

Introduction

The seductions of redemption are the substance of human transformation. Children become adolescents and then young adults, and with new eyes they confront the world of illusion presented to them as reality by teachers and parents. These moments can be bracing, liberating, terrifying, confusing. Often they signal a change of perspective that creates a hunger for something “real” where unreality once prevailed. Colleges and schools are the proving grounds of illusion. There, new realities displace old as young minds seek the promise that the world’s revealed profanities and injustices can be replaced by the salvational promises of ideology and belief.

Redemption is a risky wager, especially in a secular context. Framed by theology, redemption is bolstered by faith in the divine. But in secular humanist education, redemption’s promise of an actualized self and a perfectible society is at constant risk of being measured against the evidence. American society, in both its secular and religious dimensions, was founded on the idea that redemption is available to true believers. But the carriers of that idea in the Puritan colonies also believed that only an elect few had access to salvation. Contemporary academies provide a context for seeking that covenant anew. They proclaim openness to all, but membership in their ranks requires allegiance to secularly evangelistic education’s assumption that it can heal a broken world, even as it duplicates that world’s fractures. When that evangelism is calibrated, even unknowingly, to fix the world by ignoring the world’s innate inequities and systemic flaws, the project of secular redemption championed by these academies becomes an exercise in collective illusion making instead of illusion breaking.

In the United States, illusions cultivated in the academy are crucial to the creation and sustenance of American domestic and foreign policy. For the academic trajectory is a necessary process through which young men and women who aspire to occupational significance, wealth, and power rise to the upper levels of business, government, and the liberal professions, those positions where policy is enacted. Secular redemption through occupational success at all levels is, moreover, associated with qualitative social change and progress. Personal salvation through

education is integrated with hope for the solution of the enduring problems of poverty, disease, and war. This institutionalization of academically nurtured redemption in the service of progress obfuscates how education often serves the status quo while it engenders the illusion of change. A deeper understanding of the interplay between what academies profess and what they actually teach is the goal of this study.

This book is about the education of the young for life in American society. It explores how youth from different social classes encounter the complexities of ideology and bureaucracy in schools that prepare them for the world. It describes the class-specific education of three residential communities against the historical backdrop of the end of World War II to the present. Here, ethnographic portraits of a small liberal arts college, an even smaller high school for boys, and a U.S. Job Corps center illustrate larger issues of class, bureaucracy, and religion in American society. These ethnographic case studies aim to deepen an understanding of the relationship between education and society in the United States. They explore how youth are prepared to negotiate the occupational and extraoccupational realities they face as adults, and to what extent they encounter these realities in the educational communities where they reside. The book also describes how schools contribute to the formation of that bureaucratic character which sustains the occupational basis for and mass acceptance of American domestic and foreign policy. We analyze the academic preparation of middle- and upper-class youth for leadership, management, and technical positions in the corporate world, government, the military, and the liberal professions. We also describe the educational training for the middle and lower levels of bureaucracy where policy is coordinated, honed, and applied. Finally, we describe the academic basis for the acceptance of domestic and foreign policies by the middle and lower classes.

In analyzing how schools in their socialization of youth serve dominant political-economic institutions, we confirm Karl Marx's assumption that education, as an instrument of social control, supports the concentration of wealth and power in the upper classes while coordinating the middle and lower classes in the service of that concentration. But in our analyses of the broader implications of three academies, we also grapple with those secular humanistic values that students, teachers, and administrators internalize in their attempts to liberate themselves and change society. These secularly redemptive values form a significant dimension of a liberal arts education that not only is in tension with the workaday world but also serves those domestic and foreign agendas that the corporate world, the government, and the military pursue as a matter of course. In a plethora of ways, secular humanistic education becomes a curricular basis for personal identity, social reform, and radical change. This complex juxtaposition of curricular humanistic

values and the bureaucratization of the academy must be described if we are to comprehend how policy is sustained despite the existence of significant opposition to that policy in the educational world.

The book is informed by our lifelong experience as students and teachers in numerous schools. It is the result of decades of study and over twenty years of collaborative research. It represents an interest in the evolution of American social structure; the relationship among its economic, political, and social institutions; and the role of education in the formation of the character of men and women who encompass its institutional life. As students of society, we position this study of three educational communities in a theoretical and historical framework that attempts to clarify the relationship among education, the quality of life in the United States, and America's relationship to the world.

Throughout the book a number of interrelated questions are posed: What are the terms of success and failure in the education available to different social classes? How do schools prepare youth to negotiate the occupational and social worlds of a bureaucratic society? What dimensions of education are class specific and what universal themes encompass a variety of educational milieus? What role does secular religion play in sustaining the efforts of students, teachers, and administrators, and how do they mediate the discrepancy between their educational ideals and the behavior that schools demand? What relevance does American education have to the drift of U.S. domestic and foreign policy?

In our attempt to answer these and other questions, we can be only theoretically suggestive and are necessarily limited in our empirical research. The ethnographic case studies are situated in the Northeast, excluding regional diversity, and only high school and college students are represented in depth. While all social classes are included to some extent in the case studies, ethnographic treatment of traditional middle-class schools and formal religious academies, as well as aspiring middle-class, new-middle-class, and upper-class universities, are absent from the study. *We do not claim to offer a comprehensive ethnographic treatment of the wide varieties of class-specific schools in American education. Rather, we hope to contribute to a discussion of the nature and consequences of varieties of class-specific, bureaucratized, and secularly religious education.*

The book is organized into three parts; each section begins by locating the school in a broader theoretical and historical context. Part I, "Plufort College,"¹ is a study of a small, new-middle-class² academy whose history mirrors the post-World War II expansion of the liberal new middle classes and their response to the conservative backlash of the late 1960s, 1970s, and beyond. Driven by a search for secular redemption, Plufort's faculty, students, administration, and staff attempt to foster an education that not

only supports varieties of secular salvation but also contributes to what its liberal and “radical” participants would call “qualitative social change.” In its embrace of “progressive education,” identification with participatory democracy, celebration of individualism, advocacy of gender liberation, and antibureaucratic ideology, Plufort, as an object of research, represents what some would call “a best-case scenario.” In the same way that Robert Michels, in his book *Political Parties*, describes the development of oligarchy in the Social Democratic Party, which would become the most democratic party in the Weimar Republic,³ Plufort College, which has qualities ideologically attractive to its participants, when put under an ethnographic lens reveals a multifaceted complex of seemingly unavoidable bureaucracy and other “profane” dimensions of society penetrating and complicating the college’s secularly redemptive quest. It is in the complexities of this struggle for secular redemption in a profane community that we seek a deeper understanding of how the bureaucratization of liberal arts education helps sustain the domestic and foreign policy agendas of America’s dominant institutions.

Part II, “Mountainview School,” describes how boys who have rejected crucial requirements of upper-class life and have been expelled from prestigious prep schools are educated to return to the world they left. The distinguishing quality of this resocialization of wayward youth is that the founder and president of this prep school of the last chance is a Boston Brahmin of substantial credentials and experience whose pedagogical agenda and worldview reveal, in his relationship with students and with Mountainview’s middle-class faculty, the values and institutions that define upper-class education and its relationship to society. The theoretical, historical introduction to Mountainview raises the problem of the American aristocracy in its necessary adjustment to the development of industrialism and bureaucracy from the Civil War to the present. This aristocracy must adjust to a rapidly evolving political economy if it is going to retain its wealth and power. Mountainview’s struggle among president, faculty, and students seems to illustrate these larger historical issues. The Brahmin president appears to understand the students’ problem as they anticipate the disciplined bureaucratic occupational world where they will have to compete. In a custom-made curriculum, alienated upper-class youth can consider whether they wish to return to a world of entitlement where leadership in the dominant institutions is enacted.

Part III, “Landover Job Corps Center,” combines a three-decade history of Landover Job Corps Center with a more focused ethnographic cross section, preceded by a broader historical and theoretical treatment of lower-class education. This theoretical perspective is informed by a study of an inner-city grammar school conducted by Gerald Levy in the late 1960s and published under the title *Ghetto School: Class Warfare in an Elementary School*. A description and analysis of lower-class education at the height of

the War on Poverty, it marks the beginning of the neoconservative backlash, and the beginning of a war on drugs, a war on welfare, and the creation of an expanded prison system as an answer to lower-class problems. The historical trajectory leads into the Job Corps study, which explores the evolution of American society's relationship to its lower-class youth. In this historical and ethnographic treatment of Landover Job Corps Center, students, middle- and lower-level teachers, and staff provide a consensual perspective on Landover that mirrors and deepens the relationship of America's lower classes to their education and how they come to accept their relationship to domestic and foreign policy.

The reader may notice that each case study suggests a somewhat different atmosphere or communicates a different tone. While we did not consciously design a particular writing style for each case study but merely edited and reedited each others' drafts over time, the final ethnographic drafts settled into distinct portraits that we feel are appropriate to each case. Through atmospheric writing, the ethnographic case studies attempt to convey a variety of realities. Just as the trees might be different from the forest, the component parts of an ethnographic study might be something more than the sum of the whole. Moreover, in our theoretical and historical introductions to each case study and in the Conclusion to the book, we argue that their totality illustrates a reality that is more than the sum of its parts.

In our effort to comprehend, we do not deny the sincerity of many of the teachers, administrators, and students in their attempts to realize the values pursued in their academic settings and beyond. As we illustrate in our ethnographic portraits, despite the problematic nature of these academies, many of Plufort's, Mountainview's, and Landover's teachers and staff members care about their students and are dedicated educators, and it is impossible to measure the secondary and tertiary consequences of their work. It is this very juxtaposition of "humanistic" education and its often unintentional contribution to policies that its participants oppose that we describe.

The complex quality of life depicted in these case studies also suggests that in what is generally considered the best of circumstances, education has its problems and that in the worst, there is often something that many will affirm. Because each ethnographic portrait describes much that is paradoxical and complex, the word *enigmatic* in the title of the book has been retained. We hope that justice has been done to the ethnographic portraits we pursued and that in using them to illustrate a larger theoretical perspective, understanding has been deepened and comprehension has been served.

Enigmatic encounters are common. What one person feels the other has said and meant is often at odds with the intentions of the speaker. Organizational structures, too, can create enigmatic dissonance. As we perceive one another ambiguously, so too can we experience the institutions

that are created for us by others. The religiosity we continually notice in the academies we portray is, in part, an effort to quiet the confusion and disappointment individuals experience as they begin to perceive that promises made often cannot be kept because the promises are in tension with other institutional goals. Furthermore, participants in these educational communities may discover that their redemptive quest and what the school expects them to do are often at cross-purposes. Finally, the participants may come to understand that the ideals that attract administrators, teachers, and students to their academies are at the same time orienting them to function in the very occupational and other communities whose values they reject. The reader may discover the consequences of what it means to be educated in the academies that embody this very human trouble.

Having introduced the book's subject matter, organization, purpose, and the issues to be explored, we now describe how our research evolved.

Ethnographic methods are necessarily idiosyncratic. They are not only driven by theoretical perspectives and worldviews but also often emerge in response to formal fieldwork and life experiences that then become the basis for research. As suggested in our discussion of ethnographic writing styles, the methodological approach to this study emerged organically. As with much qualitative work, the method may be more apparent in retrospect than during the research process itself. We believe the variety of ways that social researchers acquire information should drive the method, or at least this often less-than-systematic process should be acknowledged. Moreover, we believe that ethnographic research is often at first done unwittingly. In whatever institutional settings they find themselves, ethnographers engage in an analysis of social structure. Some of the more interesting work emerges when an ethnographer reflects retrospectively on her experiences and determines after the fact that she has something to say about the world she inhabits. Looking back, she can articulate the method she was following before the research task was formulated. Sometimes the ethnographer will have field notes prior to this realization; sometimes she will not. But regardless of whether written field notes exist, the research may already be in process long before it is recognized as such.

This book is the culmination of eclectic methods and an open, humanistic research process that views social research as closely affiliated with the business of living. We believe it is crucial for the ethnographer to *translate*⁴ his lived experiences as long as he does so with an eye toward objectivity and establishing a social context for the material. Our research has been shaped by flexible qualitative methods. That is, we use the intensive participant observer position of deep immersion found in the Plufort and Mountainview studies, as well as the more systematic, planned approach found in the Landover study.

This approach offers a model for other ethnographers who may be faced with logistical quandaries similar to those that emerged as this book evolved.

Ethnographers are concerned with the ethical implications of their methods and the impact of their work on those being studied. In this book, we have painstakingly attempted to protect the identities of locations and people. In each case we agonized over the possible consequences of representing individuals against the need to describe the educational communities in detail as a basis for understanding. Because of the time that has elapsed in much of the research, and along with our efforts to protect those we represent, whenever possible we use ourselves to illustrate issues embedded in the communities we describe. (One of us is a major character in the Mountainview study.) We retain, however, the third-person impersonal approach because we believe that all too often first-person accounts are unnecessarily redundant and, unless presented very carefully, can easily distort or even avoid the reality they are attempting to describe by concentrating too much on themselves.⁵ We reject the assumption, fashionable in some contemporary social research, that, when it is all said and done, the only people that social scientists can accurately represent are their own class, ethnic group, or gender.

We use case studies to explore larger issues in the relationship of education to society; we have no interest in exposing individuals and communities. We are committed instead to an honest analysis of the issues. In a deeper sense, we seek a degree of comprehension reminiscent of Hannah Arendt's methodological vision quoted at the beginning of this book. As we make clear, qualitative work that does justice to the issues evolves an attempt to comprehend, and that attempt often cannot be fully articulated in advance of the research. And while everything possible must be done to avoid violating the privacy and safety of research subjects, so too must the protections for subjects emerge from the research rather than being rigidly determined in advance. We are also aware that no matter how hard we attempt to transcend the tension between an ethic of comprehension in the search for scientific understanding and a commitment to protecting research subjects, one cannot guarantee that this tension between those two admittedly admirable goals can be totally resolved. In our account of the research process that generated the three case studies that eventually became this book, we hope to illustrate these central methodological points that inform our study.

The research for Part I of this book was never formalized. To the contrary, we were deeply enmeshed in the field setting over considerable lengths of time as natives, occupying different spheres in the power structure and experiencing deeply personal relationships with the college and its participants that continue to this day. Churchill enrolled at Plufort College, where Levy, who had been teaching for over a decade, became his chief mentor and thesis advisor. The Plufort research was initially published in an abbreviated,

article-length format after Churchill graduated. Since then, the authors have remained engaged with Plufort College, one as a faculty member, the other as an alumnus and more recently as a trustee.

After graduating from Plufort, Churchill was employed by Mountainview, which eventually became the field setting for Part II of this book. After our Plufort collaboration, we discussed the possibility of extending the study to a larger analysis of social class and education in American society. During this time, Churchill worked for two years at Mountainview. In the early stages of that job, the authors spoke frequently about the dimensions of upper-class life illustrated there. We came to realize that Mountainview's upper-class deviants provide a natural source for extending the analysis we began with the Plufort article.

Mountainview is located within several hours of Plufort. During his time off, Churchill frequently visited Levy, where we discussed the logistical, intellectual, and ethical challenges of using Churchill's access to Mountainview to cultivate a portrait of the school equivalent in ethnographic depth and theoretical analysis to what we attempted with Plufort. Extensive discussions about Mountainview, its students and staff, and the location it occupies in the world of American prep schools eventually produced our upper-class portrait.

We eventually concluded that together with Plufort, the Mountainview study, now in its early stages of development, was a viable basis for a book. But these two field settings represented only two of the three class dimensions we felt were necessary for our project. Where would we find an equivalent lower-class experience of American education in a setting whose spiritual and economic and organizational parameters were as sharply drawn as those at Plufort and Mountainview? The Job Corps, of which Churchill was previously aware via a former mentor, seemed a perfect fit.

Unlike the field settings for Plufort and Mountainview, we had no connection to a Job Corps site and our lives and professional commitments would not allow us to immerse ourselves as completely at a Job Corps center as we had at Plufort and Mountainview. The ethnographic approach to the first two-thirds of the book was based on in-depth participant observation with the authors living and working in the field settings. How could we achieve similar results through limited on-site visits as outsiders? We began soliciting Job Corps centers in the Northeast for permission to do the research. Officials were polite and hesitantly interested in the proposal but none gave permission. However, this apparent resistance to entering the field changed when Churchill contacted the Department of Labor (DOL) national office. A top-ranking bureaucrat in Washington, D.C., called and gave us permission to do extended fieldwork at Landover. Following this official's spoken instructions (a letter was never sent), we contacted Landover and were pleasantly surprised to find not only that the center director and his staff welcomed us but also

that virtually all doors were opened to us. The Washington office apparently had instructed Landover to provide us with unhindered access. We are grateful to this official and the DOL for granting us such open-ended access to the center.

We conducted fieldwork at Landover for eight months, both spending at least one full day per week on separate days at the center. We circulated among students during free time, in classes, in the cafeteria, and in the public spaces of the dorms. We also interacted with staff at all levels, conversing with them and attending as many of their meetings as possible. Gradually, as we became a known presence on campus, staff and students sought us out to share insights and confidences. We are indebted to these people for the generosity of their time and their willingness to share their perspectives on Landover Job Corps Center. What emerged from our fieldwork experience was a complex portrait of Landover that, while different from those of Plufort and Mountainview, is hopefully comparable with them in its ability to illustrate and explore the central issues of the study in a lower-class setting. One of the most generous and helpful contributions from our Landover subjects was a series of videotaped interviews conducted, without our prompting, by several students. They told us about their project and then gave us the tape. While the information from these interviews represents only one of a number of important perspectives on the center, it proved invaluable for illustrating how a portion of Landover's students perceive and experience life there.

This account of the research process at Landover, Plufort, and Mountainview illustrates some of the idiosyncrasies and randomness of ethnographic methods. One does not know how or when a field setting will become available or viable. One cannot predict when a personal experience in a milieu will become a basis for research. Once in a setting, the researcher must be open to the opportunities for research that become apparent, as well as to the unanticipated actions of research subjects. Throughout this extensive research process, the enduring theme has been our commitment to exploring the central issues in our study. We learned that one's creative flexibility in response to unanticipated opportunities for engaging in social research may be instrumental in defining the nature and quality of intellectual work.

In our attempts to comprehend the nature and significance of these three academies, it is not our intention to expose, criticize, or appear as morally superior to the teachers, administrators, or students we represent. Instead, we stress that the study's participants did not create the world of education we portray or the larger society that appears to need these kinds of schools. We believe that their collaboration in the world we describe is one that few can avoid. The ethnographic portraits are crafted with an eye toward conveying our empathy for the faculty, staff, and students in these places who sincerely wish to create a better world and yet are frustrated in that quest by persistent

institutional resistance to the values they would realize and the changes they seek. We hope to communicate their attempts to transcend the system in which they are embedded and by which they often feel victimized. We hope that our work contributes to clarifying how primary obstacles to social and economic change and significant support for maintaining the status quo reside in the very academies that purport to point the way to progress. Moreover, as significant participants in two of the case studies and members of the larger society that creates Landover's lower-class dynamics, we do not wish to exempt ourselves from criticisms of the academies we describe. In fact, our active participation in and commitment to these institutions reveal the extent to which we collaborate in the very dynamics we analyze.

A final note about collaboration: In all phases of this project, contributions to the development of our work have been as equal as humanly possible, and we hope that this book will be read in that spirit. The listing of the authors' names is purely alphabetical and implies no senior or junior status. Of course, the authors take full and equal responsibility for the content of the book and for any errors, limitations, or other failings the reader might find.

Acknowledgments

We want to make explicit the intellectual traditions that made this book possible. Certainly, the tradition of nineteenth- and early twentieth-century classical sociology is embedded in our ethnographic description, theoretical analysis, and historical interpretation. Our work, which focuses on class, bureaucracy, and religion from a sociological perspective, would not have been possible without the enduring influence of Karl Marx, Max Weber, Thorstein Veblen, Georg Simmel, Robert Michels, and other classical sociologists, to whom we are greatly indebted. We also wish to acknowledge what we believe to be a school of sociology initially developed by Hans Gerth and his student and collaborator C. Wright Mills.⁶ Mills's substantial work on American society in the post-World War II era is well known and speaks for itself.⁷ We are even more directly dependent on the legacy of Joseph Ben-Selman and Arthur Vidich, who were also students of Gerth and whose combined work not only provides a comprehensive description and analysis of American society in the latter half of the twentieth century but also has made important theoretical contributions to sociology.⁸ If we add to this legacy the work of their collaborators and students, the contours of an important school of American sociology emerges. Bernard Rosenberg, Maurice Stein, Robert Lilienfeld, Stanford Lyman, Robert Jackall, Guy Oakes, Michael Hughey, Larry Carney, Charlotte O'Kelly, and Franco Ferrarotti are only some of the many people who have contributed important studies in this tradition of institutional analysis.⁹

The late Arthur Vidich was a mentor and friend to us both. We, and the many colleagues and students he collaborated with and mentored, hold him in the highest esteem. Arthur was that rare teacher and friend whose commitment to sociology was matched by what can only be described as a humanity in interpersonal relations that touched the lives of so many. His personal qualities, the manner in which he freely gave his ideas and encouraged his students and colleagues, are exceeded only by his legacy and those of Joseph Bensman and his other collaborators, an intellectual legacy from which Arthur never wished to be separated. It is to his memory and that of Andrew Blackett, the man who inspired our interest in the Job Corps as an illustration of the pursuit of redemption in lower-class education, that this book is dedicated.

We also acknowledge the continuing influence of Hannah Arendt, Richard Barnet, Peter Berger, Philippe Bourgois, John Cheever, Noam Chomsky, Kenneth Clark, Robert Coles, Jacques Ellul, Frances Fitzgerald, E. Franklin Frazier, Sigmund Freud, Eric Fromm, Erving Goffman, Paul Goodman, William Greider, David Halberstam, Lillian Hellman, Jules Henry, Chalmers Johnson, Kenneth Kenniston, Naomi Kline, Gabriel Kolko, Barry Laffan, Herbert Marcuse, Arthur Miller, Barrington Moore, Lewis Mumford, Barbara Myerhoff, Eugene O'Neill, George Orwell, Stephen Pfohl, Paul Radin, David Riesman, Arundhati Roy, Bertrand Russell, Nancy Scheper-Hughes, John Seeley, Wallace Shawn, Hans Spier, Edith Wharton, William H. Whyte, William Appleton Williams, and Howard Zinn. Their insightful contributions to an analysis of American society and the global crisis within which American education is being played out deeply inform the perspective of this study.

At various stages of this long project, numerous colleagues and friends contributed their ideas, support, and helpful criticism: Larry Carney, Neerja Chaturvedi, Deborah Cohan, Steven Dandaneau, Gordon Fellman, Charles Gattone, Ann Harvey, David Harvey, Michael Hughey, Robert Jackall, Peter Kivisto, Guy Oakes, Charlotte O'Kelly, Douglas Pressman, Leslie Prosterman, Laurin Raiken, Laima Sappington, Charles Simpson, and Henry Vandenburg. Many of these people were participants in conferences of the Institute for the Analysis of Contemporary Society where portions and drafts of the manuscript were read and critiqued. Kenneth Donohue and Virginia Dunnigan, reference librarians at St. Thomas Aquinas College, were unfailingly helpful in gathering research on the Job Corps through interlibrary loan. Numerous administrators, faculty, and students at Plufort College read drafts of the book at various stages of development. We greatly admire and deeply appreciate their tolerance and support for our analysis, which they and others might perceive as critical of the community to which they are committed. Of the many people connected with the college who read our work, no one ever suggested

that the research should not have been conducted. They must, of course, remain nameless to protect the identity of the college and its inhabitants.

We thank Mick Gusinde-Duffy, our editor at Temple University Press, for his interest in our study and his continuous support during the final stages of the project. We thank the anonymous reviewers for Temple University Press for their helpful criticism and insights. We also thank the entire editorial and design staff at Temple University Press, particularly Robin O'Dell, Joan S. Vidal, and Rebecca Logan for their excellent copyediting of this book. In addition, we are grateful to Rachel Nishan at Twin Oaks Indexing for creating a comprehensive, well-crafted index.

Gerald Levy wishes to thank the many friends and colleagues connected with Plufort College and who live in Evergreen County for their friendship and personal support during this project. To those who must remain nameless, as well as Larry Carney, Charles Gorodis, David Harvey, Carol Bruno Kochta, Chris Koenig, Chuck Miller, Leslie Prosterman, Kali Quinn, Laurin Raiken, Danny Wingard, Leah Wingard, and Marcy Wingard, he is eternally grateful.

For their personal support and friendship, Christian Churchill thanks Neerja Chaturvedi, Deborah Cohan, Edward Eisenberg, Suzanne and Peter Ketteridge, Doris and James Philbrook, and Phillida Rosnick. He also thanks his brother, Sean Churchill; his mother, Sheila Churchill; and his father, Christian Churchill, for the countless ways that each inspires, supports, and encourages him. He dedicates this book personally to his husband, Jody Jeglinski—his support, friend, love, and enduring light—in appreciation of not only his love and faith in this and so many other projects but also the life partnership that they share.