

New Interpretations
of Harper Lee's *To Kill
a Mockingbird* and
Go Set a Watchman

New Interpretations
of Harper Lee's *To Kill
a Mockingbird* and
Go Set a Watchman

Edited by

Amy Mohr and Mark Olival-Bartley

Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing



New Interpretations of Harper Lee's *To Kill a Mockingbird*
and *Go Set a Watchman*

Edited by Amy Mohr, Mark Olival-Bartley

This book first published 2019

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2019 by Amy Mohr, Mark Olival-Bartley and contributors

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-5275-3043-4

ISBN (13): 978-1-5275-3043-0

In honor of my parents, Mae and Paul Doherty,
lifelong educators, with love and gratitude.
Amy Doherty Mohr

To Lorna Reyes, who brought me to both Harper Lee's
masterpiece and the joy of teaching English.
Mark Olival-Bartley

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgments	ix
Introduction	x
<i>Amy Mohr and Mark Olival-Bartley</i>	
Part 1: <i>To Kill a Mockingbird</i> and <i>Go Set a Watchman</i>: New Interpretations	
The Dynamics of Segregation in Harper Lee's <i>To Kill a Mockingbird</i> and <i>Go Set a Watchman</i>	2
<i>Robert H. Brinkmeyer, Jr.</i>	
The Maycomb Model: Reading Harper Lee's Novels with Norbert Elias's Concept of Established-Outsider Relations	25
<i>Christa Buschendorf</i>	
Tackling Tin Gods: Patricide in Harper Lee's <i>Go Set a Watchman</i> and Sylvia Plath's "Daddy"	59
<i>Louisa Söllner</i>	
Part 2: Style, Translation, and Pedagogy	
The Lessons of <i>Mockingbird</i> 's Style	88
<i>Mark Olival-Bartley</i>	
<i>To Kill a Mockingbird</i> : A Challenging Translation That Sings in Arabic	107
<i>Dalia Elshayal</i>	
The Seductive Power of Literature: Teaching <i>To Kill a Mockingbird</i> in the United States	127
<i>Steven B. Shively</i>	

Teaching *To Kill a Mockingbird* and *Go Set a Watchman*:
Literary and Cultural Contexts 155
Amy Doherty Mohr

Contributors..... 189

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to thank the staff at Cambridge Scholars Publishing for their support of this project, particularly Adam Rummens for his patience and guidance. For helping us develop the Harper Lee: Revisions international conference, we are deeply thankful to our colleagues at the Amerika-Institut, LMU Munich, including Professor Dr. Klaus Benesch, Director; PD Dr. Sascha Pöhlmann and Dr. Anna Flügge; Dr. Margaretha Schweiger-Wilhelm, Managing Director of the Bavarian American Academy; the staff at the Amerikahaus and the board of the Amerikahaus Verein; Professor Hans-Peter Söder, Resident Director of the Junior Year in Munich program; Random House/DVA Publishers; and Words' Worth Booksellers. For her invaluable assistance with the Arabic text, we thank Dr. Elisabeth Meyer. We are also grateful to the scholars who contributed to this volume for their generosity and willingness to engage in discussions about American literature and culture from their individual perspectives.

On a personal note, Amy would like to express her appreciation to Joe, Elizabeth, and Emily for their thoughts, humor, insights, and debates about our culture, its history, and its stories.

Mark, in turn, tenders his gratitude to Laura, his steadfast muse.

INTRODUCTION

“Revision, n.”

I. The action of re-examining, and related senses.

1.

- a. The action or an act of looking over or surveying something again.
- b. The action or an act of taking a retrospective survey; review, or a review.

2.

- a. The action or an act of revising something; critical or careful examination or perusal of a text, judgment, code, etc., with a view to making corrections, amendments, or improvements.
- b. The result of this; a revised or amended version of a text, etc.
- c. A single amendment or correction to a piece of work.

-- *Oxford English Dictionary*, Oxford UP, 2018,
www.oed.com/view/Entry/164894.

New Interpretations of Harper Lee's To Kill a Mockingbird and Go Set a Watchman, a collection of essays re-examining Harper Lee's work, began with the publication of *Go Set a Watchman* in 2015. Published in 1960 and set in Maycomb, Alabama, in the 1930s, *To Kill a Mockingbird*—Scout's narrative of her father, Atticus, and his defense of Tom Robinson, an African American accused of raping a white woman—has been central to America's literary culture since its initial publication. Until 2015, a second publication had never appeared, and Harper Lee, despite her literary

stature and apparent love of storytelling, if judged by the style of her classic novel, remained reluctant to give interviews. With the passing of decades, readers had given up on the appearance of another publication, and then, suddenly, *Go Set a Watchman* arrived and became an instant media sensation. However, after the initial anticipation, readers faced a bewildering shift in the narrative itself—from the remote small-town life of the 1930s to heated family conflicts regarding desegregation in the 1950s; from the beloved Atticus to a bigot who would prefer to maintain a racially segregated society; from the precocious Scout to the exasperated Jean Louise; from the observations of a whimsical child to the rhetoric of an exhausted adult—the core story and its characters, real as family members to many readers, no longer existed as stable entities, and readers were left to reconcile the differences. Scholars of Harper Lee's work continue to face questions at the core of storytelling, writing, and publication. The two publications, taken together, raise issues of narrative integrity and make readers consider the position of her work in American literary and cultural history due to their respective representations of inequalities and marginalization. Many American readers have held the classic in high esteem as a novel fundamental to the U.S. literary canon and, by extension, American national identity. The publication of *Go Set a Watchman*, then, raises questions about *To Kill a Mockingbird*—its social narrative, its status as a work of great literature, its omnipresence in literature courses—leading readers to “see” the story again, this time in a different light.

This collection developed from Harper Lee: Revisions, an international conference held in June 2016 in Munich, Germany, based on the two publications, with panel presentations, a screening of the classic film, and

lively debates about our interpretations and experiences of reading and rereading these publications. In discussions with scholars, students, and the public, we considered the following questions: Should we read *To Kill a Mockingbird* in light of *Go Set a Watchman*? Should the novels be read along a continuum? In that case, which should come first, the culturally predominant version or the one that apparently was written first? Or should they be considered chronologically in terms of narrative, with Scout's point of view studied before that of Jean Louise? Shall we focus on the classic and consider the second publication to be a footnote in literary history, or does *Go Set a Watchman* tell us something fundamental about the conflicts, tensions, and untold stories that readers may have overlooked in *Mockingbird*, especially those readers who, thanks in part to Lee's masterful literary style, held the narrative of justice and empathy as a model of character? Admittedly, in light of the publication of *Go Set a Watchman*, many admirers of *To Kill a Mockingbird* held the second publication as gingerly as a china teacup, which may not quite make its way across the living room.

And yet, not all readers wholeheartedly accepted an idealistic interpretation of *To Kill a Mockingbird*. Published after the desegregation of public schools and before the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965, the classic had come under intermittent scrutiny, directly and indirectly, by critics and scholars from the time of its initial publication. Even so, the novel remained largely untainted in the public eye, winning a Pulitzer Prize and later recognized by both President Barack Obama and President George W. Bush, a rare literary fulcrum of political unity. Many young readers, especially in the U.S., found *To Kill a Mockingbird* immediate and engaging, echoing their own experiences of

childhood, providing a context for thinking about social truths, offering a model for a nation where individuals would stand up for themselves and each other in a system of equality. However, such a reading privileges the heroic narrative of Atticus, perhaps heavily influenced by the 1962 film, over the indictment and murder of Tom Robinson. The focus on Atticus's idealism, then, is only one element in a deeper and more unsettling story, whose issues we continue to face at the time of this publication.

Like a weaving still on the loom, *Go Set a Watchman* reveals the darker threads that were skillfully woven into *To Kill a Mockingbird*, and, as scholars pull a bit on those threads, we find that the narrative does not unravel but rather that the actual tapestry is more complex than initially thought. The essays in this collection reveal these threads from different angles as part of an ongoing discussion of America's closely held beliefs and the arduous work of reassessing and revising the stories that comprise our cultural narrative. We realize that each reader will take something different from Harper Lee's work; what may seem a hidden thread to one reader may be painfully obvious to another.

We have shaped this collection to represent the fundamental directions of the conference and our concerns as scholars and teachers of literature: literary and cultural criticism, studies of style, translation, and pedagogical approaches. In "The Dynamics of Segregation in Harper Lee's *To Kill a Mockingbird* and *Go Set a Watchman*," Robert Brinkmeyer explores the characters of Jean Louise and Atticus within the context of Southern race relations prior to 1960 and, by extension, Scout's influences as a child growing up in the segregated South with reference to William Alexander Percy's *Lanterns on the Levee* (1941) and Lillian Smith's *Killers of the Dream* (1949). In "The Maycomb Model: Reading Harper Lee's Novels

with Norbert Elias's Concept of Established-Outsider Relations," Christa Buschendorf considers the application of sociologist Norbert Elias's "Maycomb model" to both of Lee's novels. In the process, Elias's classic work re-emerges as an important tool for considering the mechanism of discrimination in the novels in the context of relational group theory. Indeed, both novels present the implications for society and the individual in a local community's sanctioning of violence against, and social shunning of, its outsiders. In "Tackling Tin Gods: Patricide in Harper Lee's *Go Set a Watchman* and Sylvia Plath's 'Daddy,'" Louisa Söllner traces the theme of patricide to a compelling conclusion, revealing new possibilities in a reading based in gender studies, focussing on women's roles and repression in 1950s America, which led to innovative and experimental forms of literary expression. These scholars challenge the nationally canonized version of *To Kill a Mockingbird* and allow the reader to see cross-cultural resonances in a telescopic set of interpretations focussing on the place of the individual who threatens the conformist and repressive tendencies of a society with a view towards righting social injustice.

Along with the cultural debates, this collection addresses issues related to the literary composition, translation, and teaching of Harper Lee's works. Drawing our attention to the style of *To Kill a Mockingbird*, in "The Lessons of *Mockingbird*'s Style," Mark Olival-Bartley focusses on a singular aspect of the novel often overlooked in the focus on cultural debates. Indeed, Lee's style oscillates almost seamlessly between the point of view of child and adult, resulting in its widespread appeal. While setting the foundations for a narrative conflict with sociological implications, Lee also achieves a magical and secretive effect tantamount to the placing of

icons as gifts in the hollow of a tree, enchanting and intriguing her readers. In “*To Kill a Mockingbird: A Challenging Translation That Sings in Arabic*,” Dalia Elshayal reflects on the multilayered process and rewards of translating Lee’s classic into Arabic in order to make the novel and its lessons accessible to students in Egypt. Such scholarship supports the cross-cultural dissemination of the work and considers the students as present and future scholars, the concern of the final two essays of the collection. In “The Seductive Power of Literature: Teaching *To Kill a Mockingbird* in the United States,” Steven Shively takes a retrospective look at the provocative yet central role of *To Kill a Mockingbird* for educators and argues for its enduring value today. In “Teaching *To Kill a Mockingbird* and *Go Set a Watchman: Literary and Cultural Contexts*,” Amy Doherty Mohr provides a comprehensive teaching guide with a focus on international students, taking into consideration recent scholarship and the dynamic debates surrounding both novels. Without further ado, heeding Harper Lee’s reminder that introductions always pale in comparison to the work itself (“*Mockingbird* still says what it has to say; it has managed to survive the years without preamble”¹), let us turn to our collection of essays.

¹ Foreword. *To Kill a Mockingbird*. 12 February 1993. HarperCollins, 1995.

PART 1:

***TO KILL A MOCKINGBIRD*
AND GO SET A WATCHMAN:
NEW INTERPRETATIONS**

THE DYNAMICS OF
SEGREGATION IN HARPER LEE'S
TO KILL A MOCKINGBIRD AND
GO SET A WATCHMAN

ROBERT H. BRINKMEYER, JR.

The appearance of *Go Set a Watchman* raises a vexing interpretative question: Should *To Kill a Mockingbird* and *Watchman* be read together, as the continuing story of Scout, Atticus, and others, eighteen years after the time of *Mockingbird*? Or should the two novels be read entirely separately as two distinct works with two sets of different characters, even if characters share names across the two novels? For admirers of *Mockingbird*, it is certainly easier merely to set *Watchman* aside, thereby avoiding the problem of interpreting members of the Finch family in light of the disturbing things we learn about them in *Watchman*, including Atticus's participation in the Ku Klux Klan and the local Citizens' Council. To read the novels together, however, the more difficult and more rewarding option, challenges the reader to come to terms with what seems so contradictory about the Finches, ultimately leading, I am going to argue, to an understanding of the segregated South's complicated racial dynamics and, particularly, the pressures toward racial solidarity within the white community. These pressures are at work in both novels but are more visible in *Watchman* and are best revealed in the lives of Jean Louise and Atticus, both of whom face repeated challenges that force them to define their fundamental positions on race and take their stands for or

against systemic segregation. The fate of both characters makes visible the crushing power of Southern traditionalism to mold its citizens so that their minds become as segregated as the social order.

I will begin with Atticus. The Atticus of *Mockingbird* has been widely praised, often to the point of idolization, as a man of honor and integrity who is leading the South, albeit slowly, toward a more racially just future, a lionization that derives no doubt in part from Gregory Peck's portrayal of Atticus in the film.¹ And yet, as admirable and courageous as Atticus often is, his glorification goes too far in construing him as a brave, idealistic social reformer. Atticus's concern for justice and fair play does not extend into the social realm, remaining instead rooted firmly in two places: his household and the courtroom. He treats his family's cook Calpurnia with respect, but he says nothing about the injustices of the segregated system; he does not want blacks beaten or taken advantage of by unscrupulous whites, and he wants them to have the right to a fair trial, but that is as far as he goes concerning the rights of blacks. He wants, in other words, separate but equal—and maybe not even equal.

Atticus's sense of justice harks back to that of Marcus Aurelius, the Stoic whose thinking was often embraced by Southern conservatives during the era of segregation in their defense of the status quo. For Aurelius, treating people justly meant not treating people equally but treating them according to what they deserve, according to their social

¹ Peck, in fact, exercised a great deal of influence over the script; at his insistence, the film, as compared with the novel, spends a greater proportion of time on his story than on the children's; the film also omits several episodes from the novel that present unflattering depictions of Atticus. For a full discussion of the film adaptation, see: R. Barton Palmer, *Harper Lee's To Kill a Mockingbird: The Relationship Between Text and Film*.

position. Aurelius believed, as did other Stoics, that there was a rigid, hierarchical order structuring the world as well as society that must always be defended. He also believed that in the face of chaos and ruin, one must remain true to one's ideals and one's honor. All of this understandably appealed greatly to Southern conservatives who were taking stands against the forces of change that were threatening the traditional South in the early-to-mid twentieth century. Perhaps the most visible of these defenders was William Alexander Percy, who kept a copy of Aurelius's *Meditations* by his bedside and whose 1941 memoir *Lanterns on the Levee* was profoundly shaped by Stoic thinking. I bring up Percy here not only because Atticus bears some striking similarities with him (since Percy, too, was a lawyer and a leading citizen of his hometown, Greenville, Mississippi) but also because his memoir, as I will discuss momentarily, raises issues central to both *Mockingbird* and *Watchman*.

Although he never mentions Aurelius by name, Atticus voices Stoic positions extolling honor and order throughout *Mockingbird*, as when he explains to Scout why he grudgingly accepted Judge Taylor's request that he represent Tom Robinson. Not taking the case, he says, would have meant that "I couldn't hold up my head in town, I couldn't represent this county in the legislature, I couldn't even tell you or Jem not to do something again" (86). At another point, he observes that while people are entitled to their opinions, "before I can live with other folks I've got to live with myself. The one thing that doesn't abide by majority rule is a person's conscience" (120). While in *Mockingbird* Atticus's resistance to change and his support of the Southern hierarchy are primarily tacit, his comments on public education (which are rarely mentioned in discussions of the novel) clearly point to his social conservatism and his opposition to

any sort of social leveling. Public schools, he says, ridiculously lump students of all levels of intelligence into a single classroom and thus drag down the best qualified. “[T]he people who run public education,” he says derisively, “promote the stupid and idle along with the industrious—because all men are created equal, educators will gravely tell you, the children left behind suffer terrible feelings of inferiority” (234). Also suggestive of Atticus’s commitment to the Southern order is his response to Scout when she asks him (because she has been asked by a friend) whether he is a radical: “I’m about as radical as Cotton Tom Heflin” (288).² While Atticus of course is here speaking in jest, his comparing himself to Heflin is nonetheless troubling (and revealing, as becomes clear in *Watchman*) since Heflin was a firebrand white supremacist and reputed member of the Ku Klux Klan.

Atticus’s opposition to social change is more obvious in *Watchman*, where, two decades after the time of *Mockingbird*, he forcefully takes his stand against external forces he sees threatening Maycomb’s segregated community: the NAACP and the Federal Government. Atticus’s attacks on the NAACP focus on the organization’s intrusion into the legal system. Although in *Mockingbird* Atticus knows from the very beginning that Tom Robinson will not receive a fair trial because by law and custom he will face an all-white jury, he works in *Watchman* to keep that very jury system in place, doing all he can to subvert the NAACP’s efforts to seat blacks on juries and to move local trials into federal court—two legal strategies that

² James Thomas Heflin (1869-1951), or “Cotton Tom,” helped draft the 1901 Alabama Constitution, which essentially denied African Americans the right to vote; he also supported convict leasing and segregationist policies. He was a representative of Alabama’s Fifth Congressional District in the U.S. Congress (1904-1920) for eight consecutive terms and served as a U.S. Senator from Alabama (1920-31) (Watson).

would, in fact, be important in the eventual dismantling of the South's segregated system. When Atticus rushes to take the case brought against Calpurnia's grandson, he does so not to make sure justice is done and to help Calpurnia's family but rather to keep NAACP lawyers from getting involved and befouling Maycomb's judicial system. In justifying his actions to Jean Louise, he tells her that "NAACP-paid lawyers are standing around like buzzards down here waiting for things like this to happen." After Jean Louise expresses her surprise—"You mean colored lawyers?"—Atticus continues:

"Yep. We've got three or four in the state now. They're mostly in Birmingham and places like that, but circuit by circuit they watch and wait, just for some felony committed by a Negro against a white person—you'd be surprised how quick they find out—in they come and . . . well, in terms you can understand, they demand Negroes on the juries in such cases. They subpoena the jury commissioners, they ask the judge to step down, they raise every legal trick in their books—and they have 'em aplenty—they try to force the judge into error. Above all else, they try to get the case into a Federal court where they know the cards are stacked in their favor. It's already happened in our next-door-neighbor circuit, and there's nothing in the books that says it won't happen here." (149)

In all this, Atticus speaks as a staunch defender of segregation and its ironclad exclusion of blacks' participation in the legal system, except as its victims.

Atticus's hostility toward social equality bubbles up in a later conversation with Jean Louise, who is appalled upon discovering his leadership of the local chapter of the Citizens' Council, a white supremacist organization that had formed across the South after *Brown v.*

Board of Education, which established that segregating public schools was unconstitutional. Asserting that the *Brown* decision was a frontal attack on Southern traditionalism and sovereignty, the organization vociferously opposed the integration of schools and public facilities as well as the registration of black voters. Pushing aside Jean Louise's criticisms about his participation in the local Council, Atticus fires back a series of questions whose answers are (to him) self-evident: "Do you want Negroes by the carload in our schools and churches and theaters? Do you want them in our world? . . . Do you want your children going to a school that's been dragged down to accommodate Negro children? . . . What would happen if all the Negroes in the South were suddenly given full civil rights? I'll tell you. There'd be another Reconstruction. Would you want your state governments run by people who don't know how to run 'em?" (245-46). And, then, to drive home his point, he adds, "We're outnumbered, you know" (246).

While Atticus never utters anything so harsh in *Mockingbird*, it is likely that he held similar positions but just never had reason to voice them. Atticus's silence on social and political issues (aside from advocating for fair trials for blacks) owes much to the simple fact that large forces of history are virtually absent in *Mockingbird*. Despite the fact that at the time of the novel the Great Depression was ravaging the South and, that not far down the road from Maycomb, the trial of the Scottsboro Boys had taken place (a case bearing striking parallels with Tom Robinson's), *Mockingbird* seems set in a virtually timeless and unchanging world. While threatening external forces are occasionally mentioned, they seem to be affecting only distant regions, bypassing Maycomb altogether. As a result, the novel resembles a fairy tale,

Atticus joined the Klan not to support the organization but to expose it by discovering its membership list. But Henry's observation leaves this question unanswered: Why would Atticus work to subvert the Klan when his racial views (as seen so explicitly in *Watchman*) dovetail so closely with those of the Klan? Once again, the example of William Alexander Percy looms large for understanding Atticus's actions.

During the 1920s, Percy was one of the leaders in Greenville's fight against the Klan, despite the fact that at the same time he was arguing vociferously for the purity of the white race and the preservation of segregation. As discussed in *Lanterns*, Percy opposed the Klan because he saw it as a dangerous threat to Greenville's established social and political hierarchies. The vast majority of Klan members, in Percy's eyes, were unruly poor whites who had migrated into Greenville from the countryside. Their power lay in their whiteness, making them indistinguishable in everyday life from other whites; unless they were wearing their robes (and then of course they were masked), the Klansmen were in a sense completely invisible, allowing them secretly to infiltrate Greenville's society. Percy thus deemed Klansmen spies, and he described how their presence poisoned Greenville's life: "You never knew if the man you were talking to was a Klansman and a spy. Like German parachute jumpers, they appeared disguised as friends. . . . Everyone was under suspicion: from Klansmen you could expect neither frankness nor truth nor honor, and you couldn't tell who was a Klansman" (237).

Perhaps the gravest threat Percy saw poor whites posing to the traditional order came at the ballot box, as he feared that bloc voting by poor whites would dismantle the traditional political hierarchy. Percy had already seen this happen years before when his father, LeRoy Percy, was

defeated by populist James K. Vardaman in the 1912 statewide election for a U.S. Senate seat—a result that Percy characterized as turning Mississippi politics on its head or, as he put it, putting the bottom rail on top. In another comment on his father's electoral defeat, Percy said that the rise of poor white populism in Mississippi was an early manifestation of a worldwide revolution of social and political leveling that he was witnessing in the 1930s and 1940s:

It was my first sight of the rise of the masses, but not my last. Now we have Russia and Germany, we have the insolence of organized labor and the insolence of capital, examples both of the insolence of the parvenu; we have the rise of the masses from Mississippi east, and back again west to Mississippi. The herd is on the march, and when it stampedes, there's blood galore and beauty is china under its hoofs. (153)

Atticus makes no such bold pronouncement about world revolution, but it seems likely that he shared Percy's fear of a rising tide of poor white power. As did most Southern elites from this period, including Percy, Atticus most likely associated the Klan with poor white insurgency, believing that its membership was made up overwhelmingly of poor whites (an assertion that conveniently displaces racial violence entirely upon the lower orders and so frees the segregated system, as well as himself and other elites, from any responsibility).³ The disruption of the political and social order, rather than disruption of the racial order, was the threat the Klan posed to Atticus and other Southern elites. Thus, in opposing the Klan, Atticus in all likelihood was not taking a stand

³ This view is historically inaccurate as Klan membership drew heavily from the middle class and had widespread support from all levels of white Southern society. See particularly: Nancy MacLean, *Behind the Mask of Chivalry: The Making of the Second Ku Klux Klan*.

endorsing the civil rights of blacks but was instead working to secure the traditional order from poor white disruption. By obtaining the Klan's membership list, he was thus attempting to make the invisible white enemy visible, identifying Klansmen and Klan sympathizers in order to keep them from disrupting the social and political hierarchies.

Atticus's later stand against the mob at the jail in *Mockingbird* visibly represents the opposition between the traditional order and the poor white insurgency. Atticus sits alone outside the jail, protecting Tom Robinson and more broadly the town's peace against the unruly men who have driven in from the countryside. Their purpose seems clear: They want to take the law into their own hands, seizing Tom Robinson from his jail cell, and then, in all likelihood, lynching him. The scene plays out the cultural logic underpinning the traditional South's views of poor whites: They pose little threat when they stay in their place—that is, in the country, as the aspersion “poor white trash” suggests, trash dumps typically being located out of town and out of mind—but they are dangerous when they migrate into town in this scene, threatening to undercut the workings of the legal system. Percy also draws upon a similar cultural geography in *Lanterns*, describing poor white migration into Greenville this way: “Unbeknownst, strangers had drifted in since the war—from the hills, from the North, from all sorts of odd places where they hadn't succeeded or hadn't been wanted” (230).

Almost twenty years after the time of *Mockingbird*, Atticus is once again taking his stand against alien outsiders threatening to disrupt Maycomb's segregated system—this time, the NAACP and the federal government. The poor white threat is no longer an issue as the ruling elite has now cast off its mask of Southern paternalism and is openly embracing

the virulent racism that they had previously displaced upon poor whites. It is this unveiling that catches Jean Louise by surprise and initially so upsets her. Having moved away from Maycomb, returning only for occasional visits, Jean Louise is at first unaware that the ruling elite is vocally supporting segregation and spearheading the work of the local Citizens' Council. Her first inkling of this change occurs when she finds, sitting beside Atticus's living room chair, a racist pamphlet written in support of the Citizens' Councils, titled *The Black Plague*, with a lurid cover depicting a black cannibal. Jean Louise immediately imagines the readers of such pamphlets, characterizing them as the "same people who were the Invisible Empire, who hated Catholics; ignorant, fear-ridden, red-faced, boorish, law-abiding, one hundred per cent red-blooded Anglo-Saxons, her fellow Americans—trash" (104). That *her* people—that is, Atticus, Uncle Jack, and Henry—could now be a part of this group is confirmed when she witnesses a Citizens' Council meeting attended by Atticus and other leaders of Maycomb. These men, whom Jean Louise characterizes as "[m]en of substance and character, responsible men, good men" (110), sit raptly listening to a diatribe describing blacks as bestial and predatory, threatening to mongrelize the white race—an oratory that could have been straight out of *The Black Plague*. Even Aunt Alexandra finds much to like in the pamphlet's arguments. After Jean Louise comments that "the stuff in that [pamphlet] makes Dr. Goebbels look like a naive little country boy," Alexandra responds: "I don't know what you're talking about, Jean Louise. There are a lot of truths in that book" (102).

So shaken is Jean Louise upon witnessing the Citizens' Council meeting that when she sees Atticus the following day she is surprised he looks like the same man, as she had "expected him to be looking like

Dorian Gray or somebody” (146). Once believing that Atticus’s private character (that is, his honor and high ideals) *was* his public character—and that this was the foundation of his integrity—Jean Louise now suspects it is all a sham, that Atticus has been wearing a mask to hide his toxic prejudices. She feels betrayed because, since childhood, she has patterned her ideals after what she believed were his. In another nod to the novel’s title, Jean Louise says that she now needs a watchman to help her see through the masks behind which people hide their true feelings. Or, as she puts it: “I need a watchman to tell me this is what a man says but this is what he means, to draw a line down the middle and say here is this justice and there is that justice and make me understand the difference” (181-82).

Jean Louise now understands that, in idolizing her father, she has failed to see that Atticus and the other leaders of the town have not been working to undo the inequities of the segregated system but to enforce them. Underscoring the success of their efforts is the simple fact that Maycomb’s segregated order is still firmly in place at the time of *Watchman*, having remained unchanged in the two decades since the events of *Mockingbird*. That Jean Louise now sees that Atticus is using the legal system not to protect the rights of blacks but to deny them those rights compels her to visit Calpurnia after her grandson’s arrest. She wants to make sure that Calpurnia understands that she and her family, despite Atticus’s support of segregation, really do love her and mean well toward her family. She is rudely shaken when Calpurnia, rather than thanking Jean Louise for her concern, instead asks her bluntly, “What are you all doing to us?” (160). Calpurnia here challenges Jean Louise to understand what Calpurnia has clearly known all along: that the Finches, in not working to end segregation, are responsible for the ongoing injustices and suffering of

black people, whatever their affection for individual blacks. Stunned, Jean Louise asks her, "Did you hate us?" After a long pause, "bearing the burden of her years," Calpurnia shakes her head (160).

We don't know Jean Louise's response to Calpurnia's gesture, as the episode ends abruptly at this point. But it seems apparent (to the reader if not to Jean Louise) that, whatever her denial, Calpurnia does in fact harbor a good deal of hate for the Finches, her gesture an echo of Quentin Compson's tortured claim at the end of *Absalom, Absalom!* that he doesn't hate the South, when the reader knows that most certainly some part of him does furiously detest his homeland. While Jean Louise, as we can see from some of her outbursts throughout the novel, shares some of Calpurnia's disgust at Maycomb's racial injustice, her anger seems directed less at the system itself than at her family's support of it. Indeed, her most direct challenge to the system occurs many years earlier in *Mockingbird* when she was a child and not fully socialized. As that novel suggests, the true hope for social change within the white order appears to lie with the children because, despite having learned some Southern prejudices, they still retain enough innocence to be able to recognize the inconsistencies and mystifications of the segregated system—at least for a while before socialization brings them entirely into the fold, making the system seem natural and unchallengeable.

Much of what Scout, Jem, and Dill do in *Mockingbird*, in fact, interrogates in some way Maycomb's rigid boundaries of caste and class, scrutinizing the hierarchies with a gaze not yet befouled by prejudice. Some of their activities involve crossing physical borders, as when Scout and Jem go to Calpurnia's church and when they watch the trial from the blacks-only balcony. Even more significant are their musings about what