



مجلة كلية الآداب بقنا (دورية أكاديمية علمية محكمة)

Anguish and Defiance in Elizabeth Bishop's "Pink Dog"

Dr. Mohamed Radi
Lecturer in English Literature,
Department of English, Faculty of Arts,
Beni Suef University,

ANGUISH AND DEFIANCE IN ELIZABETH BISHOP'S "PINK DOG"

Mohamed Radi

Lecturer in English Literature,
Department of English, Faculty of Arts,
Beni Suef University,

Abstract

The researcher examines anguish and defiance as a seminal theme in Elizabeth Bishop's "Pink Dog." The impact of lesbianism on the poet's life and her identification with the naked dog are also investigated. In the poem, the dog is scabious, and its skin disease makes it abhorrent to society. Likewise, the female persona's lesbianism, regarded as a physical disease, causes her to be socially alienated and despised. She undresses herself in the person of her protagonist, the dog, in rejection and defiance of society. Like her mentor Marianne Moore, Sylvia Plath, and Adrienne Rich, Bishop deems lesbianism a part of her own identity as a free woman. By the end of the poem, there is no immediate solution to the speaker's dilemma. Yet, her defiance of the status quo, along with her insistence that the society should accept her without reservations, is the beginning of the change in question.

Elizabeth Bishop (1911-1979) was born in Worcester, Massachusetts, America. She is considered as one of the great American poets. Marianne Moore describes her as "a modest expert" (345); and Randall Jarrell as an "unassuming, pleasant, charming poet of restraint, calm, and proportion" (498-99). She taught poetry at Harvard University and New York University

and was also a Consultant in Poetry to the Library of Congress in 1949-50. She won many prizes: the Houghton Mifflin Poetry Award for her first volume *North and South* in 1946, the Pulitzer Prize for *Poems: North and South – A Cold Spring* in 1956, the National Book Award for *Questions of Travel* in 1965, the National Book Critics Circle Award for *Geography III* and two Guggenheim fellowships as well as the Neustadt International Prize for Literature in 1976. “Bishop continue[s] to dominate the stories we tell about twentieth-century poetry . . . because of the continuing power of [her] poems” (Longenbach, “Between Reticence” 26).

Bishop visited and lived in many cities and countries. She spent a long time in Brazil where she got involved in lesbian relationships with two women. She spent fifteen years with the Brazilian socialite and architect Lota de Macedo Soares. “When it came to her own lesbian life,” Isa Golden notes, “the Vassar-educated Bishop lived it to the fullest” as she was “consumed by love and totally dependent on her lover, Lota” (Golden, 69). With Lota, she started to enjoy life and to feel very secure. She once called the years she spent with Rita the most productive years in her life. “Her ‘home’ in Brazil with her lover Lota . . . was perhaps the closest Bishop ever got to a sense of real belonging” (Fan, 47).

Later on, Bishop’s relationship with Lota became very stressful. Having found a new lover, Bishop decided to head back for the United States. Suffering from depression, Lota followed her and committed suicide in 1967 when Bishop did not reciprocate her love. Bishop met Alice Methfessel in 1971. They lived together as lesbians until Bishop’s death in

1979. Bishop's experience "of a lesbian identity," argues Adrienne Rich, enabled her "to perceive other kinds of outsiders and to identify, or try to identify, with them" (127). It, also, enabled her to masterfully express "intimate, low-voiced, and delicate things" (Rosenbaum, 86).

The scholarship on Bishop's "Pink Dog" is scanty and rather inadequate. This research paper endeavors to analyze the crucial theme of anguish and defiance which "Pink Dog" embodies. It, also, traces the major causes behind the speaker's anguish and defiance in the poem which are due to the humiliation and the rejection she faces at the hands of a mercilessly biased society. The speaker's identification with the *naked and pink* dog, and the implication that both are lesbians, are, also, underscored.

"Pink Dog" was published in 1979, but the poem was probably written in 1963 or 1964 in Brazil. The setting is in Rio de Janeiro during the Carnival festival. The tone is sardonic, ironic, bitter, and defiant at one and the same time. The speaker is anguished but refuses to be a victim or to be classified as a social misfit. In terms of form, the poem is written in rhymed tercets. The elaborate poetic form which Bishop uses in "Pink Dog" and the rather superficial, social theme function as double masks.

With these masks on, Bishop expresses her personal anguish which is caused by her sexual propensity. Her feeling of being sexually insulted and socially alienated urges her to use the triple rhymed tercets to convince the society at large that being lesbian does not subvert the dominant regime of

heterosexual men and women; a lesbian can be in harmony with them. This is apparent in the strict AAA rhyme-scheme which is followed throughout the poem. The lines of the first stanza, for example, end with “blue,” “hue,” and “avenue” (*CP*, 190). In this regard, Margaret Dickie explains:

Bishop’s penchant for triple rhymed tercets indicates an interest not just in the difficulty of the rhyme scheme but in the particular triangles it calls up, as in ‘Pink Dog,’ which has a subtext of sexual fury underneath its political commentary. (2)

The poem starts with a detailed description of the weather during the summer in Brazil. People are spending a nice time on the beach:

The sun is blazing and the sky is blue.
Umbrellas clothe the beach in every hue.
Naked, you trot across the avenue.

(*CP*, 190)

Cloth is available in different colors and is enough to make umbrellas that can cover and “clothe” the whole beach. The many umbrellas turn the sand of the beach invisible, and signify the presence of a large number of people. It is a very hot season; the sun is “burning” and the sky is “blue,” and there are no clouds. The addressee is unknown, but it may be understood from the “[u]mbrellas,” “the beach,” and “[n]aked” that it is a

Anguish and Defiance in Bishop's "Pink Dog"
woman who is being described. Surprisingly, the reader realizes,
now, that the addressee is a dog. Mena Mitrano argues:

Unlike her mentor, Marianne Moore, Bishop does not use animal allegory to suggest the possibility of a gentler world; rather she uses it to point to a self-censoring process, to intimate guarded, even muzzled, speech about the possibility of positing a female subjectivity against the grain of the page. . . . Bishop's female dog . . . is not simply a dog but a signifier that keeps the poem (and us) oscillating between two semantic clusters; 'woman' and 'dog'. (35)

Aware of the surroundings, the stark "naked" dog "trot[s]" across the street while determined to show her nakedness to the people around. With nothing to cover up her body, she challenges people. The insistence of "Pink Dog" on the dog's nakedness with the ugliness that it might have is strongly suggestive of the dog's / woman's rage that is both physical and sexual. It, also, reflects her deep-rooted insistence on challenging the "social conventions" and on refusing "invisibility" (Cucinella, 75).

Bishop describes the dog in the following stanza "with a remarkable eye for detail" (J.Elkins, 43). She is bare and free from hair. She is, also, self-confident; she does not fear the burning sun or the passersby:

Oh, never have I seen a dog so bare!

Naked and pink, without a single hair ...
Startled, the passersby draw back and stare.
(CP, 190)

The interjection, “[o]h,” shows how amazed the speaker is when she sees the naked dog. “Never” indicates that this is the first time in her life that she has seen such a creature in total nakedness. Bishop heightens the dog’s nakedness by using “bare,” “naked,” and emphasizes it with the prepositional phrase “without a single hair.” This justifies the passersby’s horror at seeing the dog. The emphasis on nakedness raises the dog to the level of a human being and most certainly to that of a woman as her body is “without a single hair.” This depiction strengthens the link between the female speaker in the poem and the dog. It seems that the dog is a woman in disguise. As Marilyn Lombardi points out, Bishop “project[s] her most intense feelings into a variety of poetic protagonists in order to escape stifling categorization and conventional definitions of identity” (153).

On seeing the naked dog, the passersby are not only horrified, but are also attracted to her. They “stare” because they do not expect a dog to be stark naked. Yet, the society does not allow or acknowledge her because she is naked, and her skin is pink -- the color associated with scabies. They keep staring at and retreating from her in horror. They are afraid of getting infected. It is not rabies or scabies that the poet cares for. Actually, she uses both terms so as to refer to something else. These diseases highlight a physical problem as sexual affairs are associated with the body.

The speaker's suffering as well as the dog's is unbearable. "Pink dog and speaker appear as two rival aspects of the self — one that would parade its nakedness, whatever the consequences, and one that would cover and protect, since it cannot or does not wish to expel, the body" (Costello, 88). Both the woman and the dog can be regarded as one being. The seemingly-warring aspects of this lesbian woman show the severe impact of societal conservatism on her. She internally suffers and panics as the society alienates her:

Of course they're mortally afraid of rabies.

You are not mad; you have a case of scabies

But look intelligent. Where are your babies?

(CP, 190)

The physical symptoms which are mistaken for "scabies" and "rabies," horrify the passersby and, by implication, the society at large. Rabies and scabies keep the dog alienated and socially despised. This socially rejected "eyesore" of a dog, obviously suffering from infectious diseases, is the focal point that Bishop highlights. The physical oddity is the cause of the dog's alienation. The diseased body of the dog metonymically reflects the speaker's disease of lesbianism, and will cause her to be alienated, too. She has no place in this patriarchal society.

Bishop uses the third person, plural pronoun "they" to keep herself at a distance from society and to argue that it does not care about her or about the dog which represents her; it is indifferent and biased against the scabious dog / lesbian woman. The fear that makes the society tremble is so high that the society does its best to eradicate the disease. The adverb

“[m]ortally” indicates that the society considers it a matter of life or death to combat the physically and sexually diseased dog / woman so as to protect its own stability which is endangered by her presence.

The speaker is fully convinced that she would not be considered infectiously mad if she works on her physical problem. This is further clarified by the rhetorical question “[w]here are your babies?” According to the inherited and bequeathed dogmas, a woman should be the right source for getting “babies.” She should not be attracted to the same sex, but to the other. Her lesbianism would not offer the society any new generations. The epidemic should be contained by ostracizing lesbians. The society does not regard her sexual inclination as a personal freedom, but as a deviation from the norm.

The word “babies,” which closes the rhymed tercet above, is very suggestive as it implies the presence of a woman as the subject of the poem. It reinforces the notion that the woman identifies with the dog. A woman, not a dog, can “look intelligent”:

(A nursing mother, by those hanging teats.)
In what slum have you hidden them, poor bitch,
While you go begging, living by your wits?
(CP, 190)

The reference to the “hanging teats” is a reminder that the dog is female. The reference is, also, to the lower part of the body with the adjacent sex organs. Here, the speaker is hinting at

lesbianism, the sexual inclination that causes the dog/ woman to suffer. The poet places the first line of the stanza above in parentheses to assure that the society expects the role of a mother from the dog / woman. This is her job in the society. To be part of the society, she should be like Sylvia Plath's woman who is sarcastically described in her poem "The Applicant" as a machine whose job in society is to "bring teacups and roll away headaches / And do whatever you tell it" This machine is appreciated and respected by a patriarchal society when "it can sew, it can cook, / It can talk, talk, talk" (221-22).

Ironically speaking, the poet uses the derogatory word which the society uses, "bitch." "[P]oor," the modifier that precedes the word "bitch," pinpoints the poet's sympathy for the naked dog in a misogynist society which does not offer her enough leeway to practice her sexual orientation without fear or shame. She does not have to stoop or use her skills and wits to beg for respect and for personal freedom from her society. If she does not use her "wits," she will lose her status in the society as a woman worthy of dignity and respect.

Moreover, Bishop creates bonds with the other alienated groups in society. She uses the alienation and the injustice which the poor suffer from to show how unfair her society is. She associates her cause with a general one so as to win victory for hers:

Didn't you know? It's been in all the papers,
to solve this, how they deal with beggars?
They take and throw them in tidal rivers.

Yes, idiots, paralytics, parasites
Go bobbing in the ebbing sewage, nights
out in the suburbs, where there are no lights.
(CP, 190)

Her bitter advice to the dog is emphasized with the rhetorical question, "Didn't you know?" The tense used in the question is the past simple tense which is indicative of past actions inherited by one generation after another. The bias and animosity of the society against deviant and defiant members are widespread. Also, the way the society deals with those who have a different sexual inclination, shows how conservative it is. "They," referring to the guardians of the social conventions, throw eccentric members into "tidal rivers" to get rid of them forever. They "bob" up and down on the strong waves of these rivers and are left there to sink and die. No help is offered to them.

Bishop makes her cause broad enough to include all the marginal, despised and helpless in a prejudiced society. The sexual deviants along with "idiots," "paralytics," and "parasites," face tough conditions and severe alienation. They are not allowed any rights and are restricted to living in the dirtiest places. "Sewage" is where the society keeps them stuck. The sweeping darkness as there are "no lights" pinpoints the endeavor of the society to ignore and eradicate these defiant members.

The society goes far in its animosity against the dog / woman. It allows her little room for any respect or sympathy:

If they do all this to anyone who begs,

drugged, drunk, or sober with or without legs,
what would they do to sick, four-legged dogs?

(CP, 190)

Bishop uses the pronoun "they" and associates it with everything biased, horrible and unfair. The treatment which the dog/woman receives at the hands of a merciless society is anticipated. If "they" chase "anyone who begs," it would chase the "four-legged" dog, a "bitch" and a source of infection to death or destruction. Similarly, a woman is not acceptable if she breaks the rules by openly exhibiting her sexual inclination. The rhetorical question "what . . . dogs?" that ends the stanza shows the mercilessness of the patriarchal society.

Deep inside, the poet knows that she is sexually different from the other dogma-worshipping members. Her case as well as the dog's is unique:

In your condition you would not be able
even to float, much less to dog-paddle
Now look, the practical, the sensible

solution is to wear a *fantasia*.
Tonight you simply can't afford to be an
eyesore. . . . (CP, 190-91)

The bitter advice which Bishop unleashes to the naked and pink dog to "wear a fantasia" is caused by the unfair treatment meted out to her by a prejudiced society. She uses her own weapons of disguise to survive in a society which welcomes the false. In the meantime, she shows the society its ugly face and its

ineffective standards. With the different, sexual inclination which the dog / woman has, her chances for acceptance into this society are low. But they can be enhanced if the dog/woman searches for an immediate solution which can be both “practical and sensible.”

At the Carnival festival in Brazil, “[n]aked” and “pink,” the dog is easily recognizable as an alien creature. She represents an oddity which is both physical and sexual and which is obviously unwelcome among the people around. To mingle with devoted society members and to avoid being “an eyesore,” she has to wear a mask in order to shield herself against their contempt. No one will discover her true identity behind her make-up. Her identity would also be unknown as no one would expect her to be a “dog.” They would think she’s a normal woman, because the animal in her –her lesbianism – will sink deep beneath the surface which her make-up secures.

It is the speaker’s sense of eccentricity that makes her reluctantly advise the dog to wear a “costume’ and “dress up”. Like the dog, she is part and parcel of the struggle and, of course, cannot disentangle herself. Bonnie Costello explains:

The poet writes from the margin, on the divide between culture and nature. It is her empathy for the pink dog, her own sense of marginality, that provokes her terrible advice. In a culture which abhors the body’s mutability, disguise is the only

alternative to expulsion or
annihilation. (85-86)

It is socially inappropriate for anyone – the dog / woman included-- to wear make-up or "mascara" during the time of Ash Wednesday as it is a religious event:

But no one will ever see a

dog in *mascara* this time of the year.

Ash Wednesday'll come but Carnival is here.

What sambas can you dance? What will you wear?

(CP, 191)

Bishop uses "*mascara*" to further reinforce the idea that the addressee in "Pink Dog" is not only a dog, but also a woman. A woman can reason time for festivals, "dance" sambas and select what to wear. She tries to hide the ugliness which the society sees in the naked dog by advising her to put on some "mascara" because the society will not accept her as she is. It will accept and acknowledge her if she modifies herself to suit the norms and values it requires its members to respect. This reflects the wide gap between what is false and what is real in society. The standards it respects are false, and only the false would be acceptable.

In other words, the dog has to hide her own ugliness to get accepted and acknowledged in the society. She has to disguise herself in mascara. Ash Wednesday does not offer the naked dog / lesbian woman much freedom, but another alternative is secured, the Carnival festival. It is common in

carnivals that all restrictions – dogmas, customs and traditions – are suspended. So, it is a golden chance for the dog / woman to mitigate her anguish by enjoying full freedom and equality with the members of the society while keeping her sexual inclination underneath the outer mask. Mikhail Bakhtin points out that at the Carnival:

The official life, monolithically serious and gloomy, subjugated to a strict hierarchical order, full of terror, dogmatism, reverence, and piety [is replaced with] the life of the carnival square, free and unrestricted, full of ambivalent laughter, blasphemy, the profanation of everything sacred, full of debasing and obscenities, familiar contact with everyone and everything. (129-130)

But in Bishop's "Pink Dog," the Carnival festival is not as free from rules as it is expected to be. The presence of strangers has ruined it:

They say that Carnival's degenerating --radios, Americans, or something, have ruined it completely. They're just talking.

(CP, 191)

The rules which are supposed to be ignored at the Carnival are strictly observed as it is not as free as it should be. There are strangers from other countries, the "Americans." Here, Bishop

broadens the net to include herself as one of the outsiders. She, also, assures herself and the naked dog that the Carnival is not a good occasion on which she can exhibit her sexual preference as a lesbian. She will be considered as a social misfit for the Carnival has been ruined. "The problem with carnival is that it is one of those hyperbolic concepts that can always go over into their opposites" (Pechey, 129).

The speaker ironically reinforces the idea that the Carnival is "always wonderful," but:

A depilated dog would not look well.
Dress up! Dress up and dance at Carnival!
(CP, 190)

"[D]epilated" is a word which is suitable for describing a woman, not a dog. Bishop uses "depilated" to describe the dog to strengthen the reciprocal relationship between the dog and herself. Ironically, the society would consider a woman who is lesbian as pervert as a dog that has no hair. Both are considered misfits and deeply repugnant. The imperative "[d]ress up!" followed by the exclamation mark, reflects the society's dominance as well as the speaker's anguish and defiance. Cheryl Walker argues that "people still argue about whether the recommendation the speaker gives to the dog to "dance at Carnival" is to any degree serious" (118).

Dressing up is impossible for the lesbian woman as she regards it as abandonment of her sexual inclination and a kind of surrender to the will of the society. To dress up is to admit that she has something ugly that she should cover. The poet

repeats the imperative "Dress up and dance at carnival!" This time, she couples it with "dance" which is the target result. "Dance" is suggestive of the full freedom and communal joy that the members of the society share. It, also, works as allure for the naked and pink dog / lesbian woman to abandon her sexual preference by masking her lesbian identity. Nonetheless, "the temporary cure or cover-up of Carnival" (Fortuny, 32) would not end, or even mitigate, her anguish.

In "Pink Dog," the dog and the woman are linked through their gender and through their disease that both inhere in the body. Here, as Margaret Dickie explains, we see "the hysteria of a woman who has been sexually insulted. She finds company in the diseased dog and makes that dog stand for her own sense of misuse" (13). The anguish and isolation the lesbian woman undergoes are the factors which hurt her, and suppress and demolish her feeling of relatedness to the society. Nonetheless, she gets very determined and very defiant as she purposefully faces the society with her body completely uncovered.

In conclusion, "Pink Dog" offers no clear-cut answers or effective solutions to end the speaker's dilemma, mitigate her anguish and make her feel welcome in the society as a member worthy of dignity and respect. The temporary solutions offered in the poem can be beneficial for a lesbian woman, ready to abandon or at least conceal her sexual proclivity, and accept the values of the society without questioning them. The poet calls for "frankier confessions and more forceful politics" (Longenbach, *Modern Poetry*, 9). "Her last line 'Dress up! Dress

Anguish and Defiance in Bishop's "Pink Dog"
up and dance at Carnival!' suggests a stinging indictment"
(Walker, 119) of a heterosexual society.

Anguish and defiance continue, for the speaker is determined to be accepted as she is without any modifications or wearing any masks. She believes that her lesbianism is not something ugly she has to hide. As Liz Yorke put it, "to be lesbian is to be a 'self-chosen woman', to be a woman who has said 'no' to the fathers'" (79). More fuel is added to the conflict between the woman with her lesbianism on the one hand, and the society with its inherited values on the other. She is not willing to sacrifice her lesbianism, nor is the society ready to acknowledge her as a legitimate member. Her revolt "against the oppressive designs of patriarchy" (Erkkila, 145) is the best transcendence she can achieve.

WORKS CITED

Bakhtin, Mikhail M. *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Ed. and trans. Caryl Emerson. Intro. Wayne C. Booth. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1989.

Bishop, Elizabeth. *The Complete Poems: 1927 – 1979*. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 1991.

Costello, Bonnie. *Elizabeth Bishop: Questions of Mastery*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1991.

Cucinella, Catherine. "‘Dress up! Dress up and Dance at Carnival!’: The Body in Elizabeth Bishop’s ‘Pink Dog’." *Rocky Mountain Review of Language and Literature* 56. 1 (2002): 73-83.

Dickie, Margaret. "Text and Subtext." *South Atlantic Review* 59. 4 (Nov. 1994): 1-19.

Erkkila, Betsy. *The Wicked Sisters: Women Poets, Literary History, and Discord*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1992.

Fan, Kit. "Imagined Places: Robinson Crusoe and Elizabeth Bishop." *Biography* 28.1 (Win. 2005): 43 – 53.

Fortuny, Kim. *Elizabeth Bishop: The Art of Travel*. Colorado: University Press of Colorado, 2003.

-
- Anguish and Defiance in Bishop's "Pink Dog"
- Golden, Isa. "A Touch of the Poet." *Advocate* (11 Apr. 2006):69+.
- Jarrell, Randall. "The Poet and His Public." *Partisan Review* 13. 4 (1946): 488 – 500.
- J.Elkins, Mary. "Elizabeth Bishop and the act of Seeing." *South Atlantic Review* 48. 4 (Nov., 1983): 43-57.
- Lomabardi, Marilyn May. "The Closet of Breath: Elizabeth Bishop, Her Body and Her Art." *Twentieth century Literature* 38 . 2 (Sum. 1992): 152-175.
- Longenbach, James. "Between Reticence and Revelation." *The Nation* 24 Nov. 2008. 25+
- . *Modern Poetry After Modernism*. Oxford: University Press, 1997.
- Mitrano, Mena. "Bishop's Pink Dog." *Explicator* 54. 1 (Fall 1995): 33-36.
- Moore, Marianne. "A Modest Expert." *The Nation* 28 Sept.1946: 354. .
- Pechey, Graham. *Mikhail Bakhtin: The Word in the World*. London and New York: Routledge, 2007.
- Plath, Sylvia. *The Collected Poems*. Ed. Ted Hughes. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1981.

Rich, Adrienne. *Blood, Bread, and Poetry: Selected Prose 1979 – 1985*. New York: Norton, 1994. 124 – 135.

Rosenbaum, Suzan. “Elizabeth Bishop and the Miniature Museum.” *Journal of Modern Literature* 28. 2 (Win. 2005): 61-99.

Walker, Cheryl. *God and Elizabeth Bishop: Meditations on Religion and Poetry*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.

Yorke, Liz. *Adrienne Rich: Passion, Politics and the Body*. London: Sage, 1997.

الأتين و التحدي في قصيدة اليزبيث بيشوب "الكلبة الجرباء"

محمد راضي محمد متولي
مدرس الأدب الإنجليزي
كلية الآداب - جامعة بني سويف

ملخص البحث

يتناول الباحث بالتحليل موضوع الأتین و التحدي في قصيدة اليزبيث بيشوب "الكلبة الجرباء" ، كما يناقش مثلية الشاعرة (الاجذاب إلى نفس الجنس) و توحدھا مع شخص الكلبة حيث تظهر الكلبة عارية تماماً من الشعر و على جسدها آثار مرض الجرب؛ مما يجعل منظرها منفراً لمشاهديها، و بالمثل، فإن المرأة التي تخاطب الكلبة في القصيدة (الشاعرة ذاتها) تعاني من المثلية التي يعتبرها المجتمع مرضاً جسدياً معدياً كجرب تلك الكلبة، مما يجعله يحتقرها و يتبرأ منها و يعزلها عن باقي أعضائه المحافظين على قيمه.

و قد خلص الباحث إلى أن الشاعرة تعري نفسها أمام المجتمع لتتحداه و لتسخر من قيمه الزائفة ؛ لأنها تؤمن بأن مثليتها جزء لا يتجزأ من هويتها و حريتها كامرأة عصرية. كما يبين الباحث أنه لا يوجد حل جذري و فوري لمشكلة المرأة في القصيدة ، و لكن ثورتها على الوضع الراهن هي البداية الصحيحة لتغيير قيم المجتمع المتشدد من وجهة نظرها مما يتيح لها مستقبلاً الحصول على اعتراف و قبول غير مشروط كعضو جدير بالاحترام في هذا المجتمع.