

Living in Borderlands: The Common Neutral Grounds for Relations in Ann Beattie's Novel *Picturing Will*

HILDA GAIRAUD RUIZ
Escuela de Lenguas Modernas
Universidad de Costa Rica

Abstract

In this article, the new definitions of borders and frontiers, either physical, symbolic or imagined are related to the dynamics of the process of constructing identity. At the same time, these ideas are intertwined with the novel *Picturing Will* written by Ann Beattie and the development of its characters. The most recent notions of frontiers propose the establishment of common grounds of interrelation where difference and opposition confront in neutral and connecting spaces to negotiate identity. These ideas are illustrated using the above mentioned literary text.

Key words: borders, borderlands, identity, difference, system, fragment

Resumen

En el presente artículo se propone relacionar las propuestas y la (re)definición de bordes y fronteras físicas, imaginarias y simbólicas con la dinámica del proceso de construcción de identidad, ideas que se entrecruzan con el texto literario *Picturing Will* de Ann Beattie y el comportamiento de sus personajes. Las más recientes nociones de fronteras proponen el establecimiento de espacios comunes y neutrales de interrelación en donde la diferencia puede ser negociada para la conformación de representaciones identitarias. Estas ideas son ilustradas con el texto.

Palabras claves: bordes, fronteras, identidad, diferencia, sistema, fragmento

With the latest redefinitions of borderlands in literature, narratives have enriched the representation of these spaces not only with dynamic hybrid descriptions but also with establishing a renewal in the types of interrelations making them more assertive in characterization. Distancing from the traditional association of borderlands to national and international literatures has expanded to an unlimited number of applications in cultural practices. Presumed as “those in-between places defined by the flow of people, labor, capital, information, and cultural products across borders, physical and otherwise, both within and between cultures” (Borderlands 1), borderlands in literature no longer show visible dividing lines (borders) between two or more entities and, instead, they enhance stretching spaces where difference is acknowledged and negotiated. In this sense, critic and producer Trinh T. Minh Ha defines borders as “diverse recognitions of the self through difference, and unfinished, contingent, arbitrary closures that make possible both politics and identity” (157). By metaphorically setting borders in this way, borderlands become spaces of recognition, differentiation, and transformation.

In borderlands, subjects comprise their cultural and individual baggage with that of the others. By stretching individual borders, a subject is able to acknowledge otherness. In this process, difference is signaled, negotiated and, then, transformed, as Trinh proposes, experience in the border involves movement such as “stretching” in order to reach out beyond the limits: “work at the borderlines of several shifting categories stretch out to the limits of things, learning about [her] own limits and how to modify them” (137). According to her, this movement provokes change and transformation. Trinh also explains the particular individual experience that takes place in the borders:

To move inside oneself, one has to be willing to go intermittently blind. To move toward other people, one has to accept to take the jump and move ahead blindly at certain moments of inquiry. If one is not even momentarily blind, if one remains as one is from the outside or from the inside, then it is unlikely that one would be able to break through that moment where suddenly everything stops; one’s luggages are emptied out; and one fares in a state of non-knowingness where the destabilizing encounters with the “unfamiliar” or “unknown” are multiplied and experienced anew. (119)

In this metaphorical process of constructing identity, a subject has to be willing to inquire about his/her own reality within his/ her own fragmented space. The frame of the fragment comprises the subject’s cultural and individual baggage, which in the end is what makes the subject different from others (as one is from the outside or from the inside). Its borders are the space where the subject makes a jump to otherness. Moreover, the unfamiliar and unknown become the borders and fragments of others. Blindness or a denial of the self’s cultural baggage becomes necessary for “experience anew” (119) and subject transformation. This proposal of constructing new identities in borderlands makes relationships more dynamic. In borderlands, all types of discourses are not only recognized

and acknowledged but also revised, questioned and probably changed. Borderlands propitiate an implied understanding among subjects. In narratives, borderlands are represented by those characters who are prompt to establish neutral locations to negotiate experience, realities, identities, and even existence.

Within this state of affairs, the spaces of borderlands in Beattie's novel *Picturing Will* are depicted using contrasts among characters. In the first place, in this novel, Beattie posts a confrontation between fixed hegemonic issues surrounding relationships within marriage, parenthood, and family and the new changing trends taking place at their cores. Beattie's fourth novel deals with the life of a contemporary family in the United States. Among several traditional qualifications, the narrative has been described as a story of a "daunting" (Hulbert 6) family. Daunting is the qualifier that Ann Hulbert uses to describe the characters and atmosphere surrounding family life in *Picturing Will*. However, what characterizes the representation of this family is difference— a different composition of family and its functioning from a hegemonic frame of family in a contemporary world.

The title of the novel anticipates the thematic issue of parenthood through Jody, a photographer who pictures her six-year-old son, Will, and at same time, it metaphorically associates the name Will with the ways of the human will. The novel is divided into three parts, subdivided by chapters which are interrupted by four sections written in italics, that give form to a type of diary. In Beattie's fragmented style, different voices within the narrative frame the description of characters and their lives. Each character's voice presents other characters and gives various perceptions about each other, about their lives and their destiny. Hence, the reader becomes acquainted with characters through the observations of others and, consequently, their development is the result of different points of view.

The first part of the novel consists of nine chapters. Jody's character and social environment are described through her own perception and point of view. Jody has been left by her first husband Wayne with her young child Will. She is starting her career as a photographer of weddings. Mel, Jody's lover, is also introduced in this section, as well as Jody's friends Duncan, Haverford, Spencer, Luther, Mary Vickers and her son Wagoner. The detailed narration mainly describes the types of relationships that exist among these characters. Jody and Mel are in love, but she does not want to marry him in spite of his insistent asking. This part also includes two sections of Mel's diary written in italics which describe his thoughts on child-rearing in a clear reference to the raising of Will.

The second part of the novel is called "Father" and basically deals with Will's visit to his biological father Wayne and Wayne's third wife Corky. The trip is described in detail. Haverford and Spencer accompany Will and Mel on the trip, and the narration shows the obscure experiences between them such as the description of the sexual encounter between Haverford and Spencer (a child) in front of Will. From chapter twelve to twenty, Wayne's and Corky's (his wife) dark life is fully described. Wayne appears as the easy-going, unfaithful, unconcerned husband and Corky as the devoted wife who desperately wants to be a mother.

Their neighbors, Corine, Eddy and their baby, present a typical American family confronting the difficulties of marriage. Other flat characters such as Zeke, Wayne's assistant, Kate and Elliot, Wayne's and Corky's neighbors, appear to reinforce the negative traits that serve to develop Wayne's character.

Finally, the third part of the novel called "Child" deals with Will twenty years later as an adult, already married and with a child of his own. He has become an art historian, and he is a university professor. In this last part, Will recapitulates important experiences in his past such as his trip to Florida, his up-bringing under Mel's care, the career of his mother as a photographer, and her coldness towards him. In this part, through Mel's character, Will acknowledges his mother's lover efforts to function as a father, friend, and protector.

Through the novel, Beattie questions the paradigm of the structure of a typical American family by presenting a new form. Will's family appears fragmented and dysfunctional if compared to the typical one. Culturally, in family issues, a traditional hegemonic representation of a typical American family is linked to the bourgeois, religious, mainly Puritan ideology (Green 370). Sociologist Arthur Green defines the American family as follows: "husband, wife, and children, if any, make up a typical household [. . .] a restricted conjugal family form, and for that reason its emotional ties are [supposed to be] uniquely close" (379). This type of family frame, Green sustains, is supported by all main religious faiths and the humanists. In contrast to this notion of traditional American families, Will's family presents a totally different scenery. Obscure relationships between divorced parents, a drifting selfish mother living with her lover, an adulterous absent re-married father who is also a promiscuous drug dealer represent the other side of the coin within the frame of fatherhood in the American family organization. Besides, other characters in the novel such a pederast abusive patron, alcoholic individuals involved in unhappy couples, and topics such as abortion, uncontrolled sexual desires, pederasty, and homosexuality reinforce the representation of threats surrounding a "dysfunctional" family. Juxtaposed to the steady, definite, and determined frames regulating matrimony and parenthood, the novel exhibits the uncertainty, arbitrariness, instability and constant change displayed by participants of these events in a very negative way.

Nonetheless, immersed in this gloomy negative environment, Mel appears as a mediator of difference and a negotiator of issues. Within his individual imaginary borders, he stretches out to position himself in the common grounds where all the other characters interact. Metaphorically, other characters, their perceptions and positions stand as differentiated fragments. However, in general, these characters fail to acknowledge the arbitrariness of their own borders enclosing themselves selfishly. In this state of affairs, the recognition of common grounds for interrelation seems impossible. A character like Jody, for example, ambiguously acknowledges the arbitrariness of borders, but she denies herself the possibility of interacting with others in borderlands. Consequently, her possibilities of connecting assertively with other characters, and of even acknowledging otherness, hinder Jody from constructing better ways of relating with her lover, her son, and her ex-husband. The proposal of borders and borderlands

in this novel claims to establish common grounds of interrelation where difference, opposition, and contradictions may confront in neutral connecting spaces to negotiate the realities of matrimony and parenthood. With the provision and acknowledgment of this space, at least there is a chance for relations to become real, and assertive as seen in Mel's case.

Metaphorically, the character of Mel portrays the first acknowledgment of border spaces in the novel. His characterization, his diary, and the way he is perceived by other characters support the existence of borderlands. First, Jody's description of Mel suggests the existence of borders and recognition of their arbitrariness. For Jody, Mel was "nobody's fool and [he] came close to being ideal" (9). From his attitudes, Jody perceives Mel as patient, supportive, loving, caring, and intelligent (9). In addition, she describes Mel's flexible personality and perceives his disposition of stretching and expanding his own metaphorical borders. When Jodie pretends that she will picture Mel in a Halloween party, she thinks:

Mel was sure that he was being photographed, though. He put the celery top back over his head and stood very formally, hands at his sides. Was it mock seriousness, or was he really so used to being accommodating? For a moment she felt vulnerable and sentimental. (45)

The position of Mel's hands "at his sides" indicates an attitude of extension as if he wanted to stretch and reach others. Jody also affirms that he is "accommodating," an implication that he is willing to make things work out. Besides, the term "accommodating" suggests that Mel's will is to connect elements in order to make them suitable for everyone. Though somehow idealistic, his intensions reach positive results, for the characters surrounding Mel respond positively to him.

Mel's behavior promotes the creation of spaces in borderlands to connect himself with others and to connect others among themselves. The first major illustration of borderlands exhibits the spaces in which he relates with Will. Mel takes care of Will and assumes the responsibilities of parenthood, though he is just Jody's boyfriend. In Jody's view, Mel creates common grounds for relating in unconventional ways and, according to her, he portrays almost saintly qualities:

She felt a strong bond with Will, but it was Mel who adored him sensibly, Mel who was flexible enough to use common sense instead of preconceived ideas, Mel who could silence Will by looking pained by what he was doing quicker than she could stop him by grabbing his hand and pulling him. Mel was gracious – it was one of his best qualities; he was genuinely gracious. (35)

Mel is pleasant and courteous and also "genuinely gracious" suggesting that he is merciful by nature. In addition, borderlands are implicitly represented by Mel's and Will's ways of communicating without words, only by gestures, and by the complicity generated through intimacy. Complicity between people is achieved

when there has been a record of personal, physical, and emotional connection, which disregards traditional “preconceived” ideological impositions (the fact that Mel is neither Will’s biological father nor Jody’s husband) that tend to separate people. Instead, Mel opts for flexibility – a necessary condition of borders. Not being preoccupied by conventions, he uses common sense to analyze his situation: he lives with Jody and Will; he loves them, so he needs to find the ways to connect with them. He loves Jody deeply, and although he wants to marry her, he patiently waits for her to accept his proposal. He knows that Jody has her reasons for postponing their marriage. Mel knows that what seems obvious, the type of connection he wants to establish being an outsider in Jody’s family is sometimes harder to acknowledge, perceive, and understand. Generally, it is easier to see the fact that he does not belong to this family. However, he finally resolves to fight for his goals.

Mel’s disposition to connect with others is also perceived through his relationships with other characters. For example, Mel is a friend to Mary Vickers, Haverford and Spencer, and a good neighbor in his apartment building in New York. Even Wayne jealously recognizes in Mel almost saintly attributes and a good disposition. When Will goes to visit Wayne, the latter thinks: “The holier-than-thou bodyguard would be with Will, too: Mel, with a proprietary hand on Will’s shoulder” (163). Wayne is acknowledging Mel’s rights over Will with irony because he knows that Will “belongs” more to Mel than to himself. Besides Mel’s characterization, his intention to interrelate in borderlands is also shown through his diary.

The section of Mel’s diary also constitutes an important evidence of borderlands in issues concerning parenthood and family life. Mel’s diary shows the ways in which Mel interrelates with Jody and Will. Mel approaches Will with a disposition of acknowledgment. In other words, Mel tries to evade his preconceived hegemonic cultural ideas of a family structure (he is an outsider in Will’s family), his adult points of view, and his knowledge, in order to establish a close relationship with Will. So Mel decides to assume the role of a parent, refusing to judge from his own adult point of view, so that he can comprehend Will by adopting a child’s view point. Mel inquires about Will’s world and about many other things. He learns, for example, that time does not make any sense for a child, that cartoons for children are “normative representations of everyday situations,” and that reality is often confused with imagination (90-92). He finally acknowledges that parents usually assume a position of power over their children without neither approaching nor understanding them:

It is understandable that parents play a little game of self-deception and think they know everything about the child . . . They make the mistake of thinking children are simpler than they, and that therefore they have children figured out. (The children know better. They know that at least some of the time they can rush toward danger faster than their parents can stop them. That the parent who confiscates the water gun has failed to notice the slingshot . . . That tying shoelaces is a reassuring activity for

parents. That off-key bedtime singing should be tolerated because it helps parents unwind.)” (51)

Mel looks at childhood from a child’s perspective. He “jumps” over his own borders and reaches for the other “emptying out his [cultural] luggages” (Trinh 119). According to Mel, children are more intelligent than adults, since they know how to fool adults and, at the same time, they know the ways to make adults feel reassuring and in control. In sum, to arrive to this conclusion, Mel had to “fare in a state of non-knowingness” (Trinh 119), or to function in borderlands that construct a new identity of a father who takes into account the child’s perspective of reality. Hence, in all the sections of the diary, there are many more examples of Mel’s inquiry into Will’s world, and what and how he has learned from Will.

The moment of self-denial, the “jump” into otherness, the “destabilizing encounter with the “unfamiliar” or “unknown” (Trinh 119) is clearly represented in Mel’s views of a child’s perspective, for example, in the case of night and darkness. Mel establishes a contrast between an adult’s and a child’s perception of night and darkness. Confronting an adult’s point of view with a child’s, Mel acknowledges a “destabilizing” force, considering Will’s perspective of darkness: “It is a mistake to leave a child alone in the dark, under the weight of the blanket and the heavier weight of your reassurances” (145). In the rest of the previous quotation, Mel explains how a child’s imagination has the power to create a physical world in the darkness, which is capable of terrorizing him/her. So every single object in the child’s room transforms into mysterious monster creatures of the night, he says. This description justifies the child’s night terror. Afterwards, Mel acknowledges his perspective as an adult:

The way we think of the child at night – our image of him as calm and sweetly sleeping – is a necessary delusion . . . We are all vulnerable to darkness and to silence. Yet something has to be imagined. Something has to be said. In the dark room, every night, our last whispered words are always -and only- “Good night.” (147)

By contrasting the two perspectives of darkness at night, Mel acknowledges difference, becomes destabilized, and proposes a need to position himself in a child’s perspective in order to perform better as a parent. In this way, the child’s and parent’s possibilities to connect increase.

Denying himself, Mel positions in Will’s place to understand and transform himself and the surrounding circumstances, with the purpose of connecting with the child and encouraging better ways of relating. In this way, the four sections of the diary, which seem to have a chronological progression, depict Mel’s inquiry in childhood and parenthood. This inquiry exposes Mel’s continuous denial of himself and a posterior questioning of facts, with the uncertainty of not knowing if he is doing the best for Jody, Will, and even himself.

Contrasting with Mel’s performance in the borderlands, other characterizations deny the existence of borders, their arbitrariness, and borderlands. Like

Jody, other characters portray an enclosure within their metaphorical fragments. To begin with, Wayne, the father, embodies a rigid, enclosing fragment. He represents an egotistic drifter enclosed in his own thoughts and desires. Unlike Mel, Wayne shows neither acknowledgment nor concern for others. On the contrary, he only thinks about his self-gratification and, so, he becomes involved in disaffection, promiscuity, and drugs. Wayne proves his huge self-egocentrism and indifference to others when he considers leaving his third wife:

What sort of man would leave different women three times? . . . Just for the moment, he was entertaining the notion of breaking up with his wife. That would mean that he had left Carol Ann, and Jody, and then Corky. A man who needed to be independent would do that. A man who knew that he was better off on his own. A man tired of women's expectations. (121-122)

For Wayne, women are disposable. He only thinks in his own self-gratification. He uses women and when they do not satisfy him enough, he leaves them. With his borders closed, he is incapable of seeing and acknowledging the other, in this case, his wife, ex-wives, or even his own child. All of Wayne's drives emanate centripetal forces. Besides, in response to Corky's request of having a child, Wayne prefers to ignore her. Obviously, he restrains from an acknowledgment of the other, be it the wife, the children or any other person, for he cares only about himself. Besides, he gratifies sexually with Kate and Elliot in extramarital relations provoking fails in his marriage because for the healthy functioning of families, the recognition of the other becomes mandatory. Just like in his marriage, Wayne's unsatisfactory life is a foreshadowing of his personal failure.

Other minor characters such as Wayne's successor and assistant, Zeke, also represent themselves as enclosed fragments. Zeke's characterization represents the validation and succession of Wayne's model of behavior when he expresses his admiration for Wayne. For Zeke, Wayne glows (176). In addition, the character of Haverford follows the same egotistic, drifting type of behavior. Within the same pattern, Haverford, the successful patron artist, seeks for his own gratifying needs. A major example of his attitude is seen when he drives Spencer to play sexual games with him in front of Will: "Haverbord was on his knees, and this time he was licking Spencer's nipples. Will watched his mouth move lower, leaving a snail – trail of slime as it moved down Spencer's body" (119). Disregarding the emotional damages caused by pederasty, Haverford demonstrates an egotistic behavior resulting from an enclosure of his metaphorical borders. He seeks for sexual self-gratification by using children.

In the cases of Wayne, Zeke, and Haverford, the narrative evidences a lack of connection of these characters with themselves and with others, and even with pleasure. In spite of Zeke's admiration for Wayne, he never establishes a close relationship with him. Wayne's need of gratification is never satisfied, and it never encourages close relationships with others. And in Haverford's case, Will believes that he is "neurotic" and "something like an overnight sensation" (226),

implying that nothing significant can be thought or said about Haverford. This lack of assertiveness in relationships evidences these characters' reluctance to acknowledge the common grounds in borderlands. People acknowledge not only themselves, but they also acknowledge the differences of the other in borderlands. There, people must "jump" ahead into the other's spaces seeking understanding. But Beattie's characters who enclosed in themselves are incapable of establishing connections with others. Their behavior tends to disregard others with indifference, except when they, as selfish individuals, use others for their own ephemeral self-gratification. As a consequence, this one-way process of acknowledgment of the self damages others. Hence, borderlands are necessary to complement difference because even though human beings hardly have problems recognizing their mutual differences, they refuse to try to understand, connect, and relate with the other. Without borderlands, the rates of tolerance and the possibility of a healthy co-existence are minimized.

After a twenty-year gap, the last part of the novel, "Child," presents the narrative development from Will's point of view. In this section, the narrator shows Will's recapitulation of his life. Will judges his past experiences based on conventional, hegemonic ideas of family. In his view, his previous fragmented family radically contrasts with his actual typical family, a family he has formed constituted by his wife and his son. Before, his biological parents were physically and emotionally distanced from each other and from him, and he was raised by his mother's lover. Now, the image of his own family coincides with the promoted, conventional American family structure: "He is so in love with his wife. Through the living-room window he can see Amanda, standing on the lawn talking to Mel, swaying slightly to keep their baby relaxed as he slumbers in her arms" (226). The window frame pictures a new perspective of family relations: the father lovingly admiring his wife who is holding their baby in her arms. In itself, the shift of focus becomes another narrative disruption and the contrast between the two family structures exposes variations of thought. Thus, the narrative portrays an acknowledgement of difference. But the fact that Will's accounts of his past and present life compose the end of the novel, presupposes also a signifying culminating point. By having Will's final statements, focused from a center position –the strict American family structure–the narrative suggests that different family forms end up acknowledging the established, dominating form as the valid one. With time, subversive ideological thought end positioning in centered thought.

Recapitulating his life, Will disapproves much of his mother's behavior. First, describing Will's thoughts, the narrator judges Jody's role as a mother, especially resenting the fact that she advocated much more to her profession than to Will:

Jody has been consistent through the years: Her time and energy are still reserved for her career. She is more expansive with the hangers-on than she is with Will, Amanda, or Mel . . . For years, to all but family, she has been known simply as Jo. (226)

Will acknowledges that Jody's main concern was to become a successful career woman and then to establish a close connection with the people involved in her medium; in a way, she does not communicate with her own family. Through the narrator's voice, Will's resentment because of her absence and her lack of interest in him is evidenced: "Jody was absent too many times and wanted to hear too few things. If not for Mel, he might have been sent to Florida more often" (228).

Will also compares Jody with Mel and judges their roles as parents from his traditional frame for parenthood: the care of children is primordial, the mother must relegate herself to a secondary position, the father (father-to-be in this case) must see that the mother accomplishes her job well. But knowing that Mel is not his biological father, Will questions Mel's and Jody's roles as well:

Mel was hardly a hero. He should have made Jody face up to the fact that she was his mother. Or was it to Mel's advantage that she let him take over? Was part of the bargain – Mel's caring for Jody's child as a condition of marriage? (228)

Will disapproves of Jody's trust in Mel, who ultimately was neither his father nor his stepfather. Mel is just an outsider. Evidenced by the tone of the narration, Will grew up bitterly believing that both of his caretakers were only interested in themselves. Will felt like a hindrance until Mel gives him the diary. When Will reads Mel's writing, he realizes that his doubts about Mel are unfounded, for he was almost convinced that Mel was sincere:

For hours, Will will not put [the diary] down. He always knew the care Mel took raising him, but now he will also sense a sort of narcissism difficult to separate, at times, from true involvement . . . All those years Jody was photographing, Mel was writing. (229)

Will becomes aware of the narcissist way in which Mel raised him which seemingly guaranteed the attainment of success and perfection. Will now acknowledges that Mel often "emptied out his luggages" which echoes Trinh's concept of self-denial when trying to understand the other, looked for neutral spaces to interrelate in the borderlands, and discovered new ways of being. Mel's intentions were to connect with Will in a way his mother never did. Several other passages suggest the dissipation of Will's doubts: "He had been so close to Mel" (228), or "No. Mel never misled him" (229). After having read the diary, the narration then shows Will's melancholic state.

Will seems moved and at ease after having read Mel's diary: Will feels nostalgic, sad, and happy at the same time. In this melancholic state, Will cannot decide if he should awaken his wife and tell her about the things he has just discovered, if he just "nestles against her" (230), or if he just listens to the "breeze blowing through the trees" (230). Suddenly, he feels like breeze, light and tender, because the heavy burden (his doubts about Mel) have just disappeared. Will

finally sees himself “standing on a wide green lawn [with] his eyes quite brilliant” (230). Considering the symbolic mythic meaning of the color green, Will perceives himself enclosed by expectations of hope and happiness with what he has just learned about Mel. In addition, the color green is associated to spring—a season usually related to rebirth and the flourishing of life. Thus, the birth of Will’s son also represents the birth of a new type of family, which in Will’s thoughts, is seemingly a perfect one.

The juxtaposition of the typical American family represented in Will’s case and the “dysfunctional” different one converges in one figure: Mel. In both cases, Mel appears as a negotiator of difference. In Will’s first family, he denies himself emptying his baggage out in order to understand: Jody and his friends including her ex-husband, and especially Will being an outsider. Mel modifies his own schemes in order to “reach out” the others, he transforms and create a new identity, only to be assertive and tolerant. In other words, Mel positions in those “in-between spaces” (Bordelands) in order to connect and promote connections among contrasting agents. In Will’s second family, Mel’s efforts to encourage assertive ways of relating between parents (although he is not the father, not even Jody’s husband) and children, in this case, between Mel and Will, are acknowledged. By looking at his past, Will locates Mel in assertive, tolerant, positive “sites of relating, feeling, and imagining” (Borderlands 1) in order to promote “new constellations of social identities, practices and subjectivities” (Borderlands 1) within an important institution, the family.

Certainly the propitiation of the common neutral grounds of borderlands is essential in all areas and institutions, whether political, individual, or social. Ann Beattie’s novel represents borderlands within basic ones: marriage and family. However, if the creation of these places becomes a reality, subjects might be able to share a more tolerant peaceful world.

Bibliography

- Beattie, Ann. *Picturing Will*. New York: Irony and Pity, Inc. 1989.
- “Borderlands: Remapping Zones of Cultural Practice and Representation. Department of Communication.” University of Massachusetts <<http://www.umass.edu/grads/program/index.shtml>>.
- Green, Arthur. *Sociology; An Analysis of Life in Modern Society*. New York: McGraw-Hill Company Inc., 1952.
- Hulbert, Ann. “Only Disconnect.” *The New York Review of Books* 31 May 1990. <<http://www.doc.web@nybooks.com>>.
- Trinh T., Minh-Ha. *Framer Framed*. Great Britain: Routledge, 1992.

