Editor’s Introduction
DR. BEN WETHERBEE

In early September of 2018, a former student stopped me in the hall. She told me other students had been asking her about and congratulating her on an essay of hers—a piece she had written at USAO a year before and then submitted to the inaugural volume of *The Drover Review*. After it was published, I had also assigned this piece in my Writing I sections to model essayistic strategies for using personal experience as argument. The tenor of the classroom suggested it was one of my students’ favorite readings from that unit. (We also read Virginia Woolf and George Orwell, among others—so the competition was plenty stiff.)

This is the sort of exchange that makes an English professor and editor’s day. It’s great to see student writing receive recognition. It’s even better to see student writing circulate and stir up conversation. When we first conceptualized this journal in 2017, its purposes were two, both in keeping with this anecdote. First, we hoped to showcase outstanding student writing, in much the spirit that art shows and recitals exhibit student talent, and in which *The Accent* showcases creative writing and art by USAO students. Second, we hoped to begin a growing archive of teaching resources—model essays by
USAO students written for USAO classes that could be read, analyzed, discussed, critiqued, and debated in class. But limited hindsight now suggests a third, complementary purpose for the journal, which is simply to facilitate conversation and the exchange of interdisciplinary ideas.

On that topic, the rhetorician and literary theorist Kenneth Burke offers this illustrative image of a parlor and its gregarious denizens:

Imagine that you enter a parlor. You come late. When you arrive, others have long preceded you, and they are engaged in a heated discussion, a discussion too heated for them to pause and tell you exactly what it is about. In fact, the discussion had already begun long before any of them got there, so that no one present is qualified to retrace for you all the steps that had gone before. You listen for a while, until you decide that you have caught the tenor of the argument; then you put in your oar. Someone answers; you answer him; another comes to your defense; another aligns himself against you, to either the embarrassment or gratification of your opponent, depending upon the quality of your ally's assistance. However, the discussion is interminable. The hour grows late, you must depart. And you do depart, with the discussion still vigorously in progress. (110-11)

This image—a favorite of mine, and one I yammer about so often that I hear a few current and former students groaning—instructs us of a few truths: First, knowledge is dialogic and collaborative; we speak and write as individuals, but our voices finally matter because of their relationships to other voices and fields of discourse. Second, the writer’s job is never—despite the contrary opinions trolls prowling YouTube comment sections—to shut things down or have the last word. The writer, instead, should push conversation forward, so it continues even after the writer moves on. And third, in order to advance knowledge in this manner, we need a parlor—a venue, a fo-
rum, a gathering space for ideas. Academic journals, web communities, town hall meetings, literal parlors—all exemplify Burke’s ideal in one sense of another. *The Drover Review* ought to pose one more example: a parlor for the USAO community, devotees of the interdisciplinary liberal arts, and those who champion undergraduate writing and scholarship. I hope USAO students, faculty, and alumni continue to read, discuss, debate, annotate, laud, critique, and circulate the work featured here in the spirit Burke implies.

**SIXTEEN STUDENT WRITERS CONTRIBUTE** novel ideas to this volume. Like the first volume, this one comprises three primary sections, the first two devoted to work from Writing I and II—USAO’s two-term first-year writing curriculum—and the third devoted to scholarly and essayistic writing from a range of courses and disciplines. Every submission set is its own animal, though, and this one has yielded different a makeup from volume 1. Notably, volume 2 includes considerably more upper-level writing and represents several disciplinary perspectives—including history, sociology, linguistics, and biology—that were absent from or less pronounced in volume 1. This volume also features, for the first time, the winner of the Jernigan Scholarship essay contest as a final but important addendum.

Two personal essays by Christopher Wilson and Logan Nitzel kick off the Writing I section. Wilson reflects incisively on how a college course changed his opinion of Islam after leaving the Marines, while Nitzel’s vivid narrative condemns the use of military-grade weapons in hunting. The section concludes with Wendell Hixson’s sharp rhetorical analysis of Patrick Henry’s famous address at Richmond on the eve of the American Revolution.

The Writing II section features two literary analyses. Korbyn Peebles offers an innovative religious reading of Flannery O’Connor’s renowned short story “A Good Man Is Hard to Find,” while Tia McCarley’s investigates the oft-neglected trope of male chastity, drawing examples from Arthurian legend and latter-day popular culture. These Writing I and II essays offer an enlightening sample
of the wide-ranging and sophisticated work USAO students are capable of, even in first-year courses.

The lengthy Writing across the Disciplines section features numerous academic perspectives, which are organized thematically. It begins with four literary/textual analyses. First, Baylee Bozarth, reads Eliza Haywood’s novella Fantomina as a sustained metaphor for gender performance in patriarchal society. Genevieve Gordon then analyzes Gulliver’s Travels as a prescient commentary on class and labor exploitation. Two commentaries on dystopian narrative follow: Kylea Caughman interprets the indie video game Undertale as an innovative mosaic of tropes from dystopian film and literature, while Hannah Freeman argues we ought to understand the reality dating show The Bachelor as a dystopia (thus confirming our collective suspicion that, yes, reality TV is the beginning of the end). These four essays represent the wide breadth of work USAO students undertake in literature courses alone.

The following essays represent diverse disciplinary methods. Summer Laurick’s linguistic analysis poses a heavily researched commentary on how Gaelic continues to influence Irish English. Emma Wilson then employs several sociological frameworks to better understand the racist assumptions behind the notorious Port Royal Experiment and Tuskegee Syphilis Study. And Zachary Waldroup offers a meticulously researched synthesis of scholarship on connections between depression and the physiological wellbeing of the immune system. These works offer an impressive and illustrative snapshot of writing’s role across disciplines and the complex intellectual moves USAO students adopt in their multidisciplinary research and analysis.

Three longform essays conclude the section, including two history papers: Benjamin Verser recounts the story of Brooklyn Dodgers manager Branch Rickey, whose recruitment of Jackie Robinson helped shatter the color barrier in baseball, while Katherine Loman unearths the unique and troubling history of race relations in
USAO’s home of Chickasha, Oklahoma. Finally, Eren Hall’s interdisciplinary senior seminar essay investigates how the gay rights movement has set a social precedent for the current movement for transgender equality. All three essays exemplify the sort of in-depth, sustained research characteristic of senior-level capstone writing, both in the majors and in the interdisciplinary studies curriculum.

As a separate addendum, this volume also includes a short essay by Mandy Ozment, who argues that George Washington’s “Farewell Address” presages the modern problem of acrimony between political parties. Ozment is the winner of the 2019-20 Betty Baker Jernigan Endowed Scholarship Fund, which, each year, offers $1000 to the winner of a contest open to qualified continuing and incoming USAO students; applicants write 300-500 words addressing the question: “How is America doing—politically, socially, economically?” Beginning this year, The Drover Review offers to publish winning essays like Ozment’s. We wish to celebrate these pieces alongside other examples of outstanding student writing and to help publicize this outstanding scholarship opportunity.

This journal remains a collective, campus-wide effort, and I offer my necessarily abridged gratitude to everyone who has contributed. I thank the Editorial Board—Drs. Shelley Rees, John Bruce, and Tonnia Anderson, as well as English majors Genevieve Gordon and Emily Rand—for their intelligence, hard work, and ability to make difficult decisions on a deadline. Genevieve, in her capacity as work-study for the English office, deserves additional thanks for hanging fliers around campus and otherwise acceding to my whims, running miscellaneous errands to promote the journal.

Thanks, also, go to faculty, staff, and students across campus who publicize of The Drover Review, and to all those who integrate intellectually sophisticated writing into their curricula across the disciplines at USAO. Faculty members whose coursework yielded submissions to this volume include Brenda Brown, James Finck, Annick Bellemain, Rachel Jones, Aleisha Karjala, and Misty Steele,
as well as faculty on the Editorial Board. At the Communications and Marketing office, Beckie Brennan has been especially helpful updating The Drover Review’s information on the USAO website.

I also thank all the students who have submitted work to this volume. Without fail, reading Drover Review submissions is just as rewarding as it is difficult to decide what to publish. Please keep sending in your good work. Reading it is one of the recurring joys of my job.

And once again, I thank you—the readers of this journal and of these exceptional student writers. Good writing wants to be read, so let’s get to it. ►►
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