George Newtown

James Fenimore Cooper, Frontier Mythology, and the New Ulm Apologists

Within the United States throughout much of the nineteenth century there were simultaneous regional differences in views of the American Indian. Both Easterners and Westerners used the available mythic stereotypes—of noble and ignoble savages, respectively—for propagandistic ends. European immigrants, whose cultural traditions provided them almost exclusively with the myth of the noble savage, adopted the myth of the ignoble savage as they sought to carve out farms and towns on the frontier; their freedom to act as they wished depended on a lack of freedom for the undeserving Indians. The close juxtaposition of these contrary mythologies about native Americans may have left the rhetoric of foreign settlers temporarily confused, but their course of action as frontier pioneers was clear. The German settlement of New Ulm, Minnesota, provides a useful case study of the mythic underpinnings of frontier life for immigrant settlers.

The idealizers of the noble savage in America were primarily writers of the Northeast, where the horrors of border warfare were long forgotten. For them the noble savage embodied ideals of democratic individualism, courtly love, and romantic Christianity; he practiced natural religion, he incarnated the spirit of brotherly love and self-sacrifice, and he furthered pacifism and abolitionism. In other words, behavior which a group of educated Northeasterners esteemed was attributed to the Indian.[1] Before the publication of the *Leatherstocking Tales* (1823-1841) of James Fenimore Cooper (1789-1851), Americans had been largely silent about the noble savage. Although European philosophers in the eighteenth century had found him useful for highlighting what they regarded as the vices of overbred European culture, he had not represented a myth which spoke to America's needs, wishes, or perceptions of reality. Cooper was able to create his own noble savage because Cooperstown was almost as far from the frontier as was Vienna. Cooper admitted that he had had little opportunity to see Indians; apart from meeting with Indian delegations in Washington, D.C., his re-

searches were literary—in particular the accounts of the Moravian missionary John Heckewelder (1743-1823).[2] Largely because of Cooper, during the decade 1824-1834 the decline of the Indian became the most popular theme in American romance;[3] the savage seemed to be the unfortunate victim of inexorable destiny.[4] The cult of the dying Indian arose, with its poetic idealization of life in the wilderness and its mournful protest against the brutality of the white man.[5]

For reasons which must be considered in part self-serving, Western writers who defended the conduct of those appropriating land close to the actual frontier—a term which referred to no particular geographic location but instead designated the unexplored space beyond the next natural barrier, where the original possessors of the continent were to be confronted in their own territory[6]—specifically rejected the myth of the noble savage and described Indians as ignoble savages. The ignoble savage (sometimes a debased half-breed) was impious, lazy, thievish, physically abhorrent, crafty in his awareness of evil and how to exploit it, intimately acquainted with the most devilish methods of torture, and attracted inescapably to liquor and sex.[7] Those in the West insisted that they knew, through personal experience, the "real" (ignoble) character of the savage; however, their contact was so limited that they seldom had a rounded view of Indian character. They saw little of Indian humor, little of Indian systems of justice, and little of major peace-time preoccupations. The very presence of white men on the frontier made it impossible for them to see an Indian in a "natural" state. In these respects their picture of the native American was no more complete than the image accepted by proponents of the noble savage.

As is the case with most stereotypes, elements of the characterization of both the noble and the ignoble savage were drawn from observation. The Caribs had been a beautiful, mild, innocent people when Columbus first glimpsed them.[8] Indians also often appeared lazy, and worse, seemed proud of their laziness; in their own terms, long-standing tribal custom made it impossible for males to engage in some types of work, such as crop-tending. For the most part, however, mythologizing about savages depended on the point of view of the observer, not on the characteristics of actual native Americans. The noble savage was a philosophical idealization of European (and, later, Northeastern) foreigners; the ignoble savage was an economic rationalization of American (frontier) colonists.

From the earliest Colonial days, the Puritans had the contrary urges to ennoble the savage and to debase him. They brought from Europe the urge to ennoble the savage by redeeming him, under the inspiration of the Bible. The urge to debase—founded on practical necessity, although still sanctified in religious terms—was ultimately more powerful: in order to obtain its birthright, New Israel could crush the inhabitants of Canaan. If the Puritans were to see themselves as honest men, rather than as opportunistic hypocrites, the natives had to be irredeemably worthless.[9] For interim periods early in the progress of colonization, the contrary urges of the colonists left their rhetoric uncertain. John Smith's account of Pocahontas (1624) provides an interesting example. Only the

innately noble child of nature could stay Powhatan's cruel arm from bashing John Smith's skull; Smith represents Pocahontas as a noble savage and her father as an ignoble savage. And in his perception even noble Pocahontas is confused by ignoble attributes: Smith could not separate the princess from her lusty aboriginal character, and he assures us that she would "have done what he listed."[10] Inevitably, as the early settlements grew stronger and the colonists needed less aid from the natives in order to survive, any confusion in the perception of Indian characteristics gave way before the practical necessity of taming both the land and the recalcitrant savages.

As the frontier receded and the Indian became less visible in the Eastern United States, he was gradually romanticized into a symbol of American libertarianism and independent patriotism. (In Revolutionary times, for example, the rebels who threw tea into the Boston harbor donned symbolic Indian garb.) The romanticization of the Indian had no effect on frontier policy,[11] but it did contribute to the creation of American frontier mythology. Traditional Indian characteristics, particularly skill in woodcraft and independence from social restraint, were transferred to the frontier hero. For those who were involved in the expansion westward, the Indian became, paradoxically, both a racial antagonist and the symbol of their freedom and defiance of the East.[12] Only with the disappearance of the real Indian from any frontier area was the paradox resolved into a completely favorable mythology of the Indian.

However foolish the sentimentality of Easterners might have appeared to them, Western apologists in the nineteenth century did not usually wish to appear rabid in their opposition to Indians, even when they defended their prosecution of Indian wars or their expropriation of Indian lands. Clearly, for all their apparent eagerness to defy the East, they recognized that their audience and their own cultural roots lay in the East. Thomas Sturgis's pamphlet, *Common Sense View of the Sioux War: With the True Method of Treatment, as Opposed to the Exterminative and the Sentimental Policy* (1877), was written at the height of emotion over the Little Big Horn, but the author admits that he has suppressed invective in order to retain an Eastern audience.[13] Although Sturgis claims to be no extremist,[14] he accepts without question the notion that Indians are racially inferior.[15] From his own experience, he casually recounts the removal of Sioux from a succession of "perpetual" homes and then contends that any treaty is useless, "since it binds *us* alone, who respect its ties."[16] He insists on a historical untruth, to prove the absence of "Yankee" economy among the savages: the Indians, he says, had to be at fault for the disappearance of the buffalo, because they were the only ones who used the animal.[17] In order to win over his Eastern audience, Sturgis stresses the virtues of the Yankee settlers in Cheyenne. He seems unaware that the "self assertion and independence"[18] of the settlers may have derived ultimately not from their Yankee forebears but from the Indian himself, who had suggested to Westerners their independence from social restraint.

In contrast to the simultaneous regional differences in views of the

Indian within the United States, European views of the Indian were rather unified through much of the nineteenth century; Cooper's novels were published almost immediately in both French and German translations,[19] and Europeans accepted Cooper's noble Mohican as the "real" Indian. A German reviewer of Cooper's *The Pathfinder* in the *Magazin für die Literatur des Auslandes,* 16 March 1840, contrasted Cooper's Indians with the "less realistic" presentations of François-René de Châteaubriand (1768-1848), who had previously provided the most-widely accepted literary incarnation of the noble savage: "Die Sitten der Indianer werden darin treu geschildert, während zugleich Liebe und Aufopferung mit den wahrsten Farben, also auch in einer anderen Weise, wie es Châteaubriand in seiner 'Atala' thut, dargestellt werden."[20] Although as early as 1831 Alexis de Tocqueville (1805-1859) observed that real Indians were disappointing in comparison with Cooper's, and although there was inevitable debate later in the century about the verisimilitude of Cooper's Indians,[21] most Europeans, already predisposed from their own tradition to believe in the noble savage, apparently perceived Cooper's Americanness as a source of authority. Traits of Cooper's Indians came to be considered "typical," and Indians deserved particular sympathy because they had been victimized by civilized whites.[22]

Among the European books on Indians which were inspired during the period of Sioux unrest after the Civil War is Joseph Bournichon's *Sitting Bull, le héros du désert: Scènes de la guerre indienne aux Etats-unis* (1879). Bournichon's introduction is instructive about the source of his biases. His enthusiasm for Cooper is unbounded: "Quel dommage que Fenimore Cooper ne soit plus là pour encadrer le portrait de cet homme [Sitting Bull] dans une oeuvre immortelle, telle que *Le dernier des Mohicans, L'Ontario, La Prairie.*" ("What a shame that Fenimore Cooper is no longer here to frame the portrait of this man [Sitting Bull] in an immortal work such as *The Last of the Mohicans, The Pathfinder, The Prairie.*")[23] Bournichon dramatizes important moments in the life of "Le Sitting," who, in a message to Custer, proposes a single parley, issued like a challenge to a knight-errant.[24] At the end of the book the French author appends his own abbreviated Indian-novel, which includes *topoi* made popular by Cooper, such as scenes of torture, a burning at the stake, and the rescue of a Pawnee by an Osage who adopts him as a brother. As was proper in "Indian literature," the characters express higher sentiments and noble love. Bournichon remained in Europe, and for him the noble savage was the real Indian. He has a clearly apologetic purpose on behalf of the Indians, and, presumably, responds to contrary reports of horrors which must have circulated from the United States during this time. He specifically refutes the characteristics of the supposedly depraved savage: he denies that Indians are cruel and barbarous,[25] crafty and untrustworthy,[26] and obstinately opposed to all civilization.[27]

Even though Indian visitors were exhibited in much of Europe throughout the nineteenth century, most Europeans knew Indians primarily from literary sources. In fact, more often than not, the

exhibitions served to confirm literary stereotypes. The beautiful sentiments of Cooper's Mohicans gave European immigrants impossible expectations of the flesh-and-blood Indians they met on the frontier. Reality was so disappointing that they largely replaced the rhetoric of the noble savage with that of the ignoble savage. For confirmation of this contention, it is instructive to examine documents relating to the early decades of the German settlement of New Ulm, Minnesota. A group of German intellectuals connected with the *Turnerbund* attempted to establish a semi-utopian, socialistic community in New Ulm, Minnesota, in 1854.[28] Already by 1859 the social experiment had failed, but the German town remained.[29] Since it was built on land which had been ceded to the Sioux by treaty, it is not surprising that New Ulm was besieged fiercely during the Sioux uprising in 1862.

Like Anglo-Saxon settlers, German settlers felt obliged to defend their conduct in their native tongue, so that their countrymen in Europe or in the German communities in Cincinnati or New York would not misunderstand their actions in the Sioux wars. While Thomas Sturgis might have expected that at least some members of his Eastern audience could see the untruth of ascribing noble sentiments to the savages, the contemporaneous German immigrant apologists had the Cooperian preconceptions of almost all Germans to overcome in their accounts. In order to combat the preconceptions of his audience, the New Ulm chronicler Alexander Berghold stresses (1876) that the loyalty, friendship, magnanimity, and other virtues attributed to Indians in novels are hardly to be found among real Indians: "Von einem romantischen Leben, wie man es in Büchern liest, von ihrer Treue und Freundschaft, Charaktergröße und erhabenen Tugenden ist nur wenig zu finden."[30] Captain Jacob Nix, another local historian of New Ulm (1887), and the commander of the defense against the Sioux in 1862, identifies even more closely the source of the sentimental prejudices which he must overcome. The books of James Fenimore Cooper, he says, have spread falsehoods throughout the European imagination. As a boy, Nix himself read Cooper's novels enthusiastically; only after he has met and fought real Indians does he realize how inaccurately those novels display their character:

> Der Verfasser dieses hat in seiner Jugend mit Vorliebe die Cooper'schen Romane gelesen. Hauptsächlich hat ihn "Der Letzte der Mohikaner" zur vollen Begeisterung für die Rothäute hingerissen; doch ist es von jeher das Unglück bei allen Romanen gewesen, daß die Phantasie die Hauptrolle gespielt und von Wahrheit auch keine Silbe daran war, denn hätte Cooper die wahre Natur der Indianer gekannt, er hätte sich vielleicht eher eine Kugel durch den Schädel gejagt, als so hirnverrücktes Zeug über die rothen Bluthunde zu schreiben.[31]

New Ulm was founded at the height of American nativism, when the Know-Nothing Party threatened to drive the Germans, the Irish, and other immigrant groups into ghetto-like enclaves.[32] Although there was a strong strain of anti-clericalism among the *Turner* intellectuals in New Ulm, they were lumped together with Catholics in the minds of "anti-

Roman'' American nativists.[33] The freethinkers among German intellectuals were especially suspect on account of their advanced ideas: They sought to promote drinking on Sunday, cremation, the abolition of slavery, and female emancipation.[34] And their ideas encouraged even more hostility because they were expressed in a language which was incomprehensible to most Americans. Because of the Know-Nothings, the German immigrant community must have felt itself isolated and besieged by white Americans as well as by Indians. If anything, it would have been more important to the German immigrants than it was to transplanted Easterners to defend their conduct in the Sioux wars.

The histories of the German immigrants in New Ulm were written in self-defense, in response to accounts of the Sioux wars by English-speakers who were uncomplimentary toward their German neighbors. As Jacob Nix contends in his foreword, numerous misleading accounts had been published in English: ''Es sind allerdings schon mehrere Abhandlungen über diesen Gegenstand veröffentlicht worden, doch keine derselben liefert ein richtiges und zuverlässiges Bild jener Schreckensscenen; namentlich aber trotzen die in englischer Sprache erschienenen Aufzeichnungen von Unwahrheiten und Entstellungen.''[35] Mary Butler Renville's *A Thrilling Narrative of Indian Captivity* (1863) was probably one of the accounts which Nix considered unsatisfactory. Renville was a teacher in a mission school north of New Ulm. During the uprising she remained under the protection of friendly Sioux, and afterwards she came to the aid of those Indians who were not combatants. She has unkind words for the inhabitants of New Ulm. Their religious aberrations, amoral trading propensities, and even their questionable manhood evoke her comment:

> God may have visited New Ulm in offended wrath, for we have reason to believe they burned the Savior in effigy only last Sabbath (Aug. 17th) and their laws are strictly against selling lots to any person who will aid in supporting the gospel. . . . New Ulm, we are confident, furnished its share [of firewater] heretofore;[36]
>
> Some of the [Indian] women, it is said, can fight as well as the men. Whether they can equal the German women at New Ulm or not, is a question; for they were much more courageous it is said than their husbands during the siege of that place.[37]

Especially in Jacob Nix's German account of the events in New Ulm, foolish English speakers come and go, and demand help without offering any.[38] In addition Nix has to discredit the sympathy of the religious ''bleeding hearts'' for the ''red animals'':

> Wenn er [the Indian] für die Schlechtigkeit Einzelner die Bewohner ganzer Länderstriche büßen läßt, mordend, brennend und sengend den friedlichen weißen Ansiedler überfällt, alles niedermacht, Männer und Weiber, Greise und Kinder, welche ihm vor Flinte, Bogen oder Tomahawk kommen, da rufe man jene fanatischen Pfaffen, welche sich sofort nach der Niederwerfung eines Indianer-Aufstandes der gefangenen rothen Mordbrenner salbungsvoll annehmen, da schleudere

man den heuchlerischen, augenverdrehenden Dienern des Herrn aus ihrer Bibel die inhaltschweren Worte entgegen: Auge um Auge—Zahn um Zahn![39]

In his intemperate rhetoric, Nix clearly dismisses any nobility in Indians, as well as any value in English-speaking divines. His disappointment in both the Indians and his white American neighbors is so great that he risks the rejection of the very audience he addresses, by refusing to maintain any allegiance at all to the culturally significant myth of the noble savage which he formerly shared with his audience.

From his own experience, Alexander Berghold also confirms predictable qualities of the ignoble savage, such as the long-held prejudice that half-breeds combine the worst vices of red and white;[40] nevertheless, Berghold was not able to exorcise Cooper completely from his own rhetoric. For example, after he describes a confrontation between the Sioux and the German surveyors who were laying out New Ulm, Berghold engages in a paean of the ruined noble savage, who had been destroyed by the advent of civilization.[41] It seems ironic that the three contemporaries Alexander Berghold, Joseph Bournichon, and Thomas Sturgis all agreed on one suggestion for bringing civilization to the Indian: Indian affairs should be taken out of the hands of the venal civilian bureaucracy and placed under the efficient, honest, respected Army.[42] Berghold, in particular, could not believe that the natives were innately bad; rather, the innocents had been corrupted by venal agents. Even in America this European immigrant held on to a vestige of the tradition of the innocence of the noble savage; it seems that Berghold's views had been unassailably formed by the Indians of *belles lettres*. Still, although Berghold's European education and his American frontier experiences remained in apparently unresolved conflict, his course of action was never in doubt. He nowhere suggests that the land be returned to its native claimants; as a result of the defeat of the Sioux in their uprising, the settlers have no more qualms even about evicting Indians from the land which had been promised to them: "Aus Minnesota ist der unbändige Sioux für immer hinausgedrängt."[43] Jacob Nix, whose book marked the twenty-fifth anniversary of New Ulm, makes no mention at all that the town had been settled on land ceded "forever" to the Sioux. Apparently it was the destiny of these historical apologists to help win the West, and it was their responsibility to convince their countrymen that they had done the right thing.

As a first step in the process of assimilation, it seems that new immigrant groups on the frontier had to adapt themselves to the latest in the succession of myths which supported the conquest of the continent. The noble savage, a philosophical idealization of foreigners, had to become the ignoble savage through the economic rationalization of colonists. Even when the question was not purely one of self-interest, the national mythology of manifest destiny led frontier Americans to the same conclusion about Indians. Although the earliest European colonists in North America had seen themselves as visitors whose mission it was to convert and civilize the savages, by the nineteenth century Americans had changed their view of their civilizing mission: The

immortal souls of Indians were no longer important; rather, their bodies were an obstacle to the mission of bringing a civilization of yeoman-farmers to the land, in order to make a garden of the wilderness.[44] A classless society of yeoman-farmers was a sufficiently worthy goal to justify turning Indians out of their birthright. As they sought their garden-plot on the frontier, Germans reflected the pervasive utopian expectation of pastoral beatitude. If they had been able to project a longer view, and if they could have anticipated that the country would continue to develop as it had in the Northeast, German immigrants in the upper Midwest might have expected that their grandchildren could idealize the Indian again, once the frontier (and the Indians) had moved safely further west. In the interim, any gap which remained for high-minded philosophy was filled with the belief in manifest destiny and with, at most, only a small residue of ineffectual rhetorical sympathy for the dying Indian. In fact, the cult of the dying Indian may have actually supported the thinking of manifest destiny: However sympathetically Indians were treated in the elegiac novels of Cooper and his successors, the red man in them is, inevitably, the victim of destiny.

If it was necessary for the settlers to salve their consciences in some way other than by believing in manifest destiny or by feeling regret over the decline of the formerly noble savages, they *worked* in order to deserve the natural largess. They were certainly not stealing from the Indian, since he did not own the land; and he had even less claim to enjoy it, because he did not work. In this context, it is noteworthy that Jacob Nix tells a familiar anecdote about an Indian who had been consigned, as punishment for drunkenness at a fort, to carry water all day under the eyes of the squaws; the Indian refused, except at bayonet-point, to compromise his dignity. For Nix, the story showed how difficult it was to civilize the Indian and to get him to work.[45] Despite growing interest in ethnography throughout the nineteenth century, there had not yet been sufficient development of the anthropological notion of cultural relativity to permit Nix any other conclusion (except that Indians were obviously inferior when they were judged by European cultural standards) from his observed evidence. And because of the perceived cultural insufficiencies of Indians—both their uncivilized violence and their unwillingness to work, through which they disqualified themselves from the Lockean right to property by refusing to mix their labor with it—there was no longer the slightest reason to imagine that their land should be returned to them. Even if German immigrants were not in a direct philosophical line from John Locke, they did share a Protestant tradition with Anglo-Saxon Americans and they seemed at least as committed to the work ethic. The work ethic presumed equal opportunity for the industrious; although slaves, Indians, women, and dependent minors did not have an equal chance, a large number of white lower-class and middle-class Americans believed in the vision.[46] In spite of the best efforts of the Know-Nothings to prevent foreigners from sharing in the American richness, German immigrants tenaciously maintained their belief that opportunity existed

on the frontier for the industrious, and that they themselves belonged to the in-group which deserved to partake of the largess.

In a battle of myths, the self-interest of frontier colonists was better served by the myth that they had come to a land of freedom, equality, and opportunity for the industrious than by the myth of savage nobility. Apparently, for German immigrants as much as for other white settlers on the frontier, continued belief in the freedom of the frontier depended on acceptance of the myth of savage ignobility. Through the unwillingness of the ignoble savage to behave in a civilized manner—it might be argued, through the very independence of the native American, which had originally helped create the illusion of unfettered liberty on the frontier—the Indian forfeited, in their minds, his right to respect and property, and, ultimately, his right to freedom.

Deep Springs College
Deep Springs, California

Notes

[1] Fred Arthur Crane, "The Noble Savage in America, 1815-1860," diss., Yale Univ., 1952, ii.

[2] Crane 54.

[3] G. Harrison Orians, *The Cult of the Vanishing American: A Century View: 1834-1934*, Bulletin of the Univ. of Toledo 13.3 (Toledo, OH: Univ. of Toledo, 1935) 3.

[4] Orians 5 ff.

[5] Orians 7.

[6] Leslie A. Fiedler, *The Return of the Vanishing American* (New York: Stein and Day, 1968) 26.

[7] George A. Newtown, "Images of the American Indian in French and German Novels of the Nineteenth Century," diss., Yale Univ., 1979, 7.

[8] Hoxie Neale Fairchild, *The Noble Savage: A Study in Romantic Naturalism* (New York: Columbia Univ. Pr., 1928) 10.

[9] Richard Slotkin, *Regeneration through Violence: the Mythology of the American Frontier, 1600-1860* (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan Univ. Pr., 1973) passim.

[10] Fiedler 71 f.

[11] Slotkin 418.

[12] Slotkin 426.

[13] Thomas Sturgis, *Common Sense View of the Sioux War: With the True Method of Treatment, as Opposed to the Exterminative and the Sentimental Policy* (Cheyenne, WY: Leader Steam Book and Job Printing House, 1877) 5.

[14] Sturgis 38.

[15] See Sturgis, esp. 13, 32 ff.

[16] Sturgis 33.

[17] Sturgis 32.

[18] Sturgis 5.

[19] For lists of the publication dates, see G. C. Bosset, *Fenimore Cooper et le roman d'aventure en France vers 1830* (Paris: Librairie Vrin, 1928?) 8; and Preston A. Barba, *Cooper in Germany*, Indiana Univ. Bulletin 12.5; Indiana University Studies 21 (Bloomington, IN: Indiana Univ., 1914) immediately following Barba's text.

[20] Quoted in Barba, 84 f.

[21] See Barba 86 ff.

[22] Margaret Murray Gibb, *Le Roman de Bas-de-Cuir, Etude sur Fenimore Cooper et son influence en France* (Paris: Librairie Ancienne Honoré Champion, 1927) 15.

[23] Joseph Bournichon, *Sitting-Bull, le héros du désert: Scènes de la guerre indienne aux Etats-unis* (Tours: Cattier, 1879) vii.

[24] Bournichon 163 f.

[25] Bournichon 231 ff.

[26] Bournichon 251 ff.

[27] Bournichon 263 ff.

[28] See Noel Iverson, *Germania, U.S.A.: Social Change in New Ulm, Minnesota* (Minneapolis: Univ. of Minnesota Pr., 1966) 58.

[29] Iverson 62 ff.

[30] Alexander Berghold, *Indianer-Rache, oder Die Schreckenstage von Neu-Ulm im Jahre 1862* (New Ulm, MN: Selbstverlag des Verfassers, 1876) 30.

[31] Captain Jacob Nix, *Der Ausbruch der Sioux-Indianer in Minnesota im August 1862* (New Ulm, MN: Verlag des Verfassers, 1887) 18.

[32] Iverson 43, 53.

[33] Iverson 45.

[34] Iverson 44.

[35] Nix 5.

[36] Mrs. Mary Butler Renville, *A Thrilling Narrative of Indian Captivity* (Minneapolis, MN: Atlas Book and Job Printing Office, 1863) 14.

[37] Renville 29.

[38] Nix 28.

[39] Nix 18.

[40] Berghold 38.

[41] Berghold 16.

[42] See Berghold, chaps. 5 and 6; Bournichon 289; and Sturgis's introductory remarks.

[43] Berghold 79.

[44] This is a major thesis in Henry Nash Smith's *Virgin Land* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Pr., 1973). See esp. his chap. 15.

[45] Nix 57.

[46] Kenneth Keniston, "'Good Children' (Our Own), 'Bad Children' (Other People's), and the Horrible Work Ethic," *Yale Alumni Magazine* 37.7 (1974): 7.