Faculty Forum President’s Letter

Greetings Union University Faculty!

It is a great privilege to be able to serve as your Union University Faculty Forum President for the 2010-2011 academic year. I encourage you to actively participate in this organization that was created, “to provide a means for the faculty to express its interests and concerns to The Greater Faculty and the Provost, and to make recommendations about issues affecting Union University.” Last year, the membership made valuable inquiries and suggestions in matters involving facilities and equipment, student testing services, academic and University policies, technology, and fringe benefits. Your participation will ensure that faculty voices continue to be heard, and that we can provide input that supports our core values of being Excellence-Driven, Christ-Centered, People-Focused, and Future-Directed.

The Faculty Forum is also pleased to provide a vehicle to share the scholarship and creative endeavors of our faculty via *The Journal of the Union Faculty Forum (JUFF)*. Thanks to Melissa Moore and Jeannie Byrd, who served as co-editors of *JUFF* this year. We are also grateful to University Services and Provost Carla Sanderson who provided logistical and financial support, respectively, for *JUFF*. If you were not among the *JUFF* contributors this year, please plan now to contribute to this forum of ideas in next year’s publication.

In addition to the *JUFF* editors, I would like to thank our other 2010-2011 Faculty Forum officers, Gavin Richardson, Vice President, and Terry Weaver, Secretary. Please let me or the other officers know of any issues that should be addressed by Faculty Forum this year, and become an active member so that you may lend your voice to those discussions.

Warmest regards,

Beverly Asher
A Word from the Editors

Welcome to the 30th edition of the Journal of the Union Faculty Forum. We are pleased and honored to serve as co-editors this year, following in the footsteps of several excellent past editors, including Roger Stanley, Beverly Absher, and most recently Janna Chance. Part of our mission as members of the library faculty is to “actively support and encourage academic growth and development at Union,” and serving as JUFF editors this year has given both of us additional opportunities to pursue this commitment.

We believe you hold in your hands a volume with something for everyone. Three works in stoneware/mixed media by Chris Nadaskay offer beautiful stimulation for the mind and the senses. A thought-provoking article on the drug Pitavastatin has been contributed by two faculty members from the School of Pharmacy, David Kuhl and Ashok Philip, who were assisted in their research by PharmD candidate Nicholas Van Hise. In a memorial poem, Ken Newman ponders his fascination with Edgar Allen Poe at Poe’s tomb in Baltimore. Jenny Lowery reflects on her first year as university archivist and shares some of her unexpected discoveries. Judy Leforge explores the important role played by German young people in the resistance movement against the Nazi regime in her article on the White Rose Resistance Movement. Marlyn Newhouse considers her ongoing commitment to serving students, especially those with learning disabilities, by making use of elementary teaching methods and modern technology. Last but certainly not least, it seems appropriate even as we move forward to look back at the first issue of JUFF, published in 1976. We have chosen to reprint some thought-provoking words from the pen of Mrs. Betty Foellinger, who was on the English faculty for 21 years before her retirement – words which still speak today.

Several people are due our thanks: Juanita Cotner and the staff in University Communications for their expertise in proofreading and designing this volume; Wanda Calvert and the staff in University Services who somehow made time to produce and bind this copy; the Provost’s Office for once again funding JUFF; and to Roger Stanley and Janna Chance for their invaluable support and willingness to answer a multitude of questions.

Jeannie Byrd and Melissa Moore
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Selections from the Collection “Sitting Up with the Dead”

by Christopher Nadaskay

We display items of archeological significance in museums around the world, letting us peer into the world they came from. These pieces of art attempt to place our culture into that framework; a series of works on the walls and on display as if in a museum. Historical remnants of a future past carefully placed for detailed inspection; the appearance of (dead) objects recently excavated for public viewing. Bits and pieces of memorabilia - the flotsam of our lives and the way that we might consider their passing. I would ask that you consider the metaphorical content of each title and work. How will our children view our legacy?

“Perilous Misadventures in Cultural Camouflage: Secondary Refuse Aggregate 1”
36" W x 16"H x 3"D                Stoneware / Mixed Media
“Crux Nova”
51"W x 60"H x 6"D
Stoneware / Mixed Media
(photo retouched)
“Perilous Misadventures in Cultural Camouflage: Urbi et Orbi” (to the city and to the world)
28”W x 20”H x 3”D	Stoneware/Mixed–media
Pitavastatin: The Latest Treatment for Hyperlipidemia and Mixed Dyslipidemia

by Ashok Philip, David Kuhl, and Nicholas Van Hise, PharmD Candidate

Introduction

Cholesterol, a C27 steroid (Figure 1) is the primary steroid in humans and serves as a principal component of cell membranes. Additionally, cholesterol serves as the precursor for the biosynthesis of a variety of steroid hormones (androgens, estrogens, progesterone and adrenocorticoids), vitamin D, and bile. The free and esterified forms of cholesterol along with triglycerides and phospholipids are the major lipid constituents found in the blood stream. In order to facilitate their transport and solubility in aqueous physiologic environments, these lipids along with proteins (known as apolipoproteins) exist as macromolecular aggregates known as plasma lipoproteins. The apolipoproteins, which serve as ligands for lipoprotein-cell receptor interactions as well as cofactors for enzymes performing lipoprotein metabolism, are specific to the type of cholesterol being transported, with Apolipoprotein B-100 (ApoB-100) being the major protein involved in binding LDL-cholesterol to its receptor. The five major classes of lipoproteins include: low-density lipoproteins (LDL), high-density lipoproteins (HDL), very-low density lipoproteins (VLDL), intermediate-density lipoproteins (IDL), and chylomicrons.

Hyperlipidemia, which signifies elevated concentrations of triglycerides and cholesterol (hypercholesterolemia), is a major risk factor for the development of atherosclerosis and coronary heart disease (CHD) along with cigarette smoking, diabetes, hypertension, obesity, physical inactivity, advancing age and family history. Centers for Disease Control (CDC) estimates indicate that 16.3% of adult US population (1 out of 6) exhibit high total cholesterol levels (≥ 240 mg/dl) with 445,687 deaths reported in 2005 due to CHD. The economic impact of CHD is immense with an estimated cost of $316.4 billion for the year 2010. Consequently, cholesterol is a major component of the Framingham CHD risk algorithm which is used to determine the possible risk of developing CHD in the future. This algorithm is used to help identify patients requiring both pharmacologic and non-pharmacologic therapy.
Pathophysiology

LDL functions to transport cholesterol from the liver to peripheral tissues. During this process, if too much cholesterol moves into the intima of blood vessels, oxidative metabolism of cholesterol occurs due to loss of protection by plasma antioxidants. This oxidation promotes uncontrolled uptake of LDL by scavenger receptors of macrophages which results in accumulation of oxidized LDL in macrophages leading to formation of lipid filled foam-cells and development of fatty streaks which represent early lesions of atherosclerosis. A fibrous plaque eventually develops due to subsequent lipid deposition followed by accumulation of collagen, elastin and glycosaminogycans. Such a plaque buildup is detrimental as the plaque is unstable and ruptures causing platelet activation. Platelet activation causes clotting, which leads to pulmonary embolisms, deep vein thrombosis, myocardial infarction, or even stroke. Elevated plasma concentrations of cholesterol and LDLs with reduced concentrations of cardio-protective HDLs contribute to atherosclerotic plaque formation and CHD. For this reason, LDL cholesterol continues to be at the center of risk reduction intervention strategies. Additionally, elevated levels of triglyceride rich-lipoproteins has also been linked to atherogenesis and formation of foam cells. This can be attributed to increased binding affinity of triglyceride rich to LDLs. Consequently, macrophages are able to internalize these lipoproteins much more effectively than normal LDL cholesterol increasing the possibility of foam cell formation.

Pitavastatin- A New HMG-CoA Reductase Inhibitor

Pitavastatin (Livalo®, Figure 1), is a competitive inhibitor of 3-hydroxy-3-methylglutaryl coenzyme A (HMG-CoA) reductase, an enzyme that catalyzes the rate limiting step of
cholesterol biosynthesis.\textsuperscript{1} Inhibition of this critical step results in reduced hepatic cholesterol levels that triggers a compensatory increase in the number of cell surface LDL receptors. Subsequently, increased removal of LDLs from plasma and a decrease in total cholesterol occur. The ability of LDL receptors to bind ApoE (an apoprotein that is enriched within VLDL and IDL) causes enhanced removal of VLDL and IDL (LDL precursors) from the plasma which ultimately results in reduced LDL levels. Pitavastatin, similar to other statins, also inhibits hepatic production of VLDL due to its sustained inhibition of cholesterol synthesis which contributes to decreased plasma triglyceride levels as well.\textsuperscript{1, 8} Additionally, recent studies have indicated that statins produce cholesterol-independent pleiotropic effects that reduce the risk of atherosclerotic plaque rupture, decrease LDL-cholesterol oxidation and inhibit thrombogenic response.\textsuperscript{8, 9}

Clinical trials

Pitavastatin is indicated as an adjunctive therapy to diet for primary hyperlipidemia and mixed dyslipidemia to reduce elevated total cholesterol (TC), low-density lipoprotein cholesterol (LDL-C), apolipoprotein B (Apo B), triglycerides (TG), and to increase high-density lipoprotein cholesterol (HDL-C).\textsuperscript{10, 11}

Pitavastatin, in dosages of 1mg, 2mg, and 4mg was compared to Atorvastatin, Simvastatin, and Pravastatin in the FDA clinical trials as summarized in Table 1. This table shows the mean percent changes of LDL from baseline to endpoint.\textsuperscript{12} All the following trials were done as individual studies and then compared to each other.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drug Treatment</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Baseline (mg/dL) Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Week 12 Endpoint Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>% change Week 12 Endpoint %</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>189.55</td>
<td>29.744</td>
<td>184.32</td>
<td>34.730</td>
<td>-2.35</td>
<td>12.991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitavastatin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 mg</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>173.39</td>
<td>28.790</td>
<td>119.40</td>
<td>27.416</td>
<td>-30.79</td>
<td>12.251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 mg</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>179.32</td>
<td>21.514</td>
<td>111.12</td>
<td>28.455</td>
<td>-37.98</td>
<td>14.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 mg</td>
<td>1533</td>
<td>171.50</td>
<td>27.208</td>
<td>97.02</td>
<td>28.615</td>
<td>-43.17</td>
<td>15.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atorvastatin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dose</td>
<td>LDL</td>
<td>HDL</td>
<td>Total Cholesterol</td>
<td>LDL Reduction</td>
<td>HDL Reduction</td>
<td>Total Cholesterol Reduction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 mg</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>180.82</td>
<td>17.621</td>
<td>112.34</td>
<td>27.119</td>
<td>-37.34</td>
<td>14.796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 mg</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>161.42</td>
<td>29.168</td>
<td>91.05</td>
<td>30.649</td>
<td>-43.37</td>
<td>16.248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simvastatin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 mg</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>184.07</td>
<td>17.152</td>
<td>119.07</td>
<td>27.647</td>
<td>-34.97</td>
<td>15.528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 mg</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>175.13</td>
<td>21.801</td>
<td>98.75</td>
<td>26.608</td>
<td>-43.32</td>
<td>15.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pravastatin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 mg</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>163.57</td>
<td>22.285</td>
<td>126.68</td>
<td>28.594</td>
<td>-22.41</td>
<td>14.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 mg</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>166.58</td>
<td>21.893</td>
<td>109.47</td>
<td>25.342</td>
<td>-33.98</td>
<td>14.299</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This study showed that Pitavastatin 1mg, 2mg, and 4mg had a statistically greater affect on LDL levels than placebo. It also shows that Pitavastatin 2 mg was not inferior to atorvastatin 10 mg or simvastatin 20 mg and that the Pitavastatin 4 mg was not inferior to atorvastatin 20 mg and simvastatin 40 mg. Additionally, the 1 mg, 2 mg, and 4 mg Pitavastatin was shown to have a greater reduction potential on LDL levels than all three of the pravastatin doses 10 mg, 20mg, and 40 mg, respectively. Within a randomized, double-blind trial of 240 patients comparing Pitavastatin versus pravastatin, the same conclusion was drawn that Pitavastatin was shown to be a more powerful agent at reducing LDL cholesterol than pravastatin.

A similar study of HDL levels showed that Pitavastatin had a mean percent increase of 3.4% at 1 mg to 6.4% at 4 mg. This data was similar to that of atorvastatin and simvastatin but, was significantly greater than those treated with pravastatin.

Pitavastatin 1 mg, 2 mg, and 4 mg lowered triglycerides in a similar fashion (20.1% difference from baseline) to that of pravastatin and simvastatin although, atorvastatin showed a significantly larger decrease (27.2% difference from baseline).

Total cholesterol levels using Pitavastatin 2 mg and 4 mg were also studied. The 2 mg Pitavastatin had a significantly greater decrease than the 20 mg simvastatin. Although, Pitavastatin 4 mg showed a significant difference than atorvastatin 20 mg in favor of atorvastatin. The total cholesterol levels were a 28.2% decrease in the Pitavastatin 4 mg group and a 31.6% decrease in the atorvastatin 20 mg group.

The last two things that were studied were ApoA and ApoB. As mentioned earlier, ApoA and ApoB are the main apolipoproteins that bind to HDL cholesterol. In this review, there was no significant difference that could be found between Pitavastatin and the other statins.
In an 8-week, randomized, open label trial, a dose titration study was done between Pitavastatin and atorvastatin. Within this study, the conclusion was that there was no significant difference between these two statins and their ability to lower LDL levels, TC, triglyceride concentrations, or increase HDL concentrations.  

Pharmacokinetics and Clinical Pharmacology of Pitavastatin

Pitavastatin is an oral medication with a bioavailability of 80% which is higher than other statins probably because of its heightened lipophilicity.  

Although it has not been fully elucidated, Pitavastatin is suggested by some to be taken on an empty stomach similar to atorvastatin as high-fat meals were shown to reduce the maximum concentration by 43%. The half life of Pitavastatin is approx. 11 hours, which is one of the longer half lives for statins. This drug, along with most other statins, is 99% bound to albumin and to alpha-1 acid glycoprotein. Hepatic uptake by organic anion transporters (OATPB1 and OATPB3) is required to observe any pharmacological effects.

A major difference between Pitavastatin and other statins is that it undergoes minimal metabolism by CYP2C9 and CYP2C8 and is not a substrate for CYP3A4. Pitavastatin primarily undergoes glucuronidation and is converted into its inactive lactone form. Although, this inactive metabolite is in equilibrium with the parent compound and even though it does not have pharmacological activity, there is no definite data showing it does not contribute to adverse effects. Since Pitavastatin is metabolized minimally by the cytochrome P450 system, there is a potential for reduced incidence of drug interactions relative to other statins.

Adverse Effects of Pitavastatin

Similar to other statins, a patient who has liver disease or enzyme levels 3 times the normal should not use Pitavastatin therapy. It is recommended that patients have their liver checked before therapy is started and after for any changes within therapy. Although, there were no incidents of Hy's law which shows purely drug induced jaundice with Pitavastatin, only at doses above 8 mg were elevations in AST, ALT, or CPK seen with Pitavastatin.

Myopathy is another major concern with statins because of the concern for rhabdomyolysis. Myalgia was reported by 2% of patients taking 1mg to 4mg daily doses of Pitavastatin, whereas there was a 3% incidence with pravastatin, atorvastatin, and simvastatin.
Also, in one study, Pitavastatin was compared directly to pravastatin for adverse effects in which Pitavastatin was found to show a larger incidence of creatine kinase elevation. The incidence of non-fatal adverse effects was shown to be 1.1% to 1.4% for 1 mg to 4 mg doses of Pitavastatin versus atorvastatin (1.6%), pravastatin (1.3%), and simvastatin (3.0%).

Over the course of clinical trials, there were 6 deaths taking Pitavastatin. Of these 6, the only one that was caused by something other than an extrapolated cardiovascular event is hypoxic encephalopathy. Hypoxic encephalopathy could possibly be linked to the over-expression of endothelial Nitric Oxide Synthase (NOS) with statin therapy. This is similar to the number of reported deaths seen with other statins on the market taking into account the present comorbidities of these patients.

Similar to other statins on the market, Pitavastatin is linked to a dose related rhabdomyolysis. Only at 8 mg of Pitavastatin did patients exhibit rhabdomyolysis. It is not clear as to whether the lactone metabolite or active form of the drug is responsible for this adverse effect. In a double-blind, placebo controlled randomized trial, there was no significant difference shown between the effects of Pitavastatin on elderly versus younger patients as well.

Table 2 below highlights the similarities and differences of adverse effects on each of the statins discussed. All numbers are measured in percentages.

| Table 2 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pitavastatin</th>
<th>Pravastatin</th>
<th>Atorvastatin</th>
<th>Simvastatin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P 1 mg 2 mg 4 mg</td>
<td>P 40 mg</td>
<td>P 10 mg 20 mg 40 mg 80 mg</td>
<td>P 40 mg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headache</td>
<td>x x x X 3.9% 6.2% 7% 5.4% 16.7% 2.5% 6.4% 5.1% 3.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abdominal Pain</td>
<td>x x x X 6.9% 5.4% 0.7% 2.8% 0% 3.8% 2.1% 3.2% 3.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back Pain</td>
<td>2.9% 3.9% 1.8% 1.4% 9% 10% 3% 2.8% 0% 3.8% 1.1% x x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constipation</td>
<td>1.9% 3.6% 1.5% 2.2% 7.1% 4% 1.8% 2.1% 0% 2.5% 1.1% 1.3% 2.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diarrhea</td>
<td>1.9% 2.6% 1.5% 1.9% 5.6% 6.2% 1.5% 2.7% 0% 3.8% 5.3% 2.5% 1.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myalgia</td>
<td>1.4% 1.9% 2.8% 3.1% 1% 2.7% 1.1% 3.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flatulence</td>
<td>x x x X 3.6% 3.3% 3.3% 2.1% 2.8% 1.3% 1.1% 0.7% 0.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Respiratory Tract Infection</td>
<td>x x x X 1.3% 1.3% 1.5% 2.5% 0% 1.3% 2.1% 1.9% 2.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P - Placebo

Drug Interactions
Cyclosporine is contraindicated because of the inhibition of OATP1B1-mediated uptake.\textsuperscript{11} The AUC of Pitavastatin is raised 2.8 fold by erythromycin and 29\% by rifampin when co-administered.\textsuperscript{11} Drug interactions between protease inhibitors and Pitavastatin have not been studied, although, they are not recommended based upon the fact that most other statins interact with them.\textsuperscript{15} Pitavastatin was shown to have a 1.3 fold increase in its AUC when taken with gemfibrozil.\textsuperscript{11} This increase is similar to simvastatin although, a drug like atorvastatin is not recommended to be taken with gemfibrozil because of the increased risk for myopathy.\textsuperscript{11}

Table 3 shows a comparison of relative drug interactions between Pitavastatin and the other statins that have been discussed.\textsuperscript{11}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pitavastatin</th>
<th>Pravastatin</th>
<th>Atorvastatin</th>
<th>Simvastatin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cyclosporine</td>
<td>C$_\text{max}$ of Pitavastatin increase 6.6 fold</td>
<td>Increase in C$_\text{max}$ of Pravastatin</td>
<td>Increase risk of myopathy of rhabdomyolysis</td>
<td>Simvastatin AUC increased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amiodarone</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>3A4 interaction</td>
<td>3A4 interaction</td>
<td>3A4 interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azole Antifungal agents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3A4 interaction</td>
<td>3A4 interaction</td>
<td>3A4 interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erythromycin</td>
<td>C$_\text{max}$ of Pitavastatin increased 3.6 fold</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Increases plasma [atorvastatin]</td>
<td>Increases plasma [pitavastatin]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fibric Acids</td>
<td>AUC of pitavastatin increase 1.3 fold</td>
<td>AUC and C$_\text{max}$ of pravastatin increase</td>
<td>Not recommended</td>
<td>Increases AUC and plasma concentration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digoxin</td>
<td>C$_\text{max}$ decreased</td>
<td>Minimal interaction</td>
<td>Increases steady state dig levels</td>
<td>Increases plasma [digoxin]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protease Inhibitors</td>
<td>Not recommended based on other statins</td>
<td>Plasma [pravastatin] decrease</td>
<td>Plasma [atorvastatin] increase</td>
<td>Plasma [simvastatin] increase</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusion

Presently, Pitavastatin lacks clinical data to support its use over other drugs in this class. Additionally, it provides no clear advantage in relation to incidence of side effects encountered with this group of agents. Since individual patient response to medications is not always predictable, pitavastatin could be considered when patients fail to reach desired therapeutic goals with maximum doses of other statins. Although pitavastatin has the potential to fill an important niche due to the minimal metabolism it undergoes, important drug interactions still exist. Further research is needed evaluating the extent of drug interactions and adverse effects which would allow prescribers to make more discriminating choices between agents. Since other agents that provide similar efficacy are currently available in a generic formulation, weighing the clinical efficacy versus cost of Pitavastatin could become a tough issue when hospitals or patients use this agent.
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Baltimore. 11 P.M. Poe’s tomb.

The long awaited moment had finally arrived.
Bundled against the cold, yet shivering,
I stood in front of Poe’s tomb
in the quaint churchyard in downtown Baltimore.
Poe, whose birthday I share,
and whose haunting works have always intrigued me,
brought me to this place.

As the tour group gathered around the grave,
our guide stepped onto the ledge of the tomb and began to speak…
…of Poe’s three brief years as a Baltimore resident;
…of his marriage to his beloved Virginia, buried beside him;
…of Virginia's tuberculosis, which caused her death.

Both the place and the occasion inspired the poem,
which the guide began to read.
Quietness descended over the gathered crowd
as she read the opening lines of “Annabel Lee.”
Silence reigned as she intoned the beautiful, haunting lines:
“It was many and many a year ago, in a kingdom by the sea.”
To the left of the tomb, just a few short blocks away,
lay the harbor, “the sea” that possibly caused Virginia’s illness.

As the reader continued,
“For the moon never beams without bringing me dreams
of the beautiful Annabel Lee,” the moon was indeed beaming upon all of us,
English teachers enthralled by the moment.

Chills rippled over me, not from the thirty-degree weather,
but from the awe-inspiring event.
After placing my good-luck penny with the many others on the tomb,
I reluctantly made my way to the waiting bus,
this moment indelibly etched in my memory.
Adventures in Archives

by Jenny Lowery

About this time last year, I was tasked with becoming the “go to” person for the university archives and special collections. Our previous library director had acted as archivist for a number of years and no one else in the library, including me, knew much about the mysteries of the back room. Before he left for the warmer climes of Palm Beach, Steve did give me a tour of the archives and pointed out its various collections. Since then, I have had the opportunity to explore the space and the collections, learning what riches we have and developing a vision for how the archives and special collections can better serve the university community.

Being asked to take over archives might be comparable to a teaching professor being asked to teach a new course in a related discipline. While there are some similarities between libraries and archives in that they both provide access to research materials, the underlying philosophies are somewhat different. Ideas about what to keep and even how to arrange it differ in the world of archives. While I had some training in preservation principles that would apply as easily to manuscripts as it does to books, I had no training or experience in describing or arranging archival materials. Nor did my library degree prepare me to care for the range of materials found in a typical university archives. As I explored the Union University archives I came across quite a range of materials indeed. Not only do we have the typical university records, committee reports, and old books, but also textiles, pottery, glassware and other items that would be as at home in a museum setting as they are in an archives. On the following pages are a few of the most interesting and in some cases unexpected discoveries of the past year, which are only a small sampling of the things that can be discovered in the archives of Union University. As I continue my work in the archives, I hope to make the collection accessible to the Union community for research. The archives also contain several valuable manuscript collections and documents related to the history of Baptists in West Tennessee. More treasures await discovery, I am sure.
This is one of the few items that has good documentation of how it came to be in Union archives. In 2008, descendents of Mr. Kimbrough donated this diary, along with portraits of Mr. Kimbrough, his wife, Martha Wilcox Whitaker Kimbrough, and an 1869 diploma from Union University (Murfreesboro). Bradley Kimbrough was a Baptist preacher in the early to mid-nineteenth century. In 1845 he was commissioned by the General Association of Tennessee and North Alabama to raise money for the establishment of a university to be located in Murfreesboro. By 1847, he and his brother, Robert, had raised $60,000 in cash, bonds, and pledges from Baptists in Tennessee, northern Alabama, and Mississippi. Bradley Kimbrough later served many years as a trustee for Union University Murfreesboro. This diary covers December 1836 to September 1839. During at least part of this time, Mr. Kimbrough acted as an “agent for the convention” in the middle district of Tennessee. He traveled the area accepting contributions to the convention and its missionary cause. Included in the diary is an account of Mr. Kimbrough’s visit with President Andrew Jackson at the Hermitage in Nashville.
Fluting Iron

I have to admit, I did not know what this item was when I first ran across it. Apparently I am not alone, as various people who have seen it have guessed paper crimper, pea sheller, and pasta press. Some internet searches of the markings found on it helped me determine that it is a fluting iron. Fluting irons were used to press ruffles or pleats into collars, cuffs or hems and were popular from the 1860’s to the 1880’s. Heated rods were placed in the hollow rollers and the starched fabric was cranked through. I have not been able to locate any information about the origins of this particular piece or how it ended up in our archives. If any of you have some clues, I would be glad to hear them.
This became the standard tactical text for the U. S. Army after the Civil War. This particular copy of the revised edition from 1880 is in fairly good condition with the original cover and metal clasp. Although the inscription inside the front cover read Howard Hosford, Jackson, Tenn., the book was found in the archives in a box of material from J. Franklin Ray. Ray was an alumnus of Union University who served thirty-seven years as a missionary in Japan. After returning from Japan he served on the library staff at Union.
Hand-Blown Glass Vase

This vase is accompanied by a card reading:

LIBBEY HAND-BLOWN VASE

By John Staiger

(Head glass-blower from the Main Factory and in charge of Libbey’s Glass Blowing Exhibit of New York World’s Fair, 1939)

Rare, blown, clear glass, globular bowl with blister decoration and tall, slender neck with tooled rim.

Gift to Union University by MRS. GEORGE K. MALONE of Jackson.
Replica Samurai Helmet

This helmet is one of several items presented to Union University by Aikoku College. In 1974, under the leadership of Carl Halverson, Union University established a “Sister-College Agreement” with Aikoku Junior College in Tokyo. Through the late 1970’s and early 1980’s, students from Aikoku would visit Union during the summer term. Representatives of Aikoku College presented Union not only with this Samurai helmet but also with two wooden Japanese dolls in traditional dress, and 100 cherry trees for the new campus being built north of downtown Jackson. The first group of students to come to Union from Aikoku gave one thousand folded paper cranes as a gift. Japanese legend says that any girl who folds a thousand paper cranes will be blessed with a life of peace and happiness.
The resistance of young Germans to Nazism during World War II represents an important aspect in the study of opposition movements in Germany. Because resistance is usually associated with clear-cut motives and direct actions taken to improve a deplorable situation, the spontaneous and seemingly incoherent activities of anti-Nazi youths sometimes have failed to be classified as true resistance. Yet the fact remains that young Germans did resist, albeit for reasons that some may not have understood. Indeed, Hitler must have been beside himself when he learned some members of his own trusted youth groups had forsaken his vision for a new Germany and decided to resist. Although actions taken by the numerous individual youths and small opposition groups were largely spasmodic, their activities represented a serious and substantial enough threat to warrant the organization of a separate youth department of the Reichshaufsichtscheiterhsamtsamt (the State Security headquarters) in the Prinz Albrechtstrasse in Berlin, as well as the opening of a “concentration camp for youth” in Neuwied.2

At the beginning of the war most German youth believed the Fatherland had to fight for freedom from the chains imposed by the Treaty of Versailles. This belief became uncertain when Hitler robbed other nations of liberty following Germany’s early military victories and lengthened the war indefinitely merely for the conquest of new lands. Many German youth reacted negatively to the terrible deeds of violence committed by the Gestapo and the SS. Still others reacted to the endless war that had cheated them of their best years. The alert young people told to read and hear only what the Nazi authorities ordered became distrustful.3

Young Germans who opposed the Reich searched for ways to show their contempt of National Socialism. It is important to note these young resisters usually did not contemplate the
murder of their Nazi overlords. Perhaps their indoctrination in the authoritarian creed had rendered them unable to take up arms against their former masters. Nonetheless, hundreds of young men and women looked for leaders with a plan that expressed their resistance. In 1942, a small group of university students formed around the Scholl family in the region of Swabia. This group, who called themselves the White Rose, demonstrated their way to combat the oppression of the Nazi regime. In the battle they waged against Hitler, this small group challenged all Germans to comprehend the nature of tyranny. Their brief yet valiant efforts culminated in their martyrdom.⁴

Who were the Scholls and why did they become active in the resistance effort? Who were the individual members of the White Rose? What could a small group of university students possibly hope to accomplish against the far-reaching and powerful Third Reich? Why would a handful of like-minded individuals even attempt to stand up to such a deadly force? It is the purpose of this paper to examine the personalities and influences of the individual core members of the White Rose in order to identify and understand the motives behind their actions. By first studying the early life of the group’s key members, Hans and Sophie Scholl, the attitudes of the White Rose toward the moral and political choices they faced can be better evaluated.⁵

Inge Scholl, the older sister of Hans and Sophie, believed, like millions of Germans, that Adolf Hitler’s coming to power was cause for celebration. The new administration seemed to represent a refreshing change from the apathy that had prevailed before. Hitler promised to make the Fatherland strong and prosperous again. This bright promise for their future especially impressed young people. Consequently, a wave of patriotism swept over Germany. The Scholl children, Inge, Hans, Elizabeth, Sophie and Werner, instinctively loved their country and applauded this new nationalism.⁶

The Scholls were a close-knit clan with a strong sense of each other. Their mother, Magdalene, had been a member of a Protestant nursing order during World War I. As her family grew, she gently guided them to seek Jesus as they looked for answers to life’s perplexing problems. Although not forced to adhere to any sect or even to attend church regularly, the children read the Bible daily. Even as young adults, the Scholls carried favorite verses with them. Robert Scholl had managed to bring his family virtually unscathed through the years of depression, inflation, and political unrest. Following World War I, he started his own business as a tax and financial consultant. His broad and liberal outlook set him apart from his associates.
and made some leery of his pacifism and lack of nationalist fervor. He often threw caution to the wind when he spoke his mind. On one occasion, he described Hitler as a “scourge of humanity” which prompted an immediate questioning by the Gestapo. Robert Scholl quickly realized that the Nazi regime represented a “war against the defenseless individual . . . war against the happiness and freedom of his children. . . .”  

At the time of Hitler’s ascension to power and the establishment of Nazi rule, the Scholl children were too young to be aware of the old-time parties and the “Weimar” system against which the Nazi leaders railed. They did not understand their father’s doubts about Hitler and why he compared the Nazi leader to the fabled Pied Piper. Brought up to be independent thinkers, all five of the Scholls decided to join the Hitlerjugend in 1933. Initially, they enjoyed the excitement of wearing uniforms and marching in torch lit processions. They wanted to be part of rebuilding their divided and demoralized nation. According to Inge Scholl, talk about the Fatherland and comradeship, the “Volk Community” and love of one’s home impressed them: “We were told that we should live for something greater than ourselves; we were taken seriously, in a strange sort of way.”  

When Hans Scholl joined the Hitler Youth, he did so with great intensity. For him, it symbolized a rite of passage from boyhood to manhood by defying the authority of his father and going his own way. To Hans and his brother and sisters, their father seemed hopelessly old-fashioned, reactionary, and blinded to the obvious benefits of Nazi rule. Trying to “enlighten” him, they pointed to newspaper statistics showing the depression ending and unemployment dropping. While Robert Scholl agreed the economy appeared to be improving, he questioned the war industry being created to accomplish it.  

Not long after he joined the Hitler Youth movement, Hans became squad leader of a Jungvolk unit of approximately one hundred and fifty boys. His good looks, ideological attitude and eagerness made him stand out from the crowd. Hans seemed destined for leadership. Gradually, however, he became aware of the group’s suppression of freedom of mind and opinion when his local Hitler Youth leader warned against singing foreign as well as German songs. Why should he be forbidden to sing these songs? Was it because they had been created by other races? He saw no sense in it.  

During the mindless displays of common enthusiasm at the Nuremberg Party Rally of 1936, Han’s view of the ideal Hitler Youth changed. He no longer accepted without question the
image and model which had been impressed upon him. His exposure to this mystic hallucination at Nuremberg heightened his awareness of the dangers of the Hitler Youth movement and helped him realize the group’s shameless disregard of the individual, the elimination of opposing views, and the employment of mass hysteria to change people’s minds. Hans reasoned that the individual enriched the life of a group with his own contribution of imagination and ideas. In Nuremberg, everything was directed according to a set pattern. Despite much talk of loyalty and honor, no genuine principles of conduct existed. The needless repetition of stock phrases and the hollowness of the oratory at the rally convinced Hans to trust his own instincts. He encouraged his brother to do the same.\textsuperscript{11}

All three of the Scholl girls joined the counterpart of the Hitler Youth with the same enthusiasm that had inspired Hans. But the endless regimentation of the Bund Deutscher Madel took its toil and convinced Sophie and her sisters of the suffocating effect of thoughtless group conformity to the Nazi cause. At this same time, Sophie became increasingly disturbed by the willingness of Germans to deny the brutality of Hitler’s new totalitarian vision for the Fatherland. The sudden “disappearance” of a Jewish neighbor awakened her to the hideous racial intent of the regime. According to a diary entry which quoted the \textit{Book of Ephesians}, Sophie tried to come to grips with the existence of and reason for this indifference: “Having the understanding darkened, being alienated from the life of God through ignorance that is in them, because of the blindness of their heart.” Like Hans, she sought to be different and remain true to her values in order to live with herself.\textsuperscript{12}

Despite state censorship of “non-Volkish” books, Robert Scholl made sure the family library contained a wide assortment of German literature. Hans particularly enjoyed Stefan Zweig’s \textit{Mankind’s Stellar Hours} because it told of individuals who followed their own conscience. Because Hitler declared “conscience” a Jewish invention and later banned Zweig’s book, Hans grew more determined to take the principles of Zweig’s work to heart. Because of their love for reading, all the Scholl children took part in a clandestine reading circle make up of friends of the family. It served as an underground network of youth who opposed Hitler. Members of this circle circulated forbidden literature and even printed it in their own modest newsletter, \textit{Windlicht} (Storm Lantern). Seemingly innocent, these articles contained veiled references to current political ills and Christian ideals and values. The Gestapo soon got wind of this illegal activity and arrested Hans, Inge, Werner and Sophie. Following a period of
interrogation, they won their release. This experience changed their lives forever. Never again would they consider home a place of safety.¹³

Whenever the clutches of the growing totalitarian state tried to impose itself on members of the Scholl family, they took refuge in their home life. Tradition proved stronger than the Nazis because Hans and Sophie’s parents fostered in their children a discerning attitude supported by a deep religious faith. Because of their rearing, both chose their parents as role models for their lives. Their mother served to encourage them to take a stand for Christian values and to seek God when life became too hard to understand. Both Hans and Sophie appeared well-grounded in their quest for ultimate truth and the meaning of life itself. Their father reminded them to think for themselves and not be concerned with what others did or thought. Standing for principle and conviction remained essential. Hans and Sophie chose to read, learn and then apply to everyday life the truths they had discovered. The encouragement and guidance they received from their parents provided this brother and sister with the tools necessary to make an informed choice concerning the mindless loyalty of the Hitler Youth movement, to understand the real motives of the Fuhrer, and to cope with the challenges of being a member of “the other Germany.”¹⁴

The triumphal march of German troops into Austria, the destruction of Jewish shops, homes, and synagogues on “Crystal Night,” and the invasion of the Sudetenland deeply disturbed the Scholl household. Even though such events caused them to feel like “the beast in man had lifted its mask and the time of euphemistic niceties and rationalization was over,” the Scholls maintained their faith in the God of the universe. Sophie once told a friend: “I don’t understand how ‘devout’ people can fear for God’s existence today because mankind is dogging his footsteps with the sword and vile atrocities. As if God didn’t have the power (I sense that everything rests in his hands)—the power.”¹⁵

By 1940, Hans served as a medic during the invasion of France. While her older brother was on military duty, Sophie, who found her last years in high school dull because National Socialist ideology pervaded every lesson, longed to go to the university and specialize in biology and philosophy. She sought to invest these disciplines with more human truths. Even when Sophie passed her Abitur exam, she delayed her plans to go to the university by six months because of required time in the National Labor Service.¹⁶
In the fall of 1940, Hans returned from the front and enrolled as a medical student at the University of Munich. While at the university, Hans met Alexander Schmorell. Like Hans, he came to the university to study medicine and despised the regimented lock step society of the Reich. Schmorell was the son of a Russian-born Munich doctor. At the beginning of his army career, Alex had managed to avoid swearing the oath of absolute loyalty to Adolf Hitler. Alex Schmorell appeared to be a young man dominated more by gut feelings than by convictions. In many ways, the very dissimilar personalities of Hans and Alex complimented one another. As they became well-acquainted, Alex invited Hans to his parents’ home for “reading evenings.” Much like the writings in Windlicht, these evenings became defensive measures for a people under spiritual siege. At one of these gatherings Hans came to know another future White Rose member, Christoph Probst. His acquaintance with these two young men quickly solidified into an abiding friendship.  

The son of a connoisseur who lived between Munich and Salzburg, Christoph Probst lived off his father’s private income and received the German equivalent to an English public school. He married at an early age and became the father of three children. This young man possessed an austere faith in God. Not easily disillusioned, Christoph’s humanistic Western values became part of his everyday life as he grew up. For Christoph, learning and knowledge had meaning only if they related to ethical behavior. “Life of the spirit” should be the focal point of a man’s being.  

As fellow student-soldiers at Munich, Hans, Alex and Christoph often shared their common disgust for the Wehrmacht and discussed ways to work against the National Socialist state. Almost without being aware of it, word of their military and social debates attracted a circle of like-minded people. Members of this circle of dissidents, who varied in degree of intensity, eventually became involved in the actions of the White Rose. Hans seemed especially gifted in forming connections with all kinds of people with the greatest ease.  

On June 22, 1941, Hitler launched Operation Barbarossa and invaded the Soviet Union. This turn of events shocked and frightened Germans—even those confident in Hitler’s abilities. The next month, the “Lion of Munster,” Catholic Bishop Clemens von Galen lashed out at Hitler’s euthanasia program and demanded that the high-ranking Nazi officials responsible for the program be charged with the murder of so-called “unproductive” Germans. According to Bishop Galen, only “spiritual and moral opposition” could bring an end to this murderous
regime. Although none of his sermons appeared in any newspapers, many copies passed from hand to hand. One of the copies appeared in the mailbox of the Scholl family. The sermons made a profound impression on the Scholl household. Hans expressed excitement that such words made their way throughout Germany. “At last,” he proclaimed, “somebody has had the courage to speak out.” His sister Inge recalled him also commenting, “One definitely ought to have a duplicating machine of one’s own ....” He took this thought with him when he returned for duty in Munich.20

Although most of the White Rose members were not Catholic or at least orthodox ones, the intellectual and emotional currents of opposition against the Nazis associated with Catholicism played a significant role in the shaping of their resistance. The ambiguous relationship between the Roman Catholic Church and the Third Reich had not been completely successful in safeguarding the clergy from harassment. Five hundred Protestant ministers who spoke out against the regime’s perversion of religion were arrested. The Nazis’ ultimate plan concerning religion sought to create a new state church of “German Christians” which rejected Old Testament “Hebrew” values and purposed to reawaken the “Nordic spirit” of ruthlessness and strength. For the Nazis, “traditional Christianity represented the religion of the sick and weak.” In Germany’s new “Confessing Church,” Hitler became the new messiah. According to Hitler, “We Germans have been forsaken by the Christian God. He is not a just, supernatural God, but a political-party God of the others. It is because we believed in him and not in our German God that we were defeated in the struggle of nations.” Voices of moral protest against such actions met stiff opposition. When the Nazis proceeded to de-Christianize the rituals of birth, marriage, and death, young men like Hans Scholl, Alexander Schmorell, and Christoph Probst, turned to theological and philosophical writings in their quest for a way to cope with the ever-growing barbarism. It seemed natural to seek answers in the body of Catholic thought because of its immediate availability in Munich.21

During the summer of 1941, Hans became friends with the distinguished Catholic editor Karl Muth. This friendship proved a crucial event in the evolution of the White Rose. Muth’s journal Hochland (Highland) had been banned by the Nazis that same year because of its anti-Nazi tone. This renowned editor viewed the rise of National Socialism as a result of the crisis of liberalism—a crisis that he saw in the apostasy from faith and the turn to “an empty economic liberalism, devoid of meaning.”22 Karl Muth’s home soon became a sanctuary where members
of the White Rose could discuss politics, theology, literature, and philosophy without fear of denunciation. The Catholic editor functioned as a kind of mentor who opened up new worlds for them by suggestion and example. His stringent faith provided them with stability. Under Muth’s influence, Hans and Sophie Scholl’s religious perceptions acquired greater intensity. Because of him, the Christian Gospel became the criterion of their thoughts and actions.23

Through his relationship with Karl Muth, Hans also became acquainted with Thomas Haecker, the Catholic essayist and philosopher. Haecker’s philosophy involved the use of existentialism to deal with a world that had gone mad. He warned young people that the leadership of Germany “hates the Christ whom it does not name. . . . The successful trick of these people . . . has been to combine the special interests of their basely impulsive and greedy nature. . . . with the true and genuine wishes and claims of the German people. . . .”24 According to Haecker, in times of universal uncertainty, man had to stand up in his aloneness, accept his condition, and be willing to pay the consequences for any actions he might take. For Haecker, the fate of the German Christian was to make “authentic choices.” This process required accepting God and trusting him totally on faith, without rational proofs. It should be noted that Haecker never overtly encouraged young people to resist because of the risk of death involved. Instead, he presented his young listeners with two choices: create an atmosphere of righteous indignation and opposition or resign to passive acceptance of the situation. For members of the White Rose, opposition proved their only option.25

Sometime in the spring of 1942, Hans, Alex and Christoph moved from the realm of “spiritual resistance” and committed themselves to overt opposition to the Nazi Regime. Although the exact moment that they crossed the line into open resistance is not clear, it more than likely occurred when the collective strength of their rage and desperation overcame their own personal doubts and fears. The Christian faith of the members of the White Rose constituted a significant motivation for their resistance to the Third Reich. This group of resisters possessed a Christian existentialism that could be traced back to Theodor Haecker. The rational element of this existentialism proclaimed that “only when reasoning is at its wit’s end, only then may we believe. Faith starts where reason has reached its limit.”26 The basic Christian attitude of the White Rose helped them stop talking about resistance and start taking action. Suddenly they realized being against something proved insufficient. The ethical and legal concepts of Western civilization had been perverted under Hitler and the values of Judeo-Christian culture came
under attack. Such a situation required a decision either for or against this kind of assault. Although they faced a stone wall of impossibility, the White Rose sought to find minute possibilities that would enable them to chip away at the wall. They knew their actions would put their lives in danger. Nevertheless, they prepared and distributed leaflets protesting the tyranny of Hitler and National Socialism.27

Something of a mystery surrounds the reason why members chose the name “White Rose” for this group of resisters. Some sources indicate that during his interrogation by the Gestapo in February 1943, Hans said he had picked the name because it was the title of a Spanish novel. No such Spanish novel existed at the time in German translation. However, B. Traven, a German who lived in South America, did write a novel called *Die Weisse Rose* which told the story of ranch owner who valiantly fights a predatory oil company. While this is a possibility, how can we be sure that Hans read it? Other feasible reasons include the relationship of the edelweiss, another white flower, which was sometimes used as the symbol of opposition among youth groups. Perhaps the most plausible explanation is that the white rose represents beauty and purity, ultimate opposites to the ugliness and sinister nature of the Nazi regime. Such contrasting imagery probably explains the main reason for the choice of the name.28

While taking classes at the university, Hans, Alex and Christoph became acquainted with Willi Graf. Like his new friends, Willi staunchly opposed the Nazi regime. To him, Hitler and his men symbolized the embodiment of evil. A devout Catholic, the church played a primary role in Willi’s life. He had been a member of the Gray Order, one of those “unauthorized and illegal” Catholic youth groups rounded up in 1937 and 1938. During his military service in Russia after the 1941 invasion, he witnessed the unspeakable cruelty and brutality of his fellow soldiers in dealing with unarmed conquered people. Concerning his faith and the challenges to it, Willi wrote: “To be a Christian is perhaps the hardest thing to ever become in life. We never are Christians and only in death perhaps can we become Christian to a small measure.” Willi Graf soon became the newest member of the White Rose.29

From the very beginning, Hans had no intention of involving his sister in the dangers of opposition to the Nazi regime. However, once Sophie completed her National Labor Service requirement and began to attend the University of Munich, she soon realized her brother’s intent to take an overt stand against National Socialism. Although Sophie expressed fear of her involvement in the campaign and the risks it brought to the participants and their families, she
decided to join the effort. Her political passion proved to be a fundamental part of her life. Sophie wanted to do more than just feel bad about the decline of her beloved country. According to her, she wanted “to share the suffering of these days. Sympathy becomes hollow if one feels no pain.” Sophie became a self-reliant young lady whose experiences nourished her search of the “life of the human spirit.” She believed that “every human being . . . always has to reckon with being accountable to God at any moment. . . .” Her father’s favorite line from Goethe took on personal meaning for her: “Despite all the powers closing in, hold yourself up.”

As the summer of 1942 approached, the group decided to purchase a secondhand duplicating machine and a typewriter from an out-of-the-way shop. In addition, they periodically bought inconspicuous amounts of printing paper, stencils, envelopes, and stamps. An architect friend of Hans and Alex offered them the use of his studio in Schwabing for storage of their materials and supplies. The inner circle of the White Rose financed their purchases by pooling their money. As medic-students, Hans and Alex earned 250 reichsmarks a month. This represented more than what the average German worker made. Alex also contributed the allowance he received from his father. They planned to write, print, and distribute protest leaflets that would challenge their fellow Germans to resist the Nazi regime. Such an undertaking forced members of the White Rose to operate in secrecy, even if it meant lying to their parents or losing much needed sleep. Between June 27 and July 12, 1942, Hans and Alex wrote four of the six leaflets of the White Rose. From each of the four texts, approximately 100 copies resulted. Sent anonymously through the mail, these leaflets targeted intellectuals and professional people in Munich. Such people of influence could better organize against the Nazis.

Although they served as joint authors, Hans and Alex included in each of the pamphlets their own style and philosophical emphasis. For example, Hans sought to justify the legitimacy of resistance as a consequence of the illegitimacy of the violent Nazi state. He also emphasized the necessity of a spiritual and moral reversal akin to the apocalyptic vision of Theodor Haecker. According to Hans Scholl, “every individual has to consciously accept his responsibility as a member of Western and Christian civilization in this last hour. . . . Act in passive resistance . . . wherever you are; block the functioning of this atheistic war machine. . . . Don’t forget that each people gets the government it deserves!” By contrast, passages written by Alex represented a more direct and less ideological style. His emphasis dealt with Germany’s policy to eliminate
the Jews and Poles and of German’s joint guilt, as well as pointing out specific ways to resist the regime. In reference to the slaughter of 300,000 Jews in Poland, Alex Schmorell wrote: “Why do the German people behave so apathetically in face of all these dreadful and inhuman crimes? . . . It is not only pity that we ought to feel but guilt. . . .”33 Regarding concrete ways to resist the Nazis, Alex suggested that readers of the leaflets “sabotage . . . the armament industries . . . assemblies, rallies, ceremonies, and organizations sponsored by the National Socialist Party.”34

In the fourth leaflet that appeared in mid-July, Hans and Alex both reminded Germans of their Christian obligation to resist, assured them the White Rose was not funded by any foreign power and made them a promise: “We will not be silent, we are your bad conscience; the White Rose will not leave you in peace!”35

When evaluating the early development of the White Rose resistance movement led by these university students in Munich, it is important to remember that Munich was not considered a bastion of resistance against the Reich. As a matter of fact, Hitler considered Munich his “city of the movement.” Before the war, this city had attracted a variety of dreamers and utopian planners like Lenin and Hitler himself. In addition, Munich had been the site of Hitler’s 1923 putsch. How ironic that the sacred temple of the Third Reich (the Feldherrnhalle) in 1943 would be desecrated by brightly painted White Rose slogans such as “Freedom” and “Down with Hitler.” In the totalitarian state of National Socialism, the University of Munich, like other universities in Germany during that time, represented “a shell with deceptive facades of normalcy.”36 However, the university at Munich could claim the distinction of being the alma mater of Rudolf Hess, Karl Haushofer (author of Lebensraum) and Joseph Goebbels. Although considered conservative, the university at Munich nonetheless integrated into a centralized system of control and conformity. The Nazis had entertained a number of grandiose schemes concerning the “weaklings” who resided in the “ivory towers” of German universities. For example, Ernest Krieck suggested the universities be dissolved entirely and replaced with technical and vocational schools. Alfred Baumler, a philosopher and expert on Nietzsche for the Nazis, proposed the universities be made “houses for men,” thereby eliminating all “feminine-democratic” elements. In a speech to the German press on November 10, 1938, Hitler clearly indicated his disdain for intellectuals: “Unfortunately we need them; otherwise we might one day, I don’t know, exterminate them or something like that. But unfortunately we need them.”37
When the members of the White Rose enrolled at the University of Munich in the early 1940’s, virtually all vestiges of pluralism in thought and quality in scholarship had vanished. By 1942, the university became thoroughly “integrated” into the Nazi system. Examples of “correct” university curriculum included a seminar entitled “A Stab in the Back” and a class called “Volk and Race” which included legislation on racial improvement and eugenics complete with slides and a field trip. Classrooms and lecture halls contained spies from the National Socialist Student Association who had been planted there to detect heresy in students or professors. Yet even in 1942, isolated pockets of decency persisted. For instance, some professors proved excellent manipulators of double meanings at the university. Their lectures included subtle but devastating critiques of Nazism. Kurt Huber became such a professor. Students at the University of Munich, especially members of the White Rose, were drawn to his lectures in philosophy. A master of code language, he sometimes caused a stir in the classroom with his daring, though camouflaged, anti-Nazi comments. While most of his listeners grasped his meaning, the spies of the Student Bund simply failed to catch hints of dissent when buried in a discourse on philosophy. Huber won the applause of his students without making things easy for them. He lectured on theodicy, the justification of God’s ways to man, the vindication of divine justice in the face of the existence of evil. This difficult and complicated subject proved a sensitive one to Sophie Scholl and her friends as they thirsted for an acceptable explanation for the madness of the world outside their classroom. In Huber’s lecture series “Leibniz and His Times” during the summer of 1942, he argued convincingly that all things were arranged at creation to work together for ultimate good, which implied the final elimination of evil. This philosophy, (actually based on scripture), encouraged Sophie and the other members of the White Rose to take to heart and find comfort in it. Huber’s lectures, especially concerning Leibniz, also illustrated the national responsibility of the academic intelligentsia during times of social and political upheaval. Kurt Huber made such an impression on members of the White Rose, that he was invited to an “evening discussion” at which the inner circle of resistance group would be present. During a heated debate on the value of overt resistance to the Nazi regime, Huber fervently stated that something had to be done. Action, in his view, must be taken. Though unaware the authors of the White Rose leaflets made up the membership of the “evening discussion,” Kurt Huber’s remarks energized this small group of resisters.
From July through November 1942 Hans Scholl, Alex Schmorell, and Willi Graf received orders to join their Student Company in the southern front in Russia as medical orderlies. Without a doubt this experience made a great impression on these young men. Aided by Alex’s fluency in the native language, they made contact with a number of Russians. As they got to know the people, they grew to admire these “products of traditional Russian culture” and learned that all the Russians they had met hated the Communist regime under which they labored. Perhaps because these young men had witnessed German brutality toward Russian POWs, they grew even more anxious to end a war that proved so devastating to such a noble people. By the time the trio returned to Germany, the core of the resistance group in Munich had been enlarged. Kurt Huber had joined the ranks of the White Rose. For Hans, Alex, and Christoph, their trip to the Russian front had greatly increased their rage against the Reich. Their outlook concerning their resistance efforts had changed. They now wanted to take on a larger goal with more meaning and impact by building cells of resistance in major German universities. Members of the White Rose determined to inform as many Germans as possible of the realities of the Third Reich. This new campaign would require more money, more members, and more methods of distribution. They discussed a plan to link up with a national resistance movement to increase their outreach.39

By listening to foreign broadcasts, the White Rose had become aware of the existence of a large resistance organization called the Die Rote Kapelle (The Red Orchestra). Although the Gestapo arrested and executed many members of this group in 1942, the White Rose seemed heartened to know such an organization had existed at all. The efforts of the Die Rote Kapelle had proved the presence of resistance high up in the government itself. Consequently, members of the White Rose determined to make contact with it. They connected with this group through Falk Harnack whose brother Arvid had been executed by the Gestapo for his participation in Die Rote Kapelle. Harnack, who saw himself as a link among all the remaining resistance groups, told the members of the White Rose they needed to rebuild a kind of united front, representing the military on the right and ranging all the way to the Communists on the left. Although Professor Huber balked at the prospect of working with Bolsheviks even to overthrow the Nazi regime, the remaining members of the White Rose at least considered this arrangement as a necessary step to defeat Hitler.40
Within a matter of two months—from November 1942 to early January 1943—the White Rose operation had been transformed from an isolated action performed by idealistic students into an expanding network spreading throughout Southwest Germany, up to Saarland, and making tentative strides toward Hamburg and even Berlin. In this year of new hope, the White Rose believed the upcoming Allied invasion created a revolutionary atmosphere in Munich. By January 1943, plans for a fifth leaflet began. A total of six to nine thousand leaflets resulted. In this leaflet, the authors presented themselves as “Leaflets of the Resistant Movement in Germany,” instead of the “White Rose.” When shown a draft of the leaflet, Professor Huber expressed disappointment at this omission. In Germany, this leaflet made it way to Augsburg, Stuttgart, Frankfurt, and Munich, and in Austria to Salzburg, Linz, and Vienna. The flyer called for separation from National Socialism in light of the impending military defeat. If this separation did not occur, it warned that “the Germans would suffer the same fate as the Jews.”

This leaflet, “A Call to Germans,” created a great disturbance at the highest levels of the Party and the State because of its far-reaching distribution. The Gestapo dropped all other pending projects and concentrated on finding the authors of the treasonous leaflet. In the meantime, on January 13 the Munich Gauleiter Paul Giesler made an offensive speech during a celebration for Munich University at the German Museum. Geisler’s remark that women should present the Fuhrer with a child every year caused an up-roar. The resulting riots and arrests at the university prompted the White Rose to target their fellow students to receive their next leaflet. The inner circle of the White Rose expressed joy about the uprising because they saw a direct connection between their leaflets and the events. They had sought to foment unrest, and their plan seemed to be working.

When the German surrender at Stalingrad occurred on February 3, members of the Munich resistance group decided the downfall of the regime appeared near, and an even more precise call to action seemed needed. In addition to distributing a sixth leaflet addressed to “Fellow Students,” they decided to paint large slogans like “Freedom” and “Down with Hitler” on walls in the city and the university. Professor Huber authored the sixth and final leaflet of the White Rose. It was distributed in the hallways of Munich University on the morning of February 18. Ironically, that same day Joseph Goebbels’ orchestration “light show” of Wagner’s *Twilight of the Gods* took place. For some yet explained reason, Sophie Scholl stood at the top of the stairs in one of the main buildings of the university and allowed the leaflets to scatter here and
there instead of placing stacks of them in the usually designated places. A disgruntled custodian picked up one of the leaflets and notified the Gestapo. Hans and Sophie Scholl were arrested for distributing treasonous leaflets and taken to Gestapo headquarters. Later that day, the Gestapo also arrested Christoph Probst. Following days of endless interrogation, their trial was scheduled for February 22. The most notorious and ruthless judge of the People’s Court, Roland Freisler, hurried to Munich to conduct the one day trial. Hans and Sophie Scholl and Christoph Probst all received the death sentence. Three hours after their sentencing, they were taken to a private location and beheaded. On April 18, a second trial of members of the White Rose was held in Munich. After a trial that lasted two months Alex Schmorell, Willi Graf, and Kurt Huber also received the death sentence for treasonous acts. While in his cell awaiting his death sentence, Alex Schmorell wrote: “What did I know until now about belief, about a true and deep belief, about the truth, the last and only truth, about God?”

In evaluating the significance of the White Rose, it is noteworthy that leaflets of the group made their way throughout Germany and occupied Europe bringing hope to condemned prisoners, even those in concentration camps. From Berlin, people smuggled the leaflets into Sweden and Switzerland and from there to London. An editorial appeared in the *New York Times* on August 2, 1943 which stated “these Munich students . . . protesting in the name of principles which Hitler thought he had killed forever. In years to come we, too, may honor [them].” Once the leaflets reached the West, they were reprinted and dropped by the thousands from Allied aircraft over the cities of Germany.

Because the White Rose resistance movement operated under conditions of secrecy, lack of information about its day to day activities has caused much speculation on the part of historians. The efforts of this resistance group proved hard to predict. Therefore researchers have been challenged to pinpoint significant events in the development of the organization in order to draw conclusions about its purpose and goal. Yet, careful examination of contemporary memoirs, letters, biographies and even recently released files of the first White Rose trial all point to a common motive—a revolt of conscience against the unrighteous actions and goals of the Hitler regime. Although the events of the war certainly affected their efforts, the underlying reason for the actions taken by members of the White Rose was moral and religious idealism. As the Nazi war machine began to lose its momentum, the faith and zeal of this group of university students grew in strength and resolve. Their resistance to the Nazis represented “the other
Members of the White Rose believed that each person was accountable to God for their actions (or lack of actions). Living under the murderous tyranny of Hitler and National Socialism, their consciences would not allow them to conveniently look the other way when atrocities took place. During his interrogation by the Gestapo on February 18, Hans Scholl concluded: “I had to act out of my inner conviction and I believed that this inner obligation was more binding that the oath of loyalty which I had given as a soldier.”

Hans and the other members of the White Rose firmly believed the necessity of bearing witness to their faith. Because the Nazi regime had attacked and perverted Judeo-Christian values, a stand had to be taken. Being a Christian, as Willi Graf wrote, is indeed hard. It has been said that one must simply adapt to whatever is happening in this conflicting world in which we live. But if that is true, how can a righteous cause ever prevail if no one comes forward and gives himself unequivocally to that cause? This question was asked and then transformed into a challenge faithfully met by the members of the White Rose. Friedrich Reck-Malleczewen, a man executed at Dachau for failing to answer a civil-defense conscription call, once wrote about the members of the White Rose: “They died radiant in their courage and readiness for sacrifice, and thereby attained the pinnacle of lives well lived. . . .”
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Adapting Elementary Teaching Methods to College Students

by Marlyn Newhouse

In a previous *JUFF* article some of my teaching methods were outlined. Well, times have changed and so have some of my teaching methods. Actually, I think I have just added to my “bag of tricks” because I still use the others. So, this is merely a continuation of that discussion of using elementary school teaching techniques and adapting them to college-level students, especially ones with learning difficulties.

I have been teaching since the fall of 1971. (When was your mother born?) My three degrees are all in Education: BS in Secondary Education, Chemistry major and Math minor; MA in Teaching Chemistry; and DA in Teaching Chemistry with an Industrial Safety minor. Some of the teaching methods I have used are different than my fellow teachers in the sciences. That was why I was hired. In an interview in August, 1993 with Dr. Carla Sanderson, then Dean of the College of Nursing, she was concerned that the science and student communications had broken down between some of her pre-nursing students and their chemistry professors.

The nature of the students enrolled in CHE 105, Fundamentals of Chemistry, has changed. Most of the students enrolled in 1993 were nursing majors who had NOT had chemistry in high school and were terrified! Only five per section had taken chemistry in high school. I spent 6 years in 6th grade (teaching it!) and the experience served me well. I could communicate and simplify the vocabulary, assign “vocabulary cards” like foreign language classes (Argh! You sign up for chemistry and you get Greek!) and give “vocab quizzes.” The nature of the CHE 105 student is now quite different. Only 15 of 80 students this last spring were nursing majors. Only 5 to 7 of the 80 had NOT had chemistry in high school. Eight students were “special” students with diagnosed learning difficulties.

The most obvious change in the course has been the use of technology. I was very old-fashioned about the necessity of the teacher being physically in front of the student, proclaiming the essentials of the course. That is, until the tornado of 2008. One of my students, Jason Kaspar, was one of the ones trapped under the rubble. When he was recuperating at home, a web cam was installed in the WH 312 lecture room. This allowed Jason and his mom to view the
MWF noon lectures in their home in Memphis. They could follow my movements from the lecture desk to the Periodic Table on the side wall as I moved around the room. Mrs. Kaspar reported this among the other of Our Father’s workings in their life in a meeting with Mrs. Lanese Dockery, Dr. Kimberly Thornbury, and me. She brought a lap top and power point presentation documenting the testimony of the tragedy and blessings in her son’s life.

This experience also prompted us to prepare a science kit that could be used in conjunction with our lab book experiments. CHE 105 lab has been revised to “Green Chemistry” experiments in which we use mostly grocery store chemicals! Weekly with Mr. Giley Wright’s help, Dr. Sally Henrie and I would prepare a box with equipment and chemicals needed for the Kaspars to do the experiment at home. A member of the Nursing department or Dr. Jimmy Davis would shuttle the materials back and forth to the Germantown campus. Exams were monitored at the Germantown campus and returned in a sealed envelope for grading. Thus the need for “long distance learning” techniques and its technology was instilled in this very “traditional” teacher.

One of two technology changes is in the homework and its grading which had become overwhelming. Fall of 2009 was the first semester I had courage enough to incorporate online homework. Two students took me up on the invitation to come to the lab room WH 302 twice weekly for an hour to work on OWL, Cengage publishing company’s Online Web Learning, under my supervision. Based on their work, I revised “required” OWL problems and developed a set of “OWL Snags” notices to coincide with the weekly lesson plan that was published in Blackboard.

Blackboard is the second technology used. It has taken awhile. I was enrolled in the beginning seminar with Robin Navel 4 times and the last time she threatened to make me teach it! Of course there are an abundance of other sections in the Blackboard learning collection that make it so convenient: Basics (Online or instructor-led), Webinars, and advanced topics. From a student perspective, Blackboard chat or discussion threads help the student to feel the personal attention of the teacher, even more so than when in a lecture room of 40 students. It is like the professor is right at your side encouraging you. An enormous help for me as the teacher has come from visiting with dear friends and coworkers, such as Dr. Beth Madison, Dr. Sally Henrie and Dr. David Ward, who have used these techniques more intensively and extensively than I have.
Videos in class always have a question sheet accompanying them. This was an idea Dr. Charles Baldwin passed along the first semester I taught at Union (as well as writing a brief lecture outline in the upper corner of the front board each class period). At the end of the video, if time permits, text book pages are referenced and written in the margins by the corresponding questions. On occasion the discussion of the video will take place the following lecture day after the work sheet (and attendance) has been recorded and documented in the grade book.

I try to document everything! Attendance is documented by turning a video sheet or a quiz in addition to the daily folder method. I do not spend time calling roll. I try to begin class on time but do not penalize students who are late because this is a growing campus and White Hall is a long way from the BAC.

Essay questions are included on the first three exams but NOT on exam four, which is a take-home designed to help prepare the students for the final. Extra credit points on the first three exams are available to students who write more on their essay questions than the required three points: “define the two designated terms and write a sentence of comparing or contrast.” The essay questions are announced ahead of time and put in the weekly lesson plan on Blackboard. A viable limit for essay extras is 25 points of the total 1000 for the class = 2.5%. A good rule of thumb is that anyone getting an “F” on the final will NOT get an “A” in the course no matter how many extra credit points they get!

Extra credit assignments are counted as one point (one check mark in the grade book). They are designed to encourage interdisciplinary participation by attending seminars, Town and Gown lectures, or viewing videos that we do not have time to watch in class. These are selected by me and announced in the Blackboard. It is prudent to put a limit on “extra” assignments but usually not necessary because they are designed to take at least half an hour of a busy life.

It is my earnest hope that this continuation of the discussion of using elementary school teaching techniques and adapting them to college level students, especially ones with learning difficulties, will be helpful in encouraging all our students to succeed.
A Grammar Lesson for Today

by Betty Foellinger

One of the greatest aspects of success in any project is positive action—the active voice, if you will. We cannot and should not operate in the grey area of apathy as the passive voice.

For the best fulfillment of our individual potential, we must break through into the verbs of action. Here is a list of what could be the eight most active verbs in your life.

- Do more than Exist . . . . . . . LIVE;
- Do more than Touch . . . . . . FEEL;
- Do more than Look . . . . . . OBSERVE;
- Do more than Read . . . . . . . ABSORB;
- Do more than Think . . . . . . PONDER;
- Do more than Talk . . . . . . . COMMUNICATE;
- Do more than Hear . . . . . . LISTEN;
- Do more than Listen . . . . . UNDERSTAND.

Kaleidoscope

by Betty Foellinger

Shifting shards of colored glass
Of somber hue and bright
Make many splendid patterns
When held up to the light.

Happy moments, sad ones, too
The ease combined with strife
Make an ever-changing pattern
In the Kaleidoscope of Life.
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