

---

**SOCIETY**

impose certain health standards; in the third, it may proscribe abortion except when a threat to health or life exists.)

In *Danforth*, the Court's minority argued in favor of requiring a husband's consent to his wife's abortion because the wish to continue a pregnancy should be given weight along with the the wish to end it. The minority also said that parental consent was desirable in *all* abortions involving minors "to protect children from their own immature and improvident decisions."

Annas, director of Boston University's Center for Law and Health Services, predicts that future abortion litigation will center on the issue of consent by parents or husbands, since even the majority opinion in *Danforth* states that such consent is sometimes desirable. The courts are likely to decide who is most competent to make the final decision in an abortion, even in the first trimester, with the doctor in all probability having the most influence.

---

**ARTS & LETTERS**

*Literary Amnesia  
and the Revolution*

"How the Puritans Won the American Revolution" by Sacvan Bercovitch, in *The Massachusetts Review* (Winter 1977), Memorial Hall, Amherst, Mass. 01002.

Although popular 19th-century writers used the Revolutionary War and its political tumults as a backdrop for romances, plays, and novels, the century's major American writers—from Benjamin Franklin to Stephen Crane—ignored the struggle for national independence as either theme or setting.

Washington Irving's *Rip Van Winkle* slept through the war; Franklin's *Autobiography* all but excludes it; James Fenimore Cooper's *Natty Bumppo* is a pre-Revolutionary rifleman, other Cooper heroes belong to later times. Melville, Whitman, Emerson, Thoreau—all touched on revolution in the abstract but shunned their own nation's experience.

Bercovitch, a professor of English at Columbia, suggests that this literary amnesia stemmed from the writers' strong Puritan ideology, which favored independence but feared democracy; in old age, even the Boston radical Sam Adams turned his oratorical fire on the "boundless and insatiable ambition" of what he called "king mob."

As the war faded into patriotic myth (as depicted in George Bancroft's 1834 *History of the United States*), the Puritans, not the humanistic Jeffersons and Franklins, dominated intellectual life. Puritan

## ARTS &amp; LETTERS

voices became, as Bercovitch says, "increasingly shrill" as the egalitarian Jacksonian Democrats threatened the status of mercantile New England and New York. Revolution in the abstract was fine, the Puritans seemed to say, but the best way for Americans to express revolutionary ardor was to transform it into support for a working and workable society. Melville's Ishmael, who followed even Captain Ahab's demented orders, alone was left to tell the tale of *Moby Dick* and became "the exemplum of shirt-sleeve democracy." Hawthorne's Hester Prynne, stigmatized as an adulteress, learned that in Puritan society the way to redemption was acceptance of the status quo.

*Art Forgery:  
Is It Ever Art?*

"The Aesthetic Status of Forgeries" by Mark Sagoff, in *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* (Winter 1976), Temple University and the Cleveland Museum of Art, Cleveland, Ohio 44106.

If a Constable painting is "a skillful, ingenious, and accurate representation of clouds, would not an excellent forgery be as skillful, as ingenious, and as accurate a representation?" According to Sagoff, a Cornell semanticist, the answer is no.

Aesthetically, originals and forgeries exhibit radical differences in texture and line, which can be readily detected by a knowledgeable historian or critic. Moreover, the original artist must solve a problem—conjuring up a convincing image by revealing, through design, the "symbols" that represent certain objects. The work of art records that discovery and advances a theory concerning the way we see things. It is an "experiment ending in a solution."

A forgery, however, merely repeats the solution to a problem that has already been solved. Even if both original and forgery are skillfully executed, the forgery "lacks the artist's representation" and substitutes only imitation. This aesthetic rule does not apply to admitted copies of works of art. According to Sagoff, a child's copy of a Constable would count as a "primitive," the art student's as a "study."

*Who Really Owns  
What's on Film*

"The Case for Film Piracy" by John Ziniewicz, in *Case and Comment* (Nov.-Dec. 1976), P.O. Box 1951, Rochester, N.Y. 14603.

The movie industry prefers to destroy or sell films for scrap rather than sell them to private or nonprofit collectors—who often operate outside the law when they acquire film prints. Collectors, says Ziniewicz, a Glendale (Calif.) University law professor, are liable to search and seizure, arrest, and prosecution for receiving stolen goods.

Ziniewicz tells of films and portions of films now lost for all time