From quotes to questions:

Caroline Walker Bynum: “Surely our job as teachers is to puzzle, confuse, and amaze. We must rear a new generation of students who will gaze in wonder at texts and artifacts . . . slow to project . . . quick to assume there is a significance, slow to generalize about it. For a flat, generalizing, presentist view of the past . . . makes it boring, whereas amazement yearns toward an understanding, a significance always a little beyond both our theories and our fears. Every view of things that is not wonderful is false.”

Seriously? Aren’t you here to solve puzzles rather than to be puzzled? What is presentism? Can we avoid it? Moreover, if we’re not trained to generalize from particulars, that is, to come up with statements that make sense of particulars, how can we predict and control what happens? Accurate predictions and complete control—shouldn’t those be the aims of higher education? Amazement is extracurricular; isn’t it?

William Butler Yeats: “The best lack all conviction, while the worst are full of passionate intensity.”

What might Yeats have meant by “best” and by “worst”? What would those terms have to mean for you to subscribe to the truth packed into this line?

Thucydides: “Pericles . . . was their leader rather than being led by them [the Athenians], because he did not speak to please them.”

Shouldn’t we expect leaders to be led by followers’ preferences when, in a democracy—and ancient Athens purportedly was “the cradle of democracy”—leaders are elected to implement what citizens want done?

Oliver Wendell Holmes: “Life is painting a picture, not doing a sum.”

Is Justice Holmes simply saying that quality of life should be more important than the quantities of goods we accumulate? Aren’t the two related? Or is he saying something directly relevant to the education you’re receiving?

Agnes Martin: “Art is the concrete representation of our most subtle feelings.”

Why represent them at all? Doesn’t representation render them unsubtle and perhaps crass?

Aurelius Augustine: “Justice having been removed, what are kingdoms but gangs of criminals on a large scale? What are criminal gangs but petty kingdoms? A gang is a group of persons under the command of a leader, bound by an agreement or covenant that governs the association in which plunder is divided according to a constitution of sorts. . . . For the answer given by a captured pirate to Alexander the Great
was amusing but true. When great Alexander asked why the pirate terrorized seafarers, the latter boldly replied, suggesting that his purpose and Alexander’s were identical. When I do what I do with a small vessel, he noted, I am called a pirate. Because you do the same with a mighty navy, you are called an emperor.”

Does the anecdote prove Augustine’s point about government and larceny? If you were Alexander how would you respond to the pirate’s equation?

Emily Gill: “What is needed is a reformulation of the discourse of tolerance, a repoliticization that heightens our awareness of the difference between tolerance and justice.”

To distinguish between tolerance and justice, do we really need the “reformulation” that Gill summons? Why not simply say “tolerance” is therapeutic, a result of altered orientations or attitudes, whereas “justice” is political, a result of legislated or negotiated arrangements? So if leaders aspire to manage difference, should they invest more emphatically in therapies or in media strategies aimed to “reformulate the discourse of tolerance” to change hearts and minds or should they put greater effort into changing laws?

Martha Nussbaum: “Nations all over the world will soon be producing generations of useful, docile, technically trained machines rather than complete citizens who can think for themselves, criticize tradition, and understand the significance of another person’s sufferings and achievements.”

Nussbaum thinks that the humanities could and should serve as an antidote. Do you share Nussbaum’s distress? If docile citizens are useful and well-trained, should we object that somehow they are docile and therefore incomplete citizens? Is it fair to compare them with machines? How important is it for leaders to criticize tradition?

Harry Truman: “No formula, however scientific, will work without [people] of proper character responsible for . . . the administration of the laws.”

How do you determine “proper character”? Once you find those who have it, how do you convince powerful people or ordinary folks to give them administrative authority? Should they sense that the laws they are authorized to administer were not made by people of proper character, should they also be given the chance to change the laws?

Susan Sontag: “The photographer’s intentions do not determine the meaning of a photograph, which will have its own career, blown by the whims and loyalties of the diverse communities that have use for it.”

Nonsense? Aren’t the loyalties and disloyalties—as well as the whims—of communities determined by the images that artists/photographers give them? Isn’t the person behind the camera in control? Don’t the persons, factions, and media-moguls, who pay the freight, frame what viewers see? And doesn’t what we see shape how we think about wars, leaders, candidates, poverty, nobility?

-------------

--------
In this section of LDST 101, we’re going to raise these questions as well as others that you’ll find in the schedule portion of the syllabus **in bold print.** You’ll want to take special note of these **bold** questions, because they are good candidates for exam questions. But we ask them not because the answers lay at the foundation of leadership studies; the asking does. The conversations generated by our asking ought to draw our various likes and dislikes into the open, problematize some ideas we may take for granted, and prompt intriguing encounters with problems, with problem-solvers, and with a gaggle of issues we might otherwise have left unexplored.

We’ll start with several classics in the humanities that examine the caliber of leadership in various settings. Along the way, you’ll be asked to formulate opinions about the “dirty hands theory,” the usefulness of such terms as “charisma,” “populism,” “demagoguery,” and “faction,” as well as the propriety of propriety—whether (and when) leaders are well-advised to shock followers, represent followers (thereby following, to some extent [to what extent?] followers), or identify and honor conventions and conventional wisdom.

Then, we’ll review and assess the power of imagery and oratory before concluding with what I call “applications,” that is, we will take what we’ve learned about leadership and apply it to one of the pressing problems your generation will continually face, the problem of pluralism.

If this appeals and the work I’ll ask you to complete, which is detailed in the schedule below, doesn’t frighten you into another section or class, welcome !!!

**BUT . . . before you decide whether all this might be a good way to spend parts of your semester and strap yourselves into this course, check out to the next section on . . .**

**Requirements and Grades**

Lively, informed encounters with our questions, obviously, require your lively and informed participation in class discussions. “Require” means I expect it. I deduct points from the final grades of the participants who don’t meet that expectation—who are often absent and/or unfamiliar with assignments. 100 points are available. You’ll sit for 3 mid-term exams (each consisting of take home and in-class portions, Feb 15 (25 points); Mar 21 (25 points); April 13 (40 points). Your final exam is a short quiz (10 points) scheduled by the university--check the academic and exam calendars when posted on the website.

Students who miss a midterm due to illness (please obtain a physician’s note) or to deaths in the family, and students who miss a midterm to represent the university on the road may take the in-class portion within two weeks of the scheduled date. But please check your other courses. If they require curricular, co-curricular, or extra-curricular activities that conflict with the exam dates in my class, change sections or change courses to accommodate. Other classes’ assignments do **not** excuse you from my exams.

FYI, the class will not meet on the first and last days scheduled for LDST 101. You are off January 11 and April 20. But your attendance on January 13 is critical. We will be discussing our purposes and methods. I’m circulating this syllabus in advance, so if you have a conflict on Jan 13 or plan to be late returning to campus, change sections or courses. If you’re unable to do so or you pick up a seat vacated by another after the 13th, your final grade will reflect the miss; you’ll see your A+s become A-s, Bs become C+s, etc.
Several taboos and suggestions:

Taboos during class-time: late arrivals, early departures, mid-class breaks, laptops, multi-tasking.

Suggestions: You’ll be permitted to collaborate on the take-home portions of class, composing short essays in response to my prompts. Whether you decide to submit your essays solo or submit with a group of your colleagues (no more than 4, please), I suggest you maintain a small network to review notes, sift class hand-outs, and perhaps discuss likely questions regularly-----rather than on the days before the exams. I also suggest you consolidate the information/opinions provided in assignments, during discussions, and in my presentations every week. Identify what background information will assist you to articulate coherently your views on the issues discussed. One of my colleagues whose research targets best-practices in teaching and learning confirms that the sentences you compose, consolidating your notes, will “facilitate retrieval” come exam times. Adapting his advice, I suggest capturing and compressing your opinions each week along with information that will enable you to illustrate and argue for them (and argue against alternatives) on a single page.

Finally, I’m here to help. I’ll schedule review sessions and be available at your convenience, save for those weeks preceding the exams. At least five days in advance, email me the days and times you’re available, and I’ll try to accommodate your schedules. Finally, I’ll help with feedback on your written assignments. You’ll find ++s in the margins where your point of view is well formulated and supported; you’ll find +++ where you’ve been unclear or incoherent or where the information you supply doesn’t adequately support your argument or conclusion. And you’ll find XXs if your information is inaccurate.

You’ll be responsible for readings on electronic reserve as well as for all or assigned parts of books available for purchase at the student book store.

Thomas More, UTOPIA            C. Wright Mills, THE POWER ELITE

Niccolo Machiavelli, THE PRINCE        William Shakespeare, CORIOLANUS

William Chafe, CIVILITY AND CIVIL RIGHTS

George Bernard Shaw, SAINT JOAN           Robert Penn Warren, ALL THE KING’S MEN

Susan Sontag, REGARDING THE PAIN OF OTHERS

SO-- what do we do and when do we do it?

1/13 Aims and strategies. You might as well learn what I think I’m doing, so you can determine whether it’s something you think worth doing. So, for the first time, I’m assigning one of my papers, originally commissioned by a business school in the Netherlands and delivered at several universities before it was printed. Go to http://www.elgaronline.com/view/journals/lath/3-2/lath.2015.02.05.xml. Should you fail to access it there, google Leadership and the Humanities, then click volume 3, issue 2, and you should be able to download from a university computer (12 pp).
What is “the gymnastics argument” for a liberal arts education? Is it convincing? What is “transgressive teaching”? Do you think you’ll like it?

1/18  MLK-- no class

1/20  You’ll be prepared to discuss Robert Penn Warren’s ALL THE KING’S MEN. Yup, all of it, as noted during our holiday correspondence.

Chapter one introduces you to the governor, Willie Stark; chapter two flashes back to his first and frustrating campaign. What effect might the author have intended starting with Willie’s confrontation with Judge Irwin (pay close to attention to that!) and only then drilling into the governor’s past? What should we make of Jack Burden’s role? If you had to select one episode to feature in your summation, which would it be? Why? I’d pick the resignation of Hugh Miller; what’s disclosed there? How would you compare Burden with Adam Stanton? If you were asked what this novel was doing in a course on leadership and the humanities, how would you respond?

1/25  Read Mills’s POWER ELITE, chapters 1 (pp 3-13), 5, and 10-15. Watch Richard Nixon’s “Checkers Speech” on youtube.

Mills is known for having “step[ped] back from the conventional wisdom of mainstream politics” to offer “insights into inequality and hypocrisy in America.” Of course, odd bits of the 1950s—including Nixon’s speech as well as the assigned chapters—aren’t sufficient to give you an adequate picture of that “conventional political wisdom,” but with what you have, form a provisional idea about Mills’s insights—their accuracy and value for students of leadership in this new millennium. POWER ELITE’s reception was marked by controversy. The academic community was accustomed to extrapolating conclusions about status and social mobility from studies of local communities. Mills believed that local conditions no longer reflected the clusters of power in the United States. Decades before the information revolution, he predicted that networks of the privileged and powerful would dominate the media and determine the messages which would trickle down to local leadership. So instead of studying towns to understand the country, he combined investigation and intuition to compose his POWER ELITE. The alternative was to concentrate on local conditions to learn how Americans were behaving and what they were thinking. Socio-anthropologist W. Lloyd Warner was best known for leading research teams to Newburyport, Massachusetts where, for ten years, members conducted interviews and observed local commerce in all senses of that term, before publishing five volumes during the 1940s and 1950s on status, social class, ethnicity, labor, and “the symbolic life” of their subjects. We tend to depend on opinion polls, but, if you wanted to drill or dig deeper, would you prefer Mills’s or Lloyd Warner’s approach? Why?

1/27  Continuing with POWER ELITE.

Critics were quick to catch what Alan Wolfe calls Mills’s “tone of resigned bitterness.” Did you sense the bitterness? Would you agree with Wolfe that the tone, although grating at times, complements the substance of the argument and effectively prompts readers “to think about the kind of society they have and the kind of society they might want”? Assess the effectiveness of ELITE’s final three chapters; how would you distinguish “mood” and “morality” in the 1950s— as seen through Mills’s lens—from conservatism and political morality now?
Read Machiavelli, THE PRINCE, chapters 1-19.

It’s been said that, if you scratch C. Wright Mills, you’ll find Machiavelli’s PRINCE lurking beneath. Would you agree? Whether you do or don’t, to justify your opinion, you’d likely want to talk about factions and elites. With a little help from James Madison, I’ll be ready for that discussion. You can prepare by thinking about the role of factions, elites, and parties in contemporary politics.

Read THE PRINCE, chapters 20-26.

Machiavelli has been called the first political scientist; do you think that characterization fits? Why? Why not? If you were writing an essay on Machiavelli and trust, how would you begin? How would you conclude? If you were to select a single chapter of THE PRINCE to assign to your class, which one would you select? Why? Scholars agree that Machiavelli’s DISCOURSES ON LIVY show his republican (or populist) sympathies. His PRINCE, however, seems to be a sustained argument for absolutism. Of course, if you believe that his PRINCE is satire rather than political science, the case for his populism gathers momentum. Did you find elements of satire?

Read Thomas More’s UTOPIA, book 1; watch Robert Bolt’s MAN FOR ALL SEASONS—streaming arrangements to be announced.

On a scale of “incredibly naïve” to “sane and sensible,” where would you put Raphael Hythloday? Although Bolt’s play and the earlier version of it that I’ve scheduled—if you’re on your own, get or stream the Paul Scofield, not the Charlton Heston version—concentrates on events that occurred nearly twenty years after More wrote UTOPIA, one could say that More’s fate proved Hythloday something of a prophet. Would you so say? More, as history scholars among you will know, was caught in the controversies surrounding his king’s first and second marriages. King Henry VIII had gotten papal permission to marry his brother’s wife after her husband died. The two princes’ father, King Henry VII did not want to return Katherine of Aragon (and her dowry!!) to her parents, Isabella and Ferdinand. When Henry VIII again applied for papal permission to divorce Katherine and marry Anne Boleyn, Pope Clement VII refused. He needed to appease Katherine’s nephew Charles, whose troops had invaded what we now know as Italy and who, therefore, could either improve or remove the fortunes of the papacy and of Clement’s family, the Medici, in Florence. Yes, the same family you met last week. But the relevance of all this becomes clear only at the end of the film. How would you characterize More’s defense of the papacy? Does it make him seem more or less like Hythloday? How would Machiavelli have responded to Hythloday’s position on public service? How would Machiavelli have reviewed the film?

Read any consecutive twenty five pages of More’s UTOPIA, book 2.

Would you want to live in this utopia? Why? Why not? Was it a good or bad bargain for the utopians to trade some freedoms for social harmony and relief from hardship? Was More offering a blueprint? Was he something of a socialist? Was he more a satirist? If More, the author, is represented by More, the character in the book—if the opinions formulated by the latter reflected those of the former—why did he give so much “air time” to Hythloday? Be prepared to put both books of UTOPIA alongside the quote from Bynum at the front of the syllabus, and see what develops.
2/15

First Mid-term

2/17 Read Michael Walzer’s essay on the problem of “dirty hands,” electronic reserve.

Walzer opens his essay by reporting on a symposium about morality and war. Why? Does it help him make the case that it is impossible to govern innocently? Prussian Carl von Clausewitz was known to have said that war is the continuation of politics by other means. What might that mean? Could one argue that Walzer subscribes to that analysis? What does Walzer think about Machiavelli? Why does Walzer think leaders ought to feel guilty? Compare Walzer with some of our fictional friends: Willie Stark, Adam Stanton, and Hythloday.

2/22 Read George Bernard Shaw’s Preface to his play, SAINT JOAN and the play’s first five scenes.

In what ways did Joan shock those whom Shaw describes as “conventional people”? Would you call Joan “charismatic”? Why? Why not? At the start of the fifth scene, Joan seems to shun celebrity and “let[s] the king have all the glory.” Was she being disingenuous? How would you characterize Shaw’s depictions of Cauchon and Warwick? Sympathetic? Antagonistic?

2/24 Read the sixth scene of SAINT JOAN and the Epilogue.

What does the epilogue add to your understanding of charisma, celebrity, leadership, and legend? Could one argue that Ladvenu’s remarks in the Epilogue are critical to an understanding of Shaw’s interpretation of conventional political cultures? Do the play and preface help you respond to the questions that follow the quote from Yeats at the front of the syllabus?

2/29 Watch AGE OF INNOCENCE, arrangements to be announced, and read the chapters of AGE on electronic reserve.

Let’s begin today with Madame Olenska. What do you make of her? Is she as “shocking” as Joan? Did she “flout” society (more or less as Emerton Sillerton did) or attempt to ease her way into it? Why did conventional New York society find her so unconventional? One critic refers to her as “an unsettling other,” presumably because she “unsettles” Archer. Compare her to Archer’s wife, who may seem to be “simple” at first but who proves to be (you supply the adjective here). “Conventional” New York, for the purposes of this tale, is society’s upper tier as it existed during Wharton’s teenage years, the 1870s. “Old money” was constantly vigilant, trying to preserve its influence. Olenska is not the only threat in the novel; who else seems to threaten the elite? You’ll find the aristocracy competing for leadership in the first assignment after the break. Have you found it elsewhere in this course? Are “aristocrats,” “old money,” or the equivalent competing with emerging rivals for leadership in the cultures familiar to you? Who? Where? Scorcese clearly signals that we’ll be spending time in New York’s upper tier. Keep your eye on the opulence. One could argue it envelopes and traps attorney Archer? Might the trap be compared to the one you encountered in the lawyers’ lament quoted in your first assignment for this class?
Continuing with AGE OF INNOCENCE. But to prepare for today’s class, please watch another of Scorcese’s films (see the list below).

Why is the book called AGE OF INNOCENCE? The film is something of a departure for the filmmaker, Martin Scorcese. Watch one of his others to compare; check with the MRC or check your streaming capabilities for one of the following MEAN STREETS, TAXI DRIVER, RAGING BULL, GOODFELLAS, CAPE FEAR, CASINO, GANGS OF NEW YORK, THE DEPARTED, BOARDWALK EMPIRE (at least three episodes). What do you make of Newland Archer? As you’ll learn from one of the assigned chapters, he wants to find a world in which conventional terms, “wife” and “mistress,” don’t exist. Are his efforts to escape conventional terms comparable to Jack Burden’s? Are they comparable to those efforts of Scorcese’s other protagonists? Has Wharton created in Archer a tension between pragmatic and romantic souls; to what end? Finally, one word you’ll find associated with Scorcese’s films is “savagery”; look for it in whatever other film you elect to watch, but also look for it in AGE OF INNOCENCE as well. It’s more subtle, to be sure, so would you substitute another term for “savage” or “savagery”? What episode best illustrates the savagery--or (supply your term)?

Spring break

Read Shakespeare’s CORIOLANUS, Act 1 and watch the film, arrangements to be announced.

How does the film, at its start, differ from the play’s first act? What’s missing? What’s added? What difference do the changes make in your interpretation of the text / film? When the play begins you get a glimpse of the growing pains of the young republic. Republican Rome became a model for the early American political theorists and many patricians who thought fondly of the so-called “founding fathers”--remember the pictures in Judge Irwin’s office. Shakespeare, whose Coriolanus built on the story included in Plutarch’s gallery of Greek and Roman rogues and rulers, attends to objections that surfaced when the plebeians or commoners were granted representation in the senate. See if you’re able to catch Coriolanus’ objections to letting the “crows” fly with the “eagles.” And watch also for Shakespeare’s take on the tribunes, Brutus and Sicinius. Does he consider them honorable men? Were they protecting and/or defining the ordinary citizens’ interests?

Read CORIOLANUS, the second and third acts.

The first word Martius--soon to be Coriolanus--utters is “Thanks,” yet it could be argued that the play is about ingratitude. Would you agree? Were the citizens ungrateful? Was Coriolanus ungrateful? As Coriolanus leaves Rome at the end of the third act, we hear/read: “Despising for you the city, thus I turn my back; there is a world elsewhere.” If the play ended there, what difference would it make in your evaluation of his leadership? He is called “too noble” and “too absolute”; would you agree with either or both? Why? Why not? Relate the play to the quotes from Thucydides and Truman at the front of the syllabus. Does Shakespeare help you answer the questions that follow those quotes in bold font?

3/21 second mid term
3/23  Watch the film CRASH, arrangements to be announced; read Robert Frost's poem “MENDING WALL,” appended to this syllabus.

Do these assignments help you identify, unscramble, and perhaps even resolve the problems related to pluralism and assimilation that face leaders in your generation? What do those terms (“p” and “a”) mean to you? While helping to mend the wall, Frost's speaker doubts the value of its existence. What do you make of that?

3/28  Youtube and listen to the speeches delivered at the 2004 Democratic National Convention by Barak Obama and Al Sharpton; read Sontag's REGARDING THE PAIN OF OTHERS, chapters 1-3 and 6-9; read Jarrell's “DEATH OF THE BALL TURRET GUNNER,” appended to the syllabus.

Have photographs of the kind Sontag discusses numbed us to human suffering and injustice? Would we be mistaken to call much of the photography she interprets “documentary” or “journalism”? And if so, why? Are Sontag's claims about photographs as emblems and spectacles justifiable? “Indecency” is a word Sontag uses to characterize the “co-spectatorship” or collaboration between photographers and viewers. Is it a fair characterization? What bearing does it have on leadership? Review Sontag's remark quoted on page 2 of the syllabus. Does it make more sense now that you've read her book? Google Goya's THIRD OF MAY and some of Roger Fenton's photographs before assessing Sontag's point about “taking photographs” and “making pictures.” How would you relate the quotes from Oliver Wendell Holmes and Agnes Martin (at the front of the syllabus) to what Sontag says about photography? Return to the old saw—“a picture is worth a thousand words”—and, by comparing REGARDING THE PAIN to Jarrell's poem, tell me if that old saw still cuts. Then compare Sontag's REGARDING to Sharpton's and Obama's oratory, and return to that “old saw”; still cutting? And, finally, compare Sharpton's speech to Obama's. Do they confront the problems of pluralism and assimilation similarly? Differently?


Was the evidence that Klarman presented for his “thesis” sufficient to persuade you of its validity? Can we call a movement non-violent, if it deliberately incites others' violence? From the article and film, pick four persons, events, or phrases you’d use to “headline” your explanation of leadership’s successes and failures during the civil rights crises of the 1950s and 1960s. Relate the explanation you’ve formulated to the quote from Emily Gill at the front of the syllabus.

4/4  Read Chafe’s CIVILITY AND CIVIL RIGHTS, the introduction and first five chapters.

What is “the progressive mystique”? Illustrate your answer by using the Pearsall Plan and the strategies employed by Governor Hodges?

Justice Thomas agreed with the majority opinion, which struck down integration programs in Seattle and Louisville. A footnote to his opinion claims that “nothing but an interest in classroom aesthetics and a hypersensitivity to elite sensibilities justifies . . . racial balancing programs.” He disagreed with dissenting justices who argued that “benign race-based decisions” were permissible to repair damage done by what Justice Breyer called “stubborn facts of history [that] linger,” to the great disadvantage of African-Americans. Do you agree with Thomas that there are no “benign race-based decisions”? Is Thomas or Breyer the more astute interpreter of the problems related to pluralism? What might you identify as the most compelling parts of Thomas’s argument? The most objectionable? If you were a justice, would you vote for government remedies to de facto segregation? Or would you concur with Thomas and the majority in the Seattle case that legal remedies should apply only to discrimination, which can be closely connected to laws denying minorities equal protection that was guaranteed by the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution, that is de jure segregation.


Brown is disappointed because “human rights take their shape as a moral discourse centered on pain and suffering rather than [a] political discourse of comprehensive justice.” In her view, this is a choice that renders human rights activists all but powerless. Does she make her case? What remedy does she suggest? Relate what Brown says about human rights to what we learned about civil rights activism as well as to our discussion of oratory and imagery? Then relate all that to the Gill and Nussbaum quotes at the front of the syllabus.

4/13  **final mid-term**


Has “current consumer culture” invaded our University? If so, should we beat it back or welcome it? What does Edmundson find so disagreeable about college classrooms? About students’ end-of-term evaluations? About commencement addresses? What do you find distasteful--or even distressing?
Something there is that doesn't love a wall
That sends the frozen-ground-swell under it,
And spills the upper boulders in the sun,
And makes gaps even two can pass abreast.
The work of hunters is another thing:
I have come after them and made repair
Where they have left not one stone on a stone,
But they would have the rabbit out of hiding,
To please the yelping dogs. The gaps I mean,
No one has seen them made or heard them made,
But at spring mending-time we find them there.
I let my neighbor know beyond the hill;
And on a day we meet to walk the line
And set the wall between us once again.
We keep the wall between us as we go.
To each the boulders that have fallen to each.
And some are loaves and some so nearly balls
We have to use a spell to make them balance:
'Stay where you are until our backs are turned!'
We wear our fingers rough with handling them.
Oh, just another kind of out-door game,
One on a side. It comes to little more:
There where it is we do not need the wall:
He is all pine and I am apple orchard.
My apple trees will never get across
And eat the cones under his pines, I tell him.
He only says, 'Good fences make good neighbors'.
Spring is the mischief in me, and I wonder
If I could put a notion in his head:
'Why do they make good neighbors? Isn't it
Where there are cows?
But here there are no cows.
Before I built a wall I'd ask to know
What I waswalling in or walling out,
And to whom I was like to give offence.
Something there is that doesn't love a wall,
That wants it down.' I could say 'Elves' to him,
But it's not elves exactly, and I'd rather
He said it for himself. I see him there
Bringing a stone grasped firmly by the top
In each hand, like an old-stone savage armed.
He moves in darkness as it seems to me~
Not of woods only and the shade of trees.
He will not go behind his father's saying,
And he likes having thought of it so well
He says again, "Good fences make good neighbors."

Robert Frost’s **MENDING WALL**
Randall Jarrell’s **THE DEATH OF THE BALL TURRET GUNNER**

From my mother's sleep I fell into the State,
And I hunched in its belly till my wet fur froze.
Six miles from earth, loosed from its dream of life,
I woke to black flak and the nightmare fighters.
When I died they washed me out of the turret with a hose.

---
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*Awarding of Credit*
To be successful in this course, a student should expect to devote 10-14 hours each week, including class time and time spent on course-related activities.
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