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Preface

Ralph Waldo Emerson once stated that “In every work of genius we recognize our own rejected thoughts; they come back to us with a certain alienated majesty.” While compiling the Amalgam, we have discovered this meaning and purpose through the wide selection of articles contained in this third issue. We were not alone, however, in our search for these rejected thoughts. Thanks and recognition belongs with our faculty advisors—Dr. Kearns, Dr. Bloom, and Dr. Aley—for reviewing and revising this year’s submissions. Our appreciation also includes Dean Glassman and the Liberal Arts Council for supporting and funding the Amalgam for the third consecutive year.

The third issue offers a diverse collection of ideas from many different areas of study. Ryan DeLaney explores the conventional views of creativity and how these notions are constantly being reassessed, developed, and defined. From the first essay we move on to Andrea L.C. Henke’s discussion of life for Jewish minorities in displacement camps after World War II, which offers an array of personal accounts and historical fact to enlighten the reader. Chris Schwenk’s essay considers the role of society and political parties and how these factors contribute to a person’s views on singular issues, such as abortion. Sara Elpers considers the role of heliocentrism in Tristram Shandy by discussing how the main character deviates from the conventional narrator. Megan Morrison contributes another independent study that centers on the issue of non-smoking campuses and public opinion. In our final essay, Danielle Lefler explores the mysterious nature of Iago through a psychological perspective and contemplates the character’s state of denial.

We would also like to thank the students who submitted their essays for publication. Their desire to encounter and study the rejected thoughts of society will inspire others to strive toward the same alienated majesty in the future.

Leah Weinzapfel
The attributes and characteristics pertaining to creativity continue the debate over from where creative ideas derive and what provokes the mind to create original thought. The common man would suggest inspiration spawns creativity and the greatest impact and concentration of creativity occurs when the creator undergoes dramatic emotional change. Psychologists would argue that this interpretation is, in fact, somewhat true but there exists many other determining factors that may sprout originality.

To be creative, as Webster’s New World Dictionary generalizes, is to have the quality of something created rather than imitated (p. 143). This explanation of creativity does not clarify the source of creation. One major fault in this definition is its use of the word “imitated.” We can assume nearly everything we do, everything we create, and everything we imagine is, perhaps unconsciously, merely an altered imitation of something else we experienced throughout our lives.

The concept of creativity demands a more complex definition. Teresa M. Amabile (1996) believes creativity is not merely a dormant light switch that spontaneously triggers to create an original idea. Instead, she considers that a creative idea derives from a suitable blend of knowledge, skill, and motivation. Charles Spearman (1931) deliberates that the key factor in the generation of creative ideas lies in the individual’s knowledge. He separates the broad topic of knowledge into two categories: qualitative and quantitative principles of knowing. Spearman (1931) subdivides qualitative knowledge into three categories: the ability to apprehend experiences, the ability to create relationships, and the ability to educe correlates. Spearman speculates that the most important qualitative principle, when applied to creativity, is the principle of correlates. He recognizes that the ability of a person to relate certain instances of experience and knowledge to other, often seemingly unrelated, circumstances is perhaps the most important attribute a creative person may possess. For example, the hot air balloon, invented by the Montgolfier brothers (Gillispie, 1983), was likely the product of the conceived relation-
ship between the natural qualities of hot air and knowledge of the containment of air.

Spearman (1931) also recognizes the quantitative principles of knowing, which consist of the individual’s mental energy, retentivity, fatigue, conative control, and primordial potencies. The quality of one’s mind may often dictate that individual’s creative capacity. For instance, a person who contains a low mental energy, or brainpower, and lacks in retentiveness, or recollection aptitude, will most likely not have the competence and ability to create original ideas. Spearman also relates his views of creativity to pictorial art and states that one’s creative ability to produce fine art relies on their depiction of truth, beauty, imaginative emotion, exaggeration, and style. He paraphrases his study by declaring “the final and most highly ‘creative’ act of the artist derives from transposing relations from their original fundamentals to others, thereby creating (mentally) the correlative fundamentals” (p. 78). Spearman presumes invention, reasoning, and creativity in general are highly influenced by the individual’s mental development of extracting and extorting correlates, the tendency to creatively link seemingly unrelated thoughts together to form an original idea.

According to psychologist Joy Paul Guilford (1950), people use two separate thought patterns to generate solutions to problems: convergent thinking and divergent thinking. Convergent thinkers tend to grasp ideas in a manner that suggests one solution to a problem. When a situation arises where a convergent thinking individual faces a problem, he or she seeks the solution in the traditional manner of basing their conclusion on an answer that is explicitly right or wrong. Divergent thinkers, on the other hand, can liberate themselves from the restrictions of conventional, fact-based problem solving to create a solution from loosely related correlates, generating many possible resolutions. For example, consider a taxi cab driver. A convergent thinking cab driver knows only one route from your hotel to the airport. When approaching a closed road, the convergent thinker responds by following the road signs for the detour without considering other routes. The divergent thinker, on the other hand, may develop several different routes based on knowledge of the city, choosing the best possible route based on intuition.

While divergent thinking houses one’s creative competence, the foundation of an original idea lies within convergent knowledge. Inspiration develops from a concrete understanding of the problem at hand. The creator must facilitate at least a relative understanding of the correlates he or she extracts and extorts; otherwise the basis for their idea lacks the reinforcement of factual information.

Following Guilford’s (1950) study that defined the difference behind convergent and divergent thinking, psychologists began to
ponder the physiology of the two thought processes. Many psychologists hypothesized that the two methods of contemplation occurred in separate regions of the brain. Roger W. Sperry’s (1961) experiments in particular confirmed the hypothesis that convergent and divergent methods of thinking do, in fact, take place in two different locations of the brain.

Sperry’s study (1961) determined that the two hemispheres of the brain dictate the separate thought processes. The brain’s right hemisphere accommodates divergent thinking. It controls the individual’s ability to recognize patterns, manage images, and identify melodies, amongst other functions. The left hemisphere is responsible for convergent thought. This hemisphere grants rationality and logistics to the individual. Creative insight develops strongly when the right hemisphere becomes more active than the left hemisphere. However, it is the hemispheres working in conjunction that provide the creative output.

Spearman (1931) discusses style as a determining factor concerning one’s ability to create fine art. Style refers to an individual’s personality and includes an array of attributes pertaining to one’s personal characteristics. The individual’s active interest in perplexing concepts allows them to think openly and aesthetically, bridging gaps between seemingly disconnected concepts (Amabile, 1983). The determination and motivation to enunciate and develop these notions, when combined with the individual’s personal intuition, empowers the creator to elaborate the concepts to create an original hypothesis. The creator’s self-confidence, perception of ambiguity, and likelihood to take risks strengthens the hypothesis.

German physician Ulrich Kraft (2005) suggests that several other characteristics may contribute to one’s creativity. He believes a sense of wonder and propensity to discover are both valuable traits of creativity. Kraft also states that the ability to effectively relax encourages reflection and pondering, which facilitate and often promote the construction of new ideas. An individual’s capability to identify a problem within a specific task and redefine the problem may also encourage a creative mindset.

Studies conducted by Guilford (1950) in the late 1940s suggest a person’s intelligence does not dictate their creative capability. In fact, an individual’s intelligence may restrict their creative capacity. The discovery that intelligence is not directly linked to original ideas prompted many researchers to devise creativity tests in order to measure one’s creative capacity. Developing a system that effectively measures one’s level of creativity seems impossible considering the classification of anything creative lies primarily in the eye of the beholder. Past efforts have failed to discover a reasonable method to determine creative capacity. By examining general qualities of
individual personality in a test group, however, we can broadly determine which subjects are more inclined to creative output than others.

In attempt to measure individual creativity, E. Paul Torrance created the Torrance Tests of Creative Thinking (1974). The tests score examinees using three components. First, researchers ask the subjects to participate in three exercises that focus on visual material. They are graded on five mental attributes: fluency, originality, elaboration, abstractness of titles, and resistance to closure. In the figural test, researchers ask their subjects to inspect several abstract, black and white pictures and respond with what mental images surface from the examinee’s observation. The verbal section of the Torrance test presents a hypothetical situation to the subject and allows him or her to ask questions and make suggestions pertaining to the circumstance. Strict time restraints accompany each of the tests - a factor which limits the examinee to impulsive and somewhat instinctive responses.

Another popular creativity test, published in 1965, measures the examinees’ association ability. In Wallach and Kogan’s assessment the subject is asked to conjure up as many possible items they can associate with a certain component, such as wheels. Four separate criteria determine the final results. The originality component places all the subjects of the tests against one another. An original response yields more points than common responses given by others in the test group. When grading in the fluency category, the researcher simply adds up the number of responses provided by the individual. The flexibility component measures the context of the answers given. For instance, if the examinee is given wheels as the subject for the study and they answer with “a car, a train, and a swing,” they score two points for examining two separate categories (the first two answers related to transportation and the third relates to recreation). The final component, elaboration, measures the amount of detail the subject provides. For example, answering “a train” in the test would score fewer points than “a train heading to Ohio” (Wallach & Kogan, 1965).

Educational psychologists Plucker, Beghetto, and Dow (2004) recognize several themes that often occur concerning the creation of an end product. They believe “creativity is the interaction between aptitude, process, and environment by which an individual or group produces a perceptible product that is both novel and useful as defined within a social context” (p. 90). The interrelationship between these basic attributes of the mind limits the definition of creativity. However, we can use these factors to make several assumptions about the broad nature of the human mind. The impending processing power of the human mind facilitates the potential for the creation of original conception. The ability, or apti-
tude, of the human mind also appears to be an apparent determining factor of creativity. However, the aptitude and process factors, when combined with an environment that actually facilitates and promotes creation, is of utmost importance to the establishment of innovative and novel ideas.

Amabile’s (1996) extensive research on the construction of creative ideas has effectively confirmed that an individual’s creative ability becomes limited when they are placed in a work environment that they distinguish as confined and regulated. Similarly, when applying this idea to groups of people with varying personality types who are assembled together to achieve a certain goal, a member of the group may find themselves constrained by the personal ideals or diction of the other group members.

Modern society often demands sensibility and systematization. Within these societal restrictions, the brain may naturally sacrifice creative potential in exchange for a mindset that encompasses rationalization and reason. Repetitiveness and monotony often account for this habit-based mindset. According to Kraft (2005), through many years of conforming to the education system and societal norms, the mind begins to resort to familiar neural pathways, which is the brain’s method of economically utilizing its power. Rather than exploring regions of the brain that foster abstract and unusual ideas, the mind tends to refer back to its well-established, proverbial neural pathways.

The act of creating is derived from one’s ability to deviate from normal procedures of contemplation. It is evident, however, that modern education, work-related training, and media distractions may complicate an individual’s creative capacity. Creativity spawns from disconnected ideas, which often seem unrelated. The dilemma limiting many young, creative minds loosely stems from the education system and cultural norms one must conform to for most of the initial twenty years of their life. The system generally introduces its students to problems and questions of which there is only one expected answer (Kraft, 2005).

Nearly every child enters this world with natural curiosity and love for discovery by means of cause and effect experimentation. As the child learns the tangible way in which the world operates and gains an increasing awareness and conviction that logical explanations exist inside nearly everything they find to be rather questionable, they begin to think less creatively. The human mind goes through a vast amount of cognitive development in the first eight years of life. Therefore, a child’s mind is less obedient to the cultural norms and standards directed by adults. Most children possess an enriched level of sensory intelligence, a characteristic that most adults cannot access easily (Thomas & Johnson, 2007).
Furthermore, most adults desire a secure predictable life full of certainty and devoid of mystery. This balanced lifestyle may limit one’s ability to separate themselves from reality long enough to have a creative insight.

According to Kraft (2005), natural creative talent becomes progressively repressed throughout our lives. He believes the modern educational system may be partially to blame for diminishing creative capacity. From very early ages, children are placed in institutions that commonly place an extremely caustic accentuation on instructing students to solve problems correctly and methodically. The educational system is cluttered with factual-based testing and systematic instruction. In general, modern education disciplines students to think logically and traditionally. This teaching method ultimately molds the students’ minds into conclusive, fact-based machines. Furthermore, public schools generally sever art programs first when undergoing budget cuts.

In the age of technology, individuals face an increasing amount of distraction from the media. The entire country is flooded with televisions, computers, cellular phones, billboard advertisements, and radios. All of these connected forms of media draw users’ attention away from independent thinking. In fact, many people let media outlets think for them by devoting so much time to television and computers for entertainment.

According to recent statistics from A.C. Nielson Company, 99-percent of American households contain at least one television set. The statistics also project that the average American watches about four hours of television everyday. Additionally, Nielson reports that approximately 40-percent of Americans spend at least an hour using the Internet each day. The Internet phenomenon continues to grow stronger, diverting the attention of its users around the world.

The widely accepted plague of the media attacks the creative mindset in the same systematic way as professions and education. By focusing our attention on the media, we not only deprive ourselves the time it takes to think creatively, but we also condition our mind to think in certain ways. Over twenty-five years of research suggests the media may influence our behavior or personality by forcing us to unconsciously imitate what we view on television. This factor manipulates children to a much higher degree than adults (NIMH, 1972, 1982).

Conversely, the intense ascent of technological advancement may provoke people to find new means of creation. The digital revolution provides each individual with the proper resources needed to develop a digital creation to share with the world. Social networking services and blogs, for instance, allow users to share their videos, songs, voice clips, photographs, and other concoctions with others.
around the world. Andrew Keen (2007) believes this phenomenon in user created media is dissolving our culture and ideas of expression. According to Keen, over fifty-percent of blogs posted online are based on individual opinion and experience. The downside to blogs is best exemplified by the online wonder of lonelygirl15. Lonelygirl15 was a video blog that was hugely successful on the popular video broadcasting website YouTube. Each week, millions of viewers tuned in to catch up on the experiences of Bree, the young, suburbanite creator of the video diaries. It was later discovered that the entire series was a hoax and lonelygirl15 was not actually fifteen years old and she probably wasn’t lonely either (Keen, 2007).

Keen calls those who share their digital creations “noble amateurs” (p. 35). He believes that the democratic nature of the Internet promotes amateurism rather than expertise. According to research conducted by the Pew Internet and American Life Project in June 2006, thirty-four percent of America’s twelve million bloggers consider their online contributions a type of journalism. The problem with this excessive amount of amateurs derives from the democratic culture that emerged from the digital revolution. For instance, the popular online encyclopedia Wikipedia gathers all of its content from individual, non-expert users. Additionally, each individual entry faces editing by other users. This system bases itself on the common knowledge of its users. Wikipedia prefers amateurism to expertise, creating biased and potentially erroneous entries that many may consider to be factual (Keen, 2007).

Thomas and Johnson (2007) find that art and expression may be an effective means of healing a person who can’t express their feelings verbally. He often suggests that children create art that pertains to their life, something that contains personal meaning and significance. For instance, in one activity with children, Thomas suggested that they paint rocks with symbols and objects of individual importance. Interestingly, most of the children painted symbols that pertained to their original culture. Natural symbolism occurred most frequently as the students painted representations of stars, the moon, the sun, serpents, and trees (p. 54).

Thomas (2007) believes that through art, children may demolish the walls that suppress their emotions. He believes the act of “letting go” allows the children to attain new insights and connections to their past so they may apply them to their future. Thomas states, “through insights and expression come resulting change and the ability to let go of previous patterns and behaviors” (p. 133). When a person lets go, they empower themselves by enriching their well-being.

When presented with a problem, the creative mind is provoked to summon intuition, retrieve information from personal experience,
and create an original idea based on these factors. The mind utilizes others’ perspectives and opinions to stimulate its thoughts and obtain new insights. Writer Jan Phillips (2006) defines creativity as “the energy that flows through us naturally when our emotional, spiritual, and mental channels are fully open” (p. 104). She believes the human race is creative by nature. However, we must teach ourselves how to open the three channels. Through practice and expression, Phillips supposes everyone possesses creative capacity. She states an artist lies within each of us and while not everyone considers himself or herself an artist, we each participate in shaping our own life and culture. Psychologist Robert J. Sternberg’s (2006) investment theory of creativity hypothesizes that creativity is largely based on decisions of the creator. The theory states one must “first decide to generate new ideas, analyze these ideas, and sell the ideas to others” (p. 90). Creators must initially convince themselves an insight will ultimately yield a reward worthy of their time and effort. Therefore, a student’s creative capacity increases if they believe their original ideas will generate beneficial results.

The creative mind remains one of the psychology’s major enigmas. Through research and experimentation, experts continue to unravel the cryptic marvel. To develop the ability to create and innovate is certainly one of the most important human abilities. Scientists may never unlock the unknown features of the creative mind, for it may be impossible to conceptualize the mind’s full potential. However, with each well-conceived experiment and logical hypothesis, we take one step closer to understanding the pure nature of the creative mind.

REFERENCES


May 8, 1945, or V-E Day, marks the official end of the Second World War in Europe and the unofficial end to the Holocaust. It has been assumed that the defeat of Hitler and the Nazis brought about the end of suffering in Europe. But a declaration of surrender could not halt, let alone undo, the previous six years of war and destruction in Europe. For millions of displaced persons, the end of the war marked the beginning of a new struggle for freedom, home, and normalcy. It was only after the war that the world became informed of the full events which took place in it. The Holocaust was such an unspeakable horror that the general public had a difficult time recognizing and understanding it. And in conjunction with this knowledge came a second realization: there were survivors. Unfortunately, the study of these post-war events has been neglected by academia for a myriad of reasons. The transitional years following the war have been overshadowed and perhaps even diminished in importance by comparison to the proceeding events.

It is the purpose of this paper to discuss and analyze the survivor experience immediately following the war and liberation. It will explore the displaced persons camps, the continued Jewish struggle for independence, and the reaction and actions of the rest of the world to this global tragedy. It will also offer a brief discussion of the unique experience of Soviet displaced persons, interaction with Soviet liberators, and the anti-communist influence on post-war events. This paper has utilized secondary sources and has been enhanced by the availability of survivor oral testimonies through the Shoah Visual History Foundation. These testimonies will be used throughout this paper to show individual experiences which illustrate both major events in this study and important details of survivor life.

On January 30, 1939, Adolf Hitler stated that the impending war would serve to accomplish the destruction of the Jewish race in Europe. By the end of the war, two-thirds of the Jewish population in Europe had been killed by the Nazis and their collaborators. As stated above, May 8, 1945 marked the unconditional surrender of
Germany to the Allies, bringing an end to this regime of annihilation. Liberation, however, had no specific date. Over a period of months, Nazi concentration camps were liberated by various Allied forces. The Soviet forces were the first to reach the Nazi killing centers on July 24, 1944 when the Russian army reached Majdanek, a Nazi death camp in eastern Poland.¹

By mid 1944, German forces knew the Allies were closing in and were on the run. Many Nazi captives, including Jews, were forced on death marches which were initiated in 1944 and accelerated in the winter of 1945 when Germans realized the necessity of trying to hide their crimes in the face of impending defeat. Nazis would lead prisoners on marches deeper into German territory. People who could not walk or fell behind were either killed or left to die by their captors. Miriam Bronicki, a Holocaust survivor, participated in a forced march.² She was forced, along with fifty-eight thousand other prisoners in Auschwitz, to begin walking in January of 1945. The prisoners were never told where they were going or why, but Nazi forces were ruthless with those people who could not keep up the pace. Miriam and her sister were able to continue the march because of a blanket they took from a fellow prisoner who was not able to keep going. They were also given some water, milk, and apples from some Polish civilians along the way. They later found shelter in an old barn and remained there until they saw a red flag flying, an indication of their liberation by Soviet forces.

Another Holocaust survivor, Eugene Berger, also remembered his forced death march experience.³ He was held at Mauthausen in Austria and one day he saw American GIs being marched out. They were being moved because of the Russian and American troops moving ever closer. Soon, Eugene was forced on a march himself. The whole camp was not emptied, but between fifty and sixty thousand people were forced to march. Eugene was only able to survive because of a friend who had the strength to carry him when he could no longer continue. Once again, people who could not keep up were shot or left behind to die alone.

As camp after camp was liberated by Allied troops, the situation of survivors changed drastically. However, death was still a constant part of life.⁴ Liberation could not save those who were too far gone with typhus and tuberculosis. Death continued and was even helped along by well-meaning but ill-informed liberators. Starving prisoners were given the food they had been so long deprived of. But their stomachs had shrunk drastically and their bodies were not able to digest the food properly. Miriam Bronicki remembered that upon her liberation, nearly 95 percent of survivors became very sick when they ate the food provided by their liberators.⁵ People got diarrhea and a large number, driven by their long period of starvation, ate so
much that their stomachs ruptured, killing them. Miriam survived, but she developed a chronic condition called ulcerated colitis which she had for the next eighteen years. Eugene Berger knew the danger in eating too much after being starved for so long. He warned those around him, but his voice could not stop the deaths of many newly liberated people who had gone so long without food.

As the war continued to show signs of its inevitable conclusion, Europe began what would become the largest movement of people in a short period of time the world has ever seen. The German army was retreating, making Western Europe scramble to get out of the way. Germany was being ceaselessly bombed by American and British planes, creating nearly two million German refugees. The Russian army was advancing ever westward, on a path of vengeance for the approximately eighteen million Soviet citizens who had been killed in the war. This also forced people to escape the army’s route. A fact which illustrates the chaos in Europe at this time is the wide variety of estimations of people on the move. An accepted number is twenty million people on the road in Europe between East and West and West and East. Of these, 8-10 million people would be considered displaced persons during the transitional period following the war.

Displaced persons were not only Jews who had survived the Holocaust but included a wide variety of people:

- Prisoners of war captured by the Germans; civilians transported to Germany to be used as forced labor by the Nazis;
- Eastern Europeans who had voluntarily worked in Germany industry;
- citizens of other countries who had collaborated with the Germans and were now afraid to return to their homes;
- Germans, Austrians, Hungarians, Romanians, and others who had fled to Russian army;
- Germans and Austrians whose living quarters had been taken over by the Russian army;
- and Germans whose homes had been destroyed by Allied bombings.

Within these categories lie the one-hundred thousand initial Jewish Holocaust survivors. Over time, this number would change drastically with the influx of more and more Jewish survivors. Jews who emerged out of hiding and Jews who were fleeing the newly formed Communist governments in Eastern Europe and their religious persecutions would add to this number.

Displaced persons fled to the western zones of occupied Germany, controlled by the United States, Britain, and France. Some went there to escape the growing Russian Communist reach. Some were ethnic Germans escaping retaliation in their homes in eastern Germany or being forced to leave to make room for Soviet resettlement programs. Whatever the individual reasons, Germany became
host to hundreds of thousands of its former victims and native refugees.

In response to the dilemma of what was to be done with these people, American and British liberators came up with displaced persons camps. They began as an immediate and temporary solution to house the survivors of the Holocaust as concentration camps were liberated. However, the concept was expanded to incorporate other displaced persons and was kept in use for years after the war was over. As more and more refugees began to fill the camps, Jews became more of a minority. Those in control did not have the unique Jewish situation in mind when they decided how to house people. At first this was done at random, throwing Nazis and other anti-Semites in with Jews. Former Jewish prisoners were easy to identify as some were still forced to wear their striped concentration camp clothing, or worse, German SS uniforms. As the displaced persons (DP) population grew, language differences became an issue and American General Dwight Eisenhower ordered that people be housed in categories according to nationality. He felt that identifying Jews separately from this system would give support to Nazi racial theories, and so they were categorized as to their country of origin despite many Jewish claims of having no nationality.

The experience of Jews and other DPs differ tremendously. Conditions in the DP camps were never good, but circumstances seemed to be continually working against Jewish DPs. As obtaining food and supplies was the top priority of those in authority, dealing with German and Austrian suppliers also became a priority. However, most people in charge did not have the language skills necessary to make all these arrangements. The solution was to enlist German translators who also spoke English. Over time, these people also gained the power to run the DP camps. Background checks were not required and so former Nazis could easily gain power over their fellow Jewish DPs. Ironically, those with the most experience were the most likely to have been related to Nazi administration before the end of the war. The persecution of Jews by these former Nazis has not been well documented, but it was frequent enough to spark Jewish protests in the camps.

Jewish and German DPs were not only in contention with one another, but they were also constantly compared to one another. Soldiers, aid workers, and relief organizations were among the first to come into contact with survivors and DPs. While public opinion was ostensibly with the Jews and against former Nazis, outsiders coming into the situation could not help noticing the differences between them, differences pointing to the favorability of the German people. Over time, German people came to be seen as the victims while the Jewish survivors became the villains.
Germany had to be dealt with and the country needed to be rehabilitated as soon as possible. Therefore German people were helped back onto their feet quickly, lessening any further public annoyance by a long duration as DPs.

Jewish survivors did not have an immediate solution and therefore they became the problem. Further complicating the Jewish situation in postwar Europe were the perceptions of them by outsiders. Many survivors would today be diagnosed with posttraumatic stress disorders, but as these were not understood at the time, survivors were instead criticized for their condition. Survivors often seemed unsuited to any kind of normal life because of their hopelessness, depression, anxiety, and overall sense of inertia which prohibited normal thought and behavior. These and other contributing factors made survivors very unappealing to some potential aid givers. Today, survivors are treated with the utmost respect. But the contemporary consensus among Allies, Germans, and even some outside Jewish observers was that survivors were “human debris” or “living corpses.” At best these people were to be rehabilitated if possible. Some outsiders were also disturbed by survivors’ “obsessive remembering.” Some relief workers seemed to feel that forgetting was necessary in order to move on and become productive people.

Contributing to survivor depression was the newfound realization of all that had been lost and the desperate attempt to find what was left. In the immediate aftermath of liberation, Jewish survivors were unable to send or receive mail. This meant that they had no way of knowing if any of their family survived. Their plight was at first ignored by liberators, but other Jews recognized it and worked to aid them. Jewish relief groups began to spring up with the first contact between survivors and the outside world in June 1945 when a delegation of the Jewish Brigade Group arrived in the DP camps. Also in June of 1945, the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee (the Joint) sent its first teams into the camps. The Joint was formed after World War I by a variety of religious, political, and other groups to provide help for the civilian population after that war. By World War II it ranked second in size only to the Red Cross as a world relief organization and made its focus the survivors of the Holocaust. Such organizations worked to provide survivors with the necessary tools and knowledge to once again join the world. This included aiding survivors in finding loved ones. After Miriam Bronicki was liberated, she remembered registering at a Jewish community center. Organizations such as the Red Cross put together lists of survivors and created a system to reunite families. A Central Bureau to help DPs locate relatives in Germany, Austria, and Italy was established and received over fifty thousand search requests in
the first four months of its existence. Organizations also worked together to improve DP conditions in other ways in conjunction with the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

In anticipation of the chaos after the war’s end, the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration (UNRRA) was established in 1943. The organization’s goal was to provide services to postwar refugees. After Germany’s surrender, this organization was already in place and ready to help refugees return home. Because of their preparation, the stay of most people in DP camps was relatively short. Early preparations meant that nearly all DPs were resettled within a year. However, Jews were not among these resettled people. This was because the Jews as a group had no home to go to.

As a part of a survivor’s search for newfound life and family ties, trips back to home countries became fairly common. However, these homecomings were not often greeted with joy by the community. There were several different reasons for survivors not to be welcomed home. When Jews were originally forced out of their homes and lives, their property was often taken by people left behind. When Jewish survivors made it back to reclaim what was theirs, the people who had taken possession of these houses and businesses were not eager to relinquish them. Upon Eugene Berger’s return home, he found two families in his old family home. Despite Eugene’s repeated attempts to get the local authorities to evict them, it was not until he threatened to destroy the house with the people inside that they finally left the property.

While these families were strangers to Eugene, some survivors went home to discover former neighbors and even friends in possession of their property. Josif Gavi, another Holocaust survivor, remembered that his family had asked close Christian friends to take care of their apartment and belongings while the family was away. The Christian family agreed. However when Josif and his mother returned home to Minsk after the war, the Christian family called them “dirty Jews” and refused to leave or return any belongings.

Another reason for the cold welcome received by survivors was the ever present anti-Semitism that greeted them. Anti-Semitism was not a new invention by the Nazis. Anti-Semitism has roots in Europe that extended far before Hitler’s time. Miriam Bronicki remembered anti-Semitism throughout her childhood in Romania, even before the war began. Eugene Berger recalled that there was always a certain amount of anti-Semitism taught in churches in his home country of Czechoslovakia. While both survivors also note that their situations became worse upon the arrival of the Hungarians, anti-Semitism was not new to either of them. The end
of the Holocaust and the knowledge of its atrocities did not bring an end to anti-Semitism. Therefore, survivors returned home after the Holocaust to face prejudice and even violence. Former neighbors sometimes even blamed the Jews for the war and regretted the fact that all Jews had not been destroyed.\textsuperscript{26}

Jews throughout Europe were faced with ongoing anti-Semitism, but one country that stands out among the rest for severity was Poland.\textsuperscript{27} There was a long history of deeply embedded anti-Semitism in Poland. When the German army fled the Soviets, impoverished Poles took the property that had formerly belonged to Jewish residents. Upon the return of survivors, Poles were afraid they would have to return property. Reluctant to relinquish possession and fueled by anger due to also being persecuted by Nazis, Poles often reacted with hostility, anger, and even violence to returning survivors.

The most infamous result of these tensions can be seen in the Kielce Massacre. In July of 1946, a Christian boy disappeared for three days and when he returned he said he had been kidnapped by Jews and forced to watch a ritual killing of fifteen other Christian children. Despite being an absurd accusation unsubstantiated by any facts, the Jews of Kielce were surrounded in their community center home. Forty-two Jews were killed and sixty were injured: stoned, shot, or bludgeoned to death. Although the Kielce Massacre has been remembered as one large act of violence perpetrated on survivors, it was not an isolated incident. In liberated Poland in 1945 alone, it has been estimated that 363 Jews were murdered.\textsuperscript{28}

Even some survivors who were able to return to their homes and retake possession of their businesses did not always choose to stay. After having seen neighbors turn them over to the Nazis to be taken away or otherwise collaborating with the Nazis, it was difficult to resume the lives survivors had been forced to abandon. Also, while many survivors made the journey home to find family and friends, these loved ones did not often return as well. When Eugene Berger returned home, he found some family, and as mentioned before, regained possession of his family home.\textsuperscript{29} However, he also discovered that his parents had been taken to Auschwitz and had died there. After learning this, Eugene did not feel he could live in their home without them. Eugene, like many other survivors without a real home to return to, decided to take what was left and begin again in a new country.

After making the decision to leave their previous home countries for good, survivors faced the dilemma of where to go and how to get there. Jews faced continual opposition by the very countries they were hoping to relocate to, and this opposition reaffirmed the need for a Jewish home country. Zionists were Jews committed to creat-
ing a homeland for Jews in Palestine. Zionism began in 1897 during a time in which Jews were also being persecuted, then particularly in Russia and Poland. Palestine was chosen as the destination because Jews actually originated in the biblical land of Canaan, which had become Palestine. This area has been continually inhabited by Jewish people despite being persecuted throughout history. During the early twentieth century, Jews in Europe began to migrate back to Palestine in larger numbers. However, they were not often welcomed by the native Muslim and Christian populations.

Prior to the Holocaust, Zionism was not embraced in extremely large numbers. Some Orthodox Jews believed it was heresy to establish a Jewish homeland before the Messiah had come to proclaim its existence. There was actually a large movement before the war to assimilate into countries of habitation, particularly in the United States and Germany. Eugene Berger remembered that before the war started, several family members and friends of his were planning to leave for Palestine. However, the local rabbi was fervently anti-Zionist and dissuaded them from going. In retrospect, Eugene and others blame anti-Zionist teachings for the deaths of people who would have otherwise escaped before the war. However, this was a common trend and no one could have known what staying in Europe would eventually mean.

After the Holocaust, Zionism was embraced by DP communities in overwhelming numbers. Some of the first surveys by the United Nations recorded that ninety percent of Jewish survivors wanted to go to Israel. Miriam Bronicki ended up in Italy and when she first arrived she was in a camp waiting to go to Israel “like everyone else.” However, immigrating there was not an easy process. In 1920 the League of Nations had given Great Britain a mandate to govern Palestine which at the time was home to both Jews and Arabs. Initially, British policy seemed to support Jewish immigration. However, over time they were influenced by the Arab interests in the region and withdrew any former support for Jews. They began to actively oppose Jewish immigration by allowing only 13 refugees to enter legally in 1945. In response to these restrictions, Jewish-led organizations sprang up to force the issue. One of the largest and best known of these groups was the Bircha, which is Hebrew for “flight.” This group’s ultimate goal was to bring the stateless Jews of Europe and even worldwide to Palestine. Contrary to popular thought, Zionism was not a religious movement. Jews who became Zionists did not necessarily become more committed to being Jewish, but rather more accepting of Jewish traditions.

Even after the war and the Holocaust, Zionism was still not universally embraced. Opposition groups such as the Citizens Committee for Displaced Persons were also created in an effort to
create an alternative to Palestine, namely the United States. Although these influences were not as prominent as Zionism, they were still present and important. Ultimately, Zionists were extremely successful in pushing their program as the only realistic solution for stateless Jews.

Because of the international pressure focused on the need for the creation of a Jewish homeland, on November 29, 1947 the United Nations General Assembly voted to partition Palestine into two separate states: Arab and Jewish. On May 14, 1948 the official establishment of an independent State of Israel was declared. Israel was immediately recognized by the United States and the rest of the international community followed suit.

Between 1948 and 1951, approximately seven hundred thousand Jews made Israel their home. Two-thirds of these people were DPs from Europe. Unfortunately, the official formation of a Jewish homeland did not bring about immediate security for Jews. Right after being established, Israel was invaded by five of its Arab neighbors. This invasion was successfully repulsed by the newly formed Israeli Army, but even military peace did not ensure an end to peacetime challenges. Israel had to be made into a self-sufficient state by its newly arrived emigrants. Food and shelter still had to be among the primary concerns of Jewish people.

Partially because of these constant struggles in newly formed Israel, over time early enthusiasm for Israel diminished. By 1947, a United Nations surveys showed that Zionism was fading and that over half of the remaining DP population preferred to go to the United States. After surviving the Holocaust, some survivors did not want to have the struggles associated with building a new country. There was also a large population of DPs with family and friends in the United States, and that necessarily influenced survivors.

Miriam Bronicki put an add in an American newspaper asking for relatives to come forward. She eventually made contact with her mother’s four brothers living in the United States. They petitioned for her entrance into the States, but it took five years for her to get there. She finally arrived in mid-January of 1950. Eugene Berger described himself as a lifelong Zionist, but in the end he also utilized American relatives to get into the United States. He recalled that before the war, 80 percent of his relatives lived in America. He applied to the American consulate and arrived in the United States in June of 1947. However, survivors who wanted to emigrate to the United States were also faced with opposition.

During the initial time following liberation, American forces were concerned with the issue of DPs, but did not necessarily con-
sider them an American problem. Survivors were there and needed to be attended to, but America did not consider it its job to take them in. Therefore United States immigration policies were not amended to allow any more Jews than were previously permitted. Finally in June of 1948, the first Congressional bill relating to special provisions for DP immigration was passed. It permitted the admission of one-hundred thousand DPs, but it was a small number in comparison to how many DPs existed and it imposed several limitations on who was eligible. It was not until June of 1950 that another more liberal bill was passed. By 1952, the United States had admitted 400,000 DPs, although perhaps only 80,000 of them were Jews. The bulk of the number was comprised of “Balts, Ukrainians, and ethnic Germans from Czechoslovakia, Russia, and other Eastern European countries.”

Whatever DPs wanted to do or wherever they wanted to go, it was clear by the end of 1945 that it was going to take longer than originally expected. The need to transform transit camps into self-sustaining communities was highlighted by the findings of the Harrison Report. Earl G. Harrison was the dean of the law school at the University of Pennsylvania and the American representative on the Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees. With the encouragement of American President Harry S. Truman, in July of 1945 Henry Morgenthau, the secretary of the treasury, appointed Harrison to head a delegation to investigate the conditions in the DPs camps. Harrison’s assignment was “to inquire into the needs of the non-repatriables with particular reference to the stateless and Jewish refugees.” Accompanied by a representative from the Joint, Dr. Joseph Schwartz, Harrison visited over thirty camps over a three week period. He completed his report in August of 1945.

Harrison’s report was a forcefully worded criticism of the DP camps and the people who organized them. In an often repeated quote from his report, Harrison said, “We appear to be treating the Jews as the Nazis treated them, except that we do not exterminate them. They are in concentration camps in large numbers under our military guard instead of SS troops. One is led to wonder if the German people, seeing this, are not supposing that we are following or at least condoning Nazi policy.” Along with his criticism, Harrison noted practical problems and possible solutions. Food was scarce and housing was inadequate, but with such large DP populations it was understandably difficult to meet all needs. Some camps were known to have over seven to eight thousand DPs. Harrison also pointed to the need for adequate medical care in the camps. Some of the immediate changes Harrison endorsed included:

Jews should be recognized as a separate group and
should not be forced to share housing with non-Jewish DPs, many of whom were known to be Nazis and anti-Semites. Jews should be given the greatest degree of autonomy possible – and as quickly as possible. Jewish residents should be allowed to live outside the camps, and German properties were to be set aside for their use if necessary. Far greater efforts had to be made to help the DPs reunite with their families and look for lost friends and relatives.50

Harrison also concluded that the only realistic long-term solution for DPs was the emigration of Jews to Palestine. He recommended that the British government permit one-hundred thousand Jews to immigrate at once and for the United States to open its borders as well. Great Britain responded by proposing a joint Anglo-American investigation commission.51 This commission also recommended the same immigration changes Harrison had proposed. However, neither Great Britain nor the United States went ahead with any proposed changes.

The United States did respond by further investigating DP camp conditions and possible solutions within them. President Truman asked General Dwight D. Eisenhower to also investigate the camps. Eisenhower found that most of Harrison’s immediate recommendations had already been put into practice, at least in official policy. However, some individual American military personnel were reluctant to give special treatment to DPs and Jews in particular. General George Patton is among the most widely recognized of these figures. In a diary he wrote “Harrison and his ilk believe that the DP is a human being, which he is not, and this applies particularly to the Jews, who are lower than animals.”52 Official American policy did not endorse this kind of thinking, but individuals like Patton continued to thwart policy by not conforming their actions. General Patton was eventually removed from a position of authority over DPs and soon after died in a car crash, but DP conditions continued to be less than favorable.

Following Harrison’s report, camps began their transition from a temporary solution to an indefinite home for thousands of DPs. Jews searched for ways to reaffirm their very existence from within these camps. After the devastation of the Holocaust, survivors needed to feel alive and prove their continued will to survive. DP camps became both centers of culture and the location for an unprecedented baby boom. Jews searched for both cultural and physical signs of survival.

Survivors spent on average three to five years in DP camps and
during that time survivors in camps looked for ways to express their cultural survival; through poetry, theater, music, and literature. A return to normalization could not be complete without a resurgence of Jewish culture. DP camps became the last place where Yiddish was an official language. At times it seems as if survivors needed these outlets to give an expression to their experiences. Their work showed Jews not as victims, but as survivors who intended to continue their lives and enhance their culture. During this time, an organization called the Central Historical Commission of the Central Committee of the Liberated Jews in the US Zone was created. Its mission was “to gather documents and material on the history of the just past Khurbn (destruction).” The goal was not only to gather information, but to share it with the world as both a memorial to those who died and as a potential reference for war crimes prosecutors.

Other remarkable occurrences in DP camps were the large number of weddings that took place and babies who were born. By 1946, weddings were occurring on a daily basis in DP camps. People were brought together by a desire to identify with and cling to someone in the absence of friends and family who perished in the Holocaust. Miriam Bronicki met her husband in a camp in Italy and married him in the fall of 1945. Eugene Berger was actually married before the war in August of 1943 when he realized that he was going to be taken away. However, he was remarried to the same woman in 1945 in a double wedding with his sister and her new husband. Similar backgrounds were sometimes instrumental, but a shared sense of loneliness was often enough for survivors to choose to marry. Miriam never learned which different camps her husband was in. But the most emotional part of her testimony was when she spoke about her husband’s death in 1952. Whatever brought these couples together, their connections were real and substantial.

The birth of Jewish babies from these unions gave the DP camps the highest birthrate in the world at 50.2 per thousand, compared to 7.6 per thousand for Germans at the same time. A UNRRA report in 1946 stated “There is an abnormally large number of pregnant women in Jewish camps in Germany, estimated to be between eight and ten thousand.” Miriam Bronicki gave birth to her first child, Tommy, on October 17, 1947 while still in Italy. Eugene Berger and his wife had their first child, a daughter, while staying in a DP camp.

Giving birth to Jewish children has sometimes been seen as “biological revenge.” Because Nazis killed Jewish children, giving birth to Jewish children showed the Nazis that they had not won. Not only were there survivors, but those survivors were working to
rebuild their population. Also, being pregnant during the Holocaust was often lethal since camps would often choose pregnant women to be killed first.\textsuperscript{66} Being pregnant after the Holocaust, especially while still in DP camps located in Germany, was like saying to former Nazis that they had no power over Jews anymore. Survivors were on a quest to prove their survival, both symbolically and literally.

The history and progression of the DP situation is intricate and complex. The DP story cannot be told in full without exploring its aspects in relation to the Soviet Union. Most studies of post-war Europe focus on Western Europe, largely ignoring the unique Soviet situation. Russia cannot be discussed interchangeably with the broader situation in Europe, because every aspect of its experience is different. However, academic exploration has neglected Russia’s experience both during and after the Holocaust. There are several reasons for this. One is that sources have not been easily available. It was not until the fall of the Soviet Union that new sources became available and scholars were able to explore the Soviet Union in connection to World War II and particularly the Holocaust. Study of Russia and the Holocaust has been further impaired because of its treatment by Soviet scholars.\textsuperscript{67} Most Soviet studies of World War II have either ignored the Holocaust or buried it within more general accounts of the period. Scholars have either passed over it or have blurred its significance by universalizing it. Embittered by the substantial losses altogether of Soviet citizens, the Jewish story was hidden within the larger picture.

Analysis of Russia in World War II and the Holocaust is so important because of being previously overlooked, and because Russia is so unique in comparison to the general war, liberation, and DP situation. Soviets were liberators and prisoners: heroes, victims, and villains. The Soviet story is different from long before the war, up until liberation, and continuing in the wake of the war.

With the Non-Aggression Pact on 1939, Germany and Russia agreed on specific boundaries and terms of mutual compliance.\textsuperscript{68} This was a very well-known agreement at the time. Eugene Berger and his family knew about it and thought about trying to leave Europe then, although they decided against it.\textsuperscript{69}

People were somewhat aware of the situation in Europe before the outbreak of the war; however opinion of Germany and Nazis differed tremendously. A large number Soviet Jews felt they had nothing to fear from the Germans. Iosif Gavi lived in Minsk and his family agreed that the Germans were not to be feared.\textsuperscript{70} People remembered the Germans from the First World War and did not have much, if any, warning of the things to come. Contributing to this was the Soviet press, which did not report on the anti-Semitic aspect of Nazi control, but rather described it as a fascist war on the
However, both Eugene and Iosif recalled that there were several German and Polish Jews who sought refuge in Russia, although Eugene did not see that the Russians were any better.

When the war came to Minsk, the round up of Jews into a ghetto by the S.S. came as a shock to people like Iosif. Despite warnings from escaped Polish Jews, Iosif recalled his confusion and the general chaos associated with a ghetto which housed one-hundred thousand people. He also remembered the shock of the first pogrom for people in the ghetto on November 7, 1941.

There is no debate over the fact that Soviet citizens were the hardest hit group during World War II. About one-third of Soviets killed were the 1.5 million citizens who lived under pre-1939 borders, two-hundred thousand more who were killed in combat, and the rest came under Soviet rule after the Hitler-Stalin Pact. However, Soviets were also Nazi collaborators. Nazi administration relied upon assistance from the native governments and populations in countries they occupied. Russia was no different and some of its own citizens assisted the Nazi regime.

Even Russia’s reputation as liberators is highly debated. Some survivors saw them as kind and good; some survivors could not see any difference between Nazis and Soviets, both during the war and after. Miriam Bronicki was liberated by Russians, experienced their kindness, and still thinks kindly about them to this day. Eugene Berger however, described the Russians as “crazy and wild” and “just as bad as the Germans.”

A very prominent aspect of Soviets as liberators was their reputation as rapists. Whether or not this reputation is completely deserved, especially in the face of similar acts of violence by Allied forces, it is interesting to note how undisputed this reputation has become. Soviet liberators had this reputation during the immediate post-war years and it has continued on until today. It has been claimed that it was the “unwritten law of the Red Army” to “grant a twenty-four hour free zone for acts of vengeance.” Indeed, there are numerous stories of acts of rape and violence committed by Soviet soldiers. When Eugene’s sister-in-law wanted to find her husband, his brother, he agreed that she should not travel alone because of all the Soviet soldiers raping women and throwing them off trains. In fact, Eugene was so concerned that he found a Soviet military uniform and wore it on the trip so they would not be harassed. He later used this guise again to be granted access to see his brother in a hospital. People were not eager to start a fight with him in a Soviet soldier’s uniform, which might further point to the Soviet reputation of violence. However, Soviets are individuals and they cannot be collectively labeled as anything. Just as common as
stories of rape are stories of shared food and clothing. At the end of the war, an estimated five million Soviet citizens were categorized as DPs due to being outside the country’s borders. Three million were POWs, forced laborers, and defectors to the west while two million were in the Soviet-occupied regions of Eastern Europe. The Soviet government took a very rigid view of these DPs and was very suspicious about collaboration. Russians acknowledged only two types of DPs: those who were eager to go home and those who were traitors to their country. Those in power saw the war as a test of one’s true feeling toward the Soviet regime and perceived collaboration as a significant problem, labeling the worst offenders ‘betrayers of the motherland.’ Any Soviet citizen who had spent time outside the country was in danger of being one of the tens of thousands of people sent by Stalin directly from liberation to labor camps and prisons in remote regions.

Eleanor Roosevelt was at the head of a fight with Russia to allow DPs to relocate wherever they wanted instead of being forced back to former home countries, namely Russia. Eleanor Roosevelt was assigned to Committee Three of the United Nations Assembly, which was in charge of humanitarian concerns, and she looked after the interests of a third group of former Soviet citizens: those who were both anti-Nazi and anti-Communist. Eventually, Mrs. Roosevelt won her cause of free choice of relocation after liberation which Soviets opposed, making it the first victory in the post-war battle of Communism versus western ideals.

Communism played a much more extensive role in post-war policies than just this. The desire to rehabilitate Germany was hastened tremendously by the perceived need for a buffer for the spread of Communism. This priority was part of what led to the favoritism shown to Germany and Germans instead of Jewish DPs by outside nations, namely the United States and Great Britain. Therefore, even survivors who had no tangible link to Russia were affected by them. Although it is necessary to see the Soviet situation in post-war years separately, it also greatly affected and was affected by the whole of the DP situation.

Europe following World War II was a place of turmoil and continued hardship for the millions of displaced persons searching for new lives. The Holocaust did not end with liberation; its reach has continued up and until today. From the death marches which signaled the end, to the DP camps, to Zionism, to immigration, and to the revival of Jewish population and culture, the years immediately following the fall of Hitler were full of chaos, internal revival, and outside obstacles for survivors. These survivors, whose very existence was unbelievable in the face of the atrocities of the Holocaust, were determined to rebuild the lives that had been wrenched out of
their control for so long. Despite the often deplorable conditions of the DP camps survivors were forced into, survivors worked continually to better their situation. Jews organized programs to help one another, fought for the creation of their own state, pushed for increased immigration regulations, and all the while worked to feel like real live people again.

The last of the DP camps was closed in 1957, but survivors are still continuing their struggle today. Survivors are educating the world by sharing their stories. Three of these admirable people have contributed to this paper, and I would like to extend my appreciation for the insight they have provided. The testimonies of Miriam Bronicki, Eugene Berger, and Iosif Gavi have been utilized in this study. Hearing their stories helped me to understand my research better and give a face to the millions of people who survived the Holocaust, and then had to continue their fight for existence in the following peace-time years. Their contributions to continued education and understanding cannot be overvalued, and this study has been significantly enhanced by their involvement. Surviving the Holocaust was the first part; rebuilding their lives was the next challenge. The battle for understanding is, and will be, continually ongoing.
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Social psychologists have invested much time researching the issues of persuasion and decision-making. Scientists conduct studies in this field to answer the question, “How do we make our daily choices in life?” Are we independent beings who analyze data thoroughly and make decisions based solely on an argument’s merit without any influence from outside sources, or are we all simply puppets that do and say as we are told? It seems that when it comes to making choices, human beings lie somewhere in the middle between cognitive autonomy and cognitive acquiescence.

Research has established that people have a propensity to conform to group standards even in cases when the majority is objectively wrong (Asch, 1955). This effect strengthens when the call to conform comes from one’s in-group. Mackie, Worth, and Asuncion (1990) demonstrated that persuasion is most likely to happen when the persuasive argument is strong, relevant to the in-group, and presented by a member of the in-group. Conformity to in-group standards is not necessarily a bad thing. If one flees a burning building because everyone else is doing so, clearly see this as a good decision to conform. The real mystery lies not in the fact that we do conform; rather, it lies in the understanding of when and why we conform.

Are all decisions to conform made as easily as the choice to flee a burning building, or do some decisions require more thought and analysis? Cacioppo, Petty, Kao, and Rodriguez (1986) looked at the difference between central-route and peripheral-route processes in decision-making. Central-route” and “peripheral-route” processing are two different ways of processing data in order to form an opinion or make a decision. “Central-route” processing is used when decisions are based on carefully considered, objective, issue-relevant information. Conversely, “peripheral route” processing takes place when one makes decisions based on biased, heuristically driven, peripheral cues. They illustrated that those who desire an understanding of their world or a particular situation exhibit a need for cognition, and are more likely to undergo careful, issue-related, cen-
tral-route processing when making a decision. Conversely, those less interested in understanding an issue are more likely to undergo heuristically driven, peripheral-route processing.

The issue of central-route versus peripheral-route processing seems inconsequential in some matters. It is of little importance to understand why someone chooses a blue shirt and not a red one; this is simply a matter of preference or taste. The understanding of persuasion and decision-making is important when it is applied to issues that affect our lives and society as a whole. Using the lens of political issues helps persuasion become a much more relevant and important phenomenon. As a representative democracy, our lives are influenced much by the political policies that guide us, and we shape those policies with our votes. Certain questions are very important when it comes to political persuasions. Why does one vote the way he does? Does one support a position because her party supports it, or does she support a particular party because it supports her positions?

In the two-party political system that exists in America, people perceive issues as existing on a bipolar scale with Republicans on one side and Democrats on the other. This polarization is ideal for peripheral-route cognitive processing, as evident in research findings. Heaven (1999) has illustrated that certain political attitudes are correlated to others, creating categories of political persuasion. Because of this correlation, one could likely predict someone’s views on other political issues simply by knowing if that person considered himself to be “pro-capitalism” or “pro-environment.” Similarly, one could likely deduce someone’s opinion on any political issue, simply by knowing if that person labeled himself as a Republican or Democrat. This correlation between groups of political positions likely demonstrates peripheral-route processing. Rather than independently weighing each issue, it is possible that individuals might support certain issues simply because their political party of choice endorses those issues.

As long as one’s own opinions and his party’s opinions are in unison, peripheral-route processing will be more likely to occur. What happens when one’s political party and personal ideology are in outright conflict? When someone has two cognitions that are dissonant with each other, that individual seeks to resolve this dissonance by either changing one of the cognitions so that they will agree with one another or by denying that the discrepancy exists (Festinger & Carlsmith, 1954). This problem of discrepant positions will likely call for the person to engage in central-route processing in order to solve the dilemma.

Concerning political policy dilemmas, there are three options for reconciling dissonance between one’s political opinion and party
preference: policy voting, persuasion, and projection. Policy voting involves changing one’s party preference so that it lines up with one’s previously held personal beliefs. Persuasion illustrates what happens when a person’s preferred political party persuades her to change her opinion and vote against her personal beliefs in order to align herself with the party’s position. Projection, as unlikely as it seems, is the act of denying the actual policy preference of a particular party (Ray, 1999).

In order to look at the effects of policy voting, persuasion, and projection, Cohen (2003) examined the issue of social welfare to see whether people would support a policy that contradicted their political opinions if their preferred political party supported the policy. Cohen had participants evaluate two different welfare policies: one extremely stringent and the other extremely generous. Traditionally, one would expect Republicans to support the stringent policy and Democrats the generous one. Cohen then introduced dissonance by stating that the Democrats, in fact, supported the stringent policy and Republicans supported the generous one. After reading the scenario, participants indicated which policy they were more likely to support. Strange as it seems, those who considered themselves to be Democrats supported the stringent policy because their party endorsed it. The same held true for those who considered themselves to be Republicans; they supported the generous policy because their party endorsed it. It appears that both groups engaged in peripheral-route processing when making their decisions. If the issue was truly important to them, more of the participants should have opted for policy voting and opposed their party’s antithetical position. (Ray, 1999)

Although Cohen’s research offers great insight into political persuasion, its shortcoming lies in the scope of the political issue he examined. Welfare is not the most salient issue in the political spectrum today. As an issue becomes more salient, people become more informed about the issue. This increase in information and salience leads to an increase in the polarization of attitudes (Zaller, 1992). Certain issues manifest “symbolic attitudes” that are created out of the core values that one holds (Krosnick, 1991). If the political issue in question involves a core value that represents one’s personal beliefs, individuals may be more likely to adhere to their issue opinion than their party preference (Ray, 1999).

In order to see if one can generalize Cohen’s findings to all political issues, one must apply his research to every political issue that exists. A more practical first step is to apply his work to a highly salient political issue such as abortion. Abortion easily fits into Carmines and Stimson’s (1980) definition of an “easy issue.” According to Carmines and Stimson, an easy issue is one that has
been a part of one’s political ideology so long that it has become entrenched in “gut reactions.” Opinions regarding easy issues should be much more resistant to persuasion, because they tend to be seated deep in one’s emotions. Additionally, easy issues should involve much greater central-route processing when dissonant information confronts them, because someone will not easily give up his long-held personal convictions. This, in turn, should result in people supporting their views on the issue even if their preferred party is in disagreement.

Although abortion is a highly polarized issue, some research indicates that ambivalence exists regarding attitudes toward different abortion policies. It is evident that many beliefs about abortion are linked to both positive and negative thoughts within the same person (Abramowitz, 1995; Craig, Kane, & Martinez, 2002). Craig et al. (2002) found that 67.8% of their participants showed some ambivalence concerning conditions worthy of a legalized abortion. Additionally, they found no significant difference between self-described pro-choice and pro-life voters. A relatively equal percentage of both groups experienced some ambivalence when presented with questions about abortion.

One must be aware of this ambivalence because the polarization of the issue being studied is important for research involving persuasion. As the polarization level of an issue increases, the persuasion should decrease. But if persuasion continues to occur in the midst of a highly polarized issue, a powerful phenomenon is in effect. Even though there is no issue that is completely polarized (having only two diametrically opposed positions possible), abortion remains a legitimate candidate for research concerning Cohen’s findings. Abortion’s salience and political importance is verified by the attention it is given in consideration for Supreme Court nominees and legislators.

There are two main political parties (Republicans and Democrats), each of which generally supports one of the two main stances on abortion (pro-life and pro-choice). If a government body introduced or passed a law that contradicted the stated position of a prominent political party, one could examine a voter’s choice either to be persuaded by his party to violate his personal beliefs or to vote against her own party and support her own convictions about the issue. If abortion truly is an easy issue, driven by emotional attachments, it is hypothesized that reference-group persuasion from one’s chosen political party will not sway him to violate his personal beliefs in order to adhere to his preferred party’s stated position. Instead, she will most likely reject her party’s stance in order to uphold her personal convictions.
METHOD

Participants
Participants were selected from Introductory Psychology courses at the University of Southern Indiana by an online recruitment system and were awarded course credit. Participants were first prescreened online in order to ascertain their political party affiliation (Democrat or Republican) and their stance on abortion (pro-choice or pro-life). During the pre-screening section, participants indicated on a verbally anchored Likert-like scale of 1 to 9 (see Bass, Cascio, & O’Conner, 1974) which political party they aligned with (1 = always Democrats, 9 = always Republicans) as well as which position on abortion they held (1 = completely pro-choice, 9 = completely pro-life). They were also asked a series of other questions in order to disguise the nature of the study.

Using these two scales, two groups were established: pro-life Republicans and pro-choice Democrats. Pro-life Republicans were defined as those who indicated a 7 or higher on both the political affiliation scale and the abortion position scale. Because of the slight difficulty in finding pro-choice Democrats (due probably to the fact that the University of Southern Indiana exists in a heavily conservative, Republican state), the selection criteria were relaxed so that pro-choice Democrats were defined as those who indicated a 4 or lower on both respective scales. From an original pool of 125 respondents, only 58 (n=58) qualified as either a pro-choice Democrat or pro-life Republican. Out of the 58 qualified participants, 26 pro-choice Democrats as well as 26 pro-life Republicans were randomly selected, but due to attrition the final study contained only 20 pro-choice Democrats and 21 (n=21) pro-life Republicans.

Design and Procedure
Participants were instructed to complete an online survey containing two bills that were supposedly circulating through the U.S. Congress. The first bill was a decoy to disguise the nature of the study; the second bill had to do with the issue of abortion. Pro-choice Democrats read a bill that proposed an amendment to the U.S. Constitution that would ban all abortions; a position that is contrary to the position of a pro-choice Democrat.

The pro-choice Democrats were randomly assigned to one of two groups. The first group simply read the bill as it was written (control group). The second group read the same bill, but at the end there was a statement that mentioned how a majority of House Democrats supported the bill. It also contained a quotation from a current House Democrat stating that the bill was a “monumental step for the Democratic Party” (experimental group).

Pro-life Republicans read a bill that proposed and amendment to the U.S. Constitution that would permanently guarantee a
woman’s right to an abortion for any reason she felt necessary; a position that is obviously contrary to the position of a pro-life Republican (See Appendix B).

The pro-life Republicans were also randomly assigned to one of two groups. The first group read the bill as it was written (control group). The second group read the same bill, but at the end there was a statement that mentioned how a majority of House Republicans supported the bill. It also contained a quotation from a current House Republican stating that the bill was a “monumental step for the Republican Party” (experimental group).

Both bills were drafted to closely resemble the format and wording of actual past and current legislation dealing with abortion. After reading the appropriate bill, participants were asked to rate their support for the bill on a Likert-like scale of 1 to 9 (1 = completely opposed, 9 = completely in favor).

RESULTS

Data were examined using a 2 (participant party affiliation: Democrat or Republican) ? 2 (party support for bill: included (experimental) or absent (control)) analysis of variance (ANOVA). As hypothesized, party support for the bill was not a significant factor, F (dfbn, dfwn) = [F-value], p > .01. Pro-choice Democrats who were led to believe that the Democratic Party supported the bill banning all abortions (m = 2.13, sd = .99) were just as likely to oppose the bill as those who were not led to believe that the Democratic Party supported it (m = 1.92, sd = 1.24). Similarly, pro-life Republicans who were led to believe that the Republican Party supported the bill allowing all abortions (m = 3.44, sd = 2.74) were also just as likely to oppose the bill as those who were not led to believe that the Republican Party supported it. Additionally, there was no significant interaction between the two factors, F < 1. Data analysis did reveal a significant main effect for party affiliation, F(1,37) = 4.54, p = .04, ?2 = .11. An inspection of the means in Figure 1 shows that Republicans (m = 3.43, sd = 2.55) were slightly more likely than Democrats (m = 2.00, sd = 1.12) to support the bill antithetical to their own views.

DISCUSSION

When faced with the dilemma of supporting a position on abortion that was contrary to their own values, participants did not do so, even when their political party was said to support it. This is contrary to Cohen’s findings where participants did support a position on welfare that was contrary to their beliefs when their party stated their support for the position (Cohen, 2003). What accounts for this discrepancy? As discussed earlier, abortion is a highly salient “easy issue” (Carmines & Stimson, 1980) that is rooted in the emotions. Issues such as abortion are much more resistant to persuasion
than issues of lower salience such as welfare. When faced with the dissonant information, that their party supported a position that violated their personal convictions, participants engaged in more central-route processing and chose to reject the persuading efforts of their party and instead chose “policy voting” (Ray, 1999) (Cacioppo et al., 1986).

The fact that there was a significant main effect for party affiliation raises an interesting question, “Why would pro-life Republicans support a position allowing abortions more than pro-choice Democrats would support a position banning abortions?” One would think that each group would equally oppose the position that diametrically opposes their own views, but the study’s results indicate otherwise.

There are numerous, possible explanations for this effect. First of all, because of the small sample size there may have been an interaction between selection and treatment. It is entirely possible that the participants selected were anomalous and did not adequately represent the views of the majority of pro-choice Democrats and pro-life Republicans.

Secondly, it may explain the result. The bill allowing all abortions that the pro-life Republicans read may have been misleading. Although the first four sections of the bill are obviously in favor of unrestricted abortion, the fifth section alludes to the fact that the states have the right to pass legislation regulating abortions in the last trimester of a woman’s pregnancy (a position that is included in the Supreme Court decision in Roe v Wade).

Because research shows that individuals are better at recalling the most recent items in a list slightly more than the first items it is possible that participants isolated the last section of the bill that, when viewed apart from the rest of the bill, appeared to be in opposition to abortion (Murdock, 1962). The slightly higher support for the bill may have been due to a misunderstanding of the actual nature of the bill.

Two additional explanations may account for these unclear results. First of all, in today’s American society, abortion has been legal for 33 years and more widely accepted than ever before. The thought of an amendment banning all abortions seems much more dubious and regressive than one that allows all abortions. Despite the fact that pro-life Republicans would be expected to oppose to a bill that allows all abortions, it is possible that they were more supportive of it because it seemed more realistic and plausible in today’s political climate; therefore, they chose more peripheral route processing in forming their decision (Cacioppo et al., 1986). Secondly, although this study examined persuasion by political parties, perhaps a broader dimension of persuasion was in effect. It is possible that
the pro-life Republicans supported the bill allowing all abortions slightly more because they chose to conform to a societal standard that leans toward a more pro-choice attitude: one that may also view those that are pro-life as being intolerant.

One final explanation for the results may involve the participants’ views of the Constitution. It is possible that participants did not support one or both of the bills because they simply opposed amending the Constitution. To some, abortion may be considered a trivial issue in light of the Constitution and is not important enough to consider amending it. Regardless of their feelings on abortion, individuals may feel that the issue is best resolved by federal and state legislation and not by the amendment process.

This study could and should be extended in several ways. Future studies should incorporate populations from different locations throughout the U.S. and include a representative sample regarding age. The present study included only students from a medium-sized liberal arts university in a heavily conservative area who were in their very late teens to early twenties. It would be interesting to see if people of greater age might be more loyal to their party and therefore more likely to cave to party pressure.

The present study could also be extended by eliminating the online component and include a more interactive approach. Perhaps completing a survey on paper with the researcher present would elicit a more natural and honest response. Furthermore, perhaps retaining a confederate to portray a legislator and present the bills in person might create a more persuasive and authentic environment.

In the same manner that this study built upon Cohen’s original findings, future research should closely examine additional political topics to see which ones are more susceptible to party persuasion. If all major areas of politics were examined, then researchers could conduct a metaanalysis and see how much influence individuals’ party preference has on their overall political ideology.

In closing, persuasion remains an important and complex phenomenon. Sometimes individuals conform to group standards when they are either apathetic or ignorant in their own knowledge. This allows them to function in a world where they may not have time to gain an understanding or form an opinion for every possible circumstance or issue. If in order to vote, individuals were required to thoroughly know every single candidate in an election and completely understand the positions that the candidates held, then no one would be able to vote. Instead, people generally choose select issues that are of particular importance to them, and by this selection of issues, choose their political party.

Voters support the party that supports the issues that are precious to them. If their party tries to persuade them to give up some-
thing that they believe in strongly, it is not likely to happen. But if an individual’s party does abandon the ideals that he holds dearly and that it once supported, then that person is left with the options of either reforming the party, joining a different party, or forming a new one. Abortion remains a polarizing issue, because many small third parties have been formed on the platform of this one issue. One thing is certain regarding abortion: it is a highly sensitive issue that is seated in one’s emotions and dictated by one’s conscience. An issue of this magnitude will never be settled politically no matter what the law books mandate.
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Tristram Shandy: Using Geocentrism in a Heliocentric World

“Am I not the hero of my own tale?”

- Tristram Shandy: A Cock and Bull Story

The first inclination of the reader would be to emphatically protest,—of course Tristram is the hero of the story, for is it not called The Life and Opinions of Tristram Shandy, Gentleman, and is it not Tristram, himself, who is narrating the story?—Well, yes. Tristram should be just that, the hero and the center of the story. “The confessional format of Tristram Shandy,” according to Barbara M. Benedict, “mimics the authenticity and intimacy of autobiography, already well established as the genre of individual expression” (487). The beginning of the very first line sets up this confessional comradery: “I wish either my father or my mother, or indeed both of them, as they were in duty both equally bound to it, had minded what they were about when they begot me” (Sterne 1).

Sterne sets Tristram up as the hero—making him the narrator, giving his name as the title of the novel, and letting Tristram himself believe that he is the central character—exactly because Tristram is not the hero. At the same time he allows Tristram to tell the reader exactly what Sterne is doing. First by beginning the narration, with Tristram bemoaning his own conception, the reader still feels like Tristram is the focal point of the story, but already the sense of things ‘being as they ought’ is becoming hazy and skewed. Thus the reader who continues to follow Tristram Shandy inevitably becomes horribly and irrevocably lost, not because he is unlikeable—in fact, Tristram’s funny and witty personality holds throughout the novel—but because Tristram doesn’t behave like a main character.

It then becomes apparent that Tristram’s job is to mislead the reader in order to allow Sterne to drag him or her willy-nilly, letting and even encouraging the reader to fall into grooves just to prove how often people choose to only honor or recognize the familiar. The reader looks for and attempts to force the novel into trends, expecting it to have certain characteristics. Sterne’s main goal seems
to be forcing people into these paths of familiarity, so that they can
discover why the path is flawed, and thus at the same time trying to
prod the reader out of the rut into which Stern himself places the
reader.

—Well, you may take my word, that nine parts in ten of
a man’s sense or his nonsense, his successes and miscarriages
in this world depend upon their motions and activity, and the
different tracks and trains you put them into; so that when
they are once set a-going, whether right or wrong, ‘tis not a
halfpenny matter,—away they go cluttering like hey-go-mad;
and by treading the same steps over and over again, they
presently make a road of it, as plain and as smooth as a gar-
den-walk which, when they are once used to, the Devil him-
self sometimes shall not be able to drive them off it. (Sterne
1-2)

This paragraph is placed at the end of the very first chapter, and
presumably it is directed at Tristram’s unfortunate mother who is so
used to her husband’s Sunday ritual, that when he changes things on
her, she can’t adapt. Instead, she focuses all of her energy on what
she expects to happen and looses sight of what actually is happening
to her. The trick Walter unwittingly plays on his wife is the same
trick that Sterne plays on his readers throughout the course of the
novel by setting the reader up to be taken in one direction, and then
taking off a different way.

When the reader fails to follow and neglects details, Tristram
becomes frustrated and, addressing madam, he proceeds to scold the
reader, even on the slightest offences:

—How could you, Madam, be so inattentive in reading
the last chapter? I told you in it, That my mother was not a
papist.—Papist! You told me no such thing, Sir. Madam, I
beg leave to repeat it over again, That I told you as plain, at
least, as words, by direct inference, could tell you such a
thing.—Then, Sir, I must have miss’d a page.—No,
Madam,—you have not miss’d a word.—Then I was asleep,
Sir.—My pride, Madam, can not allow you that refuge.—
Then, I declare, I know nothing at all about the matter.—
That, Madam is the very fault I lay to your charge; and as a
punishment for it, I do insist up on it, that you immediately
turn back, that is as soon as you get to the next full stop, and
read the whole chapter over again. (Sterne 40-41)

If a reader is careful and attentive, then he may be likened to the
“Sir” whom Tristram treats with the utmost respect, and for whom
Sterne carefully lays out what he or she needs to know to understand
Tristram and the novel. For instance, Tristram’s inability to move in chronological order should not surprise the reader, as he was conceived out of time; that is, when the clock was not wound. Tristram knows that his constant movement from one person to another, back and fourth between topics, and most distressingly, his total disregard for time will frustrate the reader, so Tristram makes his plea to the reader to bear with him on page seven, just four chapters into the first volume, “…as we jog on, either laugh with me, or at me, or in short, do anything,—only keep your temper” (Sterne).

Sterne again sets the reader up to be turned on end: “…my aunt Dinah’s affair was a matter of as much consequence to him, as the retrogradation of the planets to Copernicus.—The backslidings of Venus in her orbit fortified the Copernican system, call’d so after his name; and the backslidings of my aunt Dinah in her orbit, did the same service in establishing my father’s system” (Sterne 49), and it is Tristram’s own backsliding through his numerous digressions that shall carry the weight of the argument.

Tristram’s “backsliding” refers here to his tendency to digress, to go forward then loop back around to talk about a piece of information that the reader hopes is important and relevant, but does not always see as such. Here Sterne provides an opportunity to look closer at the idea of planets and to draw parallels.

It is as natural for the reader to place Tristram at the center of his own novel as it is to place the earth at the center of the solar system, and as wrong. The reader should feel no shame in this mistake; after all, the earth was believed to be the center of the solar system for over a millennium (Fitzpatrick np). It is simply a result of perspective: when viewing the solar system from Earth, it seems as though the heavens are orbiting a stationary Earth; when viewing the novel through Tristram, it seems as though he is central to the novel, but he is also oddly stationary in that he ages so very slowly it is almost unnoticeable, and comparable to the unfelt movement of the earth. On page twenty six, he admits: “I have been at it these six weeks, making all the speed I possibly could,—and am not yet born” (Sterne).

The slow movement and relative stationary position that Tristram occupies in the novel does not fit the usual pattern of a main character, yet it fits the idea of Tristram being wrongly situated at the center of his universe, not simply on accident, but rather on purpose, by Sterne to make a point.

When speaking of the merit of digressions and progressions, Tristram calls them “two contrary motions” which are “reconciled” though they “were thought to be at variance with each other, thus making his work digressive and progressive “at the same time” (Sterne 52). The next thing Tristram tells the reader is that his story
is very different from the dual movements of the earth (Sterne 52).

The problem with placing Tristram at the center of the novel is again much the same problem that occurs when the earth is placed at the center of the solar system: explanations become very complicated very quickly. In order to make the earth the center of the solar system, with the moon, sun, and planets orbiting around it, certain observations had to be explained, mainly why the planets would sometimes appear to move backwards, or in retrograde to their normal movements. So Claudius Ptolemy figured out that the planets would have a main orbit, called a deferent, that would circle not the earth, but a point off center of it, and the planets themselves would be on a second, smaller orbit, called an epicycle. The center of the epicycle would move around the deferent while the planet moves around the epicycle, thus creating a corkscrew motion in the sky (Fitzpatrick np).

If then, Tristram is the center, our earth, everything else must be orbiting around him in some complicated fashion. Like Ptolemy, the novel can be constructed to fit a Tristram-centric model, even though the core assumption, that Tristram is the center of the novel, is wrong. Toby might be one of the easiest to reconcile to the Tristram-centric model of the story. Toby’s epicycle is his Hobby-Horse: the siege of Namur and his ensuing injury, as Tristram draws on this to create his uncle’s character for the reader (Sterne 55). The deferent around which the Hobby-Horse orbits would be Toby’s life as seen by Tristram.

Walter’s epicycle and deferent then become comparable to his brother’s in that it is his obsession with reason and dissertation for he “would see nothing in the light in which others placed it;—he placed things in his own light” (Sterne 104), and again the deferent relating to that of his life as he spirals around it on his own reason. The midwife and Dr. Slop can be placed on the same deferent, that of medicine, but Dr. Slop, with his forceps, would have an epicycle of scientific advancement, while the midwife’s would be that of tradition.

People are not the only worlds to consider, however. If we look next at the world of the reader, we can place him or her on the epicycle of the “Madam” reader, which is placed upon the deferent of the “Sir” reader. “The readers of the novel are segregated by gender: where as the term ‘Sir’ solicits a sympathetic reader, ‘Madam’ evokes a bad one” (Benedict 485). As a result of this, the reader sees the “Sir” as a constant presence, remaining even when the “Madam” has been sent on her way, and thus the “Madam” as a cyclical pattern of being ignored and being rebuked. The true reader, however, remains with both the “Madam” and the “Sir” as he or
she moves around through the novel.

The world of the male body, according to Ross King, is present in a way to make the epicycle the disfigurements and diseases that are prominently featured among them (292), including Tristram’s nose and penis, Toby’s penis, and he general impotence of the Shandy men. It is then made arguable that the deferent would be that of “patriarchal power” upon which the disfigurements and diseases constantly wreak havoc in a never ending cycle of damage and recuperation (King 294).

So, like Ptolemy, the reader finds that the novel can be structured and analyzed so that it models the geocentric solar system. Yet in both systems there is a slight problem: in Ptolemy’s model the earth is not the exact center, it must be off set slightly for everything to work properly (Fitzpatrick np). The same is true of Tristram in this model. Although all of the above mentioned “worlds” are connected to Tristram, and his telling in a way ties them all together, he himself is not the heart of those worlds, but rather the heart is some offset point.

Undoubtedly, this will leave the reader to growl in frustration and exclaim—If Tristram is not the hero of his own story, then who is?

The idea that the solar system could be heliocentric did not start with Copernicus, he just happened to be the first to whom people started listening (Fitzpatrick). In the eighteenth century, scientific advancement along with the relatively new acceptance that the earth and therefore man was not at the center of the universe caused tension between religious views and doctrine and scientific discovery. As reason began to dominate over religion, literature, such as Pope’s “Essay on Man,” explored religion versus science and man’s place in the world. Sterne challenges the idea of what makes a novel, but more importantly, he challenges the narrator’s position as the story’s center and consequently draws the reader to ponder whether any man is truly the center of his own story. It is important to remember that while anyone’s story can be told so that he or she is the heart of it, our lives are not truly like that; rather, they ring more true to Tristram’s eccentric telling of his life. “The order of the ideas, their suddenness and irrelevancy, is more true to life than to literature,” was a comment given by Virginia Woolf in an article by J. M. Stedmond (244) that further emphasizes man’s role not as hero but as ordinary.

The novel ends: “L - - d! said my mother, what is all this story about?—A COCK and a BULL, said Yorick—And one of the best of its kind, I ever heard” (Sterne 457). “Yorick’s answer has been used to describe the novel itself: it is a story about nothing” (Hardin 199). As there is no center of the universe, there is no true
center of The Life and Opinions of Tristram Shandy, Gentleman.

I have constructed the main work and the adventitious parts of it [the story] with such intersections, and have so complicated and involved the digressive and progressive moments, one wheel within another, that the whole machine, in general, has been kept a-going;—and, what's more, it shall be kept a-going these forty [sic] years, if it pleases the fountain of health to bless me so long with life and good spirits. (Sterne 52)

The analogy, then by the end of the chapter has switched from planets to a machine, which doesn’t necessarily have a center or heart, but at the same time remains functional. The book is complex, with many intricate parts that are given to the reader slowly over time, but if the reader treats the story as having no central character to drive the plot forward, as having no central theme, idea, or even a central plot to drive it forward, then the reader can begin to collect the pieces of the machine and put together a multitude of characters, ideas, themes, and plots that together make up the complexity of life, not as it is plotted out in a story but random, sporadic and real. Sterne continuously takes the reader and forces him or her to think about what he or she is presented with rather than allowing him or her to be swept along with whatever notion is floating around at the time.
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Secondhand Smoke: The Unseen Hazard on Campus

Smoking is an issue that has changed drastically with time. In the beginning, many were not aware of how harmful tobacco could become. That, however, has changed. It has been proven that not only the smoker is harmed by the effects of smoking tobacco. Non-smokers, who are exposed to secondhand smoke, absorb the chemicals just as smokers do (Secondhand Smoke, n.d., para. 2). In fact, the non-smoker inhales approximately double the concentration of nicotine and tar as the directly inhaling smoker. The non-smoker also breathes in about three times the amount of the carcinogen benzo(a)pyrene, as well as five times the level of carbon monoxide, and about fifty times the amount of ammonia (Passive Smoking—What You Should Know, 2006, para. 2). The dangers of secondhand smoke are real, not imaginary. There is no level of safe secondhand smoke exposure. It has been proven through studies that even low levels of secondhand smoke exposure can be harmful (Secondhand Smoke: Question and Answer, 2007, section 4, para. 2). Therefore, USI should be a non-smoking campus.

Restrictions to protect nonsmokers have been put into place in several areas. In fact, Indiana will have one of the strictest anti-smoking regulations in the United States when Bill 691 takes effect. The purpose of this bill is to protect the rights of individuals who do not want to be exposed to secondhand smoke. Under this bill, “the only place a person is allowed to smoke is in the privacy of their own home or in their vehicle if the windows are rolled up. Smoking will no longer be allowed in bars, restaurants, and offices, as well as any outdoor areas”. Those caught smoking in forbidden areas could be fined up to one thousand dollars (Couples, n.d., para. 1-3).

There are already regulations preventing smoking in areas such as workplaces, bars, and restaurants. The idea of college campuses becoming nonsmoking facilities is not a new one. According to the American Nonsmokers’ Rights Foundation, “there are 65 colleges across the nation that have gone entirely smoke-free, both indoors and out” (Editorial Board, 2007, para. 3). This figure does not include the colleges who might join those ranks in the near future. The reasons for a campus to become nonsmoking may differ, but one fact remains constant—that secondhand smoke is not healthy
for any individual. Whether or not the university population supports this change to a nonsmoking environment is the question. In 2007, a survey was implemented at the University of Southern Indiana to answer this question. The purpose of this study was to determine the opinions of university faculty, staff, and students, pertaining to the restrictions being followed, their effectiveness, whether the college should become a nonsmoking campus, and the reason supporting such a change.

METHODS

Study Sample
From October 2007 to November 2007, students, faculty, and staff members of the University of Southern Indiana were asked to participate in a voluntary survey. The only requirement was that they fall under one of the three categories listed (student, faculty, or staff of the University of Southern Indiana). Only those who would fall into one of the three categories were asked to participate; therefore all participants asked were eligible. The University Institutional Review Board approved the study protocol prior to implementation.

Data Collection
Data was collected from 243 participants, who followed an internet link to an online survey, which helped to ensure the confidentiality of the responses. Participation was voluntary, and the individuals were informed of this via a statement at the beginning of the survey.

Measures
The criterion for this study all fell under the category of nominal data. Each participant was asked his or her sex, age, classification category (student, faculty, or staff member), what level he or she was currently at (Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, Senior, or Graduate), how long the individual has been at the university (if he/she was a faculty or staff member), whether the participant is a smoker, if he or she believes the restrictions are effective, whether the individual believes those restrictions are effective in keeping him or her safe from the effects of secondhand smoke, whether the University of Southern Indiana should be nonsmoking, and why the individual felt the way he or she did about the previous question concerning the campus becoming nonsmoking.

Data Analysis
This study was not intended to find information involving any correlations. This study was conducted to gain information about the opinion of the University of Southern Indiana population. The only statistical technique that was used involved finding percentages by calculation of a ratio between the part and the whole.
RESULTS

Characteristics of the Sample

The classification of participants was fairly balanced, with 38.7 percent staff members, 37.9 percent students, and 23.5 percent faculty members. This study saw an overrepresentation of the female population at 70.0 percent. The majority (58.0 percent) were over the age of thirty, causing the other age groups to be underrepresented. The smoking population was underrepresented at 8.2 percent. A minority (23.8 percent) found the restrictions to be followed. A minority of 36.2 percent found the restrictions to be effective in protecting the individual from the effects of secondhand smoke. A majority (62.5 percent) believed that the University of Southern Indiana should become a nonsmoking campus. Of those who believed that the University of Southern Indiana campus should become non-smoking, a majority (45.4 percent) listed a reason pertaining to health or well being as why the campus should be smoke free.

Findings

For the 2007 University of Southern Indiana survey, participation totaled at 243 individuals. Of those individuals, ninety-four (38.7 percent) were staff members, ninety-two were students (37.9 percent), and fifty-seven (23.5 percent) were faculty members. Of the student participants, fifty-seven (62.0 percent) were freshmen, thirteen (14.1 percent) were sophomores, eight (8.7 percent) were juniors, eleven (12.0 percent) were seniors, and three (3.3 percent) were none of the above. There were a total of twenty participants who classified themselves as smokers, ten (50.0 percent) were female and ten (50.0 percent) were male. Eight (40.0 percent) were faculty members, five (25.0 percent) were staff members, and seven (35.0 percent) were students. Of the eight faculty members who classified themselves as smokers five (62.5 percent) were male and three (37.5 percent) were female. Four of the five (80.0 percent) staff members who classified themselves as smokers were female while one (20.0 percent) was male. Three of the seven (42.9 percent) student smokers were freshmen, one (14.3) was a sophomore, one (14.3 percent) was a junior, one (14.3 percent) was a senior, and one (14.3) was classified as something other than freshman, sophomore, junior, or senior. Three of the seven (42.9 percent) student smokers were female while four (57.1 percent) were male. Of the individuals who participated, 170 (70.0 percent) were female and 73 (30.0 percent) were male.

There were three age categories in which the participants could choose from. Eighty-four (91.3 percent) students were between the ages of eighteen and twenty-four, five (5.4 percent) were between the age of twenty-four and thirty, and three (3.3 percent) were older
than thirty. Two (3.5 percent) faculty members were between twenty-four and thirty, and fifty-five (96.7) percent were older than thirty. Eleven (11.7 percent) staff members were between twenty-four and thirty, and eighty-three (88.3 percent) were older than thirty. In total, eighty-four (34.6 percent) participants were between the ages of eighteen and twenty-four, eighteen (7.4 percent) were between twenty-four and thirty, and one hundred forty-one (58.0 percent) were over thirty.

The results to the questions concerning smoking restrictions and changing the campus to a non-smoking area are listed below.
Eighteen (19.6 percent) students, twenty-three (40.4 percent) faculty members, and seventeen (18.1 percent) staff members believed the restrictions to be followed. Of the eighteen students thirteen (72.2 percent) were freshman, two (11.1) were sophomores, two (11.1) were seniors, and one (5.6) classified themselves as something other than freshman, sophomore, junior, or senior. Of the eighteen students three (16.7 percent) classified themselves as smokers. Six of the twenty-three (26.1 percent) faculty members were classified as smokers and three of the seventeen (17.6) staff members were smokers. In total, fifty-eight (23.9 percent) of the participants believed the restrictions to be followed. Twelve (60.0 percent) of the participants who classified themselves as smokers were included in the fifty-eight.

Eighteen (19.6 percent) students, thirty-two (56.1 percent) faculty members, and thirty-eight (40.2 percent) staff members believed the restrictions to be effective in protecting them from the effects of secondhand smoke. Of the eighteen students nine (50.0 percent) were freshman, two (11.1 percent) were sophomores, three (16.7 percent) were juniors, two (11.1 percent) were seniors, and two (11.1 percent) classified themselves as something other than freshman, sophomore, junior, or senior. Four out of the eighteen (22.2 percent) students classified themselves as smokers, seven of the thirty-two (21.9 percent) faculty members classified themselves as smokers, and five of the thirty-eight (13.2 percent) staff members classified themselves as smokers. In total, eighty-eight (36.2 percent) of the participants believed the restrictions to be effective. Sixteen (80.0 percent) of the total participants who classified themselves as smokers were included in the eighty-eight.

Fifty-seven (62.0 percent) students, thirty-three (57.9 percent) faculty members, and fifty-nine (62.8 percent) staff members believed that the University of Southern Indiana should become a non-smoking campus. Of the fifty-seven students thirty-nine (68.4 percent) were freshman, seven (12.3 percent) were sophomores, four (7.01 percent) were juniors, six (10.5 percent) were seniors, and one (1.75 percent) was classified as something other than freshman,
sophomore, junior, or senior. All of these fifty-seven students were non-smokers. Of the thirty-three faculty members three (9.09) were classified as smokers and none of the staff members were classified as smokers. In total, 152 (62.6 percent) participants believed that the University of Southern Indiana should become a non-smoking campus. Three (1.97 percent) of these participants classified themselves as smokers, which represented three twentieths (15.0 percent) of the smoking population.

The reasons of those who thought the University of Southern Indiana should become a non-smoking campus are listed below. Sixty-nine (45.4 percent) of the one hundred fifty-two participants listed a reason involving health or well-being as why the campus should become non-smoking. Twelve (7.9 percent) listed a reason pertaining to the litter on campus from cigarettes. Ten (6.6 percent) listed a reason pertaining to the individual having the right to choose to be exposed to secondhand smoke. Eight (5.3 percent) listed the reason pertaining to not liking to be around smoke in general and eleven (7.2 percent) listed a reason pertaining to the rules not being followed or the ineffectiveness of the rules. The other forty-two (27.6 percent) participants listed a reason differing from those listed above.

Of the 243 participants, 91 believed that the campus should not become non-smoking. There were different reasons why the participants thought that the campus should retain a smoking status. Twenty-six (28.6 percent) participants believed making the campus non-smoking would go against someone’s personal choice, freedom, or rights. Nineteen (20.9 percent) believed that the restrictions needed to be enforced more or that designated areas needed to be made. Four (4.4 percent) participants believed that to make the campus non-smoking would hurt the University of Southern Indiana. Six (6.6 percent) believed that a non-smoking campus would be too hard to enforce. Nine (9.9 percent) participants believed that a non-smoking campus would be too hard on smokers. Three (3.3 percent) listed the reason of not being bothered by smoking. The other twenty-four (26.4 percent) participants listed reasons that differed from those above.

The distribution of results pertaining to questions related to the restrictions and to making the campus non-smoking are listen below. Twenty (8.2 percent) participants found that the restrictions were followed and effective and felt that the University of Southern Indiana should become a non-smoking campus. Of those twenty, three (15 percent) classified themselves as smokers. Twenty-one (8.6 percent) believed both that the restrictions were not followed, but would be effective if followed, and that the University of Southern Indiana should become a non-smoking campus. All twenty-one par-
participants classified themselves as non-smokers. Twelve (4.9 percent) believed the restrictions were followed, but that the restrictions were not effective in protecting individuals from the dangers of secondhand smoke, and that the University of Southern Indiana should be a non-smoking campus. All twelve participants classified themselves as non-smokers. Twenty-four (9.9 percent) believed that the restrictions were followed and effective and that the University of Southern Indiana should not become a non-smoking campus. Of those twenty-four participants, nine (37.5 percent) classified themselves as smokers. Ninety-nine (40.7 percent) participants believed that the restrictions were neither followed nor effective and that the University of Southern Indiana should become a non-smoking campus. All ninety-nine participants classified themselves as non-smokers. Forty-two participants (17.2 percent) believed that the restrictions were neither followed nor effective and that the University of Southern Indiana should not become a non-smoking campus. Of those forty-two participants, four (9.5 percent) classified themselves as smokers. Twenty-three (9.5 percent) believed that the restrictions are not followed, but that if followed would be effective, and that the University of Southern Indiana should not become a non-smoking campus. Of those twenty-three, four (17.4 percent) classified themselves as smokers. Two (0.8 percent) participants believed that the restrictions are followed, but are not effective and that the University of Southern Indiana should not become a non-smoking campus.

**DISCUSSION**

**General**

Findings suggest that the majority of University of Southern Indiana students, faculty, and staff believe that the campus should become non-smoking. The key reasons seem to be centered on the population’s health as well as the restrictions not being followed. The majority of those who believed the University of Southern Indiana should retain a smoking status felt that way for reasons besides a personal dislike of the issue. About a forth of those who did not believe the campus should become non-smoking listed a reason pertaining to rights, personal choice or freedom. Several believed that it alienated smokers’ rights. Oscar Wendell Holmes once said “the right to swing my fist ends where the other man’s nose begins” (Finding Quotes Was Never This Easy, n.d.). This quote clarifies the point of rights having limits. As individuals we only have those rights until they interfere with those of others or go against the law.

A majority of the population did not feel that the restrictions are protecting them from the effects of secondhand smoke. This is no surprise considering the past studies on the harmful effects of sec-
ondhand smoke. An estimated 3,400 deaths occur annually, caused by lung cancer in nonsmoking adults (Secondhand Smoke, 2006, Why Is It a Problem? Section, para. 3.) There are over 4,000 chemicals that have been identified in secondhand smoke. Fifty are known to cause cancer and at least two hundred fifty are known to be harmful (Secondhand Smoke: Question and Answer, 2007, section 3, para. 1).

The current Surgeon General’s Report concluded that scientific evidence indicates that there is no risk-free level of exposure to secondhand smoke. Short exposures to secondhand smoke can cause blood platelets to become stickier, damage the lining of blood vessels, decrease coronary flow velocity reserves, and reduce heart rate variability, potentially increasing the risk of heart attack (Secondhand Smoke Fact Sheet, 2007, para. 12).

This clearly states that even a small amount of exposure can be dangerous. The University of Southern Indiana

prohibits smoking and the use of smokeless tobacco products by students, faculty, staff, and visitors in all University-owned or -leased buildings and vehicles within 30 feet of building entrances, exits, partially- or fully-enclosed walkways, open windows, and ventilation systems, with the exception of any areas located in student housing which have been designated as smoking areas (Division of Student Affairs, 2006, p.216).

It has been proven that a “nonsmoker who is employed is most in danger of exposure to secondhand smoke at work,” because they spend eight hours a day in that environment (Provisions of Smokefree Air Laws, 2005, Areas Covered By Smokefree Laws section, para. 2). Most of the University of Southern Indiana population spends at least eight hours on campus. Those who live in student housing are subjected to secondhand smoke with no restrictions to protect or deter the harmful effects of secondhand smoke. Even those who do not live in student housing must walk through areas that smokers tend to populate, causing those individuals to be exposed to harmful secondhand smoke. Secondhand smoke is a known danger. It has been the cause of multiple deaths in adults as well as children. Several ordinances have been put into place to protect individuals from these hazards. These ordinances are in public places such as restaurants, bars, and day cares. The University of Southern Indiana has restrictions, but those restrictions do not apply to student housing. A small exposure to secondhand smoke can be dangerous. Public workers have a safe environment to work in, but students, whose job is to learn, do not. The study conducted showed that the majority surveyed believed that the University of
Southern Indiana should become a non-smoking campus. The majority of the population did not believe that the restrictions were followed or effective. For these reasons the University of Southern Indiana should be a non-smoking campus.

Limitations
There are limitations to the findings of this study. The validity of the measures limits the findings. The participation of those who classified themselves as smokers also limits this study as well as the number of male participants. The accuracy of these findings depends upon the honesty of those who participated in this survey. The findings can only be generalized to the University of Southern Indiana population. Therefore, the findings cannot be generalized to populations of other universities or colleges.

Conclusion
Evidence from this voluntary study suggests that the majority of the University of Southern Indiana population believes the restrictions are neither followed nor effective in protecting the individual from the risk of secondhand smoke. This study suggests that a majority of the population believes that the university should become a non-smoking campus. To be sure of the accuracy of this study, another similar study needs to be done with the same variables used but with a better balanced participation population.
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Examining Iago’s personality and actions, what could be occurring in his brain that would make him focus his intense revenge on Othello?

In order to begin the examination of Iago we must first understand what a psychological approach is, what the mechanisms are, and which mechanisms would be best used before we can continue. According to Steven Lynn in *Texts and Contexts*, the psychological approach is the exploration of not only what a person did, but also why he did what he did (Lynn 183). Therefore we must look into the minds of people and explore what in their lives could have affected them, their ways of thinking, and, therefore, their actions.

According to Lynn, the different mechanisms of the psychological theory are isolation, sublimation, repression, displacement, denial, projection, intellectualization, and reaction formation (Lynn 191-2). Each of the mechanisms could be applied to Iago’s behavior; however, I will focus on displacement, reaction formation, denial, and projection.

Displacement occurs when a person “inserts a safe object of emotion for a dangerous one” (Lynn 191). Reaction formation occurs when a person “is convinced that the opposite of a terrible situation is actually the case” (Lynn 192). Denial is when a person “simply falsifies reality” (Lynn 192). And finally, projection occurs when a person places or projects his own feelings, traits, or emotions onto another person or a character (Lynn 192). I will discuss each of these separately pertaining to Iago’s character, but as a whole, I believe that they can be looked at in a way to explain that Iago secretly believes or fears that Cassio is actually better than he. In order to narrow the scope, I will focus on act I scene 1, act III scene 3, and act V scene 2.

In act I scene 1, Iago believes that he is worthy of the position of lieutenant. We know this because in act I, scene I, he says “Despise me if I do not. Three great ones of the city, in personal suit to make me his lieutenant, off-capp’d to him; and, by the faith of
man, I know my price, I am worth no worse a place;” (Abcarian, Klotz 825). This shows that Iago initially believes that he was more deserving of the position than Cassio. However, his reasoning for his proper advancement was that he had three people tell Othello that he deserved the position and he had been in Othello’s company longer. He states “Why, there’s no remedy: ’tis the curse of service, preferment goes by letter and affection, not by the old gradation, where each second stood heir to the first. Now, sir, be judge yourself, whe’r I in any just term am affin’d to love the Moor” (Abcarian, Klotz 825). He says he believes he is worthier than Cassio, but his actual talent is never mentioned. In the above passage, we can see that Iago is furious with Othello because he has been passed over, but he also says that Othello prefers Cassio. We can infer here that Iago is displacing the thought that Cassio was selected because of Othello likes him better, not because of his actual performance. This can be seen using the psychological mechanisms of displacement and reaction formation. Instead of conceiving that Cassio could be more deserving, he replaces the possibly “terrible situation’s” truth with the conclusion that Othello is showing favoritism. Also, it can be inferred that Iago is displacing his feelings of self-hate because he is inadequate, and turning them into hate for Othello because he has not been just.

In act III scene 3, Iago has already stated his plan for revenge and begins to plant the idea of Desdemona and Cassio’s affair in Othello’s brain. The scene opens with Emilia, Cassio, and Desdemona having a conversation, but Othello and Iago enter at a distance—where they can see but not hear (remember that visual proof is an important motif reoccurring in the play). Here, Iago says, “Ha! I like not that” (Abcarian, Klotz 864). He states this after he and Othello had seen the three talking and Cassio left. This statement is small, but it is incredibly effective in implying that something is wrong within the world of the play. It draws Othello’s attention to Cassio being in Desdemona’s presence without Othello being there. He continues answering Othello’s question of whether or not it was Cassio by saying, “Cassio, my lord? No, sure, I cannot think it, that he would steal away so guilty-like, seeing you coming,” (Abcarian, Klotz 864). Here Iago is being a snake and uses his words to twist reality. If we look deeper, we may infer that not only is Iago aware of the different mechanisms of psychology but is affected as well. Iago is falsifying reality. By reading the text, we may conclude that at this point he may begin to believe it himself. Therefore, not only is Iago in denial of his own inferiority to Cassio, but also possibly the incredulity of Cassio and Desdemona, or the fact that they do not deserve what Othello has given them. In order for an actor to be truly effective, he must be consumed by his character. So, Iago must
believe to some extent that Cassio and Desdemona have done something wrong in order for him to be so convincing.

In act V scene 2, Othello is confronting Desdemona. Iago’s plan has come to a conclusion and he has convinced Othello to the point that he will not hear any word Desdemona has to say. Iago enters with Montano, Gratiano, and others when Emilia shouts out that Desdemona is dead. She then inadvertently exposes Iago. In this act, the usually articulate Iago speaks in terse one-line pieces of dialogue. This is to show that he is finally being broken down. One line after Emilia states that the handkerchief was not given to Cassio by Desdemona, Iago says, “Filth, thou liest!” (Abcarian, Klotz 911). This may be initially seen as another defense, but it can also be viewed as a projection of himself. Perhaps he is speaking to Emilia, but maybe he is inadvertently showing his true self.

After Iago has been wounded but not killed by Othello, Othello claims that he would not kill Iago because to live would be a worse punishment. Then Iago says, “Demand me nothing: what you know, you know: from this time forth I never will speak a word” (Abcarian, Klotz 913). Here, we see the final break down of Iago. Throughout the entire play, he has been an articulate character. His entire being is based on being able to speak and manipulate words. But to never speak again is not only the end of Iago’s character, but also the condemnation. Iago has finally realized his being and the denial and reaction formation have disappeared. Once he has seen what he’s done, the only thing he can think to do is completely reform. This could be seen as his last way of getting to the other characters of the play, but I see it as a psychological realization. The mechanisms have disappeared and the only way to fix what has happened is to change the only thing he can: himself.

Iago is an incredibly complex character. Throughout the entire play, he can be easily seen as manipulative, conniving, evil, and intelligent. However, upon digging deeper, we see that Iago is in denial. He can’t believe that Cassio was possibly better than he and, therefore, is in denial and shows reaction formation by not believing, displaces his self-hate on Othello, and projects his inferiority onto Cassio and Desdemona.
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