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EDITORIAL STATEMENT

Since this is the inaugural issue of IMPACT: The Journal of the Center for Interdisciplinary Teaching & Learning, it is fitting to ask why one would launch an online journal devoted to essays on interdisciplinary teaching and research. It’s not as if there’s a dearth of academic periodicals in general, or even interdisciplinary journals in particular. But most of the latter are interdisciplinary within a specific subject area, such as Victorian studies, European studies, or ethics, while IMPACT explores interconnections among all disciplines. The main purpose of IMPACT is to highlight teaching and research practices that effectively bring together two or more disciplines in a mutually illuminating fashion.

Faculty and administrators at the College of General Studies, Boston University, have decided to launch an online journal for essays and book reviews on interdisciplinary teaching and research because we have witnessed the effectiveness of both in our program for decades. The College of General Studies (CGS) is a two-year, team-taught, interdisciplinary general education program. We emphasize interdisciplinary connections both within and among our core courses. For instance, our freshman Humanities sequence (Humanities 101 and 102, Traditions in the Humanities and Breaks with Traditions in the Humanities) surveys literature, art, architecture and music from Ancient Greece to the 21st century over the course of a year and includes a film studies component. We do not analyze these various art forms as separate subjects; instead we view them as intimately interconnected cultural expressions that often reflect very similar aesthetic and epistemological perspectives. Similarly, Social Science 101, Introduction to the Social Sciences, introduces students to methodologies of sociology, anthropology, political science, economics and history and then employs these methodologies in the second semester in an analysis of the modernization of the west. But our courses reach beyond even these broad disciplinary fields. Because we teach on teams in which 80 students share the same professors for a whole year (in both the freshman and sophomore years), we can easily make connections in our lectures and discussion to what students are studying in their other courses, something that is impossible to do in most general education programs in which students aren’t sharing the same classes and professors. Students themselves often leap to make connections between their courses even before we can, which is exactly what we want to see. It is extremely rewarding to watch students light up when they realize that something they just discussed in Natural Science informs something they are now discussing in Humanities, or something they were discussing in Rhetoric informs what they are now looking at in Social Science. These are the “light bulb” moments when you realize that students are not only learning new material, but they are learning it well enough to apply it, and they are excited about their capacity to do so. Naturally we would like to construct our lectures, discussions and assignments to maximize such moments. We have found many ways to do so through joint essay assignments and Capstone projects, informal references to each other’s courses in discussions and lectures, and the use of ePortfolios to encourage students to reflect on their interdisciplinary learning over the course of two years. We would like to share these approaches with a larger audience because we have seen their success, and we would like to learn from the successful interdisciplinary practices of others. This is why we have launched IMPACT as one of the initiatives of our new Center for Interdisciplinary Teaching & Learning (www.bu.edu/cgs/center-for-interdisciplinary-teaching-learning).
Teaching in an interdisciplinary program has led many of us to be more interdisciplinary in our research as well. I first began using a gender studies approach in my Victorian literary criticism because I was influenced by the readings on gender that were used in Social Science 101, readings that had been the basis of joint Social Science/Humanities essay assignments on my teams for years. Later, I began to write on correlations between Dickens and Darwin due to the focus on Darwin in the Natural Science sequence. Many other professors at CGS have had similar experiences. We have found that bringing the insights of a new discipline to bear on a discipline with which we are familiar pushes our thinking further with very productive results. That is why we also want to highlight in IMPACT scholarly research and creative non-fiction essays that demonstrate the rich potential of such interdisciplinary cross-fertilization.

Since we are publishing authors from a wide range of disciplines, we do not require a set documentation style but instead ask authors to use the style prevalent in their field. And since we hope to reach readers from many different disciplines, we favor essays and book reviews that are relatively free of jargon and readable to an audience of educated generalists. We hope that IMPACT: The Journal of the Center for Interdisciplinary Teaching & Learning will offer readers practical strategies that they can model while also illuminating new ways of thinking about subjects both familiar and unfamiliar. In short, we hope that IMPACT will, in fact, have a positive impact on teaching and research, and we welcome our readers to join our endeavor by submitting an essay or book review at http://CITL.submishmash.com/submit. All submissions will be eligible for our annual IMPACT BEST ESSAY AWARD, which includes publication and a prize of $250.

Natalie McKnight, Editor, IMPACT
The Capstone Project of The College of General Studies, Boston University

ROBERT WEXELBLATT
College of General Studies, Boston University

Charlie Chaplin used to entertain at dinner parties by taking requests for impressions of the famous and notorious: Woodrow Wilson, Harry Lauder, Al Capone. One evening somebody called out “Enrico Caruso!” and Chaplin perfectly executed a Puccini aria. When the applause died down, a starlet sidled up. “Oh, Mr. Chaplin,” she fawned, “that was simply marvelous. I’d no idea you’ve such a wonderful voice.” Chaplin replied, “But, my dear, I don’t. I was just imitating Caruso.”

The College of General Studies has concluded its two-year program with a project called the Capstone since 1977. The durability of this enterprise is owing to the commitment of an interdisciplinary faculty, the continuity of the project’s form, and the yearly renovation of its content. Equally important, in my opinion, is that the project reports are founded on a fiction, on students “imitating Caruso,” so to speak. In resolving the intractable problems posed by each year’s project syllabus students must pretend to be policy makers, legislators, or advocates and judges in a court of law.

The College is about to celebrate its sixtieth anniversary. The idealism and experimental spirit that animated its original faculty found expression in a final project in which groups of six to eight sophomores summed up what they had learned by formulating plans for a utopian society. This Utopia Project took up most of the fourth and last semester of the program, fully seven weeks. Students prepared lengthy project reports; some offered visual presentations, wrote plays or film scripts. The Utopia Project persisted until the end of the 1960s by which time a plurality of the faculty concluded that the project had turned utopian in the worst sense, losing touch with reality and becoming as loose and vaporous as the Aquarian visions of that giddy time. This was the epoch when one academic curmudgeon groused that he had become exasperated with puerile colleagues who “lived each day as if it were their first.”

Pendulums being what they are, the next phase in the Project’s history was overreaction. The social scientists and historians, out of all patience with utopianism, threatened to withdraw from the Project unless it were changed into something “data-based,” as they put it. They got their way and formulated a project whose feet were deep in cement. Their new project was so thoroughly encrusted with hard data that they themselves became disgusted with it after a couple of years. What they had instituted was called The City-Planning Project: a seven-week period after which students were to issue a planning document with a 100-page minimum founded on data supplied to them that described an “imaginary American city.” Because not all sophomores are “wise fools,” many figured out that the imaginary city was Boston, went to City Hall, secured copies of the city’s own planning documents, and turned in canned, excruciatingly dull papers which were indeed a hundred pages long. Like a bridge thrown up with unreinforced concrete, The City-Planning Project collapsed under its own weight.
At this point, in the early 70s, while the nation was leaving Vietnam and entering a recession, the College got a new dean. While the dean was inclined to continue the tradition of ending the program with some sort of final research project he was unsure how to save it. The College’s three sophomore divisions were bitterly divided; there was no agreement on topics, grading, format or even if a final project was a good thing. The Dean assigned the conundrum to a just-tenured member of his faculty who had never taught in the second year of the program. What emerged was The Capstone Project.

It was clear that some aspects of prior practice deserved to be retained: the small-group research teams, a written product, and an oral defense. What obviously needed reformulation were grading procedures, the length of both the project period and the papers, the topic, and also the relation between the project and the College’s core curriculum. Neither utopianism nor city-planning was well connected to what students had been learning. The sophomore humanities courses were chiefly focused on Western ethical philosophy, the natural science courses on biology, while the social science sequence examined modernization in the Soviet Union and China, then U.S. foreign policy after World War Two. To last, any new project would need to give each of the three divisional faculties an equal stake in the thing. The divisions had never been equally committed to the final project; all offered different credit for the Project in computing semester grades, from 10% of the semester grade in one course to 35% in another. The Utopia Project had been viewed as the property of the humanists, city-planning of the social scientists, the natural scientists never liked having any project at all, and nobody was inclined to return to utopia or a future Boston.

On the theory that in any seven-week project sophomores could be counted on to waste three, the new Capstone Project was limited to four weeks, with two more for oral defenses. The increased time for instruction gave the second semester greater substance, which pleased everyone. The length of the students’ reports was changed in the spirit of an instructive comment Pascal appended to one of his missives: “I have made this letter longer than usual, because I lack the time to make it short.” Instead of the 100-page minimum of former projects, the Capstone would insist on the discipline of a 50-page maximum, not counting appendices, graphs, end-notes, or bibliographies. A common value of 25% of the semester grade in all three courses was negotiated, big enough to matter but not so large as to alter fates. In the earlier projects, everyone in a given group received the same grade, a fact which sometimes exasperated students and frustrated faculty. Many students, particularly the best ones, are not unreasonably anxious about tying their grades to the efforts of the less diligent. The Capstone’s solution was to assign individual grades for the Project which would be made up of three components: the students’ research papers had, of course, to receive a single group grade, but individual grades could be assigned for the oral defense and something called “participation.” The latter grade functions as a means of achieving justice, a fudge-factor; it has no fixed percentage. The apprehension of dedicated students and the laziness of indifferent ones are both mitigated when they are told that, should they know of a group member who did no work but whose colleagues wrote a fine report, the deserving would be rewarded and the slacker punished as he or she merited. In a case where only two or three students did all the work and the report was consequently mediocre, the pluggers could be given grades higher than that merited by the report while those who let their colleagues down would receive grades lower than that assigned the report. This worked well because the taboo against ratting out classmates does not hold up over
four weeks of betrayal. In addition, at the end of the oral examinations, students are requested to fill in confidential evaluations of one another on their contributions to the work of the group. The psychological effect of this evaluation and the participation grade proved salutary for both faculty and students as it overcame one of the objections to doing a group project at all. In practice, there have been few instances in which extreme measures have had to be invoked. In fact, when students are asked to write out evaluations of themselves and their peers, most are quick to praise one another. The Capstone Project, it turns out, is an excellent occasion for making friends, if not invariably for keeping them. Relationships that begin as professional often grow into something warmer. In addition to these procedural innovations, the Capstone Project included two substantive ones.

The first change was to introduce the Charlie Chaplin approach of a fiction, inviting students to pursue problem-solving in imaginary, non-academic, real-world contexts: the proposal of programs, policies, legislation, the preparation of legal briefs and court opinions, or debates before Congressional committees. These formats, program design or adversary argumentation, change students’ perception of what they are doing. The Capstone is not to be simply another term paper or year-end task whose purpose is to do research for its own sake, to prove that one can do it. Instead, research becomes for the students what it is in other contexts, something one does in order to accomplish something else: solve a problem, resolve a policy dispute, or win a legal case. Whichever approach students elect, they are encouraged to identify with their roles as policy advisors, lawmakers, or advocates, to address their proposals to the proper authorities, or to argue on behalf of clients and, serving as arbiters or judges, to render a decision and justify it. Groups have indeed identified with their roles. Some, who have worked out policy proposals or legislative ideas, have forwarded them to actual authorities. One group, for example, changed a school district’s policy on the use of the drug Ritalin by sending their report to its superintendent and school board. The group determined that long-term side-effects of the drug were serious and that identical benefits could be obtained through controlling diet. Others have gotten so deeply into their roles that they had difficulty stepping out of them. For example, one group divided into two legal teams arguing a landmark case on the non-disclosure contracts common with technology firms, and both became so convinced of their positions they were unable to act as impartial judges. They even began to behave toward one with the acerbity of opposing lawyers, but all their competitive hostility resulted in the submission of a terrific paper. (At the faculty’s suggestion, the case was resolved by flipping a coin.)

The second reform was to devise a new topic for the Project itself, something superior to utopia or city-planning, one that could secure the enthusiastic commitment of the entire faculty. The solution here was to choose an umbrella topic that was truly interdisciplinary without being vague, that could generate a wide variety of research topics and papers, and that would reflect the curriculum the students had just completed. The first Capstone Project in 1977 was focused on twenty-odd foreign policy issues. Foreign policy had been the subject of the social science course, but the issues selected for the project syllabus required scientific knowledge (e.g., nuclear deterrence versus disarmament) and all involved ethical disagreements (e.g., human rights versus national security). It quickly became clear that the formula for a good Capstone topic was to discover contemporary issues which could be readily researched and on which experts disagreed. In short, we would ask sophomores to devote a month to resolving problems with which the society was contending. The best paper I received that first year took on the
diplomatic tangle of the Middle East. The students imagined themselves in the new Carter State Department, researched the history of the region, examined past U.S. policy, assessed the current one, and proposed the essential elements of the Camp David Accords signed by Israel and Egypt two years later. The real-world principals received Nobel Prizes; the students got A’s.

The Foreign Policy Project was a hit with both students and faculty. However, the final reform came as a surprise to the latter. This was a recommendation from the project chairman that the theme of foreign policy not be repeated. One of the drawbacks of prior projects had been to repeat them which heightened the possibility of plagiarism, faculty boredom, and the sense that all three divisions were not equally engaged. So, the final reform was to assign the responsibility for writing each year’s syllabus to a different departmental faculty, with the obligation rotating annually among philosophers, historians, and biologists. As each syllabus would have to be approved by the faculties of all three departments, its interdisciplinary nature would be assured. Fresh areas of inquiry could be chosen annually and the project could respond nimbly to changing faculty interests and contemporary controversies. Over the years, the Capstone Project has focused on such diverse areas as Education Reform, Free Speech, Mass Media, Ecology, National Security, Information Technology, Legacies of the Cold War, Multiculturalism, the Genetics Revolution, and Human Rights. The bottle remains the same, but the wine changes annually.

The scheduling of the Project has been optimally worked out over the years. During the first week, the three faculty charged with directing from sixteen to twenty groups meet twice with each group of students. Faculty and students already know one another well. The College’s team system keeps the three faculty and their students together for the full year. The students must arrive at the first session with a written paper identifying their topic and format, including the “fiction” behind their project report. The faculty must approve both and this meeting is devoted to making sure the topics are appropriate, sufficiently narrowed to be accomplished in a month yet broad enough to be worthy of four weeks’ work. The faculty also begin to guide student research, suggesting sources and sending representatives of each group for a guided tour of the appropriate resources of the University’s libraries. The College collaborates closely with the research staff of the library, who receive a copy of the project syllabus early on and report looking forward to working on it every year. At the second meeting, students must bring a preliminary bibliography and outline. The purpose of the third formal meeting, in the second week, is to approve a final outline and bibliography. We have learned the wisdom of “front-loading” student efforts, not just to get them involved as deeply and rapidly as possible, but to leave plenty of time for writing and editing at the end. Students tend to think the quality of their reports will depend on their research whereas the usual difference between outstanding and mediocre reports lies in the writing and editing. After the third scheduled meeting the students are pretty much on their own, seeing the faculty, who remain available daily, as they require, and, of course, contacting their professors by e-mail. This loosening of supervision in the latter part of the month works well. All reports are due on the same day and there are no extensions. The College makes a ceremonial occasion of the submission of project reports by holding a final assembly and giving out awards and scholarships. It is a wonderful half-hour. The students are weary but decidedly exhilarated, proud of their efforts and of their peers who have won merit scholarships. What have they learned?
In common with other problem-based learning exercises, the Capstone Project has two agendas, the hidden one being carried out by fulfillment of the visible. Students will focus, of course, on their particular topics—the juvenile justice system, monitoring of computer use, the rights of non-human species, prosecution of war crimes, the funding of public broadcasting, the preservation of biodiversity, etc. They will strive to state a problem, gather the pertinent facts about it, including its history and the range of opinion among those who dispute its solution; then, based on this research, they will formulate a decision or recommendation, show how it can be implemented, determine its implications, justify and defend their choices politically, economically, scientifically, and ethically. Meanwhile, their faculty supervisors will ensure that they appreciate the perspectives of various disciplines in assessing the problem and evaluating solutions. For sophomores in a general education program, taking mostly broad survey courses, the Capstone Project provides an experience of intensively focused and extensively ranging research on a single problem, leading them to scholarly books, peer-reviewed journals, Internet sources, and occasionally, once they are prepared, interviews with experts. Research done for its own sake is not only less exciting but less instructive than research aimed at a particular end. Students who are playing the roles of policy-makers or attorneys quickly realize what they need to know and, with the aid of the faculty, become adept at evaluating the credibility of sources. The two-hour oral defense enables students to articulate their opinions about an issue on which a month’s research has usually made them more expert than the faculty. This boosts students’ confidence and prepares them to think on their feet.

My favorite project story has to do with the expertise achieved by students. One year a group chose to write on the risk of using antibiotics on livestock causing resistance, making the drugs useless for both cattle and human beings. As it happened, a bill, H.R. 3804, had been introduced into the House of Representatives that year and the faculty suggested they research the issue, examine the bill, and prepare a report in the form of a debate on whether the legislation ought to be passed or not. Their paper was excellent, well reasoned, exhaustively researched, and lucidly written. They received a prize for it. The prize was awarded the following October. On this occasion I spoke to one of the students in the group, a bright, extremely shy young woman. She said she had a story I might like to hear. She had secured an internship for the summer in the office of her local Congressman and took up her work in D.C. just a week after the oral examination. She reported being anxious about whatever tasks would be assigned to her. On her first day, she was given half a cubicle and nothing at all to do. Late in the day, the chief of staff came by to say the Congressman would like her to sit in for him at a dinner that night. She was alarmed, picturing herself at a small party with Important People who, unlike her, knew what they were about. “No, no,” the chief of staff assured her when she expressed her misgivings. “All you have to do is fill a chair at a big dinner, like at the Oscars.” He gave her an address and told her to be there at 8 p.m. She took a cab and was alarmed when it pulled up in front of a townhouse in Georgetown. Indeed, it was her nightmare. The party included two Congressmen, their chiefs of staff, several senior staff members, and her twenty-year-old self. She said she didn’t open her mouth once, until the soup was served. It was over the soup that one of the Congressmen mentioned to the table that H.R. 3804 was due to be voted on the following week. “I don’t know a thing about it,” he admitted. “Do any of you?” Nobody did. So, bravely but filled with trepidation, the ex-sophomore quietly said, “I do.” Everyone looked down the table at her, “as if noticing me for the first time.” Having just prepared so well for her oral defense, she still remembered not only every provision of H.R.
3804 but all of the statistics she and her group had gathered. “I spoke for half-an-hour,” she confessed. “You could almost hear jaws hitting the table. It was like...a dream.” The next morning, she found a huge bouquet of flowers at her cubicle and the Congressman himself ran over to see her. “I’ve been getting calls all morning asking where I found this genius.” When I asked her, the young woman admitted that she did not tell her boss that H.R. 3804 was the only bill she knew anything about. “But,” she said with a sly smile, “I was treated like a queen all summer.”

In addition to such gratifying and confidence-fortifying expertise another item on the Project’s hidden agenda is to require students to carry out the sort of cooperative effort that is increasingly a feature of both upper-level courses and the American workplace. Much of the world’s work, it turns out, takes the form of a Capstone Project. Alumni of the College frequently mention the value of the group work, with all its trials, errors, and triumphs, calling it an invaluable asset in their subsequent careers, both academic and professional. They learn division of labor, delegation, responsibility to others, the tact and diplomacy of what is called group dynamics, the significance of deadlines, and the joys of editing one another’s prose.

The Project has another benefit, which is motivation. At the end of a two-year program, at a moment when many students would succumb to exhaustion or ennui if faced with yet another month of lectures, readings, tests, and discussions, the Capstone Project provides students and faculty with a change of pace. Instead of being enervated, students are energized. It has been observed that many students who have performed at only a mediocre level when working on their own come to the fore and excel during the Project period. In fact, most students claim not only that they have worked hard on their reports but that they have worked harder on them than on anything else in their lives. In part, this is owing to their allegiance to the group, to an esprit de corps. The emotional involvement students feel from intense, long-term, small-group work can give rise to volatility, but more often results in high levels of commitment and achievement. Not surprisingly, the Project looms large in the memories of the College’s alumni. Almost all remember and love to talk about it. Some change their majors or careers because of it.

The Capstone Project confers several benefits on the faculty. First, there is the pleasure of working with motivated students doing careful research on a topic of their own choosing. Second, there is the changed relationship between students and teachers during the Project period. The faculty serve as coaches for the first four weeks and judges during the oral defenses. They learn from students who carry out research they might not have the time to do themselves. There is also delight in working closely with colleagues from other disciplines, from a cooperation as stimulating as it is broadening. Finally, there is the intellectual challenge of the Project itself. In a core program, courses change little from year to year, but the Capstone Project changes annually. The faculty who prepare each year’s syllabus carry out research directly related to their teaching and current events. Like their students, they do so collectively. The Project strengthens and deepens faculty relationships.

As each year’s syllabus declares, the Capstone Project’s name derives from the final block placed on top of a construction project to tie the whole structure together. In the language of the building trades, each layer of brick is called a “course.” The Capstone Project is the final
course undertaken by students at the College of General Studies; it caps two years of study. With classes ended and final examinations taken, the Project refreshes faculty and students when they most need it, deepens their relationships, gives them a focus and a goal, serves up challenges and joys that replace the routine of classes and lectures. The Project is scheduled at the end of the College’s two-year program not only to revivify flagging energies, but because interdisciplinary work is best executed after prior mastery of the disciplines. With what they have appropriated in the way of knowledge and skills, students identify with their roles during the Project, throw themselves into their research, and are often amazed by how much can be learned by a small band of sophomores devoting themselves to a single task for four weeks. In the end, if all of the College’s students do not sing as beautifully as Enrico Caruso, most do it quite as well as Charlie Chaplin.
A Triangulated Pedagogy for Deep Learning Practices

FRED WALDSTEIN
Wartburg College

The purpose of this essay is to explore the value and challenges of a pedagogy identified as “Triangulated Learning” used in disciplinary and interdisciplinary college courses as a means to effectively promote deep and integrative learning within a particular context—an interdisciplinary leadership course taught by the author.

Deep Learning

There is much commentary in academe and beyond about the need for education which provides students with “deep learning,” learning which encourages students to learn for the sake of understanding meaning rather than “surface learning” in which learning is viewed primarily as an exercise in reproducing information. Space constraints limit a more comprehensive discussion of deep and integrative learning, but multiple sources on this subject are readily available (e.g., Nelson Laird, et al; Tagg).

Deep “quality of learning” indices have been acknowledged as providing appropriate guidance for establishing learning goals for the 21st century student. One of the more recent and broadly disseminated iterations of this trend is the report, “College Learning for the New Global Century,” published by the American Association of Colleges & Universities (the AAC&U). The essential learning outcomes identified by the AAC&U include: critical and creative thinking skills, civic knowledge and engagement, and integrative learning. According to the AAC&U report, “Research on the benefits of active and engaged learning is voluminous,” and it cites an extensive list of published research (58, note 15).

Triangulated Learning and its components

While few would dispute the apparent superiority of deep learning over surface learning, the challenge is to create pedagogies which encourage it, and assessment tools which measure it. One effort toward this end is the development of a pedagogy we call Triangulated Learning (TL) which relies on three interdependent elements:

• Traditional Learning: Knowledge based on expertise such as scholarly works to bear on the subject matter at hand.

• Peer Learning: Knowledge based on shared reflection with peers through dialectical reasoning.

• Experiential Learning & Service-Learning: Knowledge based on personal experiences. Service-learning is a subset of experiential learning. (For the sake of brevity, “experiential learning” is used throughout to include service-learning unless there is a specific need to distinguish between the two.)
Traditional learning is the form of learning with which we are most familiar. Typically it is comprised of assigned readings accompanied with lectures by the instructor who has expertise in the field and can provide insight into the subject matter and help the student attain greater mastery of the material. Most of our educational infrastructure, both physical and pedagogical, has been designed to accommodate traditional learning. Consequently, it is relatively efficient to deliver. The lecture halls exist and the reading assignments are readily available. Beyond that, there is much for the student to gain by exposure to the developed cannon under the guidance of one with expertise in the field.

Peer learning offers students the opportunity to share perspectives and insights. The philosophical underpinnings for the value of peer learning can be found in the work of the Brazilian educator, Paulo Freire, and his development of dialogical education. Triangulated Learning embraces Freire’s belief that the educational process is dependent upon the extent to which individuals commit to the idea of mutual co-inquiry. Dialogical education as postulated by Freire assumes that all co-inquirers, instructors and students alike, have knowledge and experiences which, if tapped properly, can contribute to deepened understanding among all participants. The learning environment is one in which there is a sense of reciprocity and co-dependence based on mutual respect and civility that has the potential to maximize the learning that can take place. Peer learning emphasizes, first, the importance of individuals taking responsibility for and ownership of their learning (the role of learner), and second, taking responsibility for their role in helping their peers maximize their learning experiences (the role of instructor).

Experiential learning and service-learning represent juxtaposition of both the oldest and among the most contemporary pedagogical approaches. The American philosopher and psychologist John Dewey noted that the fundamental nature of education in “primitive,” pre-literate societies is experiential in nature. Observation and replication are the means through which the inexperienced learn from the experienced in these societies. It is only as civilization becomes more complex and the use of symbols in language, enumeration, and the arts and sciences allows for the accumulation, storage, and retrieval of knowledge independent of experience that experience is no longer sufficient as the sole means for educating the inexperienced. Dewey argued that the scales in the western educational tradition tipped too far away from experience and that a better balance was needed. This “disconnect” between education and experience created an educational environment that for many learners was abstract and devoid of relevance other than as a credentialing mechanism necessary to attain what the student wants to achieve in the “real world.” Service-learning as a subset of experiential learning, engages students in active service that meets a real community need within an educational context (formal or informal) that includes reflection on how the service activity meets learning goals, and how the learning goals meet the needs of those to whom the service is provided.

Each of these elements can be and frequently is practiced independently of the others. It is the interdependence of traditional learning, peer learning, and experiential learning that has the potential to create a rich environment for deep learning. But this requires intentionality in the alignment of all sides of the triangle. The triangle need not be equilateral. However, the shape should reflect the emphasis placed on each side within any given course’s context.
Challenges of Triangulated Learning and efforts to address them

Combining the three elements of Triangulated Learning does not guarantee a deep learning experience. Indeed, if not done with intentionality and care it can be a source of confusion that is counterproductive to the learning experience. We will look at some of the challenges which each element poses, and offer suggestions about how these challenges have been addressed in course environments. Given the interdependent nature of successfully integrating Triangulated Learning, there is some redundancy in the challenges across the three sides of the triangle and how the challenges are addressed.

Traditional learning should provide a common theoretical framework for students in the course. But a challenge associated with traditional learning in many course settings is identifying scholarly work that is meaningful to the students so they can appreciate that the material they are asked to master is relevant to them and that encourages them to take ownership of it. This is most effectively accomplished when the traditional learning has clear relevance and application to the peer learning and experiential learning elements of the course. One useful strategy is to ask students to think of Triangulated Learning as they might think of a science course which includes both lecture and laboratory sections. The laboratory in this instance is the experiential learning setting. This requires the identification of traditional learning materials that are easily associated with the peer learning and experiential learning elements of the course.

The factors which are relevant for a meaningful service-learning, experiential learning occurrence are in some ways the mirror image of those associated with traditional learning. The experiences, whatever they may be, must allow the students to make connections to the theoretical framework developed and the scholarly materials assigned in the traditional learning environment. The more the students are able to make connections between their experiential learning and the traditional learning materials the more likely they are to value both elements. The traditional learning material encourages students to make meaning of activities as more than discreet events in ways that encourage them to integrate experience and traditional learning as active learners. Experiential learning also has the capacity to enhance peer learning. This requires a kind of balancing act. On the one hand, the experiential learning activities must provide enough commonalities among students so that they are able to generate meaningful discussion within whatever theoretical context is being explored through traditional learning. On the other hand, the individual student experiences need to vary enough so that different learning experiences and perspectives can be brought into the conversation in ways that stimulate dialectical reasoning. Finally, if the experiential component is intended to be service-learning then it must meet a real community need.

Effective peer learning requires creating an environment where students can employ the skills of critical inquiry to engage in meaningful reflection and analysis based on traditional and experiential learning. Like the other two sides of the triangle, this requires intentionality. There are three barriers, in particular, that challenge effective peer learning. The first is student resistance to taking themselves seriously as effective, active partners in the learning experience. Second, students have different thresholds for taking the intellectual risks that peer
learning requires, including the willingness to disagree. Third, it is not uncommon for students to have little peer learning experience in the formal academic setting. Even if they are predisposed to peer learning they may not know how to do it.

A variety of tools and techniques can help students meet these challenges and create an environment where effective peer learning can occur. The first step is for the individual student to make meaning through the integration of traditional and experiential learning. One tool is the creation of worksheets which students complete in advance of the peer learning session. At the beginning of the term worksheets may be quite prescriptive, but they should direct the student to link the more abstract, theoretical components of traditional learning with their personal learning experiences. By the end of the term students may be encouraged to design their own worksheets with very little prescriptive guidance.

The Application of Triangulated Learning to Leadership Education

Triangulated Learning has been used successfully as a pedagogical framework in a leadership course which satisfies an interdisciplinary general education requirement. One component of the course is a 12-year collaboration called “Community Builders: An Intergenerational Service-Learning Project.” Collaborating partners in the project are college students enrolled in the leadership course, the local school district sixth-grade classes, and adult volunteers who are mostly retired members in the community. Also collaborating are Self-Help International (SHI) and El Porvenir (EP), two nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) which engage in community development work in Nicaragua. Two college students, 6-8 sixth-grade students, and 1-2 adult volunteer meet in groups (called “neighborhoods”) to discuss the importance of community and civic engagement, and to undertake service projects. The College students serve as the neighborhood leaders and are responsible for developing an hour-long program in gatherings identified as “town meetings” five times each term. Program activities must be designed by the college students to meet sixth-grade curriculum benchmarks.

The “Community Builders” program lasts the entire academic year which, in its current setting, includes Fall Term (approximately 12 weeks), Winter Term (12 weeks), and May Term (3 ½ weeks). Each term a different group of college students participates in the program. During the Fall Term the focus is on the local community. In addition to learning about local community assets and visiting community resources (e.g., the fire station and the public library), the college students, working with the college Center for Community Engagement, identify local service projects in which all neighborhoods participate to meet a real community need. During the Winter Term, with a new class of college students, the focus is on the global community with specific reference to Central America which meets sixth-grade curricular requirements. The “Community Builders” service projects for the Winter Term include assembling school supply kits and sanitation kits for children in Nicaragua where SHI and EP operate. During the May Term a third group of college students travels to Nicaragua, works with both NGOs on local service projects, and delivers the kits assembled by the “neighborhoods” during the Winter Term.
The leadership course and the “Community Builders” component employ all elements of Triangulated Learning at multiple levels. College students read literature which discusses theories of leadership which they then apply as they put together plans to meet learning goals and outcomes and discuss how to deliver them in ways that are relevant to and engage the sixth-grade curriculum and adult volunteers in their neighborhoods. They execute their plans in their neighborhoods at town meetings as acts of service-learning. After the town meetings there is significant debriefing and peer learning involving the identification of various activities used to meet the learning goals, the degree of success in meeting those goals, and how these experiences connect to the leadership theories they study and their own leadership development. These peer learning sessions serve as opportunities to employ dialectical reasoning as students reflect on their learning and prepare for the next town meeting.

Triangulated Learning also takes place within the context of the town meetings themselves. The college students lead discussions among the sixth-graders and adult volunteers where they share insights about the value of community and civic engagement. Each neighborhood is also involved in a service-learning project each term which is a source of reflective peer learning within the neighborhood under the direction of the college student leaders.

Assessment and Triangulated Learning

Student assessment techniques most appropriate for assessing deep and integrative learning involve open-ended writing assignments where students are asked to take knowledge and information from various domains and apply them to a new domain or reflect upon them in new ways. Triangulated Learning offers an excellent pedagogical framework for using journals, worksheets, integrative essays and other similar assessment tools across the three sides of the triangle. The development of rubrics which clearly explain the intended learning outcomes and how they will be assessed can alleviate confusion and anxiety among students and allow them to focus on what they have actually learned. Peer assessment is also important. Students asked to evaluate the contributions of their peers in confidential peer evaluations are able and willing to differentiate the quality of work among their peers in a remarkably candid manner. This, in itself, becomes an assessment tool for deep learning.

Also important is the student perspective on the value of Triangulated Learning. Student assessment of Triangulated Learning as reported in their integrative essays and end-of-year confidential course evaluations is generally very positive. Even those who come to the process somewhat reluctantly can be persuaded, as the following excerpt indicates.

*The Triangulated Learning pedagogy presented at the beginning of this semester as the heart of this class seemed a little strange to me at the start. Theories like that always seem a little unnecessary to me. They always seem like the process has been overanalyzed and the theories seem not practical for everyday use. But looking at my experiences in this class and in others, too, I have come to realize that the Triangulated Learning was there in all of them and it worked well to enhance my learning. I have always been good at the traditional learning aspect of the triangle. The peer learning aspect has always been there just from working in groups and with*
others on homework and projects. The experiential aspect was lacking in some classes, but it can be hard to incorporate depending upon the subject. The small group discussions really helped my learning because we got to discuss our past experiences and what we were planning to do with our new knowledge in the future. Triangulated Learning works really well for learning new things ... and I am glad that we used it as the basis for this class. (student integrative essay)

With respect to the specific leadership course associated with “Community Builders” there are several indicators of success:

- Longevity of the project among multiple collaborators (12 years)
- National and international recognition
- Quality of student reflection and analysis
- Student demand for the course (multiple sections have been added over time)
- Student rating of instruction reports

Conclusion

Evidence accumulated from using Triangulated Learning to integrate traditional learning, service-learning, and peer learning demonstrates that the model can serve as a platform for leadership development through engaged, deep impact learning. Testimony for this can be offered by the conclusions students draw going through the process, as this example demonstrates.

In [a leadership course] we talked about critical inquiry. I learned that critical inquiry is a type of “soul searching” process on breaking things down for myself and developing a deeper understanding of what I am doing and what I still need to learn. (Student integrative essay)

Such insights offer examples of engaged learning that are the result of self-discovery and offer evidence of deep learning that can contribute to the lifelong learning we want our students to possess if they are to have the courage to maximize their potential throughout their lives. Triangulated Learning offers one pedagogical means to help students achieve that end. And it is a tool they can employ for the rest of their lives.

The potential benefits of Triangulated Learning are not limited to an academic environment. Organizations of all types benefit from constituent members who take ownership of their roles and apply deep learning techniques to help create a vibrant, dynamic environment that fosters creativity and initiative. Triangulated Learning has the potential to help generate such an environment to meet organizational goals, whatever they may be.
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“I don’t like shoppy people,” says Margaret Hale to her mother in Elizabeth Gaskell’s novel *North and South* (1855), before the Hales are forced to make their wrenching move from rural Helstone to industrial Milton-Northern. “I think we are far better off, knowing only cottagers and labourers, and people without pretence,” she explains (Gaskell 19). These lines provide an obvious benchmark of Margaret’s young attitude toward certain types of work, and the novel is largely dedicated to charting the maturation of her views on laborers, factory-owners, and even smoke and dust. But more than its simple use as a marker of the “before” position of Margaret’s understanding of work, the remark provides precise tools for analyzing two portrayals: Margaret’s view of laborers and the novel’s depiction of Margaret as the holder of that view. Margaret elaborates, “I like all people whose occupations have to do with the land; I like soldiers and sailors, and the three learned professions. . . . I’m sure you don’t want me to admire butchers and bakers, and candle-stick makers, do you, mamma?”(19). Margaret reveals several measures of value here. First, she has equated work with people. Tasks and labors identify those who perform them—hence the terms “shoppy people,” “labourers,” “sailors,” and “bakers.” Second, she assigns “pretence” to the middle-class, which suggests that she considers their status—based on commercial success and buying power—to be inauthentic. Margaret also assigns value to certain work somewhat Romantically: gentlemanly professions, occupations “to do with the land,” as well as the dignified and storied, though not elevated, positions of soldiers and sailors earn her “lik[ing].” Her maturation in the industrial city expands her aesthetic and moral judgments of work beyond the rural sphere of clergymen, farm laborers and the occasional vulgar carriage-makers, as she is faced not only with brazenly shoppy people, but also with the self-made Captain of Industry, Mr. John Thornton. In Milton, butchers and candle-stick makers are the least of Margaret’s worries: she must observe and assess many new types of workers, including mill-workers, spinners, carders, fustian-cutters, knobsticks, and policemen. While her longing for her childhood home intensifies her commitment to her earliest views, Margaret also learns to revise her Helstonian values and apply them—along with new measures of worth—to city workers.

---

1 I offer sincere thanks to my colleague Dr. Hugh Dubrulle for introducing me to the works by George Sturt and Andrew Ure and for teaching me a great deal about them. Once you have taught daily alongside another professor in a course, and you have run the course several times, it is hard to unwind your own thoughts and ideas from his. I know that ideas originally my own about *North and South* have been influenced by his observations on the novel, and, more obviously, my points here about Sturt’s and Ure’s works originated with his teaching in our class. In this essay, I have credited him as my source wherever it made sense to do so, and I am sure that I have also expressed ideas shaped by him without noting his influence. It would be impossible to indicate the many ways in which he has improved my thinking on the works of the Victorian period and ways to help students understand and enjoy them.

2 Page numbers cited in this article refer to the 2005 Norton critical edition of the novel, *North and South*, edited by Alan Shelston. Hereafter, references to this edition will appear parenthetically in the body of the article’s text.
In our team-taught, interdisciplinary course, Mid-Victorian Britain: History and Literature, my colleague Dr. Hugh Dubrulle and I assign *North and South* in the “Industrialization” unit, along with George Sturt’s *The Wheelwright’s Shop* (1923) and Andrew Ure’s *The Philosophy of Manufactures* (1835). Students also study the painting *Work* (1852-65), by Ford Madox Brown (see figure on page 27). Together, these fictional, non-fiction, and visual texts create a rich approach to the complex depiction of work and workers in the nineteenth century. Often taught as a certain “type” of novel—usually called the industrial novel or Condition-of-England novel—*North and South*, like Disraeli’s *Sybil* (1845) and Dickens’s *Hard Times* (1854), is commonly associated with the industrial life going on outside the novel and with the cultural conversation sustained by the essayists who philosophized about the effects of that life on English people and English culture. Our Mid-Victorian course brings *North and South* out of both of these accustomed contexts—1) the industrial novels’ dark imagery portraying the struggles of labor and oppressive poverty in the nineteenth-century city, and 2) the elevated rhetoric of literary sage-writing by Carlyle and Ruskin, who describe the sanctifying influence of work on the individual (*Past and Present*, 1843) and the aesthetic effect of the innately flawed individual human on his work (*Stones of Venice*, 1851-53). Even if we allow that texts may be read as reflecting “questions” like the Condition-of-England Question—which is an arguable assumption—it would not be fair to say that Gaskell’s novel, Sturt’s personal history, Ure’s observations, and Brown’s painting respond to the same questions. But they can be looked at in common, as each invites us to ask, from a distinct point of view: What makes work good?

By reading these works together, undergraduate students identify each text’s voice and viewpoint, which assign aesthetic, social, and moral value by representing work in terms of its “feel,” its effects, and its humanness. As new forms of work supplant old in each text, that shift is expressed with nostalgia or enthusiasm; losses and gains are measured according to the value the text places on the past and the anxiety with which it depicts the present. Margaret Hale’s and George Sturt’s cherishing of traditional rural labor arises, in part, from its association in their memories with childhood, landscape, and family. For Sturt, the “old” handicraft work is linked to an intimate, creative community that has been disrupted by mechanized labor. Ure’s focus on the factory system and its material and moral effects on factory “operatives” has the result of exposing the emotional, nostalgic coloring of Margaret’s and Sturt’s portrayals. Brown’s painting advances and elevates new work over old in the figure of the heroic city worker, as Ure’s does in the depiction of the efficient, liberating factory.

*Progress and Nostalgia--Interdisciplinary English and History course*

Mid-Victorian Britain: History and Literature was first offered in 2006 as a team-taught, cross-listed course. Our course website presents the Mid-Victorian focus as follows:

The period between 1851 and 1867 constituted the ‘high noon’ of Victorian Britain, an era when Britain enjoyed unprecedented stability and prosperity. Beneath the equipoise of these years, however, great changes took place, and Victorians attempted to deal with what they saw as the transition from the medieval to the modern world. . . . In each of the areas surveyed by the course—politics, industrialization, religion, art, empire, and the

---

3 *North and South* has also been called a “factory question novel” and a “social problem novel.”
Woman Question—tremendous changes [occurring] between 1851 and 1867 pointed to
the future. To be certain, mid-Victorian Britain was one of the first societies to confront
many of the elements we associate with the modern condition (Dubrulle and Cronin).

Our articulated goal was to invite students to appreciate the literature of mid-century and
examine the historical forces influencing the art, culture and people of mid-Victorian Britain.
We aimed to avoid using history as a mere setting for fiction or reducing fiction to a
representation of an historical situation; rather, the course treats literary and historical
texts/primary sources as artificed narratives created at a particular moment in a particular place
that express a perceptual consciousness of sorts. The course is subtitled “Progress and
Nostalgia”—a pairing that provides an organizing touchstone to reflect the ambivalence
Victorians commonly expressed about political, industrial, commercial, and intellectual progress.
We identify “nostalgia” as a tonal and rhetorical effect of the intersection of confidence and
anxiety; idealization of what has been “lost” can only occur after the recognition that the present
has progressed beyond—in time or “improvement”—that longed-for, past reality.

The course takes the issue of interdisciplinarity seriously, but not too theoretically. We
keep students what primary texts are, and we talk about different types of texts and their
purposes: novels, short stories, and poetry; speeches by Disraeli and Palmerston; travel literature
by Richard Burton and Harriet Martineau; scientific studies; theological tracts; reporting about
the Great Exhibition and religious practice; essays by Carlyle, Mill, Arnold, and Bagehot; and
paintings by Pre-Raphaelites, William Powell Frith, and William Bell Scott. We offer significant
texts that students can analyze in terms of argument, viewpoint, and style and also explore for
connections that arise when works written within a shared historical context serve to
contextualize each other with their variety of voices and images.

Beyond its appearance as a topic in course texts, the subject of work is notable as a
special touchstone for interdisciplinary discussion since the early nineteenth century, when labor
in the factory system became a topic of cultural debate and, in some ways, the overarching
symbol of a new world that fulfilled the promise of progress while threatening old traditions and
social structures. Literary and aesthetic approaches have provided the tools of this analysis at
least since Robert Southey wrote and Macauley reviewed Colloquies of the Progress and
Prospects of Society (1829; 1830). Southey’s approach—the use of Romantic values to evaluate
social conditions—launched, in part, the entire age of cultural criticism in this “poetic” tone. It’s
easy to agree with Joseph Bizup and others who note that the poetic, traditional mode offers a
distorting rhetoric (2). The so-called organic community of the rural countryside elevated by
F.R. Leavis is more myth than reality, and recent scholars have interrogated the nineteenth-
century cultural dichotomies which respected nostalgia for traditional, humanist values as a
‘good’ opposing grasping middle-class ambition and ignorance, while other commentators
“sought . . . to position industrialism itself as a positive moral, social, and aesthetic force”
(Bizup 5). An interdisciplinary course looking at literary and historical texts can avoid
presenting work simply as either a bucolic, authentic human endeavor or a filthy, deadening
commercial enterprise by focusing on writers’ depictions of work as part of a nineteenth-century
manner of confronting change and engaging, as Margaret Hale does, in “the confused process of
. . . accommodation that attends it” (Bodenheimer 282).
North and South and The Wheelwright’s Shop
“The future must be met, however stern and iron it be.”

Gaskell’s novel and George Sturt’s “autobiography for the years 1884-1891” (Sturt xv) depict rural labor as reflecting a relationship among a place, its people, and their work. Margaret Hale’s attitudes about rural work reflect her love for Helstone. Even before the move to Milton, Margaret, who has lived in London for ten years, describes Helstone as a beloved lost home. She tells Henry Lennox that she “can’t put its charm into words” (13) or even describe it “as it really is” (13). Though superior to them in class, Margaret feels intimately connected with the village folk: “She took a pride in her forest. Its people were her people. She made hearty friends with them; learned and delighted in using their peculiar words; . . . nursed their babies; talked or read with slow distinctness to their old people; carried dainty messes to their sick. . . .” (18). Country work—even illicit hunting—lends visual and aural pleasure to the Helstone scenes as Margaret views them: “[a] cottage door in the distance was opened and shut, as if to admit the tired labourer to his home. . . . A stealthy, creeping, crunching sound among the crisp fallen leaves of the forest, beyond the garden, seemed almost close at hand. Margaret knew it was some poacher” (51). Departure from home, for Margaret, first intensifies and then helps revise her narrowly nostalgic view of working people. It heightens her distaste for the bold, opinionated factory laborers and her initial disdain for tradesmen, but Margaret’s views of work contain other ideals signified by Helstone which she fears losing: human connection, childhood tranquility, and her father as a man of faith. In tone and imagery, the epigraph of the “Farewell” chapter (VI) corresponds to Margaret’s nostalgic feeling for working people in a departed place and disappearing time: “As year by year the labourer tills/His wonted glebe, or lops the glades/And year by year our memory fades/From all the circle of the hills” ([In Memoriam, 101]; Gaskell 49).

In The Wheelwright’s Shop, George Sturt frankly embraces nostalgia as he weaves the story of his own development from schoolboy to shopmaster with the history of his family’s business. A writer and owner/proprietor of a carriage-wheel business, Sturt wrote the book in 1923 about the shift from “a ‘folk’ industry carried on in the ‘folk’ method” to machine-assisted labor and the loss he associated with that change (Sturt 17). Known for its direct prose and melancholic tone, The Wheelwright’s Shop is both a recollection of specialized, rural artisanship and a social history in which things have value because they are connected to their makers and work is good because it connects people to each other, to traditions, and to a specific place. Though nonfictional, the literary narrative is filtered through an intimate, personal lens which imbues the subtle and jarring shifts in the progress of Sturt’s business with his own feelings of love and anxiety. Like Margaret, Sturt associates the work with his family and his place in the community. The death of his father requires Sturt, as a new owner of the business, to learn it from the employees: “eight skilled workmen or apprentices, eight friends of the family. . . . There were never ‘hands’ with us” (17). Thanks to his father’s hard work and “consideration,” “a sort of devotion to the whole family had grown up” among the men, who held this affection for Sturt even after he became “the guv’ner” (55).

4 North and South, Volume I, Chapter VII.
Sturt credits the influence of Ruskin’s *Fors Clavigera* for his belief that “man’s only decent occupation was in handicraft” (12), but his idealization of wheel-making also reflects values of tradition, landscape, and community that we see in Margaret Hale’s view, as well as the artisan’s measures of creativity and intuition. The Sturts’ two-centuries-old shop progressed from making wheels for dung carts, to dog carts, to carriages for customers who were brewers, millers, hop-growers, and timber merchants. Its craftsmen were unlettered, but skilled and wise. The “complete” wheelwright had a broad set of abilities: he could make the wheels, build the wagon, and paint it. The type of work and the amount of effort required in the shop before mechanization were “utterly beyond any man” (6), and the workmen’s skills seemed mysterious and arcane. The size and curve of each piece were customized according to local wisdom and idiosyncratic specifications with which the craftsmen were “curiously intimate”: the type of soil, the slope of a hill, the difficulty of a “miry lane,” and “the temper of this or that customer or his choice perhaps in horseflesh” (18). Sturt wistfully places his shop in the inevitable cycle of progress, in which old ways are lost when new methods like gas-engines, saws, and lathes arise to improve economy and efficiency. In Sturt’s time as a young shopmaster, men began to lose the ability “to ‘line-out’ a wooden axle.” Even the one old man who knew traditional skills like “mortarising the teeth” forgot how one day when an “ancient” dung cart needed repair (20). So Sturt’s “rather useless schooling [in geometry] came in handy for once. . . . I have no doubt that the elderly wheelwright’s tradition would have been better, if only he could have remembered it” (20).

These charming qualities could not sustain the wheelwright’s shop once American wheels and other market factors made business “grasping, hustling, [and] competitive” (53). For Sturt, like Margaret Hale, new forms of work create new disconcerting ambiguities. Sturt’s new machines allowed him to keep his men employed, but they became “hands” (201); they earned higher wages, but lost the “satisfaction” of “[growing] friendly with the grain of timber” (202). Margaret’s shift involves learning that, for many people, work means survival. In Helstone, Margaret failed to link rural work with the need to “earn bread,” a necessity she finds demeaning when Mr. Hale confronts it in Milton-Northern. Before the crisis, Margaret saw the poor as picturesque elements of the countryside and as vessels for her compassion: “Old Simon’s rheumatism might be bad and his eyesight worse; there would be no one to go and read to him, and comfort him. . . . Mary Domville’s little crippled boy would crawl in vain to the door and look for her” (39). Margaret’s reassessment of work arises directly from her experience with suffering mill hands in Milton. Not until she meets Bessy and Nicholas Higgins and John Boucher does she understand “the struggle for bread” (79) and the nearness of starvation and disease. This realization leads to her revision of her nostalgic view; she admits to Bessy that, even in the South, “there is very hard bodily labour . . . and very little food to give strength” (122).

More than anything, Margaret is nostalgic for the unambiguous delineations about labor and status, which were clear in Helstone but disappear in Milton. In the new world of work, Mr. Hale’s lack of “practical knowledge” does the family ill (46). As an “idle gentleman,” Mr. Hale appears to lack the status of Mr. Thornton, who is seen by his mother and peers as holding a “high honorable place among the merchants of his country” (104-5). Nicholas Higgins lacks the deference and geniality of the Helstone laborers; he demands respect and challenges Margaret’s Christian views about duty. These disturbances to Margaret’s Helstonian views jar her, but, as
she “works away like any servant” (70) to take care of her sick mother, redirects her charitable compassion to Bessy Higgins and Boucher’s widow, and advocates for mutual friendship to Thornton and his laborers, Margaret finds a new freedom and usefulness in her old nostalgic values.

**Ure’s Manufactures and Brown’s Work:**

“In the sweat of thy face shall thou eat bread”

Sweating for one’s bread, to Andrew Ure, is the affliction and “primeval curse pronounced on the labour of man” which could be “mitigated, and in some measure . . . repealed” (Ure 17) by the factory system, the flagship of a new world in which men are partnered with machines (Dubrulle). In *The Philosophy of Manufactures* (1835) Ure analyzes the industrial and human components of the factory system. The book, which received popular and critical praise, trumpeted the benefits factory “operatives” gained in education, health, leisure, and morality in a series of reports intended to defend factories and manufacturers against claims that they exploited workers. Ure’s aim was not only to explain the technological and organizational design of the factory as a productive social “organism”; he hoped also to show that a study of manufactures could “diffuse a steady light to conduct the masters, managers, and operatives, in the straight paths of improvement” (vii).

Ure’s depiction of factory labor idealizes it through detailed scientific information and medical reports expressed in enthusiastic, even triumphant rhetoric. The factory system, which is “the combined operation of many orders of workpeople” (13), allows for work that is flexible, productive, and efficient for laborers and, as such constitutes a great improvement over both agricultural and handicraft work. The work was pleasant and, for some, even easy, according to Ure. In well-aired factory rooms, he reports, children work with “cheerful dexterity” (346); girls join together to learn music; everyone is clean because they are encouraged to wash their hands and faces. No one is intoxicated (353). Because it does not limit specific tasks to laborers with particular talents, factory work allows men, women, and children to earn money in an amenable setting with moderate physical effort. The attendant of the power-loom machine has “certainly no muscular fatigue to sustain, while it procures for him good, unfailing wages, besides a healthy workshop gratis; whereas the nonfactory weaver, having everything to execute by muscular exertion, finds the labour irksome . . . [and earns] proportionally low wages, while he loses his health by poor diet and the dampness of his hovel” (7). Agriculture and handicraft workers, he reports, earn half the pay of cotton mill workers, and some are “physically deteriorated, mentally depressed . . . [and] care-worn” (334). Thanks to the power loom, Ure reports, “many [workers] too feeble to get their daily bread by any of the former modes of industry, [earn] abundant food, raiment, and domestic accommodations without perspiring at a single pore” (17).

The same sweat that can be eliminated by the efficient factory system is exalted in Ford Madox Brown’s famous painting *Work* (1852-63), which idealizes work with brilliance, intensity, detail, and purpose [Figure 1]. It is a critical commonplace to identify the painting’s defining theme as “the ennobling nature of work,” to use Gerard Curtis’s phrase (623). The panoramic (approximately 4.5 x 6.5 feet) painting portrays the concept of work in a layered set of forms: **working** is portrayed in a figure—a hero, the young navvy—and as a physical act, a social activity, a form of economic power with community and individual effects, and even as an idea—a moral and intellectual concept. The visual signs that create this coherent idealization of
work are explicated in Brown’s commentary on the painting, which is a lengthy narrative about the figures—manual laborers surrounded by rich and poor unemployed observers, including “brainworkers” Maurice and Carlyle, who study the scene, apparently with approbation. The commentary—written for the 1865 exhibition—provides analysis that the visual painting cannot: Brown invents back-stories, describes personalities, and limns the moments before and after the instant in which each of the figures is frozen mid-throw, mid-call, mid-lift, or mid-bark. As a painting and a text, Work asks to be read from several perspectives at once, and students can approach it on different levels of meaning: art, story, and social commentary.

The sunlight, notes Brown, displays “work in all its severity” (qtd. in Treuherz 59) and, as we can see, its dignity and purpose.\(^5\) The navvy—or excavator—is the central figure, emphasized by his placement and posture, and by the use of light. Brown calls him the “outward and visible type of Work,” “strongly developed” in “the pride of manly health and beauty” (54). Portrayed in “the full swing of his activity,” Brown’s hero-worker, he declares, “was at least as worthy of the powers of an English painter, as the fisherman of the Adriatic, the peasant of the Campagna, or the Neopolitan lazzerone” (54). Indeed, work is treated almost religiously, and the two quotations engraved on the painting’s frame indicate that the navvy’s effort is sacred to his saving of himself and his community—“Seest thou a man diligent in his business? He shall stand before Kings”\(^6\)—and that work is sustaining and good: “’In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread’”(Treuherz 53).\(^7\) In enacting Carlylean philosophy and social reform, work seems here to trump tractworthy Christian teachings; the lady tract-distributor, Brown muses, has never “reflected that excavators may have notions to the effect that ladies might be benefitted by receiving tracts containing navvies’ ideas!”(qtd. in Treuherz 56).

The unemployed and idle are portrayed as indifferent to and harmed by society: from the ragged wretch who collects medicinal herbs to peddle; to the haymakers who seek work; to the jobless Irish peasants “reduced by fever and famine” (qtd. in Treuherz 55). The rich do not work—neither the Colonel on horseback nor his daughter. Brown directs his painted subjects to attend to his message: to the well-dressed lady with the greyhound, he says, “I would beg to call your attention to my group of small, exceedingly ragged, dirty children in the foreground of my picture, where you are about to pass” (57). The beer-seller, though “starved and stunted with gin” as a child, “is a specimen of town pluck and energy contrasted with country thews and sinews” (58). Amid all these, the navvy digs—clean, strong, productive for himself and his society. For him, work seems a state of being—changed from the past, changing in present, and making change in the world.

***************

My colleague Hugh Dubrulle likes to tell our students, “Industrialization captured everyone’s imagination.” In our Mid-Victorian course, we present works by writers thus captivated: industrialization provoked new perceptions, evaluations, and depictions of old and

---

\(^5\) Brown’s effort at realism extended to employing laborers as models for the painting. One sitter, he says, “lost his life in a scaffold accident, before I had quite yet done with him” (qtd. in Treuherz 59).

\(^6\) Psalms 22:29.

\(^7\) Genesis 3:19.
new forms of work. In describing the ineluctable progress of work, Victorian writers and artists captured the effects of industrialization in their imaginations, depicting the changes it affected on England’s places and for its people.

Elaine Scarry has said about Thomas Hardy, “Human character has for him its deepest registration in the activity of work” (94). I have not focused on a single type of work in this essay. Instead, I’ve almost stubbornly invoked “work” as an element of human character, as if it carried no distinctions of class: Mr. Thornton’s work, Nicholas Higgins’s work, the work of Sturt and his men, the work of manufacturers and factory operatives, and the transforming work of Brown’s navvy—all appear in Victorian texts as influencing the individual, the community, and the future. In the representation of these effects, *North and South, The Philosophy of Manufactures*, and Brown’s *Work* are typically mid-Victorian works in their attitude that change calls for action and duty, and improvement demands work. *The Wheelwright’s Shop*, written much later, is more typically modernist not only in its mournful tone of loss and disconnection from the past, but in the insistent literary and aesthetic values with which it judges the wheelwright’s work as superior to mechanized labored, more like “a very fascinating art—than a science” (Sturt 19). While the necessity of change seems to go unquestioned, these writers and artist differ in their attachment to the labor of the rural past, and, though each recognizes the measurable benefits of mechanized improvement, they disagree about what is lost as the roles and tasks of work change. We’ve seen these differences and the distinction between confidence and ambivalence in their portrayals: as each looks forward, he or she does so with enthusiasm or wavering hesitation. All do so with the knowledge that change is inevitable and work—that is, working to benefit oneself and others—is good.

For Margaret Hale to accept Thornton’s grand idea that “man has it within him to mount, step by step, on each wonder he achieves to higher marvels still” (Gaskell 112), she first needs to negotiate what Rosemarie Bodenheimer years ago called a “psychological reorganization” in the face of extraordinary change (286)—a change that, for my purposes, can be represented by Margaret’s noticing, as her carriage heads closer to the industrial city, “There were no smock-frocks, even among the country folk” (Gaskell 55). As this symbol of the old, rural work disappears on a road leading to the smoky city of her future, Margaret is challenged to redirect her nostalgia into way of understanding a new world of masters and men. In doing so, she steps away from the margins of Brown’s painting, *Work*, closer to the strong, insightful navvy at its center.
Figure 1: Ford Madox Brown’s Work. Reprinted courtesy of Manchester Art Gallery.
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How did a colloquial German word adopted in a minor treatise by Sigmund Freud become, in the course of six decades, an indispensable concept employed across multiple languages, disciplines, and schools of theory? In *The Unconcept*, Anneleen Masschelein offers a pioneering genealogy of “the uncanny” from its early Freudian origins to its canonical position in contemporary theoretical and critical discourses. More precisely, the study elucidates the process of conceptualization itself, focusing on the periods of conceptual latency that preceded, and prepared, the triumphant re-emergence, stabilization, and dissemination of the Freudian uncanny in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries. Taking a functionalist approach, Masschelein demonstrates the complexities of the conceptualization process, tracing its indirect, sometimes abortive, trajectories and emphasizing the inherent, and ongoing, tension between canonization and instability.

Masschelein begins her genealogy by examining the occurrence of the adjective *unheimlich* and its nominalization, *das Unheimliche*, in Freud’s writing, both before and after the (now) famous 1919 essay. In her discussion of the text of “The Uncanny” itself, Masschelein focuses on Freud’s evolving interpretation of the causal relationship between anxiety and repression, taken up and elaborated four decades later in Jacques Lacan’s Seminar X. After positioning the uncanny in the context of Freud’s oeuvre, *The Unconcept* moves on to the “preconceptualization” phase that lasted from its 1919 debut to its explosive entrance on the European intellectual scene in the 1960s and 1970s. The discussion of Freud’s term as it appears in the less well-known work of psychoanalysts Theodor Reik and Edmund Bergler in the 1920s and 1930s, and literary scholars Selma Fraiberg, Peter Penzoldt, James Hepburn, Siegbert Prawer, Wolfgang Kayser, W.S. Marks, and Louis Vax in the 1950s and 1960s is Masschelein’s most original contribution to the scholarship of the uncanny. The term’s ascendance to conceptual fullness is illustrated through a close analysis of two canonical texts: Tzvetan Todorov’s *The Fantastic* (1970) and Hélène Cixous’s “Fiction and Its Phantoms” (1972).

The final chapter of *The Unconcept* offers an overview of the uncanny’s protean presence in contemporary theoretical and critical thought, tracing the concept’s development in two directions: what Masschelein calls the “postromantic/aesthetic” tradition, with its emphasis on “transcendence, the supernatural, and the occult,” and the “existential/post-Marxist” tradition of “alienation, strangeness and angst,” whose main concern is “the uncanny’s relation to society, politics and ethics,” as seen in Homi Bhabha’s adaptations of Freud in the context of postcolonial theory (131). Masschelein emphasizes the special compatibility between the Freudian uncanny and contemporary theoretical pursuits, arguing that “the sense of imperfection and human frailty that has infused the concept of the uncanny at the outset of its conceptualization, properly speaking, paradoxically made this concept/affect/effect particularly well suited to the posthuman, emptied subject of Theory” (158).

*The Unconcept* is ambitious, meticulously researched, and, much like the Freudian term it examines, intensely self-conscious. It aspires to be not only a genealogy of a particular concept, but also a model for future studies of the conceptualization process (much like Tzvetan
Todorov’s *The Fantastic* is both a study of one particular genre and a paradigmatic example of genre study. The greatest value of Masschelein’s work, however, lies not in methodological trailblazing (her debt to Foucault is duly acknowledged) but in careful, systematic, and lucid exposition, especially when she fills in the gaps in current scholarship to demonstrate how Freud’s term, in its latent phase, lived on in the work of marginal or forgotten figures. Expository meticulousness has its downsides, however: while readers unfamiliar with Todorov or Cixous might welcome a general introduction to their work (before discussing “Fiction and Its Phantoms” Masschelein takes time to explain Cixous’s particular brand of feminism, for example), more specialized audiences might find the amount of background material excessive. More importantly, the book’s propensity towards detailed exposition leaves less room for analysis: of the eighteen pages dedicated to Todorov’s work on the fantastic, only one articulates, and then hastily answers, the key question, “What makes Todorov’s study so important for the conceptualization of the uncanny?” (94). This uneven pacing is perhaps the inevitable result of the book’s adaptation from a much longer dissertation manuscript. The last chapter feels particularly rushed, especially as it ventures beyond discussions of late twentieth-century theory into emerging areas of scientific and technological research.

The interdisciplinary scope of Masschelein’s study is one of its attractions. The subject matter naturally brings together psychoanalysis and literary theory, but *The Unconcept* also references philosophy, cultural studies, religion, art, architecture, film, social science, cognitive science, neuroscience, and digital technology. Masschelein draws attention to this interdisciplinarity of the uncanny: “film studies, architecture theory, anthropology, sociology and even, very recently, the field of robotics and artificial intelligence have all adopted and transformed the notion” (131). However, her discussion of such fascinating developments as the use of the “uncanny valley” hypothesis (positing a response of revulsion to imperfect human replicas) in contemporary cinemation (the interface of animation and live-action cinema) remains tangential, rather than central, to the book’s main argument, and is largely limited to the final section. While Masschelein enlivens her genealogy with examples borrowed from multiple disciplines and areas of creative endeavor, the primary object of her study is writing in the fields of psychoanalysis, literary studies, and theory. *The Unconcept* delivers a careful diachronic analysis of a haunting theoretical concept, mapping its century-long journey to the center of our attention.

Marymount Manhattan College

Magdalena Maczynska
In her intriguing new book *Swamplife*, the anthropologist Laura A. Ogden reconfigures conventional ethnographic and ecological histories of southern Florida’s Everglades. The traditional “narrative arc,” she writes in the opening chapter, “generally begins with the landscape’s settlement and draining in the mid-nineteenth century, then details the ensuing environmental devastation, and ends with a triumphant plea for restoration” (1-2). According to Ogden, such accounts flatten the complex environmental history of the region by ignoring, and at times vilifying, the presence of the “gladesmen,” the rural and largely white poor hunters and farmers whose ancestors first moved into the region after the nineteenth-century Seminole Wars. Having scratched out an existence in the early decades of the twentieth century through subsistence farming, hunting, and occasional rum running, the gladesmen’s interactions with the landscape came under attack as the region’s intricate waterways and swamps became subject to federal and state control or were transformed into shopping malls and gated communities for the well-heeled. In the process, alligators, whose hides provided needed income for families with few other economic alternatives, became creatures to be protected and icons of the tourist trade. Hunting had been reclassified as poaching, a linguistic turn that gave rise to a subversive Everglades culture of resistance that Ogden’s book does much to illuminate.

Ogden calls her approach “landscape ethnography,” a method of “writing culture” that foregrounds the ways that non-human entities help construct human meaning and identity (28). She embraces an interdisciplinary methodology that sends her down several rhetorical paths, some more fruitful than others. She draws heavily upon the theoretical work of Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, who in the 1980s developed a “spatial philosophy” rooted in the notion of the “the rhizome,” a metaphor they employed “as a way of theorizing landscapes as complex and changing assemblages of relations that dissolve and displace the boundaries of nature and culture” (29). The rhizome conceit works well when Ogden describes southern Florida’s swampy terrain – part land, part water, filled with alligators and snakes, and populated by back-country hunters and trappers who made a home of this variegated region. Hunting alligators, for instance, turned gladesmen into a form of bi-pedal reptiles; covered in mud, they sought the creatures by prodding underwater caves with poles or beckoning them by imitating their grunts. The hunters “wade and slog through the water” with “each step an exercise in freeing oneself from the earth.” In such a place, she writes, “becoming human and becoming reptile is a becoming with mud” (50). Other efforts at theory, however, detract from this otherwise well-written and engaging book. A brief detour into Roland Barthes’ derivation of the term ‘discourse,’ for instance, seems heavy handed and unnecessary to Ogden’s larger project.

Ogden’s work comes to life in the extensive oral histories she has conducted with Florida’s gladesmen. Indeed, one wishes the book included more of these histories. A sympathetic listener who clearly gained the trust of her subjects, Ogden enriches their stories about the region’s social and ecological past with her own masterful descriptions of the terrain. In their telling, the Everglades come alive in ways that theory does not allow. Ogden also delves into past natural history writing about the region to examine how previous scientists and
explorers shaped our conceptions about life in the Everglades. These past accounts—best exemplified in the marvelous fourth chapter on the ecology and culture of mangrove swamps—sharpen her meditations on the landscape. Readers interested in folklore, ecology, or just plain old good tales, will relish the scientific details and historical depth that Ogden and those she interviewed bring to their discussions of the Everglades.

The Everglades’ protective cover and difficult traveling conditions provided ideal hideouts for criminals who needed a base of operations or a place to avoid the law. They, too, inform Ogden’s “landscape ethnography.” At the close of each chapter she briefly highlights the Ashley Gang, who in the 1920s conducted “a violent and bloody rampage across the Everglades” (39). Led by the one-eyed John Ashley, the gang’s swaggering ways (and occasional, almost comical ineptitude) facilitated the popular conception of the Everglades as a renegade place. While she might have better integrated the gang members into the theoretical underpinnings of her book, their presence underscores Ogden’s ethnographic skill and attention to historical nuance. Along with their fellow gladesmen, they contributed to a history “of former juke joints, backcountry camps, moonshine stills, and the like” that “continues to haunt the landscape like the burning swamp gases locals called ghost fires” (20).

In the final chapter Ogden examines the history and politics of campaigns to limit Florida’s alligator hunt, efforts that began in the late 1930s and increased substantially after World War II. Declining stocks inspired some of this work, but so too did the Everglades’ role in the “political economy of Florida tourism,” an industry that depended upon simulacra of nature for the tourists who visited the Everglades’ “famous roadside attractions, where alligators were star features” (133). Ogden briefly mentions without fully developing several threats to alligator viability, including rising sea levels and rampant post-War development that forever altered the region’s ecosystem. Her concern in this book, however, rests with the hunters, and she sees the limitations on the alligator trade as a direct threat to their livelihood. While the gladesmen considered alligators ‘common property,’ the new restrictions led to the ‘redistribution of these animals along class lines’ (149). Unable to halt this redistribution, the gladesmen who depended on alligator hides for additional cash were pushed further beyond the bounds of legality. Always a marginal way of life, alligator hunting had become downright subversive.

Readers will find much to enjoy in this book. The occasional theory-laden language aside, Ogden writes with great energy. Her focus on the interrelationships of people, reptiles, and swamps brings together a number of disciplines that could be usefully developed in further studies. But not just academics can relish this book. Any visitor to southern Florida, a place that Ogden notes has been reconstructed for the tourist trade, will see its alligators as marvelous and mysterious creatures that permeate the state’s real and mythic past. Their hoped-for future, as well as ours, will be made that much richer as a result of Ogden’s book.

Boston University

Adam Sweeting

**On FADS and Other Errors**

The registration of doubt is the vital first step in the writings of Amartya Sen; it is a common thread that runs throughout his beautifully written and very probing texts. *Poverty and Famines, The Argumentative Indian, Identity and Violence* and some of his most recent work—, including Sen’s introductory essay to *Peace and Democratic Society*—are testimonies to the importance of careful questioning. There is a profound need for evidence-based skepticism and disbelief.

Doubt for Sen can begin with the identification of a theory. In *Poverty and Famines*, the theory is FAD: “The most common approach to famines is to propose explanations in terms of food availability decline (FAD).”¹ On this view, famines occur because the total supply of food is not adequate to feed all of the people living in a region. There is a flood or drought or some other natural disaster that leads to the scarcity of food. The problem with this approach, however, is that it is empirically inaccurate. In all instances of famine Sen analyzes in the 20ᵗʰ century, the total supply of food does not decline in the regions suffering from famine.

To support this claim, Sen speaks to the massive famine that broke out in British-administered Bengal in 1943. Sen estimates that two to three million Bengalis died of famine and the diseases related to famine in this year.² However, food production in Bengal in 1943 was “thirteen percent higher than in 1941, and there was, of course, no famine in 1941.”³ Or, to cite another example: a famine struck Bangladesh in 1974. However, 1974 was “a year of greater food availability than in any other year between 1971 and 1976” in Bangladesh.⁴ The starvation of persons in this country in 1974 cannot be traced back to an overall decline in food supply during this year. Similarly with the famine in Ethiopia in 1972: “There is … very little evidence of a dramatic decline of food availability in Ethiopia coinciding with the famine. Indeed, a modest increase in agricultural output for Ethiopia as a whole is recorded in by the National Bank of Ethiopia for the famine years vis-à-vis the preceding years.”⁵ Food availability decline does not explain these terrible disasters.⁶

---

²Ibid., p. 215.
³Ibid., p. 52.
⁶Sen’s analysis of famines in Ireland (in the 1840s) and China (1958-1961) do draw on the reality of a “food availability decline.” However, Sen thinks of these famines in terms of “slump famines” that also involve a “food countermovement” from economically distressed to economically more prosperous areas. See *Development as Freedom* p. 330, n9.
Sen’s introductory essay to *Peace and Democratic Society* is similar to his work on poverty and famine in that it deals with a matter—the eruption of violence in society—of very great urgency. As John Stuart Mill said, “the whole value of any good” depends on the security of our person. However, Sen is as careful in his approach to violence as he is in his approach to famine. FAD is not the only example of a mistaken theory.

To start with, Sen believes purely economic explanations of individual violence are inadequate. The claim that poverty alone causes violence does not pass muster. To support this criticism, Sen compares rates of violence between deeply impoverished Kolkata and other major cities in democracies throughout the world. As Sen notes, “The average incidence of murder in the 35 cities of India is 2.7 per 100,000 people – 2.9 for Delhi. The rate is .3 in Kolkata.” He goes on: “In 2005, Paris had a homicide rate of 2.3, London 2.4, New York of 5.0, Buenos Aires 6.4, Los Angeles 8.8, Mexico City of 17.0, Johannesburg 21.5, San Paolo 24.0, and Rio De Janeiro an astonishing 34.9.” Kolkata may be “one of the poorest cities of the world.” But it is not the most violent.

The claim that inter-personal violence is caused by poverty alone does not work. The second theory of violence criticized by Sen is a “civilizational” approach to violence. In Sen’s words, “The (civilizational) approach defines some postulated entities that are called ‘civilizations’ in primarily religious terms, and it goes on to contrast the ‘Islamic world’, the ‘Judeo-Christian Western world,’ the ‘Buddhist world,’ the ‘Hindu world,’ and so on. It is the intrinsic hostility among civilizations that make them prone, it is argued in this high theory, to clash with each other.”

In reflecting on the “civilizational” approach, Sen points out how difficult it is to identify such things as “civilizations.” For instance, members of the nationalist Hindutva political movement or the influential writer Samuel Huntington might describe India as a “Hindu civilization.” But such a characterization of India is grossly inaccurate. In terms of history, Sen draws attention to the “heterodoxy” of “Indian thoughts and beliefs from the earliest days.” As Sen notes, “Sanskrit not only has a bigger body of religious literature than exists in any other classical language, it also has a larger volume of agnostic and atheistic writings than in any other classical language.” There is no uniformity of religious doctrine here. Moving forward in time, Sen notes that “Buddhism was the dominant religion in India for well over a millennium” and that “Chinese scholars regularly described India as the Buddhist kingdom.”

---

9 Ibid., p. 11.  
11 Ibid., p. 23.  
12 Ibid., p. xii.
Muslim Indian emperor who reigned in the 16th century, offered a “powerful defense of toleration and of the need for the state to be equidistant from different religions.” The history of religious and non-religious doctrines and their relations in India is a complicated story.

The past of India cannot be defined in terms of a single unbroken tradition of religious Hinduism. The “civilizational” thesis, however, is not simply a matter of what Sen calls “foggy history.” It also glosses over present realities. Sen points out that “India currently has many more Muslims (more than 140 million – larger than the entire British and French populations put together) than any other country in the world with the exception of Indonesia and, marginally, Pakistan, and that nearly every country in Huntington’s definitions of ‘the Islamic civilization’ has far fewer Muslims than India has.” Describing India as a “Hindu civilization” ignores an awful lot of people. In terms of contemporary politics, the democratically elected government in India in 2006 has “a Sikh prime minister (Manmohan Singh) and is headed by a Muslim president (Abdul Kalam), with its ruling party (Congress) being presided over by a woman from a Christian background (Sonia Gandhi).” Sen asserts that Kolkata’s very low homicide rate must be due in some part to its past as a “thoroughly mixed city.” India is “diversely diverse” and cannot be understood as a Hindu “monoculture.”

What, then, causes violence between individuals in democratic societies? Sen is very cautious in his response to this question: “I am afraid we do not know enough about the empirical relations to be confident” about the exact causes of violence that threaten “human security.” Instead Sen speaks of the need for interdisciplinary approaches to this very urgent problem: “The main thesis I would like to present here is that the economic, social, and cultural issues need serious efforts at integration.” The very hard work of thinking clearly about the causes of violence remains. And it is from this point of view that Sen hopes we read the report of the Commonwealth Commission on Respect and Understanding entitled “Civil Paths to Peace” which his essay introduces. The Commonwealth report does not definitively solve the

---

13Ibid., p. xiii.
14Ibid., p. 54. The Pew Forum on Religion and Public Life estimates that in 2010, there were more than 177 million Muslims living in India (http://features.pewforum.org/muslim-population/).
17Sen’s use of the word “monoculture”—as in his expression “plural monoculturalism”—is very revealing: in Sen’s view, thinking of “cultures” as isolated from each other is always a mistake. Rather, exchanges between persons—“the freedom to exchange words, or goods, or gifts”—are basic to human life and are always ongoing. Reflecting on the exchanges between persons is far more revealing than the imaginary idea of eternally isolated cultures. See *Identity and Violence*, p. 156 ff. and *Development as Freedom*, p. 6.
18Ibid., p. 19.
19Ibid., p. 10.
question of “Why violence in democracy?” Nevertheless, the report does illustrate how an approach to violence in democracy can be fashioned without relying on dangerous oversimplifications. It offers a way forward without rushing to answers.

Sen’s writings about poverty and famine have a very precise coda: “no famine has ever taken place in the history of the world in a functioning democracy.”20 The causes of violence in democratic societies, however, have not been fully grasped. As such, the argument in “Violence and Civil Society” does not build up towards a conclusion in the manner of Sen’s earlier texts. But doubts honestly expressed are better than wrong answers confidently proclaimed. Sen’s essay—and the report that it accompanies—is well worth the reading.

Boston University
Neal Leavitt

CITL SUMMER INSTITUTE ON BASEBALL

Each summer, the Center for Interdisciplinary Teaching & Learning (CITL) hosts one or two summer institutes for lifelong learners. These programs take a topic of general interest and explore it through multi-disciplinary lectures, discussions, films, museum outings and other excursions. Encouraged by alumni and parents of current students who have frequently said how much they would enjoy studying a subject using the interdisciplinary team approach we employ at CGS, we have decided to make such opportunities possible for them and for anyone who might be interested in participating.

This summer (2012) we offer “BASEBALL: AN INTERDISCIPLINARY SUMMER INSTITUTE,” July 20-22, in conjunction with the 100th anniversary of Fenway Park, home of the Red Sox and Babe Ruth. The weekend will include lectures and discussions on Red Sox history, baseball statistics, baseball film and baseball as religion, plus a tour of the former Braves Field where the Red Sox played World Series games in 1915 and 1916, an optional tour of Fenway Park, and an optional Red Sox/Blue Jays baseball game (tickets are very limited, so reserve early). Parking on BU campus is included. The weekend also includes an optional dinner in an 18th floor lounge in the new Student Village with one of the best views in all of Boston, where you can look out at the winding Charles River, the sparkling city skyline and bustling Fenway Park. Lectures and discussions will be offered by historian Tom Whalen, author of When the Red Sox Ruled, Andy Andres, MLB.com Datacaster at Fenway Park, Chris Fahy, co-editor of Framing Films, and Joshua Pederson, co-author of Making the Stage: Essays on the Changing Concept of Theater, Drama and Performance, all of whom are professors at the College of General Studies.

In order to participate in the optional dinner, Red Sox game, or Red Sox tour, you must register for the “Baseball: An Interdisciplinary Summer Institute.”

With regard to lodging for the “BU Baseball Summer Institute,” you can stay in a dorm room in the Student Village or you can stay in one of the two hotels below. Blocks of rooms have been reserved until June 20, 2012.
Boston University Dorm Room has single rooms available in suites of four that share two baths and a common area for $62.00 per person per night. We will make those reservations for you.

Hotel Commonwealth has Fenway view rooms available for $249.00 per night not including taxes. You are responsible for making your own reservation. The phone number to make your reservation is 866-784-4000 or 617-532-5019. In order to get the above rate, you will need to mention “BU Baseball Summer Institute.”

Hotel Buckminster has Deluxe Queen rooms and Deluxe Double Twin rooms available for $170.00 per night not including taxes. You are responsible for making your own reservation. The phone number to make your reservation is 800-727-2825. In order to get the above rate, you will need to mention the “BU Baseball Summer Institute.”

Experience baseball in all its interdisciplinary glory! Join us for a memorable weekend of fun, friends and exploration of America’s favorite pastime. Please find the full schedule at the link below. If you have any questions, please contact njmck@bu.edu or akcook@bu.edu.

Click here to register for the “Baseball: An Interdisciplinary Summer Institute.”
Announcing the First Annual

IMPACT Best Essay Competition

The Editors of IMPACT: The Journal of the Center for Interdisciplinary Teaching & Learning invite submissions of scholarly and creative non-fiction essays between 500 and 5,000 words on any aspect of interdisciplinary teaching or research. Essays should be readable to a general, educated audience, and they should follow the documentation style most prevalent in the author’s disciplinary field. Essays should be submitted by 12/1/2012 to http://CITL.submishmash.com/submit.

The author of the winning essay will receive a $250 award, publication in IMPACT, and an invitation to present at our conference on “Teaching Globalization: Crossing Borders/Crossing Disciplines” to be held in the summer of 2013 (TBA).