EDITORIAL

In a small college environment such as ours where “publish or perish” pressures are not overwhelming, it is gratifying to see such a variety of expressions contained in this unambitious journal. While Louise Bentley is “Slaying a Monster,” Frank Lower argues with the Quakers, Lytle Givens argues with death, Nancy Dayton wants us to care about nursing, Maggie Nell Brewer wants us to care about students, I’m trying to break a secret CIA code, Bobby Rogers is out cruising on a Trident submarine or in Overton Park, and during all this Wayne Alford is playing “Birthday Party.” When you add to this the snow, tulips, mushrooms, clouds, mountains and dewdrops of John David Barham and Lisa Smith, we have a cornucopia unequalled by few journals. So come, partake of this horn of plenty in the following pages. (While you’re partaking, give praises to Frank Lower for proofing this year’s edition and may mushrooms forever grow at your feet.)

Ernest Pinson
JUFF editor
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CONTRADICTIONS OF LIFE AND DEATH

by Lytle Givens

In social psychology the folk saying “opposites attract” is used to explain certain social behaviors. A person may be attracted to another person/persons even though their personalities, life circumstances, etc. may be very different. Research demonstrates individuals seek out marital partners with personality traits considerably different from their own. For example, a person with a dominant personality may marry someone who is submissive and/or shy.

Probably the most diametrically opposed social philosophies within the last one hundred years are those of Herbert Spencer and Karl Marx. Spencer (1820-1903) was a British social darwinist who believed societies evolved into higher states of being. However, this evolution would happen quicker and more completely if there were no interference (i.e., if society was not interfered with). Any type of system, was actually a hindrance to this upward social evolution. Spencer thought people were poor because they didn't have enough initiative to be non-poor. Therefore, helping the poor through social programs would inevitably lead to a perpetuation and elaboration of poverty. He believed in laissez faire economics as a means of social evolution. Needless to say, Spencer was very popular with big businesses, both in Europe and in America.

Karl Marx (1818-1833), on the other hand, believed in radical social programming. He felt society would be improved only through social intervention. This intercession would occur with the have-nots (proletariats) of society violently overthrowing the haves (bourgeoisie). Marx felt this revolution was not only necessary but also inevitable. Needless to say, this viewpoint was not popular with big businesses.

However, sometimes life is stranger than fiction, or in this case, death is stranger than fiction. Both Spencer and Marx are buried at Highgate cemetery in London. In fact, their graves are across from each other, divided only by a gravel footpath. I guess we could say they are physically closer in death than they were philosophically close in life.
AN INTERVIEW WITH MAGGIE NELL BREWER

This is another in a series of interviews of administrative personnel initiated by JUFF in 1984, having included this far among others Dr. Barefoot and Mr. Stewart. Dr. Maggie Nell Brewer has been at Union since 1965 as Dean of Women and Vice President for Student Affairs. She holds an honorary doctorate from California Baptist College, B.S. degree from U.T. Knoxville, M.A. from George Peabody and additional study at Memphis State.

Pinson (P): Dr. Brewer, how did you come into this business of student concerns?

Brewer (B): My interest in working with student concerns outside the classroom began during my early years of teaching at South Side High School. In addition to my teaching responsibilities in the areas of physical education and social studies, I was assigned to sponsor various groups such as the cheerleaders, senior class, and Try-Hi-Y; lacking a school counselor, many student problems were referred to me.

After eight years of teaching, I left the classroom to become Supervisor of Instruction of Madison County Schools, Grades 1-12. During the two years I was in that position, Mr. Jack Brown moved from the principalship of South Side High School to the Dean of Students position at Union University. When he and President F. E. Wright were looking for someone to fill the newly created position, Dean of Women, they asked me to come for an interview. In July 1965, I came to Union and began what has been a very rich and satisfying tenure.

(P): Your position is one some of us would call taxing, agonizing, even nerve wrecking. Do you enjoy your work?

(B): I can truly say I have never held a position I did not enjoy. In each of the three career positions I served, there have been aspects of the work I found unpleasant—in teaching I did not enjoy evaluating and grading, in supervision I found it unpleasant to confront teachers who were not performing up to par, and in my current position I find dealing with student disciplinary and emotional problems very taxing and draining. However, the joys and rewards far outweigh the stresses.

(P): Please describe your philosophy in regard to your office.

(B): The Student Affairs Department exists to offer services and programs in support of desired institutional outcomes. It is designed to be student centered and service oriented, promoting the total development of the student—intellectual, social, physical, and spiritual. Our department attempts to be a cohesive force to integrate the variety of out-of-class experiences into student growth and development. We also serve an important role in interpreting the institution to the student.
(P): How many staff members work in your area?

(B): There are fourteen full-time staff members including the Dean of Men/Director of Testing, Director of Career Planning and Placement, Director of Counseling, College Nurse, Coordinator of College Activities, Administrative Assistant, Director and Assistant Director of Palmer Activities Center, five housing directors, and myself. Approximately seventy-five student assistants work in the various areas of the department.

(P): What portion of a student's cost goes toward room and board, and how does this compare with Lambuth and Lane?

(B): All of our students live in apartments which have individual bedrooms, a bath, and a living room. Sixty-five percent of the apartments have individual kitchenettes. The student assigned to a kitchen unit pays $630 per semester, the Seven Meal Plan chosen by most who have kitchenettes costs $315 per semester. Rent for the non-kitchen unit is $525 per semester, and the Twelve Meal Plan which accompanies those accommodations is $530 per semester. Tuition for 12-16 hours runs $2,125 per semester, so close to one-third of a semester's cost goes for room and board when the student has the kitchen unit and Seven Meal Plan.

Neither Lambuth nor Lane have the apartment facilities or the same meal plans; therefore, it is difficult to compare our costs with their, but in the comparison made each year by the Vice President for Business Affairs our prices are very competitive with the charges they list for their traditional dormitories, and our combined room, board and tuition costs have been consistently lower.

(P): New dormitories are scheduled to be built this year; will they differ at all from the ones already existing?

(B): The basic apartment design has been retained in the new housing that is under construction because it is popular with students and has served us well. All units have kitchens, the bedrooms are larger, hot water heaters have a larger capacity, there will be a double sink in the kitchen, each individual bedroom will have a T.V. and telephone jack, and the stairwells will be covered.

The overall layout of the new complex will be different. Apartment buildings containing from six to ten apartments each will be clustered around a commons building. When the complex is fully developed it will contain seven two-story apartment buildings with a total capacity of 240 residents. Currently three apartment buildings consisting of 22 apartments with a capacity for 88 students are under construction.
(P): This is a trite question I know you are asked many times, but how do the students compare today with those, say, 15 to 20 years ago in terms of discipline problems, maturity, social manners?

(B): The majority of our students are bright, mature, well adjusted individuals who exhibit a strong Christian value system. This was the case twenty years ago. However, there appears to be an increasing number of students who have significant emotional problems and who have more “gray” areas in terms of Christian values. The basic judicial problems we handle are related to the use of alcohol, violation of visitation standards, dishonesty, and rowdy and disruptive behavior. These have been the major violations since the sixties.

As to manners, society in general has become much more casual, and there seems to be less time and emphasis given to the teaching of social graces at home or school. When I came to Union in the sixties, men in the dining room would stand and assist women with their chairs, caps inside classrooms and the dining room were never seen, and putting one’s feet on tables was unthinkable. In the sixties a one-hour class called Social Adjustment was required of all entering freshmen.

In regard to maturity, I find that many of today’s students have been exposed to more life experiences at an earlier age, but this has not seemed to change the level of maturity for the average student.

(P): I’m certain you have received some rather uncomplimentary names from disgruntled or dismissed students. Some I seem to recall include “Old Mother Hubbard,” “The Big Bad Wolf,” and “The Brewery”—does such name calling bother you?

(B): Name calling in the context you have mentioned does not bother me. There was a time as a young professional when it did, but I soon realized that I could not please everyone no matter how hard I tried, nor how good a job I did. There will always be people who do not like the actions which must be taken, and often they do not have the maturity to understand them. It quickly became apparent to me that I could not be concerned about popularity but should always act on what I believed to be right and fair regardless of the response of some students. Also, I came to realize that the results of my labors would often be deferred, that even when discipline had to be administered, many would come to understand and appreciate it in later years. Almost every year I get letters or visits which confirm this.

(P): Has Centrifuge in the summers taken its toll on the dormitories?

(B): Any time you use facilities eight to ten additional weeks per year, you increase the normal wear and tear on them. However, Centrifuge campers have not been as hard on our units in general as many of our own students, especially in the men’s housing.
(P): How many staff members work in your area?

(B): There are fourteen full-time staff members including the Dean of Men/Director of Testing, Director of Career Planning and Placement, Director of Counseling, College Nurse, Coordinator of College Activities, Administrative Assistant, Director and Assistant Director of Palmer Activities Center, five housing directors, and myself. Approximately seventy-five student assistants work in the various areas of the department.

(P): What portion of a student’s cost goes toward room and board, and how does this compare with Lambuth and Lane?

(B): All of our students live in apartments which have individual bedrooms, a bath, and a living room. Sixty-five percent of the apartments have individual kitchenettes. The student assigned to a kitchen unit pays $630 per semester, the Seven Meal Plan chosen by most who have kitchenettes costs $315 per semester. Rent for the non-kitchen unit is $525 per semester, and the Twelve Meal Plan which accompanies these accommodations is $530 per semester. Tuition for 12-16 hours runs $2,125 per semester, so close to one-third of a semester’s cost goes for room and board when the student has the kitchen unit and Seven Meal Plan.

Neither Lambuth nor Lane have the apartment facilities or the same meal plans; therefore, it is difficult to compare our costs with their, but in the comparison made each year by the Vice President for Business Affairs our prices are very competitive with the charges they list for their traditional dormitories, and our combined room, board and tuition costs have been consistently lower.

(P): New dormitories are scheduled to be built this year; will they differ at all from the ones already existing?

(B): The basic apartment design has been retained in the new housing that is under construction because it is popular with students and has served us well. All units have kitchens, the bedrooms are larger, hot water heaters have a larger capacity, there will be a double sink in the kitchen, each individual bedroom will have a T.V. and telephone jack, and the stairwells will be covered.

The overall layout of the new complex will be different. Apartment buildings containing from six to ten apartments each will be clustered around a commons building. When the complex is fully developed it will contain seven two-story apartment buildings with a total capacity of 240 residents. Currently three apartment buildings consisting of 22 apartments with a capacity for 88 students are under construction.
THE THREE CORNERED HAT IN CONCEPCIÓN

by Walt Padelford

Intense spiritual drama is sometimes manifested in small towns, or as John Bunyan might have said, the holy war is made evident. Concepción is a particular town in a particular Latin American country, but it could be any small town in any country, simply by changing the religious affiliations of the actors.

There is a struggle in progress in Concepción for the allegiance and affections of men and women. The traditional power of the Roman church is very strong in Concepción, as the painting above the door of the cathedral proclaims: "This is the house of God, this is the gate of heaven." The meaning of the message is that the only way to heaven is through the good offices of the Roman church. Eternity has been placed in the hearts of the people of Concepción, so they are interested in gaining heaven. Therefore, loyalty to the Roman church is required.

The bishop in Concepción is a problematic man. He has used his prestige and honor as a base for far-flung entrepreneurial activities. He owns a large sawmill behind the cathedral for making building materials; he owns a fleet of some forty vehicles complete with a crew of mechanics and workshop. Around sixty laborers are on the bishop's payroll. This would seem to be all to the good in terms of increasing employment in a downtrodden area of the world. However, the bishop pays his workers as hourly employees rather than full-time in order to avoid paying the national social security tax.

The bishop also sells foodstuffs at slightly above market price which he has bought from poor farmers at below the market price. People tolerate this because of the bishop's position. The mayor of Concepción is incensed at the bishop, and his hatred has driven him beyond the pale of religion.

In an effort to free the local populace from the shackles of economic oppression, a group of German anthropologists have taken up residence in Concepción. These men are developing and overseeing the operation of producer's cooperatives. These cooperatives are to be peasant-operated. The purpose will be to obtain better prices for farmers' products. The anthropologists are having some impact in the local area, not tremendously great, not tremendously small. They are fighting against the bishop and the old guard in order to ameliorate harsh economic conditions. This small group of Germans is atheistic and committed to Marxism; some of the locals say that their funding comes from the Soviet Union via Cuba.

In another corner of Concepción a training center for Christian leaders has been set up. The center is built on property owned by a small, struggling, evangelical church. Lay leaders, evangelists, and Christian workers who are too poor to continue their formal education come here to study the Bible, theology, and practical Christian teaching for two years. In a period of about four weeks, two of these men led ten people in the surrounding area to Christ.
Through the revenues generated by Centrifuge the housing complexes have received new unit furniture, more frequent painting, and money for improved upkeep and cleaning. The housing directors have received extra compensation for duties above and beyond their normal summer school responsibilities.

I am very pleased that we have Centrifuge. When I look at the number of students who are coming as a result of being here, coupled with the revenues the camps produce, I think the positives far outweigh the negatives.

(P): What do you consider your most difficult problem handled over the past years in regard to student affairs?

(B): There have been a number that stand out—the death of a student in the residence complex, a shooting and injury of a student in married student housing, and two rather significant cases involving faculty members and students. These cases unsettle the whole campus and cause many spin-off concerns.

(P): Do you have any gripes, requests, or information you would like to pass along to the faculty who read this journal?

(B): The faculty through the years has been very supportive of the Student Affairs Department, and I appreciate the contributions which individual members have made to the work of the department. The understanding and affirmation of faculty members is of immeasurable value. I know that there will always be times when there are differences of opinion related to services, policies, standards, and expectations. My office is always open to discuss these, and I request faculty input at any time about any concern.

My pet gripe with faculty and staff is with the fairly significant number who violate parking regulations, since this creates problems in the student sector. Like it or not, we are role models.

(P): If anyone is contemplating student affairs as a vocation, what advice would you offer?

(B): By all means pursue student development as a career. It offers many interesting, exciting, and rewarding opportunities; and along with these, it will challenge the best in you. Find a college with an excellent student development program and get all the preparation you can. A person coming into a position such as mine in today's college scene needs a good background in law, counseling, business administration, computer science, drafting, and public relations in addition to the traditional courses.
IN OVERTON PARK

by Bobby Rogers

We prize what is briefest through every day
is a lesson in the falsity
of this valuation. You have only to watch
the visitors to the park and witness
their unpracticed laughter in the surprise of
the year's last mild day, sensing how soon
this will end. The color of the trees
has paled to show fists of squirrel beds, preparations
for the dozen weeks of bitter weather
that should already be upon us. The bronze monument
to the war dead has turned irretrievably
cold to the touch and makes the only solid shadow I can see
in the low afternoon sun, the retreating shape
of the cast soldier stationed
to dam a torrent of forgetting.
Every day is an explanation. To love takes more
than memory, this much I will agree to. So I am left
in this park, in this city against a river, leaving pieces
of brief correspondence in my coat pocket, the letters I had wanted
to reread here; I know I cannot look down
for long enough. How many unexpected days
may we count on? Everything is best that is unseasonable,
begging notice from the bearer. The last leaves, weak
as November: one rain will take them down.
The sun setting way south is enough to kill
any tinge of warmth left out of a blinding summer
allotted only the shortest nights. I have come to believe
that everything depends on our efforts to be meticulous
as the two men sweeping metal detectors
over the dying grass, their days off
spent in patient search for forgotten items fallen
from someone else's pocket.
In headphones they hear the slightest response
the magnetic coils pick up, hinting a presence
of metal buried at a recoverable depth,
a pull tab or piece of small change
lost in the grass and subsumed by earth
out of a carelessness or unknowing,
and never missed. On the far field
the older man kneels and with a kitchen knife
upturns the gray, moldering soil.
SLAYING THE "MONSTER MYTH" ABOUT ROBERT FROST

by Louise Bentley

The writing of biography is worth fame, money, and often scandal. What is truth to one is libel to another. When Robert Frost died on January 29, 1963, the truth of the man, the poet, the personality—all may have died. An enigma in his time because of the different Frost personages he presented to the world, Frost grew more complex and controversial after his death. His life is among the “most amply documented in American literary history,” according to Donald G. Sheehy. Yet

more than twenty years after his death it remains controversial. At the center of the dispute stands not only the poet but also his official biographer, Lawrance Thompson.

...Frost’s advocates have argued that the official biography represents nothing less than a deliberate character assassination (393).

Thompson's frost was a tortured, devious man, an exploiter of others. In a letter to Denis Donoghue, Thompson had called Frost “that monster” (quoted to Stanley Burnshaw 210); later reviews echoed the term, and thus the myth became prominent.

Since the publication of the three-volume set of that authentic, "official" biography (1966, 1970, and 1976) many readers have accepted Thompson's version, but here and there others have disagreed. In 1977 Richard Poirier wrote scathingly in his Robert Frost: The Work of Knowing about his perception of the problem:

Moral and literary accomplishment are a piece in his [Frost's] poetry because of his near-mystical acceptance of responsibility for himself and for whatever happened to him. His biographer misses this entirely. In his harsh, distorted, and personally resentful view of Frost’s manipulative, calculating use of other people, Thompson sees only the determination of a man who wanted fully to control his career and his public image. Unquestionably, that was one of the things he was doing. He was also revealing something wonderful about human life, or...about his sense of what it was. He was communicating his conviction that, mysteriously, nothing happens to us in life except what we choose to have happen (43)

The decade of the 1980s furnished an even wider diversity of articles and books taking serious objection to Thompson's view. Herbert Marks in the Yale Review, July, 1982, wrote of “The Counter-Intelligence of Robert Frost” and defended the poet vigorously against Thompson's simplistic analysis of the poet's “masks” behind which it is a “privilege or duty to peer” (126). In 1984 William Pritchard presented Frost, A Literary Life Reconsidered as a corrective to the Thompson biography. Pritchard felt Thompson's books encouraged a view of the poet as a “species of monster in human form” (xii). Although he does not believe that was the intent, he blames the "intemperateness" of Thompson's language and the general tenor of his style to be perhaps unwitting culprits in producing the effect. "Despite Thompson's scrupulousness in ascertaining and recording facts...his biographical style made Frost into a particularly unattractive presence, so much at variance with what many who knew him...that something had
perhaps gone amiss” (xiii). In reviewing Pritchard’s book Philip L. Gerber chastises him for his attacks on Thompson and the impressions some readers have gotten. He feels:

Why can’t we accept Frost for what he so obviously was, a human being with huge virtues and considerable faults... This confusion of the man with the poetry is not a profitable route to pursue, chiefly because Frost, unlike some other writers, was so very successful in preventing his worst traits from coloring his verse. And it is the poetry that is our ultimate concern; the rest is gossip (135).

Even though he ignored much of Pritchard’s arguments, Gerber himself wrote an article that same year in The New England Quarterly about his interview with William Jewell, a formerclassmate of Frost’s at Lawrence High. Jewell remembered that Frost often “hit people different ways.” He voiced his strong concern about the Thompson biography: “There’s so much in there that I happen to know isn’t true about the early years. But what bothers me most is there doesn’t seem to be anything about Frost’s nice qualities” (20). Countless Frost admirers agree as they remember Thompson’s special index of topical subheadings such as “retaliation,” vindictiveness,” or “arrogant” in his explanation of Frost in the biography.

The most profound shattering of the “monster myth” has been done by Stanley Burnshaw, Frost’s companion and editor at Holt from 1958 until the poet’s death in 1963. What he has done in his 1986 book, Robert Frost Himself, is clarify, correct, and attempt to “wipe away the biases, add the missing essentials, and restore for the world the person he [Frost] really was” (xi). Waiting for “someone properly informed...to come forward to right the wrong the detractors had done” (xi) Burnshaw ultimately decided to follow Frost’s admonition: “I’m counting on you to protect me from Larry [Thompson]. Remember!” (6). His remembrance is a valuable book that offers proof to clear the maligned poet.

At the outset one must wonder why Frost selected Thompson. Burnshaw explained the strange manner Thompson was asked to become the official biographer. After Professor Robert S. Newdick of Ohio State University died while writing Frost’s biography, Frost twelve days later (July 29, 1939) picked an admirer whose writings he liked. Frost at 65 and Thompson at 35 started off rather well, but as the 1940s changed all American life, so did events change their relationship. Thompson himself listed “the period during 1949-53 [when] the relationship between Frost and myself took its first decidedly downward trend, from which it has never recovered and can never recover”—that stated in 1962 (Burnshaw 215). The basic problem was that Thompson feared Frost “held back” and often gave him “differing versions” apparently because Thompson had failed to live up to Frost’s expectations. This distrust of each other poisoned the relationship. Denis Donoghue thinks “Thompson undertook the biography...on the spur of admiring him, but...he came to loathe him.” Burnshaw adds one sad note from Thompson’s files. While Frost lay critically ill in a Boston hospital in January 1963, Thompson wrote, “Here I am, pretending that I’m anxious to see Frost when the truth of the matter is that I really don’t care whether I ever see him again, alive or dead” (217). What an attitude for a biographer!

After being assigned to cover Frost as the Holt representative, Burnshaw relates an amazing series of incidents, anecdotes, visits, talks, letters, and meetings with Frost and Thompson. It was Burnshaw who arranged to have critic Lionel Trilling for that infamous
banquet speech on March 26, 1959, to celebrate Frost's 85th birthday. Trilling reluctantly accepted, primarily to keep Richard M. Nixon from speaking at what Trilling felt was a “literature banquet” (101). The evening ended with confusion after Trilling's insistence that Frost was "a poet who terrifies" (105). Not surprisingly, Thompson had rushed away that night without defending Frost. A few months later Frost discussed the incident with Burnshaw and confided his distrust of Thompson. Saying it was "too late," he refused to change biographers. That was the occasion Frost asked Burnshaw to "protect me from Larry" (116).

After Frost's death Burnshaw, working with Thompson encountered conflicts when he asked for revisions to Thompson's views. At that time he did not understand the deep animosity Thompson held toward Frost. They released Thompson's Selected letters of Robert Frost in 1964, a book Burnshaw had striven to "cleanse...of the worst of its biases: but with rather small success." Because Leon Edel's Saturday Review article raised some editorial points, Thompson blamed Burnshaw for "Edel's hostile review" (Burnshaw 217).

Thus Louise Waller became Thompson's editor at Holt for the forthcoming Volume one of the biography. In a letter to Burnshaw she listed many instances of "Larry's jealousy of Frost" and "his competitiveness with Frost that influenced his writing." She spoke of her efforts to "neutralize his interpretations of the poet's character and his background...[and] warned him many times to delete negative interpretations that were obviously unwarranted or arbitrary." These sessions caused "stormy reactions" even into their work on Volume Two. Her conclusion—"By the time my labors were over, I was thoroughly sick of Larry's tantrums and of Larry himself" (Burnshaw 218).

Finally, Holt publishers, despite others' protests, chose an untrained woman to "traffic" books through to publication, especially Volume Two. Burnshaw's analysis:

By the time she was given the manuscript, Thompson's stature, because of the wide attention won by Selected Letters and The Early Years well might have made an inexperienced editor hesitate to go 'all out' as Louise Waller had done for Volume One. And to judge from The Years of Triumph as published—the only means that we have—she failed to 'edit out' the portrayal of Frost that made the 'monster-myth' possible" (218). Two damaging reviews in The New York Times Book Review, especially one by Helen Vendler, led many readers to accept her proclamation that Frost was "a monster of egotism" who left behind him a wake of destroyed human lives" (quoted by Burnshaw 219). Despite the fact that Lesley Frost had a current book, New England Child, paying tribute to both her parents, Vendler ignored it. It appeared that Thompson, Holt's editor, the Times Book Review editor and critics all combined to create the "monster myth." A year later, two reprints, and the Pulitzer Prize reinforced its effects (Burnshaw 220).

Before Thompson's death in 1973, after a long illness of malignant brain tumor, he had tapped Roy Winnick to complete Volume Three. Before it was published three years later, Winnick had had Carlos Baker, Edward Connery Latham, Hyde Cox, and Kay and Ted Morrison read the manuscript. He tried to keep the volume as Thompson would have wanted it, but this created great personal difficulty for him. He explained:

I wanted only to be a conduit, an alter ego for Thompson. Not his successor as biographer—My perception of Frost was so much less extreme than Larry's as set
forth in his conversation notebooks and in his comments to me that I had to temper Larry's verbally expressed and written but off-the-record sense of Frost with my own—and with the sense of Frost as a somewhat mellower and more attractive individual (224).

Winnick suffered from the reviewers as well. The Times Book Review's David Bromwich “reinforced Vendler's 'monster' distortion of Frost.” In spite of many horrified protests from Frost followers that filled five columns of print, the paper never acknowledged or printed Winnick's facts send to refute the Bromwich review. Winnick reminded Harvey Shapiro, the editor,

Frost was no saint (he never claimed to be) but neither was he, as misreaders of the Thompson biography have claimed—a monster. Frost was a complex, contradictory man, at times worth hating (as few did who knew him), at times worth loving (as many did who knew him), but always only too human in his response to experience (quoted by Burnshaw 226-27).

Thus ten years after Volume Three Burnshaw's Robert Frost Himself concentrates on Thompson and his notes. Thompson's notes at the Alderman Library of the University of Virginia were opened to the public in 1980 amid some fascinating discoveries. With nearly 2000 pages of text (from 1-1862) to confront, Robert Huyll of the Manuscript Department and Burnshaw discovered that pages 966-1424 of the Notes could not be found. That these missing pages existed cannot be doubted because of index listings to specific items on pages within numbers (227).

Although a fourth of the pages are missing, the remainder of the notes offers facts critics cannot ignore. Burnshaw lists example after example of items from the notes—then juxtaposes the passage Thompson wrote in Volumes I and II.

That some of the poet's acts and words would incite Thompson to seize every negative word he could to assuage his hurt, anger, horror, or blackening hope, should surprise no reader, once the unhealable break had occurred, once the biographer feared he had failed to live up to the poet's faith, once he apparently saw he no longer could cope with the powers his subject possessed. Since the official Frost biography had become his raison d'être, the dread of being dismissed forced him to act with a desperation fueled by fear—and more.

Burnshaw shows how Thompson strove to understand this man whom he decided was psychotic. After reading Horney's Neurosis and Human Growth: The Struggle Toward Self-Realization (1950), Thompson felt he had found the key to Frost and devotes almost 100 pages to summarizing his "discovery of a kinship between my approach to Frost's psychodynamics and Horney's." As a consequence, the picture of Frost that his volumes gave to the world led, with the aid of reviewers, to the monster-myth (229). As Sheehy astutely observed, "Thompson lost, as he had often feared, the sense of perspective necessary to either analyst or biographer" (409).

Burnshaw's revelations fill almost a hundred pages of examples of differences from Thompson's Notes and the written record plus perceptions of associates/friends often present at the same event. He treats Frost as a person, a poet, a public performer, a parent, a conversationalist, a humorist. He even chronicles every major writer of book or
essay with their views of Frost and his complexities. From all these and his diligent research he makes the following conclusions:

Thompson’s unresolved problem—to understand this man of elusive complexities—grew larger with time as his strivings became less rewarding. The wall between them thickened. The poet’s faith in his young devotee turned into doubt, distrust, suspicion, fear and a cry for ‘protection.’ The biographer—restless and unsure—reached out in all directions, ever in hope of seizing the key to the artist’s person. He could never succeed, blocked as he was by a deepening dislike and a need (conscious or not) for assuaging frustrations by resorting to a highly respectable mode of retaliation: ‘telling all in the name of scholarly truth’ (232).

One stunning example will suffice to show Burnshaw’s careful attention. He admits that Thompson’s work is “totally dependable in stating that John F. Kennedy was inaugurated January 20, 1961;—[Thompson] is totally dependable in declaring to me that Frost had intended to steal the show from the President and ‘had it planned from the start—everything.’” Here is a clear example of the line “between factual truths and events refracted through the mind of the recorder—which is to say the biased interpretation that typifies Thompson’s biography. The work as a whole sets forth an unmistakably hostile image of Frost as a person” (233).

William Prichard’s 1984 book turned the tide of criticism for some, including Helen Vendler, the reviewer who in 1970 had launched the monster myth. She not only changed her mind but declared that she would send readers to Prichard’s Frost: A Literary Life Reconsidered since “the poet’s humor, mischief, irony, teasing, and playfulness are all happily rendered” as well as the “damning account of Thompson” she finds convincing (quoted by Burnshaw 234). A widespread myth about someone famous dies hard; the more demeaning it is, the longer it tends to survive. But with the excellent sourcebook Stanley Burnshaw had provided as the capstone to his own most distinguished career in American letters, Frost is beginning to emerge in a new light. He himself was shrewdly aware of the problems he presented to biographers and probably said it best in A Masque of Mercy—"they understand me wrong." As a life-long admirer of Frost, this writer is convinced that Stanley Burnshaw has dealt deadly blows that may yet slay the “monster myth.”
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BIRTHDAY PARTY

by Wayne Alford

Time: 1936, a Saturday morning in early spring. Place: The ANDERSON house in Monroe, a sleepy little farm town in south-central Mississippi. As lights rise, WILLIAM, a blond, blue-eyed lad of five years, enters UC through a screened door onto a wide porch, crosses DC, and sits on the front steps. Appearing dreamy-eyed and a bit bored, he digs an elbow into each knee and supports his chin with the heels of his hands.

WILLIAM. (With a sigh) Nothing to do! I want something to do! (as WINFRED, his eight-year-old sister, bursts through the screened door. She is slender, and a pretty brunette.)

WINFRED. William, Mama says today is your birthday!

WILLIAM. (Surprised) It is? How old am I, Winfred?

WINFRED. Mama says you're five years old at four-thirty this afternoon.

WILLIAM. (Jumping to his feet) Oh boy! I want a birthday party, and presents, and a cake!

WINFRED. Mama says we can't afford a big birthday party, with people and all, but she is going to make a cake and Daddy's going to turn a freezer of ice cream—and (whispering), don't let her know I told you, but I think she's got you a present, too!

WILLIAM. Oh boy! Winnie, will you sing “Happy Birthday” to me?

WINFRED. (Hugging him) We'll all sing “Happy Birthday” to you, honey—Daddy, Mother, Frank, and me.

WILLIAM. Bobby can't sing, Winnie!

WINFRED. No, Bobby's only two months old.

WILLIAM. All he can do is cry. Say, Winnie (whispering), tell me what the present is!

WINFRED. No, I can't do that. You'll have to wait for the party.

WILLIAM. But I won't be five years old 'til four-thirty this afternoon. Gol-lee, Winnie, that's a long time to wait!

WINFRED. You'll have to do it anyway. (Tripping down the steps) Mama says I can go over to Willie Mae's for a while. She said don't you leave the yard, though (exits R).

WILLIAM. (Dejected) Shucks! I don't see why I have to— (as FRANK, a handsome, dark-haired ten-year-old appears through the door).
FRANK. Hey William, how does it feel to be five years old?

WILLIAM. (No longer in the mood) I'll let you know at four-thirty. (As FRANK lumbers down the steps) Where you going, Frank?

FRANK. Down to the creek to catch frogs with Pete Fowler.

WILLIAM. (Brightening) Hey, Frank, can I go? —I'll keep up! Ask Mama!

FRANK. Naw, you'll just get in the way. Besides, you know Mama and Daddy don't like for you to leave the yard. (exits R).

WILLIAM. Don't leave the yard, don't leave the yard! Five years old, and I still can't leave the yard. Winnie's eight and she can go over to Willie Mae's Frank's ten and he can chase frogs down at the creek. I'm five and I can only go out in my own yard. (Sighing) Gosh, I'll be glad when I get big enough to go to school, and go down to the creek, and to the cotton gin and watch 'em make cotton bales, and put pennies on the railroad track and watch the Panama Limited flatten them. (Another sigh) There's lots of ways to have fun when you get old enough. But it sure takes a long time to grow up in the real world. (With a sigh) It sure does (as Mrs. Wilodene Anderson, an attractive woman of thirty, purse in hand, rushes through the door and down the steps.)

MRS. ANDERSON. (Pausing, hugging WILLIAM) Happy birthday, darling. Mother's going to have to run down to the telephone exchange and work the rest of Mrs. Cruise's shift—she got sick at her stomach and had to go home. You be a good boy and play here in the yard and I'll be back in time to fix dinner. The baby's asleep, and Daddy's out back repairing the fence, if you need him. We're going to have cake and ice cream for your birthday later on. Now, you behave yourself, hear?

WILLIAM. Mama, can't I go with you? I'll be good! I'll just stand by the fire escape rail at the end of your hall and watch the train grab the mail ag when it comes by.

MRS. ANDERSON. Not this time, William, I don't have time to watch you, and I've told you over and over—that fire escape rail on the third floor is too high to leave you out there alone. Goodbye now, I'm in a hurry.

WILLIAM. Goodbye, Mama. (Calling after her) Wave at me when you get to the top of the fire escape. (He watches for his mother, waves to her, then, hands in pockets, he saunters around in front of the steps for a minute, kicking at the ground; brightens, as he sees his friend, DENNIS GRAHAM, coming down the street at L.)

DENNIS. (Entering L) Hey, William, whatcha doing?

WILLIAM. Hey, Dennis. Nothing. What're you doing?

DENNIS. Nothing.

WILLIAM. Well, do you want to do something?
DENNIS. What can we do?

WILLIAM. I don't know. Let's sit on the steps and try to think of something. It sure is a lonesome day, isn't it?

DENNIS. sure is (as they sit).

WILLIAM. (Matter-of-factly) Today's my birthday.

DENNIS. Are you five, yet?

WILLIAM. At four-thirty today.

DENNIS. (With a touch of sophistication) Yeah, I can remember when I was five.

WILLIAM. You can? When was that?

DENNIS. Seventeen days ago.

WILLIAM. Wow!

DENNIS. One more year and we'll be going to school.

WILLIAM. What do you reckon we'll do in school, Dennis?

DENNIS. Oh, I can tell you all about that. We'll have to study.

WILLIAM. Study?

DENNIS. Yeah—study how to read, and write, and study what one plus one is, and —

WILLIAM. (Brightening) Oh, I already know what one plus one is—

DENNIS. It's two.

WILLIAM. (Disappointed) Yeah, two.

DENNIS. (Proudly) And I can spell "Dick" and "Jane" and "Spot," and I can write my name!

WILLIAM. Gosh, Dennis, you know a lot!

DENNIS. And that's just in the first grade. In the second grade you learn what two plus two is, in the third grade what three plus three is, in the fourth—

WILLIAM. Why, you don't even have to go to school, Dennis—you already know all there is to know in all the grades! How did you get that smart?
DENNIS. Well, I've got one brother in the first grade, and one in the second grade, and one in the third grade—

WILLIAM. Gosh, a'mighty!

DENNIS. —and a sister in the fourth grade, and—

WILLIAM. How many brothers and sisters do you have?

DENNIS. Ten, I think (counting on his fingers) —besides me. They go right on up to high school.

WILLIAM. Wow! Are you Catholic, Dennis?

DENNIS. (Puzzled) What's Catholic?

WILLIAM. You know—the people who go to the Catholic Church. Daddy says they always have a lot of children.

DENNIS. Don't reckon we are. We don't go to church at all.

WILLIAM. We go to the Baptist church.

DENNIS. How many children do Baptists have?

WILLIAM. Well—I guess just four. That's all Mama and Daddy have.

DENNIS. Gee, I wish we had been Baptists. Then maybe we's have enough of everything at our house to go around.

WILLIAM. (After a few moments of silence) Dennis, do you see that fire escape on the side of the telephone exchange down the street there? (pointing). I can walk all the way up to the top and lean out over the rail.

DENNIS. Aww—you can't, neither. You'd fall and kill yourself!

WILLIAM. No, sure 'nuff. I've done it before. My mother works up there and I've done it a hundred times.

DENNIS. I don't believe you!

WILLIAM. Betcha my pocket knife I can (produces the knife from his pocket).

DENNIS. (Brightening) All right! If you can, I'll give you my baseball glove.

WILLIAM. Stand here and watch me. I'll wave to you when I get to the top.

DENNIS. (As WILLIAM exits R) Go ahead. (He watches for a few moments, then, astonished) He did it! He's leaning out over the rail! William, don't you fall! (At that
moment, Mr. HIRAM ANDERSON, tall, curly-haired and in his early thirties, comes onto the porch.)

MR. ANDERSON. (Calling) William? Oh—Dennis, have you seen William?

DENNIS. Yes sir. He’s on the fire escape up there (pointing R) —See!

MR. ANDERSON. William! Get down off of that—Oh, my God—he’s falling!! (He dashes off R. as DENNIS stares in disbelief. ANDERSON returns momentarily with WILLIAM’S lifeless form in his arms. Dennis! Run down and get Dr. McDonald—quick! (DENNIS scampers off) I’ve got to call Wilodene (carrying WILLIAM into the house. A few seconds later, DENNIS reappears with DR. MCDONALD, who hurries into the house. DENNIS waits outside.)

DENNIS. (Walks around for a while, then sits on the steps, half to himself) I’m sorry you fell, William.

MRS. ANDERSON. (Rushing in from R) Oh mercy! —Lord O’ mercy! (Shooting past DENNIS into the house.)

DENNIS. (Walks some more, sits again) Please don’t die, William (begins to cry).

DR. MCDONALD. (Appearing at the door with MR. ANDERSON) Whew! That was a close one, Hiram.

MR. ANDERSON. Thank God, He’s O.K.

DR. MCDONALD. The fall knocked him out, but he’s come around now, and he’ll be all right in a day or two. Give him a spoonful of that tonic a couple of times a day and don’t let him sleep too much during the daylight hours. (Noticing DENNIS, stooping to him) He’s going to be fine, Dennis.

MR. ANDERSON. What was he doing on that fire escape, Dennis? I’ve told him a thousand times—

DR. MCDONALD. (Clearing his throat) Not now, Hiram. (To DENNIS) Why don’t you run on home, Dennis. Maybe you can come back this afternoon and see William after he’s rested a while.

DENNIS. Thank you, sir. (Happily I’m sure glad he’s O.K. (Runs off L. Lights begin to dim very gradually to signify passage of several hours. As they slowly rise again, DENNIS re-enters L, with his baseball glove. MR. ANDERSON stands on the porch, smoking a cigarette.) Hello, Mr. Anderson. Can I come and see William, now? I have something for him! (showing him the baseball glove.)

MR. ANDERSON. Oh—a birthday present? —Sure, son, come on in and have some ice cream and cake. (Blackout)
THOUGHTS ON NURSING AND CARING:
SANTA FILOMENA INDUCTION SERVICE

by Nancy E. Dayton

Those of you in this room are identified as leaders in nursing. You are the individuals who will help nursing move forward into the next century, and I hope will help nursing achieve a more dynamic and independent role in the health care system.

Nursing is facing new challenges and new opportunities, but it can achieve great things if we persevere. Union’s “bulldog spirit” should help with this tenacity.

In health care ethics and other nursing courses students consistently identify “caring” as a characteristic of an ideal nurse. If nurses value this concept it will guide their actions. Nurses will demonstrate caring for nursing as a profession, caring for people in many settings, caring for the ecology, and caring for the planet. We need to keep caring in our focus, lest we provide impersonal technical care that serves to repair the body, but not the spirit or the soul of those served (Kelly 1988).

Nursing relates to three H’s that I feel are important in the context of caring. Nurses need to use their heads, their hands, and their hearts.

A nurse should have a good and honest heart. Nurses should try to keep the ideals of nursing near their hearts, for a nurse’s heart provides his or her life force. It stimulates both passion and compassion. People care with their hearts. Some emphasize that nurses need steadfast and obedient hearts. I hope we are steadfast and obedient to our Lord and Savior and to the best nursing can be. I hope we have the life force and the passion to change things for the better.

A nurse needs an open, sensitive, warm, supportive, comforting, and compassionate heart. There are nurses who don’t nurse with their hearts. They may give skilled, knowledgeable, safe care. They may no longer care because of stress, emotional pain, fear, and many other reasons. As for me, if I get sick I want a nurse with a genuine heart who will care for me as an individual. I want to be a nurse with a loving heart who will care for those I serve.

Nurses need to have skilled and competent hands. Nurses use their hand to care, to soothe, to heal, to comfort, to nurture, and to hold. Nurses need to be skillful and use their hands to give care to their patients. Nurses need to use their hands with technical skill: effecting the technology and equipment that improves health care.

Nurses need to use their hands to care for others, but they also need to use their hands to receive payment that reflects their worth. Nurses may never be paid what they are worth; but I feel there will be more equity in income as nurses identify what it is they do that makes a difference and become assertive in asking for the rewards that are deserved. While service is important, it is also important to value what we do enough to be compensated in amounts reflecting this worth.
Nurses need to use their hands to document what it is they do. They need to write about what it is they do. They need to research what it is they do.

We all know nurses who have rough, indifferent hands and we all know new graduates need time to develop skilled hands. Experienced nurses need to use their hand to reach out to each other to grow and to help new nurses and nursing develop. Nurses need to embrace each other as colleagues and help each other feel surrounded by care and support.

Nurses need to use their heads in a way that reflects more than good intentions and warm regards. They need to use their intellect to improve to nursing's knowledge, practice, and skills. Nurses need to use their heads to analyze nursing's worth, actions, and knowledge. They need to look at situations honestly and to problem solve analytically as well as creatively. They need to use their minds, their courage, their integrity, their emotions, and their heads to the best of their ability. Please note I did not say perfectly. The only thing striving for perfection does is guarantee failure. This is not to say one shouldn't do the best he or she is capable of, but it is important to realize the greatest growth often follows failure. Many of the leaders in nursing have only succeeded after initial failures. Florence Nightingale sat on the dock in Crimea before she was able to achieve her mission. Margaret Sanger, a nurse who made a tremendous impact on the lives of women and families, was jailed many times before her goals became reality.

Nurses need to use their heads to research solutions to problems. They need to use their heads to deal with others in direct, honest, genuine, and assertive manner. Nurses need to use their heads to recognize and acknowledge the worth of nursing.

It is also important to look at the physical characteristics of one's head. People have two ears to hear and to listen. People have two eyes to see and perceive. People have only one mouth. One should remember to use them in the ration God gave them to us.

We also need to care for our spirits and souls. Nursing is arduous and difficult. Nurses deal with pain, suffering, growth, death, sorrow, birth, and joy. We need to pray for His guidance, direction, and for His will to be done in our lives.

Faith can ease our burdens and give us strength and optimism. One thought as I read and prepared for this talk is that "Today is yours and mine and the only one we have. We are here to play it. It needs to be action—not whining. It should be part of love, not cynicism. It is to express love in terms of human helpfulness" (Jordan in Lytle 1948). We must stop whining about the problems in nursing. We need to focus on the promise, instead of all the problems.

I want to challenge you to use your skills holistically. Nurses need alternating rhythms, flexibility, and adaptability. Nurses need to have self-confidence and respect for themselves as well as others. Nurses need to have the humility and wisdom to accept their own limitations while retaining the courage and self confidence necessary to take risks. Nurses need to have hope not based on wishful thinking and unfounded expectations, but in something worthy of total commitment.
We need to examine the technology and the regulations in health care to prevent hospitals from becoming "no care" technical institutions. Today more than ever it is vital to rethink the purpose of nursing, man, existence and keep "caring" as an essential part of our purpose. I congratulate you on your scholarship, leadership, and commitment to the purposes of nursing scholarship and Santa Filomena. I'd like to share a poem celebrating your achievement.

What Is Success?

To laugh often and love much;
To win the respect of intelligent persons and the affection of children;
To earn the approval of honest critics and endure the betrayal of false friends;
To appreciate beauty;
To find the best in others;
To give of one's self without the slightest thought of return;
To have accomplished a task, whether by a healthy child, a rescued soul, a garden patch or a redeemed social condition;
To have played and laughed with enthusiasm and sung with exaltation;
To know that even one life has breathed easier because you have lived;
This is to have succeeded.

Anonymous
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ODE: ON THE COMMISSIONING OF THE TRIDENT CLASS SUBMARINE USS TENNESSEE, 17 DECEMBER 1988

by Bobby Rogers

Behold, he cometh with clouds...

God keep us and forgive us as we praise those who defend the land. We will put them to sea in the vessel we here commission, resting before us with the beauty of final objects. We will command them bury themselves and their introspections below atmospheres of black water, bearing this Indian name downward and hiding it. We were not born for the world as it is, its awakenings, the appraisals from conscious nights, the leaching endurance of a peace wilted under the patient disorganizing of history. It has come upon us too fast, this balance and the lengths we must go to, the cause for this ship.

Her namesake is a piece of country, three topographies marcated narrow and straight as a cooling board. This land has always given up willingly those who tend her, given them to the furied letting of others' fights; she is unjealous, but like a promise must be said and kept. The man who kills without remembrance or outlay of love is twice damned.

The last boat christened Tennessee was raised after her wounding to sail valiantly back into the storm. But there will be no more returning. In this cold day we witness the breaking, the banners torn loose into the bitter wind. No patriotism can go unchecked; it kills sure as the winter, spillingly as only hands can.

We have always been able to end the world and have done so, many times; we have moved entire nations. Stand warned: our destiny is now exhausted. We require grace and a hearing of our cacophonous prayers. Save us from our own sure hand.

Memory is a deed to property, but a contestable one: this land is stolen; all we have is stolen. We should count ourselves favored to have possessed it so long, to become possession
in return. The river, after us, will still speak
and turn north, continuing its relenting descent.

We must elevate them, those who die in a cause larger
than our individual wantings. But there is no more
turkey call and gunshot—to return at all is to be a hero,
to be raised from this dark watch so deep
and to feel again the sun which only appears to drown
in its moment of setting, far off into the sea

and without sound. We must be renewed
before we can lay these arms aside. But how
to summon this transfiguration and begin
a new vigilance? And how to let it last?
In peace we must pray
for a safer nighttime to surround us.

★★★

There is a pattern in the hooked rug still discernible
after years of troubled footsteps, the room
where your forbear waited, finding her memories
strange to this world as the iris, swooned with regret
for splitting the bulb, arisen
in its rash expending of beauty.
ROGER WILLIAMS AND THE QUAKER DISPUTATIONS

by Frank J. Lower

Relatively little attention has been given to the disputation between Roger Williams and the three Quaker ministers, John Stubbs, John Burnyeat, and William Edmunson, in Rhode Island during four days in August of 1672. In fact, only brief attention has been given to the whole subject of disputation in the professional literature. One possible reason for this situation may be the dearth of information available regarding this early form of debate. In spite of the short supply of information regarding disputation, there is available one account of an early disputation which took place on American soil, that between Roger Williams and the Quakers.

The purpose of this paper is two-fold: First, to present a brief description of the typical Cambridge disputation of the Seventeenth Century, which served as a model for the Williams-Quaker disputation. Second, to compare the Williams-Quaker disputation with the Cambridge model. Because of the dual purpose and the limited space available for this study, we shall deal with three representative propositions out of the 14 offered.

The Cambridge Disputations

The education of the Seventeenth-Century Cambridge student consisted of two basic areas: attending lectures in certain specified subjects, and participating in scholastic disputation. While this type of study was required of all students, it was especially applicable to the training of ministers. Mark H. Curtis reveals that, "In the middle of Elizabeth's reign the Puritan leaders singled out the programme of studies which Chaderton used for special endorsement. He emphasized two kinds of training in particular: study of the Bible and disputation." Disputation was required because it would develop the student's skill in defending the truth and confuting error. Although Bible study and disputation were the two major areas of study, the divinity student was also expected to receive training in the art of rhetoric because this would enable him to "discern proper speeches from those that are tropical and figurative." By the time the young divinity student presented himself for ordination he could demonstrate competence in his subject because of his intensive biblical studies, in his expression due to his rhetorical training, and in his discernment of truth and falsehood as a consequence of his practice in disputation.

The disputation were of two types: private and public. William T. Costello explains that the private disputation were held in the colleges, while the public disputation were held before the whole school or before visiting dignitaries and guests. In modern terms, this means that the private disputation were classroom or department debates with only the faculty and students in that particular area in attendance, whereas the public disputation were open to anyone who was interested. A common use of the disputation was as a showcase for the accomplishments of the University when the Monarch or some other influential person would visit the campus.
The basic procedure used in presenting a disputation is described by Curtis:

A complete performance had three separate stages. A participant, called the respondent, first offered an answer or interpretation of the question and advanced arguments to support it. Next, an opponent, or opponents, for there usually were more than one, stating contradictory propositions and attacking flaws in the respondent’s reasoning, replied to him. The final act was determination. The moderator, or determiner, who presided over the disputation, summed up the arguments pro and con, pointed out fallacies in the reasoning of the participants, called attention to treatments of the question that had been overlooked or insufficiently emphasized, reconciled differences where possible, bestowed praise and blame where each was due, and handed down the decision or 'determination' of the question. ¹⁰

While there were certain requirements expected to be met in a typical disputation, there could be many variations of this basic approach.

Costello provides a detailed account of the order of the proceedings in a typical public disputation held at Cambridge University during this time.

1. The disputants would greet and bow to each other.
2. The moderator offered a prayer.
3. The moderator would make a short introductory speech, to provide an elucidation of the question under dispute.
4. The Father, or academic patron, would make a short speech on the respondent’s behalf.
5. The respondent then provided a brief statement on the side of the question he intended to defend.
6. During the respondent’s statement, copies of the verses were distributed. The verses were intended to provide a literary introduction to the question. An example of the manner of these verses may be found in Milton’s “That Nature is Not Subject to Old Age.”
7. The Father would then briefly dispute with the respondent’s opening statement. The purpose of this being to help put the respondent at ease and prepare him for the real battle of intellect which was to come.
8. The respondent answered the Father’s points, and defended his thesis. This is the beginning of the real disputation.
9. The first opponent disputes the arguments.
10. From this point on each speaker or side is given equal time to develop the arguments and responses necessary for his side. Usually several opponents confronted the respondent and each opponent would have an opportunity to present his arguments with the respondent given the time to answer each opponent.
11. The moderator or determiner would review the disputation. ¹¹

The evidence indicates that the normal disputation involved two theses or propositions. ¹² Bromley Smith reports that during Queen Elizabeth’s visit to Cambridge in 1564 the disputants argued two propositions with the dispute consuming five hours. ¹³
This must have been a very special occasion, since Costello reveals that the ordinary session lasted for four hours and covered either two or three theses.  

In spite of the great deal of "pomp and circumstance" surrounding the disputation, the real heart of the matter was found in the logical thrusts and parries between the respondent and the opponents. Costello points out that:

In every case, the opponent follows a carefully plotted line of syllogisms designed to trap the answerer into a position where he may be logically forced, step by step, into admitting the exact opposite of his thesis. The syllogistic presentation is mandatory..."  

The Williams-Quaker Disputation

Now that we have a basic understanding of the structure and content of the typical Cambridge disputation, we can proceed to examine our specific case, the Williams-Quaker Disputation. Roger Williams had a firm grounding in disputation which can be established from two areas of evidence. First, he was enrolled in Cambridge during the Seventeenth Century. John Ward Dean points out that the famous English lawyer, Sir Edward Coke, persuaded Roger's parents to grant Coke the tutelage of Master Williams. The intention was for Roger to study law, but this did not interest him so he turned his attention to divinity in which he exhibited such a proficiency that Coke helped him get orders to enter Cambridge to study for the ministry.  

It is clear that Williams must have been trained in disputation while he attended Cambridge. The second evidence of his knowledge of disputation comes from the fact that he was trained for the ministry and that education, as earlier indicated, included the study and practice of disputation.

The only account of what actually took place at the disputation is the record that Williams wrote from memory after the debates had been concluded. Since the Williams account was published from memory some time after the actual event, we cannot be certain of its accuracy. Williams states that he was unable to secure anyone to make a shorthand transcription and so was forced to rely on his memory. However, it is interesting to note that George Fox and John Burneyat in writing their responses to Williams' *George Fox Digg'd Out of his Burrowes* do not disagree with Williams' description of the disputation, they merely publish their responses to his arguments.

Williams wanted the civil authorities to ensure the orderly dispensation of the disputation and accordingly notified both the Governor of the Colony and the Quaker Congregation of his offer. The offer of disputation contained four basic rules:

1. that he be given three days notice of their acceptance before the disputation should commence.
2. That the conference should run from nine in the morning until three in the afternoon without interruption.
3. Should any of the seven propositions remain unresolved after the day's proceedings, they should continue in the same place the next day.
4. The disputants should have the liberty to speak uninterrupted as long as they please on each proposition, but should then grant the opposition the same liberty.
The third rule was included as a safeguard lest the conference should not proceed as Williams had planned—that seven propositions be debated at Newport on the first day and the remaining seven at Providence a few days later. Williams then listed the fourteen propositions; but for purposes of this study we shall examine only three of them.

1. That the people called Quakers are not true Quakers according to the holy Scripture.
2. That the Christ they profess is not the true Lord Jesus Christ.
3. All that their religion requires (external and internal) to make converts and proselytes, amounts to no more than what a reprobate may easily attain unto and perform. 20

The offer of disputation demonstrates a basic foundation in the Cambridge disputation form. The main ingredient that is missing is the provision for a moderator or determiner. Williams seems to have felt that by notifying the Governor and having him make the arrangements for the disputation, the civil authority would be responsible for maintaining order at the conference. As far as the determiner is concerned, Williams was perfectly willing to let the audience serve in that capacity; he makes several references to his desire to turn their souls toward a proper consideration of the scriptures. 21

The second means of comparison is in terms of the propositions. Costello provides three sample propositions that were used at Cambridge: “the production of the rational soul involves a new creation, the origin of well-water is the sea, and an hereditary monarchy is better than an elective one.” 22 The first Williams proposition seems to basically agree with the models, but most of the other propositions were direct attacks on the Quakers rather than issues to be resolved. The second proposition clearly falls into the category of an attack. Such questions do not lead to logical discussions but merely defensiveness and counter-attacks. Another problem with the propositions can be seen in the ninth proposition regarding the nature of conversion. This statement begs the question. Williams is accusing the Quakers of not using the proper means to require salvation, when the proper issue concerns a determination of the proper manner according to the scriptures. At least Williams should have phrased the proposition in an affirmative manner in which he defends his method of salvation rather than attacking theirs. The Quakers viewed all of the propositions as attacks on them and consequently responded to all the propositions accordingly, even though, as has been indicated, at least the first statement was in keeping with the Cambridge model. For this reason the Quakers never responded in the syllogistic form expected.

We have a better opportunity to appraise the correlation between this debate and the Cambridge disquisitions when we examine what actually took place. Since there was no moderator present, Williams provided the introduction to the disputation himself. The reasons he gave for having requested the disputation were: (1) the vindication of God’s name, which he perceived as being trodden in the dirt by Satan, (2) the vindication of the Colony for receiving such persons whom others would not, and (3) the hope that this exercise might bring about some “soul consideration in many.” 23 The introduction ended in a brief prayer.

Following the prayer Williams read the first proposition, which the Quaker ministers read aloud with him. The entire day of August 9, 1672, was occupied with the disputing of this first proposition. The reason Williams gives for spending the whole day on only the
first proposition is that the Quakers and many members of the audience would not refrain from interruption, primarily of Williams, but to some extent of the Quakers as well.

The audience was composed of supporters for both sides. The interruptions became so bad that at one point Williams complained that he had assumed the Quakers would have the civility and ingenuity to perceive that his offer of disputation meant that he would be willing to dispute them one at a time rather than all together. Still the interruptions continued to such an extent that finally Deputy Governor Cranston, who was a Quaker, was moved to request that the Quaker ministers allow Williams to complete his argument before they responded.

When one sifts through the interruptions and the personal comments Williams provided about the situation, there are three main points which emerge as support for the first contention. Williams argues that the Quakers are not true Quakers according to the scripture because:

1. The name Quaker was given to this group of people in derision, and they themselves to not claim it.
2. The manner of quakings and shakings which these people exhibit are not the same as those quakings and tremblings recorded in the scripture.
3. George Fox and the Quakers contend that their "inner light" was given to man by God even before the scriptures and therefore they will not be judged by the scriptures but rather judge the scriptures themselves.

The disputation between Roger Williams and the three Quaker ministers was clearly not in keeping with the traditional Cambridge disquisitions with which Williams had been familiar and which had most likely served as the model for this challenge. There are three primary reasons for the failure of the first day's disputation to achieve the goal: (1) the Quaker's view of the propositions as attacks; (2) the extent of the interruptions, which prevented the development of clear syllogistic reasoning which was required of the disputation; (3) the fact that in structuring their comments neither side presented the closely reasoned syllogisms that were a required part of the Cambridge disquisitions.

The first two reasons have been discussed earlier and the remainder of this analysis will focus on the failure to present closely reasoned syllogisms as proof of the proposition. While this failing is evident on the part of both sides, it is clearly the first responsibility of Williams, since he took the position of Respondent and was required to first prove his contentions. To the extent that the Quakers' attitude was not conducive to syllogistic reasoning Williams must again be given the majority of the blame since he worded the propositions and it was the wording which first put the Quakers in a defensive position.

The first argument Williams advanced was an historical recounting of how the Quakers came by that name. It contained no scriptural references as the proposition itself demanded. Further, it was merely presented as historical narrative with no effort being made to develop the point syllogistically. The second argument purported to get to the heart of the matter, but in actual fact it consisted of Williams' assertions that certain examples from the scripture (Paul, Titus, David, and Moses) were not the same kind of quaking and trembling that was exhibited by the Quakers. Not once on this argument did Williams either quote directly the passages from which his examples were taken, or cite other passages that could be correlated to these examples. The third argument offered in
proof of the proposition started with the quotation of Isaiah 66, “To this man will I look that is poor and contrite, and trembleth at my Word.” It is in connection with this line of reasoning that Williams comes closest to following the syllogistic form. He contends that the Quakers by their own writings (he uses a quotation from an early book by George Fox) hold themselves above the scriptures because of their “inner light” and thus do not tremble at God’s Word and therefore cannot come within the purview of the prophet’s statement that God will look to (or receive) this man that accepts His Word. However, instead of providing the logical extension of this argument, Williams turns to an attempt to establish a correlation between the Quakers and the Pope. They are the same, he says, because the Pope has his infallibility and the Quakers have their “inner light” both of which are the same thing. Then in enthymemic fashion he concludes that neither the Quakers nor the Pope are Christians. The problem is two-fold: first, he does not provide the necessary reasoning, if it in fact exists, that having either infallibility or an inner light are un-Christ-like features; and secondly, by this argument Williams has shifted from the first proposition into the second, yet the disputation for this entire day was the first proposition.

Finally, the Williams-Quaker disputation does not compare favorably with the Cambridge model because of the continuous and unrelenting use of personal attacks rather than carefully structured arguments. Both sides of the dispute tended to dismiss everything the other side had argued with the statement “that is a lye” or “that constitutes blasphemy.” Williams was certainly proficient in this particular skill, but in the contest of name calling, he met his match in the Quakers.

Conclusion.

The most basic element that was expected in the Cambridge disputation was that the contestants adhere to a policy of carefully structured syllogisms in presenting their arguments. The most glaring shortcoming of the Williams-Quaker disputation is in this most basic requirement. Certainly, Roger Williams must carry a large share of the burden for this shortcoming, since he knew what was expected and failed to produce. He phrased the propositions, and had the experience to know what a proper proposition consisted of; yet he did not phrase most of these propositions correctly. The numerous interruptions did not aid him in presenting syllogistic reasoning; yet, he had ample opportunity at the very beginning of the disputation to begin presenting his arguments in syllogistic form and did not do so. One thing is very clear from this experience: no disputation or debate can be successful if one or both of the parties refuse to follow the rules prescribed for that activity.

NOTES

1. Williams’ biographers do include a discussion of the debates, but most prefer to treat it briefly because they do not view it as one of his most favorable episodes. See particularly, Henry Chupack, Roger Williams (New York: Twayne, 1967) 133-144; Perry Miller, Roger Williams; His contribution to the American Tradition, (Boston: Bobbs-Merril, 1953) 240-253; May Emery Hall, Roger Williams (Boston: the Pilgrim Press, 1917) 156-168; and Emily Easton, Roger Williams, Prophet and Pioneer (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1930) 355-358.
2. The only discussion of this debate I could locate in the professional journals was Leon R. Camp, “Roger Williams; Rhetoric or Ranting,” Today’s Speech, 12 (Sept., 1964) 21-22, 30. A reference to the debate is given in Ronald Lee Cobb, “George Fox and the Quaker-Baptist Controversy,” Foundations, 14 (July-Sept., 1971) 236-239. On the general subject of disputations, only one article appears in the Speech Communication literature, Bromley Smith, “Queen Elizabeth at the Cambridge Disputations,” Quarterly Journal of Speech, 15 (1929) 495-503.

3. Roger Williams, The Complete Writings of Roger Williams, Vol. VI, edited by Rev. J. Lewis Diman (New York: Russell and Russell, 1963). The debate was first published by Williams under the title George Fox Digg’d out of his Burrows, or an Offer of Disputation unto G. Fox then present on Rode-Island in New-England, by R. W. (Boston: John Foster, 1676). All future references to this work will be cited as G. Fox Digg’d.


5. Curtis, p. 206

6. Curtis, p. 206

7. Curtis, p. 206


9. This was exactly the situation described by Bromley Smith, 495-503.


17. G. Fox Digg’d., introduction “To the People Called Quakers.”

18.
See George Fox and John Burnyeat, A New-England Firebrand Quenched (London: 1678).


20. Ibid., pp. 4-5.

21. See for example the third reason he gives for issuing the challenge, Ibid., p. 40.


24. Ibid., p. 56.

25. Ibid., p. 58.

26. Ibid., pp. 41-51.
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Decoding the Secret of “One, Two, Buckle My Shoe”

One, two, buckle my shoe;
Three, four, knock at the door;
Five, six, pick up sticks;
Seven, eight, lay them straight;
Nine, ten, a big, fat hen.

The anonymous writer of this clever little ditty has successfully duped the readers of the world for years. Little did we realize that under our very noses in a nursery rhyme repeated millions of times to children tucked in bed is found a secret code itself safely tucked away in a numbering scheme which hides a most diabolical message. Shades of Edgar A. Poe! It should become clear to even the casual reader that the coupling of numbers at the beginning of each line “one/two,” “three/four,” “five/six” et cetera, is an elaborate code for the names of secret agents, similar to the numbering device used by Agent 007, James Bond himself. It only remains for us to see precisely what these secret agents are up to.

First of all let’s take a look at the objects or recipients of the numerical system imbedded in the poem—there’s a shoe, a door, some sticks, and a “big fat hen.” Because the first line refers to a single “shoe” we can surmise not only that someone is walking, but he/she has only one shoe on which to limp. The number “two” is a deliberate contradiction to the singular “shoe,” a distraction to lead us away from the real meaning, a deliberate ruse. Keeping in mind that the double numbers are code names for agents, it becomes clear upon closer analysis that agent number “1-2” has stopped to buckle his shoe as a signal for agent “3-4” to knock on the correct door and not miss his assignment. Agent “5-6” must then go somewhere (a prearranged rendezvous point) and pick up sticks. But the real question is—sticks of what? Sticks of dynamite? Sticks of candy (i.e., drugs)? Or the Pick-Up-Sticks game we played as children? At any rate agent 5-6 then brings the sticks back so that agent 7-8 can lay them straight—that is, lay straight the code word S-T-I-C-K-S (an obvious acronym for Secret-Tactics-In-Case-Killing-Someone) in order to decipher the instructions.

Now comes the real clue—“the big fat hen.” It is a fairly well known fact that Mafia insiders call each other by nicknames like “Big Lip Harry,” “Pretty Boy Floyd,” “Fatso Pete,” and “Gem-em-Quick Johnson,” but it is not as well known that some Army generals are also given similar nicknames, such as The Desert Fox and Trigger-Happy Sam. Thus “Big Fat Hen” can be descriptive of (a) one rich and powerful (a “fat” hen”), (b) one huge and obese, (c) Big Bird of Sesame Street, (d) one disguised as a chicken of the female species, (e) one high in command of a mafia clan or a general of a large army. Hence, we can deduce that a huge, obese female is disguised as a hen (possibly dressed in yellow as Big Bird) and that an agent of S-T-I-C-K-S (specifically number 9-10) has been assigned to cut Big Fat Hen’s craw—which leads to the very quick conclusion that by deciphering this nursery rhyme we have uncovered a long standing CIA plot to wipe out Saddam Hussein, known in CIA lingo as “The Big Fat Hen” due both to his size and his oil riches. Please copy this virus and pass along to other computers—scan and repeat, scan and repeat, scan and repeat, scan and repeatttttttttttttttttttttttttt
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