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Eliza Haywood: Feminine Role Reversal in a Virtual Context

Loretta M. Haskell

In the early 1700s, a young woman named Eliza Haywood began to write down stories of interest to the female population. Unmarried with two small children, the highly educated Haywood represented an aspect of society that was out of reach for thousands of women in her time. Haywood published over sixty novels, including journals and plays, during her lifetime (Schofield 1). Her readership consisted largely of upper- and middle-class women, specifically those in need of an escape from their bound-up lives. Haywood's novels created a simulation, a virtual reality, into which the oppressed women of the age could immerse themselves and exist, momentarily, in a life of role reversal, scandal, intrigue, romance, and adventure. By examining three of Haywood's earlier novels, one can begin to appreciate the power and impact of the stories, both on the women who were reading them and the women characters. The novels, Fantomina, or Love in a Maze; The Distress’d Orphan, or Love in a Mad-House; and Bath-Intrigues: In Four Letters to a Friend in London, express an important social and virtual aspect of the early eighteenth century. Specifically, Haywood's use of letters helps to create the world of these novels as well as the simulation into which the reader could become absorbed.

Elizabeth Fowler was born in London in 1693 to a shopkeeper (Schofield 1). Her father raised her with many liberties and educated her to the standard that was usually reserved for men. On December 3, 1711, Eliza married the Reverend Valentine Haywood, who was older
than her by fifteen years (Eliza being about eighteen at the time). Eliza had two children with Valentine before leaving him on November 26, 1721. During their short marriage, Eliza had tried stage acting, but after leaving her husband, she realized that it was not profitable enough to support her and her children (Valentine had little to do with the family after Eliza left). She turned her attentions to writing and there discovered her true talent (Schofield 1–2). From 1719 till her death on February 25, 1756, Haywood wrote voraciously (Schofield 2).

In 1719, Haywood published her first novel, *Love in Excess*, which proved an immediate success. Extremely popular among upper- and middle-class women, Haywood quickly found her niche. “During the early decades of the eighteenth century, the English reading public was undergoing a definite change....Romances and novels provided the vicarious excitement and liberating fantasies for which these readers yearned” (Schofield 4). Her female readership was yearning to believe in an escape from “their dull, despairing lives, which enslaved them to men legally, financially, and intellectually” (Schofield 5). They needed to believe that their lives “were actually the testing grounds of extraordinary heroism,” such as they were witnessing with Haywood’s female characters (Schofield 5). It is possible that Haywood’s personal libertine lifestyle was the drawing board for many of her passionate and fiery female characters. Schofield remarks that, “Hidden beneath the guise of her numerous heroines, Eliza Haywood herself remains a mystery” (1). While little is known of her life, Haywood’s characters represent a challenge, telling her readers, beneath the surface, “not to acquiesce quietly in male-imposed patterns and rules,” but to, instead, resist “complacency and [seek out] new alternatives of viewing the feminine self” (Schofield 9).

While Haywood was creating her many novels, romances, and secret histories, she was employing the tactics of “double writing” (Schofield 5). “Not content merely to adopt a masquerade technique in terms of [her] female protagonists, [the] novelist used the cover story of [her] romance plots to mask [her] feminist, aggressive intentions and to expose as facile and utterly fatuous the fictions created by men” (Schofield 5). While a female character may appear docile and controlled on the surface, always complying with the laws of a patriarchal society, beneath the façade she’s screaming out in rebellion. Haywood, in particular, extensively explored the psyche and the female consciousness (Schofield 3). The female character often “[adapts] herself to the exterior role defined for her by the male and [lives] her interior life in a way that admits to her true self” (Schofield 8–9). For instance, in *The Distress'd Orphan*, Annilia outwardly complies with Geraldo’s intentions for her to marry his son Horatio. However, internally, Annilia develops a hatred of her uncle and his son while fostering a yearning desire for Marathon. This inward truth begins to seep out as she exchanges letters with Marathon and then finally, outwardly rebels against her uncle’s wishes. Tragically though, Annilia is imprisoned for her rebellion, and even after her marriage to Marathon, she still has no control over her inheritance. This pattern is typical of double writing because the “novelist entrapped her unsuspecting readers first by presenting the escape tale they expected and desired, and then, under the cover of her fiction, revealed to them their de facto imprisoned and exploited state” (Schofield 6). Despite Annilia’s assertion of her desires, she is still physically imprisoned by her guardian. Also, after her dreams of marrying Marathon are realized, she still never gains the control over her estate. This pattern of double writing allows Haywood to offer women a virtual world of romance and independence into which they can escape while also seeking to enlighten them about the injustices of their patriarchal society and the true nature of men.

Three of Haywood’s novels express this process of creating a virtual world and double writing very clearly. *Fantomina, or Love in a Maze; The Distress'd Orphan, or Love in a Mad-House;* and *Bath-Intrigues: In Four
Letters to a Friend in London contain specific elements that allow for the creation of a virtual environment, a simulated existence, and a moment of realization. The letters employed by the characters in these three stories work to create an immersive experience for the reader.

In Haywood’s Fantomina, or Love in a Maze, the story begins with “A Young Lady of distinguished Birth, Beauty, Wit, and Spirit [who] happened to be in a Box one Night at the Playhouse” (Haywood, Fantomina 227). She decides to “dress herself as near as she could in the Fashion of those Women who make sale of their Favours and set herself in the Way of being accosted as such a one” according to “a little Whim which came immediately into her Head” (227). She returns to the Playhouse and allows a number of men seeking a private interlude to approach her. She enjoys the attention and the ability to refuse their offers. However, once she meets the handsome Beauplaisir, she allows herself to be entreated upon. He’s very insistent, but the Noble Woman remains in control of her situation. “She went out...and took Lodgings in a House...intending, that if he should insist on passing some Part of the Night with her, to carry him there, thinking she might with more Security to her Honour entertain him at a Place where she was Mistress” (229). After escorting him to the house, Fantomina, as she calls herself in disguise, believes she has successfully tricked Beauplaisir without having to fulfill the duties of her dress. However, Fantomina’s honor was not as secure as she believed:

—He was bold,—he was resolute: she tearful,—confused, altogether unprepared to resist in such Encounters, and rendered more so by the extreme Liking she had to him.—Shocked, however, at the Apprehension of really losing her Honour, she struggled all she could, and was just going to reveal the whole Secret of her Name and Quality, when the Thoughts of the Liberty he had taken with her, and those he still continued to prosecute, prevented her, with representing the Danger of being exposed, and the whole Affair made a Theme for public Ridicule. (230)

Fantomina’s honor is destroyed when Beauplaisir rapes her, but now she is bound to him. Unwilling to be cast aside and ruined in the eyes of society, Fantomina designs to make Beauplaisir her own. She continues to masquerade as Fantomina, who she tells Beauplaisir is the “Daughter of a Country Gentleman” (231). When Beauplaisir loses interest in Fantomina, she creates Celia, the country maid who entertains him while he vacations in Bath. Celia’s amours last an even shorter time, calling for the creation of the Widow Bloomer who escorts Beauplaisir back to Town. Her final disguise is as the masked Incognita, a noble woman who fancies Beauplaisir but has no interest in revealing herself to him. After their final rendezvous, the Noble Woman becomes pregnant. After giving birth at a ball her plots are revealed, and she is sent to finish out her life in a religious retreat.

Fantomina is an exploration in reconstructed reality. Pierre Levy describes the virtual as “that which has potential rather than actual existence” (23). The only real woman in Fantomina is the wealthy noble. Fantomina, Celia, Bloomer, and Incognita are virtualizations of her vision of a world without abandonment (Levy 41). But how is the potential of these four personas realized in such a way that Beauplaisir never suspects who is behind the mask?

The success of her ruse is completed through the use of letters, which act as a method for doubling herself. As Levy states, “the projection of the image of the body is generally associated with the notion of telepresence...the projection of the image” (39). When Levy describes this idea of telepresence, he does so through the idea of the telephone, which “carries that voice...and transmits it to a remote location” (39). This results in what he describes as his “tangible body [being] here, [his] audible body, doubled, is both here and there” (Levy 39). In the case of Fantomina, the female character of this story creates four different personas through which she deceives the naive Beauplaisir. She communicates with Beauplaisir...
through letters. The letters act as the specific perceptions of each woman, “a way of bringing [the Noble Woman’s] world to us” (Levy 38).

Toward the end of Fantomina, Fantomina writes to Beauplaisir “a long Letter of Complaint, that he had been so cruel in not sending one Letter to her all the Time He had been absent...subscribing herself his unalterably Affectionate Fantomina” (239). A few days later, Incognita writes “the All-conquering Beauplaisir,” that she is “infinite in Love with” his “Wit [and] Person,” signing simply “Yours, Incognita” (242). These two letters, sent by the same woman, are “in a different hand” and style (239). Fantomina writes a long letter of chastisement, begging Beauplaisir to visit her. Incognita deigns “not to fill up [her] Letter with any impertinent Praises” and succinctly states her affections (242). Fantomina writes a long letter of chastisement, begging Beauplaisir to visit her. Incognita deigns “not to fill up [her] Letter with any impertinent Praises” and succinctly states her affections (242). Beauplaisir already knows Fantomina but answers Incognita’s “Letter in Terms tender enough for a Man who had never seen the Person to whom he wrote” (243). The voice of the Noble Woman is virtually “doubled” through the letters of Fantomina and Incognita and is unrecognizable as the same author (Levy 39).

Through these letters, we get a solidification of the women they are supposedly from. Even though the letters are essentially from the same woman, Beauplaisir reads and responds to them completely differently. He’s formal and dismissive in his letter to Fantomina. He’s anxious and intrepid in his letter to Incognita. If we look closely at these two letters and the women they originated from, the completeness with which the real woman creates her characters and the importance of their letters can be seen more clearly.

In the case of Fantomina, the Noble Woman’s first creation, she is a lady of the night, “a supposed Prostitute” (227). For this guise, the Noble Woman selects the name Fantomina, a name that is as mysterious and tantalizing as the character, a certain phantom of the night. Later, she informs Beauplaisir that she is “the Daughter of a Country Gentleman” and proceeds to communicate with him in letters as such a woman (231). In the letter above, Fantomina writes a long and tortured letter, begging the return of the man she has shared her love with.

The second letter is written by the fourth disguise the Noble Woman assumes. Incognita is precisely what her name and letter to Beauplaisir suggests. In this letter, Incognita writes that Beauplaisir should not “dive into the Meaning of this Mystery, which will be impossible for you to unravel” (242). The Noble Woman dresses “endeavoring to repair the want of those Beauties which the Vizard should conceal” (244). She dresses up with her face covered, so that Beauplaisir will never know who she really is: she is going incognito. In the letter above, Incognita writes to Beauplaisir in the succinct fashion of a woman with clear intentions and rank, if not such a clear physical form. She writes in a different penmanship from that of Fantomina. She uses a tone of nobility, not pleading innocence like the supposed country girl, Fantomina.

In Fantomina, the reader experiences the transformation of one woman into four other distinct personalities. The Noble Woman behind these creations is so thorough that each new woman has her own name, voice, stature, and dress. However, it is through the letters that Beauplaisir responds in the most singular manners. He is aroused by each woman and takes each one in her turn. He then proceeds to lose interest in each until finally confronted with the true Noble Woman behind the masks. Through writing, though, Beauplaisir is forced to reconcile with each of the disguises at parallel moments. At one point he dispatches letters to both Fantomina and the Widow Bloomer on the same day. To Fantomina, he writes a formal letter of excuse, begging to see her another day, but reassures her that his affections are still with her (239). To Bloomer, he writes a letter of filled with lover’s angst. He pines to see her and begs to meet with her as soon as possible (239). By writing letters to Beauplaisir and receiving responses to the letters, “she ensures the constant ardent
embraces of a man of her own choosing...[she] satisfies her own wishes at the same time as she destabilizes the gaze of her lover, refocusing his look upon her four intentionally manufactured selves” (Craft-Fairchild 61). The letters allow for the true distinction of each woman since he’s receiving them simultaneously. Now, each woman can exist in such a way that demands Beauplaisir’s continuing affections and faithfulness. The letters of Fantomina represent something much deeper than just the duping of Beauplaisir and the doubling of the Noble Woman. The letters represent Haywood’s use of double writing. On the surface, the reader experiences a world of intrigue in which a wealthy woman explores the depths of infatuating love, but below there is something very different. After receiving Beauplaisir’s responses to her letters, Fantomina is incensed. “Traitor! (cried she,) as soon as she had read them, ’tis thus our silly, fond, believing Sex are served when they put Faith in Man.... How do some Women...make their Life a Hell, burning in fruitless Expectations and dreaming out their Days in Hopes and Fear....But I have outwitted even the most Subtle of the deceiving Kind” (Haywood, Fantomina 239). Through her romance with Beauplaisir, her love for him has revealed something more sinister: the deceiving nature of men. If read between the lines, Fantomina is making a statement about “male/female power structures” where Haywood’s usual “hidden tale of female domination [is brought] to the surface as she constructs her story around Fantomina’s supposed control of Beauplaisir” (Schofield 50–51). Fantomina’s indignation at Beauplaisir’s infidelity represents both her ability to maintain his fickle admiration (even though it’s accomplished through several guises) and to uncover his deceiving ways. “Fantomina chooses for herself what guise of femininity she will display. By manipulating the terms of her own representation instead of being manipulated by them, Fantomina avoids being ‘deceiv’d and cheated’ ” (Craft-Fairchild 64). She is able to manipulate Beauplaisir’s feelings by creating the guises and the simultaneous experiences of the letters, which she feels will maintain his interests. Since Fantomina is disguising herself in such a way to arouse Beauplaisir, she is still within a similar male over female power structure. But she is testing her power and exercising her control over the range of Beauplaisir’s affections. “By destabilizing dichotomies instead of overturning them, [Fantomina] poses a greater threat to the patriarchal order than perhaps any other masquerade text of the eighteenth century” (Craft-Fairchild 65). Haywood is making a statement to women, informing them of where they can take their own measures of control over the male power structure of their society. Fantomina represents an interesting form of female control that is solidified in the letters of the Noble Woman’s personas.

Letters play a unique role in another of Haywood’s texts: The Distress’d Orphan, or Love in a Mad-House. The Distress’d Orphan circles around the story of Annilia, a girl who “had the misfortune to lose both her Parents before she arrived at an Age capable of knowing what it was to be an Orphan” (Haywood, Distress’d Orphan 1). After the death of her parents, Annilia was sent to live with her uncle and guardian, Geraldo. His son, Horatio, is six years older than Annilia, and they were raised as companions and friends: “Whether in the Study or the Dancing-School, they scarce were ever asunder; the same Tutors and Masters instructed both” (2). Annilia was educated beyond the usual standard for women but was still unable to hold a higher stature in the eyes of her guardian. When her parents died, Annilia was left in possession of a vast fortune. While Annilia was a child, Geraldo was able to control that generous amount, but when Annilia comes of a marriageable age, he’s forced to consider its loss. Thus, to keep the fortune in his hands, Geraldo schemes to bring Horatio and Annilia together in marriage. At first, this design works well. Horatio agrees immediately to partake. Annilia, however, is hesitant: “I am at a loss to give a direct Reply; but of this am very certain,
that to whatever you think for my good, I shall submit with readiness" (6). Annilia complies without directly giving her hand to Horatio, and for a time, the three are content. One night, however, Annilia and Horatio attend a ball where Annilia meets the handsome rogue Marathon. Once they set eyes upon each other, both know for the first time what true love is. Marathon cannot let such a woman pass by. The guests flock to gaze upon a painting and "among the rest, the Curiosity of Annilia was excited, and as she was following Horatio some Steps behind him, Madam, said the watchful Lover, putting into her Hand the Letter, I found this directed for you..." (14). Marathon slips a letter professing his love into Annilia's hand. Soon after, Marathon writes another letter and dispatches it to Geraldo's house. Geraldo suspects whom the letter is from and sends him forth. Annilia rebels and starts a secret correspondence with Marathon. Eventually, they are discovered, and Annilia is barred in her room. Geraldo claiming she is insane. Geraldo then moves her in the dead of night to a madhouse on the edge of town. There, Annilia is subject to torment beyond her imagination: "The rattling of Chains, the Shrieks of those severely treated by their barbarous Keepers, mingled with Curses, Oaths, and the most blasphemous Imprecations, did from one quarter of the House shock her tormented Ears" (41–42). Marathon discovers where she is hidden and rescues her from the clutches of the insane. They are married; Annilia regains her fortune from Geraldo. Geraldo dies, and Horatio is exiled.

Again, the important aspect of this story is the letters that are exchanged between Annilia and Marathon. Within these letters, the inner rebellion of Annilia, which is eventually revealed outwardly, is expressed. According to Pierre Levy, "Just as we are able to share our intelligence and our vision of the world with others who speak the same language, we can now virtually participate in a communal body, along with those who belong to the same technological...networks" (41). Annilia is able to express her dissatisfaction with the world of her guardian and her love for Marathon through her letters, which serve as a representation of a communal knowledge both Marathon and Annilia share.

"The virtual is a kind of problematic complex, the knot of tendencies or forces that accompanies a situation, event, object, or entity, and which invokes a process of resolution: actualization" (Levy 24). Annilia's letters are a response to Geraldo's restrictions on her life. She creates a virtual world through her letters. Despite never having exchanged more than a few cordial words with Marathon, she engages in a very romantic exchange with him in writing. They fashion an existence that sustains them through her different levels of imprisonment. Their ultimate hope in the letters is to be united and married. Annilia is constantly thinking on how to placate her uncle so as to not arouse suspicion until the time is right for her to be with Marathon. The letters serve as a virtual world that hopes to end in the actualization of marriage. As Marathon's confidence professes, "What cannot Love like mine accomplish?" (23).

After meeting at the ball, Marathon is determined to make Annilia his. After professing his love to Annilia in the letter he slipped into her hand, Marathon risked sending a letter to her home so as to assess the situation with Geraldo. The messenger and letter were immediately turned away against Annilia's wishes. The letter was then given to her servant and delivered in secret, "To the most Charming and Divine Annilia" (23). Marathon continues to assert the depths of his love and desire for Annilia while also vowing to outdo his rival Horatio in both honor and devotion. He concludes by writing:

P.S. Since it is in the power of one Line to ease you of the Trouble of any future Solicitations from me, and to decide my Fate, be so divinely generous to afford it, and either at once destroy me, by avowing your Affection for my Rival; or relieve my Anxieties, by permitting me to hope I may in time alledge an equal Plea for Favour. (23)
Marathon is both observant and understanding of Annilia’s situation. He does what neither Horatio nor Geraldo has done; he gives thoughts to Annilia’s desires. Not only is he acknowledging that Annilia is already betrothed and therefore in a situation from which she cannot back away, he is laying bare his feelings and intentions so that Annilia may decide for herself if the situation is one that she would like to pursue. Her rebellious response to his letter is enough to reveal her intentions. Annilia responds in a manner becoming to her education and status:

My own Reason informing me, that to hold a Correspondence of this kind...is among the things which are justly esteem’d blamable; I must...acquaint you, that the visible Self-Interestedness of my Uncle has destroy’d that Confidence I should otherwise repose in so near a Relation, and obliged me to take a Resolution never from henceforward to consult him in any Affair, in which there is possibility of his being byass’d by a sinister View....I am inclined to believe you have Honour and Good-nature....I shall make tryal how far you are desirous of obliging. (25–26)

In the letter, Annilia introduces Marathon to her cool and reasonable line of thought. She is clearly assessing her situation from a distanced standpoint, recognizing Geraldo’s treachery, displaying her ability to make her own decisions, and, in the end, agreeing to allow Marathon to prove himself to her. Given the usual patriarchal system, Annilia would have no actual power over her decisions, particularly the ones she expresses in this letter. Annilia vows to only confer with Geraldo if the situation calls for his discretion. Otherwise, she shall make her own decisions. Also, she does not immediately give herself over to Marathon’s wooing, but expresses her interest, then makes a demand for him to be tested against her judgment to prove if he is worthy of her affections. “In one sense the entity conveys and produces its virtualities” (Levy 24). Annilia creates a virtual world in which she has the control and the ability to govern her own life. The letter, which acts as the “entity” through which this virtual reality is created, allows Annilia to both assess her situation and make her demands successfully. Eventually, the virtual reality that exists in these early letters comes into the reality of Annilia’s life with Geraldo and Horatio. In the end, Annilia is able to fulfill the desires of the letters by marrying Marathon and reclaiming her fortune from Geraldo.

Eliza Haywood’s process of double writing is more pronounced in The Distress’d Orphan than in Fantomina. In Fantomina the wrongs of men and the struggles against patriarchal oppression were buried underneath disguises and plots. In The Distress’d Orphan, however, the rebellion against society is clearly foregrounded in Annilia’s impassioned letters. By stating that she will judge the situation by “My own Reason,” she tells the reader immediately that she is not controlled completely by male impressions. Despite the pressures presented to her by Geraldo and Horatio, Annilia maintains her integrity and spirit, refusing, to the very end, to give in to their demands. Upon threat of life imprisonment, Annilia responds thus to Geraldo:

But in this she show’d a Strength of Mind...infinitely beyond what could be expected from her Years, or indeed what we have many Examples of in the other Sex; and replying to what he said with a dauntless Fortitude, and noble Boldness...that not only to procure her Liberty, but to preserve her Life, she would never yield to be the Wife of a Man, who had consented to use her with so unexampled a Barbarity. (Haywood 38)

Haywood openly praises Annilia for acting as the “other Sex” would have in such a situation. Annilia refuses to be the object of control in Geraldo’s scheme and stands firmly against his injustices, despite threats and further actions against her life and freedoms. By boldly placing Annilia in this
situation and giving her such fortitude in the face of her corrupt guardian, Haywood successfully enacts her desires to rebel against "unrestrained patriarchal authority" (Nestor 8). The reader, enjoying the text for its Gothic elements and powerful romance, is brusquely thrust into a story of open resistance to the male dominated societal order. Annilia’s letters are the seeds of that revolution, allowing the virtual to become reality.

The final text to be examined for Haywood’s fascinating double writing style and use of letters is a book that is nothing but letters: Bath-Intrigues: In Four Letters to a Friend in London. In Bath-Intrigues J. B. writes four letters to his friend Will back in London. Will, it appears, is interested in the gossip and exploits of the many wealthy patrons vacationing in Bath. J. B. is expected to report on the activities of several important visitors throughout his stay. There isn’t much development, except for the slow decline of J. B. as he moves from simple spectator to enactor in his last letter. In the beginning, he keeps up a constant stream of commentary about the different scandals and affairs he sees around him. In the end, he is the scandal after raping a woman whom he wished to share the affections of. Throughout the story, women are mainly the objects of men’s desires, and if they choose to act otherwise and take a lover of their own accord, they are shamed and looked down upon. In the second letter, J. B. remarks on a woman whose husband is constantly cheating. The woman decides to enact revenge by taking a lover and is thus "condemned as the most criminal Woman on Earth" (Haywood 20).

The letters of Bath-Intrigues serve an interesting purpose. Since no characters are clearly defined and the narrator is never fully fleshed out, not even given a real name, the letters serve as a window through which we can view the society of Bath. For Haywood, the letters represent a different view of society from that which she has previously expressed. While Fantomina and The Distress’d Lover were conducted by viewing the female protagonists’ trains of thought and inner resistance against patriarchal society, Bath-Intrigues focuses completely on the male point of view. While J. B.’s observations can be seen as satirical and critical views of man’s subjugation of women, they present an interesting view of the virtual when compared against Haywood’s other works.

As Levy states, the “so-called virtual reality systems enable us to experiment with the dynamic integration of different perceptual modalities. We are practically able to relive someone else’s complete sensory experience” (Levy 38). In the case of the letters, Levy’s statement can be applied to the experience J. B. has of viewing and participating in the degradation of moral standards in Bath and his transportation of those experiences to the reader through his writing. The audience is able to relive the scandals and injustices that J. B. is scrutinizing. By presenting us with the male perception of these events, Haywood is in fact offering her readers the opportunity to inspect societal flaws alongside J. B. without having to agree with him. For instance, in letter III, J. B. relates an observation of a young and virtuous woman who resided in Bath for a short time:

An Accident happen’d Yesterday, which has occasion’d no small Discourse here: a young Lady, who made a very handsome Figure, receiv’d publickly the Addresses of Beau Dresswell; we thought we should have had a Wedding here—there were several who would have been glad to have rival’d him; but she would not admit even of a Visit from any Man without his Approbation—they were on the Walks together, when a surly old Man came up to ’em; and taking her roughly by the Arm, bid her come along with him—she trembled, but durst not refuse—The poor Beau... saw his Mistress carried off, he know not by whom, nor where.... Early this morning, the poor Girl was pack’d off with the stern Don. (Haywood, Bath-Intrigues 42)
The young Lady, who upheld a virtuous life style, refused the approaches of other men while betrothed to another. Because of her moral standing, she was kidnapped, possibly raped, and then removed permanently from Bath to an undisclosed location. Not even her lover was allowed to reach her or know anything about her new whereabouts. The man who stole her, the Don, was a mysterious creature to all in Bath, and no one was aware of any relation between him and the young Lady. J. B. seems disturbed by this event and presents his views by his references to the woman in question. He refers to her as “poor” and “young,” implying her inexperience and inability to help herself against such a brutish man as the Don. However, the story is told and then quickly dismissed as simply good gossip. J. B. seems more intrigued by the fact that the “accident” was “no small discourse” and that it was now a town “mystery” to be unraveled (42, 43). The purpose of J. B.’s letters is set forth from the very beginning: “I am surpriz’d you should make choice of me for an Intelligence...but as you have thought me worthy of this great work, I will endeavour to go through it to the best of my power” (1). J. B. is simply supposed to report on the gossip of Bath to his London friend, which means that the incident of the young Lady may have simply been noticed for its importance to the gossip. By bringing the narrator’s intent to the forefront, Haywood is allowing her readers to analyze the situations to their own designs, since J. B. is simply supposed to be playing the observer.

Haywood’s use of double writing is varied in Bath-Intrigues, given its male narrator and pure letter format. There is little in the way of scenery, plot, and complete characters. The audience simply has the reported scandals to form their opinions and ideas from. Haywood masks her purposes with the obvious gossip that fills all fifty-one pages of the novel. Filled with scandal, rape, intrigue, and romance, Bath-Intrigues would be pure entertainment. However, as usual, there is more to read between the lines. If examined more closely, the kidnap scene of the young Lady is a pure protestation against the patriarchal hierarchy that dominates the lives of women. In the scenario, a young woman has made her intentions clear by accepting a suitor and refusing all others. But in the end her intentions are insignificant to the brute force and demands of the Don. He literally seizes her away from her lover and later removes her from Bath. Her intentions are never known, and she never gives approval to this man. “Sexual coercion, force, threats, and blackmail are the tools and techniques of the male; nowhere else is Haywood so blunt in her exposure of such tactics” (Schofield 61). The evil of men is put directly on display, without any overt opinions from the reporting narrator.

Bath-Intrigues represents Haywood’s “attempt to confront hardcore, female subjugation and to portray the age as she sees it...through extraordinary exaggeration” (Schofield 60-61). Fifty-one pages are filled with scandal after scandal of male oppression, including the narrator’s own dip into suppression after raping his hostess at a luncheon.

She went down a little pair of Back-Stairs...there I overtook her, and catching her in my Arms, frightened her...(said I) I design not to part with you so easily....I know there is one among the number...who would not forgive my offering to infringe on his Prerogative....She led me into the Garden and...completed my Desires in as riotous and full a manner as I could wish. (36-37)

After threatening to ruin her honor by informing her lover of his conquest, J. B. is able to coerce her into satisfying his lustful intentions. “Haywood’s message is clear: a woman must suffer all sorts of inhumanities, but she is not permitted to act in kind” (Schofield 61). The woman J. B. takes advantage of is trapped by societal expectations. She must be virtuous, and to remain within these parameters, she must be subject to any man’s whim or else be ruined. Haywood’s female readers may believe that they are reading simple gossip, but in truth, they are reading a statement
about their own entrapment and the injustices enacted on them by male domination.

Eliza's Haywood's novels represent a provocative view of female existence in the early eighteenth century. Surrounded by injustices, inequalities, and patriarchal oppression, Haywood made it her duty to inform her female readership of the depth of the struggles they faced in their daily lives. Her words were meant to reveal the shortcomings of society and inspire women to actively make a change in their destinies and those of their daughters. Through a process of double writing, she creates a virtual world in each of her stories that first allows the reader to escape into a new realm and then leads them on a path of self-discovery. The letters of Fantomina reveal the length a woman must traverse to capture true fidelity from her lover. By endeavoring to harness man's fickle nature, Fantomina embraces her limited moments of real female domination. The letters of The Distress'd Lover seek to express the discontentedness of Annilia and the strength that will allow her to finally dictate her own destiny with the lover of her reasoned choosing. These letters reveal her internal struggle and allow for the gateway through which her rebellion can surge from the virtual to reality. Finally, the letters of Bath-Intrigues offer a rare opportunity for women to view the world through the eyes of a man. Seemingly benign, the letters reveal the despairing rift that exists between women and any real power. Haywood's novels are filled with female voices shouting out for their proper rights. Through virtual representations, women's internal understandings and demands are foregrounded and finally allowed to be heard by an observing public. Haywood's words are tragic and beautiful, full of power and the voices of change that women today are still struggling to achieve.
Seeking out the Taboo: Re-Examining
Incestuous Desire in *The Sound and the Fury*

Samantha Long

*I have committed incest I said Father it was I it was not Dalton
Ames.*

(Faulkner 50-51)

Any close study of Quentin Compson's character from William Faulkner's classic *The Sound and the Fury* cannot ignore the taboo. The subject of sibling relationships and sibling incest is a pervasive element in the novel and an object of fixation within Quentin's world, constructing his narration—and his life—around his younger sister, Caddy. Traditionally, this relationship has been interpreted across scholarly literature as representative and symbolic of many things, from disillusionment with notions of Southern morality to a resistance to time and change, derived mainly from the examination of the double suicide attempt that occurs at the close of Quentin's section.

However, through these varied criticisms the term *incest* seems to represent everything but its actual definition. In the midst of substitutions and denials, clinical incest—the suggestion of Quentin's longing for Caddy as sexual—is overlooked, explained away as simply a symbolic guise to provide commentary on the aesthetic ideas of morality and time. I argue that reconsidering Quentin's incestuous desire as something also representative of sexuality and romantic longing is vital to the comprehension of his motivations and behaviors. Going beyond the taboo nature of such a discussion and understanding incest in its truest sense and how it functions in the novel will help not only to broaden the
interpretation of Quentin but also to break the barriers of silence that such a topic as sibling incest continues to have, even in today’s society. By searching through historical backgrounds, examining Faulkner’s own biases, reviewing aspects of modern psychology, and re-interpreting the notorious double suicide attempt in the text, I will provide ample evidence of clinical sibling incest.

The first objections to the interpretation of the sibling relationship between Quentin and Caddy as truly incestuous arrive from Faulkner’s own comments on his work, most notably outlined in the appendix he attached to The Sound and the Fury seventeen years after its original publication in 1929. In this appendix, which outlines Compson family history from 1699 through 1945, Faulkner writes that Quentin “loved not his sister’s body but some concept of Compson honor precariously and...only temporarily supported by the minute fragile membrane of her maidenhead,” and furthers his dismissal by adding that Quentin also “loved not the idea of incest which he could not commit, but some Presbyterian concept of its eternal punishment...[because he] loved death above all” (207–08). Essentially, Faulkner as author identifies with (or creates) the common conception that Quentin’s motivations are driven by a tragic notion of allegiance to the Southern moral code, however disintegrated or nonexistent that code has become.

It is no surprise then, with the author’s intentions revealed, that a great deal of the ‘literature on this relationship adheres to this conception and brings the word incest only into the context of Quentin’s hopeless idealism. However, it would be shortsighted to ignore the historical and social makeup of Faulkner’s world when searching for overt and implicit motivations for the denial of incest in the text. Cultural norms and Faulkner’s own biases provide clues for what might be thought of as resistance to accept a more clinical reading of Quentin’s desires. One of those chief concerns is that incest, across all known cultures and societies, is typically branded as taboo (Mead qtd. in Hope 13–14). Even in today’s society this topic continues to be aversive (especially when considering sibling incest), and it is rarely studied within clinical literature, despite research that has found up to 60 percent of outpatient psychiatric clients report having engaged in some form of incest with a sibling during their childhood (“Sibling Incest”). Therefore, it is easy to understand that a taboo, still largely unspeakable in today’s society, would have caused comparable, if not greater, shock and disgust in the early to mid-twentieth century. Although the progressive movement of the early 1900s began to recognize sibling incest in a Freudian sense as a natural stage of development that would be outgrown (Zender 744), the larger society would not have accepted (or certainly questioned) the relationship between Quentin and Caddy, whose ages are far beyond the stage for natural curiosity. Because of the potentially offensive nature of exhibiting such a taboo in his text, Faulkner may have chosen to avoid the controversy (either consciously or unconsciously) in order to maintain his reputation and marketability, even into the mid-century when he wrote the appendix.

Another essential aspect of Faulkner’s life that could be important to understanding his interpretation of the brother-sister relationship in the text is his personal life and chiefly his identity as a Southern man. Karl Zender writes that the author’s upbringing in the South, coupled with his evident “regional pride,” made identification with “romantic...[or] modernist interpretations” of sibling incest difficult (744–45). The stereotypical view of the South in that time (and even into the present), mostly held by Northerners, was that incest was rampant and abundant in the Southern states as a result of poverty and diminished values.

In response, Faulkner railed against this degrading stereotype, stating that there was “a volitionless, almost helpless capacity and eagerness [on the part of Northerners] to believe anything about the South not even provided it be derogatory but merely bizarre enough and strange enough.”
In this sense Faulkner may have been unable to accept a more romantic motif of the brother-sister relationship as idealized by many writers in the early nineteenth century (Hope 10) for fear of reinforcing the stereotype. Avoiding this reinforcement would have been even more crucial during the eugenics movement that occurred during Faulkner's lifetime, which claimed that the incest that was purported to occur among the rural lower class (Southerners) would threaten the vitality of the American gene pool (Zender 744). However, Faulkner was also unable to adhere to a modernist interpretation of incest (based on popular Freudian thought) because "to accept those views without qualification would imply acceptance of a more general egalitarian (and anti-Southern) political and social agenda as well" (Zender 745). The result of these conflicting agendas could be seen as a basis for the ambivalence displayed in the text about Quentin and Caddy's interactions and for the overall dismissal of the sibling incest subject by Faulkner, perhaps out of a desire to neither conform to "Northern" expectations nor be constrained by "Northern" ideology.

Besides political leanings, elements of Faulkner's personal life—specifically, his love life—may also play a part in shaping our understanding of Quentin's intense feelings of longing for Caddy in eroticized realms. Jackson Benson claims that in many ways Quentin serves as an autobiographical representation of a young Faulkner caught up in an unsavory love triangle where the object of his desire—Estelle Oldham—provides inspiration for the creation of Caddy's character (147). Biographically, Faulkner had wished to marry Estelle, but her family arranged a more "practical and established" suitor—Cornell Franklin, representative of The Sound and the Fury's Herbert Head—and she was forced to marry him instead (Benson 148). This marriage, arranged out of practicality, was similar to Caddy's wedding, which was used to cover up the shame of her out of wedlock pregnancy (Benson 148). Until Estelle divorced Cornell and married Faulkner in June 1929, her absence in Faulkner's life for eleven years could be seen as a "central emotional generating force" in his writing, The Sound and the Fury included (Benson 149). Therefore, it can be speculated that Faulkner's construction of Caddy played out emotions that he "may well have felt...after his [initial] loss" of Estelle, including "jealousy, physical desire, romantic idolatry, frustration, self-pity, wounded pride, tarnished honor and shame, and impotency" (Benson 149). These sentiments surrounding Quentin and Caddy (however unintentional they may have been) subsequently romanticize the bond between brother and sister in the novel. Perhaps, above all else, the incestuous desire present in the text can be seen as a product of its biographical basis on Faulkner's own romantic relationship.

Nevertheless, any examination into an author's thoughts, motivations, and biases has its limitations. Although debates continue to rage over what Faulkner was really trying to say in his portrayal of the sibling relationship in The Sound and the Fury, no definitive answers can be reached because the questions can no longer be asked. Yet, are the limitations of mortality truly a constraint upon our understanding of a text as readers, and in this light does Faulkner's own opinion of the work really matter at all? Previously, I focused upon events and motivations that might have guided Faulkner's own interpretations of the text, but this is not the only way.

In our understanding of Quentin and Caddy, should the author's opinion carry more weight than our own and act as the final arbiter of meaning? I and countless other literary scholars disagree with this notion, bringing forth the term "reader-response criticism" to describe audience-centered interpretations where "the meaning of the text is the experience of the reader," including the reader's many "hesitations, conjectures, and self-corrections" (Culler 63). This method of deriving meaning from a text allows for a variety of readings from multiple literary perspectives
rather than proscribing a binary "right" and "wrong" based on what has been said by the author or another authority figure. Through this form of interpretation, Faulkner’s own take on the question of sibling incest is valuable but not invaluable, providing a basis for comparison that may allow readers to see where the author’s "announced view or intention" is complicated by what actually appears on the page (Culler 66). Although opponents to reader-response criticism argue that texts become too loosely interpreted under the guise of individual subjectivity, interpretations are only accepted (can only be accepted) when they are carefully constructed and supported (Culler 66).

This form of criticism is essential to my current argument, contradicting Faulkner’s own conception of the sibling relationship between Quentin and Caddy and, along with it, the popular opinion across related scholarly literature. Overall, Faulkner has precious insights into his own text but possesses no answer book of meaning. Re-defining Quentin’s desires and actions in *The Sound and the Fury* with other interpretations as the foundation for reanalysis shapes a new understanding of the occurrence of sibling incest.

When freeing up *The Sound and the Fury* for a reader-response perspective that centers on Quentin’s sexual desires toward Caddy, an important objection surfaces: Where and when are acts of incest committed in the novel that would alert the reader? The answer to this question is complicated for a couple of reasons. First, Quentin’s section of the novel is composed in a stream-of-consciousness style which is “so unstable, so hallucinatory, that the figure of Caddy, like so much else…is enveloped in uncertainty” (Millgate 306). Also, many conclusions about what unfolds in this particular section (especially with regards to the flashback scene in which Quentin wants to kill Caddy and commit suicide) are arrived at by speculation, making this scene rich with the possibility for different readings. In addition, throughout the section we get contradictory confessions from Quentin: “I have committed incest, Father”; “If we could just have done something so dreadful that they would have fled hell except us”; “we didn’t do that did we do that” (Faulkner 49–50, 94). Comparing these statements it becomes unclear whether something has happened between brother and sister or whether it is wished that something had occurred. Usually, Quentin’s confession is viewed as a lie, serving as a self-sacrificial move to cleanse himself and his sister of the dishonor she has brought upon the family and arresting time from moving into an era less based on the traditional values and conventions of Southern morality. However, given the instability of Quentin and these conflicting patterns in the narrative, actual episodes of incest occurring in the text cannot be outright denied. Admittedly, Quentin’s weak and impotent nature makes it likely that he never successfully commits incest with his sister, but what is more important—and often overlooked—is that the desire and the attempt are still present and can be seen in thought and action throughout the climatic double suicide scene.

Following Quentin’s abandonment of the idea to kill his sister and himself, the two begin to walk farther out on the Compson property (Faulkner 96). When they near a ditch, Quentin appears to take advantage of the situation, stalling Caddy despite her growing apprehension toward him. Though the narrative is limited in detail, Caddy begins to state “Stop Quentin” repeatedly as Quentin “get[s] in front of her again,” holding her and declaring “I’m stronger than you.” Caddy replies back “I won’t fight stop you’d better stop…it won’t do any good let me go,” and he eventually frees her (Faulkner 97). Zender remarks that this scene can be read as one “in which Quentin literally attempts to force Caddy to engage in incest” (747). Caddy’s stern yet surprisingly calm reaction to her brother’s advances seems to suggest, in addition to her awareness of the situation, that this type of incident may have occurred in the past or is at least anticipated. Also interesting in this scene is the presence of
the knife as a phallic object, appearing when Quentin wants to end their lives, dropped upon the realization that he is unable to do so, and then picked back up again when he decides to attempt an incestuous act with Caddy. Nevertheless, in the tradition of Quentin’s tragic nature, he is neither able to “link incest with death” (Zender 747) and maintain his family’s Southern virtues nor to successfully act upon his sexual desires and fantasies. The statement that no incest can be found in the novel is simply untrue when the complexities of Quentin’s section are explored.

Of course, the allegation that incest is at least attempted in the text poses even greater questions for Quentin’s character and for our own interpretation: How is this desire manifested in The Sound and the Fury to come across in subtle yet powerful ways? What forces are at work within the novel that develop this pervasive notion of incestuous, physical, and romantic desire for Caddy? And, beyond conventional readings of Quentin’s actions as spurned by his disillusionment with Old South ideology, what allows readers to detect the emerging taboo? We can begin to view Quentin’s actions and behaviors in a new light when examining clinical literature on sibling incest and environmental predictors of the issue, in addition to returning to the climatic “double suicide” scene for further interpretation.

A popular theoretical perspective often employed in critical discourse concerning The Sound and the Fury is Freudian psychoanalysis and psychodynamic theory. These traditionally psychological perspectives have been used in much literature concerning Quentin’s behaviors and inner thoughts. However, psychodynamic theory over the twentieth century and into the twenty-first has become based less in psychological practice and more in philosophy, despite the fact that within literary studies this appears often overlooked. Because of this, I would like to approach Quentin’s incestuous motivations from a modern clinical perspective based on current psychological studies. Through the comparison of the Compson family environment to those of families that experience sibling incest, I feel that its presence can be inferred from the text on the basis of clinical risk factors.

Across cases of sibling incest, a chief phenomenon that is typically present is some sort of dysfunction within the family system. Kacie Thompson writes that “sibling abuse and incest cannot be considered an isolated problem but should be seen as a manifestation of family dysfunction” (532), stemming from a corruption of the “interdependent network” between parents and children for a variety of reasons (Haskins 338). Families where sibling incest occur often exhibit signs of

- low self-esteem, high impulsivity, low frustration tolerance, an inability to identify or meet needs...communication deficits, feelings of helplessness...[and also show] high levels of personal, social, and economic stress; substance abuse [and] an exaggeration of patriarchal norms. (Haskins 341)

This lengthy list of symptomatic behaviors becomes essential not only when considering how these things foster incest but also when examining the Compson family’s own troubles. It is clear from the description that Quentin and Caddy’s family displays many of these characteristics, from their father’s alcoholism to their mother’s neurotic hypochondria and maternal absence (Hope 96). Both parents are unable to fulfill their obligations, and the children are mainly treated in an emotionally cold fashion. As the dysfunction plays out in the novel, it also becomes clear that much anger and despair are not vocalized or discussed. This type of environment, especially for a fragile character like Quentin, could be seen as especially detrimental. Yet these issues alone do not guarantee that sibling incest will occur within a family system; they are necessary but not sufficient. So why, within the Compson household, do we see a manifestation of incestuous desires in Quentin?
The answer to this can be found in the transformed dynamics of the sibling relationship that often occur in these violent and neglectful environments. Sharon Brennan states that brothers and sisters may turn to one another for protection from distant or violent parents, becoming "dependent upon their sibling for comfort" since they lack an "emotional connection" to their guardians (289). However, this bond can become complicated as one or both siblings undergo "parentification" (Haskins 341), becoming divided between a child identity and a parent identity as they attempt to nurture one another. Subsequently, this quest for fulfillment can eventually become sexual in nature, providing a way for one or both siblings to "modulate anxiety and promote feelings of safety and well being, despite...feelings of shame, confusion, or guilt" (Haskins 342).

Given the shared childhood experience of Quentin and Caddy, especially when considering their parental detachment (they are primarily raised by the Compsons' servants), it becomes plausible that Quentin could seek—and continue to do so into his late teens—emotional comfort and security from his sister, made sexual due to its intensity (Haskins 341). Caddy represents not only a maternal figure for Quentin but a romantic one as well; her presence throughout this section of the novel is overwhelming as she constantly breaks up the present moment to reveal Quentin's jealousy, lust, shame, anger, sorrow, and intense longing. Although The Sound and the Fury never presents a scene where Quentin successfully initiates romantic or sexual contact with Caddy, it appears that his fantasies are only halted by his mental weakness and lack of virility. He never becomes an offender in the clinical sense, but the desire—and the environment which produces it—is clearly intact.

Nevertheless, what may single-handedly provide the strongest evidence of Quentin's incestuous yearnings can be found in The Sound and the Fury alone, with all other critical literatures set aside. Previously, I examined the actions that immediately followed Quentin's double suicide attempt for indicators of initiated sexual contact. However, exploring this entire scene and the interactions between Quentin and Caddy in depth reveals something beyond attempts: lust is expressed through thought, actions, and symbols, and it is this discovery alone that has become the inspiration for all further investigation.

Beginning when Quentin sits down by Caddy after he discovers that she has had sex with Dalton Ames, we receive a very physical description of her features (especially concerning her middle) as Quentin watches her in the water. He states that "she was lying in the water her head on the sand spit the water flowing about her hips...her skirt half saturated flopped along her flanks to the waters motion..." (Faulkner 94). Paired with his recent discovery of her sexual activity, it is both interesting and strange that as a brother he is focusing on her hips and thighs, which are traditionally sexualized parts of the female body. The focus continues on her femininity as Quentin remarks on her wet skirt and "clothes flopping" (95). Yet, these descriptions are halted when Caddy begins to talk fondly of Ames as she "clasp[s] her wet knees [with] her face tilted back" (95). Caddy's words and actions in this moment suggest her romantic fixation on Ames, and this desire is perceived and rejected by Quentin who takes the role of the spurned lover when he demands "do you love him" (95).

However, after this question is posed the physical contact between Quentin and Caddy intensifies. Caddy reaches out to Quentin, her hand "fumbling" down his arm until she grabs his hand ("fumbling" suggesting nervousness or spontaneity) which she then places flatly against her chest so he can feel her heart "thudding" when she answers "no no" (Faulkner 95). This negative response contradicts her racing heart, but Quentin accepts her verbal answer and uses it as a source for vengeance, wanting to kill Ames for what only could have been (in his mind) the rape of his sister. Much of the time, this particular moment in the text is used as a...
source for Quentin's resistance to changes in modern thought and values, and he is cited as trying to preserve his sister's "honor" by explaining that the sex was nonconsensual. However, this desire to kill Ames can also be understood as the product of a madly jealous lover, strengthened by the fact that Quentin suggests that he and Caddy could run away after the murder using the money intended for his college education as a means of financial support (95). Quentin states, "Caddy you hate him don't you." She can only respond by moving his hand to her throat where her "heart was hammering," saying, "Poor Quentin" (95). This is a powerful moment in the text because Caddy seems to acknowledge Quentin's distraught emotional state and, perhaps, his romantic desire for her that she is unable to fulfill.

In a symbolic sense, Quentin's sexual arousal also appears to intensify as the scene unfolds. He continues to feel her "blood pound against [his] hand," and this prolonged physical contact with her "chudding," "hammering," "pounding" pulse causes the arm he is leaning on to begin to "jerk and jump" as he "pants" from the overwhelming presence of honeysuckle in the air (Faulkner 95). It is interesting that this stimulation brings about a physiological response that can be interpreted as either a weakening of willpower or strength in Caddy's presence (subsequently causing his unsteadiness) or as a blatant phallic symbol of his arousal. Yet the climax of Quentin's sexual desire for Caddy appears when he proposes the double suicide. As previously mentioned, the knife Quentin unveils can be seen as phallic and when it is interpreted in this way the dialogue shared between brother and sister is quite explicitly sexualized. As Quentin lies with his head on her chest, he states that "it won't take but a second," that "yes the blades long enough," and that he will "try not to hurt" (96). On the other hand, Caddy is seemingly submissive or resigned to the action, responding that Quentin will "have have to push [the blade] harder" (96). At this point incest and death become intertwined, but Quentin ultimately cannot commit either, and he gives up and drops the knife (96). In this moment, many analyses concerning Quentin and Caddy's relationship intersect; Quentin is unable to maintain his sister's purity, stop time from moving the "Old South" into the modern age, or satisfy his fantasies by committing incest. The sequence of events is not restricted to one meaning but several, with sexuality not overlooked or forgotten.

Overall, conceptualizing sibling incest in *The Sound and the Fury* as sexually and romantically motivated has displayed as much strength and merit as previous interpretations. Through the history of the taboo, Faulkner's own reservations, family environmental risk factors, and re-interpretations, Quentin's longing can be seen in a new way and will hopefully someday join (or be incorporated into) the ranks of other popular analyses. The importance of this reading becomes twofold when the stigma of the taboo is considered. Bringing this topic out from the darkness of shame and revulsion, even if only in scholarly criticism on canonical literature, may help to promote greater discussion of incest across a wider academic audience and begin to give this very serious issue, still present in today's society, the attention it rightly deserves.
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**The Sound and the Fury: A Cubist Novel**

Megan Gorsuch

Painters and writers are both creators. The artist starts with a blank canvas, the writer a blank page. This shared purpose leads to many parallels in the art and literary worlds. One such parallel is Pablo Picasso’s journey to cubism and William Faulkner’s characters in *The Sound and the Fury*. The mature stages of cubism precede the publication of the novel by only a decade. Picasso first began to challenge perception by painting the female form realistically but without a model. His form then became what is defined as cubist in that the features of his subjects were geometric and analytical. In the final stages of cubism, the female figure is removed completely. Similarly, Faulkner’s characters and their views of Caddy progress from the idealized but personal view of Benjy, to Quentin who puts Caddy on a pedestal without actually acknowledging her as she is, and finally to Jason who erases her out of the Compson family. Caddy is never represented directly in Faulkner’s work, as the feminine form was avoided in cubism. This absence creates a distant and unrealistic representation of the female in both mediums.

Painting for the modernist artists was a mode of expression, a reflection of the painter. For Picasso painting was a very personal act. Throughout the history of painting, the purpose of art was to produce an image of beauty, an ideal. Often a model was used for purposes of proportion and anatomy, but the ultimate goal was the ideal. Beauty was something to strive for, not something that existed. As modern painters began to challenge this definition, the works of art and purpose
of painting became more personal. Artists began to use their talents to express emotions and to convey messages. The female figure was still portrayed, but a model was not always utilized. Art became more about interpretation and personal discovery. Picasso was one such artist. As Daniel Schwarz explains, Picasso, "thought of his works as a diary, and the history of his art as his autobiography. He used his paintings not simply to reflect his feelings but to create his identity. For Picasso, the artist's creative imagination has the power to recast the world" (312). Picasso made images according to his vision and need for exploration, not the predetermined values of the art world. Because of this personal approach, his art often reflected aspects of his life, including relationships. He tended to use "his art to self-fashion his relationships with women" because "the aesthetic and the sexual, art and desire, are inextricably linked" (Schwarz 322).

The novel can also be a reflection of the creator, the author. The art of the novel took on a more personal approach during modernism. William Faulkner's novels did not strive to support an ideal but instead sought to examine and dismantle the false expectations of society through the lens of reality and history. He did not write of times past but chose to explore what was happening to current society and to the traditional family structure. The Sound and the Fury is an example of how "modernism is derived from cultural and historical events which provide the frame for understanding its development. If ever there was a period in which authors' self-fashioning in response to a confused and complicated cultural milieu is a central subject, it is this one" (Schwarz 311). Confusion and complicated relationships are key elements to the novel. Besides examining the current state of society, Faulkner wrote for very personal reasons. As Picasso's paintings were often influenced by the different women in his life, Faulkner's inspiration was also the feminine. "I did not realize then that I was trying to manufacture the sister which I did not have and the daughter which I was to lose, though the former might have been apparent from the fact that Caddy had three brothers." Faulkner explains in an introduction he wrote for the novel (Introduction 230). The Sound and the Fury is his own way of addressing conflicts within himself.

An essential element of cubism was the innovative way it approached perspective. During Picasso's life modern painting became removed from ideals and attempted to explore what is seen, what exists in the physical world. At the same time it wished to acknowledge the internal dialogue people have within themselves because "the coherent self of a major artist is a myriad of selves" (Schwarz 313). Cubism did not restrict itself to one angle of vision. It sought to explore multiple perspectives at once as "the essence of cubism [is] the insistence that we need not restrict perspective and that reality depends on the angle of vision" (Schwarz 319). Picasso realized that in capturing only what can be seen from a single perspective, not all of an object would be visible to the viewer. This is another key foundation to cubism. Gertrude Stein writes that for Picasso during the mature stages of cubism from 1912 to 1917, the cubes were no longer important, the cubes were lost. After all one must know more than one sees and one does not see a cube in its entirety. In 1914 there were less cubes in cubism, each time Picasso commenced again he recommenced the struggle to express in a picture the things seen without association but simply as things seen and it is only things seen that are knowledge for Picasso. (51)

In exploring only what can be seen, the images became fragmented and dismantled. The Sound and the Fury also challenges traditional uses of perspective. It is essentially a cubist novel. Multiple perspectives are explored. Each
section is narrated by a different character giving each a unique perspective of events. Beverly Gross observes that in the novel, no frame of reference or formal exposition is anywhere expressed. Form of this novel calls marked attention to itself: the balanced juxtapositions of past and present action; the attempt to build a structure out of successions of apparently random moments from both the past and present; the shifting point of view and the base of narrative present time from one section to the next. (439)

The story does not unfold in the manner of most traditional narratives. The reader is not able to fully comprehend events until the end when the multiple perspectives can be placed together, much like a puzzle. Even then, we, the readers, never get the full picture, which is Caddy. The novel challenges tradition because "the fragmentation of the action and the refraction of the points of view do not lend themselves to the expectation that this novel is heading toward the fulfillment of a climax and a subsequent resolution of its complications" (Gross 444). Olga Vickery points out how, similar to cubism, "each of the sections [of the novel] is itself static. The consciousness of a character becomes the actual agent illuminating and being illuminated by the central situation [Caddy]. Everything is immobilized in this pattern; there is no development of either character or plot in the traditional manner" (279). The Sound and the Fury is a unique novel because it has conflict but no climax and no resolution. The novel's primary momentum comes from the conflict itself.

Picasso's first paintings in his journey to cubism only slightly distorted and exaggerated the female form. An example of this realistic yet slightly disproportioned vision of the female is Nude with Hair Pulled Back, which he produced in 1905. Even though Picasso at this stage in his career produced images of women, he did not necessarily always use a model. This may have been because in the "nineteenth century painters discovered the need of always having a model in front of them, in the twentieth century they discovered that they must never look at a model" (Stein 3). He sought to construct how he viewed women. This was different from the ideal previously portrayed. Chris Altieri writes that Picasso abandoned the old ways because "when modernist painters and writers [were] presented with the old heroic or pathetic images, they see them through a contaminating veil. Then even the temptation to sympathize produces an ironic self-consciousness trapped in a paralyzing gulf between what can be represented and an actual representing force" (16). Picasso wished to portray women as he saw them. His memory and imagination were his guides. Many of his images from this time consisted of voluptuous women, often nude. For Picasso, as well as other painters, "when women are the subject, the flow of forms and tones is inseparable from the painter's desire as it merges with the energies released in the evoked human presence" (Altieri 30). In Nude with Hair Pulled Back the woman's curves are slightly exaggerated. One leg is folded against her body and the other leg crossed in front. She is caught as if in mid-conversation, playing with her hair and very casual. Her features are not realistic but are recognizable and lifelike. Picasso adhered to general guidelines of female portraiture while exploring his own desires.

The first perspective of Caddy presented in The Sound and the Fury is similar to the female in the beginning stages of cubism. Caddy through the eyes of Benjy is still very much a soft and natural female figure. He worships her and she makes him happy. No emotional conflict exists for him because he is concerned only with her physical presence. Faulkner believed that "Benjy must never grow beyond this moment; that for him all knowing must begin and end with that fierce, panting, paused and stooping wet figure which smelled like trees. That he must never grow up to where the grief and bereavement could be leavened with understand-
 leasing" (Introduction 230). To Benjy Caddy exists in the physical world of sensations only; "she is the smell of trees" (Vickery 280). Benjy says, "Then I saw Caddy, with flowers in her hair, and along veil like shining wind. Caddy Caddy" (Faulkner 25). He still recognizes her as a being that exists and has control over his life. His devotion to her is shown when he describes how she once calmed him. He narrates, "The room went black, except the door. Then the door went black. Caddy said, ‘Hush Maury’ putting her hand on me. So I stayed hushed. We could hear us. We could hear the dark” (48). She is his sole comfort, and his perception of her is limited to his needs.

As Picasso developed cubism, he began to skew perspective and distort the female form. Women became more abstract and geometric. He began to dismantle and fragment the female face and figure. In his painting Woman with Mirror, which was completed in 1909, the image is no longer of the woman’s complete form but only from the shoulders up. Her features are not as natural as those in Nude with Hair Pulled Back. At this point in his career “the souls of people do not interest him, that is to say for him the reality of life is in the head, the face and the body and this is for him so important, so persistent, so complete that it is not at all necessary to think of any other thing and the soul is another thing” (Stein 21). The edges of the woman’s face are hardened as if made of stone, like an unfinished sculpture. Her face is refracted as if viewed through a prism. Picasso’s “naturalistic painting changed to the large women, at first women on the shore or in the water, with a great deal of movement, and little by little large women because very sculpturesque” (Stein 54). In this progression, Picasso made the female face a concept, more abstract, more of an object. He was not attempting to capture a piece of her soul or even adhere to any existing rules of portraiture. With this image he freely and deliberately distorted the feminine, moving away from the sensual and favoring logic.

Faulkner’s character Quentin approaches the female in a way similar to Picasso’s Woman with Mirror. He cannot come to terms with his own desire, so his memories of Caddy are distorted. He chooses to remember her not as she is but how he wishes her to be. Benjy may accept Caddy for what she is, but Quentin holds to a distanced vision of her that he has created. He desperately tries to hold on to the idea of her being of her pure and virtuous. “for Quentin, [Caddy is] honor” (Vickery 280). She directly challenges this honor with her promiscuity. He is also in conflict with his own feelings, as they range from brotherly love to incestuous desire. In his mind she is even less real than she is for Benjy, and “Quentin too has constructed for himself a private world to which Caddy is essential… his order is based on emotions rather than sensations, on concepts rather than physical objects” (Vickery 283). Because she is perceived through his internal conflict, she becomes distorted. He increasingly becomes “lost amid these shadows, feeling that they falsify the objects they pretend to reflect, yet unable to reach out beyond them” (Vickery 284). His obsession causes him to dwell on the shadows. The unacceptable love he feels for her leads him to despise her. Quentin attempts to justify this view of women by recalling the words of his father who told him women are difficult because they are so delicate so mysterious Father said. Delicate equilibrium of periodical filth between two moons balanced. Moons he said full and yellow as harvest moons her hips thighs. Outside outside of them always but. Yellow. Feet soles with walking like. Then know that some man all those mysterious and imperious concealed. With all that inside of them shapes and outward suavity waiting for a touch to. Liquid putrefaction like drowned things floating like pale rubber flabbily filled getting the odor of honeysuckle all mixed up. (Faulkner 81)
Quentin's recollections of Caddy become delusional. In his mind the image of her by the water transforms into a “white blur framed out of the blur of the sand by her hair” (95). Like Picasso's distortion of the female to deny the sensual, Caddy becomes more abstract through Quentin's view of her.

In the final phase of cubism women are completely removed. The female form is only suggested by a guitar, whose curves resemble those of a woman. The mixed media work *Guitar on Table*, which Picasso completed between 1912 and 1913, is an example of this complete removal of the feminine. In this piece, as with his other prominent cubist works, he “broke up the surface into several planes and destroyed the distinction between foreground and background; they all decentered the subject and recontextualized it by odd juxtapositions and unique forms” (Schwarz 320). Picasso abandoned the human form altogether in preference for objects. He progressed from objectifying the female form to simply discarding it altogether, choosing to paint objects. The prism effect is still present but the human element is gone, favoring one of geometry and shapes. One explanation for this progression is that “Picasso's constant war against his own facility makes it necessary to turn away from the female figure. She is too easy a source of painterly lyricism. The evocative image blocks the full intellectual complexity of his new world of formal relations” (Altieri 30). Because he chooses logic over lyricism, the female disappears from his images.

This third phase in cubism is mirrored in *The Sound and the Fury* by the way Jason denies Caddy's influence, her importance to him. He will not let her see the family or her own child. Jason deals with Caddy by erasing her presence from his mind. He is so filled with hate and yet is the most logical and calculated of the brothers. In the “progression from Benjy to Quentin to Jason: we see the brothers becoming more and more responsible for their destructive acts, more and more diseased, less and less capable of love” (Gross 441). Similar to Picasso trying to show simply what is, for Jason “it is his very insistence on facing facts that causes his distorted view of Caddy” (Vickery 286). By focusing on the logic, on what only he can see, the real issue, Caddy, is denied. He essentially erases Caddy from the family. Jason says to her, “We dont even know your name at the house,” I says. ‘Do you know that? We dont even know your name. You’d be better off if you were down there with him and Quentin” (Faulkner 128). Jason cannot deal with her and feels she has betrayed him. Instead of facing his feelings and keeping the family together, he distances himself. This also keeps the family in a state of turmoil and agitation. However, he feels this is best and reflects, “After she was gone I felt better. I says I reckon you’ll think twice before you deprive me of a job that was promised me. I was a kid then. I believed folks when they said they’d do things. I’ve learned better since” (Faulkner 129). His bitterness is as hard as the geometric edges of cubism.

The concept of ideal beauty denies women. Modernist artists and authors fought hard to do away with these ideals but in doing so created another means of denying women. Instead of using models, artists painted their personal vision of the female, one that was not standardized or dictated to them. However even with this shift in purpose, the woman was still absent. The feminine was not directly addressed and in the end was abandoned in favor of the curves of a guitar. Caddy too is never given a chance to exist as she is. We are given various views of her, each of the three brother’s narratives being tainted with their own emotional conflicts. Picasso and Faulkner both do not seem to know how to approach the complexities of women and as a result create art based on evasiveness. They are fearful of the sensual and are unnerved by the power it has over them. The solution for both men is to seek refuge in the abstraction of perception.
A Rhetorical Analysis and Critique of
“The Enemy at Home”

Jessica Wozniak

In today's world of Twitter, Facebook, and texting, the opinion section of the newspaper does not get the credit it deserves. Indeed, stating an opinion on the Internet is remarkably easy. As a forum for expression, a newspaper's opinion section usually contains pieces with well-researched views that are supported by evidence. Generally, a journalist takes time to thoroughly plan out an argument and mold it into a persuasive piece, which likely involves much more thought than the average Twitter user attempts. At times, however, a journalist does not do all the necessary research and presents a piece that, albeit persuasive, is not as carefully supported as it should be. Perhaps today's Internet-based society—where one can express one's unfiltered thoughts to a large audience with the click of a button—has leaked onto the pages of newspapers. This scenario seems to be the case with Mark Steyn's article about the Fort Hood shooting in the *Washington Times* entitled “The Enemy at Home.” Although Steyn craftily employs rhetorical principles in his piece, holes exist in his argument from the beginning, and instances occur where he falls short in employing certain rhetorical strategies.

Through an arrangement that begins with an emotional appeal and ends with a question of policy, Steyn's article gains a reader's attention immediately and attempts to hold it throughout. Steyn begins with a pathos appeal to emotion in order to draw in the reader. After his introduction, he peppers the body of his piece with quotes and testimonies, enhancing the logos of his argument. He also draws comparisons and relates the...
topic to other instances that are familiar to the reader. Finally, Steyn’s conclusion brings up a stasis point. Steyn ends his piece with the remark that “America has the best troops and fiercest firepower but no strategy for throttling the ideology that drives the enemy—in Afghanistan and in Texas” (Steyn). His final sentence explains his stance: a policy needs to be put into effect to silence people with ideas that differ from Steyn’s version of patriotism. When one looks at his piece in terms of quality of arrangement, Steyn does well by first gaining the readers’ interest through an emotional appeal, later stoking their emotions with carefully placed logos appeals, and concluding by questioning authority. The end of Steyn’s piece contains a call to action to the readers, subtly encouraging them to think about current military policies and their—according to Steyn—weaknesses and to take action to right these societal wrongs.

Steyn is wise enough to know that he must word his final point very carefully. He cannot make sweeping judgments, as it would be especially dangerous to make an obvious remark that disparages all Muslims. Steyn’s expression of racist sentiment is not immediately clear when one glances at his final sentence. However, when the last sentence is examined in the context of his entire piece, it becomes obvious that Steyn feels strongly about Muslims in the armed forces and would like to see a system in place to better regulate the so-called “enemy” that he feels has infiltrated the U.S. military.

Throughout the article, Steyn infuses his opinion piece with pathos, attempting to persuade his audience by appealing to their emotions and their patriotism. While his use of pathos is carefully constructed, it is not, perhaps, conducted in the most scrupulous manner. In his introduction, Steyn immediately invokes pathos through the use of a brief narrative. He explains that the Fort Hood shooting would have been just as bad an event if it had happened in Afghanistan, but since it took place in America, it is “not merely a tragedy, as too many people have called it, but a glimpse of a potential flaw” in the system. By starting off with a mention of the number of dead and wounded, Steyn tugs at the readers’ heartstrings and immediately attracts their sympathies. The mention of September 11th in the introductory paragraph also serves to fire up readers. Steyn knows that, years after the event, the reference to September 11th still causes Americans to reflect, and for most, it still invokes some anger and grief. The term “war on terror” is also a loaded one, as strong opinions abound, both for and against the war. In fact, Steyn’s entire essay plays off Americans’ predisposition to stereotype Muslims because of the sentiments after September 11th. Steyn recognizes this fact and uses it to manipulate his readers. Instead of discouraging labels and pigeonholing, Steyn seems to encourage these behaviors. Later, Steyn lists a number of events in which Muslims have been responsible for tragedies (although this is implied; he does not use the word “Muslim” in this paragraph). He attempts to raise anger in his readers when he talks about people who have been “flying planes into skyscrapers, blowing themselves up in Bali nightclubs or London Tube trains, planting improvised explosive devices by the roadside in Baghdad or Tikrit.” For the majority of people, this list causes flashbacks and invokes specific unpleasant memories. While some readers may recognize that Steyn is playing with their emotions in order to gain their support for his cause, many will be blinded by anger while they intently devour his points without fully considering them. In this way, Steyn is not quite honest. He does use pathos expertly as a means of persuasion, but the perspective he wishes to spread is one of bias rather than of acceptance, a dangerous thing to encourage.

In order to follow up his pathos-heavy introduction, Steyn rounds out the body of his piece with a logos appeal full of quotes and facts. He knows that readers will initially be drawn into a debate by emotions, but that blind passion alone can rarely sustain an argument. Instead, he appeals to readers’ logical side by providing them with a bevy of data
and testimonies. Steyn’s first inclusion of a quote from Major Nidal Hasan is used in an extremely interesting way. Hasan is quoted as saying, “Muslims should stand up and fight against the aggressor.” Until he cites this sentence attributed to the shooter, Steyn does not use the word “Muslim.” By doing this, if questioned or called racist, Steyn can point to the quote and suggest that he, himself, did not draw a connection between Hasan’s religion and Hasan’s actions, but that instead Hasan initially made the association. After the quote, Steyn goes on to list other information that Hasan supposedly posted to the Internet, yet he does not point out where these ideas were gathered from. While an opinion piece in a newspaper does not have to cite sources as an academic work does, Steyn does no favors to his own credibility by not substantiating or explaining the referenced information more thoroughly. Perhaps he thinks readers will be so emotionally involved by this point that they will gloss over his un-cited references.

Steyn reintroduces the Muslim thread a few paragraphs later when he continues his logos appeal. He quotes ABC’s Martha Raddatz, when she had, in turn, quoted an officer’s wife, who remarked about the significance of Hasan’s name: “I wish his name was Smith.” Later, Steyn quotes Hasan’s superior officer. By using these extrinsic proofs and testimonies from credible sources, Steyn works to enhance his own credibility. He also supports his argument by using deductive logic when he reasons that “lots of people are antiwar,” and then that “not many in that latter category are U.S. Army majors.” Later, he includes more extrinsic proofs, including descriptions of Hasan’s work area. At one point, Steyn discusses two other cases and compares them to the Fort Hood shooting using a logic of science approach, which involves collecting instances to discover the truth. Readers are generally persuaded by logic of science approaches like this because a collection of instances tends to point to a trend. The majority of Steyn’s logos appeals are thus crafted in an attempt to cause the reader to support his viewpoint. He weaves his logos appeals alongside his pathos introduction to form an argument that applies important principles of rhetoric. However, Steyn falters in two places. The first, as already pointed out, occurs when he does not explain where he found the quotes from Hasan. The second is his inclusion of an example involving “the brave ex-Muslim Nonie Darwish.” The paragraph containing this quote is hard to follow and does not reveal anything especially pertinent to the argument. Instead, the reader feels slightly confused because, although Steyn may have had a point, it is difficult to discern.

Besides his use of pathos and logos appeals, Steyn’s stylistic choices further reinforce his argument. Steyn uses honorific language in the beginning of his piece, choosing phrases like, “the heart of the biggest military base in the nation” and “brave soldiers.” In a later paragraph he uses accumulation and repetition when he lists a number of tragedies. Additionally, he employs ethopoeia to describe the qualities of Hasan’s character. Right before the ethopoeia of Hasan’s character, Steyn talks about how Hasan’s pathologies “incubate[d].” This interesting word choice serves to paint Hasan as a born killer whose murderous traits were just waiting for the right time to surface. Here, Steyn injects his own prejudicial beliefs into his work. This is one of the times when his views are most obvious. Another stylistic choice Steyn pursues is the use of a rhetorical question. He does this to make the readers feel as if they are a part of the discussion and thus have a stake in the outcome of the argument. His use of rhetorical stylistic devices serves to sway readers to his viewpoint in a subtle way.

Looked at in relation to its application of the strategies of rhetoric, Steyn’s piece is well arranged, includes numerous pathos and logos arguments, and is full of significantly persuasive stylistic choices. However, Steyn encourages a point of view without significant evidence to support his argument. Although he does have a number of logos arguments,
some are flimsy and unsubstantiated. Because of the employment of stylistic choices, the reader is swept into the debate and may at first nod in agreement with Steyn's points. Still, a closer analysis reveals the truth behind Steyn's words and paints the picture of a writer who seeks to push his views without having any goodwill toward the audience or enough support to back up his claims.
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**Obstructions Sink Communication: The Use of Letters in *The Sinking of the Odradek Stadium***

Amy Weissenburger

Communication can make or break a relationship. Whether it is through pictures, words, or another form, people are constantly receiving and giving messages. But sometimes the meaning of the message fails. This can happen for a variety of reasons and in a variety of ways. One novel that aims to demonstrate this problem with communication and truth is Harry Mathews's *The Sinking of the Odradek Stadium*. In this novel husband Zachary and wife Twang are communicating only through letters while searching for treasure on different continents. However, time and time again, the truth and meaning of their messages are obscured, causing great confusion and misunderstanding. The novel uses the misunderstandings of the main characters to demonstrate that communication of truth and reality can be difficult.

In order to understand the failures of communication, it is necessary to understand basic communication itself. Psychologists Brant Burleson and Wayne Denton have proposed a theory that describes three aspects of communication as well as the role that context plays in interpreting messages. The first aspect of communication they discuss is motivation. According to the theory, the motivation behind communication is the "person's intentions and goals" in regard to the message he or she is trying to send to another person (Burleson and Denton 887). This is almost self-evident. When someone is trying to send a message to another person, he or she has a goal in mind. What that goal is can vary, from wishing good luck to cursing the recipient. However, there is always a reason or motivation for the communication.
The next aspect of communication is skill. Skill is the “ability or capacity to realize communicative goals during the course of an interaction” (Burleson and Denton 887). To put it another way, skill is the ability a person has to achieve his or her motivations for communication. That means that if the person wanted to wish another good luck, he or she would need the vocabulary to do so. But skill goes beyond vocabulary. It requires the use of any “interpretive and symbolic resources” (Burleson and Denton 887). This includes, but is not limited to, verbal language, body language, and pictures. There are many ways to communicate, and these methods make up a communicator’s skill.

The third and final aspect of communication, as described by Burleson and Denton, is behavior. Behavior is the “verbal and nonverbal actions that the speaker actually emits” (Burleson and Denton 887). Even though a person may have the skills to communicate, that does not mean he or she actually uses them. The communicator may mean to congratulate someone but frown while doing so, sending mixed signals. The person has the skill to smile, but his or her behavior does not show it. This final aspect of communication is the easiest to see, as it is what the communicator actually portrays to the receiver.

The three aspects of communication can be simple enough, but they are complicated by the context of the situation. Whenever someone communicates with another person, there is a context surrounding the two that includes the specific “intentions, circumstances, and interpretations” (Burleson and Denton 888). It may seem obvious to state that communication does not occur in a vacuum, but it is very important to remember. The speaker and the receiver, as well as the situations they find themselves in, have an effect on the communication and the message. Depending on that context, the message can be taken in a way separate from the intentions. This is a fact that is agreed upon by many theorists, including Raymond Gozzi Jr. He states that “there are as many messages’ as there are parties to a communication” (146). Just because the sender has certain motivations and displays behaviors that are appropriate to it, the context of the situation might distort the message and cause the receiver to interpret it in a different way. Due to that, the structure of communication in itself can be complicated, causing failures at times.

The communication that failed in The Sinking of the Odradek Stadium occurred in the format of letters sent between the two main characters, who are thousands of miles apart. One theorist who discusses the problem of communicating from a distance is Jacques Derrida. In his book The Post Card, Derrida discusses this and the way in which it makes the written message independent from both the sender and the receiver (Mitchell 60). According to Derrida, a message written on a post card, or a letter, is not necessarily going to meet the sender’s motivations. He explains that the message is “inhabited by non-arrival and non-belonging to such a degree that, even when it ‘arrives’ safe and sound, its nature is not completely present” (Mitchell 60). This means that even if the receiver gets the post card or letter, it does not mean that he or she have actually received the message. Based on his or her interpretations of the text, the message received may be completely different from the one sent or intended. This makes communication through written venues more difficult than through any other format.

Derrida also discussed the unreliability of testimony from someone in general. As he showed, what someone writes on a post card or in a letter can be misconstrued. But so can any message in any format. This is because what someone says—a person’s testimony—does not necessarily represent the truth. As explained by author Simon Wortham, Derrida theorizes that testimony “entails parasitism, the radical impurity of an undecidable co-possibility of truth and lies, testimony and fiction” (129). Whatever someone says cannot always be taken as the pure truth, as he or she may be purposely lying or accidently failing to communicate
skillfully. Therefore, a message that is communicated can be truth, fiction, or a combination of the two. That is why Derrida cautions about the reliability of testimony, as well as the reliability of a message sent through written formats.

Another theorist who questions the reliability of information is Jean Baudrillard. It is well-known that language is a way of representing the world. However, Baudrillard questions the parallelism between the representation (words, pictures, etc.) and the actual reality. He problematizes this relationship, stating that it has become not a “question of imitation,” but a “question of substituting signs of the real for the real itself” (Baudrillard 167). This means that people are not only using images or words to represent objects but that they are actually using them in place of the objects. He gives the example of Disneyland, explaining that people experience the park rather than the reality that the park is supposed to represent (Baudrillard 171). This representation of reality can become complex.

As part of his theory, Baudrillard outlines four stages of an image as a representation of reality. The first is the reflection of reality, second is the masking of reality, third is the masking of the lack of reality, and fourth is the non-relation to reality at all (Baudrillard 170). He is trying to explain the ways in which images, or representations of any kind, can pretend to be something that they are not. If representations can do all those four different things, then representations are not necessarily true. This, in a way, is questioning the reliability of representation, or information itself.

As evidenced by the previous three theories, communication can be difficult. Not only are there contexts that can distort meanings, but there are problems with distance as well as with messages and information in general. This is important to understand when examining the novel *The Sinking of the Odradek Stadium*. Throughout the text, the two main characters run into situations where messages and meanings are obscured. This happens in a variety of ways, but each case boils down to a problem with communication.

The first way in which meaning is obscured in Mathew’s novel is through a simple language barrier. Twang is from Pan-Nam and therefore did not speak English as her first language. In her letters to Zachary, especially the first ones, she uses broken English with poor grammar and many misspellings, and this causes misunderstanding between the two. One such misinterpretation occurs when Twang is discussing how she first met the man she came to call Bonzo. In her letter, she says, “I’m strong, but he’s top, and unwieldy, just be fore the stazion I have-braek two of my best naels on him. It’s pael dawn as he con-ducts me to a hostel” (Mathews 51). All her original letters contain this many misspellings and grammatical errors. It is likely hard for Zachary to understand what she is saying because of this, leading him to misinterpret her message. Twang was actually trying to explain that Bonzo tried to rape her but that she took control of the situation, and he simply walked her back to her hostel. However, Zachary thinks that she means that they went back to a hotel together (Mathews 52). This is a big miscommunication.

Zachary’s misunderstanding of Twang leads him to believe that she is cheating on him. This obscuring of the truth is due to Twang’s lack of communication skills in this situation. She knows what she wants to say and has good motivations, but she lacks the grasp of English necessary to send Zachary a message that properly relays her meaning. This can be related to Derrida’s idea that a message on a post card, or a letter in this case, becomes independent of the writer and his or her intentions. Twang means to tell Zachary a funny story, but she ends up upsetting him a great deal. This language barrier, however, is just one way in which truth is obscured in the novel.

Meanings are also misrepresented due to the form of communication itself. Because the couple can only speak to each other through letters,
what they can say is limited by space. If they were able to talk face-to-face, they could say more. Likewise, if they had a means of communication that was much quicker, they could describe more of their lives. However, as letters are limited by the length of paper as well as the time it takes for the mail to get from one person to the other, the communication between the two characters is obstructed to a greater extent than it otherwise would be. This creates problems with meaning and truth.

One time this problem of limitation is brought to attention occurs when Twang accuses Zachary of not caring about her findings. She writes to him, “Why do you not expressed no interest, in that I tell you of Salvestro? and his mother, that I find to have be a sclave? I wait during two letters, yet now I tell you anyway, you are able to take it or live it” (Mathews 110). She had been trying to tell him about something she found out concerning the treasure, but he had chosen to write about other topics. While this could be construed as him not caring, it could also be because he has so much to tell her that his attention to her stories dwindles while he’s writing his letters. However, no matter the reason, Twang simply takes it as Zachary not being interested at all.

Twang’s feelings about Zachary’s apparent lack of interest can be explained through the theory of communication as being caused by poor behavior on Zachary’s part. It is possible that he cares about what she has to say, and it in fact seems like he should since it could help them find the treasure he desires. However, his behavior is to not mention it at all, which portrays to Twang that he does not care at all. It can also be explained by Baudrillard’s idea of representations replacing the things they represent. Twang takes the representation of Zachary’s thoughts—the letter—to be his actual thoughts. In this manner, she assumes that he doesn’t care at all because the letter seems to be uncaring. In reality, it is quite possible that this is not his intention. The communication between Zachary and Twang is therefore weakened in this case.

Another time communication is stunted due to the limitations of a letter occurs when Zachary mentions something about Montpellier. He says in a letter, “I’m too nervous to work. (But Montpellier promises to help.)” (Mathews 52). When Twang receives the letter, she doesn’t understand the message. She replies, “Yet how, gives Montpellier the help (who’s he?)” (Mathews 52). Her response shows that she has no idea what Zachary is talking about. He then has to reply, “Montpellier is a city in the south of France – funny question. Professor Blesset of Montpellier University is to send the microfilm of a document from Montpelias” (Mathews 55). This exchange could have been simplified if Zachary had fully explained what he meant in the first letter. However, as it is a letter, some details need to be overlooked for the sake of time and concision. Therefore, he might have assumed she knew what he was talking about and left out the details, which in turn left her without a grasp on his message. It is a clear failure of communication.

This specific communication problem can be explained by Derrida’s theory. It is his main premise that the message is independent from the sender and the receiver, and that is what appears to have occurred here. Zachary thought he was sending one message about the university, but Twang received a completely different one about a man. The message is therefore independent of Zachary’s intentions and meaning, and it is independent of Twang’s understanding. The distance between the two of them has distorted the message, causing the truth and meaning to be obscured.

Truth is also obscured in the novel by Zachary’s blind trust of other people. The clearest example of this is when he writes to Twang about witnessing the “murder” of Hodge. He tells her that he “barely glimpsed the silver pistol in Mr. Hood’s hand as he shot Hodge point blank,” and goes on to explain that the treasure maps were then burnt (Mathews 172). This is the explanation he gives Twang, causing her to believe that
it happened. However, readers quickly discover that the murder was a scam, but Zachary has already told Twang that it had really occurred. In this instance, the meaning of Zachary's message reaches Twang, but the message itself is obscuring the truth.

Both Derrida and Baudrillard can explain this problem with truth. First, Derrida theorized that testimony from anyone is unreliable because it could be true, false, or a mixture of the two. In the novel, it is Zachary's testimony that Hood has murdered Hodge and burned the maps. Since it is his testimony, it is a subjective statement and is actually unreliable, according to Derrida. Another way to explain it is through Baudrillard's idea that representations can mask reality. Not only is Zachary's claim masking the reality from Twang that Hodge is still alive, but the murder scam in itself is masking reality. So while Zachary's actual meaning is relayed to Twang, truth in itself is being obscured because of the nature of testimony and representation. That makes this dilemma just one more way in which truth and meaning are distorted within the text.

The last major reason that meaning is obscured in the text is that Twang knows others are reading the letters and therefore devises a scheme to write in code to trick them. However, the letter to Zachary that explains this gets sent back to the post office for Twang. This creates a series of communication problems that can be further examined. The first of these problems is that Zachary accidentally uses code words she had made up, causing them both to visit the other at the same time. In the letter that never made it to Zachary, Twang tells him to use the words "dictionary" and "Pogo O'Brine" to alert her that she should come visit him instead of him visiting her (Mathews 131). In his next letter, Zachary unknowingly uses those words, and she mistakes it for a sign. Twang replies to him, discussing the trip as if he was going to travel to her, but concludes with, "Thus I'm glad when you mention a dictionary. It is also interesting, that Mr. O. Brien is come to the town" (Mathews 135).

She took his use of the code words to mean that she should visit him, and thus they both end up traveling to the other's country and never do get to see one another. This whole debacle ensued just because of the miscommunication between the two.

The obscured meaning in this case can be explained by two of the three discussed theories. The context, as described in the communication theory, played a big role in the problem. Those words on their own have no real meaning to Zachary or Twang, but due to the context of the letter that Zachary never received, they had a very important meaning. The context can determine the meaning of a message, and in this case it severely distorted the intended meaning. This dilemma can also be explained by Derrida's theory that messages on post cards, or letters in this case, always have the possibility of not arriving both physically and theoretically. In the case of the letter Twang wrote, it did not arrive physically, but that fact caused Zachary's meaning to not arrive on a theoretical level. He simply meant to describe recent events, but that message did not get to Twang. The context and the physical and theoretical non-arrival of the message caused a big communication problem between the two characters.

Twang's idea to trick the people reading their mail also caused a problem with Zachary's understanding of her sympathies. In the letter that never made it to Zachary, Twang sympathizes with his problems, but Zachary only receives her fake letter and therefore replies, "Is it you or I who is losing their marbles? I needed help, not a sermon. I try to be Greek with the Greeks and Pan with the Pannamese, but your advice is very obscure" (Mathews 132). Her second, fake letter is cold and confusing, which only causes Zachary to think she is not being sympathetic to his problems. Later on, he still does not understand her plan and accuses her of not even reading his letters. He discusses how the check he sent is not as large as the others and states, "If you ever peruse my letters, you may be aware of the local shortage" (Mathews 151). Zachary has
become frustrated with Twang's letters because he is not understanding the meaning inside her message. She does not mean to be cold or obscure, but she feels she needs to act in this way so the others reading her letters don't know what they are talking about. However, Zachary does not know this and continues to misunderstand her intentions.

Zachary misunderstands Twang's sympathies in part because of Baudrillard's theory of representation versus reality. Once again, this is a case of taking the representation as the truth. Zachary thinks that Twang's letters, or the representation of her thoughts, are what her thoughts actually are. He does not understand that she is speaking in code and therefore thinks that the image of the letter is reflecting reality, not masking it as it is actually doing. Due to that fact, Zachary is not understanding the true meaning of her letters.

The final way that Twang's idea to trick the others obscures meaning is by causing Zachary to think she has abandoned their relationship. In one of her letters, she lies about her feelings for Bonzo in order to use him and states, "Is it then a surprise that I shall want to forsake a pariah of such irritability, sensuality, and cruelty, and marry the mild man Bonzo?" (Mathews 180). Her intentions are to trick Bonzo, but Zachary does not see the actual meaning and takes it to mean that Twang wants to leave him. Once again, the truth in the message was obscured from the receiver.

A major cause of this problem was the context. As communication theory explains, the context can cause a greatly different meaning between both parties in the communication. Twang's meaning was to boldly lie to deceive Bonzo, but the meaning Zachary received was that Twang loves Bonzo and no longer wants to be Zachary's wife. The context of the situation is that the letter is supposed to be a deception, but Zachary does not understand this. In that manner the context has completely distorted the message and caused truth to be obscured.

As shown, truth and meaning were obscured in the novel in a variety of ways. Twang's broken English caused Zachary to misunderstand her, the form of the letters restricted what could be said, Zachary misunderstood his own reality and therefore caused Twang to believe a falsity, and Twang's idea to deceive the people reading her letters caused many communication breakdowns. The novel is rife with examples of how messages can be distorted to hide the true meaning. Due to this, the novel is demonstrating the shakiness of communication and the fact that meanings can easily change when two people are trying to speak to each other, especially through written formats. Messages can be misconstrued in a variety of ways, as proved by the three previously described theories, and the text is demonstrating that this is a common problem.

Everyone knows what it is like to communicate, and everyone has had experiences where communication failed. It is a common problem that can occur because of context, behavior, skills, distance, or simple unreliability of testimony or representation. The reasons communication can fail are numerous, as are the ways in which it can play out. In The Sinking of the Odradek Stadium, the two main characters frequently experience this problem in a variety of ways. Through Zachary and Twang, readers can watch the obscuration of messages and truth. Getting a message to another person can be tricky, and Mathew's novel clearly demonstrates that fact.
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Far East Dystopia:
A Historical Study of Japanophobia
and Its Presence in Gibson’s Neuromancer

Samantha Long

The commercial and critical success of William Gibson’s Neuromancer, an unlikely combination in the contemporary publishing field, has brought the 1984 classic continued attention from a wide audience of readers. For the average reader or science fiction enthusiast, Gibson’s vision of a fast-paced, technocentric future with conspiracy at its heart provides a thrilling adventure, navigating the reader through unfamiliar terrain both real and virtual, a non-Western dominated economy and the virtual disembodiment of cyberspace (an imaginative precursor to the Internet). On the other hand, for the literary scholar, Gibson’s text is heralded as a thoroughly postmodern work, typically cited as a major influence to—if not foundational work of—the cyberpunk genre.

Consequently, this critical acclaim has opened up a variety of discourse on the novel, though it appears that few analyses in the literature return to the structures of Neuromancer that make the reading so thrilling and the vision of the future so alien in the first place, for both the everyday reader and for the scholar. Instead, these questions are typically written off, with Gibson’s future explained either as a dystopic world where capitalism has run amuck or as a celebratory vision of globalized, free-market capitalism despite corporate control, urbanization, and environmental damage. For me and a few other scholars, these interpretations of what is happening in Gibson’s world, from Chiba City
to the Sprawl, are too limiting, ignoring the historical context in which the novel was written. To place the blame on capitalism alone or, more importantly, to see *Neuromancer* as a celebratory and progressive space where the white, Western economy no longer dominates is to overlook how the portrayal—and absence—of the Japanese in the text is often quite problematic. I argue that the re-emergence of “yellow peril” fears in response to Japan’s burgeoning economic success in the 1980s shapes the entire structure of *Neuromancer* and our reaction to it as readers. I will examine the historical events that occurred during the time of Gibson’s writing, the U.S. media’s reaction to those events in print, and how those influences play out in *Neuromancer*.

One of the first questions that must be answered when trying to determine what Gibson’s world projects is the chief concern posed by the opposition: Why is this not a celebratory vision of the future? Why, when white, Western power has been displaced by nonwhite, Eastern power (specifically Japan’s power) is the world considered a dystopia? In that case, they might add, it is perhaps a Japanophobic reaction on the part of the critics who interpret this type of future as undesirable. Certainly there is truth to these statements, but what they ultimately fail to address is that neither the content nor the structure of Gibson’s text ever actively embraces this new cultural and economic influence. In fact, many essential parts of this work, even the basics of character and plotline, seem to be aggressively fighting against Japanese influence. To begin, as Lisa Nakamura points out in *Cybertypes*, the principal characters in the novel (the protagonist Case included) are all white, while “there are no Asian hackers” presented (66) and—for the most part—“the oriental city serves largely as backdrop” devoid of visible Japanese inhabitants (Yu 61). When Japanese elements are presented, they immediately become part of the overbearing “zaitatsu” multinational control that Case and the others do not want to be part of. Instead, they are reminders of a Japanified corporate world where the constant bombardment of Japanese trademarks in the text shows a lack of Western (American) control—control Case and the others try to recapture in cyberspace.

Even though Nakamura notes that “these Asian characters install, manufacture, and maintain the body modifications that make heavy duty hacking possible for console cowboys” their role in the novel is ultimately diminished since “[they] supply the props but stay hidden in the wings” (66). If *Neuromancer* was celebrating a shift in world power structures, it becomes odd, then, for Japan to occupy only the position of the antagonist other—the voices of its people silenced by a lack of (a) positive character(s) to represent them, the plot essentially working against them with “Case as a warrior against Japanese capitalism” (Nakamura 65). Nakamura further comments on the imbalance in the scholarly literature concerning how power is represented in the text, stating how “many critics…have discussed the ways in which Gibson critiques and refigures capitalism, yet none seem to discuss the racial politics or historical context of that critique as a product of 1980s American Japanophobia” (65). With the basic problems of this view identified, I would now like to examine on a deeper level how the American climate toward the Japanese in the 1980s positions this text into its historical context and, by doing so, further removes it from any type of progressive, positive interpretation.

The easiest way to summarize (and simplify) the differences between the economies of the United States and Japan throughout the 1980s is that the United States was in a period of decline as the Japanese market (and American demand for Japanese goods) was booming. For a variety of reasons too complex for the purposes of this essay, Japan rose up in the early eighties as an influential economic power, providing among other things new technologies and advanced technological products for consumers. Sheila Johnson in *The Japanese through American Eyes* notes that during this time, “Americans were changing…their impressions of
Japanese products....They stopped thinking of them as cheap, shoddy, and gimmick, and began to regard them as highly reliable, precision-made, and well designed" (129-30). This new view caused an increased demand for these products by Americans, be it televisions, radios, or more energy-efficient cars, principally because there was the belief that these Japanese items were" better than comparable American-made items" (Johnson 130). Specifically, Japanese vehicles became popular in response to the 1979 U.S. oil crisis because they were more fuel efficient (Oweiss). This growing demand for Japanese products overseas, in addition to increased domestic demands as the Japanese became wealthier, continued the country's economic growth.

However, America—in a period of industrial decline and recession—began to feel the effects of this increased importation as its trade deficit with Japan grew from $6.9 billion in 1980 to $52 billion in 1987 (Johnson 134). Suddenly, Japan had "entered an era of true internationalization...now ineluctably engaged in the world" (Emmott 21) and, to some Americans, this "new global reach looked sinister, evidence of the country's expanding control over the world economy" (Emmott 17). In response, many American manufacturers pushed for legislation to impose tariff barriers and quotas on foreign imports (Johnson 133) since they felt the Japanese "deliberately kept their markets closed while exploiting the openness of the American market" (Heale 22). Such legislation included the auto industry's successful 1981 lobbying "for 'voluntary' quotas on the number of Japanese cars to be sent to the United States each year" (Johnson 133). Other American manufacturers launched "Buy American" campaigns to try to direct consumers away from foreign goods (Heale 44). Yet, despite these policies and campaigns, the deficit continued to grow and, as a result, Japan began purchasing factories and businesses abroad—especially in the United States—due to their low prices. The growing presence of these Japanese multinationals was greeted with much apprehension in the United States where, for many, "the price of liberty was eternal vigilance, and they were wary as ever of their nation's vulnerability to internal subversion..."—namely, Japanese corporate influence (Heale 19). One opinion poll conducted in the eighties "revealed that Japan had replaced the Soviet Union as the greatest perceived threat to the U.S." (Heale 19).

Bill Emmott in Japanophobia further comments on this dislike of multinationals in the States, citing how public opinion on corporations in the twentieth century has soured. Although entrepreneurial businesses in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were often portrayed as desirable and led by "robber baron" types, nowadays there is a sense of entrepreneurial business as being "on a human scale" with a celebrity-like appeal even, as Emmott comments, if "the companies are huge...headed by Bill Gates...[or] Donald Trump" (44-46). On the other hand, the corporation is not so easy to understand: "its motives are not clear, its loyalties are hard to discern, its ultimate ownership impossible to pin down" (Emmott 44-46). Therefore, this structure has become unpopular with the public due to its seemingly mysterious nature, and Emmott argues that the suspicion only grows stronger when the corporation is foreign owned (44-46).

With motivations and loyalties largely unclear in the first place, the multinational corporation becomes the target of even more suspicion, since it is assumed that "whatever their loyalties actually are, by definition they must be loyalties to foreigners. Multinationals, in other words, appear like agents of a foreign power, whose interests are surely different from that of the host country" (Emmott 46). It is within this climate of Japan's growing corporate power in the United States and its new positioning in the world economy that the media backlash—and Gibson's dystopic vision of a future dominated by the Japanese—can be understood.

A popular joke through the late eighties and early nineties read, "The
Cold War is over and Japan has won" (Heale 37). This statement only expresses a small portion of the surprise—even dismay—felt by many in the American public as the nation's success and power appeared to be surpassed by the Japanese. Heale writes that "just as the United States was on the verge of winning the Cold War, Americans were being told that they had backed the wrong kind of capitalism after all" (37). With the slumped American market and no end in sight to Japan's growth, defense mechanisms were suddenly engaged and the blame game began across the U.S. media—an aggressive and paranoid reaction prophesying the nightmare of potential Japanese takeover—as much a response to "main U.S.-Japan policy decisions and actions that were carried out by the United States government" (Luther 138) as it was a manipulator of public opinion and policy.

During this time, nonfiction texts speculating about the future of Japan-U.S. relations filled the bookshelves and varied from texts like Ezra Vogel's Japan as Number One which encouraged the United States "to learn and adapt [Japan's] techniques" (Johnson 136) to the bleak vision presented in Coming War with Japan, which claimed that "the coming, second U.S.-Japanese war will occur in spite of the best intentions of all concerned" (Friedman and Lebard 403). In American fiction, journalist Josh Getlin remarked that "Japanese businessmen" were quickly replacing "Nazi spies and Soviet agents...[as] archetypal enemies," with "U.S. novelists...flinging poison pens back at Japan, reflecting a growing mood of anger and resentment...." One of the most popular and controversial novels of the time that seemed to profit from this climate of fear was Michael Crichton's Rising Sun, a murder mystery set within a Japanese corporation in Los Angeles but also dealing with the notion of "a beleaguered America losing control of its economy" (Getlin). These kinds of texts emerging in the eighties and early nineties are especially important to consider in relation to Gibson's Neuromancer.

Nevertheless, the re-emergence of yellow-peril politics can be most strongly felt in the era's newspaper publications, which highlight the extent of U.S. paranoia in regard to Japan. Catherine Luther examines common themes appearing in print throughout the 1980s relating to American self-identity and the media's conception of Japan. She summarizes that a majority of newspapers reporting on the strengthening Japanese market fell under these categories of representation: "The United States...licking its wounds, but still standing tall" (138); "Japan as inherently weak and ineffective" (141); and "Japan as duplicitous and unscrupulous" (143). Essentially, the press felt that the "Japanese were not able to come to terms with their new international standing," making their new power not only appear to be temporary but also in need of the United States' "continued guidance" (141). As a nation, the United States still felt that it was "the torch-bearer for Democracy" and had the "means to regain...[its] strength" (138). In addition to these excuses, the validity of Japan's success was also constantly called into question, with many news sources suggesting that Japan only "managed to acquire economic achievements through unprincipled and dishonest means," presumably in contrast to "honest" advancement in the United States (143).

Yet, looking past Luther's study, one can also find that Japanese business transactions occurring stateside were also given ample attention by the U.S. press, best exemplified in Time magazine's 1987 article, "For Sale: America." In this piece, the very opening paragraph deploys the stereotype of "serious-minded, dark-suited Japanese [businessmen]" as they examine a rundown American factory that they want to buy; they are the modern, yellow-peril antagonists ("For Sale: America"). From there, the article only continues to outline the increased presence of foreign corporations on U.S. soil and, at best, portrays these buyers within the problematic confines of the model minority stereotype, marking them as "racially exceptional yet not of the mainstream" (Ono and Pham 80).
Initially, aggressive, warlike language is frequently used in the piece, turning the United States into an economic battleground that “Japan Inc.” (Cose) has invaded. To the journalist, America has become “a huge shopping mart in which foreigners are energetically filling up their carts” and where “never before have U.S. citizens witnessed so many familiar American landmarks passing into foreign hands” (“For Sale: America”). The Japanese investors are likened to “raiders,” “taking America’s skylines by storm” (“For Sale: America”) and, at least to the journalist, the continuation of this trend will only bring the demise of the United States. Similarly, Sony’s acquisition of Columbia Pictures in the late eighties is dubbed by *Newsweek* as “the biggest advance so far in the invasion of Hollywood,” where one industry executive states that the Japanese could use the cinema to manipulate American minds (Cose).

Unfortunately, these yellow-peril fears were allowed to reach a fever pitch throughout the 1980s with little to stop them or call them into question. Although many Americans did not share the opinions being perpetuated by the press, and though many Asian and Asian American groups protested against these racist representations that harkened back to earlier periods in American history, these voices were not as powerful. The reality, as Kent Ono and Vincent Pham suggest, is that these negative images were and are able to persist due to “continuing unequal relations of media power” among minority populations, “with dominant white society controlling the means of representation” (42). Without a fairly balanced media, the Japanese and other Asians and Asian Americans are subsequently “depicted without much information, knowledge, or education about who they are” (42), which allows stereotypes to become the norm. Unfortunately, this was certainly the case in the 1980s as these Japanophobic fears permeated every media form to become the defining characteristic of the decade. Yet it is this historical positioning and influence (when we last return to *Neuromancer*) that should not be forgotten in any close examination of Gibson’s text because this context transforms the reading as something that is far from celebratory and far from just unregulated capitalism. There is a new dimension now, one of race and fear.

The essential vision in Gibson’s novel is that Japan has indeed taken over in the near future, as imagined likely in the time of his writing. This is a strange world, both exotic and dystopic to the crumbled West, a world where the U.S. dollar has been replaced by “New Yen” (6), where the American breakfast of “eggs [and] real bacon” is typically substituted by “that rebuilt Chiba krill” (47), where American trademarks have been wiped out, replaced, or hijacked—the “Hosaka computer; Sony monitor;... Braun coffeemaker” (46), the “Mitsubishi Bank of America” (52), “Yeheyuan filters” (9), and “Kirin’s rather than Buds” (Chun 3)—and those of non-Asian descent are frequently undergoing surgery to add epicanthic folds to their eyes (58). Overall, from a macro to micro level, this is a future dominated by nonwhites, though the plot subsequently focuses on a handful of white characters who are carefully navigating through this world, hacking into the zaibatsus and railing against oppressive corporate culture, a lifestyle that is intricately tied to the Japanese in the text. From Chiba City to the Sprawl, the urbanization of space is nearly identical, and the United States can be understood as having lost its economic might and any power it once had as a nation.

Nevertheless, on the individual level, the lead protagonist, Case, attempts to regain power for himself through his position as a “console cowboy” in the virtual frontier of cyberspace (Buell qtd. in Chun 4). It becomes a final, desperate attempt to reassert American subjectivity/embodiment (Yu 65). So, as Stephen Song Hohn argues, “the West... [can] preserve its identity in the imagination of the future” (8). It is not necessarily clear whether Case successfully opens a space for American subjectivity by the novel’s end since his actions appear to change very
little around him; however, his declaration at the close of the text, stating
“I don’t need you” (270) after throwing the shuriken into the TV screen
(presumably Japanese manufactured) is very interesting to consider as
a “final, violent excision of Japan” where Case’s identity is once again
“grounded in the white male body” (Yu 65), the privileged American
form. Overall, Neuromancer in its entirety makes clear the impact that
current events implicitly had on the construction of the novel.

In closing, one concern worth addressing in light of this analysis
is Gibson’s intent, and how, if at all, that should influence the novel’s
reception. When confronting the issue in a 2001 article about his use
of Japan as the setting for the future he responded that “Japan is the
global imagination’s default setting for the future” (qtd. in Nakamura
64). Interestingly enough, as Nakamura notes, Gibson seems unable to
realize that his “own fascination with Japan is partly the reason...[why]
it has come to signify the ‘future’ in technological narratives,” due chiefly
to Neuromancer’s success as a groundbreaking, cyberpunk work (64). Yet
his statement suggests that in the writing of Neuromancer there was no
conscious attempt to engage the text with current U.S.-Japan relations as
a way to gain exposure. In my opinion, unlike in Crichton’s controversial
Rising Sun, which used current events to engage a wide audience and
reap profits, the historical markings present in Gibson’s novel are on
a far more subconscious, implicit level. At most, there was simply the
belief that Japanese power could eclipse U.S. power in the near future,
something that seemed possible in the eighties.

Though debates over implicit or explicit intent may appear fruitless,
I think that understanding the depth and complexity of Neuromancer
revealing of these problematic dimensions in a futuristic setting is an open
invitation for his readers to explore, critique, and further reflect on these
issues. Thus the middle ground in a contextual examination of this novel
must be maintained. To gloss over the issues with the text disjointed from
its background is, in some ways, to ignore and affirm those dimensions
of race and nation relations as the norm. Yet to discredit the novel as
dated and offensive overlooks the subtleties present, in addition to losing
sight of the many other reasons why this postmodern work is so highly
revered. An understanding of historical background should not condemn
a text like Neuromancer but instead allow us to approach it in a new way.
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The Harry Potter series had a cultural impact that most books are unable to achieve. Julia Eccleshare describes the scene of a release party for J. K. Rowling's novel *Harry Potter and the Order of the Phoenix*: “4,000 school children filled the Albert Hall in London....They were already in a frenzy of expectation as they awaited the arrival of the ‘world’s best selling and most famous author,’ as her host, Steven Fry, described her” (287).

The scene sounds more like a movie premiere or fans awaiting the arrival of a popular band before a concert than a book-release party. It is unusual for a book to achieve such popularity so quickly—especially a children's book. Many people, because of the commercial success of the books, are starting to devalue them as literary works. Several people I spoke with who consider themselves to be very “intellectual” and “well-read” stated that they thought the book were “not literature” or “nonsense,” even though they had never read the books. These opinions are formed simply on the popularity of the books. The widespread success of Harry Potter raises the issue of whether a text can be both popular and culturally valuable, and, further, who decides what constitutes value in a literary work.

Stacy Gillis offers some explanation to the intense popularity of the series, reasoning that “the early popular reception of the *Harry Potter* novels was largely contingent upon word-of-mouth recommendations of...children liking it...and telling their friends” (303). “In general,” Eccleshare states, “children’s books do not figure importantly into the world of media, and when they do achieve celebrity status, the process of...
finding the right publisher and audience may...take several years—but the almost instant success of the *Harry Potter* series has stood such received wisdom on its head" (287). Rowling's series is outsold only by the Bible and Shakespeare's works. Rowling has made approximately $425 million from the Harry Potter franchise, including movie rights and a Coca-Cola deal. It is no wonder that many are beginning to regard Harry and Rowling as more of a cultural phenomenon than a novel.

The series' target audience, children and teenagers, is another reason many question the value of Harry Potter. The book has quickly transformed from a literary work into a franchise. Suddenly, children and teenagers are wearing Harry Potter clothes, waiting in line for Harry Potter movies, and even buying tickets to a Harry Potter theme park. It seems that whenever an object becomes this outrageously popular, especially among children and teenagers, it begins to lose its cultural value. Stuart Hall and Paddy Whannel explore the type of entertainment that is typically created for an adolescent audience. They argue that with cultural objects pertaining to adolescents, “the use intended by the provider and the use actually made by the audience of the particular style never wholly coincide, and frequently conflict” (45). Such is the case here, as it is doubtful that Rowling ever intended her readers to be wearing Harry Potter memorabilia and frequenting an amusement park in his honor. This is evident in Eccleshare’s article; she recounts a scene where Rowling attended a release party with thousand of screaming fans. As the roar of the crowd became deafening, “no one but Rowling could hear the involuntary ‘wow’ which could be seen to pass her lips” (Eccleshare 287).

Hall and Whannel also point out that teenage pop culture usually contains “elements both of emotional realism and of fantasy fulfillment” (48). This was used to explain the impact of popular music, but it can be applied to Harry Potter as well. Harry goes through all the emotional trials that children and teenagers can relate to: struggles with schoolwork, feelings for the opposite sex, and the fight to fit in among his peers. However, he does this in an environment that is strictly fantasy. Harry’s world in the books is an escape from the mundane and typical school environment: Harry’s school teaches spells and magic. What’s more, he comes to this fantasy world after eleven years in the “real” world, living an ordinary, often fairly difficult, life. He has had no knowledge of the wizard world before this; it is a completely foreign concept to both him and the reader. Many children and teenagers no doubt fantasize that there is something more to this world than they can see, that someday they will find that they are destined for greatness and stand out from others around them in a major way.

Hall and Whannel also note differences between the younger generation and their parents, saying, "Parents are always one generation behind their children, today they seem to be two generations behind” (46). While the authors do acknowledge that the media often exaggerate the stereotype that parents misunderstand teenage culture, there is some truth to it. The generation gap seems prevalent especially today, when technology is creating a “new tempo of life” that parents are struggling to adjust to, but children and teenagers have grown up with (Hall and Whannel 46). However, this is precisely why these parents should cling to cultural objects such as Harry Potter. The wizard world is entirely separate from our own world and transcends the generation gap. Technology as we know it does not exist at Hogwarts. “Muggle [non-magic] technology doesn’t work on the grounds [of Hogwarts],” Harry’s friend Hermione points out about halfway through the fourth novel, *The Goblet of Fire* (Rowling, Goble: 434). This realization shocks Harry, but not as much as it shocks the reader. In four novels the absence of technology is never realized until it is blatantly pointed out. Technology is necessary in our society. But it is not needed in the wizard world, so its absence is unnoticed. No references to any recent popular music are made in the series.
either, nor is there any mention of films, television shows, or anything readily associated with “our world.” Further, the object itself is a novel. It may have developed into a larger franchise, but this does not detract from the fact that the Harry Potter series is, at its core, a collection of literary works. Instead of looking down on the series, we should embrace it as a way to bridge the generation gap.

The fact that the series is a worldwide phenomenon does also not detract from its literary value. Eccleshare brings up several times that many wonder how a children’s book could be so popular, but really, only the first two books in the series could be considered children’s novels. The first book, *Harry Potter and the Sorcerer’s Stone*, is more of a children’s book, as Harry and his friends explore the magical wizarding world and their school, Hogwarts, for the first time. However, by the seventh novel, *Harry Potter and the Deathly Hallows*, the world has been completely shattered by the series’ villain, Lord Voldemort, and Harry finds himself on the run, facing nearly impossible decisions every second, such as which he values more: his own life or the lives of his friends. Along the way, Harry has been faced with extreme hardships: he has inadvertently gotten some of the people he loves most killed, he has been ridiculed for standing up for what is right, and he has finally been clung to by those who previously ridiculed him as the supposed future savior of the wizard world. The later books in the series are actually written more for adolescents and adults than for children. Those who dismiss the novels as simply children’s literature miss the complexity and substance that is present throughout the series.

There are still those, however, who do not believe that Harry Potter is valuable as a literary work. To examine why this belief is held, what constitutes a literary work must first be explored. In her article “Masterpiece Theater: The Politics of Hawthorne’s Literary Reputation,” Jane Tompkins examines the definition of a classic. “The classic definition of a classic,” Tompkins states, “is a literary work that has withstood the test of time” (137). This definition was created by Samuel Johnson in his *Preface to Shakespeare*. It is a definition that seems to be prevalent in defining the value of literature in a culture. In her article “Contingencies of Value” Barbara Hernstein Smith cites the “endurance” and “survival” of a text as what defines it as classic (147). In his article, “The Analysis of Culture,” Raymond Williams references an “ideal” state of culture in which culture is, “a state or process of human perfection, in terms of certain absolute or universal values” (32). These values, according to the definition, are “timeless,” therefore the work is also timeless. All of these definitions seem to share a common thread: what is contemporary is not “classic.” If this belief is taken literally, Harry Potter cannot possibly be a classic because there is no way to determine if it will stand the test of time.

This definition of literature can be very limiting, to say the least. The idea that literary works need to pass a certain test in order to be considered worthy of the canon seems daunting and limiting to the type of works that can be read. Tompkins asks, “Which test? Or rather, whose?” (142). Generally, what is considered to be “high” art, or in this case “high” literature, is “the best that has ever been thought or written in the world” (Williams 32). This definition seems to have a few problems because what is “best” is entirely subjective to each person. Williams, too, sees the flaws in this definition, because, an “ideal definition...attempts to abstract that it describes from its detailed embodiment and shaping of by particular societies—regarding man’s ideal development” (33). The flaw in this definition is that even man’s view of “ideal” development is constantly changing.

This is not to say that we should not continue to study Shakespeare, Shelley, Arnold, or any other literary works that have stood the test of time. It simply means that we should explore the possibility that a literary work may have value before it has passed this test. Smith points out,
“at any given time under the contemporary condition... a particular object—let us say an artifact or text—may perform certain desired/able functions quite well for some set of subjects” (148). Literary critics are already writing about Harry Potter, teachers and professors are using the individual texts and the series as a whole in the classroom, and thousands read the books just for enjoyment. Clearly, Harry Potter has served a purpose for all of these people and holds some value.

If it is so important for a work to stand the test of time, what criteria must that work meet in order for this to happen? Tompkins points out that “the grounds for critical approval are always shifting,” so it is hard to determine exactly what constitutes a good literary work (142). Often, there is a skewed view of high art, that all great artists are unappreciated in their own time. Tompkins shows that this is not true, using Nathaniel Hawthorne as an example of an author who was well received when he lived in the nineteenth century and is still admired today. She notes that there has been a slight shift in the appreciation of his work, most notably in the types of works read. For example, those in the nineteenth century preferred “Little Annie’s Ramble” to “Young Goodman Brown,” which is studied more today (Tompkins 140). Still, Hawthorne is an example of an author who was acclaimed in his own time and still is today, which shows that sometimes literary works can be considered valuable even in the time in which they are published. Smith notes that “the texts that survive will tend to be those that appear to reflect and enforce establishment ideologies” (151).

If this is the case, then Harry Potter should have no problem surviving through the years, for a classic ideology that good should triumph over evil is the overall ideology present in the series. Lord Voldemort seems to represent every tyrant in history and is often compared to Hitler. He promotes one “pure” race and enjoys killing innocent people to achieve this. Harry represents a fairly average person with a few unique abilities who rises above adversity and puts the greater good above his own well-being to overcome this evil force. This seems as though it is an ideology that will remain relevant throughout the years.

Whether or not literature can stand the test of time is not the only criteria for whether it is considered valuable. Janice Radway describes the way her professors viewed “high” literature, saying that they “seemed genuinely moved by Ishmael’s damp November of the soul and by the epiphanies of Stephen Dedalus but utterly disdainful of the trials of Silas Marner and Clyde Griffiths, not to mention Scarlett O’Hara” (202). Essentially, these professors have constructed a different view of high literature from the one previously discussed: what is popular is bad and unintelligent—only more “intellectual” works belong in the classroom. Radway struggled with this notion, as, no doubt, do many college students. Radway says that she learned to “keep [her] voracious taste for bestsellers, mysteries, cookbooks, and popular nature books a secret... from everyone, including the more educated and cultural self [she] was trying to become” (200). Radway essentially felt that she could not be considered a “cultured” individual until she learned to appreciate more “intellectual” literature.

This, however, draws attention to another side of the argument. If “academic” and “intellectual” texts such as Faulkner or Shelley begin to be categorized as “too pretentious” or “not relatable,” this simply reverses the stereotype and the divide. Radway discovers this in her article when she remembers attending a meeting of the Book-of-the-Month Club. Radway says that many books suggested at the meeting were judged as “too academic for us,” “desiccated,” “too technical,” and “highly specialized.” The Book-of-the-Month club favored the tastes of the “general reader” (206). Radway soon realized that the “general reader” had “perhaps evolved historically precisely as a reader not general but focused, professional, technical, and specialized. The general reader was
most obviously not the academic reader” (206). Just as it is wrong to assume that “academic,” “technical,” and “specialized” texts are superior to popular works, it is equally harmful to assume that popular works somehow replace or refute “academic” works. Neither is superior to the other; there is no reason why someone can’t read Rowling one week and Faulkner the next.

Williams too warns of the dangers of adopting one view of culture. The “ideal” version of culture regards “man’s ideal development as something separate from and even opposed to his ‘animal nature’” (Williams 34). Using this to analyze literature, we can say that humans, ideally, should not study anything that strays from “ideal” values. Therefore only the “best” that has ever been created is deemed worthy for study. Next, there is the “documentary” definition, which is also flawed, for “it finds value only in the written and painted records, and marks this area off from the rest of man’s life in society” (Williams 34). Since society and lifestyle have a great impact on a literary work, this cannot easily be removed from the analysis of literature.

However, Williams also points out the “social” definition of culture can also be harmful because it “treats the general process of the body of art and learning as a mere by-product, passive reflection of the real interests in society” (34). Williams says that instead, “we have to try to see the process as a whole” (34). Culture and works of literature are influenced by a number of aspects: the time in which they are written, who writes them, and how they are received all factor into an object’s cultural value. Therefore an object’s cultural value can shift over time. Obsessing over whether or not to read a literary work because it is “too academic” or “too popular” is useless. Today, Harry Potter seems “unworthy” of canonical status, but in a hundred years, if it has stood the “test of time,” it may be held up against another novel as an example of high culture. No doubt its popularity will have some impact on its durability; those who enjoy it will pass it on through generations. If it ultimately survives, it will be because it also has substance, because it has something to offer the reader.

In my college classes, I have begun to see Harry Potter referenced more and more as an academic text. One of my drama professors frequently referenced the series when she was trying to illustrate classic struggles of good and evil. In this class we read Hamlet, Oedipus, Antigone and Cyrano—all of which would be considered “high literature”—but there were also frequent references to a “popular” novel. The class worked well. It never seemed strange or out of place when a Harry Potter reference was made. The “academic” work and the “popular” work were able to co-exist together.

This is a method that can be applied to many works of literature, especially Greek and Roman literature, and it is used to help analyze a high culture text. Thus, in a college classroom it is not necessary to separate what is academic from what is popular. Often, as my professors have proven, using a text that is popular and well known can actually aid in the understanding of difficult texts. If a professor were to explain a complex theory with a highly academic novel that many students have not read before, the students may have greater difficulty grasping two unfamiliar concepts at once. However, if an academic theory is coupled with a popular story, students’ comprehension of the unfamiliar will happen much faster. Harry Potter is so popular that even those who have not read the books know the basic storyline, so it can be used as a general example in many classrooms.

Whether or not the novel deserves to be popular should not be the issue; the fact remains that the novel is popular, so a constructive use of that popularity should be found, whether that be encouraging children and teenagers to read other novels after Harry Potter or attempting to use the novels to somehow achieve a greater purpose, such as using the stories to illustrate larger concepts. The images on the news of hundreds of
children dressed in "wizard gear" do not represent the series, only the way the series has been taken up in society. The promotion of the series and the series itself are two separate entities; one cannot be judged simply by knowledge of the other. Overall, literature and culture as a whole cannot be looked at from simply one angle. It is better to accept that there is no "perfect" literary work rather than constantly search for some "ideal" definition of literature, which will no doubt change in a few decades.

Works Cited


Authoring Nine Books in One Year:
The Pros and Cons of Ghostwriting

Amy Weissenburger

What do Fidel Castro, Hulk Hogan, John McCain, Tom Clancy, and Harry Houdini have in common? They have all been rumored to have used a ghostwriter for their books (Amos). The merits of these accusations can be questioned in some cases, but the claim is still there. And if they did use ghostwriters, is that so bad? Answering that question requires an understanding of what ghostwriting actually is as well as of its benefits and ethics. In examining the practice of ghostwriting, I will show that it is beneficial to most parties involved but that the procedures need to be altered in order for more credit to be given to the ghostwriter.

The definition of a ghostwriter can be complicated. In general, it is a person who, with little or no credit, writes a book for someone else. In fact, Webster’s dictionary simplifies the definition of the term *ghostwrite* to “to write for and in the name of another” (“Ghostwrite” 208). However, this is ambiguous when it comes to the world of ghostwriting. A ghostwriter can do many different tasks in the creation of a book, and the degree of contribution varies from book to book (Garfield 461). The help of a ghostwriter can be limited to a very thorough editing job. However, the ghostwriter can also write the entire story, whether as dictated, from an outline, or based off a given idea. No matter the degree of help given, the ghostwriter never appears as the actual author.

The amount of credit given to a ghostwriter can vary greatly. It ranges from the extreme of being acknowledged as a co-author to having to sign a
contract that states he or she will never mention his or her role in the text. In fact, more extreme than co-authorship are the cases where the public rightfully assumes that the work was not written by the “author,” such as speeches and works by political leaders who do not have the time to do all the writing (Garfield 461). This can be said for books attributed to certain celebrities as well, as the public knows they are busy with filming and are not necessarily experts on writing. In these cases, though, there is still ambiguity because the ghostwriters sign a contract and therefore cannot say anything about their help in creating the work.

Ghostwriting is not a recent development. Many types of authors and speakers have been using ghostwriters for a long time. In fact, ghostwriting goes as far back as the time of Nero. It is suspected that his speeches were actually written by Seneca (“The Ghosts Behind” B4). There’s also a famous figure in American history who is suspected of using a ghostwriter for a speech. Many believe that George Washington’s farewell address was written by Alexander Hamilton (“The Ghosts Behind” B4). But ghostwriting was not used only in speeches in the eighteenth century. One interesting case in the nineteenth century involves a famous author writing for a famous figure. It is believed that Mark Twain wrote Ulysses S. Grant’s autobiography (“The Ghosts Behind” B4). But ghostwriting was not used only in speeches in the eighteenth century. One interesting case in the nineteenth century involves a famous author writing for a famous figure. It is believed that Mark Twain wrote Ulysses S. Grant’s autobiography (“The Ghosts Behind” B4). In a more contemporary example, we have Tom Clancy. According to author Thomas Kellner, two of Clancy’s series, Net Force and Op-Center, were ghostwritten. While these cases occurred when the authors and speakers were alive, there are ghostwriting cases that occur after the author’s death. This can be done either to complete an unfinished manuscript or to create new words altogether in order to increase sales. For example, Thomas Kellner states that ghostwriters were creating new books for V. C. Andrews even after she had been dead for sixteen years. As evidenced, this is not a recent or uncommon practice.

It is clear that ghostwriting has stood the test of time. Presumably, this is because it offers many benefits. However, it is important to know who benefits, whether it is the publisher, author, ghostwriter, reader, or a combination of the four. This can help establish why it is such a popular practice as well as what any possible ramifications could be.

Every novel that is ghostwritten has to be published somehow. While it can be self-published, I think it is safe to assume that most ghostwritten novels are brought to the public by way of a traditional publishing house, as most “authors” are big names that will draw in a lot of money. Celebrities can hire ghostwriters, as can well-established authors who do not have time to keep up with the demand for their novels. In fact, one company that offers ghostwriting services, The Penn Group, claims on their website that their ghostwriters have written recent texts under the names of a CEO of a Fortune 500 company, the founder of a national charity group, a historical figure, a television host, a well-known motivational speaker, and the founder of a pharmaceutical company. People in these positions are big names, and therefore their books have more selling-power than an everyday person trying to break into the industry.

The monumental selling-power of these big-name people is why publishers benefit so much from the use of ghostwriters. One example of this is the books by the best-selling author James Patterson. He is one author who has been more or less open about using ghostwriters. In “Stranger than Fiction,” Thomas Kellner states that the first time a second name appeared on the title page of one of Patterson’s novels was in 1996, on the book Miracle on the 17th Green. This was the first of many cases. The ghostwriter of the 1996 novel was Peter de Jonge, and as of 2002, he and Andrew Gross have been credited as co-authors for multiple books by Patterson (Kellner). Even though his books have co-authors, people still attribute the work to him and continue to buy his novels. This creates a lot of money for the publishers. In fact, according to Kellner’s article, in 2002, Patterson’s publisher, Little, Brown, put over $1 million into
promotions for his books. Publishers don’t put as much money into books that don’t sell. Patterson is a best-seller, and I’m sure Little, Brown made much more than the $1 million. They recognize that he is a best-selling author and reap the benefits from publishing works with his name on them. Kellner points out that the publishing company, in fact, does not care if Patterson uses ghostwriters because the books are always of high quality and therefore have a lot of selling power. As evidenced by this case, publishers benefit from ghostwriting.

It is clear that ghostwriting is good for publishers, and likewise, it is good for authors. Ghostwriters not only help authors who struggle with the craft of writing, but they also help popular authors in producing more and thereby making more money. Writing a novel can be a long process, but because James Patterson uses the help of ghostwriters, he is able to publish an average of nine novels every year (Kaffer MM10). This is a lot of novels compared to what most authors publish yearly. The large number of books he publishes makes him huge amounts of money. His products (books, movies, etc.) make hundreds of millions of dollars every year (Kellner), and it is likely that a large sum of this goes to him. The big-name authors of ghostwritten books get a lot of money as well as fame for producing so many novels. Due to this, it is evident that they benefit from the process of ghostwriting.

Another person involved in the ghostwriting process is the actual ghostwriter. Publishers and authors benefit from the process, but do the ghostwriters themselves? They put a lot of work into these texts, generally receiving little or no credit. However, there is a lot of evidence that they receive benefits as well. The first benefit is money. The ghostwriting service The Penn Group states on their company website that they charge anywhere from $8,000 to $250,000, depending on the size of the manuscript and the qualifications of both the client and the ghostwriter. While this money is paid to the company, it can be assumed that a large amount of it goes to the ghostwriter who is actually doing the work. In fact, if a ghostwriter freelanced, he or she could make this amount of money on his or her own. Ghostwriting can be a lucrative business for the ghostwriter.

Another benefit the ghostwriter receives is recognition, depending on the contract. If a ghostwriter produces quality work and has not signed a nondisclosure agreement, he or she can use the ghostwritten text as evidence at publishing houses, giving the ghostwriter a benefit if he or she wants to publish his or her own book. This was the case with Michael Gruber. He ghostwrote fourteen novels for author Robert K. Tanenbaum, splitting the advances and royalties even though his name never appeared on a book cover (Andriana 40). He helped the other author and eventually benefited from it himself. As he stated, ghostwriting was “a cushion, a back door into writing novels” (qtd. in Andriana 40). He saw it as a way to boost his own credibility as an author, and it worked. The practice helped him to prove his worth as a writer, and he ended up publishing three books of his own (Andriana 40). Being a ghostwriter clearly benefited Gruber.

Michael Gruber was not the only one who benefited from being a ghostwriter. Michael Robotham is another author who was a ghostwriter first. According to columnist Lucy Clark, he wrote fifteen autobiographies for others before he published his first novel. And this novel was not published with just any company. Due to his skills as a ghostwriter, the well-known publishing house Penguin published his first novel, The Suspect. Not only did he get a deal with Penguin, but his novel got other benefits that other authors only dream of. According to Clark, The Suspect was published in ten languages, distributed in twenty-six countries, and generated subsidiary rights when the BBC bought film rights and rights to his character. Like Gruber, Robotham provides evidence that being a ghostwriter can hold great benefits.
As established, ghostwriting can benefit publishers, authors, and ghostwriters. The last part of this process is the consumers. In some cases, they benefit as well. Fans of James Patterson, for example, get the benefit of reading nine new novels every year. Their favorite authors can publish more works thanks to ghostwriting, and they can enjoy more reading. But this can only be a benefit if the reader does not mind that a book is ghostwritten.

There have been cases where readers were less than thrilled, negating the benefits. One such case occurred in 2001. According to Kellner, reader Adam Rice enjoyed the novel *Chains of Command* by William J. Cauntiz, until he realized it was ghostwritten. Rice's horror at this discovery caused him to go straight to the courts. Kellner states that Rice sued Penguin Putnam (and lost) for what he called: "classic bait-and-switch." He could not believe that the publisher had produced a book that listed one author when there was another one behind-the-scenes. In his article, Kellner explains that what had happened was the author, Cauntiz, died when the manuscript was only half-finished, so Christopher Newman finished it for him and turned it in to the publisher. The publisher put Cauntiz's name on the cover and gave credit to Newman on the copyright page. Cauntiz's novel had potential, and Newman was simply ensuring it got to the public. However, Rice saw this as fraud and did not see the ghostwriting as benefiting him as a reader at all.

Rice's reaction might seem extreme, as he sued the publisher, but it is safe to assume that many other readers feel the same way he does. The readers think they are getting the latest novel from a great author, and they feel a connection to the author's words and style. But then they find out those words came from someone else, and they naturally feel betrayed and upset. While it might be excessive to sue, it is understandable that they become upset. So while the process benefits all others involved, it is likely that the reader won't think as fondly of the ghostwriting practice.

Ghostwriting benefits some people and alarms others. This creates two opposing views: that ghostwriting is good and that it is bad. The people who most obviously support ghostwriting are the publishers and the authors involved. The way they defend their choice is by making the point that publishing is a business and the point is to sell. Having ghostwriters produce works to be credited to famous people is the best way to sell copies of something. According to Kellner, many literary agents simply describe this as branding and state there is nothing wrong with it. Companies of all kinds use their brand-name power to sell more products, and it is no different in the literary world. As James Patterson points out, "This is commercial fiction" (qtd. in Kellner). The goal is to make a profit as well as produce a quality product. Some people are just more talented authors, so if they write the novel for someone famous, the public is getting their "brand name" as well as a good book. Due to that, there is a lot of support for ghostwriting.

There are also a lot of people against ghostwriting. Most of these people are the consumers, although there certainly are some people in the publishing field that are against it. Most of the arguments are simply about lying to the consumer and not giving credit to the actual author. As evidenced by the lawsuit brought against Penguin Putnam by Adam Rice, there are a lot of readers who feel betrayed by the whole practice. Presumably, people who agree with Rice would like the practice to end.

I personally don't belong to these two extremes. In my opinion, ghostwriting as a practice is okay. We cannot expect everyone who wants to write a book, whether it fiction or autobiography, to have the skills to produce a quality product. As stated in the article "Honesty Pays," ghostwriting can almost be expected when celebrities and athletes publish books, as it is known that some of them are "not gifted wordsmiths, and need a little help with their writing skills." Anyone who has attempted to write a novel knows the obstacles that face all writers, and not everyone
is naturally talented or trained to complete this task well. Yes, we can all write; we all have the physical ability. But we can’t all write well. That is why ghostwriters can be necessary. However, I believe there should be some limits to it.

Ghostwriting can be necessary, but what I do not agree with is the way it is handled in some cases. When ghostwriters need to sign contracts that keep their help a secret, there is a problem. In my opinion, some credit should be given to the ghostwriter, even if it is simply on the copyright page. This is especially true when the ghostwriter produced the entire book from the author’s idea. While it was not the ghostwriter who came up with the idea, it was the ghostwriter who turned that idea into something that people cannot stop reading. Due to that, ghostwriters should be acknowledged somewhere in the book. This would allow them to receive the credit they deserve, as well as give them a chance to show off their writing skills in order to receive deals for books that are entirely their own.

I believe that ghostwriters should be acknowledged not only for themselves but for the reader as well. Like Adam Rice, many people become distraught when they discover one of their favorite novels was written by someone besides the named author. It is even believed that this deceptive practice can hurt the reader’s opinions of books in general, because the reader’s view of books as authentic, trustworthy objects is gradually, but corrosively, eroded (“Honesty Pays”). People trust that books come from the author on the cover, but at some point in their lives they will discover that this is not the case at times, and this can cause them to view all books differently. To me, this is something that does not need to happen. As long as some sort of acknowledgment is given, I think that ghostwritten books can be less deceptive and therefore, hopefully, have less of a negative effect on readers.

Ghostwriting is clearly a complicated topic, with many degrees of ghostwriter contribution and many viewpoints on the ethics of it. However, when it comes down to it, it is a practice that has been occurring for hundreds of years, and there is no sign that it will stop. This is good for the publishers, authors, and ghostwriters, though the readers might not agree. There will always be dissention. But maybe one day the practice will change to allow for more acknowledgment of the ghostwriters, and then opinions might change as well. But as for now, ghostwriting will stay the same, allowing people without writing talent to have their names on books and allowing big-name authors to produce multiple books each year.
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