

**“A WHOLE NEW POETRY BEGINNING HERE”:
THE POETICS/POLITICS OF ADRIENNE RICH
AND AUDRE LORDE**

Susan J. Hubert

Western Michigan University

ABSTRACT

The insistence on the inseparability of poetics and politics as articulated by Adrienne Rich and Audre Lorde, two powerful voices in lesbian-feminist poetry and criticism, represents a significant contribution to twentieth-century poetry. The poetics/politics of Lorde and Rich represents movement from silence to speech and from lesbian invisibility to woman-identification as a basis for poetry, and ultimately creates a lesbian poetry that has the power for personal and social transformation. Although queer theorists have tended to reject lesbian-feminism as an essentialist and totalizing discourse, advancement in any of these three areas remains a significant achievement in poetry and politics.

Writing before the critical dominance of queer theory, Bonnie Zimmerman commented that all lesbian criticism is based on these assumptions: that a woman is not defined only by her relation to a male world and male literary tradition, that “powerful bonds between women are a crucial factor in women’s lives,” and that a woman’s consciousness and thus her creativity is “profoundly affected” by her sexual and affectional orientation.¹ Indeed, Adrienne Rich and Audre Lorde, two powerful voices in lesbian-feminist poetry and criticism, address these assumptions in their poetics/politics.² Although queer theorists have tended to reject lesbian-feminism as essentialist, the insistence on the inseparability of poetics and politics as articulated by Rich and Lorde represents a significant contribution to twentieth-century poetry. As queer theorist Arlene Stein has written, lesbian-feminism “provided the most vibrant and visible lesbian culture that had ever existed in [the United States].”³ The poetics/politics of Lorde and

Rich creates and represents a movement from silence to speech, from lesbian invisibility to homoeroticism and woman-identification as a basis for poetry, and, finally, toward a lesbian poetry that has the power for personal and social transformation.

The poetics/politics of Rich and Lorde begins with an awareness of silence. As Rich as written, “lesbian existence has been written out of history or catalogued under disease.”⁴ It is important to note that, until recently, critics did not speak of a lesbian poetic tradition. Because women are presumed to be heterosexual unless there is evidence to the contrary, a great deal of critical and biographical work has been devoted to uncovering the sexuality of lesbians, especially canonical writers such as Emily Dickinson and Willa Cather. Lillian Faderman argued against the need for evidence of sexual activity to include a work in the canon of lesbian literature.⁵ Scholars have also sought to recover works that represent, at least to some extent, lesbian experience. At the same time, new poets have contributed to a growing body of lesbian poetry.

Several lesbian poets of the 1970s wrote explicitly about lesbian experience, and Rich and Lorde were among those who claimed that their erotic connection to other women was integral to their poetry. Although Gertrude Stein’s work reflects her lesbianism, the lesbian experience is always encoded; Dickinson’s advice to “Tell all the Truth but tell it slant” could be said to summarize the rules for earlier lesbian poets. As Rich has written,

Whatever is unnamed, undepicted in images, whatever is omitted from biography, censored in collections of letters, whatever is misnamed as something else, made difficult-to-come-by, whatever is buried in the memory by the collapse of meaning under an inadequate or lying language —this will become, not merely unspoken, *but unspeakable*.⁶

The “silence” of the lesbian experience in poetry is therefore an expression of societal oppression. The oppression of lesbians has caused lesbianism to be “misnamed” as perverse and unnatural, and has rendered lesbian existence invisible.

According to Rich, “writing is re-naming.”⁷ “Poetry,” she writes, “comes out of silence, seeking connection with unseen others.”⁸ But this movement from silence to speech is not an easy one. It involves, first of all, valuing the unspoken and unspeakable realities of one’s own life as experiences that must be articulated. Here the imagination is critical. The transformation of lesbian experience from something unspeakable into poetry is a work of the imagination. The imagination allows lesbians to “re-vision” the reality of their lives and to re-name lesbian experience in positive ways. It could even be said that imagination is necessary for women to recognize their erotic connection to other women, because this possibility has not only been censored but also condemned.

The condemnation of lesbianism creates another barrier to the articulation of lesbian experience. Lorde wrote several poems and essays about the way that fear silences lesbians (and other “marginalized” groups). “In the cause of silence,” she writes, “each of us draws the face of her own recognition, of challenge, of annihilation.”⁹ However, it is not simply fear that prevents what Lorde calls “the transformation of silence into language and action.”¹⁰ Silence is also maintained by the illusion that invisibility protects lesbians; as Lorde writes in “A Litany for Survival”:¹¹

for by this weapon
 this illusion of some safety to be found
 the heavy-footed hoped to silence us. (19-21)

Lorde came to the realization that silence is not ultimately protective, nor does it really stop lesbians from being afraid.

and when we speak we are afraid
 our words will not be heard
 nor welcomed
 but when we are silent
 we are still afraid. (37-41)

"So," she concludes, "it is better to speak / remembering / we were never meant to survive" (42-44). According to Lorde, "the first and most vital lesson" is that "we were never meant to survive."¹² This lesson is necessary for survival because it allows lesbians and others "on the margins" to give up their illusions of safety. Lorde maintains that the "visibility which makes us most vulnerable is that which also is the source of our greatest strength."¹³ Perhaps most important is the lesbian poet's commitment to the transformation of silence into language and action.

The poetics/politics of Rich and Lorde begins with an acknowledgement of the rendering of lesbian existence as unspeakable. Both assert that lesbian poets need to reclaim a language that has been used against them. Although Lorde more fully developed the relationship between invisibility and survival, both poets assert that the articulation of lesbian experience and existence has far-reaching implications in terms of poetics and politics. For Rich and Lorde, a consideration of the movement from silence and invisibility to the articulation of lesbian existence and experience naturally leads to questions about the definition of lesbian poetry. Lesbian poetry cannot simply refer to poems about lesbians nor can it consist of poetry by "lesbians" (another word which can be hard to define). If any poem with lesbian content can be called lesbian poetry, then poems that characterize lesbians as perverse and lesbian sexuality as abnormal would be included. On the other hand, even if one accepts a simple definition of "lesbian," perhaps based on genital sexual activity, lesbian poetry would include poems by women whose work is derivative of current poetic trends and not based in their experience as lesbians. In her study of lesbian fiction from 1969-1989, Zimmerman limits lesbian literature to those works written by self-identified lesbians. Moreover, she states that the protagonist must "[understand] herself to be a lesbian."¹⁴ Faderman, on the other hand, considers the problems of categorization and offers an expansive definition of lesbian literature.

Although the dangers of inclusivity are readily apparent, Rich and Lorde seem more concerned about overly exclusive definitions of lesbianism and lesbian sexuality. Both poets have an expansive understanding of the meaning of *lesbian* and of what constitutes lesbian sexuality. In asserting the inseparable connection of sexuality with everyday life, Rich and Lorde make lesbian sexuality the basis of women's creativity and poetic power.

For Rich, the word *lesbian* evokes the image of "the self-chosen woman, the forbidden 'primary intensity' between women, and also the woman who refuses to

obey, who has said ‘no’ to the fathers.”¹⁵ According to Rich, this “sense of desiring oneself” and, “above all, of choosing oneself,”¹⁶ which she calls “lesbian,” is the essential poetic impulse for women. As she has written:

I believe it is the lesbian in every woman who is compelled by female energy, who gravitates toward strong women, who seeks a literature that will express that energy and strength. It is the lesbian in us who drives us to feel imaginatively, render in language, grasp, the full connection between woman and woman. It is the lesbian in us who is creative, for the dutiful daughter of the fathers in us is only a hack.¹⁷

Without this poetic impulse, women’s poetry is at best derivative, at worst, mere lying.

Using *lesbian* to describe a poetic impulse avoids essentialist notion of “the lesbian poet” and includes women poets who would not call themselves lesbian. As Rich writes, “Even before I wholly knew I was a lesbian, it was the lesbian in me who pursued that elusive configuration” of the lesbian poetic impulse.¹⁸ However, such an extended definition also runs the risk of turning lesbianism into a metaphor.

Rich addresses this potential problem by using the terms “*lesbian existence*” and “*lesbian continuum*” (she considers *lesbianism* too limiting and “clinical”). “Lesbian existence” refers to the “historical presence of lesbians and our continuing creation of the meaning of that existence.”¹⁹ Implicitly defining *lesbian* in terms of sexual or affectional orientation, Rich’s use of “lesbian existence” prevents *lesbian* from becoming purely metaphorical. She uses the term “lesbian continuum” to refer to her expansive understanding of *lesbian*:

I mean the term *lesbian continuum* to include a range —through each woman’s life and throughout history— of woman-identified experience, not simply the fact that a woman has had or consciously desired genital sexual experience with another woman.²⁰

According to Rich, “woman-identified experience” has the power to give birth to a new poetry. These lines from Rich’s “Transcendental Etude” show that the desire for connection with other women and with oneself (“*Homesick for myself for her*”) can be revolutionary:

Homesick for myself for her —as after the heatwave
breaks, the clear tones of the world
manifest: cloud, bough, wall, insect, the very soul of light
homesick as the fluted vault of desire
articulates itself: *I am lover and the loved,*
home and wanderer, she who knocks, a stranger
in the storm, two women, eye to eye
measuring each other’s spirit, each other’s
limitless desire,
a whole new poetry beginning here. (137-147)²¹

When women desire themselves ("*I am lover and the loved*") rather than "the fathers," when they choose to define themselves, to "[measure] each other's spirit," then their lives and their poetry will no longer be derivative of men's work. The lesbian impulse allows women to use their creative power to create a new poetry rather than remain handmaidens of the male literary tradition.

Audre Lorde also equates the poetic impulse with lesbian sexuality; however, she focuses on sexuality itself. Lorde understands the erotic connection between women as a source of power and creativity, and, just as Rich extends the definition of lesbian, Lorde uses "the erotic" in an expansive way. According to Lorde, the erotic is "an assertion of the life force of women" and "the nurturer or nursemaid of all our deepest knowledge."²² The erotic is not "an easy, tantalizing sexual arousal"; it is "the deepest life force, a force which moves us toward living in a fundamental way."²³ The effect of her argument is to eliminate the separations between sexuality, spirituality, politics, creativity, and everyday life. In this way, she advances a major feminist tenet: the personal is the political.

By emphasizing the erotic, Lorde focuses on a common human characteristic instead of something uniquely lesbian. However, rather than completely departing from Rich's idea of "the lesbian in us," Lorde's expansion of the compass of sexuality implies that the meaning of *lesbian* (or "lesbian sexuality") encompasses much more than genital sexual activity or even affectional orientation. One could say that lesbian sexuality represents a different way of being in the world and, therefore, a different kind of creativity. Because Lorde considers the erotic as "that force which moves us toward what will accomplish real positive change,"²⁴ lesbian sexuality may be seen as a unique force for creativity and revolution.

It is clear that the affirmation of lesbian sexuality in the writings of Rich and Lorde would be criticized—if not completely rejected—by the majority of poets and critics. At the same time, however, both poets have been criticized by lesbian-feminists as well as by queer theorists. Lorde's use of the erotic has been labeled "antifeminist" for equating women's power with the aspect of gender that is most often used against women—sexuality. Rich has been criticized for "blurring the distinctions between ... lesbian identity and female-centered identity."²⁵

Rich's concept of the lesbian continuum was immediately controversial, and the significance of the ensuing debate is beyond question. Nearly twenty years later, the essay has retained its canonical status although, as Martindale points out, it is "largely rejected by lesbian theorists." Martindale claims that the lesbian continuum "desexualizes lesbianism." She agrees with Ann Ferguson's critique that the concept makes lesbian identity a "transhistorical phenomenon."²⁶ Moreover, Ferguson maintains that

[Rich's] idea that the degree to which a woman is sexually and emotionally independent of men while bonding with women measures resistance to patriarchy oversimplifies and romanticizes the notion of such resistance without really defining the conditions that make for successful resistance rather than mere victimization.²⁷

Yet, as Jacquelyn Zita points out, "Rich's notion of lesbian continuum must be understood in terms of the political interpretation that Rich brings to her lesbianism."²⁸

Rich's essay, like much of her poetry, emphasizes lesbian visibility and the naming of lesbian experience. In response to Ferguson's critique, Zita writes,

it is not the case that lesbian continuum misnames the past; rather it is meant to illuminate what needs to be named by us. It is naming into visible existence a long history of sexual /political resistance. This act of naming is far from fraudulent—it is a politically important move in our redefinition of personal identities and the *raison d'être* of our communities. It is a return of the political to the personal and of the repressed to politics. It speaks to all us.²⁹

Zita and others maintain that in striving to articulate commonalities, Rich has not ignored the particular contexts of lesbian experiences. Lorde, who strongly asserted that no theory of lesbian identity should ignore factors such as race and class, influenced the development of Rich's thought. For Lorde and Rich, the diversity of lesbian existence is crucial, particularly in conceptualizing social change.

According to Rich and Lorde, lesbian poetry can also be personally and socially transforming. Both poets understand their work to be political, and this belief is apparent from the way they describe themselves. Lorde calls herself "a Black woman warrior poet doing my work,"³⁰ and Rich writes (in "Natural Resources") that her vocation is to "reconstitute the world":

My heart is moved by all I cannot save:
so much has been destroyed

I have to cast my lot with those
who age after age, perversely,

with no extraordinary power,
reconstitute the world. (171-176)³¹

In addition to seeing their own work as political, both poets argue that poetry is essential for personal and social change. Lorde writes that

For women ... poetry is not a luxury. It is a vital necessity of our existence. It forms the quality of the light within which we predicate our hopes and dreams toward survival and change, first made into language, then into idea, then into more tangible action. Poetry is the way we help give name to the nameless so it can be thought. The farthest horizons of our hopes and fears are cobbled by our poems, carved from the rock experiences of our daily lives.³²

Poetry, then, forms the very basis for social change. The very nature of poetic language allows the expression of what otherwise could not be communicated. As a work of the imagination, poetry can represent what could be, rather than what is (or simply resorting to "sterile word play"). The imagination can be the catalyst for social change. Rich claims that

to write poetry or fiction, or even to think well, is not to fantasize, or to put fantasies on paper. For a poem to coalesce, for a character or an action to take shape, there has to be an imaginative transformation of reality which is in no way passive ... Moreover, if the imagination is to transcend and transform experience it has to question, to challenge, to conceive of alternatives, perhaps to the very life you are living at the moment. You have to be free to play around with the notion that day might be night, love might be hate; nothing can be too sacred for the imagination to turn into its opposite or to call experimentally by another name.³³

Although poetry can give birth to new worlds, this does not happen through objectification of fantasy. Poetry is an imaginative process that can transform reality by changing the way we think about the world.

Poetry can also be transforming because of the kinds of experiences it represents. Both poets have written poems about tragic realities as well as poems that depict everyday life. For instance, in “Power”,³⁴ Lorde writes about the acquittal of a white policeman who killed a ten-year-old black boy and, in “Need: A Choral of Black Women’s Voices,”³⁵ of two black women who were murdered. Lorde’s “Love Poem”³⁶ is a celebration of lesbian sexuality, and Rich’s “Twenty-One Love Poems”³⁷ portray a lesbian relationship that is deeply rooted in politics and the demands of everyday life.

In these poems, both poets reject any notion of universality, choosing instead to focus on their particular experiences. Lorde maintains that “our *real power* [as poets] comes from the personal.”³⁸ She says that “the poem happens when I, Audre Lorde, poet, deal with the particular instead of the ‘UNIVERSAL.’ My power as a person, as a poet, comes from who I am.”³⁹ Lorde asserts that the idea of the universal has been used to render lesbians and black women (as well as members of other marginalized groups) invisible. Reflecting on her early experiences as a black lesbian, Lorde writes:

Self-preservation warned some of us that we could not afford to settle for one easy definition, one narrow individuation of self ... It was a while before we came to realize that our place was the very house of difference.⁴⁰

According to Lorde, living in “the very house of difference” gives one a unique vision. Accepting an award for her poetry, she said:

I am a Black Feminist Warrior Poet Mother, stronger for all my identities, and I am indivisible. Out of the insights and power of those identities have come the work which you honor here tonight.⁴¹

Lorde insists on the unity of all aspects of her identity, purposefully omitting the commas when she describes herself as “a Black Feminist Warrior Poet Mother.”

For Lorde and Rich, commonalities can be based on particular experiences, but an insistence on universality is oppressive to lesbians. Indeed, the revolutionary power of poetry relies on its ability to speak to commonalities among people. As Lorde writes, “for every real word spoken, for every attempt I had ever made to speak those

truths for which I am still seeking, I had made contact with other women while we examined the words to fit a world in which we all believed, bridging our differences."⁴²

Similarly, Rich's "dream of a common language" does not image a society in which differences such as sexual orientation, race, and gender do not matter. Rich's poem "Origins and History of Consciousness" suggests that behind her dream of a common language lies "the drive to connect," which she might consider "the true nature of poetry" (lines 11-12).⁴³ The poetry of Rich and Lorde aims to communicate across differences rather than silence those whose lives deviate from a privileged "norm." The dream of a common language symbolizes the ultimate goal of lesbian poetics/politics: the end of oppression. "As the title indicates," writes Paula Bennett, lesbian-feminist poets "were determined to reform language and culture at once."⁴⁴ According to Bennett, lesbian-feminist poetry made a significant contribution to American poetry even though the political movement of lesbian-feminism was short lived:

Despite the differences of race, class, ethnicity, and religion that divided [lesbian poets of the 1970s], lesbian-feminism seemed, however momentarily, to have brought them together under one roof in the service of one cause, the cause, they believe, of women everywhere. As later events made clear, this sense of unity in purpose was illusory, but it was an illusion that made the lesbian-feminist revolution in poetry one of the most productive and exciting periods in the history of American women's literature.⁴⁵

In the 1980s, the connection between lesbianism and feminism was severed. Lesbian-feminism was rejected as a totalizing and essentialist discourse. As Martindale points out, "because there is no necessary connection between lesbianism and particular sets of political, aesthetic, or sexual preferences, no single theoretical discourse fits all lesbians."⁴⁶ The AIDS crisis and queer politics created new alliances between lesbians and gay men. According to Stein, "the term 'queer' attempted to separate questions of sexuality from those of gender."⁴⁷ Lesbianism was no longer considered a logical extension of feminism; queer theory thoroughly rejected the rhetoric of feminist sisterhood.

Despite its current prevalence in the academy, queer theory has not completely eclipsed lesbian-feminist literary criticism. Even before the critical hegemony of queer theory, feminist theorist Janice Raymond detected an apolitical turn in lesbian communities. According to Raymond,

There was a time when this movement called lesbian feminism had a passion, principles, and politics. Without romanticizing that period as the golden age of lesbian feminism, I would like to recall for us what that movement was and what it stood for. This movement was the strongest challenge to hetero-reality that feminism embodied. It challenged the worldview that women exist for men and primarily in relation to them ... But then something happened.⁴⁸

Barbara Smith has questioned the usefulness of queer theory for lesbians, particularly lesbians of color. Smith suspects that "queer" itself is an exclusionary term; "I see something disappearing there," she writes, "namely, 'lesbian,' and perhaps 'gay'

as well."⁴⁹ Ironically, although queer theory rejects lesbian-feminism as a totalizing discourse, queer politics can reinscribe white male dominance.

From the perspective of queer theory, the poetics/politics of Rich and Lorde is passé. Queer theory has moved beyond the focus on articulating lesbian experience and creating new forms of poetry and language, and has rejected the lesbian-feminist rhetoric of social transformation as a master narrative. However, it is still possible to view advancement in any of these three areas (which are clearly interrelated) as a significant achievement in poetry and politics. The belief that poetry can play an integral role in social transformation might seem naive, but the political nature of lesbian-feminist poetics cannot be denied. Rich and Lorde realized that in a heterosexist society, the naming of lesbian experience and the affirmation of lesbian sexuality can be revolutionary acts.

Notes

¹ Bonnie Zimmerman, "What Has Never Been: An Overview of Lesbian Feminist Literary Criticism," *The New Feminist Criticism*, ed. Elaine Showalter (New York: Pantheon, 1985) 201.

² I use the designation "poetics/politics" to represent the inseparability of poetics and politics for Rich and Lorde.

³ Arlene Stein, "Sisters and Queers: The Decentering of Lesbian Feminism," *Socialist Review* 22. 1 (Jan.-Mar. 1992): 33. For other discussions of queer theory's opposition to lesbian-feminism, see Paul Bennett, "Lesbian Poetry in the United States, 1890-1990: A Brief Overview," *Professions of Desire: Lesbian and Gay Studies in Literature*, eds. George E. Haggerty and Bonnie Zimmerman (New York: MLA, 1995) 98-110; Lisa Duggan, "Making It Perfectly Queer," *Socialist Review* 22. 1 (Jan.-Mar. 1992): 11-31; Kathleen Martindale, *Un/Popular Culture: Lesbian Writing After the Sex Wars* (Albany: SUNY Press, 1997), especially 1-54; Michael Warner, "From Queer to Eternity," *Voice Literary Supplement*, June 1992, 18-19.

⁴ Adrienne Rich, *Blood, Bread, and Poetry* (New York: Norton, 1986) 50.

⁵ Lillian Faderman, "What Is Lesbian Literature? Forming a Historical Canon," *Professions of Desire: Lesbian and Gay Studies in Literature*, eds. George E. Haggerty and Bonnie Zimmerman (New York: MLA, 1995) 49-59. Faderman presents her argument at length in *Surpassing the Love of Men: Romantic Friendship and Love Between Women from the Renaissance to the Present* (New York: William Morrow, 1981).

⁶ Adrienne Rich, *On Lies, Secrets, and Silence* (New York: Norton, 1979) 199.

⁷ Rich, *On Lies* 43.

⁸ Rich, *What Is Found There* (New York: Norton, 1993) 57.

⁹ Audre Lorde, *Sister Outsider* (Freedom, CA: The Crossing Press, 1984) 42.

¹⁰ Lorde, *Sister* 40.

¹¹ Lorde, *The Black Unicorn* (New York: Norton, 1978) 31-2.

¹² Lorde, *Sister* 42.

¹³ Lorde, *Sister* 42.

¹⁴ Zimmerman, *The Safe Sea of Women: Lesbian Fiction, 1969-1989* (Boston: Beacon, 1990) 15.

- ¹⁵ Rich, *On Lies* 202.
- ¹⁶ Rich, *On Lies* 200.
- ¹⁷ Rich, *On Lies* 201.
- ¹⁸ Rich, *On Lies* 200.
- ¹⁹ Rich, *Blood* 51.
- ²⁰ Rich, *Blood* 51.
- ²¹ Rich, *The Dream* 76..
- ²² Lorde, *Sister* 55, 56.
- ²³ Claudia Tate, ed., *Black Women Writers at Work* (New York: Continuum, 1985) 115.
- ²⁴ Tate 115.
- ²⁵ Zimmerman, "What Has Never Been" 205.
- ²⁶ Ann Ferguson, "Patriarchy, Sexual Identity, and the Sexual Revolution," "On 'Compulsory Heterosexuality and Lesbian Existence': Defining the Issues," Ann Ferguson, Jacquelyn N. Zita, and Kathryn Pyne Addelson, *Signs* 7 (1981): 160.
- ²⁷ Ferguson 160.
- ²⁸ Jacquelyn N. Zita, "Historical Amnesia and the Lesbian Continuum," Ferguson et al. 174.
- ²⁹ Zita 186-7.
- ³⁰ Lorde, *Sister* 41-42.
- ³¹ Rich, *The Dream of a Common Language* (New York: Norton, 1978) 67.
- ³² Lorde, *Sister* 37.
- ³³ Rich, *On Lies* 43.
- ³⁴ Lorde, *Black Unicorn* 108-9.
- ³⁵ Lorde, *Chosen Poems Old and New* (New York: Norton, 1982) 111-15.
- ³⁶ Lorde, *New York Head Shop and Museum* (Detroit: Broadside, 1974) 26.
- ³⁷ Rich, *The Dream* 23-36.
- ³⁸ Tate 106.
- ³⁹ Tate 109.
- ⁴⁰ Lorde, *Zami: A New Spelling of My Name* (Freedom, CA: The Crossing Press, 1982) 226.
- ⁴¹ Lorde, "What is at Stake in Lesbian and Gay Publishing Today," *Callaloo* 14:65.
- ⁴² Lorde, *Sister* 41.
- ⁴³ Rich, *The Dream* 7.
- ⁴⁴ Bennett 106.
- ⁴⁵ Bennett 106.
- ⁴⁶ Martindale 49.
- ⁴⁷ Stein 50.
- ⁴⁸ Janice Raymond, "Putting the Politics Back into Lesbianism," *Women's Studies International Forum* 12 (1989): 152.
- ⁴⁹ "On the Beginnings of Lesbian Literature in the United States: A Symposium with Maria Irene Fornes, Bertha Harris, Jill Johnston, Lisa Kennedy, and Barbara Smith," *Queer Representations*, ed. Martin Duberman (New York and London: New York UP, 1997) 355.