Faculty Forum President’s Letter

It is the fate of those who toil at the lower employments of life, to be rather driven by the fear of evil, than attracted by the prospect of good; to be exposed to censure, without hope of praise; to be disgraced by miscarriage, or punished for neglect, where success would have been without applause, and diligence without reward.

— Samuel Johnson, Preface to A Dictionary of the English Language (London: 1775)

As is customary, I have been asked, in my capacity as president of the Union University Faculty Forum, to compose a letter introducing this year’s edition of the Journal of the Union Faculty Forum. Having reviewed some examples of the letters written by past Forum presidents, it seems to me that these letters serve primarily as a preface to each edition. A preface is defined by Webster’s New Collegiate Dictionary as “a preliminary statement or essay introducing a (work) that explains its scope, intention, or background,” and this appears to be the intent of the letters penned for preceding editions. It will, therefore, be my intent for this year’s “President’s Letter” as well.

I begin this letter with a quote from Johnson’s Dictionary of the English Language because I, like Johnson, find that composing an appropriate letter to serve as preface puts one in the position of being “driven by the fear of evil” rather than “attracted to the prospect of good.” What prospect have I, after all, of adding anything to this year’s Journal that can possibly do good? It seems much more likely that this letter will (at best) be roundly ignored or (at worst) might actually be seen to detract from the quality of the scholarship and creativity reflected in the Journal. At any rate, here is my attempt to provide a sound preface for this year’s Journal of the Union Faculty Forum.

As to scope, the Journal is this year, as always, an interdisciplinary and broad-scoped publication. Authors included in this year’s edition represent the disciplines of History, Christian Studies, and English, and cover a wide variety of topics.

As to intent, the Journal was created both to provide an outlet for the scholarly work of Union University faculty and to serve as a means of informing the University community of the variety of work being done across the various disciplines. Since fragmentation is one of the pernicious problems faced in the modern university, the informing/communicating function is one I believe to be especially valuable.

As to background, the history of the Faculty Forum itself, which was created over thirty years ago to provide a means of communication both between faculty and administration and within the faculty, is reflected in the history and intent of the Journal both past and present.

I ask that you join Drs. Troy Riggs (Forum Vice President) and Jeannette Russ (Forum Secretary) and me in thanking the authors for submitting their work for inclusion in the Journal. I also wish to thank Professor Roger Stanley for his willingness to serve as the Journal’s editor. Roger has been serving the Faculty Forum and the University in this capacity for some years now, and his editorial efforts and expertise should not go, in the words of Johnson quoted above, “without applause,” nor his “diligence without reward.”

William R. Nance, Jr.
A Word from the Editor

After a decade’s stint in this time-consuming but ultimately fulfilling post as your JUFF editor, I’ve exhausted most of the permutations and variations on previewing the issue ahead which normally fill this space. Besides—as only befits the former leader of the Jackson’s Writer’s Group—Forum head William Nance has already penned the longest opening letter of greetings in JUFF history. I trust you didn’t skip over it. I trust that if you did, you will go back and read it now, for it foreshadows the pages ahead well. And if it’s contributor life data you’re after, I hope I did each person justice on the back page: leap there if you’re of the biographical school of lit. crit.

Still, allow me to reflect on the current issue, its omissions and commissions, as it were. Longtime JUFF editor (and dear friend of mine) Ernie Pinson made a point to do at least three things in this publication which have fallen by the wayside with the turn of the century: no photographs, no dedication page, no interview with a campus administrator grace these pages, as was the case a decade ago. Perhaps I will follow through on my silent avowals to reinstitute one or more of these features next summer, next fall. . . .

Even so, the two longer centerpiece essays and the three shorter articles to follow all are substantive pieces of writing, if from a fairly limited (Arts & Sciences) disciplinary range. In the shorter camp note that both our outgoing and our incoming PEW faculty directors step up to the plate, proving that this is a thriving summer program whose administrators practice what they preach in terms of carving out time for research and writing. David Thomas reflects upon his time working with faculty and administrators alike; Gavin Richardson, while not authoring a piece directly on PEW, addresses the intersection of past and present linguistic practices in a way cogent to all academic researchers in 2005.

Allow time to read our longer articles too, both historical reflections. David’s colleague Terry Lindley revisits Vietnam, a topic still much with us as proven by this fall’s History Lecture series speaker who coupled Vietnam with Iraq. You might be surprised to note the attention given to our three Tennessee Baptist schools here, as well as the active role of a current Union staff member a few decades ago. Then Gavin’s colleague Patricia Hamilton takes us back to Daniel Defoe and combines the more recent discipline of business management with the time-tested skill of historical literary criticism; credit her spouse Bud Hamilton for some nice insights into this essay as well.

I am pleased to close the issue with Kelvin Moore’s brief reflections on race and region—surely a germane topic given the efforts of President Dockery and others on our campus to raise consciousness in this area of racial reconciliation.

OK, so I’m approaching Nance’s word count. I’m proud of our issue, and only hope librarians, nurses, and others [hint: you’re housed in BAC] will join the humanities folks in submissions for 2006. Thanks as always to Provost Carla Sanderson for funding and College Services (notably Marjorie Richard) for hard labor. Enjoy.

Roger Stanley
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The Pew Grant and "Integration"

by David Thomas

During my service as chair of the Pew Summer Research Grant, I regularly encountered faculty who were unsure of and sometimes frustrated by the grant requirement to write a short essay integrating their faith with their academic discipline. Up to this point I have answered such requests verbally; this is an effort to answer those questions in writing.

For most of us, the primary convictions about our academic careers were shaped at modern, secular research universities. The universities, major journals, conferences, and other discipline-related institutions all agree: scholarship has its greatest authority when it is thoroughly secular—in other words, when it is removed from the influence of religion. Secularization is not all bad. As Marsden points out so well, when your car is ailing, you don’t want your mechanic to exorcize the demons out of your fuel injectors. You want a solution that operates independently of your mechanic’s religious faith; in other words, you want a solution that is methodologically secular.¹ Most of us have benefited from the rigorous thinking, insistence upon credentials, and opportunities to teach that have come with modern secular education. Science has been so remarkably successful with this approach that every discipline has had to confront comparisons with scientific methods, epistemology, and authority, all of which include the conviction that the best inquiry is thoroughly secular and value-free. But here, of course, lies the problem; during the past century and a half, secularism became more than merely methodology—it became an ideological foundation. Ironically enough, as is now obvious, modern secularism has become a distinct faith perspective.

Encompassed within this tradition are corrosive arguments and attitudes that most of us have faced and tolerated. Directly anti-Christian commentary and assumptions are fairly common. Additionally, the terminal degree confers professional credentials, authority, and the right to speak; thus, academic specialization is widely believed and felt to be superior to every other (non-credentialed) area of thought and action. When we step outside our credentials, we apologize and defer. We could probably list some more features, but the larger point is the important part: the academic community assumes and argues for the separation of faith and discipline, and this presents some problems for believers. We have all been deeply shaped by the goals and values of secular education. One set of by-products among Christian academics has been religious self-censorship, a reluctance to think through religious arguments, a separation of private faith from public secularism, and a hesitation to raise critical questions founded in Christian faith.²

The challenge for the Christian academic isn’t really to integrate faith and discipline. Faith and knowledge are inseparable. The challenge is to integrate a Biblical faith with our academic discipline, as we do with other aspects of our lives. It’s a discipleship issue. We need to transform our thought and behavior to conform to a Biblical faith, Biblical standards, the known will of God as expressed through the community of faith. Discipleship is not easy; harsh skepticism, professional credentialing, individualism to the point of isolation, and antagonism towards the Church only make it harder. Nonetheless, discipleship is our calling—our only calling, it seems to me—and this means taking seriously the claims of our Lord Jesus Christ upon our work.

When the Pew grant asks you to “integrate your faith and discipline,” it is asking for a concerted, articulate effort to extend your commitment to Christ into your scholarship. It’s also valuable to ask how scholarship informs your understanding of the Lordship of Christ. For some disciplines, this can be easily articulated in the content—a history, say, of revivals in twelfth century France, or a sociological study of poverty in Appalachian coal miners. For all disciplines, though, this can and should be explored in the philosophical and theological assumptions of the discipline as a whole and in the project as a part of that whole.

“Integration” is not an overlay; it is not a Christian veneer over an otherwise secular project. Rather, it is just the opposite; it reworks the foundation. That said, “integration” also does not mean that we must all become philosophers and theologians. Historians (such as myself) often are rather poor philosophers, as a basic antagonism exists between historical thinking and philosophical thinking that makes communication and agreement problematic. Integration does not ask for additional credentials in theology, nor does it ask for simply laying hands on the paper and blessing it. It means discipleship. It means reading some of the many books and articles Christians have written about our disciplines. It means writing some ourselves. It means actively seeking out and attending conferences that pursue the meanings and values of our disciplines from Christian perspectives. It means reading Touchstone, Books and Culture, First Things, and the discipline-specific journals that value Biblical perspectives. It means consulting bibliographies, some of which are listed at the close of this article. It means studying the Bible and knowing our Lord. It means feeling the pleasure and creativity of God in our work. It means asking critical questions of our disciplines and our faith and thoughtfully, prayerfully considering the values and agendas of our teaching, our creative art, and our research. As is true of all discipleship, nobody expects us to be exhaustive, but the Pew Selection Committee does want faculty to grapple with the issues seriously and in an orthodox manner. "Orthodox": the word is sometimes a red flag. I mean on the one hand “orthodox, not just Baptist,” and on the other hand “orthodox, not heretical.” It’s a good word. If we discuss seriously the questions it will engender, we have a decent chance of becoming a more faithful community.

The Pew Grant Selection Committee requires a brief essay. For most successful applications these run to about a page; some are longer. It’s a modest request, to be honest, a bare starting point. In other contexts, I have advocated that the university ask all new faculty to write a full-length scholarly article on this topic during their first five

years here. Lacking that, the Pew Grant application is the only formal written
opportunity on campus for faculty to articulate their integration of faith and discipline.

For examples of how Union faculty have addressed this, some successful Pew Grant
applications have been placed on file in the library. These come from a range of
disciplines, so the odds are high that something close to your discipline is available.
Three bibliographies are available from InterVarsity’s Grad and Faculty Ministry
webpage: http://www.intervarsity.org/gfm/mba/resource_item.php?id=1804 (business);
http://www.intervarsity.org/gfm/resource_item.php?id=2133 (women in the academy);
http://www.intervarsity.org/gfm/esn/resource_item.php (the core bibliography—a copy is
on file with the Pew Grant applications in the library.) Finally, Dr. Dockery compiled
bibliographies from Union faculty several years ago. This can be found on the Carl F. H.
Henry Center webpage: http://www.uu.edu/centers/christld/bibliog/.

If nothing else, these bibliographies accentuate the presence of an active, energetic
Christian community interested in these issues. The Pew Grant gives Union faculty a
nudge to join these, to think with them, as we work to reinvigorate a Biblical faith at the
foundation of our disciplines.
The Language of Prayer in the South, or, 
Cædmon in Kentucky

by Gavin Richardson

A few semesters ago I taught a seminar on the Anglo-Saxon epic poem Beowulf. While the semester was devoted to that masterwork, the students and I also looked at other features of Anglo-Saxon literary culture, especially the many devotional poems which comprise its rich vernacular achievement. One such poem — "Cædmon’s Hymn," preserved in Bede’s History of the English Church and People—prompted me to consider the forms of prayer through the ages. Bede tells us that Cædmon, a simple shepherd of the seventh century, was embarrassed by his inability to compose extemporaneous songs during feasts and celebrations. Apparently this skill was not uncommon, for Bede tells us that whenever the lyre was passed around, Cædmon would leave the celebration rather than be the only one who could not sing. One night after retiring to the stables to look after his flock, Cædmon, in his sleep, heard a man say, “Cædmon, sing me something.” Cædmon replied that he did not know how to sing, but the voice was insistent, ordering him to sing of creation: In his dream he did so, composing this hymn, the first English poem ever recorded:

Nu we sculon herigeane  heofonrices Weard,
Now we should praise  of heaven-realm the Guardian
Meotodes meahite  and his modgepance,
The Creator’s might  and his purpose
weorc Wuldorfeæder,  swa he wundra gehwæs,
the work of the Glory-father  as he of wonders each
ece Drihten,  or onstealdæ.
The eternal Lord  the beginning established.
He ærest sceop  eordan bearnum
He first shaped  for the earth’s children
heofon to hrofe,  halig Scyppend.
Heaven as a roof,  the holy Creator
ða middangeard  moncynnes Weard,
Then middle-earth  mankind’s Guardian
ece Drihten,  æfter teode
The eternal Lord  afterwards adorned
firum foldan,  Frea ælmihtig.
For men, the earth  the Lord Almighty.

When Cædmon awoke, he discovered that the gift of song he had received in his sleep had stayed with him. Cædmon then became a monk, devoting the rest of his life to versifying sacred history.

"Cædmon’s Hymn" offers a good, brief introduction to Anglo-Saxon poetics, helping to illustrate what scholars have come to call “oral-formulaic theory.” It seems that poets such as Cædmon did not compose poems with pen and parchment, nor did they “memorize” them in a conventional sense for recitation. Rather, like a jazz guitarist
improvising a solo, an early Anglo-Saxon poet could extemporaneously sing a poem, transforming a narrative into poetry by means of stress and alliteration. Such oral poets were also aided by *formulae*—stock poetic phrases which could be substituted one for another whenever the stress and alliterative patterns demanded it. For example, God could be referred to as simply *god* (God), *heofonrices Weard* (guardian of heaven-realm), *halig Scyppend* (holy Shaper/Creator), *moncyynes Weard* (guardian of mankind), *ece Drihten* (eternal Lord), and *Frea ælmihtig* (Lord Almighty)—all within the space of a few lines. Interestingly enough, such a skill survived in some parts of the world even into the twentieth century. In the 1930’s, the Harvard classicist Milman Parry went to what was then Yugoslavia to search for oral traditions there, hoping to explain how the lengthy Homeric epics *Iliad* and *Odyssey* could have been orally composed. What he discovered was that illiterate Yugoslavian shepherds were still extemporaneously spinning incredibly complex poems (as long as 13,000 lines) in much the same way that a Homer or *Beowulf*-poet might have done. Parry’s student, Albert B. Lord, immortalized Parry’s research in *The Singer of Tales*, and the Parry-Lord oral formulaic theory, while not universally accepted, nonetheless revolutionized the scholarly view of ancient poetry.

So what does all this have to do with the language of prayer in the South?

Whenever I try to explain oral-formulaic theory to my students, I suggest that two contemporary rhetorical forms seem to feature elements best described by oral-formulaic theory: rap music and Southern Baptist prayer. Rarely are these two forms mentioned in the same sentence, and while I have no experience with the former, I do claim some with the latter. Having been raised Southern Baptist, I have heard Southern Baptist prayers for most of my life. I can still recall men in my church who could ostensibly pray forever (usually around dinner time), and some whose prayers were so eloquent that they approximated oral poetry. I didn’t necessarily think of these men as prayer “warriors” (the bellicose metaphor never did much for me); rather, I thought of them as prayer artists, craftsmen who worked in the language of prayer the way a sculptor might work in clay or a painter in tempera and oil. When I became an academic, I was more and more intrigued by the possibility that oral-formulaic theory could be applied to explain their art, to describe certain forms of prayer I heard growing up in western Kentucky. Indeed, many of these *formulae* are still current. Try filling in the blanks for these common *formulae*: “Lead, guide, and ___________ . . .” If you answered “direct,” congratulations! From a strictly rhetorical standpoint, what exactly does the word *direct* do in this sentence? Doesn’t the request become redundant after *Lead*? Don’t *lead*, *guide*, and *direct* all say pretty much the same thing? Try this one: “Bless this food we are about to partake for _________________.” If you answered, “the nourishment of our bodies,” then you’re two for two! But what else is food used for? The phrase “the nourishment of our bodies” seems less important for conveying what food is for and more important in making the prayer sound poetic—the same reason Elizabethan forms such as *thy* and *thine*, and archaic verbs such as *partake*, still crop up in prayer. A rhetorical formula may also give the mind time to compose the next element of prayer, whatever it may be. For example, my father would often add a corollary to the “nourishment of our bodies” formula: “Bless this food for the nourishment of our bodies and *our bodies in thy service*.” I would like to think that this corollary was original to him, but again, I suspect it was yet another formula.
At a recent conference on medieval studies, I had lunch with colleagues from Concordia College (a Lutheran school in Minnesota), and another good friend from Augustana College (another Lutheran school in Sioux Falls, South Dakota). Perhaps because we were all from Christian schools, religious matters dominated the conversation. When I brought up the application of oral-formulaic theory to prayer (as only a Christian medievalist among a group of Christian medievalists would), one of my colleagues wondered if the usage of such stock formulae threatened to violate the traditional Southern Baptist view of prayer as an extemporaneous call to God, a religious correlative to Wordsworth’s definition of poetry as the “spontaneous overflow of powerful feelings.” Indeed, such spontaneity was an important informing principle of prayer in the church of my youth. There were no “notecard prayers” at Hawesville Baptist. Only the most original prayers would do. But my colleague’s question was a legitimate one. If certain religious traditions prized spontaneity in prayer, yet availed themselves of prayer formulae, was the spontaneity of the prayer voided, and by implication, its sincerity as well? Was a prayer that used “lead, guide, and direct” and “bless this food for the nourishment of our bodies” less genuine than one which did not?

Fortunately, I think this question raised by oral-formulaic theory can be answered by it. Theorists such as Parry and Lord did not devise oral-formulaic theory to denigrate the art of Homer, but to describe it and speculate on how its marvel might have been achieved. Similarly for Anglo-Saxon poetry, the beauty of a Beowulf is not that every half-line is completely original; rather, the beauty lies in the way the poet arranges stock phrases with new ones to spontaneously craft an expression of the spirit. In Beowulf, the art of the scop (or “poet”; literally, “shaper”) is described with the phrase “wordum wrixtlan” (“to weave [with] words”). For an Anglo-Saxon devotional poet, the skillful manipulation of formulae amid his own more original phrases was thought to be constitutive of good art, and pleasing unto God.

As I think back on the prayer artisans of my youth and those I am privileged to hear today, I think about Cædmon and his songs. In the great Southern traditions of extemporaneous prayer, I hear echoes of a tradition which stretches from a small church on the banks of the Ohio back down through thirteen centuries of Christian history to an illiterate shepherd’s stable in Northumbria. The language may have changed, but the call is the same to all the sons and daughters of Cædmon, the eloquent and leaden-tongued alike:

“Cædmon, sing me something.”
Tennessee Baptists and the Vietnam War

by W. Terry Lindley

The 1960s were a turbulent decade for the United States in general and for Southern Baptists in particular. Concerns that touched Southern Baptists included such issues as Engel v. Vitale and school prayer, government aid to church-supported schools, civil rights for black Americans, and the conflict in Vietnam. In his study of Tennessee Baptists, Albert Wardin deals at some length with each of these issues, with the notable exception of Vietnam. Even though he covers the reaction of Tennessee Baptists to World Wars I and II, he is silent on America’s struggle against the spread of communism in Southeast Asia.¹ Does this mean that Tennessee Baptists were silent on an issue which divided the American people and brought down the presidency of Lyndon Johnson? It is hard to imagine Southern Baptists being silent on any important topic, and this was certainly not the case regarding the Vietnam War.

From June 1964 through June of 1968, the presidency of the Southern Baptist Convention (SBC) was held by Tennessee pastors—Wayne Dehoney of First Baptist Church in Jackson and H. Franklin Paschall of First Baptist Church in Nashville. Both men were staunch supporters of America’s efforts to fight communism in South Vietnam. In early 1966, Dehoney went to preach in South Korea and Japan and to observe firsthand Southern Baptist mission efforts in the Far East. Upon his return, he stated, “I supported the United States policy before I left for Viet Nam. But I am returning even more convinced this nation is doing the right thing.” The Jackson pastor also endorsed efforts by American soldiers to help the people of South Vietnam “in building hospitals, orphanages and in developing other humanitarian projects.”² Dehoney amplified his views in his 1967 book detailing his trip to the Far East: “...the United States is doing in this small Asian country what no great power has ever done—not even the United States through the Marshall Plan. The material and human resources of our nation are being poured into Vietnam to win a war against human misery and to enlarge the hopes, prosperity, and personal liberties of the Vietnamese people that they might find a place of dignity and freedom among the nations of the world!”³ In addition, at the 1966 Southern Baptist Convention, he steered through a resolution entitled “Concerning Peace,” which called on all “Baptists and fellow Christians” to pray for American soldiers in the field and to guide the nation’s leaders in finding “the high and honorable road to peace.”⁴ Given what Dehoney voiced on his return from Southeast Asia earlier in the year, an “honorable” peace could not have included a communist victory.

Like Dehoney, Paschall backed the U.S. effort in Southeast Asia. This is seen in numerous letters he wrote while president of the SBC. Responding to Jerry Gaskin of Beaumont, Texas, Paschall asserted, “Communism has never gained a foothold by fair and honest elections” and seeks to achieve its aim through “violence and war.” Therefore, the United States was “justified in helping people to be free from this evil government and unsatisfactory life.” He concluded that any settlement ending the war “must be honorable and with justice.”⁵ In a second letter, Paschall employed the phrase “a just and honorable peace”⁶; a third note used the words “a just and enduring peace.”⁷
Like Dehoney, Paschall considered an “honorable” or “enduring” peace to be one without a communist triumph.

A point of controversy surrounded a March 1967 article in The Nashville Tennessean, which quoted Paschall as saying he considers “a total military victory in Vietnam ‘pointless.’” Had his views on the war radically changed? Not likely, especially when he spoke of “a negotiated peace on the basis of honor and justice in Vietnam” and maintained that “the United States could not afford to abandon Vietnam to the Communists.” When a South Carolina radio station used the word “pointless” in an editorial in May, Paschall quickly dashed off a letter correcting this misinterpretation of his position on the war. He stated that the newspaper’s use of the word “pointless” was misleading and that his position on the “war is not in conflict with the view of the United States Government.” He concluded, “I do not believe in a negotiated peace unless that peace is honorable and just.” However, as his biographer Wardin argues, the Nashville pastor believed he had no right to tell the federal government how to achieve this peace.

The 1967 SBC meeting in Miami appeared to confuse the issue of Baptist support for the conflict in Southeast Asia. On the one hand, both the report of the Christian Life Commission (CLC) to the convention and an address by Republican Senator Mark Hatfield of Oregon raised questions about the war. The CLC report warned “the churches not to be blinded by distorted appeals to false patriotism” and was “disturbed both by the large weight of world opinion which questions the wisdom of our current policy and by those here at home who doubt the patriotism of anyone who questions our government’s present official position.” The “dovish” Hatfield said: “You cannot superimpose the cause of freedom upon another man unless he is willing to fight and die for it himself.” Questioning the South Vietnamese willingness to do just that, the war, he worried, was becoming a “quicksand” that would demand “more and more and more American boys.” Since America’s resources—both manpower and material—were limited, he asserted that “we cannot become the world policeman” or “do for other men that which they will not do for themselves.”

On the other hand, there was much stronger support for the war among the messengers. Most of those attending the convention disliked the CLC report and quickly modified it to remove any suggestion of “the withdrawal of United States forces from Vietnam apart from an honorable and just peace.” Second, as part of the Baptist Sunday School Board’s exhibit, one thousand messengers were surveyed on the issues of civil rights and Vietnam. Two-thirds of the respondents believed that “the United States should do whatever is necessary to win the war” and that the level of fighting should be increased, which demonstrated the hawkish makeup of the convention delegates. Finally, Roy Jones of Knoxville, Tennessee, presented a resolution from the floor on Vietnam for consideration by the Committee on Resolutions. It demanded support for “efforts to win the war” as well as bringing to bear “individual pressure on Congressional leaders to implement these expressions on war.” Jones added, “Surely we can do more than ask people to pray. While we are ducking issues, our men in Vietnam are ducking bullets; while we are passing resolutions, they are passing ammunition.”

The key parts of the main resolution on the conflict in Southeast Asia (No. 4) read: “we assure our duly elected leaders in government that we support them in developing strong and wise policies, in pursuing a just peace in Vietnam, and in helping to maintain order in the world” and “we uphold in prayer men who are engaged in restrictive
measures against destructive forces of invasion so that law and order may obtain.”

While not as “hawkish” as what Jones had desired, this final version was more inclusive. But was it less supportive of America’s war efforts against communism in Vietnam? A letter by Paschall answers in the negative. Prior to the convention, a member of First Baptist Church of Memphis, in reference to the CLC report, warned the SBC president that he firmly believed “a determined effort is going to be made to have Southern Baptists join the Left-leaning-liberal church groups in stabbing our Viet-Nam boys in the back!” He urged Paschall to prevent this from happening. After the meeting in Miami ended, the Nashville pastor replied that the recent convention had done nothing that “could be interpreted as a disloyalty to our boys who are fighting in Viet Nam. In fact, prayers and support for these boys were voiced. I hope you were not disappointed with the reports in the newspapers.”

Certainly Lyndon Johnson was not disturbed by the final version of the resolution. In a letter to C. Emanuel Carlson of the Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs thanking him for a copy of Resolution No. 4, the President added, “If we are to achieve a just and lasting peace—in Vietnam and around the world—such support as you have voiced is a vital importance.”

The only noticeable discord at the Southern Baptist meeting in Houston in 1968 regarding the conflict in Southeast Asia occurred outside the Pastor’s Conference at the beginning of the week. Here a dozen or so clean-cut Baptist students—no “Hippies” were present, according to one state Baptist newspaper—peacefully and silently picketed the meeting, displaying posters calling attention to “issues of race, poverty, and the war in Vietnam.” However, a number of messengers labeled these student activists as “Communist-inspired and against the teachings of Jesus Christ.” Little had changed in the last year regarding the delegates’ views on the righteousness of the American cause in Vietnam.

The Houston convention was more unified than the previous one in Miami on the issue of Vietnam, possibly because the Johnson administration had initiated formal peace negotiations with the North Vietnamese government in early spring. Absent were alternate resolutions from the floor on Vietnam, and while Resolution No. 10 dealing with the conflict in Southeast Asia was debated for thirty minutes, the discussion centered on wording, not content. Noting that the war was “taking an awesome toll in human life and property,” the resolution called on all participants in the conflict to pursue “an immediate cease fire and a termination of all hostile activities and any further buildup of military power or advantage.” Moreover, it urged all responsible parties “to seek an honorable solution that will bring a just and durable peace.” Given the ongoing peace negotiations in Paris and the desire on the part of most messengers to bring the fighting to a successful conclusion, this resolution could be backed by both proponents and moderate opponents of the war. While the latter could emphasize an “immediate” end to the fighting, the former could focus on an “honorable” and “just and durable” end to the conflict. In fact, continued support for the fight against communism may have been the main goal of Resolution No. 10, given that the chair of the Resolutions Committee was Dehoney, a strong supporter of America’s effort in Southeast Asia.

At the Tennessee State Baptist conventions, the issue of the Vietnam War was raised only one time, in 1967. On Tuesday evening, November 14, B. J. Morris, the pastor of Stones River Baptist Church in Smyrna, put forward a resolution supporting the conflict in Southeast Asia. “Whereas American men are fighting and dying at this hour in
Vietnam and, whereas, these men are in many instances Tennesseans or men trained in one of three military installations of our state, be it resolved that we affirm our faith and support in their (our) fight against tyranny.” When the resolution was brought before the convention for a vote, there was no debate or amendments offered, and it easily carried.21

On February 11, 1965, Richard N. Owen, editor of the Baptist and Reflector (the state Baptist newspaper) as well as a supporter of the fight against communism, quoted at length from the last letter written by a twenty-eight-year-old Lutheran captain recently killed in Vietnam. This “last will and testament” urged his wife to inform “people of the vital necessity of our mission here in Vietnam” and to admonish “those who think we’re needlessly expending lives and money that they, by their indifference or ignorance, are directly opposing our struggle to maintain our freedom and our lives.” Moreover, the soldier added that dedicated Christians “could contribute to the defeat of the Viet Cong and thus insure the reduction of the threat of communism to our society.” Owen ended the article with a call “for devoted servants of God” to labor “in the countryside of Vietnam.”22

Two years later, Owen wrote two editorials staunchly defending the struggle in Southeast Asia. The first appeared in the Baptist and Reflector on May 11, 1967. While Americans are “frustrated and confused” about the situation in Vietnam and “mourn the suffering and heartbreak wrought by war,” he proclaimed, “peace cannot be bought by appeasement of evil. Peace cannot be secured by abandonment of helpless peoples to cruel tyrannies which have revealed all too clearly their inhuman aims.” Genuine peace, Owen went on to assert, would remain elusive “until North Vietnam and the Viet Cong show a willingness on their part to act peaceably.” He then took peace demonstrators to task for “prolong[ing] the war by their refusal to see that peace depends not only on the desire of the Administration in Washington but also on the readiness of the powers-that-be in Hanoi to end the war.”23 On December 14, Owen returned to the theme that it takes two to make peace and again castigated opponents of the war. This time dissent came from religious groups who, Owen noted, “have spoken out-of-turn in their demand for unilateral withdrawal of American forces from Vietnam.” Such bodies, he maintained, have no right to address diplomatic endeavors and military strategy or to make proposals to the federal government on specific issues.24

In May 1970, Owen addressed the issue of campus violence related to the conflict in Southeast Asia, especially as it had just been manifested at Kent State University in Ohio. Owen lamented this “tragic loss of life and entreated God to spare the nation from a similar misadventure in the future.” However, this incident, calamitous as it may have been, “serves to remind us that governmental decisions and constitutional legal interpretations can not be made on college and university campuses.” He called on the nation’s pastors to mount their pulpits and proclaim for all to hear that “a government under law must be respected and obeyed, even if we disagree with decisions of that government.” Owen warned, “Christian self-discipline and obedience to the laws of the land are necessities in an ordered society.”25

This reiterated what Hershal Hobbs, well-known Oklahoma City Southern Baptist pastor and Bible commentator, had said two and a half years earlier. In his exegesis on Romans 13:2, Hobbs argued that Paul taught that civil disobedience was a sin against God. “Simply because one does not agree with a given law is not grounds for defying it either in demonstrations or by the more prosaic method of ignoring it.” To resist, the
Oklahoma City pastor asserted, means to line up against “the government which is ordained by God. . . . And since government is ordained of God, it is rebellion against God.” 26 Civil disobedience could also apply to resistance against a stated government policy, e.g., the war in Vietnam.

Among the three Baptist colleges in the state, Union University seemed to support the war effort the most, even though the Cardinal and Cream, the school’s newspaper, carried few stories about the conflict in Southeast Asia and there appears to have been little campus-wide debate on the issue. 27 Atypical of student attitude were two reprints of letters without additional comment. One dealt with the search for a peaceful resolution to the conflict; the other advocated a society based on peace rather than one “mobilized for war.” The former was written by Elmira Kendricks of the National Student Christian Federation, who was one of a “group of 14 American and world religious leaders who had visited Vietnam to seek a solution to the conflict,” while the latter was penned by Philip and Daniel Berrigan, two Roman Catholic priests then in jail for burning “selective service records in protest of the Vietnam war.” 28

More typical of student sentiment at Union was an April poll of 1,200 area college students on the upcoming 1968 presidential election. Coordinated by Union University History Professor James Edmondson, the results clearly demonstrated that Union students supported the war candidates. Of the four colleges surveyed, only Union gave former Vice-President Richard Nixon a clear majority in the Republican race for the White House and saw President Lyndon Johnson defeat New York Senator Robert F. Kennedy for the Democratic nomination. Moreover, Alabama Governor George Wallace, an outspoken proponent of the Vietnam War, was preferred in a race where the Republican nominee was either Senator Charles Percy or Governor George Romney. 29 And when peace was finally achieved in early 1973, the only Cardinal and Cream editorial on the war congratulated Nixon for achieving “a satisfactory agreement” and defended the 1972 Christmas bombing as a means to that end. 30

In the wake of the National Guard killing of four Kent State University students in early May 1970, student Cathi Spencer, in a letter to the editor, differentiated between patriotism and dissent. The true patriot, she wrote, willingly served in Vietnam, paid “his taxes to help those who can’t help themselves,” strived “to right those things that are wrong,” took pride in reciting the Pledge of Allegiance and seeing the Stars and Stripes ripple in the wind, hated no one for different beliefs, and regularly attended church. On the other hand, the dissenter avoided Vietnam, “burned his draft card and spent his youth in jail,” felt nothing when he recited the Pledge or saw the flag fly, and declined “to go to church because to him God is dead and he hates the man who goes.” While the patriot “feels pride and accepts responsibility,” the dissenter “feels nothing and accepts nothing” and trampe “the path to hippy [sic] joints and demonstrations.” Clearly, the patriot added to the greatness of America, but the dissenter detracted from the nation’s shining image. 31

The most prominent aberration in this picture of support for the war at Union occurred behind the scenes in early 1971. Carroll Griffin, Student Government Association President, was concerned over the continued fighting and mounting death toll in Vietnam—a close high school friend had been killed there—and joined with five hundred other student body presidents and editors of student newspapers in signing a petition against the war that the group then sent to President Nixon. 32 The signatures
called on Nixon to “reverse futile and immoral policies and use your authority to end the bloodshed in Vietnam.” If he refused, the petitioners warned, the result would be “an intensification of public divisiveness and disunity which will further weaken the already torn moral and social fabric of American life.” Griffin’s action was out of step with most Tennesseans, Union students, and Southern Baptists, as he represented only one of four Southern Baptist institutions of higher learning and one of five colleges and universities in Tennessee in affixing his signature to this petition.33

Belmont College, located in Nashville, had a more campus-wide debate on the war in Southeast Asia than what occurred at Union University. In the spring of 1966, the *Belmont Vision*, the student newspaper, carried a story by student Thomas C. Dunlap entitled “War and the Christian.” Dunlap saw no contradiction between killing in war and the commandment “Thou shalt not kill.” “Kill,” he argued, means “murder,” whereas killing in combat was self-defense. In other words, “murder means to kill because of hatred of the other person; and self-defense means to kill to preserve your own life or your liberty, with no premeditation.” Vietnam, Dunlap asserted, fell into the area of self-defense and necessity, because Vietnam’s surrender to the communists would result in “the fall of much of Southeast Asia.” Moreover, a loss in Vietnam “would have serious effects in our own hemisphere and facilitate a communist takeover in the Americas, leading to our eventual isolation and neutralization, or defeat.”34 This column generated a response from fellow student Bob Hayes, who declared that there was more than one opinion on Vietnam and that many critics of American policy are “responsible and patriotic Americans.” Since a number of people believe “that the war is undermining our nation’s honor and ethical values,” the subject demands “our deepest thought.”35

Dunlap’s support of the war was seconded in a reprint of a letter from a soldier in Vietnam to a Belmont student. The soldier spoke of America’s “moral obligation” to help the Vietnamese people. As “the greatest, the mightiest nation ever to grace the face of the earth,” the United States was obligated to “help those who ask.” The writer was even willing to lay down his life in Vietnam in order to give the Vietnamese “people more than they have ever dreamed possible,” a “life without terrorism or intimidation.” Those who oppose American involvement in Vietnam were to be held in “contempt,” because they were protesting something they had never experienced.36

Two years later, two editorials concerning the war were printed in the *Belmont Vision*. After listing all the reasons against American participation in the Vietnam War, student Jerry Ragan labeled all who held such views as “traitors and subversives.” America’s policy in Southeast Asia, he asserted, was purposeful, supported by “common sense and logical unbiased thought.” The other student writer, Charles Vaughn, seemed not so much against the war in Southeast Asia as distraught over how the conflict was being fought. Referring to ancient warfare where the defense that utilized a moat had the advantage over the attacker, Vaughn asked if it would not be more prudent for “sane men” to “withdraw across the moat and wait for the aggressor to show himself openly, and then smash the barbaric communist invader with the powerful sword of a mighty and honest people.”37 It is unclear if the writer were opposed to search-and-destroy missions where the Viet Cong and North Vietnamese held the initiative or if he were proposing a fortress America strategy. Either way, Vaughn was anti-communist.

On Wednesday, October 15, 1969, Belmont College took part in Moratorium Day, a national rally against the Vietnam War held on college campuses across the nation. A
few students and at least one faculty member met in the center of campus to discuss the war. While no exact numbers were given, a picture in the student newspaper showed only a dozen or so well-dressed demonstrators. One participant described the majority of those who walked by as rude, looking down on the protesters as if infected with “the Bubonic plague.” A neutral observer disagreed, seeing student indifference resulting from the cold weather or lack of interest about what was happening. Those who participated agreed unanimously on immediate American withdrawal from Vietnam. However, student Danny Evans’s letter to the editor castigated the newspaper for presenting only one side of the issue (the anti-war position) when the Moratorium was first announced. While not averse to discussion of controversial issues, Evans stated that “controversy must have two sides,” and this one did not. Given the small number of demonstrators, opposition to the war on Belmont’s campus appears to have been insignificant.

*Belmont Vision* also published a call to sign two war-related petitions. The first was a 1969 reprint of an article entitled “Tell it to Hanoi,” but contained no information on how to participate. The petition was sponsored by Young Americans for Freedom (YAF). YAF’s goal was to mobilize nationwide “support for President Nixon’s determination to effectively combat communist aggression” and to secure an honorable peace in Vietnam. The second petition, in October 1970, called on Belmont’s faculty, staff, and students to decry North Vietnamese unlawful treatment of American POW’s, treatment “not in accordance with the standards of the Geneva Convention, the Bible and the laws of human survival.” Once completed, the petition would be sent to Nixon to forward to the North Vietnamese government.

Meanwhile in Jefferson City in East Tennessee, Carson-Newman College was very much pro-Vietnam in the mid-1960s. In November 1965, Bill Smallwood, president of the Veteran’s Club, conducted a survey of Carson-Newman faculty and students on U.S. involvement in Southeast Asia. The vote was 764 in support of American policy, 76 against, and 119 unsure. While Smallwood was surprised at the “one-sided” result, he was very “gratified” at the strong show of support for the war effort. From those backing the country’s fight against communism, a number of interesting comments were made. One student argued, “it’s time to stop kidding ourselves. Communism is a threat, and every time America concedes, Communism advances.” A second declared that “defense strategists have found the [sic] quick, firm action of this sort is necessary to halt aggression.” A third proclaimed, “I would rather be dead than Red.” Using the Democratic slogan of 1948, a fourth expounded, “Given ‘em hell, boys!” And a faculty member testified, “I would support it [the war] with my life – if necessary.”

An accompanying editorial in the campus newspaper *Orange and Blue* chastised those who protested the war “in front of the White House, the Capitol Building, the UN and at various colleges and universities throughout the U.S.” The writer also denounced individuals who burned their draft cards as well as those who published ways of avoiding conscription. Such extremism has not been found “in the cradle of East Tennessee.” Since the communists refused to honor the Biblical command to “[L]ove thy neighbor as thyself,” the U.S. government must take “a firm military stand” in Vietnam in order “to avert an ultimate world war.” The only letter to the editor regarding this editorial and the survey of faculty and students labeled some of the student comments “unthinking, anachronistic opinions” and urged the campus community “to think seriously and then
speak and act.” While not denouncing the conflict in Vietnam, American involvement did not automatically warrant our “approv[al] of everything we do there.”

The campus-wide survey and editorial in favor of the Vietnam War was followed in early December with a petition reading, “We, the students of Carson-Newman College pledge our support to the policies of the President of the United States concerning his action in Vietnam.” Close to 600 students signed the petition. Student Government President David DeLozier then presented the petition to Tennessee Governor Frank C. Clement. This was one of twelve such petitions from Tennessee schools that supported the war effort. Clement commended the students of Tennessee for their actions and said he would personally deliver the petitions to the Johnson administration.

In early November 1966, the Circle K Club sponsored a two-day demonstration backing American policy in Southeast Asia. The chairman of this patriotic event described it as the first such occurrence on any college campus across the United States. There was musical entertainment by local bands, speeches by several Republican politicians, and a blood drive. “In contrast to the prevalent [sic] apathy, the professors and students are working and showing their interest for the many men who are presently dying in Vietnam.” The *Orange and Blue* failed to do a follow-up story on the demonstration, but given what had transpired over the previous year, the event was probably well-attended by students, faculty, and maybe even some local residents of Jefferson City.

In March 1967, the *Orange and Blue* contained a thought-piece by student Cecil Morelock on “whether it is right or necessary for” American commitment in Vietnam. Rejecting critical charges of “imperialistic motives,” the author urged the United States to stay the course in Southeast Asia because if the nation let communist aggression “go unchecked,” it would ultimately lead to a new world war. America was in Vietnam, he argued, to procure the inalienable rights that are listed in the Declaration of Independence for the South Vietnamese people. Morelock concluded, “The test of Viet Nam will serve as a judgment of the sincerity of our commitments to those nations who have the desire—but not the strength—to withstand powerful foes and keep themselves free.” In other words, the credibility of the United States was on the line, and the world’s defender of liberty must not be found wanting.

By the fall of 1967, a sense of apathy among the administration, faculty, and students seemed to have descended over the Carson-Newman campus, at least according to the *Orange and Blue*. An October editorial stated that the average student was “unconcerned” and “uninformed” regarding “current events.” He or she, the writer asserted, was only concerned with “the football game Saturday night, who his [or her] date will be, the society program Friday night or passing zoology (English, Bible, etc.).” Carson-Newman was not presently failing in educating denominational leaders, exalting “the practices of Christian principles,” promoting “a high level of scholarship,” and training “socially responsible citizens.” The blame rested with a system that emphasized grades over knowledge, a “student who just does not give a damn about anyone except his own intimate circle of friends,” and an administration and faculty more preoccupied “with perpetuating a sterile institution” than “with giving each student the best well-rounded education possible.”

How true was this assessment of the Carson-Newman family? A letter from an alumnus presently serving in Vietnam disagreed with much of the editorial. He pointedly
asserted, “A person who does not openly participate cannot be labeled uninvolved or disinterested. If a man does not speak from the pulpit, cannot he still be a good Christian?” Regarding the subject matter being taught, the soldier concluded, “Carson-Newman teaches one to think from the heart. The world is in great need of such ‘isolated’ teachings.” A second letter-writer added, “Your newspaper seems to reflect an apathy which I do not see among the students.”48

There was certainly little apathy on campus during and in the wake of the 1969 October Moratorium against the Vietnam War. The Young Republican chapter at Carson-Newman vehemently denounced the Moratorium as a “use of the demagogic appeal to mobs” to force “the Nixon Administration to change its Vietnam policies.” American foreign policy, this group argued, “is far too complex and important to be influenced by the simplified ideas and actions of a few left-wing extremists and radicals who are able to have their way on college and university campuses.” The October 15 boycott of classes was nothing more than a New Left “attempt to gain control of American college campuses” and “to disrupt the orderly process of study.”49 Students Jerry Davis and Robert Ayers rejected the “peace-at-any-price policy” and argued that the moratorium only “gives moral support to the enemy.” American soldiers fighting and risking their lives in Vietnam deserved the support of the American people “rather than being stabbed in the back by” peace demonstrators at home.50 Proponents of the Moratorium passionately disagreed with the assessment by the Young Republicans of the student demonstration. October 15, they stated, was neither just “a boycott of classes” nor an attack on the President’s “sincerity and wanting to end the war,” but a time to “THINK.” They asked, “Do All Men Need Extremists to Denounce? Some people do because their minds are closed to the right to speak one’s opinion.”51

Not only did the October 15 Moratorium divide the student body, but it also split the faculty. Jan Hedderman, Dean of Students, and Dr. James Baumgardner, Associate Professor of History, opposed the Moratorium. Hedderman felt that President Nixon, who was more knowledgeable than she on the situation in Vietnam, “is doing all that he can” to secure peace. While he rejected the idea that the demonstrators nationwide were “either communists nor [sic] communist sympathizers,” Baumgardner nevertheless believed “that their actions obviously are giving aid and comfort to the other side in this struggle.” Dr. Robert Burts, Professor of History, had reservations regarding the demonstrations, “feeling that these activities hamper negotiations in Paris and further aid the Communists by showing” a divided nation. On the other hand, Gene Mathis, Assistant Professor of Speech, endorsed the Moratorium and would support future ones, but only if they “were held over a Friday-Saturday and they not disrupt more than one day of classes.” The most unique and interesting faculty response came from Ron Roberts, a member of the English department. Roberts said he was hired to teach the art of communication, which requires one to think. Since “his job is to help them think,” he planned to use the Moratorium as a teaching tool.52

The October edition of the Orange and Blue also published a scathing attack on the draft system. The editorialist labeled conscription a “fiendish monster” and “a flagrant violation of the American constitution,” about which all Americans should be “outraged.” Those who supported the concept of “America—Love it or leave it” encompassed “Birchers and Baptists” and most Carson-Newman students “are products of such a background.” The writer argued, “This type of thinking is largely influenced by the
right-wing alarmist, generally, the super-patriot prototype who enjoys imposing his standards on everyone else.” He then compared this attitude with “the nationalistic spirit of Nazi Germany.” Yet, the editorialist saw some hope as “a few Carson-Newman students have discovered that a dissenter is not necessarily a traitor, nor a protestor necessarily a communist.”53 The next month an article by student Denny Metz discarded a recent speech by Nixon on Vietnam as saying nothing new and designed for political purposes—“to take the end off the first Vietnam Moratorium and its follow up” and to influence the recent Congressional elections.54

In the wake of the American invasion of Cambodia in the spring of 1970, the Orange and Blue carried an article entitled “SHUT IT DOWN!” which labeled the U.S. action “unwarranted and illegitimate” and called for “a strike by students against the University.” This was a reprint of an exposition circulated nationwide, calling on “the entire academic community of this country” to strike. There is no indication that Carson-Newman students heeded this call to action; indeed, they strongly disagreed with the sentiment expressed in the article. In a student survey conducted the following fall, 310 out of 530 considered “Nixon’s decision to dispatch U.S. ground troops to Cambodia” to be correct. Moreover, 306 out 528 believed that the President’s action “was a wise one.”55

The last two mentions of the Vietnam War in the Orange and Blue came in 1971. In April, the newspaper called on Carson-Newman students to “[h]elp end the torture or physical punishment and mental anguish” of American POWs by writing “to the President of North Viet Nam.” In October, an article mentioned a new, nationwide student strike against the conflict in Southeast Asia for early November followed by a massive demonstration “in 16 large cities across the nation,” with Atlanta being the closest to East Tennessee. The writer concluded, “While the Orange & Blue can neither endorse nor condemn the student strike and the demonstrations against the war, it should be noted that for those students who believe that Carson-Newman students should concern themselves with issues more significant than dancing, November sixth provides an excellent opportunity for many of them to turn their words into action.”56 There is no record of Carson-Newman student participation in this anti-war demonstration.

The fall of South Vietnam in the spring of 1975 witnessed the mass exodus of thousands of South Vietnamese men, women, and children to the United States. Southern Baptists warmly reached out to these victims of communist aggression. The Baptist and Reflector carried stories of Baptist churches or individuals throughout the South who sponsored “Vietnamese refugee families” as well as information on how to become a sponsor through the Southern Baptist Home Mission Board. While some individuals and/or congregations in Tennessee surely reached out to these Vietnamese refugees, the state Baptist paper carried no such stories.57

In conclusion, Tennessee Baptists supported the American effort to halt the spread of communism in Southeast Asia. This was seen at the national level through the work of Dehoney and Paschall and at the state level with the 1967 resolution at the annual meeting of Tennessee Baptists and in Owens’s editorials in the Baptist and Reflector. Even on the three college campuses, a majority of Baptist students backed the Vietnam War; opposition to the conflict only involved a small number of students. Thus, Tennessee Baptists were very much like their counterparts in Texas.58
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The Intersection of History, Theology, and Business Ethics in Daniel Defoe's *The Complete English Tradesman*

by Patricia L. Hamilton

Most people today who recognize the name of Daniel Defoe know him as the author of early eighteenth-century novels such as *Robinson Crusoe* and *Moll Flanders*. Few realize that Defoe was better known in his own day as a political propagandist and journalist than as a novelist or that he worked at various times as a merchant, a government agent, and a spy. As a writer, Defoe was so prolific that even Isaac Asimov might have been impressed by his output. With a journalist's savvy, Defoe catered to contemporary tastes for both entertainment and self-improvement, producing works on economics, history, adventure, travel and exploration, crime, spirituality, and family life in addition to his novels, which were not written until his late fifties and early sixties.

Among the more than thirty book-length works Defoe produced in the last dozen years of his life was the two-volume *The Complete English Tradesman*, written and published over a two-year span, from 1725 to 1727. As early as 1713, in the midst of his career as a political journalist, Defoe commented that the subject he enjoyed writing about most was "trade," or business (Novak, "Daniel Defoe" 153). *The Complete English Tradesman* is an early management text directed at small business entrepreneurs. Because of its breadth of topics, from accounting and cash flow to inventory control and business ethics, it bears a striking resemblance to modern small business management texts. In fact, Defoe covered in 1727 almost two-thirds of the topics addressed by one widely used small business management textbook published in 2003, *Small Business Management: An Entrepreneurial Approach* by Longenecker, Moore, and Petty. To put this fact in a broad historical context, *The Complete English Tradesman* anticipated a great deal of modern small business management theory fifty years before Adam Smith's seminal *The Wealth of Nations* was published.

Fascinating as this information might be to management professors, Defoe's *The Complete English Tradesman* has particular significance to scholars interested in the Christian intellectual tradition. *The Complete English Tradesman* is important not merely as a small business text, but as one that demonstrates the integration of Christian principles with business practices—a topic, I would suggest, vital to each of us. Most of us are aware of the spectacular ethical failures involved in the downfall of WorldCom and more recently HealthSouth, corporations headed by men who have expressed a personal commitment to Christianity. We have seen the negative effects that large-scale corporate ethical failures such as the Enron debacle can have on the business climate and the disastrous consequences that can ensue in the personal lives of countless individual workers. Closer to home, each of us would no doubt like to work in communities where we could trust the people we do business with, free from the fear of getting cheated, swindled, or scammed. In other words, even though we know we live in a fallen world, we may find ourselves wishing that everyone from mega-corporations to mom-and-pop operations would follow scriptural principles—principles that affirm the importance of truth and integrity, of justice and equity, in our dealings with others, principles which teach us that wealth is not an end in itself but a tool for bringing God's kingdom purposes
to fruition. In fact, an important facet of our calling as Christian teachers and scholars is to help produce graduates who can translate Biblical principles into action, wherever they settle and whatever professions they choose to follow. At some level, then, we're all touched by ethical issues related to business. Daniel Defoe's *The Complete English Tradesman* can help us think through how ethical concerns in the marketplace can be viewed from a Christian perspective.

But how, you may well ask, could an eighteenth-century novelist who wrote so convincingly about a deserted island know anything relevant to the twenty-first century marketplace? And what qualifies him more than the next person to comment with any credibility on approaching business from a Christian worldview? To answer these questions, we need to briefly explore Defoe's interesting but somewhat checkered personal history.

Daniel Defoe was born in London in 1660, the year of Charles II's restoration to the throne after an eighteen-year period of civil war and Puritan reform. Defoe survived both the epidemic of Bubonic Plague that devastated London in 1665, killing an estimated 97,000 inhabitants (Backscheider 7), and the Great Fire in 1666 that destroyed ninety percent of the city's housing, resulting in property losses totaling about ten million pounds (4). Along with the physical and economic devastation that resulted from these two disasters, the 1660s saw a strong wave of persecution against Dissenters, including Presbyterians, Baptists, and Quakers. As a means of enforcing civic order under the restored Stuart monarchy, the Crown and Parliament joined together to require all clergymen and any teachers or tutors—even those employed in private families—to take oaths of conformity to the Church of England. As one of Defoe's biographers, Paula Backscheider, explains, Dissenters objected to "the words used in the baptism ceremony and to the 'absolution' of the dying, to including the apocrypha in the canonical books, and to using liturgical, rather than original, prayers 'from the heart'" (8).

Among the 1,800 dissenting clergymen ejected from the Church in 1662 was Samuel Annesley, Defoe's family pastor (Backscheider 7). His name may not ring a bell, but his family connections will: Annesley's daughter Susannah married Daniel Defoe's classmate, Samuel Wesley, and became the mother of John and Charles Wesley. Both Samuel Wesley's grandfather, Bartholomew Westley, and his father, John Westley, were Dissenting ministers as well (Wesley Connection). The record of persecution against Dissenters during the 1660s reads much like accounts of persecution suffered by house churches in China in the 1970s and 80s, complete with spies and informants, arrests and imprisonment, and exorbitant fines for public preaching. Throughout his life, Samuel Annesley was a model of humility, faithfulness, and unflinching obedience to conscience (Backscheider 10-13). From Annesley's example, Daniel Defoe grew up understanding the cost of discipleship.

A second godly influence on Defoe came from Charles Morton, a minister and first-rate scholar who established an influential Dissenting academy at Newington Green and who later became Vice President of Harvard at the invitation of Increase Mather. Since Dissenters were excluded by their nonconformity from careers in the church, the law, the military, and medicine, Morton's curriculum emphasized practical subjects such as geography, modern languages, and physics, along with the traditional Trivium (rhetoric, logic, and Latin grammar) and Quadrivium (arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, and music) (Backscheider 15). Morton also educated his students in casuistry, the branch of moral
philosophy in which general ethical principles are applied to particular cases that involve a moral dilemma or questions of right conduct. The study of applied ethics appealed to Defoe, who like other Dissenters of his era was faced with conflicts between duty to the State and duty to conscience. As Backscheider notes, casuistry offered Dissenters "ways to examine conscience and learn to choose correct moral action" (19). From both Amnesley and Morton, Defoe absorbed an interest in practical teaching and a concern for the public welfare (16-17).

Barred from the professions, Dissenters during Defoe's lifetime became the backbone of England's mercantile economy (Backscheider 11). Defoe's father, James, was a prosperous tallow Chandler in London and rose to considerable influence as Renter Warden, or treasurer, of the Butcher's Company, the equivalent of a powerful trade association (27, 29). Defoe followed his father into business, initially setting up shop as a hosier in 1681 (30). As his business grew, he began to invest in ships and deal in commodities, trading in cloth goods along with beer, wine, and spirits (50). However, by 1688, the year of the Glorious Revolution, Defoe began to experience financial difficulties due to a combination of shipping losses and mounting debts. From our modern-day vantage point, we may surmise that Defoe was a risk-taker, possessed of an entrepreneurial wheeler-dealer personality. Instead of cutting his losses, he continued to borrow and to speculate, investing in raising civit cats for their musk and in a diving bell project designed to recover sunken treasure. Finally, hounded by creditors and embroiled in lawsuits, he was arrested twice for debt before declaring bankruptcy in 1692. When Defoe got back on his feet again, it was as an accountant for a commissioner of the glass duty, a tax on glassware and bottles. Defoe's entrepreneurial spirit could not be quelled, however, and he invested in a successful factory that manufactured bricks and roofing tiles (Backscheider 64). But a second bankruptcy followed in 1703, this time less due to mismanagement and overspeculation than to Defoe's inability to oversee his business while he was imprisoned for his political views. His failed political satire, The Shortest Way with Dissenters, offended the ruling powers, and he was sentenced to stand in the pillory.

As a result of his two stints in the Catch-22 world of debtor's prison, Defoe became a strong advocate for the reform of English bankruptcy laws. He recognized, quite sensibly, that throwing people into prison until they paid their debts prevented them from earning the money necessary to discharge their debts (Novak, Master of Fictions 76). More remarkably, Defoe adopted a strikingly modern perspective on business failure. Rather than seeing bankruptcy as disqualifying a person from engaging in future ventures, Defoe saw failure as a steep, albeit costly, learning curve that would allow a man of integrity to start over again. By the time Defoe began writing The Complete English Tradesman at age 65, he must have recognized that in his younger days he had been gambling not only with his own income but also with the livelihood of others. Apparently Defoe realized too that scrupulous honesty and exact accounting were more consistent with Christian values than the self-interested, fast-and-loose financial practices he had indulged in as a younger man. Although he never overtly mentions his own business or ethical failures in The Complete English Tradesman, it is clear that he draws as much on his failures as on his successes in the advice he gives.

The 990 pages of The Complete English Tradesman are certainly filled with advice. Defoe ranges among dozens of topics—sometimes, it seems, in no particular order.
However, a close examination of the text reveals that a central, unifying thread throughout the work is Defoe's concern for honesty and integrity.

One example that illustrates Defoe's focus on honesty is his stance toward dealing with counterfeit money. In Defoe's day, counterfeit coins were a serious, recurrent problem. Many tradesmen, after inadvertently receiving counterfeit money as payment, simply passed it on to unsuspecting third parties. Defoe calls this practice "dishonest and knavish" (243), arguing, "My having been cheated does not authorise me to cheat any other person." If it were not honest for someone else to pass money he knew to be bad, Defoe reasons, "how can it be so in me?" (244). Defoe proposes that tradesmen have a duty to law, justice, and conscience to absorb the loss if they have unwittingly accepted counterfeit coins (245), and he appeals to the notion of serving the public interest to support his argument. This advice occurs, by the way, in a chapter entitled, "Of the customary Frauds of Trade, which honest Men allow themselves to practise, and pretend to justify" (241). Defoe points out that the marketplace supports "customary frauds," or what we might call generally accepted unethical practices. He also identifies the underlying spiritual problem: men who are otherwise honest allow themselves to practice small frauds because "everyone else is doing it." In other words, when faced with temptation, they give in without resistance. They "pretend to justify" what they know in their consciences to be wrong in order to avoid financial loss, which in their minds has been elevated into a greater evil than dishonesty. Defoe will have none of it.

In the same chapter, Defoe discusses what today we would call "truth in advertising." He calls attention to "the various Arts made use of by tradesmen to set off their goods to the eye of the ignorant buyer" (248). These practices share a common intention of cheating the unsuspecting. Defoe complains, for instance, about the false lights, artificial side-windwos, and skylights that are used to show off fabric in a way that deceives the buyer. There is a difference, he argues, between marketing "sizzle"—setting out goods to their best advantage, "well dress'd, well pres'd and pack'd" --and presenting them "with fraud and false colors" in order to "delude the eye" (249). He complains that it's hard to argue against such unethical practices when they are so pervasively followed (248), but he boils the matter down to an either/or proposition: "Either [the practices] are honest, or they are not; if they are not, why do we, I say, universally make use of them? if they are honest, why so much art, and so much application to manage them, and to make goods appear fairer and finer to the eye than they really are? which in its own nature is evidently a design to cheat, and that in it self is criminal, and can be no other." Why, indeed.

A final customary fraud that Defoe argues against in this chapter is what he calls "shop-rhetoric" and what we might call "high pressure sales hype." Although in an earlier passage he exhorts dealers in retail goods to practice "courtesy, civility, and good manners" behind the sales counter (86), here he blasts the "mass of rattling flattery to the buyer" that is filled with "hypocrisy, compliment, self-praises, falshood, and in short a complication of wickedness," claiming it is "a corrupt means to a vicious end" (251). To listen to Defoe, one would almost think he'd been given a pitch by an unscrupulous used car salesman. Defoe concedes that "there is a modest liberty, which trading license, like the poetick license, allows to all the tradesmen of every kind" but concludes that "tradesmen ought no more to Lie behind the counter, than the parsons ought to talk treason in the pulpit" (251).
The particular liberties that Defoe will permit a tradesman to take include asking a higher price than he will accept and promising payment to a creditor by a certain date even though he may not be able to keep his promise. In the latter case, the promise is made with "a contingent dependence upon the circumstances of trade" (231), such as being paid on time by those who owe him money. Defoe goes on to distinguish between "wilful premeditated lying" and "the necessity men may be driven to by their disappointments, and other accidents of their circumstances, to break such promises, as they had made with an honest intention of performing them" (238). Here we can see the influence of Defoe's early study of casuistry. He tests the circumstances under which a person may be seen to either uphold or break his word. Defoe is trying to wrestle with the slippery nature of language and reason his way toward a practical set of ethical guidelines. Interestingly, Defoe sets his discussion of promise-breaking within a larger Christian framework: "Christianity supposes we acknowledge that life and all the contingencies of life are subjected to the dominion of Providence, and liable to all those accidents which God permits to befall us in the ordinary course of our living in the world; therefore . . . 'tis but justice to us as Christians, in the common acception of our words, that when I say I will certainly meet my friend at such a place, and at such a time, he should understand me to mean, if it pleases God to give me life and health, or that his Providence permits me to come, or as the text says, if the Lord will; for we all know, that unless the Lord will, I cannot meet, or so much as live" (232-33). Defoe acknowledges the provisional nature not only of promises, but of all human endeavor as well.

While Defoe is clearly concerned with a businessman's ethical stance toward his customers, he also urges the tradesman to maintain an ethical stance toward his competitors. Defoe is aware of the vital role that reputation plays in a small business's success. Maintaining a good reputation is closely connected to a tradesman's ability to obtain credit, which Defoe sees as a business's lifeblood. This being the case, he argues that a tradesman ought to be just as careful of his neighbor's reputation as his own: "Religion teaches us not to slander and defame our neighbour, that is to say, not to raise or promote any slander or scandal upon his good name" (185). He then reasons that a person who wounds a tradesman's reputation or his credit is like a murderer because the result of maligning a competitor's reputation is to kill his business. While this analogy might seem rather extreme, the negative effects Defoe describes of rumors or speculation about a possible insolvency are analogous to the negative effects we see on Wall Street of rumors regarding low quarterly earnings, hostile takeovers, or impending bankruptcy. Even more interesting is Defoe's psychological analysis of how rumors work on the hearer's mind: although a person may suspect that the devil himself is the author of a malicious rumor, it will still leave an impression on his mind; and though he knows the devil is a liar, he may reason to himself that in this instance the devil is speaking the truth, which will put him on his guard. "Thus insensibly and involuntarily," Defoe concludes, "nay, in spite of friendship, good wishes, and even resolution to the contrary, 'tis almost impossible to prevent our being shockt by rumour, and we receive an impression whether we will or not, and that from the worst enemy" (192). Defoe goes on to give a case study of the effect of gossip on business and argues that tradesmen should not run down their competition with the observation, "I know no case in the world, in which there is more occasion for the golden rule . . . do as you would be done unto"
(202). Here we can see Defoe drawing explicitly on a scriptural precept to support his argument.

Along with prescribing an ethical stance towards customers and competitors, Defoe encourages tradesmen to act ethically toward their creditors. Here, perhaps more than in any other passage, we can see Defoe drawing heavily on his own personal history. Defoe says that to guard against over-extension, a businessman should "be very sure not to give so much credit as he takes" (63). But if he does run into trouble, he should own up to the fact and deal with it in a responsible and timely manner. If through unfortunate circumstances he finds he has "nothing left to trade on but his credit," Defoe questions "whether it can be honest for any such man to continue trading" because he would be "making his creditors run an unjust hazard without their consent" (76). When business failure seems unavoidable, the tradesman "ought to call his creditors together, lay his circumstances honestly before them" (76), and offer to pay them as much as he can at the best possible rate. If his creditors respond generously by extending additional credit in hopes he will be able to turn his business around, Defoe says, "well and good" (77). But the tradesman "cannot honestly oblige them to run the risque of his unfortunate progress, and to venture their estates on his bottom," or foundation, "after his bottom is really nothing at all but their money" (77). Ultimately, declaring bankruptcy, or what Defoe refers to as "breaking," may be the most ethical course for all parties concerned. Defoe exhorts his reader, "By breaking in time,"—that is, before all his assets are completely gone—"you will . . . obtain the character of an Honest, tho' unfortunate man" (77). By demonstrating his integrity, the tradesman will be able to hold up his head in the business community after a business failure. Not only that, but he will experience the "peace and satisfaction of mind" that "the Tradesman will always have when he acts the honest part" (79). In all of this advice, we can see that for Defoe, honesty is the foundational virtue upon which rests a businessman's reputation and ultimately his business's success.

In what we might see as a further application of the Golden Rule, Defoe believes a businessman should extend the same compassion with which he wants to be treated by his creditors to the "poor unfortunate neighbor" who owes him money. He should be willing to accept partial payment as a discharge of the whole debt. Defoe argues that "a Tradesman, let his circumstances be what they will, has the most reason to consider the disaster of the unfortunate, and be compassionate to them under their pressures and disasters, of any other men, because they know not, no not the most prosperous of them, what may be their own fate in the world" (162). He goes on to explain, "There is a Scripture proverb . . . very necessary to a Tradesman in this case, Let him that thinketh he standeth, take heed lest he fall " (162-63). Defoe's Christian worldview prompts him to suggest counteracting the potentially destructive effects of pride with a prudent humility regarding the actual degree of control he has over his life and affairs. His conclusion that "compassion to the miserable is a debt of charity due from all mankind to their fellow-creatures" (164) affirms once again that financial success is not of higher value than the practice of virtue.

Defoe believes that to be considered honest, a tradesman "must act honestly and justly, and that in all his dealings; he must neither cheat or defraud, over-reach or circumvent his neighbour, or indeed any body he deals with; nor must he design to do so, or lay any pots or snares to that purpose in his dealing" (226). He wants tradesmen to think not only about themselves but also about their primary and secondary stakeholders.
Over the course of forty-five years, Defoe learned from the school of hard knocks that honesty and integrity are the best policy—best because they yield good results. In *The Complete English Tradesman*, Defoe is trying to help others avoid some of the pitfalls he tumbled into himself. He does so not simply by reciting abstract principles but by arguing logically and illustrating with anecdotes, examples, and cases and by occasionally lacing his discussion with references to Scripture or scriptural principles. As part of his Dissenter heritage, Defoe recognized that human nature is fallen, and he accepted the implication that people must therefore be *taught* to do their duty. In the society in which Defoe lived, there was little doubt that the individual did in fact owe a duty to society. Over the course of the eighteenth century, however, cultural assumptions shifted such that Adam Smith's ideas about duty rested on Deistic rather than Christian notions about human nature. Smith's laissez-faire capitalism posits that if everyone acts according to self-interest, ultimately everything will work out. But when Daniel Defoe acted according to self-interest, he wound up in debtors' prison.

What we can learn from Defoe's experience, then, is that ethical behavior in business—even among Christians—doesn't just happen. Either it comes as a result of painful experience, sometimes involving failure, or it must be actively inculcated. Accordingly, we need to challenge our students—all our students, not just the business majors—to connect the dots between scriptural principles and the particular circumstances they are likely to encounter in their professional and personal lives that will raise issues of right conduct. If we are successful at training them up in the way they should go, then when they become CPAs and CEOs and principals and directors of nursing and engineers and city councilmen, they will not depart from it.
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Reflections of a Pastor of Southern Churches

by Kelvin Moore

In 1978, at the age of eighteen, I was invited to preach by a small congregation in west central Alabama. Later, I became pastor. Little did I know the impact that experience would have in shaping my life. For the next four years, throughout my college experience, I pastored a church fewer than five hours driving time from Montgomery, the first capital of the secessionists’ South. Since then I have pastored churches in Louisiana, West Virginia, and Tennessee. “Dinners on the ground,” “Sunday singings,” and baptizings in a pond are a few of the fond memories I have of pastoring Southern churches. I have found the Southern churches I pastored to be committed to Christ and passionate about the Great Commission. But my first church, in the “Heart of Dixie,” taught me two valuable worldview lessons.

Being young at the time of Alabama’s integration, I cannot remember my school without blacks. To my knowledge, my Lamar County school integrated without incident. Not only was integration not a problem in my school, Lewis and Joe Lee, two of my best friends, were black. But my first church taught me an important lesson. Unambiguously, I became aware of a deep-seated blemish held by some—prejudice. To my surprise and dismay, prejudice left me reeling when a church member informed me of his opposition to allowing a black person to worship in our church. As I spoke quietly with church members, I realized that others, albeit a minority, were prejudiced as well. My Southern congregation taught me that everyone did not view other people with a sense of tolerance and respect.

During my tenure there, I taught and preached against prejudice, at times with subtlety and at other times more forcefully. I allowed the Bible to speak to the congregation regarding God’s acceptance of all peoples. I spoke of prejudice as demeaning and sinful. Four years later, my Southern congregation taught me another priceless worldview lesson—people can change. As I resigned the church in order to continue my education, I spoke, for what would be the final time, with the man who had vociferously stated his opposition to blacks worshipping in our church. He admitted to me that he had changed his views toward blacks and shared with me his willingness to accept black people. I knew that if he could change, others could change too.

The church celebrated its fiftieth anniversary in August of 2004, and I was invited to return and speak. As I traveled to the church, my emotions oscillated from nostalgia to apprehension—and then to simple curiosity. While I had communicated across the years with a few of the church members, time and distance prohibited much of this. Consequently, I knew little about the church. I wondered as to its integration progress or lack thereof. In the twenty-year interim, the church had added new educational space and a fellowship hall. I did not recognize many of the faces. But more pressing matters concerned me. Stepping up to address the assembly, I had hoped to see some evidence of an integrated congregation. The fact that I saw no visual evidence of this saddened me. After the worship service, I spoke with a man who had likewise struggled with racism twenty years ago. After talking about the “good ole days,” softly I asked about the current status of the church. As the conversation moved to integration, he informed me
of black families who worship there periodically and of black children who attend the
church’s Vacation Bible School annually. While the change experienced by that
congregation cannot be likened to the First Great Awakening, the change is, nonetheless,
just as real. Regardless of the grave flaws possessed by that Southern congregation,
people can change.

I shall always cherish my recollections of that small Southern church. The church
patiently supported me and endlessly encouraged me. The church graciously accepted
me even as I knew far less than I thought I did. And I shall always be grateful for two
worldview lessons my Southern church taught me: unfortunately, prejudice lives;
fortunately, people can change.
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Flannery O'Connor at Union and Beyond

by Roger Stanley

Flannery O'Connor, whose premature death from lupus in 1964—just before her fortieth birthday—marks one of Southern literature's biggest losses, is the writer who has meant the most to me both in the Union classroom and beyond.

Indeed it has been the opportunity to take students from two separate summer classes to Georgia for sites associated with O'Connor which will always provide one of my most fulfilling Union memories. We first embarked in August 1997 at the end of a four-week class in the major Southern authors Faulkner, O'Connor, and Percy; in 1999, chair Barbara McMillin was gracious enough to let me teach a special topics course exclusively on my favorite writer (“The Fiction and Faith of Flannery O'Connor”). Both journeys took us to O'Connor’s birth home in coastal Savannah, but focused primarily on rural Milledgeville, the residence of most of her adult life which also serves as the repository of her papers inside her alma mater’s library.

Flannery O'Connor’s fiction consists of some three dozen short stories, plus the two novels *Wise Blood* and *The Violent Bear it Away*. While the longer works are a harder sale best reserved for upper division courses, I have never neglected the opportunity to teach such hilarious stories as “A Good Man is Hard to Find,” “Revelation,” and “Good Country People” at the freshman level.

As might be surmised from these titles, O’Connor’s subject matter ultimately involves a search for goodness; ironically, such epiphanies often come to her characters only in the aftermath of a textbook being hurled up side of their heads or of finding themselves abandoned in a hayloft short one artificial limb. It’s this mixture of violence with a comic sensibility driven largely by accurate representation of how mid-twentieth century Southerners actually talked (and still talk today) which makes O’Connor’s stories stick.

Using the word “Faith” in the 1999 course title was much more than just a recruitment pitch in light of Union’s mission and evangelical orientation. A cradle Catholic born in that rare Southern city where Catholics were more than a token minority, O'Connor never quite adjusted to the Bible Belt of central Georgia when the family moved there from Savannah just before her teen years. Still, both her letters and her fiction are imbued with theology—more overt and speculative in the former, subtler in the fiction.

Indeed any sect or denomination might well appropriate O’Connor’s writings in an enriching way. One of the best O’Connor conferences I ever attended was held at Brigham Young University under the auspices of its Center for the Study of Christian Values in Literature. Closer to home (and to the theological mainstream), I was pleased to assist Union Artist-in-Residence Michael Mallard last fall in a six-week Wednesday night study series on O'Connor at First United Methodist of Jackson. This creator of “a Christian in spite of himself” (O'Connor’s label for her *Wise Blood* protagonist) is the exclusive province of no one religious perspective—Catholic, Protestant, or otherwise.

I am struck too by allegiance to O’Connor not only from her fellow prose stylists, but also in what might be loosely (but not disparagingly) labeled “secular popular
culture.” Singer/songwriter Lucinda Williams, who recently won her third Grammy for a probing vocal on her song “Get Right With God,” once prefaced a live performance of “Pineola” by noting that it “could be right out of Flannery O’Connor.” Strikingly, “Pineola” is based on an actual Catholic funeral she attended, but Williams changed the characters and imagery in the lyrics to Pentecostalism. Artists like Tom Waits (who entitled one song “A Good Man is Hard to Find”) and Bruce Springsteen (who avows reading the “just incredible” O’Connor prior to releasing *Nebraska*) have also come under O’Connor’s sway.

As much as music, conferences, study groups, and certainly the classroom have meant and continue to mean to me, I always return to the “field trips” I have led, especially the 1999 one, when assessing what O’Connor has provided me. The five of us attended Sacred Heart Catholic Church of Milledgeville on a hot July Sabbath, O’Connor’s actual parish in the 1940’s and 1950’s.

A “cradle Baptist” myself, I had never attended a Catholic service, and I sought to alleviate any misgivings by offering a ride across town to any student who wished to “opt out” and attend a more familiar denomination. There were no takers. We were made to feel welcome by this small enclave of worshippers, and one elderly lady proved to be a cousin of Flannery and reminisced in our presence after the service.

The great writer is buried rather anonymously with family in Milledgeville’s public cemetery, where the mourner can stand graveside and take note of the First Baptist fellowship hall directly across the fence. After a brief stop there, I couldn’t prevent this spirited quartet of students from guiding me to Andalusia, the O’Connor farm house which I knew to be officially off limits to visitors. It must have been that offer of extra credit I had half seriously dangled out to them, for before I knew it, they were all navigating their way past barbed wire and Pinkerton security signs and onto the driveway proper. What could a professor cast in a supervisory chaperone’s role do but follow in their wake?

Never very patient with academic analysis of her prose, O’Connor would probably be appalled at the cottage industry surrounding her work in literature and creative writing programs today. She once famously said, “Everywhere I go I’m asked if I think the universities stifle writers. My opinion is that they don’t stifle enough of them.” Touché: and thank goodness her own counsel was not heeded in her case.
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CLIO Encounters Eschatology:
Recent Historiographical Interest in Christian Belief About the Future

by James A. Patterson

Introduction

In 1970, Hal Lindsey publicly inaugurated what proved to be a remarkable career as an evangelical prophecy guru with the initial release of *The Late Great Planet Earth*. This volume, which was not far removed from the literary genre of tabloid journalism, became a national best seller and precipitated a deluge of books, newsletters, films, and television shows devoted to frequently sensationalized depictions of prophetic themes.¹ For his part, Lindsey essentially popularized the dispensational tradition of John Nelson Darby, C. I. Scofield, and Lewis Sperry Chafer; of course, he offered several new interpretive twists to fit the unfolding events of the late twentieth century into the classic system. Moreover, as Chris Hall has recently noted, Lindsey “unexpectedly uncovered a deep vein of eschatological and apocalyptic longing in the fundamentalist/evangelical subculture and in American culture at large.”²

In the same year that *The Late Great Planet Earth* gazed expectantly toward the future for the impending fulfillment of biblical prophecies, the late church historian Ernest R. Sandeen published *The Roots of Fundamentalism*, a landmark monograph that looked to the past for perspective on, among other things, conservative Christian beliefs about the future.³ Lindsey and Sandeen probably were unaware of each other in 1970; in addition, they wrote for different reasons and disparate audiences. Nevertheless, Sandeen’s explorations in British and American millenarian sources yielded historical insights that subsequently would help to explain the Lindsey phenomenon. If American evangelicals and fundamentalists had devoured *The Roots of Fundamentalism* with as much gusto as they imbibed *The Late Great Planet Earth*, their grasp of Lindsey’s context and significance would have been much sharper. Furthermore, they might have been far less euphoric about the former tugboat captain’s prophetic speculations.

Sandeen, then a professor at Macalester College in Minnesota, was not the first scholar to address historical manifestations of prophecy belief.⁴ What set his endeavor apart from others was his focus on American fundamentalism as a theological tradition that could not be explained simply in cultural, psychological, or social terms. As an intellectual historian, Sandeen contended that premillennialism represented one of two major components at the very heart of the fundamentalist movement.⁵ He carefully traced the influence of nineteenth-century British millenarians like Edward Irving and John Nelson Darby, giving special attention to the latter’s ecclesiology and theory of a secret rapture.⁶ Through a number of visits to the United States, the Plymouth Brethren leader convinced many American Protestants to accept his dispensational theology, even if few were inclined to join his movement. As Sandeen demonstrated, dispensationalism was then Americanized through the efforts of men like C. I. Scofield, known especially for his *Reference Bible*.⁷

In his thorough investigation of the origins of fundamentalist eschatological beliefs, Sandeen showed that he took them seriously. While his overall interpretation of fundamentalism has been justifiably challenged, Sandeen contributed significantly to the historiography of Christian beliefs about the future.⁸ His book provided a useful historical backdrop for what was happening among more apocalyptically-oriented evangelicals after 1970; at the same time, it
suggestively paved the way for further research into the historical development of Christian eschatology.

Timothy P. Weber, now the academic dean at Northern Baptist Theological Seminary near Chicago, pursued some of Sandeen’s themes in his doctoral dissertation at the University of Chicago, eventually published as *Living in the Shadow of the Second Coming*.9 Weber shared Sandeen’s interest in the theological world view of premillennialism, including its methods of biblical interpretation. But he also sought to incorporate the historical models of Robert F. Berkhofer Jr. and Martin E. Marty, his dissertation advisor.10 Hence, Weber aimed his analytical skills not only at doctrine, but also at the forms of behavior that were shaped and influenced by doctrine. He approached his study of premillennialism by asking whether a belief in the imminent return of Christ made any difference in how people actually lived, behaved, or conducted their lives.11

After explaining the eschatology of premillennialism, Weber then examined the impact of belief in the imminent Second Coming on attitudes toward social reform, foreign missions, war, Zionism, and other issues with potential links to biblical prophecy. Like Sandeen, Weber presented premillennialism primarily as a religious movement: “Although it has had some social and political consequences, premillennialism’s paramount appeal is to personal and religious sentiments.”12 On the other hand, Weber’s behavioral perspective allowed him to show more interest than Sandeen in the social and political implications of premillennial beliefs. In the final analysis, Weber went beyond Sandeen’s basically theological treatment, resulting in a more realistic picture of premillennialism.

Led by historians like Sandeen and Weber, there was an explosion of scholarly writing about prophecy beliefs and apocalypticism in the 1970s and 1980s. These works ranged in scope well beyond American fundamentalism and evangelicalism to include several different historical eras and types of eschatological doctrines.13 Clearly, Christian eschatology had gained acceptance as a legitimate topic for historical research and writing. In fact, the 1990s would bring a further expansion of scholarly efforts to understand and explain the historical development of Christian beliefs about the end times, most notably in the works of Paul Boyer, Bernard McGinn, and Robert Fuller.14

**Paul Boyer: Mining the Sources**

In 1992, Paul Boyer, the Merle Curti Professor of History at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, published *When Time Shall Be No More*, the most exhaustive study of modern American premillennialism yet written. Raised in the Brethren in Christ denomination, Boyer first became aware of prophecy issues during childhood through the sermons of his grandfather.15 Through previous works on the Salem witchcraft episode, urban history, and the nuclear age, Boyer achieved wide acclaim in the guild of professional historians.16

In *When Time Shall Be No More*, Boyer’s central concern is to account for the pervasiveness, persistence, and adaptability of prophecy belief in modern American culture. He steadfastly avoids condescending or reductionistic analyses, preferring to treat premillennial eschatology with respect as primarily a religious belief system. At the same time, Boyer alertly recognizes that doctrines concerning the end times contribute to a world view that offers psychological and ontological benefits: "Prophecy belief is a way of ordering experience. It gives a grand, overarching shape to history, and thus ultimate meaning to the lives of individuals caught up in history’s stream. Here, I believe, is a key to its enduring appeal."17
In a recent article that serves to update his book, Boyer elaborates further on this more functional side of prophecy belief:

So long as premillennial dispensationalism continues to meet the emotional and psychological needs of a great many Americans, and so long as the popularizers of Bible prophecy continue to weave our deepest collective anxieties into their end-time scenarios, this ancient belief system, with its infinite flexibility and its imaginative, drama-filled vision of history, will remain a significant shaping force in our politics and culture. Boyer's sensitivity to these dimensions of eschatological belief, while not fully developed in *When Time Shall Be No More*, nonetheless helps to qualify the criticisms of reviewers who judge him as long on narrative and short on analysis and interpretation.

Like Sandeen, Boyer is most comfortable employing the tools of intellectual history; in particular, he depends primarily on the reading of texts for his information about the "hidden world" of prophecy belief. Indeed, the mere quantity of prophetic materials that Boyer read staggers the imagination. During a four-year period, he digested over three hundred prophecy books, as well as papers from prophecy conferences, prophecy newsletters, and religious periodicals devoted to prophecy themes. To supplement his scouring of written sources, Boyer also interviewed five prophecy writers, listened to prophecy sermons by visiting speakers at two churches in Madison, Wisconsin, and attended a prophecy seminar held under the auspices of the Seventh-day Adventist Church. Over one hundred pages of endnotes attest to the thoroughness of Boyer's research.

In good historical fashion, Boyer sets the stage for the core of his book by establishing the background and context of premillennial eschatology. His first chapter concisely scans the early development of prophetic and apocalyptic thought in ancient Israel and the early church. He limits his discussion of biblical materials to Ezekiel, Daniel, Mark 13, and Revelation; here his comments indicate at least a modest acceptance of higher critical conclusions. For example, Boyer states that "the weight of scholarly opinion views the Book of Daniel as a pseudopigraphic apocalypse written around 167 B.C. and predated to enhance its credibility." Even so, he recognizes the enormous influence of the Bible's apocalyptic texts on later believers who viewed them as "vital source of doctrine, reassessment, and foreknowledge."

His overview in chapter two of the "rhythms" of eschatological beliefs throughout church history covers key individuals and movements like Irenaeus, Augustine, Joachim of Flora, the Reformers, the Puritans, and Jonathan Edwards. The compressed character of this section is understandable in light of Boyer's overall purpose; certainly it invited other scholars like McGinn to shape more substantive treatments of apocalyptic thinking in periods and contexts to which *When Time Shall Be No More* gives short shrift. Still, Boyer manages to glean some suggestive themes from his historical survey, including (1) the durability and adaptability of prophetic beliefs; (2) the danger of these doctrines becoming politicized; and (3) the reality that in the contemporary world, intellectual and theological leaders are no longer the chief expounders of the prophetic scriptures.

Boyer's third introductory chapter, which covers some of the same ground as Sandeen's *The Roots of Fundamentalism*, charts the history of premillennialism through 1945. The Wisconsin professor is especially adept at measuring the impact of the World War II era on premillennialist scenarios. In fact, the momentous wartime events, Boyer concludes, provided prophecy writers with "compelling empirical validation of their unfashionable but remarkably tenacious vision of human destiny." Many of the themes that unfold more fully in later chapters are introduced in this section.
The heart of Boyer’s tome can be found in the five chapters that make up part II. Here he meticulously draws on his vast reading of prophecy literature to recount the story of dispensational premillennialism over the last half-century. Boyer focuses specifically on how the prophecy movement sought to interpret biblical texts in response to the advent of the atomic bomb, the regathering of Israel as a nation, the rise and fall of the Soviet Union, and the prominent role of the United States in world affairs. Chapter eight tactfully catalogs the host of Antichrist candidates that prophecy speculators have identified since 1945--Anwar el-Sadat, King Juan Carlos, Henry Kissinger, Mikhail Gorbachev, and Ronald Reagan, among others, received consideration for beasty status. In these chapters, Boyer copiously cites prophecy writers and preachers like Donald Grey Barnhouse, M. R. DeHaan, Dave Hunt, Salem Kirban, Tim LaHaye, Mary Stewart Relfe, Chuck Smith, Charles Taylor, Jack Van Impe, John Walvoord, and, of course, Hal Lindsey. The reader has to be struck not only by the apocalyptic nature of the times, but also by the boldness with which the prophecy experts put forth their applications of biblical texts to current events.

The final two chapters reveal Boyer at his interpretive best. For example, he offers the image of the theater as the most helpful metaphor for understanding the premillennial view of history as predestined. Premillennialism’s keen sense of harmony, symmetry, and meaning in history, in fact, partly explains its appeal: “With secular historians no longer speaking the language of progress or portraying the majestic unfolding of a divine plan in history, prophecy popularizers took up the slack and found a vast audience in the process.” Boyer is also effective in pointing out how the premillennial concept of history is linked to a pronounced utopianism with its emphasis on the coming Millennium as an “alternative future.”

Boyer’s most weighty achievement in this long volume is his consistent attention to the resiliency of prophecy belief. Even when the prophecy teachers and writers have been wrong on the significance of events or in their identifications of the Antichrist, they have not hesitated to reset their timetables or rework their interpretations of prophetic passages. Near the end of his book, Boyer comes close to commending the flexibility of contemporary premillennialists: “As the configuration of world power alignments and public concerns shifts at the end of the century, prophecy popularizers, like their predecessors over the centuries, are proving extremely resourceful at restructuring their scenario.” While this assessment might suggest that biblical prophecy becomes a ball of wax in the hands of some of its expounders, it also helps to explain why a distinguished historian like Paul Boyer regards prophecy belief as an enduring reality in modern American culture.

Bernard McGinn: Antichrist over Two Millennia

Bernard McGinn’s Antichrist represents only one of several works that this respected medieval historian has penned on the historical development of Christian eschatological beliefs, an area he has researched for over twenty years. Among other important volumes on prophetic doctrines, the Naomi Shenstone Donnelley Professor of Historical Theology and the History of Christianity at the University of Chicago Divinity School has authored Visions of the End and served as one of the editors for The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism. Like Boyer, McGinn writes primarily as an intellectual historian, although his major area of expertise is Europe, not America.

The fact that McGinn is a Roman Catholic in the Augustinian tradition helps to explain his overall approach in Antichrist. From the outset, he disclaims a literal Antichrist, averring
instead that the paramount manifestation of evil has already come: “the most important message of the Antichrist legend in Western history is what it has to tell us about our past, and perhaps even about our present attitudes toward evil.” He then elaborates on this theme with the proposal that “the Antichrist legend can be seen as a projection, or perhaps better as a mirror, for conceptions and fears about ultimate human evil.” Thus an allegorical or symbolic understanding of the Antichrist functions as McGinn’s vehicle for taking Christian eschatology seriously.

McGinn’s aversion to a literal Antichrist is even more evident when he discusses the internal-external and dread-deception polarities that have characterized the various images of the Antichrist in Christian history. He unequivocally identifies with those Christian thinkers, such as Augustine of Hippo, who have located the central meaning of Antichrist in “the spirit that resists Christ present in the hearts of believers” or in the deceit of those “who confess Christ with their mouths but deny him by their deeds.” For McGinn, this spiritualized, even domesticated Antichrist is far more plausible than an external enemy who inspires dread like a persecutor or who practices outright deception from a seat of religious power.

These theological musings about the nature of the Antichrist form the backdrop for McGinn’s historical survey. He begins his account by delving into the apocalyptic traditions of Second Temple Judaism, which he regards as a complex interaction of myth, legend, and history. The angelic and human adversaries of God and His messiah that emerge in these writings, McGinn argues, “form a necessary part of the background to the Antichrist legend.” Among the important Jewish antecedents he discusses is the “Final Tyrant” found in the Book of Daniel, a writing that McGinn dates to the Maccabean period. By limiting the application of the “little horn” in Daniel 7-12 to Antiochus IV Epiphanes, McGinn adopts a posture toward the Old Testament prophetical book that is very similar to Boyer’s. In other words, the author of Daniel creatively utilized apocalyptic eschatology to interpret his own troubled times. Even as he ignores any predictive value in Daniel’s prophecies, McGinn frets over the apocalyptic writer’s externalization of good and evil “in terms of present historical conflicts.” Consequently, McGinn infers that the apocalypticism of Second Temple Judaism influenced Christian eschatology in deleterious ways.

McGinn’s comprehensive overview of Christian Antichrist images occupies eight chapters, each one devoted to a distinct historical period. In covering early Christianity, the Chicago historian combines a higher critical approach to the New Testament with a marked preference for patristic authorities like Origen, Jerome, Tyconius, and Augustine. All of these Fathers articulated non-millennial eschatologies, usually accompanied by inner moral interpretations of Antichrist. Four chapters on the Middle Ages, McGinn’s specialty, scrutinize topics like the monk Adso’s “Last Emperor” motif, Hildegard of Bingen’s innovative symbolism, Joachim of Flora’s apocalyptic speculations, and dissident Franciscans’ espousal of a papal Antichrist. In these sections, McGinn incorporates useful references to poetry, drama, and art, thus illustrating how apocalypticism played out in popular culture.

For the Reformation and modern periods, McGinn employs the rubrics “Antichrist Divided” and “Antichrist in Decline.” First, he adeptly shows how polarization became inevitable as a result of Martin Luther’s “uncompromising denunciation of the papacy as true and final Antichrist present in the world.” This stridency set the tone for later debate; indeed, radical, Anabaptist, Puritan, and Catholic voices all responded in one way or another to the Lutheran Reformer’s identification of the papacy as the Final Enemy. Second, McGinn depicts
the marginalization of literal Antichrist beliefs after 1660, a development he appears to welcome. He offers this critical prognosis of modern trends:

Antichrist as a form of vague rhetoric to be used against any opponent helped weaken the content of a term that was already being undercut by the neglect of its more personal applications. . . . Antichrist’s reality became increasingly problematic as Enlightenment ideas spread, but Christianity itself had prepared the way for this collapse. Because of this, most eighteenth- and nineteenth-century views of Antichrist seem empty repetitions of once-vibrant symbols. 38

In McGinn’s analysis, a divided Western Christendom lacked the resources to sustain a viable Antichrist tradition.

In his final chapter, “Antichrist Our Contemporary,” McGinn assesses various twentieth-century versions. After a brief discussion of Roman Catholic perspectives, he evaluates dispensational premillennialism’s chronic search for the Antichrist, covering much of the same ground as Sandeen, Weber, and Boyer—although failing to cite the latter. McGinn seems somewhat hopeful about the Antichrists of literature, noting writers of modern fiction like Frank Kermode, Czeslaw Milosz, Robert Hugh Benson, and Charles Williams, all of whom wrestle with the motivation behind ultimate human evil. McGinn also points to Carl Jung’s notion of Antichrist as “an inexorable psychological law,” not because he views it as plausible but rather as another possible way of emphasizing the “inner meaning of Antichrist.” 39

McGinn’s quest for the contemporary relevance of Antichrist stems largely from his concern that the traditional “legend” serves mainly to foster “hatred and oppression of groups, such as Jews and Muslims, seen as collective manifestations of Antichrist’s power.” 40 His salvage operation on Antichrist belief finally arrives where it began, stressing the symbolic nature of the Antichrist within: “At the end of this millennium we can still reflect on deception both within and without each of us and in our world at large as the most insidious malice—that which is most contrary to what Christians believe was and still is the meaning of Christ.” 41 As some of McGinn’s critics have suggested, it remains to be seen whether this Antichrist image is adequate to account for either the biblical texts or contemporary manifestations of evil in our world. 42 Nevertheless, McGinn has written the best one-volume historical account of the Antichrist tradition, one that is still influencing our journalistic culture today. 43

Robert Fuller: An American Obsession?

Following Paul Boyer’s magisterial study of prophecy belief in America and Bernard McGinn’s thorough examination of the Antichrist tradition in Christian history, Robert Fuller’s Naming the Antichrist is something of a disappointment. First, Fuller is much briefer than McGinn on the overall history of Antichrist belief and not nearly as comprehensive as Boyer when dealing with the American scene. Second, Fuller writes with an obvious agenda. He is appalled by the persistence of literal interpretations of biblical prophecy in fundamentalism. Rather than appraise these beliefs at face value, Fuller attempts, with limited success, to explain them primarily with psychological and social categories. In fact, he claims that one of the essential tasks of intellectual history is to be alert to “the sociology of knowledge”:

The whole point of humanistic inquiry, particularly historical inquiry, is to explicate meanings that are not overtly present in a text, a historical event, or a person’s self-awareness. A judicious use of social, economic, and psychological perspectives that
make such an explication possible is thus an indispensable part of the interpretive process.\textsuperscript{44}

While this is a laudable goal, Fuller seems more bent on discrediting the fundamentalist world view than on offering a plausible and convincing account of it.

Fuller, Professor of Religious Studies at Bradley University, contends in his introduction that Christians through history have used the Antichrist symbol to shape their self-understanding and to demonize their enemies. For Americans, in particular, naming the Antichrist aids in the establishment of “the symbolic boundaries that separate all that is holy and good from the powers of chaos that continually threaten to engulf them.”\textsuperscript{45} Apocalyptic thought then, according to Fuller, functions as a protective device for those plagued by doubts and uncertainties about life.

The initial chapter of Naming the Antichrist traces the origins of Antichrist doctrine from the New Testament era through the colonial period in America, a span of almost eighteen hundred years. Fuller’s psychosocial approach to eschatology is clearly evident when he interprets the beast of the sea, or Antichrist, in John’s Apocalypse as “a mythic device” that has allowed readers “to label and interpret their fears and frustrations.”\textsuperscript{46} The remainder of Fuller’s historical survey through the Reformation correlates apocalypticism not so much with theological speculation as with social, economic, and political disruption.\textsuperscript{47}

Fuller’s treatment of the Puritans in chapter two leaves much to be desired. In terms of historical matters, he wrongly implies that Puritans were Separatists, and fails to distinguish carefully between Puritans and Pilgrims.\textsuperscript{48} On the interpretive side, he organizes his analysis around the idea that apocalyptic thought in New England provided a mechanism for the Puritans to demonize their enemies, whether they be native Americans, dissenters, or witches. Fuller, however, does not supply sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the Puritans identified all their “enemies” with Antichrist, or that they viewed all their social and political conflicts in apocalyptic proportions. He also delivers some low blows; for example, he suggests that “Cotton Mather’s lifelong obsession with the devil was an inherited trait.”\textsuperscript{49} Except for his generally balanced presentation of Jonathan Edwards’s eschatology, Fuller’s overview of Puritanism is condescending and much too driven by social and psychological explanations.

Following a chapter on developments in American apocalyptic thought during the nineteenth century, Fuller devotes most of the remaining parts of his book to fundamentalist eschatology. Overall, his explication of fundamentalism in many ways parallels his treatment of Puritanism. He sees both movements as representative of the darker side of apocalyptic belief; both used Antichrist doctrine to project their fears and anxieties upon demonic enemies, thus serving as typical exemplars of the American “obsession.” Hence, Fuller writes about both with a decidedly polemical edge.

Fuller’s portrait of fundamentalism draws on the scholarship of Boyer, Marsden, Sandeen, and Weber, among others. The major difference is that they are more nuanced and less tendentious than Fuller. For example, far more than any previous author, Fuller wants to identify premillennialism as the sine qua non of fundamentalism, ignoring the fact that not all fundamentalists have been premillennialists. He also jumps from a discussion of early fundamentalism in chapter four to “Crusades of Hate” in chapter five, assuming significant historical continuity between those who stood for the fundamentals of the faith in the 1920s and those more extreme fundamentalists who later launched virulent anti-Semitic, anti-Catholic, and anti-New Deal campaigns. Indeed, it is not entirely obvious who falls under this judgment of Fuller: “[t]he story of twentieth-century Antichrist is thus in large part the story of naming,
dramatizing, and mythologizing the enemies of ultraconservative Protestantism. At times, Fuller appears to classify anyone who believes in biblical inerrancy, premillennialism, evangelism, and social and moral separatism with the “apostles of discord” and “paranoid” types described in chapter five. Fuller’s assessment of fundamentalism as basically ill, empty, and even evil has provoked one critic to remark that Naming the Antichrist “is an invitation not to understand but to deride and dismiss.”

Although Fuller drops many interpretive hints throughout his book, he waits until the epilogue to reveal his full agenda. After reviewing several earlier theories concerning apocalypticism, he opts for a perspective that combines philosophical pragmatism and functionalism:

A functionalist interpretation of specific religious beliefs, such as belief in the Antichrist, focuses on the functions of these beliefs in guiding individual and group interaction with the surrounding world. Philosophical pragmatism comes into play as we begin seeking some means of comparing or evaluating competing ideas or beliefs. Pragmatism shifts our attention away from philosophy’s traditional interest in judging the truth of an idea, in favor of the task of assessing an idea’s functional value.

What especially irks Fuller about apocalyptic fundamentalism is that its eschatological beliefs promote nativism, territorialism, and “tribalistic boundary posturing,” which he apparently judges to be “absolutely” wrong, even though his philosophical allegiance is to a system that denies absolutes.

In the final analysis, Fuller regards naming the Antichrist as a functionally counterproductive activity. It not only prevents people from becoming fully participating contributors in a pluralistic society, but it also represents an attempt to project one’s own faults and shortcomings onto an enemy, which is psychologically dysfunctional. Yet Fuller seems not entirely satisfied with his functionalist perspective when he borrows social gospel rhetoric for his last sentence: “[t]his relentless obsession with the Antichrist appears to have done more to forestall than to signal the realization of the Kingdom of God on earth.” Perhaps even a pragmatic functionalist like Robert Fuller is entitled to entertain an eschatological hope.

Conclusion

In his recent book Apocalypses, retired UCLA professor Eugen Weber sets forth a compelling rationale for the historical investigation of prophecy belief:

If scores of eschatologists have proved mistaken, the answer is not that one of them will prove right one day, but that too many of them have proved too influential—destructive, constructive, inspiring, consoling—and that it is foolish for historians to dismiss or, worse, to ignore them.

The point of Weber’s statement reverberates through the scholarly contributions considered in this essay. Because several researchers chose not to neglect an important and legitimate sphere of historical inquiry, we have a fuller and much richer portrait of the development of eschatological doctrines in Christian history. Their work not only demonstrates the significant impact that beliefs about the future have exerted at various times in the past; it also illuminates the cultural, historical, and religious contexts that have helped to shape those beliefs.

The studies of Boyer, McGinn, Fuller, and others hold special relevance for Christian readers. As Weber observes, several “eschatologists” have made serious miscalculations about prophetic timetables or patently erroneous conjectures regarding the fulfillment of biblical
prophecies. The existence of contrived, sensationalized, or highly speculative apocalyptic scenarios in the past should alert evangelical Christians against such follies in the present. If the history of prophecy belief teaches anything, it calls its practitioners to exercise caution and humility when attempting to chart the future plans and actions of God.

Finally, while the historical labors reviewed here yield many benefits, they also suggest some interpretive limitations. McGinn, Fuller, and—to a lesser degree—Boyer at times adopt an adversarial posture toward their subjects. As a result, some of their analyses tend toward reductionism, especially when they employ political, psychological, and social explanations for the vitality and persistence of prophecy belief. While such perspectives certainly have validity, they also threaten to obscure the importance of religious aspirations and theological convictions in the lives of those energized by eschatology. To enlarge on Weber's warning, patronizing the eschatologists can be as problematic as dismissing or ignoring them.
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Tennessee: Raveling the Edges of Who I am

by Jenny Brooks White

When I was there, I was a cotton farmer's daughter with wild hair and bare feet and I let no one tie my days to order. I climbed the highest trees, fingered scars in the rough bark, and felt my hands turned raw and sweaty. When I looked over the cotton fields, I saw deer flash their white tails and run when they caught my scent. I've run, too, through the roughest fields with grass whipping my bare legs and the ground rising up to meet my fast steps. I was a sister and fought my brothers with the wrath of a young woman. I pounded my fists into their adolescent chests and I even bloodied their noses. And I bloodied my knees and elbows, fell from swings and bicycles, cut my feet on the gravel drive. I was a granddaughter and I walked my grandfather's garden rows, found bits of coal and glass, reached through the scratchy squash and picked fruit swollen with time. And now time reaches up for me and takes me back to Tennessee, a place far away, a place once visited, once lived, and it shakes out its memory in my mind the way my grandfather shook fruit trees—bringing the ripest, most delicate to the ground. I look back at that cotton farmer's daughter and see her ragged pants and tangled hair and I say to myself: this is who I am.
JUFF Contributors

Randall B. Bush, author of the children’s book Gabriel’s Magic Ornament, is Professor of Christian Studies and Philosophy and also Director of the Interdisciplinary Honors Program; the article here is part of his ongoing research into the symbolism of the mountain of God.

James Huggins was selected to be the primary speaker at the inaugural 2002-2003 Faculty Colloquium series on the seventeenth century; he serves the Department of Biology as University Professor and Department Chair.

Glenn A. Marsch, Associate Professor of Physics, came to Union in 1996; his post-doctoral research stints include time at Vanderbilt University and the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory.

Michael McMahan serves as this year’s Faculty Forum President after being its vice-president in 2002-03; an avid book collector, he holds the title of University Professor of Biology.

James A. Patterson came to Union in 1999 as Professor of Christian Studies; while continuing in full-time classroom service, he has recently taken on the mantle of Associate Dean of the School of Christian Studies as well.

Roger Stanley, Assistant Professor of English, has contributed both poetry and articles on Southern literature and film to JUFF; he then succeeded Ernest Pinson as the publication’s editor from 1996 forward.

Carrie Whaley is a Union alum with seminary work at the master’s level and an Ed.D, both completed in the state of Texas; she is Assistant Professor of Education.

Jenny Brooks White just began her service to Union this fall, teaching multiple sections of composition as Visiting Instructor of English; the poems gracing front and back of this issue are from her master’s thesis (with creative writing emphasis), completed at Iowa State University.
honorific, which became widely popular in the Middle Ages. Honorius Augustodunensis writes that Mary Magdalene merited her singular Christophany ("angelum videre meruit Dominusque resurgens primo omnium ei publice apparet"), and that Christ sent her as an apostle to his Apostles ("eamque apostolam apostolis suis misit"); Honorius sees Mary as a second Eve bearing the message of eternal life instead of subjecting humankind to mortality ("et sicut prima femina mortem viro traderet, ita nunc femina perhennem vitam viris nunciatet"; PL 172.981). In Joseph Szövérfy’s survey of medieval Magdalene hymns, Apostola is one of four principal titles that she is repeatedly given (92). Vernacular authors such as Osbern Bokenham (139) and Nicholas Love (206) also observe this distinction in their praise of the Magdalene, and Joseph Harris has argued that the ballad “Maiden in the Mor Lay” draws upon similar Magdalene traditions (79). Possibly the most dramatic illustration of her apostolic role can be found in an English twelfth-century psalter probably prepared for Christina of Markyate. Here the Magdalene, with hand raised, extends her finger in a gesture of address, recounting the news of the Resurrection to eleven wide-eyed Apostles who hang on her every word. This iconography is not common, but it can be found in multiple manuscript illustrations, carvings, and stained glass beginning in the eleventh century (Haskins 220, 452).

Conscience’s suggestion that the Magdalene noised her news indiscriminately abroad undermines her quasi-evangelical authority. Even his summarizing statement, “Thus cam it out þat crist overcoom, recouerede and lyuede,” implies a random relaying of information. The language of the Vulgate, confirmed by patristic, hagiographic, dramatic, and lyric traditions, stresses Mary Magdalene’s role as an appointed envoy to the Apostles, not the indiscriminate speaker we find in Conscience’s account.

III

Conscience’s portrayal of a garrulous Magdalene offers an ideal opportunity to employ the proverb “What a woman knows may not well remain secret.” The garrulity of women was a proverbial commonplace, and its appearance in one of the most encyclopedic poems of the English Middle Ages may therefore be unsurprising. Examination of the contexts in which this proverb occurs elsewhere, however, reveals more specific, and more specifically ideological, agendas which condition its use and which motivate Conscience’s apparently gratuitous denigration of the Magdalene.

The “counseile” proverb’s first English attestation comes from the widely popular Proverbs of Alfred, in which we are told that King Alfred was “þe wysuste mon þat wes englelon on” (lines 23-24). For the author or compiler of the Proverbs, part of the king’s wisdom involved a facility with misogynistic traditions. At “Sifford,” before a gathering of bishops and earls, knights and clerks, Alfred counsels his men: “Be never so insane nor so drunk with wine that you ever tell your wife all your plans, because she will reveal all in front of all your enemies . . . for woman is word-crazy and has a tongue too swift, and even though she

---

Le Culte de Marie Madeleine en Occident, des origines à la fin du moyen âge.

6 I translate from the J text (Jesus College Oxford MS. 29). The “counseile” proverb is item W534 in the Whitings’ proverb dictionary; compare items F426 and W485, and Tilley’s item W649.
might want to, she cannot withhold anything.” In the Proverbs of Alfred we first witness what will become a recurrent narrative context for this proverb: the secrets which a “word-wod” woman divulges will be hazardous to men.

No text more strongly emphasizes the danger of confiding in wives than Jean de Meun’s portion of the Roman de la Rose, in which the female personification Nature “confesses” to a male Genius for creating that most reprehensible of all creatures, Man. What ensues is a broad parody of Catholic confession in which a priestly Genius uses his authority not only to counsel Nature, but also to embark on a diatribe against the seductive menace and verbal infidelity of women, employing the same sententious advice found a century earlier in the Proverbs of Alfred:

No man born of woman, unless he is drunk or demented, should reveal anything to a woman that should be kept hidden, if he doesn’t want to hear it from someone else . . . for if, just one single time he ever dares grouch at her or scold her or get angry, he puts his life in danger—if he deserved death for his deed—that she will have him hanged by the neck, if the judges catch him, or secretly murdered by friends. (276)

As in the Proverbs of Alfred, we see the details of the insanity or drunkenness that must afflict a foolish man who speaks his mind to his wife, as well as the disastrous consequence which would befall him. A few lines later, Genius dramatizes the proverb by portraying a sexually seductive wife who weasels her husband’s secret out of him, saying:

I see all these other women who are sufficiently mistresses of their houses so that their husbands confide in them enough to tell them all their secrets. They all take counsel with their wives when they lie awake together in their beds, and they confess themselves privately so that there is nothing left to them to tell. Truth to tell, they even do so more often than they do to the priest. I know it well from them themselves, for many times I have heard them; they have revealed to me everything, whatever they have heard and seen and even all that they think. In this way they purge and empty themselves. However, I am not the same sort. (278)

Jean de Meun’s mention of priests in this passage transforms these loose-lipped wives into metaphorical confessors—a metaphor further explored below.

Chaucer would make liberal use of the “counseille” proverb, employing some form of it in The Wife of Bath’s Tale (the digression on Midas and his ass’s ears, line 980), The Monk’s Tale (2015-30; 2090-94), and The Tale of Melibee (1060). Chaucer’s Monk, for example, does not ascribe Samson’s downfall to fortune, but to his error of confiding in women:

Of Sampson now wol I namoore sayn.
Beth war by this ensample oold and playn
That no men telle hir conseil til hir wyves
Of swich thyng as they wolde han secree fayn,
If that it touche hir lymes or hir lyves.

(MkT 2090-94)
The Wife of Bath is especially fond of quoting proverbs, even to the disparagement of her own gender. In her tale, when she discusses the suggestion that a woman most desires her husband’s confidence, she embarks on a long digression employing, and radically altering, the familiar myth of King Midas and his ass’s ears—a digression in which Midas’s wife, not his barber, betrays his embarrassing secret. She further affirms the truth of the proverb in a confessional passage concerning the secrets of Jankin:

My fiftie housbonde—God his soule blesse!—
Which that I took for love, and no richesse,
He som tyme was a clerk of Oxenforde,
And hadde left scole, and went at hom to bord
With my gossib, dwellynge in oure toun;
She knew myn herte, and eek myn privytee,
Bet than oure parisshe preest, so mout I thee!
To hire biwreyed I my conseil al.
For hadde my housbonde pissed on a wal,
Or doon a thyng that sholde han cost his lyf,
To hire, and to another worthy wyf,
And to my nece, which that I loved weel,
I wolde han toold his conseil every deel.
And so I dide ful often, God it woot,
That made his face often reed and hoot
For verray shame, and blamed hymself for he
Had toold to me so greet a pryvete.

(Prol. WBT 531-42)

Thus Jankin joins husbands from the Proverbs of Alfred, the Roman de la Rose, and the Wife’s own tale as men whose lives are ruined or jeopardized by their loose-lipped wives.7

---

7 One might also observe that the verbal promiscuity of these women frequently possesses a sexual correlative. The wife of Genius’s Roman de la Rose diatribe partially undresses as she solicits her husband’s secret, while Delilah and the Wife of Bath are both portrayed as sexually powerful and potentially dangerous. The “counseille” proverb also features prominently in Thomas Hoccleve’s Tale of Jonathas, in which the prying woman is the prostitute Felicula. This correlation between verbal and sexual promiscuity might have prompted Langland’s audience to recall the Magdalene’s traditional status as a reformed prostitute, thereby associating her with the Venerien Wife of Bath, the prostitute Felicula, the temptress Delilah, and the seductive wife of Genius’s diatribe in a sorority of sexually and verbally dangerous women. Langland alludes to the Magdalene’s sexuality in passus 5, lines 496-498 and passus 10, line 428, presenting the Magdalene as one of salvation history’s greatest sinners whose redemption illustrates God’s abundant grace. No one, according to the Dreamer, could have led a worse life in the world than her. Conscience, however, does not make the Magdalene’s presumed sexual past an issue in passus 19.
This selective but representative narrative history of the proverb reveals that loose-lipped and prying women jeopardize men’s crucial secrets, and sometimes their very lives. And in two instances the usually domestic “counseille” proverb carries with it implicit ecclesiastical associations. Genius’s diatribe in the Roman de la Rose, with its portrayal of women as irresponsible secular confessors, reinforces the exclusively male role of confessor by pointing out a woman’s inability to hold an office so dependent upon the ability to “keep counseille.” Chaucer was to repeat these ecclesiastical associations in the Wife of Bath’s Prologue, in which Alisoun asserts that her gossip “knew myn herte, and eek my privatve, / Bet than oure parishe preest . . . .” If this is how women keep counsel, so the argument would run, they surely would make disastrous priests. In the Roman de la Rose and the Wife of Bath’s Prologue, the proverbial garrulity of women is expanded from a domestic sphere to reflect a religious one.

However, the author who provides the clearest connection between the “counseille” proverb and anxieties over women’s religious authority is Langland himself. In passus 5, Wrath, a former friar, slanders all women while confessing to Repentance:

I haue an Aunte to Nonne and an Abbesse bope;
Hir were leuere swowe or swelte þan suffre any peyne.
I haue be cooke in hir kichene and þe Couent serued
Manye Monþes wip hem, and wip Monkes bope.
I was þe Prioresse potger and opere pouere ladies,
And maad hem loutes of langlyng þat dame Iohane was a bastard,
And dame Clarice a knyßtes doußter ac a cokewold was hir sire,
And dame Pernele a preestes fyle; Prioresse worþ she neuere
For she hadde child in chriyetyme; al oure Chapitre it wiste.
Of wikkede wordes I, wraþe, hire wortes made
Til “pow lixt!” and “pow lixt!” lopen out at ones
And eþer hitte ooþer vnder þe cheke.
Hadde þei had knyues, by crist! hir eþer hadde kild ooþer.
Seint Gregory was a good pope, and hadde a good forwit:
That no Prioresse were preest, for þat he purueide;
They hadde þanne ben Infamis, þei kan so yuele hele counseil.

(5.153-68)

For Wrath, the “counseille” proverb involves no mere metaphor but stands as the principal argument against women priests. Wrath dismisses the prioresses’ assumptions of authority with the same reproach that Conscience levels at the Magdalene, using the same proverb; they cannot restrain their “janglyng” mouths.

IV

Up to now my focus has been on literary traditions that may help make sense of Langland’s problematical Magdalene, but it is in a social context that Conscience’s proverbial denigration of the Magdalene can be better understood, and gendered controversies of the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries recommend such an approach. In the first half of the
thirteenth century, it appears that some prioresses were testing the limits of their religious authority despite the oft-repeated injunctions of I Timothy 2:11-12, encroaching upon the priestly duty of hearing nuns’ confessions. Their presumption led to a sharp rebuke by Pope Gregory IX, who forbade prioresses to assume such duties. It is this decretal to which Wrath alludes in passus 5, and Wrath’s use of the “couseille” proverb implies an association on some level in Langland’s mind between the Magdalene and these prioresses who had overstepped their bounds.

Perhaps Langland was concerned with these gendered tensions because his age was uniquely marked by an increasingly public feminine religiosity that became associated with everything subversive and dangerous. The explosion of lay piety, affective devotion, and vernacular translation of Scripture threatened to circumvent the already-besieged clerical community in England. Mystics such as Julian of Norwich were recording their spiritual experiences while Langland was writing his poem, and those who received visions from God authorizing non-traditional actions would prove most difficult to contain. Jean de Gerson, the staunch defender of orthodoxy best known for his vigorous persecution of Wycliff’s continental counterpart, Jan Hus, felt compelled to remind Langland’s generation that “the female sex is forbidden on apostolic authority to teach in public, that is either by word or by writing . . . . All women’s teaching, particularly formal teaching by word and by writing, is to be held suspect unless it has been diligently examined, and much more fully than men’s” (Colledge and Walsh 151). Here we may be reminded of a Canterbury monk’s reaction to Margery Kempe: “I wold how wer closyd in an hows of ston pat per schuld no man speke wyth pe” (27).

If contemporary accounts can be trusted, there were not enough houses of stone in all of England to contain the women who were supposedly assuming important roles in heretical movements of Langland’s day. Lollardy especially offered opportunities for women that orthodox Catholicism would never have allowed, as women assumed important but hazardous roles as readers and interpreters of Scripture. Yet the extent to which women were actually involved in Lollardy is the subject of considerable debate. Claire Cross has suggested that through being central to the family unit by which Lollardy thrived, women were spiritual leaders in the heresy. According to Cross, women were active teachers mainly through Conventicle recitation of memorized Scripture (360, 370-71). Margaret Aston continued Cross’s line of inquiry, additionally addressing rumors that Lollard women were actually functioning as priests. However, Shannon McSheffrey has cautioned against exaggerating women’s roles, reminding us that most of these women were illiterate and ancillary to a definite male leadership structure. McSheffrey writes, “Even most influential female Lollards confined their endeavors to informal situations rather than public teaching roles” (21).

Although the extent of women’s actual involvement in Lollardy is debatable, one thing is certain: women were perceived to be usurping traditionally male roles in heretical movements, including preaching and expounding Scripture, and this usurpation was to be a source of great anxiety. Margery Kempe’s public religiosity repeatedly earned her the accusation of “fals looller,” suggesting an association among her contemporaries between the heresy and preaching

---

8 See Friedberg, Decretal Gregor. IX Lib. V. Tit. XXXVIII. cap. x (cols. 886-7).
women. It may be no coincidence that the two great persecutors of Wycliffite and Hussite belief, Thomas Arundel and Jean de Gerson, also made a point of condemning women preachers. Margaret Aston adduces considerable evidence from chronicle and sermon literature, poetry, and polemical tracts to reveal widespread concern over women’s roles among the champions of orthodoxy. By the 1390s rumors were circulating throughout London that women were celebrating masses, and Hoccleve’s oft-quoted verbal assault on Oldcastle shows how women were already established as vigorous heretical interpreters of Scripture in the minds of the orthodox by this time:

Some wommen eke, thogh hir wit be thykke,
Wole argumentes make in holy writ!
Lewde calates! sittith doun and spynne,
And kakele of sumwhat elles, for your wit
Is al to feeble to despute of it!
To Clerkes grete apparteneth hat aert
The knowleche of hat, god hath fro yow shite;
Stynte and leue of for right scleender is your paert. (13)

Hoccleve responds to the threat of Lollard women scholars in what is by now a predictable pattern: by impugning their authority through misogynistic portrayals of small minds and big mouths. The imagined “kakeling” of Hoccleve’s women is a revealing correlative to Langland’s depiction of “janglyng” prioresSES and an indiscriminate Magdalene. The charge of garrulity seems to have been a multi-purpose putdown for any group of presumptuous women.

Aston discusses the most compelling evidence for a late fourteenth-century debate over women’s religious authority in the case of Walter Brut (or Brit), arrested in 1391 on heresy charges. Brought before the Bishop of Hereford, John Trefnant, Brut contended that women did indeed have priestly powers denied them by orthodoxy, expressing such powers in explicitly Petrine terms (e.g., they have the power “to bind and to loose”).9 Prominent theologians were convened to counter Brut’s claims, and his case evolved into a kind of referendum on whether women could attain religious privileges formerly reserved to men. In the debate between Brut and his opponents, the Magdalene was introduced as proof of the defensibility of women preachers: “multe mulieres constanter predicaverunt verbum quando sacerdotes et alii non audebant verbum loqui et patet de Magdalenæ et Martha” (“Many women steadfastly preached the Word when priests and others did not dare speak the Word, as evinced by the Magdalene and Martha” (Aston 52; my translation). Brut’s case demonstrates that the symbolic power of the Magdalene’s voice could be and was appropriated by proponents of expanded female religious liberties.10

9 William White was also alleged to have used these Petrine terms in the early fifteenth century; see Aston 52, 59.

10 Here one might also be mindful of allegations made toward Waldensian women. In his Summa adversus Catharos et Valdenses (ca. 1241), the Dominican Moneta of Cremona asserts that “the Waldensians appealed to the example of Mary Magdalene to justify preaching
Brut's defense benefitted from hagiographical traditions that made Mary and Martha outstanding women evangelists. In the *Legenda Aurea*, St. Peter entrusts Mary Magdalene to the care of Maximin fourteen years after the Resurrection. When the disciples disperse to spread the gospel, Maximin, Mary, Martha, Lazarus, and others are cast out to sea in a rudderless ship by unbelievers. Miraculously arriving safely at Marseilles, the Magdalene immediately sets to work converting heathens through the power of her speech. The composer of the *vita* invests the Magdalene's lips with both erotic and rhetorical power:

When blessed Mary Magdalene saw the people gathering at the shrine to offer sacrifice to the idols, she came forward, her manner calm and her face serene, and with well-chosen words called them away from the cult of idols and preached Christ fervidly to them. All who heard her were in admiration at her beauty, her eloquence, and the sweetness of her message... and no wonder, that the mouth which had pressed such pious and beautiful kisses on the Savior's feet should breathe forth the perfume of the word of God more profusely than others could. (376-77)

It is no wonder then, given Mary Magdalene's status as an emblem of the value—even the privilege—of women's speech, that she could be perceived as a dangerous role model by later clerics. A figure outside the male apostolic circle of Christ but who was still clearly favored by him, the Magdalene would serve as an inspiration for a growing body of late medieval women who similarly sought an affective bond with Christ independent of a male clerical "inner circle." Prominent women such as Christina of Markyate and possibly even Richard II's Queen Isabella owned Psalters depicting the Magdalene proclaiming the Resurrection to the other Apostles. Osbern Bokenham tells us that Lady Bouchier, Countess of Eu, commissioned the English translation of her *vita*, with pointed emphasis on her apostolic role:

"I have," quod she, "of pure affecccyoun
Ful longe tym had a synguler deuocyoun
To þat holy wumman, wych, as I gesse,
Is clepyd of apostyls þe apostyllesse;
Blyssyd Mary mawdelyn y mene,
Whom cryste from syn made pure & clene,
As þe clerks seyn, ful mercyfully,
Whos lyf in englysshe I desire sothly
To han maad, & for my sake
If ye lykyd þe labour for to take,
& for reuereunce of hyr, I wold you preye."

(5065-75)

And when Margery Kempe portrays herself repeatedly answering the question, "Why wepist þu so, woman?" surely she is engaging in more than a little self-fashioning. Conscience's proverbial

by women" (Kienzle 105). Of course, since this *Summa* was intended to point out the errors of the heresy, its allegations may be distortions of actual Waldensian practice.
denigration of the Magdalene, then, reflects contemporary tension between a male clerical orthodoxy struggling to maintain ecclesiastical control in opposition to a growing number of women who, like the Magdalene, refused to be silent, who believed in the validity of their spiritual experience, and who sought a greater public authority in matters of the soul.

V

We are finally confronted with an issue raised at the outset of this study: if Conscience is such a courteous character in passus 19, why attribute this proverbial misogyny to him? Any discussion of Conscience's role must begin with a definition of his function in faculty psychology, and Mary Carruthers offers a useful summary of scholarly readings. According to Carruthers, scholastics held that Conscience represented basic "moral sense," a blend of synderosis and conscience. Quoting Aquinas, Carruthers defines synderosis as a "habit, a natural disposition of the practical intellect, 'the first practical principles bestowed on us by nature,' by means of which the practical intellect is inclined to the good and is able 'to discover, and to judge of what [it has] discovered'" (Schroeder 15). Conscience, then, is a catch-all term for several "intellectual habits" derived from synderosis, and is a faculty devoted to making distinctions and applying knowledge. Carruthers further comments, "The role of conscience was able to include not only the function of moral judge but also that of intellectual judge distinguishing between truth and falsehood" (16). Given this definition, it appears strange that Conscience would depart from Scripture and portray an indiscriminate Magdalene by means of an antifeminist proverb in his account of the Resurrection. Perhaps Carruthers' discussion of Conscience's collective role explains the portrayal. Citing the work of Morton Bloomfield, Carruthers observes that Conscience's role as knight "may indeed reflect an aspect of the monastic conception of conscience--not only as the guide and protector of the individual soul but as a collective conscience defending the collective soul of the Church" (17-18).

I would suggest that Conscience's account of the Resurrection results from his collective role as defender of Holy Church, and his use of proverbial misogyny constitutes an attempt to unify and defend an increasingly fractured Catholic orthodoxy. This is a role he will play in greater detail as the final two passus unfold--building and defending the Barn of Unity. Immediately after employing the "counseille" proverb, Conscience tells us that "Peter parceyued al pis and pursued after, / Bøpe James and Johan, Iesu to seke, / Thaddee and ten mo wiþ Thomas of Inde." Conscience emphasizes Peter's intellectual understanding of Mary Magdalene's words, for these words prompt him and other Apostles to await Christ's appearance before the Eleven. The sense of 19:157-69 is that Mary Magdalene indiscriminately broadcasts the news of the Resurrection, but it is Peter who first fully understands its ramifications and, with the other Apostles, takes action. Here Landal used may have been influenced by an interpretation best developed by Aquinas, who argued that the Magdalene's Christophany was flawed, that she was unfit to preach and needed the male Apostles to translate her information into action (Børresen 245-46).

Perhaps Conscience, in devaluing Mary Magdalene's authority and affirming Peter's, is making clear just who exactly has the power to bind and loose. Given the historical rivalry that
obtains between the two figures, it may be no coincidence that the divestment of Mary’s authority and the investment of Peter’s occurs in the space of a mere thirty-four lines, culminating with the papal privilege given to St. Peter:

And whan þis dede was doon do best he þouȝte,
And yaf Piers pardon, and power he graunted hyn,
Myght men to assoille of alle manere synnes,
To alle maner men mercy and forȝiynesse
In couenaunt þat þei come and kneweliche to paie
To Piers pardon þe Plowman redde quod debes.
Thus hap Piers power, be his pardon paiied,
To bynde and vnbye þe boþe here and ellis,
And assoille men of alle synnes saue of dette one. (19.182-90)

Here Conscience replaces Christ’s post-Resurrection commission to all of the Apostles (John

---

11 Christ’s command to Mary Magdalene to bear the news of the Resurrection specifically to Peter entwines these two figures forever in the narrative of the greatest authority-conferring experience in church history, and calls attention to Peter’s dependence upon Mary Magdalene for the news. The Magdalene’s Christophany granted her a privilege unattained even by Peter, the foremost of the Apostles and the “rock” upon which the church is founded. The respective designations of Mary Magdalene and Peter even betray a kind of hierarchical rivalry, as apostola apostolorum and princeps apostolorum both make special claims for themselves. This rivalry was much more than a nominal one. Gnostic gospels reveal a well-documented and strongly gendered tension between Mary Magdalene and Peter in nascent Christianity. (On the Magdalene in Gnostic writings, generally see Malvern 42-56; Pagels 12-14, 22, 64-66; and Haskins 42. For other early texts that depict a gendered tension among the Apostles, see Schüssler-Fiorenza 304-9, 332-33.) Perhaps Gnostic and medieval writers were elaborating on the same tensions suggested in New Testament accounts in which Peter seems to doubt the Magdalene’s words (e.g., Luke 24:12). Most importantly, Mary’s unequivocal privilege of seeing Christ first was undermined by Paul’s mention of Peter and omission of Mary in the Resurrection account of 1 Corinthians 15:5, thus making them competitors for the distinction and fostering a debate that would prove to be of the highest importance in establishing papal power and the roles of women in the church. In the figure of Peter, medieval dramatists would depict an Apostle angrily dismissive of the Magdalene in terms that emphasized her gender. The Towneley Thomas Indie, for example, begins with Mary Magdalene bringing the news to the Apostles; Peter shouts her down with an impassioned “Do way, woman, thou carpys wast!” (1 line 7). The exchange continues at length, with the Magdalene accusing Peter of heresy and Peter vigorously maintaining that the Magdalene’s lying is shameful. For other medieval texts which depict Peter’s skepticism of the Magdalene, see the Coventry (“Corpus Christi”) Appearance to Mary Magdalene (Davies 343-46), and the Ms. e Museo 160 Christ’s Resurrection (726-29; Baker 191). This rivalry would provide Langland with an inviting narrative context in which to insert a misogynistic proverb so dependent upon gendered tension and mistrust.
20:19-23) with Peter’s singular commission (Matt. 16:18-19). Conscience also undermines the communal sense of John 20 by referring to the gathering as “Peter and . . . his Apostles”—a foregrounding of Peter not found in Scripture. Peter’s special commission is similar to the communal commission, but it occurs well before the Resurrection, even before Christ’s transfiguration. Perhaps Conscience makes these changes in the belief that a resurrected Christ would have greater divine authority to bestow on Peter; the sequence of events is shifted accordingly.

Given Langland’s skepticism regarding the ecclesiastical abuses of the post-apostolic church, perhaps Conscience’s portrayal of the Magdalene is meant to demonstrate how earthly power can corrupt this essential faculty. (Conscience’s unwise decision to allow the friars, particularly Frere Flaterere, entrance into the Barn of Unity will later demonstrate his debilitated powers of discernment.) In Conscience we see a figure enhancing the authority of Peter (and, by extension, papal authority) at all costs, even at the expense of a beloved saint. And of course the Great Schism forms the contemporary backdrop for Langland’s narrative—a backdrop of divisiveness in which church authority was fragmented among two and three popes between 1378-1417, and to which Langland alludes in 19.417-27. Conscience’s efforts in the name of unity illustrate the impulses that yield such a state of affairs; his attempts to consolidate Peter’s authority necessarily detract from Mary Magdalene’s. For a church to have one earthly leader, there can be no division of power.

Although it is true that Langland was in many ways a social conservative who probably would have opposed women’s pursuit of greater ecclesiastical authority, Conscience seems too deeply flawed for his views to be considered authorial. Langland might have supported the end of his arguments, but not the means, characterized as they are by a mocking application of proverbial misogyny. Conscience’s prejudices involving Mary Magdalene cannot be attributed merely to a confusion of traditions; Langland manifests a strong familiarity with relevant Scripture and Magdalene hagiography elsewhere. There are six references to Mary Magdalene in Piers Plowman. In 5.497 Repentance says that Christ appeared to the Magdalene first to show that he died for sinners. In 10.428 Will refers to her sinful nature to justify a self-indulgent predestinarianism since even some of the most iniquitous are saved: “Than Marie Maudeleyne who myȝte do worse?” In the speech attributed to Trajan in 11.250-58, Langland employs the interpretation of Luke 10:40-42 that casts Mary Magdalene as a representation of the contemplative life in order to praise poverty. In 13.194 Conscience praises poverty as well, noting that Mary Magdalene gained more from her box of ointment than Zacchaeus did from half his riches. Anima also associates the Magdalene with virtuous poverty in 15.294, observing the extra-biblical tradition that she lived on roots and dew and her devotion to God in her later life. The Resurrection account of 19.157-62 marks the final appearance of Mary Magdalene in Piers Plowman. It seems, then, that for Langland’s characters, as well as for principal actors in church history, Mary Magdalene could be whatever each figure needed her to be—saint, sinner, whore, apostle, gossip—and Conscience is no different. His interest in affirming male ecclesiastical authority leads him to apply the proverb “ȝat womman witeȝ may noȝt wel be counsale,” with all of its unflattering narrative associations, in depicting a “word-wod” Magdalene unworthy of the momentous news she bears, incapable of using it to establish Holy Church. For Langland, Conscience is the revisionist historian of a church lamentably estranged from a once unified, divine origin.
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The Status of Pollution in Tennessee

by H. W. Wofford

What places come to mind when you think about polluted sites in the United States? Perhaps you think about Love Canal in Niagara Falls, New York, where the Hooker Chemicals and Plastics Co. buried 22,000 tons of chemical waste in a half-dug canal and where a housing development was built on top of it (1). Or maybe Lake Erie comes to mind. It was so heavily contaminated by industrial wastes and sewage that it was closed for fishing and swimming, and many species of lake fish were on the verge of extinction. In 1965, almost one-fourth of the lake was so polluted that its oxygen supply was virtually depleted (2). What about Los Angeles, California? Los Angeles is located in a geological bowl which traps air pollution, and during the sixties smog sometimes got so bad that industries and motor vehicle traffic had to be shut down for several days a year. You may not be as familiar with Boston harbor. At one time it was so polluted that there were reports of rats walking across the harbor on the floating debris!

When people are asked to name polluted states, New Jersey is often mentioned. This is probably because of areas on the coast such as Newark, with its sprawling railroad yards and chemical refineries. Much of Newark is an eyesore, prompting a friend of mine from New Jersey to describe it as the “armpit of the universe.” However, this is probably not a fair way to characterize New Jersey as a whole. When you get away from the industrial areas, the countryside in New Jersey is among the most beautiful and undisturbed in the United States. Sometimes Texas and Louisiana will be added to the list because of the expansive petrochemical industries on the Gulf Coast of these states.

But what about our state? Where would you rank Tennessee as a polluted state? I don’t think most people in Tennessee would consider our state to be very polluted. After all, we have traditionally been known for our agricultural economy, rather than for our industrial output. I must confess that, until I returned to Tennessee after having spent fifteen years training as an ecotoxicologist, I did not think of Tennessee as polluted. It is interesting how differently you look at the place where you grew up after having been away for some time. You can back off and look at it a little more objectively. Coming back as a trained environmental toxicologist, I looked at Tennessee through new eyes. Over the last twelve years, I have been accumulating information about the state of pollution in Tennessee from newspaper clippings, state and federal publications, and web sites. My goal for this paper is to pass on to you a summary of what I have gleaned from all this information. What you read may surprise you.

I can’t possibly write about every environmental problem in Tennessee in a paper of this length. In order to make the task a bit more manageable, I will begin with some overall statistics concerning the status of pollution in Tennessee, and then focus on our immediate environment, Madison and surrounding counties.
Tennessee’s Environmental Scorecard

There are many ways in which the environmental health of an area can be assessed. These include determination of the amount of air pollution, the amount of water pollution, the amount of waste emptied into the sewer system, the rate of deforestation, the public health status, and the status of environmental education. I have summarized some of them in Table 1. As you can see, Tennessee consistently comes in as one of the ten worst polluted states in the nation.

It is informative to go to the Agricultural Museum in Milan, Tennessee. In this museum, there is an exhibit about soil erosion and conservation efforts made by Tennessee to prevent it. There is a picture in this exhibit of a man standing in a ditch caused by soil erosion. He cannot see out of the ditch! Great strides have been made in recent years to control soil erosion, with no-till farming being the most recent such control measure.

Air pollution is also a big problem in Tennessee. It is probably contributing to the destruction of hundreds of thousands of acres of trees in the Great Smoky Mountains Park. Air pollution, mainly sulfur and nitrogen oxides, from industry and the cars of the millions of tourists who visit this park weakens the trees, making them susceptible to infections by fungi, bacteria and insects (5). I had the opportunity to talk to a technician at the Agricultural Experimental Station here in Jackson. He has been measuring the pH of the rainwater falling on the station for several years. Though it isn’t part of his job, he does it out of interest. On several occasions, the precipitation falling on Jackson was acidic enough to be classified as acid rain. Interestingly, this always happens when the wind is coming from the southwest. This shouldn’t be too surprising, since Memphis, the largest center of industry in West Tennessee, is southwest of us. On one or two occasions he recorded alkaline rain. I have never seen this discussed in the environmental literature. What are we putting into the air in West Tennessee that is making our air more alkaline (basic)?

Tennessee Rivers and Lakes

Another way to assess the environmental health of a state is to examine the health of its rivers and lakes. 60,000 stream miles and 540,000 lake acres can be found within Tennessee (27). One way of determining the health of these waterways is to look at whether or not these waterways have been posted. In other words, have some intended uses of these waterways been restricted? This usually means that either body contact, recreation, or fishing has been restricted or banned. In 1996, twenty-six per cent of stream miles and twenty-two per cent of lake acres in Tennessee were classified as not fully supporting their intended use (27). These waterways have been posted for such diverse causes as presence of fecal coliforms, lead, mercury, PCBs, chlordane, and dioxins.

Two Tennessee rivers, the Forked Deer River and the Obion River (which pass through parts of Madison or Gibson Counties), are classified as completely failing to support their intended use (Table 2). The Mississippi River, which is notorious for its pollution, has been added to the table for purposes of comparison. As you can see from the table, our local river systems are not considered safe for the usages we commonly make of waterways and are considered less safe than the “mighty Mississippi.” Having contracted either Giardia or amebic
dysentery from swimming in the Forked Deer River in the days of my youth, I heartily recommend that you heed the warnings!

**Madison and Gibson Counties’ Environmental Scorecards**

The Environmental Defense Fund maintains a web site that allows individuals to rank almost any site in the country according to its rate of release of toxic chemicals and the health effects of these chemicals (28). In terms of release of Toxics Release Inventory (TRI) chemicals, an inventory of chemicals maintained and monitored by the EPA, Madison County ranks forty-seventh in the state in release of these chemicals, while Gibson County ranks sixteenth. This surprised me. I expected that Madison County would release more chemicals than Gibson County. However, Gibson County has four facilities in the top one hundred for most chemicals released, while Madison County has none. It is important to note that these numbers do not take into consideration non-TRI chemicals, including many agricultural chemicals. I shudder to think of what I was exposed to while “growing up on the farm.”

However, these rankings should not give residents of Madison County too much peace of mind. Although Madison County fares well in comparison to other Tennessee counties, it must be compared to the nation as a whole (28). Madison County ranks in the top twenty per cent of all counties in the U.S. in terms of:

- Release of non-cancer hazards
- Water releases of recognized developmental toxicants
- Water releases of suspected immunotoxicants
- Release of chemicals with ozone-depleting potential.

Gibson County fares even worse. It ranks in the top twenty per cent of all counties in the U.S. in terms of:

- Release of cancer hazards
- Air releases of recognized carcinogens
- Air releases of recognized developmental toxicants
- Air releases of suspected cardiovascular or blood toxicants
- Air releases of suspected reproductive toxicants.

**Problem sites in the Madison County Area - Superfund Sites**

Another criterion that can be used as a yardstick of the environmental health of a region is whether or not that region contains any Superfund sites. Residents of Jackson have the dubious distinction of living within thirty miles of four EPA Superfund sites (Table 3). Two of these are located within the city limits of Jackson and are within two miles of ten of Jackson’s water wells. EPA Superfund sites are sites that are deemed to be so contaminated and pose such a health risk that they are assigned the highest priority for cleanup. The problem with Superfund sites is that when the funding was set up for this program, the cost of the cleanup was grossly
underestimated. As a result, many sites have been identified, but have not been cleaned up. Regarding the four sites in the vicinity of Jackson, only partial cleanup has been undertaken, and cleanup efforts are still underway.

The state of Tennessee also has a Superfund program. Table 3 contains a listing of the Tennessee Superfund sites in Madison and Gibson Counties. As you can see, Tennessee has added an additional seven sites in our area to the Superfund list. Of these sites, only the Owens-Corning site has been declared clean. Table 3 also includes some sites in this area that have not been declared Superfund sites, but have been in the news lately because of environmental problems.

In order to give you a better appreciation of the magnitude of these environmental problems in our area, I have given some of the history and the possible health consequences of some of these sites in the following sections.

American Creosote Works

The American Creosote Works was declared an EPA Superfund site in 1987 and is considered to be one of the worst creosote-contaminated sites in the country (21). The plant operated from the early 1930’s until 1981. It was located on fifty-five acres in southwest Jackson just off of State Street, between the Forked Deer River and the 45 Bypass.

Creosote is used as a wood preservative. It is most often seen in old telephone poles and railroad ties. After the wood was treated by placing it in baths of hot creosote, it was stacked on racks outside to dry. The excess creosote dripped onto the ground and has been working its way into the water table. Creosote contains a large number of chemicals called polyaromatic hydrocarbons and related compounds, many of which are potentially carcinogenic (cancer-causing). One PAH, benzo[a]pyrene (BAP), was found in high concentrations in the soil. BAP is one of the five most carcinogenic chemicals that we have currently identified.

In 1991, the EPA started the cleanup of the site. All of the remaining creosote (approximately 200,000 gallons) was removed, and all structures were torn down to the ground. However, funding problems halted the cleanup of the soil at the site (22). The state and federal governments planned to spend $5 to $12 million to clean up this site (21). However, the total projected costs have increased to as much as $50 million. About 8.4 acres of land will be scraped two to five feet deep, removing 35,000 to 88,000 tons of soil. The work was scheduled to begin in 1996 or 1997, but I have not seen evidence of cleanup operations. At one point it was seriously suggested that the site be used as a jail! I can’t imagine how many lawsuits that would have generated. Does being used for bioremediation constitute cruel and unusual punishment?!

Iselin Railroad Yard

The Environmental Protection Agency wants to put Jackson’s old Iselin Railroad Yard on its Superfund list of the most serious hazardous waste sites (12). This eighty-acre site is just south of Iselin Street in Southeast Jackson, directly across from Washington-Douglass Elementary School. It is also near ten of JUD’s city water wells. This site was used for the maintenance and repair of railroad engines for many years by the Mobile & Ohio and Illinois
Central railroads (13). The degreasers used to clean the engines and their parts were often allowed to run onto the ground and into a creek that fed into the Forked Deer River. Often, the water in the creek ran black.

Among the chemicals found at the Iselin site are chromium, lead, vinyl chloride, chloroethane, benzene, copper, tetrachloroethane, dichloroethane, ethylbenzene, and xylene. These chemicals carry such possible health risks as cancer, birth defects, liver toxicity, kidney toxicity and neurotoxicity. JUD is currently monitoring the city water for these chemicals and has plans in place for treating the water if necessary.

Cleanup of the Iselin site was predicted to start in 1996, but to the best of my knowledge this process has not started yet (14).

**Milan Army Ammunition Plant**

The Milan Army Ammunition Plant has been in operation since 1942, manufacturing ordinance for the military. From 1942 to 1978, wastewater from the O-line production area was discharged into eleven unlined settling ponds. In 1991, it was discovered that RDX and other potential carcinogens such as TNT, 2,4-dinitrotoluene, nitrobenzene, and HMX used in the manufacture of explosives, had seeped out of these ponds and had gotten into the groundwater that provides the drinking water for Milan (19). In 1992, the U.S. Army started a $9 million study to assess the degree of contamination of the water, eventually drilling four hundred test wells (16, 20). The results of this testing indicated that the city’s drinking water was below the danger point of 2.0 ppb.

In light of concerns that the levels of these chemicals could increase in the future, the Army agreed to spend $9 to build a water treatment facility at the plant and to drill three new water wells for Milan farther away from the arsenal. In May 1995, the levels of the chemicals in the city water had not increased significantly (17). By 1997, the Army had spent $58 million on the cleanup operation. This involved the design and construction of cleanup systems using a combination of high-tech filtration and UV systems, and a low-tech artificial wetlands where native plants and microorganisms break down the chemicals, a process called bioremediation (18). The O-line ponds were also capped with clay to prevent further leaching of the chemicals into the water table. A recent report indicates that the cleanup of the contaminated ground water is on schedule and should be complete by 2009 (29). Unfortunately, parts of the city park will be unavailable for the next six to eight months as wells are being dug which will be used to filter the groundwater.

**Lead Exposure in Jackson**

Jackson is the only city in West Tennessee to be cited by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) for having high lead levels in the drinking water. According to EPA guidelines, lead levels in drinking water must not exceed fifteen ppb. Unsafe levels of lead were found in a small number of homes with lead materials in their plumbing and are not due to lead in the JUD water supply. Although a report in 1994 showed that about twenty-two per cent of the children
in Madison County have elevated levels of lead in their blood, it is believed that most of this lead did not come from the water, but from lead-based paint and leaded gasoline.

More recently, residents of East Jackson in the neighborhood of the former H. O. Forgy recycling plant have been tested for lead levels (15). This plant that turned scrap metals into materials for industry allowed lead to seep into the soil for thirty-seven years, from 1946 to 1983. When evaluated for its risk, this site received a score of 85.26. In order for a site to be placed on the EPA Superfund List, it must have a score of 28.5. The score for the H. O. Forgy site is one of the highest ever seen.

**Velsicol Corporation Dump Site**

The Velsicol Corporation is a Memphis-based company involved in the manufacture of insecticides. Several hundred thousand drums (seven million gallons) of waste created from the production of these insecticides were buried on thirty-seven acres between 1964 and 1974 in Hardeman County near Toone, which is just south of Jackson (23). Over time the drums rusted and leaked, allowing the chemicals to leach into the water table. It is estimated that over one thousand acres of groundwater are contaminated because of this leakage (24).

Removing and properly disposing of all these drums could cost in excess of $1 billion. At this point, a ground water treatment plant has been constructed, and the area has been capped with clay to prevent further leaching into the water table. This is all the cleanup that is currently planned. Velsicol has spent $12 million on capping and stabilizing the site to this point (25). However, the clay cap over the site has been found to be only ninety-eight per cent effective (26). It is now being capped with plastic, which will be “one hundred per cent effective.” The workers who went into this site to stabilize it were either very brave or very foolish. This is by far the worst contaminated site that I have ever encountered, and it’s only a thirty-minute drive away!

**Conclusions**

I have presented a large number of facts and figures about the state of pollution in Tennessee. What conclusions can we draw from all of this? The obvious conclusion is that Tennessee is a relatively contaminated state. It is very likely that health problems are and will continue to be a result of this contamination. Many of these sites are areas where chemicals are entering our water table. Adequate quality drinking water may very well be the next great environmental crisis for the whole world, including the United States. West Tennessee is blessed with one of the best aquifers in the world. However, there are many sites in which chemicals are slowly working their way into this aquifer. These chemicals will not stay localized. Hydrologists tell us that the aquifer in West Tennessee flows. As it does, it will carry chemicals to areas that are many miles away from the sites of contamination.

It should be noted that as bad as the status of pollution in Tennessee may seem, it is getting better. Almost every statistic I have mentioned in this paper has shown improvement in the last twenty years. For example, in 1996, twenty-six per cent of stream miles and twenty-two per cent of lake acres in Tennessee were classified as not fully supporting their intended use (27). In
1984, forty-six per cent of stream miles and thirty-four per cent of lake acres were not fully supporting. This constitutes a significant improvement.

How did we get this way? I suspect it has much to do with our state historically having a predominantly rural economy. Thus, some of the problems resulting from urbanization and industrialization have come to us later than for other states, and we are dealing with them much later as a result. Also, I feel there is almost a vacuum of environmental awareness and consciousness in West Tennessee. I was impressed by this when I came back to Tennessee after having spent fifteen years in other parts of the country. Many people think nothing of littering in this area, and they tend to pour out chemicals such as used oil and antifreeze on the ground. This same attitude has carried over into industry. For most of this century, industrial wastes have just been dumped into a ditch. Jackson has only very recently put a tree ordinance in place. In New England, you must get permission from all of your neighbors before you can cut one tree in your yard. Union, as a Christian university, must set an example of environmental stewardship for the community.

I suspect that the contamination of our area also has to do with the loss of contact between our citizens and the environment. As people moved away from the farms, seeking jobs in the cities, they lost their contact with the soil. I grew up on a farm. I spent most of my waking hours prowling around, turning over logs, watching birds fly, and catching insects and tadpoles; in the process, I developed a deep appreciation and love for the environment. The students in my classes have learned this, as I frequently get on my “soap box” about environmental issues. Children who grow up in cities don’t have these opportunities. Studies have shown that inner city children have no idea where their food comes from, other than the store. These children don’t have a connection to the land, and it is less likely that they will show concern about environmental issues. I have been impressed on many occasions by individuals who will get outraged about the fate of whales, which they have never seen, and not be concerned about the destruction of the environment going on behind their own house.

Ultimately, the contamination of Tennessee is about our population. As the population and economy of Tennessee has grown, so has the demand for food and goods. With this increase, there has to be an increase in the utilization of chemicals and subsequent problems of dealing with the byproducts of the manufacture of these chemicals. My dad understands this very well. He is a retired farmer. During his career as a farmer, he has released thousands of pounds of agricultural chemicals into the environment. He despises these chemicals, but he can’t see any way around the use of them. Without the use of pesticides and herbicides, we wouldn’t be able to feed everyone in the U.S., much less export excess food to starving people in other parts of the world.

What can we do about it? We can’t avoid the use of water. There are some things that we can do at a personal level to help protect ourselves. For example, we could drink bottled water. But recent studies have shown that bottled water, despite its cost, is not necessarily any safer than our tap water. It would be a good choice if you live in an area with a known contamination problem.

Filtration of the water might be an option. However, this also has its problems. The type of filtration employed must match the contamination problem. A different approach is necessary to remove bacteria from water than to remove heavy metals or organics. Another problem is
knowing when to change out the filters. In many cases, there is no obvious way to tell when a filter is saturated other than having the water tested. After a filter becomes saturated, it may start to release its absorbed chemicals back into the water and, in some cases, the concentration of the pollutants in the water may be higher than without a filter.

You can have your water tested. This is especially advised if you have reason to believe that it is contaminated. However, unless you can convince the Health Department that there is a problem, you may have to pay for the testing yourself. Depending on the contaminant you are concerned about, this can range from fifteen dollars up to several hundred dollars per test. If you have city water, it should be tested for a wide range of chemicals on a regular basis, and you should be able to get a report from the city.

The best way to get good quality drinking water is to have uncontaminated water in the first place. This requires us to develop a sound environmental ethic about the proper handling of waste products. Here, education is probably the most important factor. Be informed. I suspect that often chemicals have been released into the environment more out of ignorance than out of greed. Get involved. Attend community meetings on environmental issues. There have been many in this area, some very recently. Write your legislators. Remember that in even the worst cases that I have described, the companies involved were not breaking any laws at the time.

After reading this article, has your opinion about the amount of pollution in Tennessee changed? If so, let me know.
### Table 1 - Tennessee’s Environmental Scorecard

#### Quantity of release

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. 1 in the nation for soil erosion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2\textsuperscript{nd} worst air-polluting state</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139 million lbs of toxic chemicals into the air in 1990</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12\textsuperscript{th} worst water-polluting state</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8\textsuperscript{th} worst state for toxins dumped into sewers</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 million lbs of toxic wastes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10\textsuperscript{th} worst state for toxins dumped into sewers</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.7 million lbs of toxic wastes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6\textsuperscript{th} worst toxin-emitting facility in the country</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Johnsonville power plant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3\textsuperscript{rd} worst state in the nation overall</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3\textsuperscript{rd} worst state in the nation overall</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>(9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5\textsuperscript{th} worst state in the nation overall</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Health Implications of the release

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2\textsuperscript{nd} worst in the nation for protecting the environment</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria: Drinking water, Food safety, solid-waste recycling, forest management, and impact of growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9\textsuperscript{th} worst in the nation in release of chemicals which cause birth defects</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11\textsuperscript{th} worst in the nation in release of chemicals which cause cancer</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three cities in top 25 % with premature heart- and lung-related deaths linked to particulate air pollution: Nashville, Memphis, Chattanooga</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2 - The Health of Local Rivers in Tennessee (27)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>River</th>
<th>Miles in Tennessee</th>
<th>Fully Supporting</th>
<th>Partially Supporting</th>
<th>Not Supporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forked Deer</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obion</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>175.3</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>14 %</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Supporting** - Can be used for body contact, recreation and fishing
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EPA Superfund Sites</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Creosote Works</td>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iselin Railroad Yard (Proposed)</td>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milan Army Ammunition Plant</td>
<td>Gibson</td>
<td>Milan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Velsicol Corp. Dump Site</td>
<td>Hardeman</td>
<td>Toone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tennessee Superfund Sites</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. O. Forgy and Son</td>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boone Dry Cleaners</td>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porter-Cable Corporation</td>
<td>Madison</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noma-ITT</td>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owens-Corning (Now declared clean)</td>
<td>Madison</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B &amp; H Transformer</td>
<td>Gibson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michie Dump</td>
<td>McNairy</td>
<td>Michie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Problem Sites</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITT Milan (Jones Companies Ltd.)</td>
<td>Gibson</td>
<td>Milan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkville Elementary School</td>
<td>Gibson</td>
<td>Yorkville</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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John Jaeger further explores his interest in philosophical issues here, on the heels of his 1998 JUFF piece on Kierkegaard. He is assistant professor of library sciences and holds a master of divinity degree as well.

Randy Johnston is Department Chair and associate professor of chemistry. This is his third article to appear in JUFF since his 1994 arrival at Union.
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