FACULTY FORUM PRESIDENT'S LETTER

by Don Richard

I hope you enjoy this year's edition of The Journal of the Union Faculty Forum (JUFF). As you read through these pages, note the variety of topics and the creative approaches used to express those subjects. Prose, poetry, photographs, other visual art—all of these are acceptable. This is your journal; feel free to submit to this year's editor, Roger Stanley, anything you would like published in Volume 16, 1996.

For those of you who have not been involved with Faculty Forum in the past, please plan to participate this year. The constitution of the Faculty Forum is in your Faculty Handbook, Appendix C, and states that our purpose “... is to provide a means for the faculty to express its interest and concerns to the greater faculty and to the Vice President for Academic Affairs, and to make recommendations about issues affecting Union University.” I invite you to browse through the constitution in your handbook, as it also gives the organization and the duties of its officers in addition to giving membership information. The cost is right—just your interest and commitment to participate are all that are required.

Historically the Faculty Forum has made valuable recommendations to the administration in the areas of work load, salary, safety, curriculum, and numerous other topics that fail to fit precisely into some-committee's structure and responsibilities. The Faculty Forum also makes recommendations for speakers for the Jones Lecture Series. Your input can improve the overall quality of our educational institution and is greatly desired.

Our meetings are usually scheduled on the same day and time that the Student Government meetings are held; those usually fall on either Monday or Friday at the ten o'clock hour. Personal reminders will be delivered to each of you.

Your officers for this academic year 1995-96 are Don Richard, President; Kina Mallard, Vice President; Ann Singleton, Secretary; and Roger Stanley, JUFF Editor.

I am looking forward to an interesting and productive year in which the Faculty Forum can serve as a catalyst in moving Union University to the next level in academic excellence.
A WORD FROM THE EDITOR

In this my initial year of what I hope will be many as JUFF editor, I search vainly for a pattern or motif which unites the several splendid yet diverse components of JUFF 1995. This is perhaps as it should be; the rubric “academic scholarship” can and should encompass a wide range of material, and Union’s faculty—both those represented here and others—continues to move beyond the 27-hour annual teaching load to accomplish much professionally. Thus as you continent-hop with Pat Pinson from the Old World of Europe to Central America, and era-hop with Profs. Arendall and Pray from Old Testament days to today’s corporate board rooms, bask in the comparative, the diverse. Considering the several earned doctorates among our faculty announced in 1994-95 and the granting of at least two full-year leaves (one post-doctoral in London, one for doctoral work in the Piedmont Triangle of North Carolina), our faculty would appear to be quite actively engaged in meaningful scholarship and professional development.

I am heartened by multiple contributions this year from our professional librarians (with more promised from that quarter in 1996!). As for the by now platitudinous “charge” that English professors tend to dominate these pages, I can only note that this may still apply under the new editorship and cry out: we, I, solicit from any and all departments. Keep us in mind for fall of 1996 ye sciences (social and natural), ye languages, ye education division, et. al. June 15, 1996, marks our next deadline.

So much could and should be said for Ernest Pinson, University Professor of English and editor, save for a brief hiatus in the late eighties, of this publication since its inception in 1977. I use the word “tutelage” to describe our relationship on the last page of this issue; it has been that and much more since I came to Union in 1990. Thanks for grooming me for this job, Ernie, and for your example of scholarship in the English Department. During my absence in July, Ernie provided valuable proofreading for these pages and general troubleshooting for which I am thankful.

Thanks too to my erstwhile Summer Term I student worker, Peggy Harris, who did much of the leg work and proof work for this during the noon hour each June weekday while I caught my breath amid a three-course load (and who came up with questions nine and ten for the interview). All the College Services folks deserve kudos, especially Marjorie and Juanita—Polly too for her “photographic eye.”

+++

This year’s dedication (see next page) will be brief but heartfelt. Although the decision was a group one, I consider that Marilyn Smothers hired me in 1990. In her first few months as chair of the English Department, hiring a new faculty member was just one of several difficult but necessary tasks. I do not know how coincidental the job advertisement being in the career services listing of my (and her) alma mater ETSU was, but after a treadmill of non-responses from Chronicle of Higher Education ads, this one was a refresher for which to apply, be interviewed, and get eventually hired. Marilyn came into her own in this decade at Union: department chair, Faculty of the Year, president of Faculty Forum, officer in a statewide college English teacher’s organization, first airplane ride/study abroad trip. Each time I submit a paper to a conference or board a plane for Europe, her example is one model which comes to mind. Marilyn Smothers stands for what JUFF stands for: Christian kindness in dealing with others melded to a respect for scholarship. As you continue to see her at campus events, cultural/academic or otherwise, I hope you will acknowledge her as such a model.
Dedicated

to

Marilyn Smothers
Assistant Professor Emeritus

FOOD FOR THOUGHT
by Pat Pinson
Sherlock Holmes Pub, London
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A good book is a new friend with whom I visit each night before retiring. At times we chat only a few minutes before I rudely fall asleep, but many a night she is my lone companion when slumber will not come or stay. Often we share thoughts for weeks until we come to the final page and it is time for her to go and for me to choose another friend. Yet on rare occasions, my old friend may return for another installment or to relish past experiences in more depth.

—by Pat Morris

MEMORIES OF MARTYRDOM

by Pat Pinson

St. Stephan, Bamberg, Germany
FEMININE FEARS IN TWO FROST POEMS

by Louise D. Bentley

Robert Frost’s early 20th-century world elicited the same fears as ours in the century’s final years. Although the increase in things to fear is more prevalent, the types of fears remain the same. Not only did Frost articulate these accurately and succinctly, but he also often portrayed them through feminine figures. That he understood fear is a given; that he could show a woman’s fear so precisely and cogently is incredible. Two basic fears—of/for others and of the unknown/dark/evil—have been preserved dramatically in two of his poems. These early dialogues accent women with their unique perspectives of this universal emotion. Fear is a harsh word in its sound; to see its results can be ghastly. It changes one’s personality; it scatters discipline; it creates treacherous quicksand for its victim. In these two poems, “The Fear” and “Home Burial,” Frost clearly showed his insight and his poetic skill in photographing with words that universal emotion.

All of us recognize fear as “unpleasant, a strong emotion caused by anticipation or awareness of danger.” The fear of others, particularly the fright of sudden “startling fear” created by a sense of “immediate danger,” often sends alarm throughout the body. Most man-to-man encounters may not be as highly charged emotionally as when a woman is introduced into the dialogue; the undercurrent of emotions becomes more forceful. Differences involve the tone of voice, the silences, and the unexpected responses of those caught off guard. One such dialogue, more technically a dialogue with three speakers, is “The Fear.”

“The Fear” (Frost, Poetry 89-92) tells of a couple coming after dark to their lonely farmhouse and of the woman’s compulsive insistence to confront a stranger they had passed on the road. Her companion is amazed at her bravado in accosting a stranger to inquire his business there at night. The door of the barn provides the setting for their argument as to whether there even was a person; he did not see anyone and thinks she should forget the incident. Her conversation exposes the deep psychological problem that motivates her behavior; she fears the seeking eyes of a former lover or husband she thinks is watching her every move with another man. She insists, “Joel, I’ll have to look. I can’t go in, / I can’t, and leave a thing like that unsettled.”

His attempts to restrain her are useless. She takes the lantern, orders him “not to come” because it is her “business,” and declares, “Now’s the time to have it out with him.” Joel quietly deflates her ego by saying, “But it’s nonsense to think he’d care enough.” Rational, levelheaded Joel reminds her that their standing and talking in the light has probably already had its effect—“if to see was what he wanted, why/ He has seen all there was to see and gone.” Ignoring Joel, she shouts, “What do you want?” When there is no answer, Joel tells her, “You’re wrong.” But her second shouted question receives an answer: “Nothing.” “What are you doing round this house at night?” The identical answer silences her.

The stranger offers to show himself and explains that he and his son are merely “out walking. Every child should have the memory / Of at least one long-after-bedtime walk.” It is his simple three-word statement—“You seem afraid”—that causes her embarrassment. In her
confusion she foolishly suggests he walk somewhere else, but he gently reminds her this public highway is leading to the Dean home where he and his son are “stopping for the fortnight.”

Her humiliation shows in the concluding explanation to Joel: “You understand that we have to be careful. / This is a very, very lonely place.” When her call to Joel goes unanswered, the tension of the situation causes her more anxiety. Having already felt “faint,” she is unable to catch the lantern as it falls and goes out. The unwelcome dark then surrounds a limp, fearful woman who has acted foolishly before two men and a child. Panic—“unreasoning and overmastering fear causing hysterical activity”—has overtaken her.

A kind stranger willing to identify himself is, obviously, not what she expects. His innocent actions and surprise at her fear emphasize the greater problem. Her real fear is of an avenging lover or husband who will

be everywhere
Around us, looking out of trees and bushes
Till I shan’t dare to set a foot outdoors
And I can’t stand it.

Such tension grips her that “doors locked and curtains drawn will make no difference” unless she satisfies her curiosity. Beneath all her reasons lives a great guilt that activates her fears. Like the woman in “The Hill Wife,” she rattles the house key to “warn someone to be getting out / At one door” as they enter another; unlike the hill wife who runs away from everything because of her fears, this woman takes a lantern and dares to shout aloud for answers. She appears to be bravely in control, but her bravery leads to humiliation and the possibility of losing her second companion. The rushing, insistent conversation shows the surging emotional stress within the woman. Joel asks:

“Are you sure—”
“Yes, I’m sure!”

“—it was a face?”

The lines themselves, both in content and tension, suggest that the couple may already be at odds. Past events may have given rise to his stressed “Are you sure” (emphasis added). Her insistence—“I’m sure”—may imply that he has often been indecisive and unsure. Their relationship shows signs of frustration and uncertainty. Frost’s use of images here heightens the tenseness. The contrast of one lantern and “all the dark” creates an uneasy atmosphere while they argue. Inside the barn the “horse’s hoof pawed once the hollow floor”—not a reassuring sound in a lonely place where a stranger’s kicking a stone on the road sounds loud. In the excitement, she holds the lantern too close to her skirt, and the “smell of scorching woolen” punctuates the night air. All these events must have made a memorable walk for a small boy who is puzzled about adults’ behavior.

The end of the poem led Amy Lowell to an even stranger conclusion. She asks a question that indicates her own misunderstanding in calling the stranger “the first husband.” Then she asks about Joel, “Does he kill her, or does she merely think that he is going to do so?” (Lowell 121-22) The poem clearly shows that the stranger is simply a stranger, not her husband; furthermore, her present companion would hardly be likely to “kill her” because of an embarrassing case of mistaken identity.
The woman is so distraught that fear and guilt rule her actions. George Nitchie thinks that contact with anyone else becomes for her a source of "perpetual dread because of the possibility of exposing her common-law status" (124). This may be a greater source of fear than simply a husband's revenge. Neither of the men—the stranger or her companion—fears as she does. Neither would have faced the confrontation she ordered because they felt no need, saw no importance in the simple incident. Both men exemplify a more rational, healthy outlook on life, an attitude which Howard Mumford Jones feels is often predominant in the men of Frost's poetry (125).

Frost was himself a "habitual nightwalker," according to Paul Elmer, a man who "Loved the dark" yet who greatly "feared it" (37). He was, therefore, probably sympathetic with the characters of his poems. His years of alienated isolation on the Derry farm made him understand the psychological effects of environment and the mental suffering that is intensified by darkness (Cook 299). He reported in a letter to Miss Ward, February 10, 1912, an encounter with "a mysterious figure at the juncture of two roads," an encounter with a presence he did not understand but called his "second self" (qtd. in Elmer 45). He and five-year-old son Carol had actually been the innocent, surprised stranger accosted on the South Road by the woman in the poem. He did not understand the woman's situation until his hosts, the Lynches, explained. A local girl in the White Mountains, trained as a nurse in Boston, had fallen in love with one of her patients and run away from her husband. The lovers hid on a small farm not far down the road from the Lynches' (Thompson 344). As one "acquainted with the night" in the city and the country, Frost had often heard the "interrupted cry" and knew emotional sufferings as intense or worse than physical pain. The recurring motif of darkness and strangers was no idle choice but an adherence to truth. He told Edward Garnett in 1915: "A realist I may be if by that they mean one who before all else wants the story to sound as if it were told the way it is because it happened that way" (Frost, Selected Letters 179).

A second facet of fear is dread—"intense reluctance to face or meet a person or situation. . . [that] suggests aversion as well as anxiety." This often evolves into terror—"the most extreme degree of fear." The angst understood by millions today but veneered with activity flows through the poet's understanding in the tense dialogue "Home Burial" (Poetry 51-55). Frost reveals a husband and wife torn apart by grief over the death of their young son. Their true relationship spills out as they confront each other on the stairs. By the end of the dramatic scene, which Frost leaves in mid-sentence, both husband and wife are nearly inarticulate in their anger and irritation at the mistakes of the other. The burial of their once loving relationship comes because Amy's grief leads to terror.

The dialogue both begins and ends on the stairs as the husband tries to find a common ground to share their sorrow. Early in the third line we see her "Looking back over her shoulder at some fear." Everything he says aggravates her until she cries "Don't, don't, don't, . . . Don't." His gentle pleading and listening are clear indications of his deep love for her. He wants to be let inside her grief; he wants her to share with him—not someone else. His ill-timed honesty in line 62 signals a change: "I do think, though, you overdo it a little." From this moment to the end of the poem things grow worse, even to the point of violence. Amy wants pity and sympathy for her fears, her grief; judgmental accusations, though gently and rationally expressed, only raise the barrier between them. His slight change of tone and emphasis from pleading for himself to
accusing her is all it takes to shock her onto the defensive. She refuses to be consoled and blames him for "sneering" at her. He is infuriated by her rebuff: "You make me angry. I'll come down to you. / God, what a woman! And it's come to this, / A man can't speak of his own child that's dead."

Day after day as she has looked through the narrow upstairs window at the family plot, she has relived the horror of seeing him dig the child's grave. Of the infinite details, she remembers his "rumbling voice" talking to visitors about "everyday concerns." Dumbfounded that she could blame him for his act of love, he shouts, "I'm cursed. God, if I don't believe I'm cursed." She is so alienated from him and has moved so deeply into herself and her own terror she sinks into what Frank Lentricchia calls "masochistic aloneness as some kind of compensation for the child's death" (64). She is repulsed at her husband's acceptance and interprets his acts of love as callousness. Even the meter and tension in the lines betray the secret of her real fear.

Peter Vandenbergh believes her grief is a compulsion because she "refuses to accept the definitive cause/effect model: birth/death. To accept her husband's ability to cope with the death of their child would require acceptance of her own mortality" (Robert Frost Review 21). As she begins to talk generally about death, she talks of friends, but she obviously includes him and his attitude:

    Friends make pretense of following to the grave
    But before one is in it, their minds are turned
    And making the best of their way back to life
    And living people, and things they understand.
    But the world's evil. I won't have grief so
    If I can change it. Oh, I won't, I won't!

She threatens to leave the house as he begs her to close the door and not let someone coming down the road see her crying. Her opening the door wider causes him, in a mixed threat and plea, to declare he will follow and bring her back: "I will!—" This open ending is the only possible one; the "dilemma these...characters portray is as old as humankind, as current as the most recent funeral we've attended. There are no solutions for those who can't reconcile mortality;...its ambiguity mirrors life" (Vandenbergh 21).

Their basic differences show in the argument and Amy's aversion to him. The core of the argument is not only the dead son; it is the difference in their perceptions of how to accept death. What is to be done with grief; how is one to cope with overwhelming sorrow? Her fears are so strong she refuses to accept grief; conversely, he faces the reality that grief is inescapable, that a man should take what is coming without succumbing. John Doyle notes that their conflict is not of "petty differences leading to a divorce court; their clash is deep, pervasive, and irreconcilable" (38). Their totally different approaches to life and death permit no common ground on which to reconcile differences. In this violent clash the husband and the wife are not acting on the basis of the immediate situation; they are following their inner natures, attitudes established before their marriage. Thus, the poem is partially a clash between masculine and feminine natures. In this situation, however, each fails to understand the other because the enigma of death cannot be approached simply as a male or female concern. Yet Frost skillfully exposes the path her grief takes in an escalation of fear, of true terror.
Amy in this poem portrays not only an aversion to this husband who has now become a stranger to her but also a terror that his lack of understanding for her fear is a universal fact. Is she alone in this universe as the only one who recognizes this evil, this grief for what it is? Unspeachable terror reigns supreme.

Frost insisted repeatedly that the inspiration for the poem was the crucial marital estrangement which overtook Nathaniel and Leona Harvey (Elinor Frost’s sister) after their firstborn child died in Epping, New Hampshire, in 1895 (Thompson 597). He told several persons, including Elizabeth Sergeant, that it was written in Derry during 1905-06 (429). Yet he told Lawrance Thompson on another occasion that it was written in England in 1912-13 in “not over two hours. It stands in print as it was in the first draft” (594). At whatever time, it could not have been entirely separated from the personal grief shared by Frost and Elinor following the death of their firstborn, Elliott, in 1900. The poem seems to have some thematic bearing on Elinor’s own difficulty in surviving that grief. Frost told Thompson that Elinor repeatedly said after that loss: “The world’s evil” (258).

Some things can create such an aversion to others that one is immobilized by terror and obsessed with his/her loneliness. Frost’s “Good Relief,” not published in any of his own volumes, explains his idea of grief: “No state has found a perfect cure for grief / In law, in gospel, or in root or herb” (Frost, Poetry and Prose 362-63). The similarity between the poem’s wife and Frost’s sister Jeanie deserves comment because it shows the poet’s keen understanding of such fear and aversion. He wrote of Jeanie to his friend, Louis Untermeyer, that she was unable to accept the “coarseness and brutality” of existence; in particular she found the facts of birth, love, and death revolting. Her ideal world could never be reconciled with the fearful, actual world of daily life, and World War I unsettled her fragile mind permanently (Frost, Letters 102-03). The symptoms, however, had been apparent for many years. During a visit in 1907 Jeanie had run screaming into the yard after an argument with her brother (Frost); he threatened her so sternly she came in, packed, and left (Thompson 340). Perhaps this combination of family experiences and relationships kept Frost from ever reading this dialogue in his hundreds of public and private readings; he told Thompson it was “too sad” to read aloud (597-98).

Robert Frost followed his own dictum of “grief without grievance.” He suffered monumental personal distresses but kept his complaining to a minimum. Without a doubt, these experiences surely gave him profound insight into the more open, emotional responses of women—such as in these two poems—that are both poignant and powerful!
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BEMIS, TENNESSEE: INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT AND SOCIAL CHANGE IN THE SOUTH, 1900-1926

by Steven L. Baker

The noted southern historian C. Vann Woodward characterized the southern textile mill as "a symbol of the New South, its origins, and its promise of salvation."¹ This hope of salvation was the driving motivation of New South boosters who promoted the region's development toward industrialization in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The rate of expansion in the southern textile industry made it one of the chief expressions of this hope. The number of spindles in the six major textile producing southern states grew from 502,000 in 1879 to 17,650,000 by 1929.² With this expansion of wage-earning capitalism came foreign conceptions of work and society which were superimposed on the southern rural mindset. However, the underlying agrarian ways were not easily abandoned and as a result there was a chronic problem of turnover and absenteeism in the mills. The industrialists responded to this problem by turning to welfare capitalism in hopes of retaining workers. They created model mill towns, and the operatives constructed new ideas of work and society that assured the salvation offered by the mills would be worked out on their own terms.³ To better understand this process the early development of Jackson Fibre Co. and the town it nurtured will be examined in some detail.

As the nineteenth century drew to a close, Judson Moss Bemis, president of Bemis Bro. Bag Co., dominated the nation's textile bag market.⁴ As the turn of the century approached he had been investigating possible sites for a textile mill in which to produce the cotton cloth needed to supply the company's extensive bag making operations. The Jackson, Tennessee, area was


³There are differing interpretations of the forces at work in the history of the southern textile industry. For an economic interpretation see Galenson, Migration. For an emphasis on class conflict look at David L. Carlton, Mill and Town in South Carolina, 1880-1920 (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University, 1982). This paper takes a more organic approach which draws from these interpretations but utilizes a sociological interpretation as its organizing principle. For an example of such an approach see Jacquelyn Dowd Hall, et. al., Like a Family: The Making of a Southern Cotton Mill World (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 1987).

one of several locations under consideration. Jackson was not without its boosters who aggressively pursued the possibility of a textile mill with the hope of stimulating the economy. Chief promoters of the campaign to secure this operation for the city were Sterling Anderson, W. T. Alexander, Stokley D. Hays, and Gilbert C. Anderson. After locating a suitable 300 acre site three miles south of Jackson and obtaining a favorable response from Bemis, a proposal was made to the Madison County Court. It called for the County to purchase the land and, in turn, grant it to Bemis under the stipulation that his company use it to build a 21,000 spindle mill. On January 2, 1900, the court voted to purchase the property for the sum of six-thousand dollars. 5 One week later a deed was filed at the county courthouse that transferred the property to Bemis. At the same time a charter for the new operation was filed under the name of Jackson Fibre Co. 6 That summer, construction was in full swing and the mill town of Bemis began to take shape.

5Harris Brown, "Two Horsemen Rode at Night to Get Bemis Located Here," Jackson Sun (May 19, 1950); "Bemis Might Not Have Been Except for Squire's Alertness," Jackson Sun (May 19, 1950)

The site for the mill, which lay three miles south of Jackson, was ideal from the company's standpoint. It met all three of the established criteria which Bemis used to judge possible locations: (1) proximity to the raw material, (2) ready access to rail transportation, and (3) a substantial local labor supply.7 The property on which the mill-town was developed consisted almost entirely of open cotton fields dotted with an occasional sharecropper's shack. Madison County lay on the northwestern point of the crescent-shaped black belt; one of the south's most productive cotton growing regions. This cotton supplied the raw material that kept the mill busy producing the material essential to the company's finished product. Because Bemis Bro. Bag Co. had numerous factories across the country by 1900, access to dependable rail service was critical. Jackson was an important rail junction with a large Illinois Central engine shop located there. The land secured by Bemis fronted the Illinois Central railroad tracks, thus providing it with the necessary transportation link. There was also a largely untapped labor supply in rural West Tennessee at the turn of the century. Sharecroppers and small farmers of the period were looking for opportunities to improve their economic standing. These agrarians and their families were critical to the company's need for large quantities of unskilled labor.

The Jackson Fibre Co. and the town of Bemis are unique in two important regards. The mill's location in West Tennessee isolated it geographically from the heart of the southern textile industry. The center of the textile industry in the south was the Piedmont region of the Carolinas. Alabama and Georgia also had significant concentrations of the industry, as did Virginia to a lesser degree. Tennessee's textile industry was the smallest of the southern states and was almost entirely located in the eastern and central sections of the state.8 This isolation from the main concentration of the southern textile industry probably meant that it avoided some of the fierce competition for workers which plagued the mills in the Piedmont.

The town of Bemis was consciously developed as a grand experiment in welfare capitalism. Albert Farwell Bemis, son of Judson Bemis, succeeded his father as president of the company in 1909. While it was Judson's dream of building a mill town in Bemis, it was his son's intellectual talents that shaped it into a model for the whole textile industry. He had received a degree in civil engineering from Massachusetts Institute of Technology in 1893.9 While there he developed an intense interest in housing that would become his legacy, a legacy still preserved in the landscape of Bemis.10

Although Jackson Fibre Co. may have been less susceptible to worker losses to other mills due to its isolation, it did suffer from a high rate of worker turnover and absenteeism. In fact, the

---


9Edgar, Judson Moss Bemis, p. 244.

problem became so acute that after the expansion of the mill in 1905 the company undertook a major study of the situation in order to find a solution. The report of that study is essential to a proper understanding of the early development of company and the town of Bemis. The author of the report, Malcolm B. Stone, characterized the mill operatives and the situation facing the company. He first noted that the workers were a "good looking set of people distinctly above the average of those usually found in New England Mills."\textsuperscript{11}

While being impressed with their physical appearance, Stone was shocked by their habits of personal hygiene and quite surprised by their material wealth. They were, in his words, "very ignorant and prejudiced and, in some cases,....very dirty, not to say, filthy in their habits." He attributed their lack of personal hygiene to the fact that they were used to living in isolated rural areas where sanitation standards were not so critical to community health as in more urban areas. He also observed that they were "very independent and even impatient of the exercise of authority," noting that such independence was characteristic of southern white laborers. Most interestingly, he found that many of the Bemis workers were "fairly well-to-do." Stone arrived at this conclusion after discovering that many of the operatives owned land. It was this characteristic which was judged to be the primary cause of the mill's labor supply problem as the following excerpt from the report illustrates.

About the end of February, or the first of March, a great many people leave the mill annually to go to work on their own or rented farms. Some of these people return to the mill, after the season is over, to work until harvest time, and then after the crops are all gathered, they again return to their mill work for the winter months.\textsuperscript{12}

The disruption caused by this "coming and going" of the workforce was made only worse by the employees' "natural easygoing and shiftless ways" as demonstrated by "the ease with which any of them can live on their friends' generosity" for a time if unhappy or weary of work.\textsuperscript{13}

Therefore, rather than competing for workers with other textile mills, Jackson Fibre found itself sparring with a different sort of competitor: the mindset of its own workforce. To the rural agrarian, work was an individualized action in which one participated with nature in creating a product following the unregulated schedule of the seasons. By contrast, work for the typical textile mill operative was a corporate activity in which one attended to machines in a depersonalized environment according to a highly regimented schedule. The

\textsuperscript{11}Malcolm B. Stone, "General Data on Bemis," November 1906. Photocopy in Bemis Cotton Mill Collection, Union University.

\textsuperscript{12}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{13}Ibid.
operatives characterized their mill jobs as "public work." In the days before the New Deal this term simply referred to working for a large organization in the company of many fellow workers rather than working privately for oneself or another individual. Louise Garey Gaugh was born in Bemis in 1907. When telling of her father's migration to Bemis she alluded to public work and how the rural people were enticed by its promise.

When the Bemis company came here there was no public employment of any kind, except for the railroad shops in Jackson. This was rural farming community. So in order to have people to work in the plant when they got it built they went out into the countryside and looked for large families who would be willing to move into the village. They told them they would furnish them a house, they would give employment to anybody in the family that wanted to work.15

If a mill job was public work, then by inference farm labor was private work. For many of the early Jackson Fibre workers, the private work of the farm was their primary occupation and the mill was just something they did in the off season to make additional income. Robert Buckingham testified to such when he related his father's first experience working in Bemis. Dad, when he was a teenager, would help his father in the fields get the crop in and when the crop was in he would come to the mill and work. He started in the spinning room. Then, when they would start gathering the crop in the fall he would stop, go help his father, and then after they got it all in he would go back in the mill and work.16

If the company had any hope of winning the battle for the minds of these workers, then it clearly had to do something which would invest the concept of public work with new meaning.

Company officials planned and/or experimented with several ways of addressing their labor supply problem. They seriously considered hiring immigrants, as had been done in the textile mills of New England. In his report, Malcolm Stone included a study of the cost of living in Bemis, the wages paid in the mill, and the cost of farm land in the vicinity. This information was accompanied by details on immigration costs from New York and a summary of proceedings at the Southern Immigration Conference held in Nashville on November 12-13, 1906. Stone cautioned company officials, who were considering the hiring of immigrant labor, that such an undertaking would likely meet with resistance on the part of the present workers and cause further disruption. He advised a long-term approach of

---

14For a finely detailed examination of the operatives conception of "public work" see Hall, Like a Family, pp. 44-113.

15Louise Garey Gaugh Interview, 9 July 1991, Bemis Cotton Mill Collection, Union University.

16Robert Buckingham Interview, 9 October 1991, Bemis Cotton Mill Collection, Union University.
settling a few selected immigrant families on farms near the Jackson Fibre Co. property and gradually bringing them into the mill. Another solution experimented with was the sending of representatives out to other textile towns in the south to recruit experienced workers. This was common practice among the southern mills. One company official related the following incident many years later.

One of the unhappy events in my career was a trip in the early days to Cordova, Ala., to steal some help away from the Indian Head mills at that place. Three days at a makeshift boarding house were not too pleasant. I had several encounters with the sheriff and local constable, and there were threats that I would not leave Cordova alive. As a result of this trip, I believe we got six to 10 spinners from that section when they were badly needed.

---

17 Ston, "General Data on Bemis".

18 G. R. Wadleigh, "Early Incidents and Episodes at Bemis Recalled by Engineer G. R. Wadleigh," Jackson Sun (May 19, 1950)
Clearly, such recruitment efforts were desperate attempts to find an answer to the problem. Finally, company officials decided to capitalize on the town's uniqueness as a planned village by carrying the idea of welfare capitalism to a new level. They decided to greatly elaborate the structure of the village by adding new public facilities, building additional housing, and upgrading the town infrastructure. In the process they made Bemis a model for the textile industry, which in turn led the workers to reconstruct the idea of public work by filling it with new meaning.

From its earliest conception in the company boardroom and engineering office, Bemis was designed with careful attention to town planning. As noted previously, Albert Farwell Bemis had an intense interest in housing. He established Bemis Industries, Inc. as a holding company which included architectural, engineering, and construction firms focused primarily on housing development and town planning. He published a three-volume work, under the general title of *The Evolving House*, as a means of promoting his ideas. After his death in 1936 his estate provided for the creation of the A. F. Bemis Foundation whose purpose was the study of housing.  

The development of the town of Bemis can be easily divided into two general phases. The first phase, from the beginning of the mill in 1900 up to the construction of the YMCA building in 1914, was carefully planned by the company engineers. This period saw the construction of all the structures needed to provide the town with the basic social institutions necessary to its viability as a community. The second phase, from 1915 through the construction of the last major housing project in 1926, witnessed a substantial elaboration of the town as an organic unit with a distinctive identity. A closer examination of each of these periods will reveal how the company capitalized on its uniqueness to become a model for the industry.

During the first phase of development the mill itself was the key architectural feature. The four-story structure, designed by Lockwood, Greene and Company, was planned and constructed in two phases. The original brick structure had its east wall boarded over in anticipation of expansion. This expansion occurred in 1905 and effectively doubled the capacity of the mill. In addition, a large warehouse for cotton storage was built. Also, in 1906 the company built a cotton gin adjacent to the mill. Of course, the mill and other business-related structures did not make Bemis a viable community. To this end the company constructed housing for the workforce, a company store, schools, a public bath house, a church, and finally a YMCA. The earliest housing was constructed to the south of the mill itself, as was the company store. When the mill was expanded another housing development was built to the north of the mill. A separate housing development for blacks, named Congo Street, was built very early in an area somewhat isolated from the rest of the town. Schools for white and black children were constructed by the company, which operated them in a joint effort with county school officials. A public bath house, designed in a Spanish Mission style architecture, was built in hopes of encouraging personal hygiene. A church, styled in Tudor Revival architecture, was built in 1908 to provide a place of worship for the various denominations represented in Bemis. Finally, a YMCA building was constructed with an Indo-Chinese motif suggested by A. F. Bemis. The completion of the YMCA effectively marks the end of the first phase of Bemis development.

---

The second period witnessed the development of two additional housing projects, a park, an auditorium, additional commercial facilities, a new mill administration building, another school, and a major upgrading of town infrastructure. What makes this phase particularly important is the way in which it greatly elaborated on the typical concept of the southern mill town. It is no coincidence that this phase begins the year that Albert Farwell succeeded his father as president of Bemis Bro. Bag Co. He was now in a position to use the full resources of the corporation to complete his dream of a model mill town in Bemis. One very important part of that effort involved the creation of a subsidiary engineering firm named The Housing Company. It would be the primary agent for the construction projects of the second phase.20

The World War I years saw no significant construction activity in Bemis. However, with the war's end, plans got underway for a flurry of activity beginning in 1920. A. F. Bemis enlisted the services of former classmates and friends who had MIT connections to assist with the designing of several new buildings. Two of them were the renowned architects Andrew Hepburn and Arthur Shurcliff who later collaborated on the restoration of Colonial Williamsburg.

Members of Bemis' first baseball team about 1910. Back row, standing, are unidentified man in tie, Hugh Tant, Schoolfield, and Will Harris. Middle row kneeling are Moore, Eller, E. E. Bennett, unidentified player, Barber, and F. J. Young. Front row seated are Earl Lovett, G. D. Cobb, Joe McCoy, and George Thompson.

Hepburn designed a one thousand seat auditorium, a hotel, and an administration building. These were to be located on three corners of the same intersection. The hotel was never built but the other two structures were constructed on adjacent corners. In addition, a housing development was laid out on newly acquired property across the railroad tracks. Twenty-four single family units and fifteen duplexes were constructed on this property. A new brick school house was also built. Shurcliff created a landscape design for a buffer area along the town's frontage on the Illinois Central tracks. The key feature of this was an enclosed park directly across from the company store. In addition to these major new buildings and landscaping, the company store was enlarged and a laundry was built. A major upgrading of the town's infrastructure in the same period provided for improved drainage and an expanded water and sewage system. Finally, the last of the company housing developments was constructed in 1926. In the eight years since the end of the war the town of Bemis had been quite literally redesigned.21

There can be no doubt that this great elaboration of the original plan for Bemis was the result of A. F. Bemis' attempt to implement his ideas about the rationalization of the industrial community. In an autobiographical sketch written for his thirtieth reunion at MIT he stated that the aspects of business that interested him the most were not financial, but rather "the physical plants (building and machinery) and the manufacturing and personnel problems."22 Industrial rationalization is, of course, at the heart of the welfare capitalist ideal. Perhaps no better summation of that ideal can be found than in the words Judson Moss Bemis delivered to the citizens of Bemis at the dedication of the Union Church in 1908.

We believe capital and labor are generally working toward a more complete understanding for the mutual benefit of both. Anyway, we will try to solve this world-wide question right here in Bemis.... If you, the people who have come here with us to help us in our enterprise, have better wages, better schools, better churches and, in a general way, are better conditioned than before you came here, then we think to that extent our enterprise has been successful.23

That welfare capitalism could solve the world's labor problems may seem laughable today but in the 1920's this was standard rhetoric for most of the nation's political and industrial leaders.

A more important question for this study is whether or not Bemis succeeded in accomplishing what it set out to do in a local sense: stabilize the labor situation. The company apparently was successful. In an article published in 1927 the mill manager, J. B. Young, responded to a question concerning labor turnover by stating, "If you should ask me whether or not Mr. Bemis' plan has worked out successfully, I should answer with an unqualified 'yes'."24

21Ibid.

22*Class of '93 Thirtieth Anniversary* (Boston: MIT, 1923), p. 64.


Any success was due in large measure to the fact that the company had the leadership and resources necessary to establish Bemis as a company town which would serve as a model of the welfare capitalist ideal in the 1920's. In the process the operatives found new meaning in "public work" but found it on their own terms. For by the 1920's a new generation of Bemis workers was coming of age. Many of them had been born or grew up in Bemis. To them living and working at the mill was not simply a choice between private farming and public labor. Nor was it a supplement to the farm income. It was increasingly viewed as workplace and living space that held its own rewards as well as struggles.

More than mere generational change was occurring in Bemis. The people of Bemis were experiencing a mental shift from their rural independent mindset to a more urban dependent mentality. What was actually occurring was a community socialization process as the people, particularly those who were younger, were shaped by their environment and certain major events. An important part in this process was the great elaboration of the town plan that occurred after World War I. This elaboration gave Bemis the look and feel of a much larger city. One of the chief elements in this urban atmosphere was the new theater. One Bemis resident related his experience of opening night at the theater in words which indicate the structure's importance.

When the theater was built I happened to be in it the night that it opened and the name of the picture was 'In Old Kentucky' and the star of that picture was Anita Stewart. When we moved from the old show hall down to the new theater, which was the finest thing anywhere around between Memphis and Nashville, it was beautiful. Oh, we thought we had really gone somewhere.25 The structure was not only impressive, but more importantly it provided an appealing atmosphere in which the latest Hollywood productions could play. This exposed the residents of Bemis more effectively to a powerful urban influences of the film industry.

It is clear from the testimony of other Bemis residents that by the 1920's they had begun to exhibit a social identity that was more urban than rural. One aspect of this was the manner in which the people of Bemis began to classify themselves as residents of distinct neighborhoods within the larger town of Bemis. According to Reuben Smith, who arrived in Bemis in 1915 at the age of six, the northside was known as "Egypt" and the southside as "Pumpkin Ridge." He recalled that "if some of them from Egypt would come up there, if Pumpkin Ridge didn't like them they had a gang of boys..., they'd get into a scrap and run them off."26 If there is one characteristic that is commonly associated with the urban mindset it is neighborhood or gang identity. Another aspect of this urban identity is revealed in the way Bemis residents viewed people who lived in the rural areas around the town. The best example of this comes from a woman who lived on a farm near Bemis and attended the school there. She recalls how she was viewed differently by the children who lived in Bemis.

25W. M. Greer Interview, 29 June 1991, Bemis Cotton Mill Collection, Union University.

26Reuben Smith Interview, 5 August 1991, Bemis Cotton Mill Collection, Union University.
When I was six years old I started to school in Bemis.... We took our lunches to school and ate them outside. There was a small recessed area protected from the weather where we often went to eat our lunches. The Bemis' children went home to eat. We were so-called 'country children'.

Clearly, the children of Bemis viewed themselves as different from the "country children" who lived in the surrounding rural areas. It is safe to say that a similar perception was probably developing among the adult population as well since children usually reflect the attitudes of parents.

Another contributing factor to the shift in mindset among Bemis residents was the impact of significant events in the life of the community. Annual events such as the Fourth of July parade served to confirm the community identity of Bemis. This was particularly true during the World War I years. One resident related how such an event had a profound effect on her as a child.

One thing I remember so vividly, and I must have been a very small child, when World War I was over..., the whole community met on a playground over by the 'Y' and we burned the Kaiser.

The patriotic fervor of such events undoubtedly gave the residents of Bemis the feeling of being a part of something larger than their own community but it also helped to create a sense of solidarity within the community itself. Tragic events in the life of community also had the power to create community identity. One such event was the explosion that occurred in the mill boiler room on February 10, 1913. A Bemis resident who witnessed this event as a small child recalls the experience in the following manner.

One morning I started out to school..., right out in the middle of the road and seen stuff started going up in the air, before the explosion; before the racket. Boy, racket! Lord, have mercy, it just jarred everything down the mantles..., knocked lamps off the mantle, dishes off and everything else. The women come out screamin' and a yellin' and a hollerin'.... The economizer busted and number one boiler blowed[sic] up right after that and just covered up a colored man that was sitting down eating his breakfast. It was three days and nights finding him.

The impact of such an event left an indelible mark on the community of Bemis. These and other emotionally charged events helped create a new sense of community identity.

Perhaps the most revealing evidence of the shift in mindset from independent rural to dependent urban among Bemis residents lies in the recollections of early residents about the

---

27Evelyn Reeves Rogers Interview, 23 July 1991, Bemis Cotton Mill Collection, Union University.

28Lucille Herron Interview, 10 July 1991, Bemis Cotton Mill Collection, Union University.

29Ab Frye Interview, 1 October 1991, Bemis Cotton Mill Collection, Union University.
nature of the town and its leader, Mr. J. B. Young. Apparently Bemis experienced a certain degree of class distinction. This is apparent to anyone who spends time talking to the older longtime residents. A good example of this is recorded in the following words of one such native of Bemis.

The people that lived on the hill were the privileged class of people and the people that lived in the village they were of course people who worked in the factory and we all looked up to people who lived on the hill who were the supervisors in the factory and the office.... there was definitely a class distinction.... Mr. Young was very revered and respected.... the people in the village were well cared for.... there was definitely a very, very pronounced class distinction.\textsuperscript{30}

Such class distinction is not unique to Bemis. In fact, one might make the case that the south was the most class-conscious region of the nation. What makes it important for this study is how it suggests a type of paternalism which engendered a mindset of dependence among the operatives. The words of another longtime Bemis resident illustrate this paternalism.

Bemis was a little world all its own. It furnished its own electricity, its own water...., and the rent was cheap.... Life was real nice in many, many ways. There was no crime, no thought of robbery or theft in those days and many people had no key to their front door or back either because you felt absolutely secure. Mr. Young, the founder, he was a great man and very unique in many ways but he was a great leader. People had a very, very high respect for him. I guess you would almost call him a benevolent dictator, he was loved and appreciated but his word was pretty much taken for law because he was right about so many things. He loved the people of Bemis and he cared for them and they felt that he cared for them.\textsuperscript{31}

Attitudes such as this are clear indicators of how the mindset of rural independence gave way to an ideology of urban dependence.

With the expansion of wage earning capitalism in the south during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries came a conception of work and society which conflicted with the rural independent mindset of the populace. One result of this conflict was a chronic problem with absenteeism and turnover in many of the new southern industries. Some industrialists turned to a program of model company town building and welfare capitalism as a means of securing a more stable workforce. This paper has examined how one such company, Jackson Fibre Co., undertook an ambitious elaboration of the classic southern textile village in response to its labor problems. In the process this made the mill village of Bemis, Tennessee, a model for the textile industry and created an atmosphere which fostered a shift in the mental outlook of the town's residents. Rural independent minded folk who moved to Bemis in hopes of finding some financial security by engaging in "public work" at first tended to view it as a supplement to their primary occupation as farmers. However, as a new generation grew up in Bemis, and as the town

\textsuperscript{30}Yvonne West Interview, 24 July 1991, Bemis Cotton Mill Collection, Union University.

\textsuperscript{31}W. M. Greer Interview.
took on a unique urban identity of its own, the residents began to adopt an attitude of
dependence upon the company and its manager. The shift helped to solve the problem of labor
force instability and established a pattern of paternalism that would characterize Bemis until well
after World War II.
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THE JUFF INTERVIEWS: CONVERSATION IX
with Dr. Charles Fowler
Vice President for Student Affairs

The following continues a tradition begun in 1984 by Ernest Pinson of interviewing university administrators and outstanding staff members for JUFF. Among the previous eight interviewees have been Dr. Hyran E. Barefoot, Dr. Maggie Nell Brewer, Mr. Larry Stewart, and Mrs. Polly Spencer. This year’s conversation welcomes Union’s newest vice president to our community.

On a stormy Friday afternoon, June 30, JUFF editor Roger Stanley sat down with incoming Vice President for Student Affairs Charles Fowler for the following interview. Dr. Fowler had been on the job several days, meeting with Dr. Maggie Nell Brewer daily even though his position would not be “official” until July 1. Aside from the introduction of a coffeepot to the Student Affairs suite, other significant changes may be noted in the excerpts of the interview which follow; Dr. Fowler certainly invites faculty to his office area to get acquainted.

JUFF: Welcome. Perhaps we can begin by telling our readers something about your background, your recent work at Mississippi State, what field your doctorate is in, and what you have been up to the last year or two.

CF: Well, I guess from my educational background, I’ve been really in two areas. Both my bachelor’s degree, which I got from Union, and my master’s degree, from New Orleans Seminary, are in church music. My Ph.D. from Mississippi State University is in higher education administration. That seems like a quantum leap from one into the other, but my Ph.D. has a specialization in college teaching. I had a good advisor who allowed me to customize a degree that would combine my experiences in seminary education as part of my Ph.D., so that was a good bridge between the two for me. My history primarily has been, and I still consider myself very much a minister; I have been serving local churches since I started college in Louisiana, Mississippi, and here in Tennessee. While at Mississippi State on the higher education experience, I really did wear two hats. I split my time while I was there. I taught a graduate and undergraduate course each semester while there, and generally a graduate course during the summer. Graduate courses that I taught were in educational administration and leadership, and undergraduate courses were basic methods courses in education, predominantly music education—I did teach some core courses.

JUFF: Roughly a decade ago you were completing a degree from Union yourself. This is an overgeneralization, probably, but how would you compare the 1986 Union student with the 1996 Union student with whom you will be working?

CF: Basically I think the students are a bit more demanding today than I feel we were back in the mid-eighties, not only in academics but in every area of their lives. It seems we have such fast service. This generation has never known anything but that in one minute you can have basically whatever you would like, and that is translated over into education. I think that directly impacts
us here at school, both in residence life and in academics as well. I think many of our students today have grown up in homes where both parents are working and maybe have had less of a foundation than I may have had growing up, and many who were here with me. Therefore, students have been required to assume roles and responsibilities that I probably never did. I don’t know whether that necessarily has translated into a more mature student, but I do think this generation does bring some interesting challenges with it.

**JUFF:** Speaking of those challenges within the umbrella of Student Affairs—perhaps our readers would be interested in just what subdivisions or areas Student Affairs covers. What basic sorts of things come under your leadership in that title?

**CF:** The major divisions of Student Affairs would be all of residence life—all housing, counseling services, career planning and placement, health services, campus recreation and activities, student organizations including the Greek organizations; we also coordinate testing services and the overall college calendar. All fall and report within the Student Affairs department.

**JUFF:** What about the new Safety and Security position? Is that within your realm?

**CF:** It sure is. Larry Ross is our new Director of Safety and Security. It is the newest division, in fact, in Student Affairs.

**JUFF:** Of those seven or eight subdivisions, depending on how you break them down, of those you named, are there one or perhaps two areas that will see more changes under your leadership in the next year, or even in the next decade, than others? Which specific subdivisions of Student Affairs might you most focus on as a new leader here?

**CF:** I think one area that I will focus on a great deal will be the area of Career Planning and Placement. I think regarding expectations in general, not only at Union but at other schools like Union—similar size and makeup—a greater emphasis is being placed on the need to not only provide job opportunities for current students, but to make significant strides in placing our graduates within their fields. I hope to work with our Director of Placement and Career Planning in a significant way to build relationships within the college and with corporations and businesses outside who would be potential employers of our graduates. Another area that will be of great interest to me will be Safety and Security. This is a brand new position for the school. We have had security beforehand, but we are going to be trying to improve the overall security of the campus and working on and developing new strategies to do that. But the area that is probably going to have the greatest impact on us is going to be safety. This touches every department and every area of our campus, in developing policies and procedures that would help us assure students and other constituents of the college that we have a safe and secure environment wherein students live and go to school.

**JUFF:** I know you’ve been on the job only a few days and change is a gradual process. Is there any striking example of a policy, one or two policies, which might involve changes even in the fall
semester of 1995 that readers of this publication, which comes out in August, might want to know of?

**CF:** I have been working, since I have come in, on some restructuring within the department. Probably the most significant change within the department is the addition of a new position as an Associate Vice President for Student Affairs. This person is going to be directly responsible for all residence life, discipline, and certain student organizations. The person will serve primarily as director of student life, as I see it. The main reason for this is that there are many time-consuming responsibilities that come into this Office of Student Affairs, and it is my intention as Vice President for Student Affairs to find out much more about student wants and needs by having positive interaction with them in campus life. I can only do that if I can get away from the office some and get involved. Therefore, this new Associate Vice President will assume some responsibilities that historically have been done by the Vice President; thus both can have an increased level of participation and not only have interaction with students when they’re in trouble, but build some positive relationships that hopefully can be preventive of other behavior.

**JUFF:** You mentioned the historical comparison. We all know your predecessor is a very well-respected, longtime Union person—Dr. Maggie Nell Brewer. In the words of Dr. Barefoot, her “big shoes” will take some filling in the future. I wanted to ask you about a quote she made in a 1990 interview with this publication. She mentioned that for her, the most taxing and draining part of the job involved “student disciplinary and emotional problems.” Perhaps you agree; perhaps you disagree on that. What in your background would equip you, or what resources would you bring to bear on these important issues of discipline and emotional problems?

**CF:** Well, there are a couple of things that I think are important in this area. While I may be responsible in toto for these, the new Associate Vice President and others within the department will be providing increased assistance in dealing with these so that one person is not required to assume the entire load. But my basic background and philosophy in dealing with disciplinary problems suggests that many times those are just by-products of deeper problems that go on, and may be emotional problems as alluded to earlier. And my background, being a Baptist minister, is one of redemptive discipline when it is at all possible. While I intend to consistently and firmly enforce our university policies and regulations, I do realize that behavior is sometimes only evidence of other problems, and I hope to utilize a very ministry-oriented approach to handling discipline and judicial matters when it can be of benefit to the student.

**JUFF:** Well, to push that a little further maybe, and to get back to our earlier question about the 1996 student versus the 1986, I’ve heard it said, not about Union necessarily and maybe more actually at the grade school or secondary level, but I’ve heard it said that private schools, especially those with a religious emphasis, sometimes tend to get a certain percentage of “problem students” of parents who perhaps have had discipline problems with kids in public schools. They see a private school as somewhat corrective, if you will, or “redemptive,” to put it in a more positive light. Is Union a part of that? How would Union fit into that attitude on
the part of parents if it does exist, and is there in fact such a thing as a percentage of problem kids sent to schools like ours?

CF: I’m sure that there are parents who do—that is at least part of their motivation for sending students to a private Christian school. There’s no way of knowing what percentage that would be, but I do realize that does exist. I believe Union has had great success in having few discipline problems comparatively with other schools; most everyone would gladly exchange their problems for ours on the level of seriousness. I think part of that is because we provide an environment at Union where students are exposed to other individuals who can be positive role models and have positive interaction with them. I think we have faculty and staff that—at least as a student when I was here—I felt very comfortable working with and going to faculty and staff to assist with problems or answer questions more so than at other schools I’ve attended. I think Union does that very well—provides that environment where students know it’s OK to ask for help and to work and to develop those positive relationships.

JUFF: Perhaps one more question that would tie in with Dr. Brewer as your predecessor—I suppose since this phrase has appeared in both The Cardinal and Cream and The Unionite, that I can use it here—what will be your equivalent of the “Sap’s A-Rising” speech yearly? Shall I say, will there be an equivalent?

CF: There may very well be, but the script hasn’t been written yet!

JUFF: Good response! Two specific things I wanted to ask you about, and these questions come as the result of talking to students informally. I’ve heard it said that some students see the meal plan as a bit inflexible; that is, students with kitchens in their dorms as some of our students have are obligated, are they not, to purchase a certain number of meals each week? Is this a policy you would expect to continue, perhaps alter? Is it really a problem in your mind as some students have suggested?

CF: Well, as with any complaints, I will have an open-door policy for students to come in and discuss and look at issues of concern to them. But I think one of the underlying reasons for requiring meal plans of our students is that the students have an opportunity—it is documented that students with a good nutritional plan do learn better and perform better in school, and while some students would be very responsible and prepare good meals and eat sound meals in their rooms in their kitchens, I don’t know how many would do so. Students are very much encouraged in taking advantage of the good food service we have here on campus. Again, that’s just a small part of how I see Student Affairs and academics working hand and hand. Because we are a Christian institution, soundly committed to not only providing and assisting students to perform very well academically; we also want to help develop the whole person and provide opportunities for the whole person to grow and develop.

JUFF: The second specific area is a bit more positive, perhaps: housing. I’ve heard it said a number of times that Union’s unique private room concept draws a lot of students. The fact that
though a student shares a living area with possibly three or four others, he or she can retreat to his own space, ultimately. The downside of that might be a very full capacity in the last few years with housing at Union. Tell us where housing stands now in terms of capacity, and perhaps look to the future in terms of building.

**CF:** Well, for the last several years, looking at records, Union has been at capacity on campus housing. In response to that, currently there are two more residence facilities being constructed in the McAfee Complex, which would increase our housing capacity by eighty, and these are scheduled to be completed sometime this fall. They will relieve quite a bit of the pressure that you feel in being able to adequately meet housing needs of the students. As has been the case with all our Centrifuge kids who have been on campus, they just think that our housing is a tremendous plus for Union, and as a result many of them do come to Union. Adding more spaces, giving us a little bit of flex room so that we can stay on schedule in providing renovation and maintenance of our existing facilities, I believe will prepare Union to continue setting the pace for housing accommodations.

**JUFF:** You’ve provided a perfect bridge to my next question. Of my five years here at Union, four of these I have taught summer school, and each of those four has been very much dominated, I would almost say, by Centrifuge on campus. I certainly realize the benefits to the university economically and also to the kids socially and spiritually. Maybe there’s a perception, though, that summer academics take a back seat to Centrifuge in a sense. I have heard that expressed by faculty in the classroom areas and by students who, as I understand it, are housed in one area with Centrifuge in the other. My question is basically what about the Centrifuge program? Will it remain at Union into the next century? What’s the status of Centrifuge?

**CF:** My understanding is that Union is one of the most heavily requested sites to attend Centrifuge, so I’m sure, barring any unexpected circumstances, that the relationship Union has with Centrifuge will continue. It’s constantly a balancing act in trying to find ways to protect our students and adequately provide for their academic and social needs on campus, and still provide a service to our local churches who do have a very large stake in Union and have been very large supporters of the school for all these years. And with increased facilities and changes that are going on, I think our ability to balance these two will be improved, such as the addition of this Student Union Building that is here—moving all the meals and cafeteria and everything over here has removed a great deal of traffic flow out of the Penick Complex. We’re constantly looking for ways to improve, and we’re open to suggestions, but at this time I don’t see or know of any reason why the relationship would not continue.

**JUFF:** In closing, perhaps a couple of more abstract or general questions that I’ll throw out and let you run with them. Perhaps it’s a cliché, but what vision do you have for your Office of Student Affairs at Union in the few years, even into the next century ahead?

**CF:** I guess that my vision is fairly simple for Student Affairs, fairly broad in scope, but simple. Based on a very capable, willing, qualified staff that we’ve got, who first and foremost continue
operating and assisting the college in meeting our overall mission, personally I want to see an increased amount of positive interaction of all of our staff with the students. So many of our staff only have meaningful interaction with students when they’re sick, when they have parking tickets, or when they’re in trouble with discipline problems; therefore I think it may limit some students’ perception of what Student Affairs is all about. While we do provide those services and are required to do that, there is so much more to Student Affairs—moving more in line with being student developers and being the Department of Student Development instead of simply providing those services. So my long-term vision would be that we would make this transition to have both positive and negative constructive interaction with the students so that we can follow the model of Luke 22: Jesus increased in wisdom and stature and in favor with God and man. I see our department as being more involved in helping students develop mentally, socially, spiritually, and intellectually, just as Christ was the example.

JUFF: Finally, I’ll just repeat verbatim a question that my predecessor, as editor, had for your predecessor five or so years ago. In closing, do you have any gripes, any requests, or any information you would like to pass along to the faculty who read this journal? Trustees receive the journal, but basically it is a journal for faculty. Any gripes, requests, or information that we haven’t covered?

CF: Well, I haven’t been here long enough to have any gripes. I want to strengthen the relationship between faculty and Student Affairs. My goal is to build a good strong, healthy relationship among myself, my department, and the faculty.

JUFF: Thank you very much for your time.

CF: Thank you for the opportunity.
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BIBLICAL MANAGERS AND THE FUNCTIONS OF MANAGEMENT: DO TODAY'S MANAGEMENT PRINCIPLES APPLY?

by C. Steven Arendall
and
Bevamlee B. Pray

From the earliest writings in management literature, there have been innumerable variations of theories, concepts, and buzzwords. Fads in management have come and gone. Popular management authorities conflict in many areas. However, the one area covered in nearly every management class on every educational level in some way is the functions of management and managers. These, too, may vary slightly among authors in the level of detail in which they are broken down and in the specific titles assigned to the functions. Nevertheless, they appear to be the common thread that links all management authors and classes. One of the most popular classifications, and the one followed in this paper, involves the four functions of **planning, organizing, leading, and controlling**.

**Planning** involves selecting future goals and objectives and deciding upon the actions necessary to achieve them. An old maxim says, "Management means looking ahead." This is the first function, and also the most important. Without a plan, there is no method or direction in an organization or in one's life.

**Planning** encompasses goal setting. This process includes formulating the organization's mission, which legitimizes the firm to stakeholders and provides a driving force behind the organization's existence. The mission is an effective way to communicate top management's vision of where the organization should be in the future. Using this vision as a guiding light, managers are able to determine strategic, operational and tactical goals and plans to enable managers to fulfill the organization's mission.

**Organizing** follows closely after a well established plan. Once the plan is determined, a manager must then organize the activities and the people required to accomplish the plan. The activities must be identified and classified. They must then be grouped in a logical manner. Next, the groups of activities must be assigned to the people who can best carry out the activities. Finally, the manager must coordinate all of the activities throughout the completion of the plan. Activities in the **organizing** function include developing an organization structure, diagramming an organization chart, delegating authority, determining the chain of command, establishing a span of management, and formalizing all of the above.

**Leading** is often defined as the ability to influence. A successful leader must use the power of his/her position both effectively and responsibly. He/she must have the ability to inspire and to motivate those who follow by having a clear understanding of people. This applies to all leaders no matter what their personal style of leadership might be.

An effective leader will embrace the organizational goals and advance them by affecting the attitudes and actions of others. Leaders often call upon their power base (French & Raven, 1959), including the concepts of legitimate, reward, coercive, informational, expert, and charismatic, to influence the attitudes and behaviors of followers. Although many (sometimes conflicting) theories have been developed to help explain leadership and leader-follower
interactions, only one undeniable conclusion can be drawn: an effective leader is an essential element in the management process. The leader will motivate employees toward the goals established during the planning process.

Controlling is in partnership with planning. A plan could not be accomplished effectively if it were not evaluated and corrected as needed. Controlling involves setting standards, measuring performance against those standards, and correcting variations from the standards and plans. It is important to note that controlling is not the last function, but a continuous challenge for management. Managers should anticipate control issues throughout the planning, organizing, and leading functions. By monitoring activities on an ongoing basis, managers can often avoid or decrease performance problems.

As mentioned, these four functions are exhibited in practically all successful managers. This paper examines Biblical managers to see if they show signs of conducting their duties in the same manner. Eight Biblical characters are sighted who, through their managerial roles, performed the four management functions.

Noah (Genesis 6-10)

Genesis 6 - 10 records the story of Noah, but Noah had begun his managing duties long before he is mentioned here. Noah was a righteous man in the midst of evil. He ignored the influences from his external environment and planned his life around following God. His mission was to do what was right in God's sight, no matter what the consequences. This prepared him for the task God called him to do. Noah was to build an ark and spare His creation from ultimate and total destruction. When God warned Noah to prepare for the flood, he began to plan and organize. Noah obviously was a good organizer. He gathered pairs of all animals for breeding. He also assembled clean animals to have as food for his family and sacrifices to God. He arranged the animals in correct locations on the ark to avoid problems. He had plenty of food for the animals and people to survive the forty days at sea. Noah led his family members in the ways of God, and they were spared as well. Finally, Noah controlled his management plan by sending the dove three times to determine if the goals of the mission had been completed, if God had sent the dry land. God sealed this contract with the sign of the rainbow. Noah's life is an example of managing a family, materials and other resources, and one's personal life.

Joseph (Genesis 37-50)

Early in his life, Joseph knew he was his father's favorite son and that he was destined for a special place in God's service. Joseph's brothers became jealous, and they sold him into slavery in Egypt. There, he grew to be a respected prisoner and after a time became known even to Pharaoh for his ability to interpret dreams. Pharaoh had a dream, and with God's help Joseph interpreted it. This resulted in Joseph's telling Pharaoh that his country was going to experience seven years of abundance and seven years of famine. Joseph was the Old Testament's example of a crisis manager. He formulated a plan deemed worthy of the Pharaoh to be enacted in all of Egypt and gave his manager, Joseph, the authority to make it happen. Joseph's plan was to collect a fifth of the harvest in the good years, to be held in reserve for use during the time of famine. He organized the collection into barns, and during the famine he was responsible for the
grain's allocation to the people as needed. During this time of famine, Joseph was reunited with his family, which lived in Israel. Through his skillful use of the knowledge of Egyptian culture he had gained through his years of work there, Joseph took the lead in enacting a treaty that enabled his family to move peacefully to the land of Goshen to be near him. However, in so doing he did not take advantage of his position. Charles Swindoll, in his Bible study guide *Joseph: From Pit to Pinnacle*, describes Joseph's leadership by stating: "he planned ahead with wise objectivity, he submitted to authority with loyal accountability, he arranged for survival with personal integrity, and he accepted the challenge with innovative creativity" (1990). In all of his managing positions, Joseph proved himself an excellent planner and leader. He was a "hands-on" manager who controlled his followers' work by assuring his plans were carried out accurately and efficiently.

**Joshua (Joshua 1-8)**

Joshua had the difficult task of being a successor to a great leader. Moses had been the faithful leader of the nation of Israel as he led them out of Egyptian bondage. Now, this great man of God was dead and young Joshua had to attempt to take his place. Joshua accepted this tough assignment with a strong faith and confidence that he, like Moses, could accomplish the impossible. God told Joshua that he would defeat the strong walled city of Jericho in an unusual manner, by marching around the city, blowing trumpets, and shouting. Joshua accepted this seemingly illogical plan and sold the vision to his followers. When leading his army, he unknowingly was using Vroom's theory of expectancy (Vroom and Yetton, 1973). He was able to motivate the people to follow him by increasing their expectancy that their effort would lead to performance and that the performance would lead to the desired outcome. He inspired them to believe wholeheartedly in God. He organized the march around the city, strictly following God's instructions. The plan, of course, was successful. In terms of the control function, Joshua continued his careful heeding of God's instructions throughout his life as he compared all actions taken to the plans God gave him.

**Esther (Esther 2-7)**

Esther was not expecting greatness; it was thrust upon her. She won her position as queen in a beauty contest. One day she and her Uncle Mordecai discovered a plot to kill their people, the Jews. Together, they developed a plan wherein they would ask the king to stop this horrible act. She prepared for the task by praying and fasting to receive strength from God. The first step involved entering the king’s throne room to ask him to come to a special dinner. This was extremely dangerous because no one was allowed to enter this room without an invitation. If this rule were broken, it was punishable by death unless the king held out his scepter to the offender. Because of her position, Esther felt she should step forward and become the leader and spokesperson for her nation. She entered the room, the king held out his scepter, and Esther was able to begin enacting her plan. Esther also invited the one who formulated the plot against the Jews, Haman, to the dinner. Esther skillfully organized two dinners in which she prepared the king for the news of his trusted advisor Haman's despicable plan. At the appropriate moment, Esther pointed out the villain, and the king immediately had him hanged. Esther's position as queen placed her as a leader of the palace and her peoples' interest within the kingdom. She
took her job seriously and put her followers' interests above her own. Many of the early behavioral theories of leadership concentrated on autocratic versus democratic leaders and how followers respond to each. Esther understood that in many situations followers respond better to democratic, relationship-oriented leaders. Her leadership style was definitely that of a people-focused manager, a wise, calm leader. She **controlled** the situation by putting the plan into action and using good timing and judgment. As her uncle told her, she was given her position for "such a time as this." She stood alone and made a difference.

**Nehemiah (Nehemiah 1-6)**

Nehemiah became the cupbearer for the King of Persia while the Israelites were in exile there. This was an important position and allowed him access to the ear of the king. When Nehemiah heard that the walls of Jerusalem were torn down and the city was in ruin, he was very upset. The king noticed and offered to help. With the king's supplies, Nehemiah was allowed to return to Jerusalem. Upon arrival, Nehemiah surveyed the damage and formulated a **plan** for the reconstruction. The citizens were **organized** into groups, some of which worked while the others stood guard; then the jobs would rotate. People were assigned to work on the area of the wall closest to their home. In this way, Nehemiah had dedicated workers because they could see that what they were doing directly affected their personal safety as well as the safety of their family. Nehemiah's organizational design incorporated several of the dimensions of job enrichment such as skill variety, task significance, and autonomy (Hackman, Oldham, Janson, & Purdy, 1975). During the work, two men who were jealous of how much the Israelites were accomplishing tried to oppose Nehemiah and distract him from the job at hand. Nehemiah did not give in to their pressure. He was a strong **leader** who kept his plan on track despite the critics' attacks. Nehemiah is remembered as a governor of Israel who was responsible not only for the rebuilding of the walls, but also for restoring the values of his people through God-fearing leadership and dedication to **controlling** the plans God had given him.

**Abraham (Genesis 12-22)**

Abraham was called by God to leave his homeland and go to a place where God would lead him. Through his faithfulness to God's call, Abraham became extremely wealthy with an abundance of land, animals, and servants. His nephew, Lot, was made a partner in all that he had. When Lot's and Abraham's servants began to quarrel, Abraham discerned that too many people together could result in unnecessary strife. He **planned** to separate from Lot and go whichever way that Lot did not choose. Lot chose the good, fertile land and left the high, rocky ground for his uncle. Unswayed, Abraham **organized** his servants and family to go this way. God was faithful to continue to bless Abraham. Just as Abraham successfully led his own family, he eventually led a nation. In history, Abraham is considered the father of the Israeli nation. This brief incident early in his life showed his ability to **control**, his discernment and perception of possible troubles, and his ability to apply a strategy that allowed him to remain focused on the real plan for his life by following God. These are examples of the control function.
Paul (Acts - Hebrews)

Paul is one of the leading characters and the principal author of the New Testament. When he was persecuting Christians, God called him to change his lifestyle and become God's voice to the Gentiles. Paul heeded God's call. The book of Acts records the missionary journeys of Paul. Paul's plan was to evangelize as much of the world as possible with the Good News of salvation. He charted geographical routes, the best modes of transportation, and the best methods by which to reach various groups of people. He organized and led the journeys himself. His partners included Barnabas, Timothy, and John Mark, all of whom became great champions of the faith. On the journeys, Paul illustrated his ability to control by often giving in to time constraints and reformulating his strategy. A contingent plan always emerged. If he were unable to visit all of his scheduled stops on a particular journey, he would certainly not miss those cities again. Paul's managerial strength was in his leadership. He was able to visualize how things should be and find ways to make them happen. In Romans 12:11 Paul advises us to be, "Not slothful in business; fervent in spirit; serving the Lord." Paul was very serious about his business, and he called other Christians to be so as well.

Jesus (Matthew - John)

During His earthly ministry, Jesus became a manager in many respects. His most consuming and overarching mission was the salvation of the world through His sacrificial death and His resurrection. All of the plans that Jesus made somehow contributed to this goal. He organized an unlikely group of disciples that He empowered to be His messengers. He led these men by understanding and actualizing each one's unique talents and by making them aware of their important task of evangelism. He led them to a greater knowledge of who He was and the principles of right living. Even when all looked hopeless, Jesus was in control, and His plan was ultimately successful.

The Bible has many references to each of the four management functions or to areas that are included in them. Ecclesiastes 8:5 (NASB) says, "A wise heart knows the proper time and procedure." Many times the Bible encourages us to plan and to follow God's plans and make them our own. God promises that His plans are higher than ours, and He knows the plans He has for us.

In the book of Numbers, God organized His servants the Levites and assigned them specific responsibilities for specific ages. All Levites over the age of twenty-five were called to perform service at the tent of meeting. At age fifty, they were to retire. The retirees could assist their brothers, but were not to perform the actual work. In organizing their obligations, God's plan for these servants was carried out in the best possible way.

Leadership is one of the spiritual gifts given to Christians when the Holy Spirit came. In Romans 12:8 (NIV), Paul writes of this gift, "... if it is leadership, let him govern diligently." Those who are leaders must step to the forefront and set the example for others to follow.

Proverbs 10:17 (NIV) says, "He who heeds discipline shows the way of life, but whoever ignores correction leads others astray." Each person must evaluate his/her own life in the light of God's word and make adjustments to keep on track. These adjustments include confessing sin and turning away from it, becoming more disciplined in the ways of God, and showing a greater love for people. In Galatians 5:23, self-control is named as one of the fruits of the Spirit. This is
the ability to restrain oneself in a given situation. This could also apply to being aware of when one is diverting from the necessary path and sensing how to restore oneself to that path.

The fundamental functions of a manager can be applied to any area of a person's individual or corporate life. This is seen through the lives of the aforementioned and other great Biblical managers. These men and women were willing for God to use their abilities as managers for His service. They managed their personal lives, the people who followed them, the materials and the time available, and all other areas one would expect from a modern manager. When a subject such as management can be seen in different applications, it is easier to appreciate its diversity and to note that it has an importance not exclusive to those in the world of business. Although a modern manager may not be commissioned by God to perform a specific task, God can give the ability and the knowledge necessary for the work. One of the most fundamental Scripture verses for a businessman or woman is Colossians 3:23: "Whatever you do, work at it with all your heart, as working for the Lord, not for man."

(Additional material for this article was contributed by Amy Creighton.)
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SHAKESPEARE'S SHYLOCK: VICTIM OR VILLAIN?

by Lillian Faulkner Baggett

William Shakespeare's Shylock has intrigued scholars since he first appeared on stage—still an enigma, he insists that he receive a fair hearing before being judged. Shylock is a pivotal character in *The Merchant of Venice*, one of the two most popular plays in the Shakespearean canon, along with *Hamlet*. Even though Shylock is not the merchant referred to in the title, he captivates playgoers and is the major factor responsible for the play's popularity. Shylock the Jew is a moneylender—not a merchant. As a matter of fact, in the late sixteenth century Jews in Venice were forbidden to be usurers; they made their living as merchants (Lyon 143). This historical inaccuracy does not diminish our appreciation of the play or our fascination with Shylock. Antonio, the wealthy merchant of the title, frequently mistreats Shylock. Antonio owes his significance in the drama to his dealings with Shylock in an attempt to provide his young spendthrift friend Bassanio with funds to woo Portia. Antonio's flesh is that mentioned in Shylock's suit, but Antonio's flesh symbolizes the flesh of all those persecutors of the Jews down the corridors of time. John Lyon states that whereas some view Shylock as "the consistent villain," others view him as "victimized humanity" (11). Hermann Sinsheimer's contention that "never before or since has the Jewish fate been portrayed so clearly and convincingly" (113) certainly rings true.

In his review of Joseph Papp's production of *The Merchant of Venice*, David Sterritt says in *The Christian Science Monitor* that Shylock's anger appears not as "the arbitrary venom of a congenitally spiteful man, but rather...a product of Jewish suffering inflicted by anti-Semites and their allies" (13). Such suffering occurred in twelfth century England when numerous Jews accepted William the Conqueror's invitation to settle there. For instance, in 1144, when a young boy disappeared, Christians suspecting the Jews launched an attack against a Jewish settlement, and the angry mob performed the first of a series of ritual murders. Pope Innocent IV's protests went unheeded. However, during the reign of Henry II (1154-89), political and social conditions improved for the Jews. Nevertheless, Jews could not join artisan guilds, nor could they hold land (Lelyveld 4). By default they became moneylenders. Since Christians were forbidden to charge interest for loans [the Church considered this usury, regardless of the amount of interest charged], Jews were permitted to be moneylenders. Thus Jews were both needed and despised. A few Jews acquired expertise as bankers and thereby gained power. One such Jew, Aaron of Lincoln, "became one of the most influential bankers of Europe" (4).

Shylock can be better understood when the facts of his Judaism are known. For example, since Jews were categorized as royal serfs, when they died their money went into the king's coffers, not to their heirs (5). Jews were compelled to pay taxes to the king and tithes to the Christian Church. According to Toby Lelyveld,

the Jews of England paid one-half of King Richard's 100,000 marks' ransom, while the entire city of London was assessed only 1,500 marks....Although the Jews constituted only one-quarter of the total population of England in the twelfth
century, they contributed eight percent of the total income of the treasury. (5)

Sinsheimer, in his *Shylock: The History of a Character*, identifies the time between the eleventh and the thirteenth centuries as the period which gave birth to "those myths ... which branded the Jews as enemies of God, of Christianity, and of mankind in general" (34). These myths abound in the twentieth century. Recently the Associated Press reported from Paris, France, the recall of a new Bible that "portrays Jews with old-fashioned stereotypes long considered derogatory" ("Bishop Orders..." 4B). The Roman Catholic Bishop who recalled that text did so because it held that "Jewish people killed Christ because they were not able to control their fanaticism" (4B).

When several Italian banking houses opened in England during the twelfth century, the English began transacting business with them, and this shut out Jewish bankers. Now the English no longer needed the Jews, and the precariousness of the Jews' fate seemed all too clear. If anyone doubted the validity of such an abysmal outlook, he no longer did after a mob attacked Jews bearing gifts to Richard I during his 1189 coronation. These bearers of gifts forfeited their lives by that act of good will. The mob slaughtered all of them. Riots begat riots and by 1217, English Jews were required to identify themselves by wearing a yellow badge, the antecedent of the Nazi tattoo. By this time, the word "Jew" had become synonymous with many derogatory terms (Sinsheimer 5).

During Edward I's reign, in the final decade of the thirteenth century, Jews were exiled from England. Most of these sixteen thousand Jewish refugees sought asylum in France; one-tenth of them migrated to Flanders (5). Some prominent Jews remained in England, where they were joined later by Jews fleeing Spain's Inquisition. This contingent, known as Marranos, or crypto-Jews, survived by pledging allegiance to Christianity but secretly worshipping as Jews (6). Jews were scapegoated again in the fourteenth century when Europeans blamed them for a plague. Jews were rumored to have "poisoned the springs and wells in order to decchristianize the whole continent" (35).

In the Middle Ages Jews could not enter the military, nor could they bear arms. Medieval people felt far removed from Jews and did not trust them. As a matter of fact, Christians viewed Jews as arch-murderers, the Jews having, in their opinion, murdered the Christians', Savior (132).

By Shakespeare's day, "Jews had been officially banished from England for three centuries" (Evans 250). Jew baiting, however, still existed, and known Jews constantly encountered prejudice and cruelty. In Dr. Roderigo Lopez, Queen Elizabeth's Portuguese-Jewish physician, sixteenth century Englishmen found a ready and vulnerable Jewish victim. Lopez and the Earl of Essex had engaged in a long feud, and Essex finally convinced Elizabeth that Lopez had conspired in a poisoning plot against her life (250). Although later historians have found the evidence against this physician inconclusive (Lelyveld 6), the English found Lopez guilty, and in 1594 he was hanged and quartered as a traitor. Lopez professed his innocence to his last breath when he convulsed his execution onlookers with laughter by declaring that he "love d the Queen as well as he loved Jesus Christ" (HarrISON 579). Spoken by a Jew, under these circumstances, this declaration was remembered by the bloodthirsty
crowd long after Lopez ceased to exist. Such was the climate in England when William Shakespeare began writing *The Merchant of Venice*.

Shakespeare's Shylock is far removed from Christopher Marlowe's *The Jew of Malta*, written earlier. Marlowe's Barnabas resembles Shylock in that both men have a daughter who flees from them. However, Barnabas goes far beyond merely feeling betrayed and outraged; he pursues his daughter, and in exacting his revenge, he poisons an entire nunnery where she has taken refuge (Harrison 581).

Shylock resides in Venice, where he has accrued considerable wealth. He has managed to maintain his dignity while ignoring Venetian slights. When Venetians have spat upon him and ridiculed him, as even his creditor, the honorable Antonio, confesses he has done, Shylock has summoned the strength to resist remonstrating against his enemies. Somehow he has managed to do as Christians have been instructed to do, to turn the other cheek. Of course, his being an alien in a strange land and dependent upon his detractors and persecutors for his livelihood has compelled him to suffer his wrongs in silence. Nevertheless, this fortitude has exacted a heavy price. In his home the music has fled, his dearly beloved wife has died, and his daughter Jessica has fled, taking with her ducats and jewels, among which is the ring her mother had given to her father as a pledge of love before they were married. As if those circumstances were not sufficiently tragic, Jessica has received Christian baptism and married the Christian Lorenzo.

Some theatregoers have criticized Shylock for appearing as distraught over the loss of his ducats as over his daughter. In all fairness to Shylock, it must be pointed out that whereas the life of a wealthy Jew in Venice left much to be desired, the life of a poor Jew in Venice was bleak indeed. Small wonder that Shylock would have been devastated over such a loss, especially when the thief was of his own flesh and blood! Shylock's familial love cannot be doubted when he reacts to his friend Tubal's report that Jessica had exchanged his treasured ring for a monkey:

> Thou torturest me, Tubal...
> ...I had it of Leah when I was a bachelor. I would not have given it for a wilderness of monkeys. (III.I.120-23)

What eavesdropper could hear those lines and feel that they were being delivered by a heartless monster? One scholar views the turquoise ring as Shylock's "connection to his emotional past" (Picker 180). Seen from that perspective, small wonder that Shylock's grief overwhelms him.

Just prior to Jessica's slipping away from home, the wealthy Venetian merchant Antonio, one of her father's most aggravating tormentors and the same Antonio that Lyon calls "the greatest anti-Semite of them all" (88), arrives to request a loan from Shylock on behalf of Antonio's spendthrift young friend Bassanio. Shylock can scarcely disguise his delight. The accumulated wrongs against his people of centuries past, combined with present indignities, have imbued Shylock with fantasies of revenge, and now he seizes an opportunity to balance the scales of justice. To Antonio's surprise, Shylock demands no interest for a three-month loan of three thousand ducats; instead, he appears to jest that he would prefer a pound of Antonio's flesh should Antonio be unable to repay the loan on time.
Shylock has followed the Elizabethan practice of demanding a bond before executing a contract involving risk to the moneylender (Berry 183).

Later, when Antonio hears that his ships have been lost at sea, he is unable to repay Shylock’s three thousand ducats, and Shylock demands his pound of flesh. John Gross, author of *Shylock: A Legend and its Legend*, calls Shylock’s bond a proposal “to commit ritual murder at one remove” (qtd. in Alter 31), and he views Portia’s denying to Shylock “any drop of blood” as the “very core of the anti-Semitic nightmare image” (31). He suggests that the Jew’s thirsting for Christian blood is analogous to the stereotypical Jewish usurer, and he extends this image to “Marx’s notorious essay on the Jews to Nazi and Communist propaganda” (31). Harold C. Goddard suggests that “the idea that as intelligent a man as Shylock could have deliberately counted on the bankruptcy of as rich a man as Antonio, with argosies on seven seas, is preposterous” (qtd. in Lyon 51). Evidently Goddard overlooks the magnetic pull of long submerged desires. Shylock has picked up the scent of sweet revenge and wills it into being. Thus the bond is sealed and Shylock sits back savoring the thought of avenging himself against Antonio, savoring the thought all the more because he envisions attaining his revenge with impurity. When questioned by Solanio and Salerio, the counterparts of Rosencrantz and Guildenstern in *Hamlet*, about his strange request for a pound of Antonio’s flesh, Shylock responds that it will feed his revenge. Then he delivers one of his most stirring speeches:

He hath disgrac’d me, / and hind’red me half a million, laugh’d at my losses, mock’d at my gains, scorn’d my nation, thwart’d my bargains, cool’d my friends, heated / mine enemies; and what’s his reason? I am a Jew. / Hath not a Jew hands, organs, / dimensions, senses, affections, passions: fed with / the same food, hurt with the same weapons, subject / to the same diseases, heal’d by the same means, / warm’d and cool’d by the same winter and summer, / as a Christian is? If you prick us, do we not bleed? / If you tickle us, do we not laugh? If you poison us, do we not die? And if you wrong us, shall / we not revenge? If we are like you in the rest, we will resemble you in that....The villainy you teach / me, I will execute, and it shall go hard but I will / better the instruction. (III.i.54-73)

Any oppressed individual or group could substitute her/its name each time Jew is used in this famous oration, for it is the primeval cry of all those who who suffer at the hands of hate-mongers and bigots. Certainly here Shylock resembles Aristotle in his wish for revenge, a wish which Aristotle placed “under the banner of justice in the form of reciprocity” (Wheater 34). In Book V of his *Nicomachean Ethics*, Aristotle says:

...People seek to return either evil for evil or good for good. It seems like slavery to them not to return an evil; and if they do not return a good, there is no interchange of services; and it is this interchange that holds society together.

Since the early nineteenth century, Shylock has emerged as an increasingly sympathetic individual. Gross credits actor Edmünd Kean’s Shylock with endowing the moneylender with
"a large measure of dignity and humanity" (cited in Alter 29). Later in the century another actor, Henry Irving, viewed Shylock as "the type of a persecuted race; almost the only gentleman in the play, and the most ill-used" (30). Nineteenth century Romantics, of course, sympathized with outsiders, so their taking up the cause of Shylock comes as no epiphany. In the twentieth century, perhaps the most famous actor to have played Shylock, that "constant lodestar for actors and audiences" (30), was Sir Laurence Olivier, in Jonathan Miller's 1973 National Theatre Production. Ever the innovator, Miller clothed his actors and actresses in nineteenth century costumes. The 1860's costumes do not detract from the drama. If anything, they lend a modernity to the proceedings and enable the viewer to discern the universality of time and place for this Jew.

Neither Alter nor Gross can account for the positions held by twentieth century critics and directors who have "very often been entirely unaffected by what happened to the real Jews of Venice and Berlin and Warsaw in the terrible middle decades of the century" (3). Naturally, Shakespeare did not pen The Merchant of Venice with "future catastrophes of European history" (29) in mind, but how a reader or a viewer of this play could fail to see Shylock's tragedies as a portent of those endured by future generations of Jews is astounding. Especially surprising is American critic Mark Van Doren's 1939 review of The Merchant of Venice in which Van Doren refers to Shylock's speech as "nothing but a snarl, an animal cry sounding outrageously among the flute and recorder voices of persons whose very names, unlike his own, are flowing-musical phrases" (30). Gross finds unconscionable Van Doren's referring to Jews in bestial terms, especially since Van Doren shows not "the least gesture of regret for what the Christian habit of thinking of Jews in bestial terms had led to" (30). Certainly Shylock recognizes the incongruity of Christian's owning and treating of other human beings as animals, for he mentions slavery during the famous courtroom scene. Little did this fictional, EveryJew man know that a few centuries following his departure from the Venetian courtroom his people would suffer even more horrible fates at the hands of the Nazis, who would strip them of their clothing and their dignity, expose them to the most vile and inhumane treatments, and load them into cattle cars to transport them to their deaths!

Following his reference to Van Doren's review, Gross concedes that while "literature may be a realm apart, governed by its own subtle laws of imaginative coherence" and that there is virtue in "studying those laws in a spirit of detachment" (30), he feels that "literature also issues from, and feeds back into, the realm of history and politics" (30).

Jewish dramatist Arnold Wesker views The Merchant of Venice as "Shakespeare's anti-Semitic play" (cited in Lyon 19). Perhaps Wesker cannot see the sympathy with which Shakespeare reveals Shylock in the above and other lines because Wesker is seeing the play through the eyes of a post-Holocaust Jew. In Wesker's play The Merchant (1976), written in response to Shakespeare's play, Shylock and Antonio are "old friends in their mid-sixties" and Shylock's sole form of miserliness is his hiding of Hebrew books "to prevent the Christians [from] burning them" (19). Wesker attempts to change the image of Shylock the father by showing that Shylock treasures Jessica even more than he treasures his books. Wesker's Shylock is a feminist who crusades for the education of females; in addition, he altruistically supports Venetian arts and Jewish refugees! (19-20). Wesker's attempt to airbrush Shylock's portrait fails. His redaction so favors Venetian Jews until it is "at odds
with Shakespeare not merely in attitude but in method and art. While more obviously liberal, Wesker is also less exploratory" (21).

The pound of flesh fable appears in Marlowe's *The Jew of Malta* and in Wesker's *The Merchant*. This fable appears much earlier in Oriental legends, in Hindu mythology as well as in the Jewish Talmud. The Talmud account tells of Moses' anger as he descends from Mount Sinai and sees an eagle bearing away a lamb in its beak. Just minutes earlier Moses had received God's commandment "Thou shalt not kill." Upbraided by Moses, the eagle drops its prey but tells Moses that now he must feed the eagle's young. Without hesitation Moses exposes his breast and permits the bird of prey to feast on his flesh. Later, in Byzantine literature, the pound of flesh fable was transformed into a secular legend (Sinsheimer 71-72). According to Sinsheimer, flesh bonds were of "common usage in European countries until, at least, the fifteenth century....But no case is known in which such a penalty was seriously demanded or paid" (82). Referring to the remoteness of Shylock's chances of obtaining such a forfeit, H. B. Charlton says that "even with the signed bond and its forfeiture clause in his possession, Shylock's chance of demanding the forfeit are in fact almost equal to the chances of a first prize through the holding of one ticket in the Irish Sweepstake" (qtd. in Lyon 51). Goddard believes that the bond reveals "a hidden desire on Shylock's part to tear out Antonio's heart," but he labels it a "power-fantasy pure and simple" (cited in Lyon 92-93).

In Shylock's day Jews were surrounded by their enemies--ironically their fiercest enemies were Christians. As recently as last fall, the Anti-Defamation League, in its report "The Christian Right: The Assault on Tolerance and Pluralism in America" ("Jewish, Christian Groups Meet" 7A), accused some Christian leaders, notably the Rev. Jerry Falwell and the Rev. Pat Robertson, of "undermining the Constitution and threatening civil liberties in America." The accused remonstrated by attacking the report and calling it "Christian bashing" (7A). Shylock and his brethren had had to fear the Venetians, as well as members of the Spanish Inquisition who searched Venice for those Jews who, to protect their lives and possessions, had been baptized in Spain or in Portugal but had in Venice returned to their faith. In 1553, a scant eleven years before Shakespeare was born and some forty-two years before he wrote *The Merchant of Venice*, the Inquisition had scoured Venice, seeking out Jewish literature which this tribunal piled into heaps in Venice's St. Mark's Square and burned (Sinsheimer 94). This bookburning bears an uncanny resemblance to the book bonfires ignited by the Nazis during the twentieth century. The sixteenth century bonfire was lit by religious zealots, the twentieth century bonfire by Nazi ideologues.

Socrates, in his *Symposium*, predicted that tragedy and comedy could, in the hands of a genius, be reconciled. Few people would deny that Shakespeare is that genius. His *The Merchant of Venice* is comedy and tragedy. Shakespeare moves his play along so deftly that often the mesmerized theatregoer or reader finds it difficult to pinpoint exactly when the drama has metamorphosed from comedy to tragedy or the reverse. The reality of the simultaneous presence of tragedy and comedy in Shakespeare's characters' lives endows them with the breath of life. Shylock is one such character. While he hungers for revenge and appears to be unfeeling, he at the same time can voice with pride, "I am a Jew" and then ask, "Hath not a Jew...passions..?" (III.i.59-60). G. Blakemore Evans elaborates on this:
"Shylock is not, strictly speaking, a villain; he is a serio-comic intriguer who will justly be hoisted with his own petard" (24).

The book of Genesis provided the names of the four Jewish characters in *The Merchant of Venice*. These names appear in the genealogy listed in Chapters 10 and 11. Shelack, the name of one of Noah's great grandsons, is the etymological antecedent of Shylock. Jessica is the Italian equivalent of Jiska. The names Chus and Tubal remain the same (Sinsheimer 87).

When Shelack/Shylock enters the Venetian courtroom, momentarily he has forgotten that he is the resident alien; thus he asks for and believes he will receive justice. Mere moments following Portia's arrival in the courtroom, she asks not, "Which is the merchant here? and which the moneylender?" Rather she asks,"Which is the merchant here? and which the Jew?" (IV.i.174). Next Portia asks Shylock if his name is Shylock. When the moneylender answers in the affirmative, Portia promptly casts the knowledge of his name aside and refers to him as the Jew: "Then must the Jew be merciful" (182). In response to Shylock's question why he should be merciful, Portia delivers this lovely oration:

- The quality of mercy is not strain'd,
- It droppeth as the gentle rain from heaven
- Upon the place beneath. It is twice blest:
- It blesseth him that gives and him that takes.

(IV.i.184-87)

Significantly, Portia [named after the wife of the famous Roman Marcus Brutus] (Alvis and West 234) conveniently forgets these lyrical sentiments after she has won the case for Antonio. Then she gives Shylock no quarter. Shylock receives neither justice nor mercy. Even in the courtroom the law has been violated. The disguised Portia "makes a mockery of the tribunal and trifles with right and law" (Sinsheimer 100). Catherine Belsey points out that "Portia's right to exercise her authority depends on her lawyer's robes" and that the courtroom vignette spotlights "the injustice which allows women authority only on condition that they seem to be men" (cited in Lyon 140). Had Portia been poor, she never could have inveigled her way into that Venetian courtroom, anymore than she could have entered that august chamber as an undisguised female. Wealth, then as now, provides leverage, if not always equality. Too, Portia is married to Bassanio, who has a personal stake in the outcome of these proceedings. In this courtroom "Shakespeare exposes to ridicule the unevenness of the courts in general and the inequality of the individual before the law and the courts" (Sinsheimer 100).

In *The Merchant of Venice*, "the most ingenious satire on justice and courts of law in the literature of the world" (139), an oppressed man turns "the tables at last on his oppressors. For that is what Shylock essentially does--more than any other figure in world literature. That he has to atone for this does not detract from the success of his mission to bully the bullies for a while" (143). Like Euripides' Medea, Shylock metamorphoses from victim to victimizer, but unlike Medea, Shylock possesses no supernatural powers with which to flee his oppressors. He must stand still and suffer his punishment.

Sinsheimer calls Shylock "a furious rebel against the medieval a d post-medieval enslavement and calumniaion of the Jews"; he sees him as "a tragic character who perishes because he fights a just fight with unjust means" (144). John Lyon voices similar sentiments
when he suggests that this play "remains unpleasantly alive for us...because...in the interests of the values of the community...the opposing scapegoat must be defeated and expelleé, or transformed" (2-3). The unexpected happens: just as the community wins its victory, we experience a kinship with the victim. Consequently, Lyon refers to the triumph as "Pyrrhic" (3).

Shylock's prosecutor-nemesis, Portia, is wealthy and far brighter than Bassanio, the young man she has chosen to marry. Portia arrives in the courtroom fully aware that she will save the day for Antonio and Bassanio. She knows that Shylock will be denied his pound of flesh. A self-possessed young woman, Portia is accustomed to getting her own way, but in order to accomplish her goal, this time she must masquerade as a male. She enjoys playing with her victim as a cat would play with the mouse she plans to devour.

Shylock has been riding a roller coaster of emotions ranging from elation to dejection. At the end of the proceedings he is left without a modicum of dignity and without the comfort of his Judaism which has long sustained him. He has lost his wife whom he loved dearly, and his daughter who has robbed him of one of his dearest possessions, the ring given to him by his wife; now he has been directed to renounce the faith of his fathers and become a Christian. Thus, these Venetian Christians silence Shylock the outsider. John Picker points out that "in restraining Shylock," the community "ironically draws attention to the unrestrained cruelty that it uses in its own punishment of difference" (187).

Still reeling from the blows he has received, Shylock hears Portia ask: "Art thou contented, Jew! What dost thou say?" (IV.390-91). Justice is blind in this courtroom. Portia sees not another human being standing before her, not an individual with a name of his own, but simply a Jew. She feels no compassion for a man who has lost everything, nor does she feel that his forced conversion (surely oxymoronic) is an overkill. As a devastated Shylock leaves the arena a defeated and disillusioned man, Portia, without a backward glance, leaves for Belmont, an idealized world where the likes of Shylock never intrude. Portia seems to have forgotten the words she directed earlier to Shylock and their aptness toward him during the sentencing:

But mercy is above this sceptred sway,
It is enthroned in the hearts of kings,
It is an attribute to God himself;
And early power doth then show likest
God's

When mercy seasons justice. Therefore, Jew,
Though justice be thy plea, consider this--
That in the course of justice none of us
Should see salvation; we do pray for mercy,
And that same prayer doth teach us all to
render

The deeds of mercy. (IV.i.188-97)

Slathering salt into Shylock's wounds, Antonio asks the court to rule that Shylock's possessions be willed to Lorenzo, the Christian who stole Shylock's daughter. Earlier Shylock had given as his justification for demanding the bond his emulation of the Christians:
"The villainy you teach me I will execute" (III.i.71-73). Now the Christians' revenge is even heavier-handed, for Shylock is not simply to emulate Christians; he is to become one. While Shylock had sought to destroy Antonio physically, these Christians are here bent on destroying Shylock's spirit. The Christians' actions indirectly deprive Shylock of his life no less surely than Shylock's claiming of his pound of flesh would have destroyed Antonio:

Shylock  Nay, take my life and all, pardon not that.
       You take my house when you do take the
       prop
       That doth sustain my house; you take my
       life
       When you do take the means whereby I
       live.  (IV.i.369-72).

Betrayed by his daughter and by the Venetian court, Shylock faces his fate alone, confronted by those to whom his daughter Jessica has fled. In light of the accumulated ignominiies that this man has suffered, is it any wonder that he is left a "man that hath no music in himself, / Nor is not moved with concord of sweet sounds"! (V.i.83-4). Always fated to be the outcast, Shylock resembles those World War II Jews who failed to enjoy the lively strains of Wagner's music wafting in the air above them as they were marched nightmarishly into the crematoriums. This is the response to a paraphrasing of Pete Seeger's "Where Have All the Flowers Gone?" The music has fled just as surely as have the flowers. Shylock must live in a world bereft of lightness and joy, and he must live out his final days behind the mask of Christianity, as—alas—so many Christians do. Scapegoats have always suffered attacks from "good," well-meaning people, and while the scapegoat du jour varies depending upon geography and other variables, he will not disappear. Man's appetite for scapegoats appears to be insatiable. German Protestant theologian Martin Niemoeller sounds this warning:

      In Germany they came first for the Communists, and I didn't
      speak up because I wasn't a Communist. Then they came
      for the Jews, and I didn't speak up because I wasn't a Jew.
      Then they came for the trade unionists, and I didn't speak up
      because I wasn't a trade unionist. Then they came for the
      Catholics, and I didn't speak up because I was a Protestant.
      Then they came for me, and by that time no one was left to
      speak up.

Shylock's world apart from his working world—lending money to Venetians—is a world far removed from that of the Christians at Belmont, a sort of Venetian Country Club full of gaiety and music, where only the chosen ones are allowed to mingle. Jessica now enjoys membership privileges in the Belmont Club, but first she had to be baptised a Christian. By the end of the play she appears to have been assimilated into this new world—until she confides to Lorenzo that its music causes her to be sad. Perhaps she feels some twinge of sadness and regret concerning her father's ignominious defeat. More than a little sadness pervades this comedy, even in the Never-Never-Land of Belmont. The required reconciliation scene involves only the lovers; Jew and Gentile remain suspicious of each other and
separated by their mutual antipathy and bigotry. Jessica and Lorenzo escape a similar fate by their love for each other. No hope is hinted that Jessica, like King Lear's daughter Cordelia, will fly to her father's side in his darkest hour. Shylock, like the later Existentialists, experiences angst, loneliness, nausea, alienation as he draws his cloak around him in a futile attempt to feel warmth and affection. Alas, for him Venice offers no such comfort. Rudolph von Ihering, called "one of the greatest German scholars of the last century in historical and psychological law research," describes Shylock's exodus from the courtroom:

When he, persecuted by bitter scorn, cracked, broken, totters out with trembling knees, who can help feeling that in his case the law of Venice has been deflected, and that it is not the Jew Shylock who crawls away, but the typical figure of the medieval Jew, that pariah of society, who cried out in vain for justice?....the catastrophe bursts down on him, dragging him out of his delusion and teaching him that he is nothing else but the outlawed Jew of the Middle Ages, who is given his right only to be cheated out of it. (cited in Sinsheimer 99)

Alter sums up his thoughts concerning The Merchant of Venice:

...through his uncanny dramatic intuition, [Shakespeare] invites Christian audiences to a kind of out-of-self experience. If the looming, sinister other embodies all the hateful qualities that Christian culture would like to think are alien to it, there are also brief but powerful intimations that the other may be the moral and psychological consequence of treatment by the self: that the self may harbor the fearsome attributes it habitually projects on the other; and that both participate profoundly in a vulnerable human condition which the self is usually predisposed to see as its own private property. (34)

Jeff Jacoby, whose father was imprisoned by the Germans at Ebensee until the Nazis fled Ebensee fifty years ago, writes in The Commercial Appeal, "Fifty years ago, the holocaust did not end...it was only suspended" (B7). Jacoby warns that "there is nothing so evil, so demonic, that people cannot be induced to do it" (B7). Unlike his unfortunate descendants, Shylock was not a crematoria victim: he was not robbed of his life, only his livelihood; he was not robbed of his soul, only his spirit. Nevertheless, he clearly emerges from the fray a victim—not a villain. Heinrich Heine, the brilliant German-Jewish poet, once overheard a theatregoer in London who had just seen Shylock portrayed on the stage exclaim, "This poor man is wronged." With these words the case rests.
Works Cited


Berry, Herbert. "Shylock, Robert Miles, and Events at the Theatre." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 44.2 (Sum 1994): 183-201.


Kitchen Dreams
By Pat Pinson
Reitoca, Honduras

50
C. Stephen Arendall has been commuting to Jackson and Union from Memphis in bow ties since the fall of 1990. He is Associate Professor of Management in Union’s School of Business Administration.
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Don Richard, Associate Professor of Mathematics, counts among his interests the game of chess and the state of New Mexico. Long involved in Faculty Forum in various capacities, he served as Forum vice-president in 1994-95.

Roger Stanley, after serving as assistant and co-editor of this publication under the tutelage of longtime editor Ernest Pinson, is the 1995-96 editor. Instructor of English at Union, he has contributed a poem and essays on film and literature to past JUFF issues.