

makers intending to work solely with the calceolan needs of hands need not receive a classical shoemaker's education and should instead receive an education better suited to the practical day-to-day demands they will actually face. They propose a curriculum genuinely relevant to the needs of shoemakers for hands, yet every bit as rigorous as the traditional shoemaker's course of instruction. They would still be shoemakers, to be sure, and shoemakers every bit as good as their pedical colleagues. To this the traditionalists reply that shoemakers for hands still need a classical shoemaker's education, if only to discern when a customer is mistakenly requesting shoes for the wrong appendage, since to the untrained eye many feet appear to be hands, and many hands look like feet. A shoemaker for hands who lacked a standard education would not know what to do when presented with a hand that turned out, on professional inspection, to be a foot.

Still another faction of glovemakers — the Eucheripapoutsiological Institute — asserts that their profession is dedicated to the promotion of shoefulness of hand rather than to the reduction of shoelessness of hand, and that this focus should be reflected in their training. A shoeful hand is not at all the same thing as a hand that is merely not shoeless. There are many other factions of glovemakers, and great disagreement among them regarding practically every matter of concern to the profession, including the nature of the finished prod-

uct, its proper care and maintenance, the choice of glovemaking technique, the establishment of professional standards and a policing mechanism for enforcing them, the extent to which routine glovemaking matters can be entrusted to nonglovemakers, how much government control is acceptable in return for government funding, and how best to convince people that they

need gloves when they do not realize that they do.

All of these questions provoke vigorous controversy and debate. But the one thing on which all glovemakers agree is that they are not glovemakers.

Jay F. Shachter
Writer and educator
Chicago, Ill.

What price, peace?

On Mar. 3, 2003, amateur and professional actors around the world presented roughly 1000 readings of Aristophanes' play *Lysistrata* to protest the imminent war in Iraq. In this exchange, the protagonist reaches an attitudinal stumbling-block.

Lysistrata: ... Now tell me, if I have discovered a means of ending the war, will you all second me?

Cleonice: Yes verily, by all the goddesses, I swear I will, though I have to put my gown in pawn, and drink the money the same day.

Myrrhine: And so will I, though I must be split in two like a flat-fish, and have half myself removed.

Lampito: And I too; why to secure peace, I would climb to the top of Mount Taygetus.

Lysistrata: Then I will out with it at last, my mighty secret! Oh! sister women, if we would compel our husbands to make peace, we must refrain —

Cleonice: Refrain from what? tell us, tell us!

Lysistrata: But will you do it?

Myrrhine: We will, we will, though we should die of it.

Lysistrata: We must refrain from the male altogether — Nay, why do you turn your backs on me? Where are you going? So, you bite your lips, and shake your heads, eh? Why these pale, sad looks? why these tears? Come, will you do it — yes or no? Do you hesitate?

Cleonice: I will not do it, let the war go on.

Myrrhine: Nor will I; let the war go on.

Translator anonymous. Text available at: <http://eserver.org/drama/aristophanes/lysistrata.txt>

Pharmacia

Arthrotec

1/3 page 4 clr.

New material