

THE
BERKSHIRE
SCHOLAR

2010 - 2011

THE BERKSHIRE SCHOLAR

Vol. 1 • Issue 1

A COLLECTION OF ACADEMIC ESSAYS
2010 - 2011

Sophie Perekslis Fathers' Great Expectations and Sons' Lost Ambitions	3
Louisa Boltz The Easter Bunny	7
Unyimeabasi Udoh Her Thoughtful Progeny	9
Phuong (Max) Le Seeing the Vietnam War from a Different Angle . . .	12
Jack Lewers Humans are Simpler Than We Think	14
Peinyun (Penny) Ni Far-reaching Debate: The Shandong Problem in the Paris Peace Conference of 1919	16
Scott McMillan Glory	21
Katie Kernodle Not Who They Thought They Were	23
Dakota Richardson Restructuring the Budget and Solving the Deficit Crisis	27
Long Viet Tran O God, Shall I Grant You My Freedom?	33

THE OPINIONS AND ARGUMENTS
PRESENTED IN “THE BERKSHIRE SCHOLAR”
ARE THE SOLE WORK OF THE WRITERS
AND DO NOT NECESSARILY REFLECT THE
VIEWS OF THE EDITORS, FACULTY, OR
ADMINISTRATION OF BERKSHIRE SCHOOL.

FATHERS' GREAT EXPECTATIONS AND SONS' LOST AMBITIONS

William Shakespeare's *Henry IV, Part I* stresses the dysfunctional relationship between a father, King Henry, and his son, Prince Hal, and their inability to fulfill each others' personal expectations. King Henry IV of England must overthrow his archenemies Glendower, Mortimer, and Hotspur. However, Henry's judgment is constantly clouded by the fact that his son, the Prince of Wales, associates himself with drunken thieves. Prince Hal eventually reveals a plan in a soliloquy in which he vows he will, at the most unexpected time, rise to his intended role and impress the discontented public. Prince Hal must redeem himself by overcoming his family's enemies and his foil, Hotspur.

Prince Hal is a thoughtful politician attempting to justify himself to the public, which degrades him and believes that his irresponsibility and unprecedented actions will lead him to become to an unfit king. In Act I, scene i., Shakespeare portrays Prince Hal as an irresponsible, dishonorable, and unworthy prince to the throne who associates himself with criminal degenerates. Prince Hal "mak'st [his father, King Henry IV,] sad, and mak'st [him] sin" (I, i, 77) because of his unprecedented actions as a prince. However, as explored in scene ii of Act I, Hal's true personality exhibits intelligence, wisdom, and a political view on how he will regain his reputation and impress the people who disbelieve in his leadership. He illustrates a spark of political and regal manner when stating, "For wisdom cries out in the / streets and no man regards it" (I. ii. 94-95). This exhibits his care for the voice of the common people and not just for prescriptions of the elite. At the end of Act I, scene ii, Prince Hal's soliloquy reveals his emotions and his intentions to regain his reputation. Hal plans to "imitate the sun, / who doth permit the base contagious clouds / to smother up his beauty from the world" (I. ii. 204-206). This reveals that Prince Hal has the ability to shine like a king and

plans on doing so. However, in order to justify himself to the public, which doubts his intelligence and ability to rule, he clouds his potential to prove to them that anyone can change. If Prince Hal does not act on his actions soon, then the “sun”—he himself—will set below the horizon. Prince Hal’s chance to redeem himself might be lost below the horizon forever.

Throughout Acts II and III, Prince Hal begins to justify himself by verbally proving to his father that he has the capability of regaining his position and reputation as Prince. However, before Hal can prove to his father that he is worthy of being the Prince of Wales, he must acknowledge and answer the causes for his father’s disappointment. In Act II, scene iv, Shakespeare’s use of role reversal, with Prince Hal play acting as his father, King Henry, and Falstaff as the Prince, causes Prince Hal’s vital recognition of why his father is frustrated with his irresponsible actions. Prince Hal, by acting as his father, realizes that he is “violently carried away by grace [and that] there is a devil haunts [him] in the likeness of an old fat man” (I. iv. 462-464). Prince Hal discovers that Falstaff’s influence on him is the cause for his father’s depression and dissatisfaction. Through Shakespeare’s use of acting, Prince Hal is capable of acknowledging his father’s concerns and, therefore, reasons for disappointment. In Act III, scene ii, Prince Hal and King Henry discuss Prince Hal’s unruly actions and irresponsible behavior. As the argument unfolds, King Henry’s disappointment escalates to anger and he eventually compares Hal to Hotspur. This comparison motivates Prince Hal and he promises his father that he “will redeem all this on Percy’s head, / And, in the closing of some glorious day, / Be bold to tell [him] that [he] is King Henry’s son” (III. ii. 137-139). The image of Prince Hal redeeming all this on Percy’s head illustrates not only his determination but also his bravery to fight and overthrow Hotspur, a vicious, hotheaded, talented warrior. The statement “Be bold to tell him that he is king Henry’s son” provides evidence of confidence and proud behavior that Prince Hal wishes his father to have towards him. Prince Hal wants his father to be able to tell the public proudly that Prince Hal is his son. The determination that Prince Hal exhibits proves to his father that he is capable of being a good king and can justify himself to the public. However, Hal has still not officially acted on his intentions and, until then, he is still thought by the public an unfit king.

In Act V, Prince Hal finally redeems himself by killing Hotspur. This regal act of

courage reveals that Prince Hal has finally earned the title of Prince of Wales. Even before Hotspur and Hal's duel to the death, King Henry conveys that Prince Hal "hast redeem [his] lost opinion / And showed [he] mak'st some tender of [King Henry's] life. / In fair rescue [he] hast brought to [the king]" (V, iv. 48-50). The repeated use of "hast" and the recurring mentioning of Prince Hal emphasizes how Hal is the one who hast redeemed himself. The stress on King Henry's view also illustrates that Hal has finally justified himself to father. "In a fair rescue" Prince Hal has saved his reputation in a noble way by killing Hotspur. By having King Henry express this, Prince Hal realizes that he has not only redeemed himself, but his father is now proud of him, too. However, Falstaff decides to claim that he was the one who killed Hotspur, not Prince Hal. Once Falstaff enters with Hotspur on his back stating that he killed him, Hal, knowing perfectly well that he was the one who listened to Hotspur's final words, lets Falstaff take the glory. Prince Hal believes that "if a lie may do [Falstaff] grace/ [he'll] gild it with the happiest terms [he has]" (V, iv. 161-162). Through the repetition of "he", it highlights that he, Hal, is letting Falstaff steal Hal's glory to prove himself to his father. By doing so, Prince Hal shows a humble and unselfish personality. Even though Prince Hal will not be able to truly prove himself to the public because he does not kill Hotspur, he does redeem himself to his father and to himself. In the beginning, Hal believes himself to be a thoughtful politician by dealing with thieves; in the end, however, Hal defines himself as a glorious, humble, and unselfish leader. Even though it was hard to try to haul himself out of the hole he dug, he is capable of doing so. In the final scene, Prince Hal has redeemed himself *to himself*.

Prince Hal and King Henry's dysfunctional relationship is resolved at the play's conclusion. In the beginning, King Henry was disappointed in Hal's decisions to associate himself with thieves. However, Hal proves to his father that he has the determination to grow into the prince his father and the public expects him to be. Prince Hal not only illustrates his growth as a character when he slays Hotspur, but also when he allows Falstaff to take the credit. In the end, Prince Hal fulfills his father's dream as a successful and regal prince of England. Fathers constantly dream of their sons achieving glory and success that ascends higher than what sons believe is possible. However, without that bar that sons must attempt

to rise to, then what do sons wish to aspire to be like? Sons and fathers relationships can be dysfunctional and, most likely, in the end, the conflict can be overcome and a new level of appreciation can be achieved. Without fathers' great expectations, sons' ambitions are lost.

THE EASTER BUNNY

“I promise, you will see the Easter bunny next time” my sister whispered in my ear. I remember each Easter from the age of five to seven. My older sister Julia played the exact same game every year. Of course, I believed her when she told me that there was an Easter Bunny, which brought Easter eggs and candy. Who did not? I can still imagine what he would look like: shiny coat chocolate brown, a rose colored bow on the top of his head. He looks beautiful with his little bag in which he carries all the gifts. When I was young, I drew a lot of pictures of him.

Each Easter, Julia and I woke up at six o'clock in the morning because we were excited about finding the eggs and all the candy. We knew we should not annoy our parents too much, so we waited quietly in our room on the second floor. “Louisa and Julia, come down!” our parents screamed. “Ei ei ei ei ei, the Easter bunny was here!” We ran down the stairs as if a tiger followed us. My mother gave each of us a basket, and the Easter egg hunt, and my sister’s game, began.

While I still stood in the kitchen thinking about where I should start, my sister ran down the stairs into the garden and waited five minutes before screaming my name. I was so excited that I dropped everything I carried and screamed “What? What happened?” I always got the same answer. “The Easter bunny! The Easter bunny is here!” Unfortunately, but certainly, there was no Easter bunny. I cried, and my sister laughed and told me “He just left. I promise you will see him next time!” I believed her every year, but I never saw the Easter bunny.

When I turned eight, I got smarter. I had an idea how I would see the Easter bunny before my sister. When we got the baskets, I pretended that I was thinking about where I should go, but then turned around and ran down the stairs on the other side of the house. I hid behind a little tree in the garden and waited for my sister. Of course she came. “Louisa, come down into the garden! The Easter bunny is here. Hurry up!” my sister shouted. I looked everywhere for the Easter

bunny, but I could not find him. At first I felt stupid because I could not see anything and thought he must be somewhere in our garden. After some time, I realized that it was not my fault; there was just no Easter bunny. But how do I get my candy, I wondered. There must be an Easter bunny. I sat behind the tree for twenty minutes until my parents and Julia found me.

“Mom, how can it be that there is no Easter bunny? Who brings all the gifts? Tell me the truth!”

“Oh dear, there is no Easter bunny. We hide the candy and the presents.” When I heard that sentence, I cried. “Darling, Easter is not just about presents, and maybe there is an Easter bunny, and we just do not know. But we can still have fun and have a wonderful day.”

That was how I got to know that there is no Easter bunny. I am still sad that I will never see a bunny with a chocolate brown coat and rose bow on the top of his head.

HER THOUGHTFUL PROGENY

It is a gray summer in Switzerland when Mary Shelley pens her famed horror novel, *Frankenstein*. The plot comes to her in what she describes as a “ghastly image of [her] fancy” (Shelley 172); the tale, written for a contest between her, her husband, and their companion, is intended to frighten. However, as says critic Abby Wolf, “What Mary Shelley produced was not so much a ghost story as a meditation on the dangers of genius and creativity, and of man’s responsibility to his own creations, and to the world into which he releases them.” While Mary Shelley might mean for her “hideous progeny” to alarm the reader, the bulk of the novel’s emphasis rests on the consequences of Victor’s actions and *in*actions rather than the gruesomeness of his creature’s deeds. In *Frankenstein*, it is not the monster who frightens, but Victor and his own irresponsibility who terrify the reader.

Throughout the telling of the story, both Mary Shelley in her writing and Victor in his narration of events take the emphasis off of the gore that would make *Frankenstein* more of a “traditional” horror story. Details of the monster’s murders are glossed over and left as almost afterthoughts to the rest of the tale. The scene in which the monster “grasped [William’s] throat to silence him” (Shelley 97) lacks elements to inspire fear in the reader. Likewise, the image of Elizabeth “lifeless and inanimate, thrown across the bed, her head hanging down, and her pale and distorted features half covered by her hair” (Shelley 185) is chilling, but not particularly horrific. Because the details of the murders are less important than the decisions that cause them, *Frankenstein* becomes less of a gruesome tale than it has the potential to be. Details such as these make a story frightening, and the lack of them in this novel indicates that *death* isn’t meant to be the terrifying factor. Even the monster who commits these heinous acts is portrayed as a good person with “the greatest ardour for virtue . . . and abhorrence for vice” (Shelley 87) who is driven to kill by his loneliness, his creator’s neglect, and humanity’s contempt. Shelley goes to great lengths to highlight the creature’s merits, despite

his murderous tendencies; she tells of his great intelligence, his initial feelings of goodwill towards mankind, and his saving of a young girl from drowning. Far from the usual antagonists of the horror genre, he expresses no malice when unprovoked by others. People outside of Victor's small circle of relations are in no danger of facing his wrath. It's clear from this that Frankenstein's monster isn't *scary* in the traditional sense; he's just ugly and misunderstood.

While the various incidents of slaughter Shelley scatters throughout her novel and their perpetrator are unsettling at most, her protagonist's rampant irresponsibility is truly grisly. From the moment that he sets out to fashion his creation, Victor throws morality, common sense, and accountability to the wind. Even his relationships with those he holds dearest fall prey to his ambitions. His drive to do what no other has done before him causes him "to forget those friends who were so many miles absent, and whom [he] had not seen for so long a time" (Shelley 33). While neglecting to catch up with one's relatives every so often may be excusable, in Victor's case it provides insight to a darker side of his nature. He is so engrossed in his science that he lacks empathy and foresight as to the effects of his actions outside of his laboratory. In addition, he is so disconnected from the real world and so self-centered that he feels not for those around him until they are lost to him forever; he has *two* younger brothers, but the older is rarely mentioned after the novel's first pages because he never comes to any harm. Through this Shelley poses a difficult question to those living in the Age of Enlightenment: are they such scientists that they lose touch of what is not directly related to their science? Her contemporaries surely would be chilled by the realization that they see elements of themselves in Victor. Shelley, though, goes on to push buttons by asking about a scientist's responsibility to his work. Victor is unsatisfied with the results of his experiment, so he, filled with "breathless horror and disgust...rushed out of the room" (Shelley 34). It is only when he abandons the creature to its own means that it truly becomes a monster. All of the horrors that it works are spurred on by Victor's repeated refusal to act with the responsibility that a creator should; he is right when he laments the deaths of his loved ones as being wrought "through my infernal machinations" (Shelley 127). Victor's intrinsic flaws are far more frightening than a rampant murderer because they are much harder to get rid of and are, in some degree, present in everyone,

especially in such an age of advancement as the one in which Shelley lives.

Frankenstein is indeed a frightening novel, although not for the reasons that one would assume at first glance. For it isn't as much a tale of the havoc of a patchwork killer as it is a tale of how one scientist's lack of responsibility has the potential to end many lives. Shelley tells of the dangers of obsession and neglect through the accounts of Victor and his creation. The reason *Frankenstein* is able to disquiet now as it did when it was written is not because of its iconic antagonist, but because of the uncomfortable way in which the reader can relate with Victor. While only Victor has the power to create such a monster, everyone can experience the repercussions of neglecting something under their care.

SEEING THE VIETNAM WAR FROM A DIFFERENT ANGLE

On April 30th, 2002, sitting on the corner of my grandma's plank bed and watching a black-and-white documentary on TV, I fastened my eyes on a tank bulldozing the main gate of a behemoth building. Next, the music rose up with ardor as a soldier, who was then standing on top of the tank, waved the victorious flag of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. Aired on several channels on that Reunification Day, the documentary served as a remembrance of the occasion on April 30th, 1975, when the Viet Cong and North Vietnamese troops captured Saigon, signaling the end of what westerners call the Vietnam War.

I was nine years old then, and little did I know about the devastating aspects of war. For the rest of my sixteen years growing up in Vietnam, I had been immersed in various perspectives of many people around me regarding the Vietnam War. Startlingly, Vietnamese feelings and attitudes towards the war ranged from pride, resentment, indifference, objection, and sorrow, to deep regret. Nonetheless, almost everyone agreed that the tumultuous war period had polarized the entire nation; it was horrific that, besides fighting against a foreign country, Vietnamese soldiers had to fight against their brothers in the battlefields, where blood was shed and lives were taken away every hour.

In my junior year at Berkshire School, reading *The Things They Carried*, I was able to look at the war through completely different perspectives of American soldiers who fought in the Vietnam War, and I became more aware of the universality of soldiers' emotional burdens, including grief, terror, wistfulness, and love, and of the ineffable gravity of guilt and regret that existed on both side of the frontline.

For example, during the war, the young First Lieutenant Jimmy Cross is so pre-occupied with his infatuation with Martha that he fails to become a true leader of his troop and is tormented by Ted Lavender death's, since Cross believes he is re-

sponsible for it. Other soldiers, especially Azar, develop moral confusion as they have to constantly face life and death and are paradoxically afraid to show their fear of dying, observing that

When someone died, it wasn't quite dying, because in a curious way it seemed scripted, and because they had their lines mostly memorized, irony mixed with tragedy, and because they called it by other names, as if to encyst and destroy the reality of death itself. (O'Brien 19)

This moral confusion is depicted by the vulgar language and shocking actions that become common among the soldiers. They kick corpses, play catch with smoke grenades, shake hands with a corpse, cut off thumbs, slaughter innocent animals, and smoke dope.

Nevertheless, the image of Norman Bowker driving his car around a local lake on a late afternoon on the Fourth of July, carrying the burden of memory, haunted me the most. It struck me that Bowker's inability to escape from memory and his struggle to find a direction in life after the war were not uncommon among war veterans. As a matter of fact, a memory of an old photograph of the thousand-yard stare of an unknown Vietnamese soldier in a Vietnamese newspaper immediately popped up in my mind every time I tried to visualize Norman Bowker. I could clearly recall my perception that the traumatizing war had taken all of the liveliness away from that Vietnamese soldier, temporarily locking him up in nightmarish memory. Furthermore, I was convinced that Norman Bowker would definitely share the same kind of tormenting war experience with the soldier.

On a more general note, with a better understanding about the similarity of depressing war experiences among soldiers on both sides of the front line, I could not agree more with my U.S. history teacher's saying that war is the ultimate insult to the intelligence of humankind. As war is always a manifestation of death, destruction, and all of the negativities in life, I strongly believe that any act of brinkmanship which pushes nations towards war should be discouraged by any means.

HUMANS ARE SIMPLER THAN WE THINK

It is often said, “You can’t buy happiness.” Why doesn’t money make people happy? The correlation between wealth and happiness is not in favor of the wealthy. Yet nearly everyone dreams of becoming wealthy and equates money with success. Wealth has come to represent a basic human need in our minds because of internal and external expectations that a “good life” is dedicated to achieving it.

The human brain is not simple by any means. Years of evolution have made it capable of complex processes no one will ever fully understand. But at its core, the brain is a logical system designed for survival. The requirements for physical survival are obvious: to stay alive, a person needs warmth, shelter, food and water. But what about emotional survival, or rather, emotional stability? What does a human need in order to stay happy? American psychiatrist William Glasser suggests that the emotional needs of humans are rooted in our senses of belonging, power, freedom, and fun.

It is helpful to view the brain as a system with three main functions. The first function is judgment, the part of the brain that can make moral and sound decisions that will benefit the person in the long term. The second function is instinct. It stays dormant most of the time, but when a situation presents itself that threatens the survival of the person, the survival function will make decisions that override the moral goodness of the person’s judgment. In other words, our inalienable instinct to survive can cause people to act in ways that are misrepresentative of that person’s good nature. The final and most important function of the brain is reward. This part of the brain releases dopamine, the chemical that induces pleasure. This simple chemical reaction ensures that when we meet our needs, we experience a sense of well-being. It is the motivation to seek out the things we need for long-term benefit when our lives are not at stake.

But what does this have to do with money? First, it is necessary to understand

that money represents instant access to everything we require, and it does so in a non-perishable form that is always available. In a practical sense, you can never have too much money. Because of its apparently limitless value, money has eclipsed all of the other basic human needs in our society and rooted itself as a survival need in our brains. We don't ever have to worry about food, water, warmth or shelter — as long as we know we have money to buy as much as we want. The goal, then, is to accumulate as much money as possible, so that we can feel secure and certain that we'll always survive. Herein lies the problem. Instead of being rewarded by meeting a simple human need, we are rewarded every time we get paid. The difference is significant. A hungry polar bear is rewarded when it kills a seal because its brain delivers a shot of the pleasure-inducing dopamine and, more importantly, the bear is no longer hungry. It can relax and digest until it is hungry again. The oscillation from pleasure to fulfillment and anticipation to reward keeps the bear from taking its meals for granted. But can a human's hunger for money ever be sated? Maybe, but only when we feel certain that we've made enough money to take care of ourselves and our loved ones for the rest of our lives, and there's no way to know how much is enough. The need to get paid has already rooted itself in our brains at an instinctual level. During the Enron scandal, the chief executives had made enough legitimate money to support themselves and their children, yet they started increasing their profits by committing corporate crimes. Even if they didn't need the cash to support them financially, they needed it to support them psychologically — no amount of money was ever going to be “enough.”

How can we change our society to protect ourselves from this destructive cycle of greed? It is not really possible to suddenly begin to appreciate the luxury of having running water and a bed to sleep in, and to just forget about our financial endeavors and ambitions. But a simple awareness of the psychological power of money leads to a better understanding of how desires and dependencies can be transformed in our minds into false needs. We can take comfort in the fact that our primal survival instinct will take care of us no matter what happens. Instead of building a craving for the chemically induced satisfaction associated with getting paid, we can pursue long term natural happiness by focusing instead on satisfying our genuine psychological needs.

FAR-REACHING DEBATE: THE SHANDONG PROBLEM IN THE PARIS PEACE CONFERENCE OF 1919

“The recent history of both Europe and Asia shows beyond a doubt the futility of trying to turn a tiger into a kitten by giving it a dish of cream.”

—Dr. V.K. Wellington Koo, Chinese delegate to the Paris Peace Conference

Shandong Province, the birthplace of famous Chinese philosopher Confucius, is a resplendent pearl on the eastern coast of the People’s Republic of China. Its favorable topography, large population, and rich mineral resources attracted many of the western powers in the late 19th century. When China granted Germany the lease of Kiaochow Bay of Shandong under the pressure of imperialism in 1898, the Shandong problem, an issue which would haunt China for more than 20 years, was in embryo. In the Paris Peace Conference of 1919 after World War I, China endeavored to restore her sovereignty over Shandong Province as an allied victor after Germany handed it over as a defeated power. However, Japan demanded that Shandong should be under its administration, based on the secretly signed Twenty-One Demands with China.

The Shandong Problem was thus heatedly debated in the Paris Peace Conference, not only by China, Japan and Germany but also by the United States, France and the United Kingdom. The debate ended with the Treaty of Versailles satisfying Japan’s demands and China’s refusal to sign it. Though China failed to accomplish its goal in the conference, the debate brought world attention to China and paved the road for the final recovery of Shandong Province in the 1922 Washington Naval Conference. It consequently led to the May Fourth Movement in China and greatly sparked Chinese nationalism to fight against imperialism.

Japan's Lure of Shandong and the Twenty-One Demands:

The outbreak of war in Europe in August 1914 marked the end of the German regime in the Far East, which was greatly hastened by the participation by Japan in the conflict. ¹As Germany was deeply involved in World War I, it had little time to deal with its leased territory in the Far East, Kiaochow Bay. Japan thought it a perfect opportunity to take advantage of this neglect to spread its sphere of influence in Asia. On August 15, 1914, Japan delivered an ultimatum to Germany, asking the latter "to deliver on a date not later than September 15, 1914 to the Imperial Japanese Government, without condition or compensation, the entire leased territory of Kiaochow, with a view to eventual restoration of the same to China."² Germany deliberately ignored Japan's "advice". As a result, Japan officially declared war on Germany on August 23, and succeeded in defeating German troops in Qingdao on November 7, 1914.

To legalize and ensure its control over Shandong, Japan made the Twenty-One Demands. In the "First Instructions given by Baron Kato (then Japanese Minister for Foreign Affairs) to Mr. Hioki (the Japanese Minister at Peking) - which were officially published at Tokyo on June 9, 1915- Mr. Hioki was informed that ".....for the purpose of ensuring a lasting peace in the Far East by strengthening the position of the (Japanese) Empire, the Imperial Government have resolved to approach the Chinese Government with a view to conclude treaties and agreements.....Believing it absolutely essential, for strengthening Japan's position in eastern Asia as well as for the preservation of the general interest of that region,the imperial government are determined to attain the end by all means with their power."³

The "treaties" in the instructions refer to the Twenty-One Demands. They were presented to China on January 18, 1915, and accepted in part on May 7 of the same year. They included China's assent to the direct disposition between Japan and Germany of the German rights, interests and concessions in Shandong, and to the building by Japan of a railway from Chefoo or Lungkow to join the Kiaochow-Tsinan Railway.⁴ The Twenty-One Demands complicated the Shandong Problem because they provided evidence in the Paris Peace Conference that Japan had the legal right to inherit Germany's lease of Shandong.

China's Political and Economic Background:

Qing Dynasty, the last ruling dynasty in China, ended in February, 1912. Having suffered enough of the corruption and bribery during the Qing Dynasty, people in China desperately wanted democracy and an end of imperialism. Yuan Shikai, prime minister in the former imperial cabinet, became Provisional President of the Republic of China. However, he was an ambitious and decisive politician who always wanted to become an emperor himself. When Japan presented him the Twenty-One Demands as well as the support for him on condition that Yuan would agree to the contents of the treaties, he signed them at the cost of China's sovereignty.

However, Yuan's ambition was not the only and most influential reason for the outcome. Chinese economic development fell far behind the western powers. In the late 19th century, national capitalism was gradually established. Some Chinese landlords and factory owners began to hire workers for their own interests. Though economic conditions in China became better as the owners started to learn from western businessmen how to manage their finances, national capitalism was still not mature enough because the factories lacked advanced technology and depended largely on the investment of western companies. Besides, the scales of these factories and companies were relatively small compared to those of the western powers. At the same time, unequal treaties threatened Chinese owners by low import taxes on the foreign goods.

On the other hand, Japan developed rapidly after Meiji Restoration. For example, during 1909 to 1914, Japan's raw silk production reached 12460 tons, while China had only 10000 tons.⁵ China was at a disadvantage in the debate because of her still developing economy .

The debate in the Conference:

Though the odds of winning seemed slight, the Chinese delegates to the Paris Peace conference still hoped to try. Five Chinese diplomats represented China in Paris at that time—Head diplomat Zhengxiang Lu, Representative of Southern government Zhengting Wang, Ambassador to U.K Zhaoji Shi, Ambassador to Belgium Chenzu Wei and Ambassador to U. S. V.K. Wellington Koo.⁶ A graduate of Columbia University with a PhD in international law and diplomacy, V.K.

Wellington Koo took the major responsibility to negotiate with Japanese representatives. Wellington Koo was young, but knowledgeable and thoughtful. He discovered that there might be a chance to seek support from the United States, because according to President Wilson's 14 Points, "Open covenants of peace, openly arrived at, after which there shall be no private international understandings of any kind but diplomacy shall proceed always frankly and in the public view." The Twenty-One Demands were treaties signed secretly without the knowledge of the Chinese people and the public.

Shortly after the Chinese representatives arrived in Paris, Japan proposed to the Committee of Paris Peace Conference first that it should inherit Germany's rights in Shandong. On January 28, 1919, Wellington Koo gave his speech on behalf of China in front of the supreme committee composed of representatives from five countries: U.S., U.K., France, Italy and Japan. He stated that the Chinese could not concede Shandong, which was the birthplace of Confucius, an important Chinese philosopher, as much as Christians could not concede Jerusalem, and he demanded the return of sovereignty over Shandong, to no avail.⁷ But his speech was a huge success, and the leaders of five countries spoke highly of him and were greatly surprised that China had such a talented diplomat.

However, the speech of the Japanese delegate was relatively simple. He stated that since China and Japan had already signed the Twenty-One Demands, there was no need to discuss the problem here.

At first, President Wilson had sympathy for China. According to the "Open Door Policy", multiple Imperial powers could have access to China, but none of them could be in total control of that country. He viewed Japan's attempt as violation of this policy. However, when the Japanese delegates indicated that they would leave the Paris Peace Conference and refuse to join the League of Nations if Wilson continued to support China, Wilson hesitated. Compared with the interests of a developing country, his love for the League of Nations was apparently much stronger. On April 30, 1919, the United States, the United Kingdom and Japan decided to allow Japan to have all the rights in Shandong Province in the Treaty of Versailles.

When V.K. Wellington Koo and other delegates heard the news, they were angry and disappointed. The next question was whether to sign the Treaty. After

hard and long consideration, they decided to refuse to sign the treaty because it was unfair to China as an allied victor. China became the only country that did not sign the treaty.

The decision ended the tradition of China compromising when facing the western powers. It greatly encouraged the Chinese people to fight against imperialism instead of quietly endure. The May Fourth Movement marked the beginning of China's modern history and its struggle against the western powers.

¹ Wood, Ge Zay. *The Shantung Question; a Study in Diplomacy and World Politics*. New York: Fleming H. Revell, 1922. 40. Print.

² Hervouet, Yves, and John K. Fairbank. "The Cambridge History of China. Volume 12: Republican China 1912-1949, Part 1." *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 29.2 (1986): 95. Print.

³ *The Shantung Question, a Statement of China's Claim Together with Important Documents Submitted to the Peace Conference in Paris*. San Francisco: Chinese National Welfare Society in America, 1919. 4. Print.

⁴ Wood, Ge Zay. *The Shantung Question; a Study in Diplomacy and World Politics*. New York: Fleming H. Revell, 1922. 16. Print. Yamamura, Kozo. "Success Ill-gotten? The Role of Meiji Militarism in Japan's Technological Progress." *The Journal of Economic History* 37.1 (1977). Web.

⁵ Koo, V.K. Wellington. *Reminiscence of V.K. Wellington Koo*. New York City, NY, 1976. Chinese Oral History

⁶ Koo, V.K. Wellington. *Reminiscence of V.K. Wellington Koo*. New York City, NY, 1976. Chinese Oral History

GLORY

I have never been asked what I would live for, much less die for. My life has been struggle-free when compared to the lives of many people around the world and those who came before me. I have never fought for a cause, person, belief, or nation.

I have essentially led a life of privilege I will never fully appreciate. I was born to loving parents in a small town in a developed and prosperous nation. I have lived seventeen years in exceptional health and comfort. I have been able to access first-rate educational opportunities and pursue many personal interests in an encouraging environment. I have had the opportunity to travel and see other cities, states, provinces, and nations and compare them to my own. I have had the right to believe, and disbelieve, in whatever I choose. Perhaps most importantly, I have led a life that has boasted the ultimate luxury: happiness.

A life without happiness is similar to an automobile without an engine. It may seem beautiful from the outside, and even comfortable on the inside, but it will never move forward. Life is indeed a journey; one that should be spent content with one's self and others. There is simply little point to living a life devoid of happiness. Yet history proves that human existence is a story of oppression, misery, and death. So what would I fight for? What would I die for?

I would fight and die for the opportunity to share the privileges I have with the people of the world. I would fight and die for true human progress. I believe the privileges I have should be inalienable rights for all people. However, I live in a world where over 925 million people are going hungry. To put that in perspective, the total number of World War II casualties came to just over 60 million. Today, there are approximately 37 wars currently being waged. In addition, people of different religions continue to spread hypocrisy and violence across blood-stained lands. As if that weren't enough, humanity is rapidly exhausting its main source of

energy, petroleum, and the consequences of its depletion remain unknown.

To me, it is a miracle and a blessing to live the life I am living. It is my hope that someday every person on planet Earth can live the dream I live in. I hope that one day the glory to live for one's country will overshadow the glory to die for it. I hope that one day education and knowledge belittle superstition, ignorance, and intolerance. I hope that one day love and happiness are rights and not just blessings. I would die for this global and human opportunity despite being ignorant of where or what my opposition would be.

Our leaders speak about change in our country, opportunities for job creation and a future for the coming generations. I think change should occur everywhere. Change and progress should be goals at the heart of the world's agenda. Imagine a clean, natural world, free of human pollution. Imagine a global economy based on alliances and better business. Imagine peace in the Middle East and global socio-economic independence; imagine a world without war.

I have never thought about what I would die for, but I believe this cause is just and noble. To die for the sake of humanity and its future would truly be an honor. Despite humanity's history of faults and evils, I think the species is worth dying for. As a people, we have the opportunity to help ourselves and the Earth become better. Let us be the first species to improve our condition and environment without forsaking our own or others. That is an idea worth dying for.

Works Cited

1. "Hypocrisy." Wikipedia, the Free Encyclopedia. Web. 27 Jan. 2011. <<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hypocrisy>>.
2. "The World at War." GlobalSecurity.org - Reliable Security Information. Web. 27 Jan. 2011. <<http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/world/war/index.html>>.
3. "World War II Casualties." Wikipedia, the Free Encyclopedia. Web. 27 Jan. 2011. <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/World_War_II_casualties>.
4. "2011 World Hunger and Poverty Facts and Statistics." World Hunger Notes Homepage. Web. 27 Jan. 2011. <http://www.worldhunger.org/articles/Learn/world_hunger_facts_2002.htm>.
5. "Glory (1989) - IMDb." The Internet Movie Database (IMDb). Web. 27 Jan. 2011. <<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0097441/>>.
6. "Peak Oil." Wikipedia, the Free Encyclopedia. Web. 27 Jan. 2011. <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Peak_oil>.
7. Baig, Khalid. "Religious Wars" Albalagh Home Page. Web. 27 Jan. 2011. <http://www.albalagh.net/food_for_thought/religious_wars.shtml>.

NOT WHO THEY THOUGHT THEY WERE

Due to the limited-omniscient narrative points of view in Hilary Mantel’s *Wolf Hall* and Joseph Conrad’s *Heart of Darkness*, the reader is able to view the contemplations and opinions of just one character per novel, Thomas Cromwell and Charlie Marlow, respectively. Through this method of narration, their self-perceptions are shown to undergo significant transformation. Various similarities arise between the characters’ attitude and evolution throughout their journeys. While the specific changes may in themselves be disparate, the way in which Cromwell and Marlow psychologically evolve is similar, both characters experiencing steady disillusionment with the powers they work under.

Both Marlow and Cromwell begin with a relatively idyllic view on their impending journeys. Marlow desires to explore the Congo in the way Cromwell idolizes Cardinal Wolsey: under a naïve mirage. He describes thinking of Africa in his youth as “a blank space of delightful mystery – a white patch for a boy to dream gloriously over” (Conrad 8). Similarly, the initial description of Wolsey, in the limited-omniscient narrative point of view, is at times one of idolization. He is detailed in venerated—even exaggerated—awe, through the eyes of Cromwell “still as handsome as he was in his prime...his height impresses...his [large] belly is another princely aspect of his being” (Mantel 18). Wolsey’s impressive academic credentials, his manner of speech, and even his dress are admired.

However, both characters, though in a prevaricating manner, show a certain amount of conflicted contempt for the respective “imperial powers” under which they labor. Marlow claims that Africa “had become a place of darkness” (Conrad 8) and upon arriving in Belgium, describes a “city that always makes me think of a whited sepulchre” (Conrad 9). This observation alludes to verse 23:27 of Book

of Matthew, which states “Woe to you, teacher of the law and Pharisees, you hypocrites! You are like whited sepulchres, which look beautiful on the outside but on the inside are full of dead men’s bones and everything unclean” (Weymouth New Testament, Matthew 23:27). An allusion of this evasive nature shows that Marlow is aware of the inherent corruption of the Belgian colonization but chooses to be indirect about his opinion, perhaps in an attempt to justify his voluntary participation in the abominations. In a similar manner, backhanded comments are interspersed within the lengthy idolizing description of Wolsey. Cromwell points out numerous examples of hypocrisy by the Cardinal, saying, “He is Archbishop of York but has never visited his see” (Mantel 18). In addition, he notes that the Cardinal, bypassing the clerical law of celibacy, has a son and a daughter, whom Cromwell notes is already placed in a convent, as if to redeem the obvious hypocrisy of her very existence. When Wolsey discusses personal matters divulged to him by the King in confession, Cromwell describes the Cardinal disdainfully, claiming “He waits, for some gratifying small reaction. His servant simply looks back at him: taking it for granted that the seal of the confessional is broken at the cardinal’s convenience” (Mantel 24). At certain points, Cromwell’s attempts at justifying the Cardinal’s corruption and illuminating him in a positive light seem to unintentionally point out more of Wolsey’s flaws. When the Cardinal pretends to recall the old king, Cromwell notes, “Wolsey talks as if he himself had witnessed everything, eye witnessed it, and in a sense he has, for the recent past arranged itself only the patterns acknowledged by his superior mind, and agreeable to his eye” (Mantel 26). In trying to justify the lie, Cromwell points out that Wolsey egotistically warps the past to suit his needs. Cromwell even nonchalantly details the corruption of Rome, stating that Wolsey would have been Pope “if at the last election the right money had been paid out the right people” (Mantel 23).

As their individual journeys progress, Marlow and Cromwell experience a gradual but consistent enlightenment of sorts. They cease their vain attempts at sugarcoating the truth or ignoring it completely and in this the grotesque interiors of their respective idols are revealed. In Africa, Marlow encounters the cruelty of the Belgian colony, masked by their claims of “civilizing” the natives. While he never sincerely shows respect for the African people, he has a conflicted

admiration of them. In viewing Kurtz's African mistress, Marlow describes her as a "wild and gorgeous apparition of a woman...savage and superb, wild-eyed and magnificent; there was something stately in her deliberate progress" (Conrad 60). His admiration, however conflicted with his inherent belief in her savageness, contrasts the total superiority to the natives felt by the Belgian Company and by Marlow himself in the beginning of his journey. By the end, he questions what the true definition of sanity is. Kurtz, who for the majority of the story had been the epitome of madness, a respectable man gone native, is lauded by Marlow, who says, in referencing his own near-death moment:

If such is the form of ultimate wisdom then life is a greater riddle than some of us think it to be. I was within a hair's-breadth of the last opportunity for pronouncement, and I found with humiliation that probably I would have nothing to say. This is the reason why I affirm that Kurtz was a remarkable man. He had something to say. He said it. (Conrad 70).

In a comparable spell of disillusionment, a pragmatic Cromwell distances himself from his formerly beloved Cardinal in order to advance in court under Henry VIII and his Reformation, despite his desire for vengeance after the swift fall of the Cardinal. While Cromwell continues to advance Wolsey's objective of acquiring Anne Boleyn for the King, his view of Wolsey becomes progressively less revering. Due to the astounding amount of influence with Henry he gains after the King's marriage annulment with Catherine of Aragon and subsequent marriage to Anne Boleyn, Cromwell then begins to view his eminence as surpassing the Cardinal's. However, it is ironic that Cromwell sets out to modernize England by annihilating the presence of the corrupted Catholic Church, yet acquired his base of influence by working loyally under a highly depraved Cardinal.

Marlow, initially neutral in regards to the Belgian Company and entranced with what he views as a primitive, unexplored Africa, ends his journey in questioning the validity of the European concept of civilization versus savageness. Similarly Cromwell, who begins in total admiration of the highly corrupted Cardinal Wolsey, abdicates his ties in order to better his position at court. In the end, he becomes more and more aware of Wolsey's hypocrisy and shifts his admiration to himself and the high status he worked hard to acquire. It is obvious that

both Marlow and Cromwell are inherently aware of the hypocrisy and corruption they are working under, but are attempting to ignore reality in order to justify their position in the world and to make their jobs easier to bear in their consciences. As their journeys progress, however, the veil is lifted and the truth they were avoiding harshly manifests itself, forcing them to reevaluate what they thought they understood.

RESTRUCTURING THE BUDGET AND SOLVING THE DEFICIT CRISIS

With the looming crises of rising debt levels and the growing deficit gap within the budget, the U.S. federal government needs to make adjustments to the budget in order to solve both problems. In order to understand these adjustments, the concepts of the national debt and the budget deficit, must first be understood. And analyzing exactly what the federal budget is, the resulting conclusions lend vital information about how to move forward from the crises. To further understand why the U.S. must escape the growing national debt, careful examination can be given to countries that have suffered from these same problems, explaining what could lie ahead for the U.S.

There are clear adjustments to be made with the budget that will solve the deficit crises. Canceling or delaying some weapons programs for the defense sector and reducing the number of troops in Iraq and Afghanistan to 30,000 will both help the budget crisis. An increase in both the Medicare eligibility age to 70 and the Social Security retirement age to 70 will also generate savings. Social Security benefits for those with high incomes should be reduced and estate tax rates should be returned to the Clinton levels. In order to stabilize both the national debt and the deficit crises, the U.S. must sacrifice some luxuries, such as astronomical incomes for the rich, and use tax increases—as opposed to spending cuts—on viable sectors to close the deficit gap and lower the national debt levels. Tax cuts for those with \$250,000 or more should be eliminated, and a Payroll Tax for those with \$106,000 or higher added. A millionaire's tax on incomes above \$1 million will help the deficit as will the elimination of tax exemption and loopholes. Lastly, the government should implement both a carbon tax and a bank tax.

The federal budget is a hot-button issue in an on-going debate about how the U.S. should rise out of the recession. By definition, the federal budget is how the president and members of our government allocate funds to different government sectors, keeping in mind that our monetary resources are not endless. In simpler terms, the federal budget is similar to your standard family budget. Just as families must figure out how best to spend on food, clothing, education, and other expenses, the federal budget must determine how to allocate its own resources. The key components in this equation include the country's revenue, national spending, and the effects these two have on national debt.

The federal budget encompasses all of the major government programs that the U.S. has today. The U.S. citizens generate the funding for the government programs by paying taxes, and the debate within the U.S. today is how this revenue stream should be spent and whether the cutting of government spending will make up for the growing deficit.

The federal budget allocates funding to programs such as domestic and foreign aid, the military, healthcare, and social security. *The Washington Post* recently published an article on "Taking Apart the Budget," which helps illustrate exactly what makes up the budget and where the money goes. As of 2010, the U.S. brings in 2.57 trillion dollars in revenue generated from corporate taxes, payroll taxes, and income taxes. Per annum, the U.S. is currently spending 3.83 trillion dollars resulting in a 1.27 trillion dollar deficit that has compounded the debt over the last few years. The Federal government allocates \$895 billion in defense, \$730 billion in social security, \$491 billion in Medicare, \$297 billion in Medicaid, and \$520 billion in other discretionary programs.

Considering the budget, a close inspection on the impact that the revenue and the spending has on the national debt will help define what needs to be done. When the country's spending exceeds its income or revenue, there is a deficit. The government then borrows money to offset this deficit, and this borrowed money is considered the national debt. For every transaction borrowed there is an interest rate, which establishes an incentive for countries and other national governments to lend money to the U.S. based on the fact that they will receive more money to offset their risk, and the fact that the United States is considered a "sure thing," meaning the debts are always paid back in a timely fashion. The

problem with this process is that the U.S. has built up quite a bit of national debt; if the economy continues to struggle and the debt continues to grow, other governments may lose confidence in the U.S., and our nation may not be able to borrow money one day. The U.S. is now almost 14 trillion dollars in debt, which is a major concern. There have been problems recently with other countries suffering from high national debt, including Greece, Portugal, and Ireland. Greece suffered because its debt was over 100% of the Gross Domestic Product and with continued deficits in subsequent years, many investors who were buying up Greek debt became concerned that the country would default on its debt. This lack of confidence caused interest rates on the debt to skyrocket, and it became much cheaper to buy other countries' debt, such as that of Germany. When Greece's debt became unattractive, the country crashed financially.

Ireland is another example of how high national debt can have serious problems. When the real estate market collapsed, Ireland was forced to aid its banking sector, which put heavy strains on the country's monetary resources and caused high debt levels to accumulate. The country was ultimately forced to go to the European Union for a bailout package. The resulting complications from high debt caused a nation-wide economic stagnation. Investors now have less confidence in Irish bonds and in the country's overall ability to recover from a recession, causing interest rates to jump, and private sectors may see a decrease in growth. The high debt levels will also cause the federal government to put a halt on spending packages, most likely causing citizens to panic and hoard money, furthering contributing to the economic stall.

Today, the U.S. is plagued with a similar debt crisis. Eliminating the deficit problem is not an overnight fix, but the problem can be fixed if some adjustments are made to the U.S. federal budget.

First, with the military sector reaching funding levels of almost \$900 billion, the government needs to cancel and delay some weapons programs. Cancelling the F-35 fighter jet and the MV-22 Osprey projects, along with several other research and development programs, would save the U.S. \$19 billion by 2015. Since the U.S. has the largest Air Force in the world, it seems extremely sensible to cut spending in this sector. The government also needs to reduce the number of troops currently deployed in Iraq and Afghanistan to 30,000. President Obama

stated that he would be reducing the number of troops, but he has yet to take significant action. By reducing our deployed troop count, the U.S. could save up \$86 billion over the short term and \$169 billion by 2030. The savings that result from a reduction in troops would put a significant dent in the \$1,345 billion deficit projected for 2030.

Another way to reduce the deficit is by increasing the eligibility age for Medicare to 70 years. Studies have shown that the U.S. life expectancy has risen from 49 years at the turn of the 20th century to 77.5 years of age in 2003. Americans are living much longer, well past age 70, and an extended two years on Medicare eligibility will create savings of \$104 billion by 2030. If the deficit is to be solved, we need to sacrifice some luxuries.

Another, more important key to solving the deficit will be reforming Social Security, in crisis as the baby boomers finally reach retirement eligibility. For the past few decades, the Social Security program has been operating at a surplus; the U.S. has been receiving more money from the taxes for this sector than it has been paying out. But when the baby boomer generation starts to collect Social Security, that surplus will become a deficit, and the problem with this is that the surplus in Social Security has helped pay for other government deficits. Now the deficit problems could be compounded, and by raising the retirement age to 70 the government would save \$247 billion by 2030, funds that would help to negate the Social Security crisis. Furthermore, by reducing the benefits of Social Security for those with high incomes through an economic means test, the U.S. can save another \$54 billion by 2030. The effects of this proposal would create very slow growth in payouts for those above the 60th percentile of per capita incomes, while those of lower incomes would continue to see growth in their benefits.

By returning the estate-tax levels to the Clinton-era, a minor sacrifice, the U.S. can save \$50 billion by 2015, and generate a lot of revenue that could be redistributed.

The federal budget also needs to make adjustments in the Bush-era tax cuts. These cuts were at the center of the debates in the 2010 mid-term elections. By allowing the Bush cuts to expire for those with income greater than \$250,000 a year, the top two percent, the government can acquire \$54 billion by 2015.

To ensure steady revenue streams, a payroll tax is another budget reform that

can be put in place for those making over \$106,000 a year. The tax will cover the historic 90 percent of U.S. taxpayers as opposed to 80 percent that the tax covers today, and by 2015 the tax would create \$50 billion in revenue and by 2030 generate \$100 billion.

In other tax matters, a budget reform that would likely harm few citizens and create large monetary revenues is the millionaire's tax on incomes above \$1 million. If passed, this tax would tack on a 5.4% surtax on incomes above \$1 million, affecting on the top percentile in miniscule ways. By 2015 the tax would save \$50 billion. Again, in tough economic times we must sacrifice luxuries from viable sectors to reverse the deficit troubles.

Considering that most of the generated revenue has been from taxes with the higher percentile brackets, a reduction in rates could make a large dent in the deficit. This may not make sense, but by eliminating loopholes and tax exemptions the U.S. can earn \$75 billion by 2015 and \$175 billion by 2030. With the overall elimination of loopholes, tax rates can be reduced while revenue is gained. While corporate loopholes may be cut, the overall corporate tax will drop from 35% to 28%, as will all the brackets of individual tax.

Because of much concern over global warming, there has been a steady trend for alternative (green) energy. Many groups and organizations have long fought for carbon restrictions, and now it seems necessary for the U.S. to start considering carbon offsets from corporations and other companies that pollute. The carbon tax will not only result in a cleaner environment and reduce the chances of global warming, but also generate \$40 billion in the near future by 2015 and \$71 billion by 2030.

Lastly, the federal budget must reflect changes in the banking sector. The economic crash in 2008 was largely due to many banks' taking high risks on investments that were never supposed to go "belly-up." By imposing a bank tax, the government can restrict risky holdings and large-scale monopolies through higher tax rates. The revenue stream that would follow would total \$73 billion by 2015 and \$103 billion by 2030.

In conclusion, the solutions to the growing national debt and widening deficit lie within the U.S.'s ability to sacrifice luxury for the betterment of the country as a whole. By imposing tax increases on the top percentiles, the wealth all together

begins to be redistributed and the flow of money within the economy will circulate, causing prosperity to flourish once again. Justice Louis D. Brandeis once said, “We can have democracy in this country, or we can have great wealth concentrated in the hands of a few, but we can’t have both.” Considering that this country was founded on democratic principles enshrining equal opportunity for all, the U.S. must reform the budget to reflect the country’s core principles in order to reduce and eventually eliminate the deficit.

Work Cited:

Carter, By Shan. “Budget Puzzle: You Fix the Budget - Interactive Feature - NYTimes.com.” The New York Times - Breaking News, World News & Multimedia. 11 Dec. 2010. Web. 11 Dec. 2010.

<<http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2010/11/13/weekinreview/deficits-graphic.html?src=me&ref=homepage>>. Liberty Tree. “Wealth Quotations.” 2008. Web. 11 Dec. 2010. <http://quotes.liberty-tree.ca/quote/louis_brandeis_quote_503c>.

Pettinger, T. “Problem With Greece Economy.” Economics Essays. 8 Dec. 2010. Web. 11 Dec. 2010.

<<http://econ.economicshelp.org/2010/02/problem-with-greece-economy.html>>.

Shrestha, Laura B. “Life Expectancy in U.S.” 16 Aug. 2006. Web. 11 Dec. 2010.

<<http://aging.senate.gov/crs/aging1.pdf>>.

Steinberg, Ed. “Understanding the Federal Budget.” Public Information Department. Federal Reserve Bank of New York. Web. 11 Dec. 2010. <<http://www.ny.frb.org/education/addpub/budg4.pdf>>.

U.S. Government. “Total Budgeted Government Spending.” Government Spending in United States: Federal State Local 2010 - Charts Tables History. 10 Dec. 2010. Web. 11 Dec. 2010. <<http://www.usgovernmentsspending.com/index.php>>.

U.S. Treasury Department. “National Debt.” Federal Budget Spending and the National Debt. 4 Dec. 2010. Web. 11 Dec. 2010. <<http://www.federalbudget.com/>>.

White House Budget Office. “Taking Apart the Federal Budget (washingtonpost.com).” Washington Post - Politics, National, World & D.C. Area News and Headlines - Washingtonpost.com. 11 Dec. 2010. Web. 11 Dec. 2010.

<<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/special/politics/budget-2010/>>.

O GOD, SHALL I GRANT YOU MY FREEDOM?

When Bruce Feiler, a renowned writer on God, was asked by his daughter, “Daddy, if I speak to God, will he listen?” he froze, unable to come up with an immediate response.¹ Sadly, Mr. Feiler’s daughter is not the only one to ever ask that question. Talk to Ted Olson, husband of a 9/11 victim, and he will tell you how much he prayed on that fateful day.² Talk to an old woman who lost her family in the Auschwitz camp and you may hear that her only spiritual support was her belief that God would save her parents from Hitler. Talk to a victim of a recent anti-gay crime in the Bronx, and you would hear the same thing.³ Most of the time, God gives no reply to these suffering men and women, and many have rightfully asked: Where is God when moral crimes happen? If He exists, shouldn’t He listen to our prayers? Or shouldn’t He stop these crimes even before our prayers then?

The atheists who doubt the existence of God, an omniscient, omnipotent and omni-benevolent being, have, for a long time, elaborated on these questions, proposing *The Problem of Evil* against God’s existence. The foundation of this argument seems to be incredibly simple: an omniscient being must have had the *knowledge* to eradicate all evil, an omnipotent being must have had the *means* to eradicate all evil, and an omni-benevolent being must have had the *will* to eradicate all evil. Therefore, the existence of an omniscient, omnipotent and omni-benevolent being must have been incompatible with that of evil; that is, one cannot co-exist with the other. And because moral evil exists in our everyday life, God must not exist.

Across the globe, many sincere believers find themselves speechless before this seemingly unsophisticated argument. Some Christians respond by compromis-

ing one or some of God's attributes to explain evil, hence effectively abandoning the Christian theists' view of God. A few stubbornly sweat to come up with a *theodicy*, which supposedly retains all of God's attributes while introducing an account for evil. Glenn Beck, for example, said before thousands of his followers that 9-11 was God's "wake-up" call to restore America, implying that evil is a means for good.⁴ While Beck's theodicy might be met with cheers and applause, it is highly controversial under a more careful judgment. If God is really all-powerful, all-knowing, and perfectly good, why can't He come up with a peaceful way to correct America? Why did He have to kill so many people? Beck, as we all know, chooses to ignore these "progressive" critiques.

While Beck's argument is less than compelling, other theodicies have touched a much more powerful ground and rightfully earned much serious attention. One of the most notable is the *Free-Will Theodicy*, whose central element is that free-willed human beings, rather than God, are responsible for moral evil.⁵ That said, God could have created an alternative world where there is no moral evil, but by doing so he would have effectively abandoned all free will. Having evaluated all the possible worlds, God, our omniscient, omnipotent and omni-benevolent Creator, realized that a world with free will and some moral evil (our world) is far better than a world with no moral evil and no free will (World A). As a result, all moral evil is due to human free will, rather than God's fault, as St. Augustine wrote:⁶

Now [...] wherever there is any requirement in the divine admonitions for the work of the will to do anything, or to refrain from doing anything, there is at once a sufficient proof of free will. No man, therefore, when he sins, can in his heart blame God for it, but every man must impute the fault to himself. Nor does it detract at all from a man's own will when he performs any act in accordance with God.

On one hand, this theodicy distances God from moral evil and puts blame on men as free agents. If terrorists attack civilians, for example, it is not God's fault that these terrorists commit such a terrible crime, for God does not make them do so. Rather, it is the terrorists' sin for abusing the freedom given by God, and according to St. Augustine, these sinners will later be condemned under the judgment of God. On the other hand, the *Free-Will Theodicy* seems to suggest that the

existence of moral evil is justified by the existence of a greater good: freedom of the will. The theists insist that without free will, there could be no moral goodness. What is the point of goodness, they say, if everyone is not free to do evil? In such a case, would we be able to appreciate and embrace such goodness then? The theists' answer is, "No". Therefore, the good created with the existence of free will more than outweighs the moral evil associated with it, and God did the right thing in creating free humans, fully aware of the risk inherent in these beings. Someone then asks: Can God create a world (World B) where humans are both free and unable to commit evil; that is, they have an option to do wrong, but always choose the right thing? The theists rebuke by claiming that such an idea is ridiculous, and that the kind of free will in World B is not real freedom, for after all, such humans still cannot commit crime even though they have the option to do so.

Even though the *Free-Will Theodicy* ignores natural evil—evil not created by men's actions, such as tsunami, earthquake and disease—and the theodicy's claim that moral evil is a necessary accompaniment to freedom is controversial at best, the atheists may generously overlook such flaws. Yet even the atheists' generosity cannot save the theists' attempt, as anyone may apply the theists' own argument to question God's free will itself. It is without a doubt that God, as a perfectly good being, can neither commit evil nor intend to commit such an act. For instance, God is unable to lie, to cheat, and to be unjust.⁷ Given good choice and evil choice, God cannot choose the evil one, simply because he is by definition incapable of choosing evil. Now, in developing the *Free-Will Theodicy*, the theists reject World B by pointing out that moral evil is a necessary accompaniment to freedom of the will, and that any being unable to commit evil, *with or without an option to commit evil*, is not free. If that is the case, it seems to follow that God does not have free will because He can never do wrong, even though He, like the beings in World B, might have an option to commit crimes. In other words, God is not free. And if God is not free, are God's actions still praiseworthy? "No," say the theists. However, if the theists reason that God still has free will, though this kind of freedom does not always exclude an inability to do wrong, then they fail to answer the objection of World B.

Like other theodicies before it, the *Free-Will Theodicy* falls short in providing a coherent, logical account of the co-existence of God and evil. Nevertheless, we

must acknowledge that this theodicy should still deserve some respect from the sympathetic, big-hearted atheists. Why? Well, at least St. Augustine, Platinga, and many others try quite hard, though they are no closer to the truth than Mr. Beck. If they tried just a little bit harder, I would suggest that the atheists offer the orthodox God a piece of freedom.

¹ From New York Times:

http://www.nytimes.com/2010/10/17/fashion/17ThisLife.html?pagewanted=1&_r=1&sq=bruce%20feiler&st=cse&scp=1

² From Huffington Post: http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2010/08/18/liz-cheney-keep-america-_n_686697.html

³ From New York Times: <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/10/09/nyregion/09bias.html>

⁴ From Media Matters: <http://mediamatters.org/mmtv/201008280017>

⁵ Link: <http://www.philosophyofreligion.info/arguments-for-atheism/the-problem-of-evil/the-argument-from-moral-evil/the-free-will-defence/>

⁶ St. Augustine. On Grace and Free Will. Church Fathers. *New Advent*. New Advent, n.d. Web. 16 Nov 2010.

<<http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/1510.htm>>.

⁷Link: <http://www.iep.utm.edu/evil-log/#H5>



BERKSHIRE SCHOOL

SHEFFIELD, MASSACHUSETTS

“The Berkshire Scholar” is produced, in part, with wind-powered mills and on a solar-powered press.