may not even be in the cards with its struggling functionality. While, hopefully, sustainable practices would increase soil quality, only 20% of Haiti’s land is currently arable, even though 50% is being used for agriculture. Would the soil be able to support polyculture in its beginning stages? It’s a risk that communities would have to take, but many may not wish to.

I believe that to make substantial changes in protecting their community from the impacts of climate change, Haitians must fix their erosion problem, starting with sustainable agriculture practices. Although I don’t think it would be beneficial to put it into legislation immediately, I believe if the Haitian government took more steps into properly using the money raised by NGOs, those organizations could help majorly facilitate the switch in agricultural practices. Ideally, this could be done by their government, but realistically that could be much more difficult and take much more time. While the loss of food quantity is definitely a risk, especially in the first few growing seasons, over time sustainable practices would help restore soil quality, and ground covers that protect from erosion, and hopefully combat saltwater intrusion. Another vital step to take would be replanting Haiti’s forests. This step would most likely be significantly harder, especially since the risk of them cutting down the regrown trees for fuel or exports is high, but the increase in agriculture that would occur with more sustainable practices would hopefully diversify the market enough over time that exporting timber wouldn’t be as necessary. Although the potential decrease in crop yields in the first years of transition is a risk, with proper monetary and nutritional support, the pros of mitigating soil erosion would outweigh any cons that switching to sustainable agriculture presents.
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According to American psychologist Abraham Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs, before one can fulfill their need for love, belonging, or self-actualization, they must first satisfy their most basic physiological need: food and water. Unfortunately, in the United States today, food—our most basic human need—is not equitably accessible to all. In fact, the systemic racism that the United States has been steeped in and built upon for generations is a primary source of this inequality. While there is some disagreement about the proper terminology to describe food injustice in the United States and there are varying proposals for the most effective solutions, one thing is clear: inequality and discrimination within the country’s food system exist, and the nation must take action or risk leaving those marginalized groups behind.

In recent years, the term “food desert” has become common vernacular in the fast growing sustainable food movement; however, the more accurate term, coined by food justice activist and co-founder of the Black Farmer Fund, Karen Washington, is “food apartheid.” The term “food desert” intends to designate a region that lacks access to affordable, good quality, healthful food, but it is an outsider term that fails to account for the systemic racism at the root of the problem. Apartheid, in its original definition, was government sanctioned racial segregation in South Africa beginning in 1948. While racial segregation existed in South Africa before 1948, apartheid was conceived by Daniel F. Malaan, leader of the newly elected National Party, in 1948 to strengthen and ensure the endurance of a racial hierarchy. Apartheid consisted of, but
was not limited to, regional segregation, disenfranchisement of black South Africans, acts to limit black students’ access to education, and prohibition of interracial relationships of any kind. Additionally, communism was used as an excuse to detain anyone who opposed the government, and the police were given the authority to, “commit acts of violence, to torture, or to kill in the pursuit of official duties” (Britannica). While the United States government did not implement “apartheid” as it existed in South Africa, it has exercised the same systemic oppression of black Americans through slavery, segregation, Jim Crow, red-lining, police brutality, and discrimination under the law. This systemic oppression is the root of the racism and economic disparities which prevent BIPOC from having a voice in the American food system and, consequently, experiencing the negative impacts of limited access to healthful foods. Furthermore, the term “food desert” implies a place that is desolate and without potential and ignores the social impacts on low-income neighborhoods and BIPOC. As Karen Washington puts it, “We have to understand, as a people we always have been brainwashed to think of ourselves in terms of deficits. But people, we are Black people, we are proud people, and coming together collectively we are powerful… You may be designated as poor, but there is nothing poor about you” (qtd. in Satterfield). To designate an area a “food desert” simultaneously neglects the racial underpinnings of food injustice and undermines the community’s self-concept.

The United States agricultural system was built on the backs of indigenous and enslaved people, in fact enslaved African people were brought to the U.S. for their agricultural knowledge; however, from the relinquishment of the 40 acres and a mule promise to red-lining, segregation, and suburbanization, people of color have been systematically excluded from the American food system. In response to the housing shortage in 1933, Roosevelt’s administration established a New Deal program meant to help white, middle- and lower-class citizens find
housing. The Federal Housing Administration subsidized new, suburban communities for white homeowners and pushed black residents into urban housing projects. The FHA justified their actions in the Underwriting Manual, which explicitly states that, “incompatible racial groups should not be permitted to live in the same communities” (Gross). Additionally, beginning in 1934, they refused to insure mortgages to black homeowners or those living near black neighborhoods. Red-lining was developed under the New Deal when color-coded maps of metropolitan areas were used to determine whether an area was insurable or not; any area with a predominantly black population was colored red to signify that the area was too risky to insure. Richard Rothstein, author of The Color of Law, notes in an interview with NPR’s Terry Gross that, "The segregation of our metropolitan areas today leads ... to stagnant inequality, because families are much less able to be upwardly mobile when they're living in segregated neighborhoods where opportunity is absent" (qtd. in Gross). Rothstein’s argument is clear in the data: “Today African-American incomes on average are about 60 percent of average white incomes. But African-American wealth is about 5 percent of white wealth. Most middle-class families in this country gain their wealth from the equity they have in their homes. So this enormous difference between a 60 percent income ratio and a 5 percent wealth ratio is almost entirely attributable to federal housing policy implemented through the 20th century” (Gross).

From the 40s to the 60s, African American families could afford suburban homes, which on average sold for about two times the median income; however, they were not allowed to purchase these homes. While white homeowners experienced a notable increase in their property values—their homes increased to sell at six to eight times the median income—black families did not. Even when the Fair Housing Act passed in 1968 allowing African Americans to buy those homes, they could no longer afford them. Cities like Philadelphia, one of the three largest
cities in the U.S. in the 30s, saw a steady population decline after 1950 due to white-flight and suburbanization, leaving behind black communities in urban areas with little to no upward mobility. When chain grocery stores were introduced in the 30s, they were present in both urban and suburban areas, offering access to cheaper goods than one could find in mom-and-pop-shops. Commercially owned, self-serve groceries came to dominate the market during the Depression when locally owned stores could no longer compete. Unlike water, electricity, transportation, etc., which are forms of government subsidized infrastructure, the food distribution industry is mainly privately owned; thus, it is vulnerable to the capitalist inclination to maximize profit. Initially, corporations didn’t halt the development of urban supermarkets because they still believed they were profitable; however, eventually, urban stores could not turn enough profit to account for the high cost of square footage in cities. Thus, in order to stay competitive, corporations began opening larger stores in predominantly white, wealthy suburbs where they hoped to profit. Closing stores in urban areas meant that groceries were no longer within walking distance for many urban residents, and for low-income and elderly residents who had limited mobility, access to adequate stores was almost non-existent. While some smaller stores remained, they were more expensive and, thus, inaccessible to most. Additionally, smaller stores had fewer options, especially in terms of fresh, nutritious foods. This form of infrastructural exclusion—“the reorganization of spatial and material interdependence into a semi-autonomous and path-dependent force that separates resources from those reliant on them”—has created a national food system that is dominated by white voices and solidified the structure for food injustice (Deener).

Unfortunately, the solution to this infrastructural exclusion is not as simple as increasing access to a diversity of healthful foods. The mainstream sustainable food movement, as it exists
now, is exclusionary in nature because it is dominated by white voices and guided by the concept of “food deserts”. Conversely, the food justice movement is driven by an understanding of food apartheid and strives to design a more equitable food system through community engagement. The mainstream food movement valorizes organic, whole, slow food over all else. Michael Pollan, author of *The Omnivore’s Dilemma* and a leading voice in the sustainable food movement, criticizes the “industrial eater” and promotes a mindset that denounces certain foodways and assigns good and bad labels to food effectively condemning the way communities eat. In response to the detrimental effects of large scale agri-business, some argue that the best option would be small-scale, independent, sustainable, farming; however, this structure—dependent on the production and consumption of fresh, organic, local foods—excludes low-income communities that do not have the economic resources to support that lifestyle. Yes, the issues of sustainability and environmental degradation caused by large-scale agriculture need to be addressed; however, “eating cannot and should not be reduced to a simple binary of acceptable and unacceptable”, particularly when access to healthful foods is limited (Bradley and Galt). There is no one-size-fits-all solution to the inequities within the food system; thus, it is critical that one understands and respects how a community eats before action is taken. If the food movement remains focused on solving the issue of the so-called “food desert” by opening grocery stores, creating healthier school lunch programs, and running farmers markets, marginalized groups will be left behind. It is necessary to expand access to nutritious foods, but it must be in a way that is economically and culturally appropriate for the community rather than an expansion of the already white-washed food system.

Furthermore, even if the diversity of foods available to communities is augmented, that would not fully address the health crises that communities of color face disproportionately to
white communities. Systemic racism is a contributor to health. Before launching the Black Farmer Fund, food justice activist Karen Washington, was a physical therapist. Her clientele was predominantly people of color suffering from diabetes, obesity, and hypertension, all side-effects of structural exclusion from food markets and the impacts of systemic racism compounded with the burden of daily discrimination. For people of color, health issues resulting from poor diet tend to be addressed with medications rather than targeting the root of the problem: infrastructural inequality. Washington noted the differences she saw in her neighborhood and predominantly white neighborhoods: hers had many fast food restaurants while white neighborhoods did not; her grocery stores were stocked with low-quality, sometimes old, produce while white neighborhoods had access to a variety of fresh, healthful foods; and her neighborhood had drugstores springing up on every corner—to provide medicine for the aforementioned health crises. Similarly, Bryant Terry, chef in residence of the Museum of the African Diaspora in San Francisco and long-time food justice activist, notes that those who usually don’t have access to healthy, fresh, affordable food, tend to be the same communities that have “crumbling infrastructure, underfunded, segregated schools, very little safe green space for people to be active for their physical health, [and] very few jobs that pay a living wage” (Satterfield). Infrastructural exclusion, systemic racism, and limited upward mobility simultaneously promote health crises in low-income communities and communities of color, and undermine access to affordable healthcare to address the very same health concerns. By failing to address the root of the issue, those that dominate the infrastructure and food system fields are effectively exploiting communities of color to increase their own profit. As Washington puts it, “The fact is, if you do prevention, someone is going to lose money. If you give people access to really good food and a living-wage job, someone is going to lose money. As long as people are
poor and as long as people are sick, there are jobs to be made. Follow the money” (qtd. in Satterfield). The mainstream sustainable food movement is not the solution because it only addresses part of the problem. Without understanding the social implications of food inequality—specifically economic disparity and systemic racism—justice in American foodways is not possible.

When solutions are community driven and applicable to the community’s foodways and food culture, they are most effective. Promoting self-determination in production, distribution, and consumption restores power to affected communities and provides a sense of autonomy and competence, “instead of coming in and changing the dynamics and the complexion of our neighborhood” (Washington cited in “Food Apartheid”). In the unincorporated cities of Ashland and Cherryland, California—predominantly low-income communities of color—the processes of suburbanization, red-lining, and the concentration of low income housing in the area have led to food-apartheid in the area. In response, Alameda County Sheriff’s Office sergeant Marty Neideffer launched Dig Deep Farms & Produce in Spring 2010 to combat the impacts of food-apartheid in the community. Neideffer’s goal was not simply to provide healthful foods to the community but also to give community members autonomy in the production and distribution of goods to create a self-sufficient, local food system. To do so, Neideffer, a white law enforcement officer, hired Hank Herrera, a food justice activist and person of color as general manager, and he brought in black residents looking for jobs. With the recognition that Dig Deep’s purpose was to serve the community, not change it, Dig Deep started by researching local foodways in order to understand the culture of eating in the community to serve the community in a way that fit them, rather than attempting to conform the community to a system based on prevailing food advice. The farm’s crew members were an invaluable resource; they had understanding of the
community, local foodways, and mindsets that Neideffer could not know. Additionally, after crew members shared their grievances about some of the farm’s management practices, Neideffer increased transparency with all company meetings, and all managers showed respect to the crew by listening to their concerns, values, and requests. For Dig Deep Farm, their success was not so much about the products that they were making available to the community—though the value of fresh produce and nutritious foods cannot be understated—as it was focused on engaging with the community in a way that allows them autonomy to enhance their local foodways in a way that is culturally appropriate. The same sentiment is observable in supermarket intervention policies. Stores have greater staying power when the community is involved. In fact, some government intervention is not supported because it does not involve the community and is, therefore, seen as increased gentrification rather than the installation of a supermarket meant to serve the community. Similarly, while commercial interventions can be established much faster than their community-, government-, or non-profit-driven counterparts, they do not have the same success rates as stores that were developed in collaboration with the community. In a study conducted for the *Journal of Public Affairs*, Catherine Brinkley finds that, “Comparing the development process to store status, we find that while all categories [government, commercial, nonprofit, and community-driven] have produced stores that successfully opened, none of the stores opened through a nonprofit or community-driven process have closed. Further, if canceled plans or a store closing are considered failures and an open store is considered a success, then the success rates for stores with substantive community engagement are higher. Nearly half of the commercial-driven cases and one third of government-initiated cases have failed compared with roughly 10% for community-driven and nonprofit efforts” (Brinkley et al.). Community intervention takes longer, and it requires some resources
from the community itself; however, the success rates are undeniable. By working with the given community, a supermarket is able to cater to the needs and desires of the community to serve them rather than the mainstream food movement narrative.

Food apartheid’s roots run deep in the United States, nurtured by segregation, suburbanization, systemic racism, and the very food movement itself which strives to conform rather than support affected communities. The issue of food justice is complex; its solution cannot be manufactured as dominant, mostly white, voices in the mainstream food movement would like to believe. Real change will occur when the food movement is diversified and marginalized communities are granted the autonomy to shape their local foodways in a manner that promotes their values and culture.
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Life as a woman during the Victorian Period was extremely limiting due to the fact that almost every aspect was governed by the presence of a male figure. Whether that be a father, husband, brother, uncle, or cousin, the presence of man was practically mandatory in order to have an organized and stable livelihood. In *Jane Eyre*, Bronte explores this element of Victorian society with many of her female characters demonstrating different ways for women to navigate society. Through the characters of Jane and Bertha, Bronte contrasts the values of marriage founded on material gain and marriage founded on values of mutual respect and their effectiveness in providing purpose for women in the Victorian Era.

Bertha’s marriage to Rochester was arranged out of material desire and depicts the typical values of Victorian upper class society. While wealth was certainly a mark of achievement and necessary to be a member of high society, this was only one among several values held by the Victorian upper class. Title was equally important for one’s social standing and, because of this, one (either wealth or title) was often used as a bargaining chip to achieve the other. In the case of Edward Rochester, while his family name held significant value, he was not going to inherit the wealth of his father. Before the death of his older brother, Rochester was not supposed to receive any financial inheritance and, as a result, his father planned to use their family name as a means of achieving greater opulence (through his youngest son). Thus spawned the union between Bertha Mason and Edward Rochester. As Rochester later explains,
I was sent out to Jamaica, to espouse a bride already courted for me. My father said nothing about her money; but he told me Miss Mason was the boast of Spanish Town for her beauty: and this was no lie. I found her a fine woman, in the style of Blanche Ingram: tall, dark, and majestic. Her family wished to secure me because I was of a good race; and so did she. (465)

This marriage was arranged by his father with the goal of attaining the Mason’s fortune, and the Masons, who were equally invested in this relationship, were after the prestige of the Rochester family name. On top of this, Bertha is described as beautiful; she was one if not the most elegant woman in all of Spanish Town, and to have had a woman of such beauty as a spouse would have also been viewed as a commendable achievement in Rochester’s world of aristocracy. This engagement is a depiction of a marriage based solely on commerce and is very reflective of common values held by those in the Victorian era. It was not merely the goal of Victorians to achieve wealth since it was equally important to possess a sense of social vanity. For Edward, this vanity came in the form of Bertha who, aside from her family’s money, provided social prestige by serving as his “trophy wife.” Their relationship was founded on very weak emotional ties and because of this, Bertha’s family was able to hide the fact that she was mentally ill. This was a mercantile relationship in which the Masons were able to present Bertha how and when it best suited them. As Edward told Jane,

They showed her to me in parties, splendidly dressed. I seldom saw her alone, and had very little private conversation with her. She flattered me, and lavishly displayed for my pleasure her charms and accomplishments. All the men in her circle seemed to admire her and envy me. I was dazzled, stimulated: my senses were excited; and being ignorant, raw, and inexperienced, I thought I loved her. (465)
As he explains, Edward was given very few chances to get to know Bertha personally, and she was always presented with overwhelming charm during extravagant social gatherings. The Masons were able to sell Edward on the thought of their daughter through flashy showmanship and as a result, a decision was made without forethought of personal compatibility or genuine emotion. It wasn’t until after the wedding that Edward realized that Bertha struggled with mental illness and that she was not a suitable partner.

Despite the marriage to Bertha being one of commercial design, in the end, it failed to prove useful to Rochester and Bertha was left without purpose. After the marriage, both Edward’s father and older brother died, leaving him with the family fortune (that he was not meant to inherit) and making Bertha’s wealth unimportant. Rochester was left with an excess of wealth and an insane wife whom he did not respect as his partner. Bertha had essentially lost all of her commercial value as she could not fulfill his desire for social vanity and her fortune was no longer of any benefit to him. What Rochester had initially mistaken for love -- Bertha’s beauty, social extravagance, and affluence -- were all lost and, as such, he was left with a feeling of resentment towards Bertha. She was kept out of sight in his family’s English estate, and, though the attic was preferable to Victorian era asylums, Edward still offered little in the way of respect towards Bertha, which can be seen in the way in which he describes her to Jane:

“The paroxysms, when my wife is prompted by her familiar to burn people in their beds at night, to stab them, to bite their flesh from their bones, and so on – ‘Sir,’ I interrupted him, ‘you are inexorable for that unfortunate lady: you speak of her with hate – with vindictive antipathy. It is cruel – she cannot help being mad.’ (458-459)

As Jane remarks, Edward speaks of his wife with slight disdain and mockery. She has lost most of his sympathy and without the tie of marriage between the two, he would most likely have not
been inclined to hold himself responsible for her wellbeing. Due to her mental illness, Bertha is disadvantaged in attaining purpose, and without the appeal of her wealth she had lost any sense of purpose that remained. Her appeal was completely material and as a result, she failed to achieve a functioning role in Victorian society. This opposed Jane who lacked both riches and social standing so had to rely on her character.

Jane’s marriage to Edward is founded on respect and is successful in maintaining Jane’s sense of purpose. From a young age, Jane has felt the need to be useful to those around her. She has always existed in a liminal zone having been born into a wealthy family with living relatives yet equally cast out as an orphan and viewed as one of low class. This made it hard for Jane to find a sense of belonging; however, her solution was to make herself serviceable. Part of this drive to find purpose was instilled in her by Bessie who, in Jane’s youth, explained that Jane, as she existed then (outcast from the family), possessed less belonging than a servant on account of the fact that she did not offer anything of use to the Reed family. Whereas at least a servant provided services that were useful to their environment. Jane took this criticism to heart and resolved to make herself an asset by making good use of her studies at Lowood and eventually becoming a governess at Thornfield. However, as Carla Kaplan remarks, “in spite of her extreme youth, her habits of quiescence and submission, her need to be loved and approved, even if only by her oppressors, Jane stands up for herself and for fairness.” Jane conducts herself in a manner that is true to her character and the path that she has paved. This authenticity can be seen in instances such as her refusal of the fancy attire recommended by Edward in which she exclaims that if he were to keep doting upon her with fancy fabrics and jewels, she would “wear nothing but my old Lowood frocks to the end of the chapter. I’ll be married in this lilac gingham—you may make a dressing-gown for yourself out of the pearl-grey silk, and an infinite series of
waistcoats out of the black satin.” (409-410) In this case, Jane does not wished to be paraded around as another accessory of wealth. She refuses to be placed back into a liminal zone between upper and working class and is firmly determined to maintain the sense of belonging she has strived to achieve within her community. This resolve is exactly what draws Rochester to Jane. He appreciates her intellectual competence, integrity, and willingness to address the world as she sees it. As Rochester proposes to Jane for the first time he says, “My bride is here, because my equal is here, and my likeness.” (387) He respects Jane for who she is and because she is able to act and make judgments for herself based on her own set of morals and values. It is because she stays true to those values that she has made herself useful both as governess of Thornfield and eventually wife to Rochester. And while Jane initially refuses to marry Edward, it is out of respect for her values. She will not subject herself to a life with a man currently married to another. This, of course, only serves to strengthen her integrity and in turn, the story rewards Jane by removing Bertha from the picture. Upon returning to Rochester, Jane is able to maintain her sense of purpose and belonging while also remaining true to her morals. She made herself needed by demonstrating her value through her efforts and she has secured a sense of purpose through marriage despite lacking all of the material values of the Victorian Era.

Both Jane and Bertha exist within the liminality of life as a woman in the Victorian Era and look to find purpose through being needed. They both attempt to achieve a place in society through the means of another because women were not given the opportunity of self sufficiency. There were very few options for women without family (husbands, fathers, brothers, etc.) and Jane’s experience was certainly not representative of the majority of women in her situation. Instead, her story is in part a protest against Victorian values and social conduct. As Sandra Gilbert mentions, “the young novelist [Bronte] seems here definitively to have opened her eyes
to female realities within her and around her: confinement, orphanhood, starvation, rage even to maness.” Bronte uses Jane’s story as means of promoting qualities of self advocacy and independence despite the fact that Jane was restricted by the social climate at the time. Bronte most likely contrasts Jane’s search for purpose with that of Bertha in similar protest towards the treatment of those who failed to prove themselves “useful” to society in a traditional sense. Because Bertha was not able to secure a clear sense of purpose, she was cast aside with no means of changing her life (both as a woman and someone who suffers from mental illness). Jane’s story however, serves as the opposite side of the same coin by providing a suggested change in perspective: the idea that you can achieve purpose through your own means regardless of the cards that life has dealt you.
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Motivation during the Civil War

The Civil War was the deadliest war that the U.S has ever fought. Throughout the Civil War, soldiers on both sides fought through treacherous conditions and withstood countless hardships. It is hard to imagine today what it would take to be motivated to fight such a war. Despite horrible conditions and mental trauma, many soldiers, Union and Confederate alike, remained motivated to fight throughout the war and maintained pride in what they were fighting for. However, Union and Confederate forces were also alike in the sense that both sides had countless soldiers who lost their motivation to fight. The difference between the motivation in the two sides was what the soldiers were actually fighting for. Wartime letters from Augusta County, Virginia and Franklin County, Pennsylvania can give insight into these similarities and differences in motivation for Union and Confederate soldiers during the Civil War.

Despite horrible conditions and the high likelihood of death, many soldiers, Union and Confederate alike, remained motivated to fight. They managed to maintain pride in what they were fighting for and refused to give up. This is evident in a letter from Union soldier Franklin Rosenbury to his father where he says, “I feel satisfied that I felt it my duty to come out as a man for my country. And if it costs my life it is right.” Rosenbery is aware that his life could be lost in the war but that does not deter his motivation to fight for his country and defeat the Confederacy. Another Union perspective that shows motivation can be seen in a letter written by Union Officer James Harman. Harman tells his father, “You also Say if You were in my place You would resign and come home, well Farther it is not that I have not been tempted to resign before this when I look and See how things

---

are going but, I have taken an oath to Support the Constitution of the U. States and obey the President and assist him in carrying out and administering the laws.”

Similar to Franklin Rosenbery, Harman is aware of the current situation and that he could die any day but he remains motivated to fight to protect the Constitution and support President Lincoln. This letter was written days after the Union defeat at Richmond which cost the side over 5,000 lives. To remain dedicated to the war effort after witnessing such a battle shows true motivation. Evidence from Confederate soldiers can also be used to prove that both sides of the war had motivation to fight. In a letter from Confederate soldier James McCutchan. McCutchan finishes by saying, “This is the darkest hour the Confederacy has ever seen. Now is the time for every true & patriotic spirit to rally ’round the Bonnie Blue Flag & fight & never cease to fight while there is an enemy South of Mason's & Dixon's line.” This is a powerful message that shows true pride in the Confederacy. Despite the odds being heavily against the Confederacy, McCutchan remains motivated and encourages others to fight to the death alongside him. This theme of maintaining motivation and pride during hard times is can be seen on both sides of the war.

Another similarity found in both Union and Confederate forces is that many soldiers lost motivation to fight. While some of the soldiers remained motivated to fight through hard times, many others couldn’t take the mental and physical toll of fighting any longer. An instance of this happening from a Union perspective is shown in a letter from Samuel North to his father. In the letter he describes the Union defeat at Chancellorsville and lists the casualties and deaths of men in his regiment. The whole letter has a sense of hopefulness and desperation. North assures his father, “as I have just come from the battle field you need not fear that I will enlist again. there was five days fighting.” North is obviously no

---


longer motivated to fight and for good reason. He is no longer willing to risk his life and endure the mental impacts of watching his companions die. Another interesting Union perspective comes yet again from James Harman who had previously written to his father expressing his motivation to fight. In a letter written to his father after the Battle of Fredericksburg Harman expresses quite the opposite of the motivation he had shown in the letter he had written a few months prior. Harman states, “Farther, I never want to get into another battle it is terrible Persons falling all around me.” He then expresses his desire to resign from the army but explains that only one out of the last 12 resignations have been approved. It is evident that Harman’s once strong motivation was lost after fighting through countless battles and being forced to witness thousands of soldiers die around him. The mental toll of witnessing all this death eventually overpowered Harman’s desire to fight for the Constitution and serve his duty. Lack of motivation also can be seen on the Confederate side. In a letter to his wife, Confederate soldier Jedediah Hotchkiss explains how much he misses her and expresses how he would rather be back home with her than fight in the war. Hotchkiss’s love for his wife overrode his motivation to fight for the South. This homesickness and longing for loved ones was seen in soldiers across the board fighting for the North and South. Motivation for many soldiers, both Confederate and Union, was lost due to homesickness, the mental impacts of war, and the physical impacts of war.

Lastly, there were major differences in what was motivating Confederate soldiers to fight versus what was motivating Union soldiers. While slavery was the overarching cause of the war, soldiers across the board fought for a variety of different reasons having little to do with slavery. From a Union perspective many soldiers saw the war as a rebellion that threatened the survival of the nation and needed to be put down. This is evident in the letter from Franklin Rosenbery in 1864 where he refers to the war as a “wicked rebellion.” He also tells his father, “I can not last long if the men of the North only pull together as they ought and show the South that they will tramp slavery down and are determined to have a

---

free country and a free government.”7 For Rosenberg, this war was all about freedom. In his eyes, the rebellion of the South was threatening the freedom of the entire nation. He was fighting to protect freedom by helping to free slaves and establish America as a free country once and for all. Motivation for Union soldiers also came from the idea of having a duty of serving the nation. This is shown in James Harman’s first letter where he states, “I have taken an oath to Support the Constitution of the U. States and obey the President and assist him in carrying out and admistrating the laws.”8 The duty of serving his country was a major motivating factor for Union soldiers. The reasons for fighting on the Confederate side were very different. In a letter written by Confederate Col. James Baldwin in 1861, Baldwin expressed that the South had the “right of revolution” and should be allowed to peacefully secede from the Union. Baldwin ends his letter blaming the North for the war by saying,

“The issue of peace or war is in the hands of the North. We only ask to be let alone, and to be allowed to consult our interest and our safety in peace. If this is denied to us, mark the prediction, we will give you a fight which will stand out upon the page of history an example for all time of the determination with which a people can make war when they are conscious of having exhausted all honorable means of pacification.”9

From a confederate perspective, Baldwin feels that the Union is the aggressor in the war. He is motivated to fight by his want for peace and for the North to leave the South alone. Another Confederate soldier who was motivated to fight for the Confederacy was James McCutchan. In his letter to his sister, McCutchan describes why is fighting when he says, “Most all of our company have reenlisted I haven't reenlisted & I don't intend to do it, but I mean to stay & fight for my country & her rights [illeg.] to my friends and to the World that my service can't be

7 Rosenberg, Franklin
bought for fifty dollars.” McCutchan, similar to Baldwin, feels that the Union is threatening the rights of the Confederacy and he is motivated to protect those rights. In an earlier letter, McCutchan reveals another motivating factor. At the beginning of the letter he describes how miserable his day to day life is inside of his camp. He then says, “It (the war) will never be ended except by fighting + the sooner we do it the better. I despise inaction, I want to be doing something, something that my mind or hands can be employed at.” McCutchan is motivated to fight because he simply wants the war to end. Defeating the Union will allow him to go back to his normal life and the things that he enjoys doing. While Union and Confederate soldiers both had motivation to fight, their reasons for fighting were very different. Based on these letters it can be assumed that Northerners were fighting to put down a rebellion that threatened the survival of the United States of America. On the other hand, Confederate soldiers were motivated to fight because they felt that the North was threatening their rights and way of life.

Motivation played an important role in the civil war. While some soldiers remained motivated to fight through the bloodiest war in the history of the United States, many others could not stay motivated. This applied for both Union and Confederate forces. The difference between Union and Confederate forces was what exactly was motivating those soldiers who continued fighting. Slavery was the major cause of the war but many of the soldiers were fighting for completely different reasons. In the end, most of the motivation came down to protecting rights. The Confederate soldiers fought hard to protect their individual rights while Union soldiers fought because they saw secession as a threat to the survival of the nation that established their rights.
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