

INFORMATION TO USERS

The most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this manuscript from the microfilm master. UMI films the original text directly from the copy submitted. Thus, some dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from a computer printer.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyrighted material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each oversize page is available as one exposure on a standard 35 mm slide or as a 17" × 23" black and white photographic print for an additional charge.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. 35 mm slides or 6" × 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.



300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA

Order Number 8803793

Administrative revenge

Phillips, James Bruce, Ed.D.

The University of North Carolina at Greensboro, 1987

Copyright ©1988 by Phillips, James Bruce. All rights reserved.

U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

PLEASE NOTE:

In all cases this material has been filmed in the best possible way from the available copy. Problems encountered with this document have been identified here with a check mark .

1. Glossy photographs or pages _____
2. Colored illustrations, paper or print _____
3. Photographs with dark background _____
4. Illustrations are poor copy _____
5. Pages with black marks, not original copy _____
6. Print shows through as there is text on both sides of page _____
7. Indistinct, broken or small print on several pages
8. Print exceeds margin requirements _____
9. Tightly bound copy with print lost in spine _____
10. Computer printout pages with indistinct print _____
11. Page(s) _____ lacking when material received, and not available from school or author.
12. Page(s) _____ seem to be missing in numbering only as text follows.
13. Two pages numbered _____. Text follows.
14. Curling and wrinkled pages _____
15. Dissertation contains pages with print at a slant, filmed as received
16. Other _____

U·M·I

ADMINISTRATIVE REVENGE

by

J. Bruce Phillips

A Dissertation Submitted to
the Faculty of the Graduate School at
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education

Greensboro
1987

Approved by



Dale L. Dumbauld
Dissertation Advisor

APPROVAL PAGE

This dissertation has been approved by the following committee of the Faculty of the Graduate School at The University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Dissertation Adviser Walter L. Dumbak

Committee Members Edwin D. Bell
Wesley S. Bryant
Harold B. Tucker

June 22, 1987
Date of Acceptance by Committee

June 22, 1987
Date of Final Oral Examination

©1988

JAMES BRUCE PHILLIPS

All Rights Reserved

PHILLIPS, JAMES BRUCE, Ed.D. Administrative Revenge.
(1987)
Directed by Dr. Dale L. Brubaker. 130 pp.

The purpose of this study was to investigate revenge feelings, or attitudes of "getting even" and the effects these attitudes have on the operation of an organization, particularly a public school organization.

The principle methodology of this investigation is empirical and involves organizations and incidents that in many cases have little to do with education directly. The theory here is that school business is people business, and human nature does not change with occupations.

The study is based in part upon the assumption that self-awareness is basic to an understanding of others, that interpretation and application of the concepts of others are affected by one's personal perceptions of his own experiences. Cooperation demands understanding and if people realistically expect to reach goals that have been set, they have no choice but to cooperate and work together.

For the most part, authority and power are dependant upon the cooperation of people at large in order to function. Self-control is the only control needed in most cases, then authority can concentrate on the few that remain.

During this study, one can easily conclude that revenge is a product of insecurity and a dearth of

confidence both in others as well as ourselves, and that only the strong and well prepared can afford to extend time and help to those who are weaker.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are many persons who have contributed significantly to my educational and professional growth, and particularly to my experience in the doctoral program. To these persons I wish to express my appreciation.

I especially wish to acknowledge with sincere appreciation, the excellent professional counsel, genuine interest, and stimulating guidance of Dr. Dale Brubaker, chairman, who, in spite of my short comings, has helped me to establish a sense of direction throughout the doctoral program. I consider his writing to be a model to which one might continue to aspire.

Dr. Joseph E. Bryson's cheerful support and courteous enthusiasm, Dr. Harold E. Snyder's genuine interest and concern, and Dr. Edwin Bell's scholarship and willingness to assist continually challenged me in this endeavor.

Special appreciation is acknowledged for the helpfulness of Mrs. Pauline Cheek, who served as proofreader and Mrs. Betty Jolley, Professor at Mars Hill College, who served as proofreader but who also provided encouragement and technical assistance throughout.

Stuart Jolley, a young teacher at Madison High School, was my special chief assistant. He is a computer-printer whiz who was always ready to computerize and print at a moments notice. His help was invaluable and I shall always be most grateful.

Finally, I am deeply grateful to my wife, Mildred Payne Phillips, who has served as my unofficial research assistant, and for shielding me from untold numbers of interferences along the way. She has worked many hours to free my time for this project, which could not have been successfully brought to conclusion without her help as well as her inspiration and encouragement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Chapter 1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Need for the Study	1
1.2 Definitions	4
A. Vengeance	4
B. Administration	4
C. Leadership	4
D. Superintendency	5
E. Principalship	5
F. Attitude (s)	5
G. Retribution	5
H. Behavior	6
I. Organizational Setting	6
1.3 Methodology	7
A. Portraiture	9
B. Case Study Approach	10
1.4 Overview	11
Chapter 2. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	13
2.1 Introduction	13
2.2 Historical Perspective on Revenge	16
2.3 Wild Justice	31
2.4 Revenge for a Different Reason	36
Chapter 3. ATTITUDE AND PERCEPTION	51
3.1 Introduction	51
3.2 Taxonomy of Revenge	55
A. Expressed Revenge	56
B. Withheld Revenge	65
C. "Bushwhacker's" Revenge	74
Chapter 4. PERSONALITIES AND REVENGE	79
4.1 Personality Types	83
4.2 Some Case Studies	89
4.3 Administrative Leadership and Attitudes of Revenge	111

Chapter 5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY	114
5.1 Summary	114
5.2 Conclusions	116
5.3 Recommendations	119
BIBLIOGRAPHY	121

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 The Need For The Study

Every organization is a unique arrangement of people, with very diverse reasons for being associated together. In spite of this uniqueness, almost every group relationship or setting echoes similar designs attempted in earlier times and in other places. The creation of a school is just such a design, although hardly unique. While each school is different in some ways, there are many similarities including shared problems.

An organizational setting involves places and tasks, but it is mostly people and how effectively their various relationships function that make the difference. Each organization consists more than anything else of a loosely knit blend of the strengths, abilities, and personalities of the individuals involved. The blend will include more of these "ingredients" from the "core group" but no one will be totally excluded from the mix that creates the setting.

The crying need in America's schools today is for effective leadership. There is an overabundance of those who aspire to leadership positions but a

grievous deficit of candidates who possess the qualities required of a successful leader: competence, confidence, vision, and command.

The purpose of this study is to explore certain personality traits of individuals involved in school settings and how these traits may be shaped and harnessed to the advantage of the whole group in ways that will add to the net effectiveness of the school as an organization. Primarily, research will be looking at the human impulse toward revenge in the interpersonal relationships of group members. This impulse toward revenge often comes from the inner recesses of the mind. The source of this feeling is different from person to person and will generally tend to manifest itself differently in each case.

If people expect to accomplish the goals that have been established for their particular setting, it is imperative that they work together. Here, however, problems are encountered. Groups fail to reach complete agreement with regard to goals, and their members do not all agree on methods of achieving these goals. In addition, each member of the organization has his own personal goals, which may require a different order of priorities. The degree of commitment to the objectives of the group will vary. All of these combined with differences in personality lead to conflict and reduce

the chances of success for the entire group.

There is a tendency for people to be silent about some personal goals. Once the setting has been formally established and the core group defined, individuals in the group will be less vocal about any lack of agreement and they will not cooperate as readily, except for the sake of appearances. Some members of the organization either actively impede progress or passively withhold their cooperation for a multitude of reasons. It is these activities and the subsequent "getting even" and "back even" that are the focus of the present study. Revenge comes from program administrators but also travels in the opposite direction. The attitude of each person in the group and his perception of the attitudes of his fellow group members are important indeed. Often, reality and perception of reality are not the same. Usually in the creation of a setting, each person reacts to his own perception of events.

This dissertation is an outgrowth of an Independent Study which was taken during my course of study at UNC-Greensboro. It was a study of Susan Jacoby, a former student of Dale Brubaker in Michigan, and a book that she authored entitled Wild Justice: The Evolution of Revenge. Jacoby's work will be discussed in more detail at a later point as she reviews her own concepts of justice and revenge.

1.2 Definitions

The following definitions are important to the present study.

Vengeance - Punishment of a private nature inflicted in retaliation for a perceived injury or offense; or personal retribution using great force, usually to an excessive degree.¹

Administration - Management, or the performance of executive duties as distinguished from policy-making.²

Leadership - The mobilization of the inner forces of others causing them to behave in ways suitable to the leaders;³ or the full exercise of influence.⁴ It is highly situational; and while there are many qualities included in leadership, there is no list that when combined will total to "leadership."⁵

1 Websters Third International Dictionary, s.v. "Vengeance."

2 Ibid., s.v. "Administration."

3 Ben Solomon, Leadership of Youth (Mount Kisco, N.Y.: Youth Sevice, Inc., 1950), p.4.

4 Ibid., p.4.

5 Dale L. Brubaker, Creative Leadership in Elementary Schools (Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company, 1976), p.5.

Superintendency - The office, post, or jurisdiction, (or body of responsibilities) of a superintendent, who is the formally designated administrative head of a school system.¹

Principalship - The office and body of responsibilities of a principal, who is the formally designated head of a school.²

Attitude (s) - A mental position with regard to a fact or subject; a feeling or emotion toward a subject; a position assumed for a specific purpose or for an expected reaction; a readiness to respond in a characteristic way to a concept or situation.³

Retribution - To repay or recompense; to dispense payment, good or bad; usually more in accord with justice than with "revenge."⁴

1 Websters Third International Dictionary, s.v. "Superintendency."

2 Brubaker, Creative Leadership, p. 5.

3 Webster, s.v. "Attitude."

4 Webster, s.v. "Retribution."

Behavior - Anything that an organism or group does involving action and response to its environment;¹ action implementing (or reflecting) an attitude, or the propensity to behave (or act) in a certain way.²

Organizational Setting - Any instance when two or more people come together in new and sustained relationships to achieve certain goals.³

1 Webster, s.v. "Behavior."

2 Personal interview with Dale L. Brubaker, 17 December 1986.

3 Seymour B. Sarason. The Creation Settings and the Future Societies (San Francisco: Jossey-Boss Publishers, 1978), p. ix.

1.3 Methodology

Several months ago, when the present investigation into administrative revenge began to come into focus as a dissertation topic, and a file of appropriate research, books, and articles began to grow, the investigator became increasingly aware, almost daily, of the dubious good fortune of finding a subject that had heretofore been relatively untouched. This also meant that little material was available. Moreover none of the material addressed revenge in the administration of schools. Much of what has been written is scattered throughout the academic and literary repositories in books and articles that were written with other purposes in mind. This has greatly increased the amount of time spent on research and reading in order to become prepared to write a dissertation. The result is that the study will necessarily be heuristic to perhaps a greater extent than some other topics, that might be researched to a greater extent.

The method of approach to the main body of qualitative research will be portraiture.

In "Portraiture," the plan is to look at portraits

of the revenge impulse as they appear in the works of some current writers. The qualitative research methodology known as "portraiture", has its origins in the writings of Harvard's Sara Lawrence Lightfoot, whose book The Good High School: Portraits of Character and Culture was the 1984 winner of the American Educational Research Association Award. (This was an amazing feat given the quantitative research orientation of the organization.) Lightfoot argues that the astute qualitative researcher performs much like the portrait artist as he tries to capture the essence of the subject being observed rather than simply the visible symbols that come to one's attention. In the process of working "inside-out," the observer needs to remind himself that will also be shaped by the context or setting created as the observed and observer relate to each other.¹

Therefore, as one looks at revenge impulses, he must try to "get-inside" those who practice the use of revenge in administration. A high school student, who sometimes serves as a researcher's office assistant, observed recently that for a statement to take on real personal meaning that would have lasting value for a

¹ Sara Lawrence Lightfoot, The Good High School (New York: Basic Books, 1983), pp. 13-14.

student, it is essential to know who said it as well as what was said. "You have a much more lasting impression of a meaningful statement if you know and understand the person who made the statement," she said. "Otherwise, a teaching statement is almost out of context.¹ To be complete, the portrait of an attitude must include a portrait in prose of the person himself. One sees what one's attitude appears to be, but to understand one must study the framework that is internalized by the speaker.

In portraiture - case study projects such as this, fewer subjects will be examined, but in much more detail. The evidence of the struggles of the subjects will be examined with the impulses toward revenge and how these impulses affected the lives and labors of the subjects. It seems that no two subjects are ever affected in the same way. In some cases, the impulse is very destructive. In other cases the power of the impulse is harnessed to push the individual involved to extreme heights of accomplishment.

As the study of the impulse toward revenge progresses, the writer will gradually turn to see it in the light of the administration of educational programs. This research will attempt to explore the effects of attitude in general, both on the administrator and on

¹ Personal interview with Kay Rice, 21 January 1987.

those under the supervisors supervision.

The investigator has adopted the case study methodology for a number of reasons. First, it complements the "inside-out" approach of portraiture. As a kind of mini-biography, it freezes the subject being studied in much the same way that a camera creates a snapshot. Second, in the process of freezing the subject in time and space, the investigator can systematically analyze both subject and context. Third, particular behaviors are not seen in isolation but are instead part of the whole (the case itself). Finally, the case study approach gives the researcher permission to talk in subjective terms about complexities in a setting in a way that experimental quantitative research does not.¹

¹ Hildreth Hoke McAshon, Elements of Education Research (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963), p. 21.

1.4 Overview

The initial chapter introduces the dissertation and gives a brief look at its goals and how the writer hopes to reach them.

Chapter 2 will be a review of the literature. This will certainly not be an exhaustive review, but one in which the writer will look at major works on the subject which are most current. Works have been chosen which have been written by those writers who are generally recognized as having written some of the best literature that examines human attitudes. This literature on human attitudes can be found in many subject areas. The areas chosen will not be limited to "education."

Chapter 3 introduces the main body of the dissertation. The taxonomy of "revenge" will be discussed in detail, with an explanation of how this mentality works its way into the philosophy and work of individuals who make up some of our most important institutions. Also included will be an analysis of some historical examples.

The writer will explore the working of revenge in the field of education and the writer will also observe the developed attitudes of some professionals

in education toward revenge as a factor in the larger portraits of some school units.

Chapter 4 will outline suggested guidelines for administrators as they deal with the impulse for revenge. The feeling of a need for revenge is perhaps representative of other attitudes. This chapter will explore some ways to deal with these feelings within one's self, as an administrator, and also how to deal with these feelings as they appear in members of the staff.

Chapter 5 will present a summary and conclusion of the study. It will also identify possibilities for further work in the field of personnel relations and professional preparation. The reader will be challenged to continue reading, studying, and observing. It presents what is perhaps a larger challenge of putting these thoughts into practice. It is easier to talk about good attitudes and leadership than it is to bring them to reality.

Chapter 2 Review of the Literature

- 2.1 Introduction
- 2.2 Historical Perspective on Revenge
- 2.3 Wild Justice
- 2.4 Revenge for a Different Reason

2.1 Introduction

More than anything else, the desire for revenge is an attitude. If revenge is achieved, its effect is a change in the attitude of the revenge seeker, often in ways other than had been expected. Since revenge is not usually considered the most respectable preoccupation in the world most vengeful people are careful to disguise their feelings. It was more than a few of America's grandfathers who made famous the motto: "Don't get mad, get even," but, in public, few will admit holding a grudge or harboring feelings of resentment. People have been conditioned to avoid these attitudes. On closer scrutiny, however, researchers find that while most deny the hidden impulses toward revenge, the feelings are there and most people are at least "closet avengers."

Feelings of resentment and the desire to even the score stem from causes as seemingly insignificant as a minor social affront or as indescribably horrible as the

Holocaust. But from one end of the spectrum to the other, victims and/or their families almost invariably declare themselves to be interested in seeing that "justice is done."

The desire for justice is said to be a mask for the desire for revenge. But justice has to be a part of law, though one must grudgingly agree that the two abstract notions sometimes share some common ground. Revenge is an exciting word. The very sound of it provokes strong emotional responses of anger and varying degrees of contempt or even hatred as one leans forward and mentally rubs one's hands together, thirsty for the blood of overdue retribution.

For the purposes of this study, and in most situations which might be conjured up, revenge is generally thought of on one of three levels. Level one will be revenge for personal and social grievances (insults, affairs of the heart, job rivalries, jealousy, etc). The second level will be revenge involving physical or deeply emotional traumas (wanton destruction of property, serious theft, rape or murder of a family member or close friend). The third level will describe revenge that places serious threat or damage to the cherished fabric of society. It has been said of revenge, how one stands depends mostly upon where one

stands (whether or not one has been victimized). An important consideration is "Whose ox is gored?"

2.2 Historical Perspective on Revenge

"I don't get mad, I just get even!" is the modern excuse of many, a symptom of one being "fed up." However it is not easy to know "with what" or "by whom" one is fed up. What does one actually do about retribution or revenge when someone cheats, betrays, or takes advantage of someone or in some way treats someone unfairly? Perhaps the most morally offensive feeling there is comes upon one when one sees a situation that one feels is not fair. Most people made their first moral judgements in terms of something not being fair. Perhaps a brother or sister got away with something or was allowed to have what appeared to a jaundiced eye as undue privilege.

This early childhood concept of fairness is brought into focus by watchful parents. Almost from birth we are taught to "play fairly" and to share. These ideas are so profound, however, as to imply that all people are born with an innate sense of justice and the postulate that things should be fair. Among the many fundamental needs of man, in order to maintain peace of mind, is the need for a belief in fairness and equity. Even the inmates of prisons tend to feel guilt for their

crimes and to accept some measure of punishment.¹ Social values reflected in the "immorality" of a crime are commonly held by the staff and inmates alike although not to the same degree.² There are some crimes which would place one in dire physical peril, even in prison. The point is that all people believe in some degree of fairness.

In any case, one is reminded that violation of generally accepted standards of belief and/or behavior will carry certain penalties. There is always a price, and sooner or later it will be paid. Within the "control panels, circuit boards, and memory banks" of the individual mind, there is a large "chip" that carries an innate "gyrostabilizer" which eternally seeks balance in the affairs of man. Therefore, in spite of the extremes of appeals from all directions, balance will ultimately be achieved.

Thousands of years ago, when the only law was the "law of the jungle," any appearance of generosity would have been interpreted as a sign of weakness. The insecure at times, make the same interpretation to this day. Therefore it is the leaders with strength and self-assurance who can most easily afford to be kind,

1. F.E. Emery, Freedom and Justice Within Walls (London: Tavistock Publications, 1970), p.9.

2. Ibid, p. 34.

generous, and helpful to their colleagues.

Aggressiveness to the point of savagery was once the rule. As ages evolved it was essential that potential enemies and aggressors understood the possible cost of stepping over the line. Very often the cost was total annihilation. If one felt he had a grievance, the only recourse to justice was to "fix his hash here and now." By the time of the "Golden Age of Greece," "revenge" and "justice" were synonymous.

Autocratic or other forms of despotic government rule by decree, whether supported by God or an army. In a democracy we profess to govern by law. Aggrieved parties have a right to expect justice as a part of the social contract under constitutional law. In retribution, revenge, retaliation, vengeance, getting even, or whatever it might be called in all its shortcomings, and in spite of a variety of motivations, at least part of what results from the action is called justice. If the law cannot provide a feeling of justice to its aggrieved citizens, they will seek to provide justice for themselves. Machiavelli said that "a wise ruler will quickly insert his own justice between the guilty and the aggrieved so that the people will soon learn to look to him for justice." ¹

¹ Niccolo Machiavelli, The Prince, Allen Gilbert, Trans. (New York: Hendricks House Inc., 1964), p. 217.

In more recent times, some consider it to be uncivilized to harbor a very strong desire for personal revenge. In addition it is considered a tactical error to exhibit an undue thirst for vengeance before or during the trial of the object of those vengeful feelings, especially if one is to be called as a witness for the prosecution. The display of these feelings might taint a verdict of guilty or an appeal. It could even assist the defendant by serving to impeach a witness who would otherwise be valuable to the prosecution of the case.

The Bible also serves to provide one with a good deal of historical perspective on revenge. On close examination, however, the Bible does not always say some of the things that we have come to believe that it says.

The "Pentateuch" was the Greek name for the first five books of the Old Testament. These were the books of the law of Moses, called "Torah," meaning "the law" in Hebrew. During the time of Moses and the Judges, the Mosaic Law and the body of the interpretation that grew around it served as law for the Hebrews. This was their only code of law, regulating both religious and civil life. In theory, God ruled Israel with this law through the priests (Levites), the Judges, and an occasional Prophet. The Mosaic Law, based

primarily upon custom, tradition, and the Ten Commandments, served, in a manner of speaking, as a constitution. Hebrew life was entirely governed (theocracy) by this law, and while everyone was expected to know and obey the law, everyone was also responsible for helping to enforce the law. If the laws governing society were broken, society was responsible for applying the law (with the help of the Priests) and for restoring peace and balance. If an individual was victimized, the family of the individual saw to it that "justice" was done.

Sometimes, in the process of being done, justice could easily be overdone. The Mosaic Law had instructed that

If any mischief follow,
then thou shalt give life for life,
Eye for eye, tooth for tooth,
Hand for hand, foot for foot,
Burning for burning, wound for wound,
Stripe for stripe.¹

While this may not be considered the most sophisticated code of law in the world, it was a great improvement upon most other codes of the day. Even if one disregarded all religious significance of the system, it was rule by law. Crimes (sins) were spelled out as well as the penalties for their

¹ Ex. 21: 23-25.

violation. Also provision was made for safe havens in case the commission of a crime involved mitigating circumstances. These "cities of refuge" provided protection until the accused could be judged. Revenge was used as a tool to enforce the law and inflict punishment at the same time:

Then ye shall appoint you cities to be cities of refuge for you; that the slayer may flee thither, which killeth any person at unawares.

And they shall be unto you cities for refuge from the avenger; that the manslayer die not, until he stand before the congregation in judgment.¹

But one could see that the impulse toward revenge was controlled at least to some extent. The cities of refuge were referred to again by Moses:

Then Moses severed three cities on this side Jordan toward the sunrising;

That the slayer might flee thither, which should kill his neighbor unawares, and hated him not in times past; and that fleeing unto one of these cities he might live.²

The description of the crime here provides explanation. For the city of refuge to protect a person for the taking of a life, the act must not have been premeditated and it had to be able to pass the "absence of malice" test.

1 Num. 35: 11-12.

2 Deut. 4: 41-42.

Further regulation came about with these cities during the time of Joshua:

Speak to the children of Israel, saying Appoint out for you cities of refuge, whereof I spoke unto you by the hand of Moses:

That the slayer that killeth any person unawares and unwittingly may flee thither and they shall be your refuge from the avenger of blood.

And when he that doth flee unto one of those cities shall stand at the entering of the gate of the city, and shall declare his cause in the ears of the elders of the city, they shall take him into the city unto them, and give him a place, that he may dwell among them.

And if the avenger of blood pursue after him, then they shall not deliver the slayer up into his hand; because he smote his neighbor unwittingly, and hated him not beforetime.

And he shall dwell in that city until he stand before the congregation for judgment, and until the death of the high priest that shall be in those days: then shall the slayer return, and come unto his own city, and unto his own house, unto the city from whence he fled.¹

Here also was that requirement that in order for a "slayer" to be guilty, the elements of malice and the intent to kill must be present. Also the factor of pre-meditation is strongly implied. The accused would be tried by a counsel of elders. If unmitigated guilt was found, one was delivered to the avenger "or a lesser penalty could be extracted by the counsel if circumstances warranted."²

1. Josh. 20: 2-6.

2. Telephone interview with M. Holland Kendall, Emeritus Prof. of Religion, Mars Hill College, 17 Feb. 1987.

In that case, or if a decision of "innocence" was found, a "cooling off" period was required, dictating that the defendant remain in the city until the death of the high priest. Of course he could leave at his own peril. Since there were no police forces, these rules attempted to apply the "fairness of general opinion" and public responsibility. It may have been the best way to regulate the revenge impulse at that time and under those circumstances. Life on the early American frontier was very similar, except that there were no cities of refuge as designated.

Vengeance was reserved for God, and man was usually admonished to refrain from infringement in this area. Probably the most quoted passage on that subject comes from Paul's letter to the Romans:

Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves, but rather give place unto wrath: for it is written, vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord.¹

It may be important to remember that here one is speaking of revenge for its own sake with men participating. Abundant other references from similar contexts can be found.

1 Rom. 12:19.

Bless them which persecute you:
bless and curse not. Recompense to no
man evil for evil.1

Say not, I will do so to him as he
hath done to me: I will render to the man
according to his work.2

Not rendering evil for evil, or railing
for railing, but contrariwise blessing;
Knowing that ye are thereunto called,
that ye should inherit a blessing.3

And Jesus himself said to two of his most trusted
disciples as illustrated in the following excerpt:

And when his disciples James and John
saw this, they said, Lord, wilt thou that
we command fire to come down from
heaven, and consume them, even as
Elias did?

But he turned and rebuked them, and said:
Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of.4

At another point, the Apostle Paul in his letter
to the Hebrews said:

For we know him that hath said
vengeance belongeth unto me, I will
recompense, saith the Lord. And, again,
the Lord shall judge his people.5

Clearly God had in most cases admonished man to

1 Rom. 12: 14,17.

2 Prov. 24: 29.

3 I Pet. 3: 9.

4 St. Luke 9: 54-55.

5 Heb. 10: 30.

forego revenge and leave it to Him to pass judgement. Note the fact that two decisions are thus called for, although the above references deal mostly with the instructions to the people. This did not mean, however, that transgressors would not pay:

And I will execute vengeance in anger and fury upon the heathen, such as they have not heard.¹

And to you who are troubled rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from Heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ.²

At times the Bible records instances of persons being used as agents of God's wrath:

And when Jehu was come to Jezreel, Jezebel heard of it; and she painted her face, and tired her head, and looked out at a window.

And as Jehu entered in at the gate, she said, Had Zimri peace who slew his master?

And he lifted up his face to the window, and said, Who is on my side? Who? And there looked out at him two or three eunuchs.

And he said, Throw her down. So they threw her down: and some of her blood was sprinkled on the wall, and on the horses: and he trod her under foot.

And when he was come in, he did eat and drink, and said, Go, see now this cursed woman, and bury her: for she is a King's daughter.

And they went to bury her: but they

1 Micah 5: 15.

2 II Thess. 1: 7-8.

found no more of her than the skull, and the feet, and the palms of her hands.

Wherefore they came again, and told him. And he said, This is the word of the Lord, which He spake by His servant Elijah the Tishbite, saying, In the portion of jezreel shall dogs eat the flesh of Jezebel.¹

Another example of a person being used to carry out the Lord's revenge is Saul, the first Hebrew King:

Thus saith the Lord of host, I remember that which Amalek did to Israel, how he laid wait for him in the way, when he came up from Egypt.

Now go and smite Amalek, and utterly destroy all that they have, and spare them not: but slay both man and woman, infant and suckling, ox and sheep, camel and ass.²

King Saul followed instructions, except he saved the very best of the Amalekite sheep and cattle, and he took the Amalekite King, Agag, prisoner. He tried to excuse himself by putting the blame on the soldiers looking for choice animals for religious sacrifice. At this point, the prophet Samuel cut Agag into pieces with a sword.

1 II Kings 9: 30-36.

2 I Sam. 15: 33.

And Samuel came no more to see
Saul until the day of his death: nevertheless
Samuel mourned for Saul: and the Lord
repented that He had made Saul King
over Israel.¹

It is not too difficult to move to a "gray area" on the edge of revenge. For example, when Moses was a young man, he went out among his people and, on one occasion, saw an Egyptian taskmaster beating one of the Hebrews, who had been enslaved by the Pharaoh. Looking around and seeing no potential witnesses, Moses promptly killed the Egyptian and buried him in the sand.² Was this action intended to defend the Hebrew? Was his purpose to prevent other Hebrews from being beaten? Did he intervene and consequently have to defend himself? Or was Moses just getting even with the Egyptian for beating his fellow Hebrew? Was Moses in fact seeking Justice? Obviously there are elements of most of these choices involved in the action of the future law-giver. Justice and revenge may not be the same but neither can they always be completely separated.

Many of the central characters of the Bible had more than one wife, an accepted custom of the day. David, the writer of Psalms, was an example. On one occasion, Amnon, his son by one wife, raped David's

1 Ibid., v. 35.

2 Ex. 2: 11-12.

daughter, Tamar, who was, of course, his half sister. She was a beautiful virgin, who was dearly loved by Absalom, who was her full brother.¹ For this Absalom killed Amnon, a clear case of pure revenge. But there is more to the story. Amnon was King David's oldest son, and therefore heir to the throne. Absalom, being very ambitious, may have seen this as a chance to put himself in better position for the future. If so, we now have a case of cold blooded, premeditated murder, with "revenge" as an excuse, and "justice" to add legitimacy. It is interesting to note that the beautiful Tamar was allowed to waste away quietly in the house of Absalom for two years, while Absalom waited for a good opportunity to get Amnon.²

The Patriarch Jacob had a beautiful daughter, Dinah, who was seduced by the prince of the Hivite people, who so loved her that he agreed to pay any price and make any sacrifice to have Dinah for his wife. Her brothers made a deal to gain time, then slaughtered every man in the city.³ Since Dinah had been more than willing, we might suspect that her brothers were more interested in their pride than in her honor, especially

1 II Sam. 13: 11-14.

2 Ibid., v. 19-20.

3 Gen. 34: 2-25.

since she is not mentioned again.

Samson was one of the Hebrew judges, ruling Israel for twenty years.¹ He is one of those fabled characters of history who are well known even to people only vaguely familiar with the Bible. He lived during a time when the Hebrews were almost constantly under foreign domination and without hope as a nation. They needed a national hero and Samson filled that need. As with many such heroes, the stories about him may have "larger than life" legends. He often took revenge on the hated Philistines, much to the delight of his own people. Samson was not an organizer, and he always acted alone, using only his cunning and great physical strength. His exploits of daring and revenge gave his people courage but did no permanent harm to their enemies. Samson's last act of revenge against the Philistines, as is often the case with the act of simple revenge, did great harm to many of his enemies, but also destroyed Samson himself.²

So we see that God not only denied revenge to his people, but reserved it for himself. Those who took it upon themselves to serve vengeance upon an enemy, often suffered along with their victims. In some cases it

1 Judges 16: 31.

2 Judges 16: 30.

seems God did appoint someone to act as his agent. Before assuming this role, one should take great caution to insure that he has been commissioned by God and not self-appointed, as is sometimes the case. In the great majority of these situations, more harm than good is accomplished and the results are often quite different from those expected. It would seem that since the dawn of civilization, more grief may have been poured over the bloody heads of mankind in the name of religion than for any other cause.

2.3 Wild Justice

Susan Jacoby grew up and attended school in Michigan. She is married to Anthony "Tony" Astrachan, a journalist, and has worked as an education reporter for the Washington Post and as a columnist for the New York Times. She was a free lance writer in the Soviet Union for two years, 1969-1971. From this period Jacoby wrote Moscow Conversations; The Friendship Barrier, and Inside Soviet Schools. She is the author of "Hers," a weekly column in the New York Times, and has contributed to magazines including Nation and McCall's.¹

During her years in Moscow, Jacoby managed to develop relationships with members of the Russian population in spite of the surveillant bureaucracy, and out of this came Moscow Conversations, a personal account of everyday life in Soviet society, an examination of a number of Soviet lifestyles. In Inside Soviet Schools, Jacoby takes a look at the Russian education system, comparing it to our own in the United States. She talked to teachers, students, and parents, but always protected their identity. Incidentally, it is remarkable that she was able to accomplish this work

¹ Contemporary Authors, Vol. 108., s.v. "Jacoby, Susan."

without being deported, although her husband was beaten up on one occasion, probably as a "warning."

In Wild Justice, Susan Jacoby is dealing with a few terms which have never been well defined in a manner that is generally acceptable to everyone. Justice is considered a legitimate concept in the modern code of civilized behavior. Vengeance is not. Even in court, it is generally unacceptable to admit that vengeance has a part in motivation. But in reality the difference is clouded. Jacoby points out that "vengeance and justice are not mutually exclusive." In fact, they are very closely related, at times virtually synonymous. In a democracy, justice, at least in theory, is what happens as a result of "due process." Private revenge by any process including the vigilante system is outside the law (wild justice). This "technical" difference is what separates the two terms. Also, in the justice system, the law takes into consideration rehabilitation, circumstances, conditions, and shared responsibility and at the same time attempts to follow the path of the constitutional guarantees of "due process." Justice is applied with "fairness" and "tempered with mercy." Circumstances and motives are weighed and degrees of guilt and responsibility are assigned. Vengeance, on the other hand, is "wild justice," and usually outside the law, at least in criminal justice action.

In recent years the courts have begun to recognize that retribution is to some extent a part of justice. Jacoby states that revenge is regarded as the sick vestige of a more primitive stage of human development, a serious perversion. She points out that the question of revenge is raised today usually within the context of psychological and social deviance. Some do not agree that this should be regarded completely as fact. People are expected to exercise the restraint that enables themselves and their peers to live with one another under the law. They believe that one of the essential tasks of civilization is the attainment of a balance between this restraint and the powerful impulse to retaliate when harm is inflicted. Here we repeat Machiavelli's idea: "the wise ruler is one who swiftly interposes his own retribution between a criminal and the offended." A society that is unable for any reason to convince individuals of its ability to exact atonement for injury runs a constant risk of having its members revert to the wilder forms of justice as we saw in the Bernard Goetz case on the New York City subway. In a world of law, the absence of just retribution poses as great a threat to liberty and order as revenge gone wild. People must be able to look to the law for justice, or they will look elsewhere.

As Jacoby is pointing out, the importance of the

rule of law, she raises another point that the writer believes that many have not considered. She says that private forgiveness (deciding not to prosecute or not to testify for the state) should not be allowed to cancel out public penalties. The principle is the same as private revenge. Someone has taken the law into his own hands.

Jacoby, in her chapter on sexual revenge, points out that most of the hot-blooded crimes have been unofficially placed in a different category from cold blooded crimes. For example, the killer of his spouse's lover will be much more lightly treated than a Charles Manson type. Also, a female killer is more likely to go free than a male, though it is true that a woman is much less likely to kill in the first place, or if she does, she is not nearly as likely to kill again as a male under similar circumstances. But this is statistical evidence, and each case should stand on its own merits. Jacoby is revealing her frustrations about dealing with the death penalty here, a subject that can quickly involve the emotions.

Jacoby brings out the fact that, unlike the present, in the past specific cases which fueled public outcry for capital punishment: the Saco-Venzetti Case, the Tate-LaBianca Case, the Loeb-Leopold Case, the Lizzy Borden Case, the Lindbergh Case, and the Rosenberg Case,

to name a few.

In most of this book, Jacoby talks of the extreme and the celebrated cases, which usually turn out to be murder cases. By far most of the revenge most often encountered or witnessed in life, however, is much less celebrated and far more subtle. It may even reach the point of the receiver being unaware, and perhaps at times even the avenger not being fully cognizant of the individuals actions or motivations. There are many, many, ways of "getting even." Probably the most common result of the feeling of injustice is simply a "soured" attitude. Since there are many forms of revenge, a few representative examples will be examined in the following chapter.

2.4 Revenge for a Different Reason

Thus saith the Lord God: Because the Philistines have dealt by revenge, and have taken vengeance with a despiteful heart, to destroy it for the old hatred;

Therefore thus saith the Lord God: Behold I will stretch out my hand upon the Philistines....;

And I will execute great vengeance upon them....;
.... and they shall know that I am the Lord, when I shall lay my vengeance upon them. 1

1 Ezk. 25: 15-17.

Cease and Desist

On September 5, 1972, eight Palestinian terrorists, members of a group who called themselves the Black September, very quietly arrived at the Olympic village in Munich, West Germany. Part of the "fedayeen" (Islamic "men of sacrifice."),¹ they were first seen scaling a six-foot wire fence at 4 A.M. about fifty yards from the apartments of the Israeli athletes. Two athletes were killed and nine were captured by the terrorists in the initial action, which lasted only about twenty-five minutes.² Contact was established with the terrorists as the world watched breathlessly on T.V., but these talks broke down by 10:40 P.M. In the fighting which followed, the remaining captured athletes were executed and five of the eight "fedayeen" were killed by German soldiers. The remaining three were taken prisoner.³ At 1:30 A.M. it was all over.

During the weeks that followed, German and Israeli interrogators pieced together events preceding the massacre, and they were able to identify participants as well as planners and/or organizers of the massacre. From this information the Israeli intelligence agency

¹ George Jonas, Vengeance (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1984), p.5.

² Ibid., p.6.

³ Ibid., p.7.

developed a list of central operatives marked for reprisal:

Ali Hasan Salamah - The main architect of the Olympic atrocity. He and four of his bodyguards were blown up when his Chevrolet station wagon passed a parked Volkswagen at 3:30 P.M. in Beirut on 22 January 1979. He had married the Lebanese [1971] Miss Universe in 1978, and had thus become domesticated to the point of predictability in his daily routine. His death was first reported on Israeli television news.

Abu Daoud - Explosives expert. He was one of the masterminds behind the killings and was the founder of the Black September faction. While in the lobby of a hotel in Warsaw, Poland, on 1 August 1979, he was shot.

Mahmoud Hamshari - PLO official. He was a leader of the Black September and coordinator of the Munich massacre. He was killed 8 December 1972 in Paris by a plastic bomb which had been placed inside his telephone.

Wael Zwaiter - Yasser Arafat's cousin. He was the major organizer of Palestinian terrorism in Europe. He was shot and killed in the lobby of his Rome apartment building on 16 October 1972. He was eliminated less than six weeks after the Munich assault.

Dr. Basil al-Kubaisi - He was the organizer of logistics and weapons supply for the Popular Front for the liberation of Palestine. He was shot and killed on a street in Paris on 6 April 1973.

Kamal Nasser - The official spokesman for the PLO. He made no secret of his connection with terrorism and was assassinated in his Beirut apartment on 12 April 1973.

Kemal Adwan - He was in charge of sabotage operations for Al Fatah in Israeli occupied lands. He was assassinated with Nasser (above).

Mahmoud Yussuf Najjer - Known as "Abu Yussuf," he was one of the highest ranking officials in the Palestinian movement. He was also assassinated

with Nasser and Adwan (previous page).

Mohammed Boudia - He was a handsome playboy who also had links to top level PLO echelons in Europe. He was blown up in his car in Paris on 28 June 1973.

Hussein Abad al-Chir - He was the PLO contact man with the KGB in Cyprus. He was killed by a fragmentation grenade in his hotel room in Nicosia, Cyprus, 24 January 1973.

Dr. Wadi Haddad - He was a universally acknowledged mastermind of terrorism, and second in importance only to his friend, Dr. George Habash. He was the only one of the group on the Israeli list to escape death by this operation. When Israeli agents finally located him he was a patient in an East German hospital, facing imminent death from cancer. His death was not long in coming. He was cremated only twenty-two days after being admitted to the hospital. The date was 5 September 1978, six years to the day after the atrocity at Munich.¹

The four-man squad assigned by the Israelis to complete this counter-terrorist operation was reduced by half during the hunts and assassinations across Europe. In addition, more than two dozen other persons were killed incidental to the completion of the assignment. These include one KGB agent who was unlucky enough to contact the PLO in the right place but the wrong time. Through secret diplomatic channels, the Israelis are believed to have apologized to the Soviet Union for this "unfortunate incident."²

1 Jonas, Vengeance pp. 1, 359.

2 Ibid., p. 354.

The Israeli mission, while having national vengeance as its surface motivation, actually was designed to send a message to Israeli enemies everywhere. Golda Meir herself had chosen the team members, and the Israeli Massad (Intelligence Agency) was in charge of the operation.

There is a fine line between terrorism and counter-terrorism, but the line is a very definite one. The story of this counter-terrorism is told in Vengeance, by George Jonas. It is a true story to the extent that the author's research can be depended upon, and his notes and scholarship seem both extensive and quite reliable. The book raises questions of good and evil, right and wrong, life and death. Jonas causes the reader to stop periodically and wonder, "Have we really come to this?"

Beyond questions of right and wrong, a final point of interest may be the utility of counter-terrorism. It is often suggested that counter-terrorism solves nothing; it increases rather than decreases terrorist incidents. The objections may or may not be true. Yet it seems that the utility of counter-terrorism cannot be decided on the basis of what it solves or fails to solve. If one believes a cause is just, one must either support that cause or surrender to injustice.

The tragic fact is that the maps of the world are

drawn in sweat and blood, not in tea and roses. Unfortunately, that is the nature of man in the "human zoo." There is little evidence to prove that man has changed man's basic nature since before the dawn of written history. Only God can change the nature of a person, and even God will not change that person against one's will. While the spirit of a struggle is alive, nations have no choice but to fight it every day, regardless of whether a day's battle solves anything or not, because the only other choice is giving up and going under. It is hypocritical of older nations, which have drawn their own maps on the globe with the blood of their forefathers, to apply to younger nations standards of restraint which had they been applied to themselves in the past, would have prevented their emergence or survival in the first place. At the same time, the emerging nations must recognize the changing circumstances and increased dangers of the atomic age. This is not to say that there are no standards of restraint in warfare. One can, in terms of moral justification, distinguish between terrorism and counter-terrorism in the same way one distinguishes between acts of war and war crimes. There are standards; terrorism is on the wrong side of them; counter-terrorism is not on the wrong side. It is possible to argue that the Palestinian cause is as

honorable as the Israeli cause; it is not reasonable to say that terror is as honorable as resisting terror.

Ultimately both the morality and the usefulness of resisting terror are contained in the uselessness and immorality of not resisting it.

From Anger to Tragedy

On the drizzly cold morning of September 29, 1983, the small town of Ruthton, Minnesota, was stunned by a double murder. Two of its most prominent citizens had been ambushed and gunned down in cold blood!

As is often the case, much larger developments had long been at work creating circumstances contributing to this crime. These circumstances were worldwide in scope and had implications ranging from history to economics and from international politics to the American farm problem. It was its more immediate circumstances, however, that would be presented to the jury.

The efficiency of the American farmer has fed America, and much of the rest of the world, with an oversupply which has driven the prices of the products down. The conservative American farmer tends to believe that honest hard work will cure anything; therefore the farmers response to falling farm prices is to produce even more efficiently. Meanwhile, supplies that farmers need for production continue to rise in price. In 1974, when soybeans were bringing ten dollars a bushel, a new tractor cost \$14,360.00, which was twelve times its 1950 price. In 1983, the price of soybeans had fallen to

approximately \$6.00 a bushel, while the price of that same tractor was \$55,000.00. 1 In 1985, one hobbyist rebuilt and restored a twenty-nine year old farm tractor and sold it for four times what it cost when it was new, and it was probably a bargain at that price. In 1984 workers for Oliver Tractor Company, who assembled some of those tractors, went on strike because the \$28.00 an hour in wages and fringe benefits was "unfair."

The inflation which drove up the price of land during the 1960's and 1970's, seemed to work in favor of the farmer, or so it seemed. One thus had more to offer as collateral for the capital one needed to borrow. Farms were consolidated and people began leaving for jobs in the urban areas. However, opportunity was shrinking in the land of opportunity. Foreclosures took farms that had been in the same families for a hundred years or more. For every seven farmers who went under, one local business folded too.2

But Oliver went out of business too. The banks which had foreclosed on some farms were themselves taken over by larger regional institutions with their impersonal cost cutting experts.

Poverty and hardship tend to strike unevenly. The

1. Andrew H. Malcolm, Final Harvest (New York: Random House, 1986), p. 170.

2. Ibid. p. 171.

situation looks especially uneven to those who are at or near the breaking point. Problems tend to strike agriculture first, but others were getting their turn as America moved toward the mid-eighties.

These conditions led to an explosion of violence on that September morning in Ruthton, Minnesota. James Lee Jenkins' farm operation was in trouble. He was middle-aged, and the tolls of the long economic fights were starting to add up. The doctors discovered the cause of his failing eyesight and informed him that his tunnel vision was incurable and probably would end in blindness. Jenkin's wife, Darlene, left for an easier life, taking their young daughter with her. Their son, Steve, remained with his father. Jim Jenkins also had developed diabetes and needed to be on a special diet at all meals, which did not come regularly after Darlene had left.

At last Jenkins gave up, sold his cattle, which had been used as collateral in a chattel mortgage, and left town with his sixteen year old son. This left the local bank, which was having problems of its own, holding another thirty-thousand dollar loss and another abandoned farm, which it would have trouble selling.

But the banker, Rudolph (Rudy) Blythe, and his loan officer, Deems Adair (Toby) Thulin, went to the Jenkins farm on the morning of September 29, thinking that they

were to be met by a prospective buyer. Blythe's wife was close behind in their station wagon. When she arrived, she was met by a shout from Rudy: "Go get the sheriff and tell him we've got trespassers on the old Jenkins property." Mrs. Blythe followed the sheriff back toward the farm but arrived to find both her husband and Thulin dead from multiple gunshot wounds from what appeared to be a large caliber, high powered rifle.

Steve and Jim Jenkins made their way south to Paducah, Texas, and a farm where Jim had once been employed, but which was now abandoned. James L. Jenkins had remarked about how his farm was gone, his wife was gone, and so was his daughter. His dreams of a new start on a new farm were gone too. He had sent Steve off to Sheriff Frank Taylor and the Texas Rangers with the epitaph that his "future had died in that Minnesota farmyard right along with those bankers." Jenkins then walked a short distance, placed the muzzle of a double barrel shotgun in his mouth and ended his mortal problems. The date was October 2, 1983.

Steven Todd Jenkins turned himself in to the Sheriff and was returned to Minnesota. His trial began on April 10, 1984. On April 26 he was found guilty of one count of second-degree murder and one count of first-degree murder. Appeals consumed seven

months and on May 22, 1986, Steven Jenkins was sentenced. America will be into the twenty-first century before he becomes eligible for parole. He will be thirty-eight years old.

The Marriage of Politics and Religion

India is the world's largest democracy in terms of population, an estimated eight hundred million persons. Half of these have been born since 1965. 1 They speak hundreds of languages and dialects, with English being the most common language bond. They are also a people of many races, religions, histories, and customs.

One Indian sub-group, the Sikhs, has attained some notoriety of late. An extremist faction of this group, in an attempt to create chaos and anarchy, killed hundreds of people by acts of terrorism in the Punjab region in 1984. 2 These terrorists, said Indian officials, were part of an international conspiracy to destabilize India and create out of chaos a new Sikh nation.3 Prime Minister Indira Gandhi sent troops to the city of Amritsar, in northern Punjab. These troops assaulted the Golden Temple, flushed out hundreds of terrorists, and slaughtered more than ninety-five percent of them.4 This episode of revenge for the

1 Pranay Gupte, Vengeance (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1985), p. 10.

2 Ibid., p. 74.

3 Ibid.

4 Ibid.

acts of terrorism was probably the event for which two Sikh bodyguards assassinated Indira Gandhi on the morning of October 31, 1984. 1 This violence touched off a holocaust in which many thousands of ordinary Sikhs were massacred by Hindu mobs.2

One can see by this example how each round of revenge tends to escalate by geometric proportions.

That morning, I went to see my father in his hospital room in Bombay. A doctor had already told him about the shooting of Mrs. Gandhi. He pointed to a sheet of paper on which he had written something. Since his tracheotomy he had lost his voice.

"I knew this would happen," my father wrote. "It was destined on the day she ordered the attack on the Golden Temple in Amritsar. This is vengeance."

"Vengeance?" I said.

"What do you expect?" my father wrote out on his shiny white pad. "You send in troops to the temple, you take untold lives. You don't know how fanatical Sikhs are. What is the Biblical saying - an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth? This is one life avenged for a thousand lives taken in June. But this life was worth more than all of them. This life was priceless."

"How do you know she is dead?" I asked. The early reports had only said that the prime minister had been shot and wounded in her garden by two Sikh security guards.

"Vengeance," my father wrote, slowly. "When you shoot someone in Vengeance, you shoot to kill. She must be dead. What a tragedy; what a loss to this nation! Nehru's daughter dead. What will happen to India now?"3

1 Ibid., p. 27.

2 Ibid.

3 Ibid., pp. 25-26.

We can see from these examples that revenge occurs between nations as well as between individuals. It has begun to take on different meanings and to exist for different purposes. We must have clear definitions and an understanding of the taxonomy of the subject before we can see and interpret the portraiture.

The concept of revenge has existed for many years, appearing in literature from the very dawn of written history. Revenge was one of the few restraints upon behavior, but problems arising out of that gave rise to some attempts to further control the human penchant for getting even, such as the Hammarabi Code of 1850 B.C. and the Mosaic Law of approximately 1200 B.C., which was based upon the "Ten Commandments."

There are three examples of of "Revenge for a different reason": what appears to be other things that will not comply with the researcher's definition as it develops. These examples are strategic offense, frustrated rebellion against circumstances, and fanatical religious loyalty.

ATTITUDE AND PERCEPTION

Chapter 3

3.1 Introduction

Tell me Son:
Who will change man,
Who will save him from himself?
Tell me, Son:
Who will speak on his behalf?

--Elie Wiesel

Each person has his own attitudes or perceptions. Yet each of us tends to think that his own attitude is much the same as that of everyone else within his culture. Psychologists simply call this projection. People also tend to feel that their perceptions about other people are accurate assessments of them. For the most part these two ideas are erroneous. One could never know all that which forms the basis for another person's perceptions. Even if all this information, were available, one would have "to stand in his shoes" and be subject to the same errors and misconceptions that plague him in order to arrive at his perceptions. Therefore, researchers will do well to gain a knowledge and understanding of themselves. This body of knowledge will serve as the window through which people may gain a better understanding of their fellow man. All persons want to be understood. They want to be accepted for

what they are attempting to project. When errors are made in these projections, people want to be forgiven and/or at least given another chance to bring the perceptions of others more clearly in line with their intentions.

It follows, then, that if one's peers are to extend such generosity to them, they must not express either in word or deed any feelings of revenge, retaliation, or vindictiveness. People, in turn, must reciprocate when they are the offended parties. Often this attitude requires that a person be strong enough to "meet the other party more than half-way," giving him the benefit of the doubt.

Much of man's behavior regarding power and authority is determined by his motives, beliefs, and values. Values, beliefs, and ideologies are seldom neutral or completely rational, but are often linked to feelings and emotions. If a person's attitude is to be determined by these things, why do those of similar background and body of experiences not also share attitudes concerning common subjects? How is it that some leaders can bring out in people the best of loyalty, commitment, and dedication to a task, while other leaders in similar positions seem to bring out the opposite?

One large part of attitude and behavior is

perception. Obviously, if one is going to behave in an acceptable way in society, he must know something about the world, what is in it, and where the pitfalls are located. Knowing begins with the sensory systems: vision, hearing, taste, touch, and smell. One must be able to sense the stimuli that make up the environment and to perceive meaning or information.

This information is "processed" by the brain and used in several ways depending upon the "meaning" that is interpreted by the brain. This meaning or understanding varies widely with the accuracy, completeness, and interpretation of the information as well as the skill and experience of the person in receiving them. Another factor which comes into play is the receiver's ability to filter out and eliminate bias, both his own and that of the information sender. Not only are the sensory systems and skills involved in understanding, but also, and perhaps more importantly, communication skills contribute to both "transmission" and "reception" of information. Truly throughout life one's degree of success at both work and play turns on the acuity with which he handles communication skills. Both attitude and perception are vitally important in communication.

In summation, man's behavior is greatly influenced

by how he views his world and the people around him. In addition, man's behavior is influenced by two other forces which are closely entwined: his view of himself and his concept of how he is viewed by others. Each of these forces influences the other. Each is formed largely by impressions communicated, intentionally and unintentionally, back and forth between people. No matter how much people concentrate on "things," this world is mostly a "people" world.

3.2 TAXONOMY OF REVENGE

The word "revenge" has several different shades of meaning, depending upon the context of its usage, and also expresses different degrees of feeling. Vengeance, retaliation, retribution, reprisal, or simply "getting even" are some definitions for "revenge." It could be expressed in as many ways as there are people and potential offenses. The offended can be a person or a nation. The outraged could be the family of a crime victim. Those transgressed against could be a race, nationality, or ethnic group. Offenses can range from the Holocaust to a simple social snub.

"Outrage" implies offending beyond endurance and calling forth extreme feelings; "affront" implies treating with deliberate rudeness or contemptuous indifference to courtesy; "insult" suggests deliberately causing humiliation, hurt, pride, or shame; "resentment" suggests indignation or smoldering ill will.¹

All these can arouse feelings of suppressed or unsuppressed anger, jealousy, or resentment, with all their varying degrees of intensity.

¹ Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary, s.v. "offend."

A. Expressed Revenge

An incident of revenge in Egypt illustrates also that one can buy services much more readily than he can buy loyalty. During the fall of 1984, Muammar Kaddafi was shown snapshots that appeared to offer proof that his hit squads had killed Abdul Hamid Bakkush, a former Libyan prime minister living in Cairo as an exiled dissident.¹ These photos were just what Kaddafi wanted to see, for they showed Bakkush in various poses, bound, gagged, and lying in a pool of blood. There was also a letter from agents hired by Libya, which confirmed the death of Bakkush.² Kaddafi was pleased and proudly announced the assassination on Tripoli radio, calling Bakkush a "stray dog" who had "sold his conscience to the enemies of the Arab World."³

According to Egyptian investigators, four agents - two Britons and two Maltese - had contracted to kill Bakkush for a quarter of a million American dollars. These "hit men" sub-contracted the job to Egyptian double agents for one hundred fifty thousand dollars. It was these double agents who faked the murder pictures

1 Tony Fuller, "A Stray Dog Springs A Trap For Kaddafi," Newsweek, 26 November 1984, p. 69.

2 Ibid.

3 Ibid.

and sent them to Kaddafi, who then authorized payment of everyone involved.

Egyptian spokesmen explained their action by saying that they had faked the assassination in order to expose the Libyan plot and prove that Kaddafi rather than a genuine Arab leader is an international criminal who remains one of the world's most dangerous men.¹

From time to time one can encounter examples of expressed revenge close to his own experiences. For example, Captain Steven Ponder, an instructor at Fort Levenworth, tells of a technician in a National Guard unit who took a handful of nuts from the supply room and started placing them, one every few days, where a "snake in the grass" sergeant would find them: in his boot, his desk drawer, a glove, in his automobile dash pocket, his jar of instant coffee, or the toe of a fresh pair of his socks. "The sergeant's paranoia about finding nuts," said Ponder, "drove him nuts."²

A lady by the name of Carrie Payne, one of the old-timers of the smokey blue mountains of North Carolina, related a story from a generation ago about her father learning that a neighbor was stealing corn

1 Ibid.

2 Personal interview with Captain Steven Ponder, 1 March 1987.

from his corncrib. Carefully the father set a bear trap down among the shucked ears of corn. Less than two hours later he was summoned from his house by the screams of the suspected culprit, who was now caught literally red-handed, almost losing a hand in the jagged teeth of the bear trap.¹

In an article on revenge Barbara Stern told how a young woman learned that a man she had dated was falsely claiming that they had slept together on several occasions. She retaliated by responding that she would never sleep with him "because he has herpes."²

In the lofty reaches of the mountains of Madison County, North Carolina, many events, stories, and legends for the most part remain unrecorded, even though there are mounds of documentary evidence and some living witnesses.

One story which has been partially documented, the story of the Laurel Massacre, was a part of the great saga of the American Civil War. Sentiment was somewhat divided in the mountain region with regard to Union or Confederate loyalties. The people of the more isolated

¹ Personal interview with Carrie Payne, 1 January 1987.

² Barbara Lang Stern, "Seeking Revenge," Vogue, April 1986, p. 400.

communities had a tendency to favor the Union or to stay out of a war that they considered to be someone else's fight. They wanted only to be "let alone." Porter Black wrote to Governor Vance during the winter of 1863, "Our pore class of men are all gon off to the ware to fight to save our countrey, and the rich men and the niggers are all back at home."¹

A band of about fifty men from the Laurel Valley, or "Shelton Laurel," as it was sometimes known, were cold, suffering from want, and especially desperate for salt. Some of them were deserters from the Sixty-Fourth North Carolina, a regiment drawn from the surrounding country-side. They were poor and mostly uneducated, considered almost uncivilized by those from more comfortable circumstances.² On a bitter cold night in 1863 they stole quietly into the county seat of Marshall and plundered the stores and nearby homes for salt, clothing, blankets, shoes or anything else that struck their attention. The raiders then moved to the home of Colonel Lawrence M. Allen, Commanding Officer of the Sixty-Fourth, broke the lock off trunks and bureaus, and took everything they could use including the blankets

1 Manly Wade Wellman. The Kingdom of Madison (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1973), p. 85.

2 Phillip Shaw Palodan, Victims (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1981), p. 84.

which were on the beds of Colonel Allen's children, two of whom were deathly ill with scarlet fever.¹

Under Allen and Lt. Colonel James A. Keith, the Sixty-Fourth was sent from Bristol, Tennessee, to clean up the situation. Suspected raiders and Union sympathizers were rounded up in the Laurel Valley. Some were arrested and sent to jail. Some, including women and children, were flogged, beaten, and tortured. Several were killed in pitched battles or shot down in what would become known as "search and destroy" missions more than a century later. In the most notable action, thirteen local suspects were forced to dig their own grave into which they fell or were pushed after being shot by a firing squad.²

The attacks on the town of Marshall and on the family of Col. Lawrence Allen were not the only causes of this retribution. These were, however, the events which precipitated the action, and, as one can easily see, the price was high indeed. Col. Allen had been a wealthy man and very popular Clerk of Superior Court prior to the war.³ Even though he was only thirty-two years old when war began, Lt. Col. Keith was also a

1 Ibid., p. 85.

2 Ibid., pp. 97-98.

3 Personal interview with J. Rex Allen, 24 January 1987.

popular land owner with a thriving medical practice in the county. He was tall and lean with a slim face, high forehead, and coal black hair and beard which contrasted with his steel grey eyes. He was known for traveling at night through snow or rain to treat sick children, sometimes without pay. But he also was known to be a dangerous man when circumstances demanded.¹ Both of these were leaders of what the army called "partisan rangers," men who made their own rules of war, when they had rules.

After the war, Keith was arrested. His case was such an emotional issue that no lawyer or judge would ask or grant a writ of habeas corpus under the Amnesty Act of 1866. He remained in jail until his trial began in December of 1868.² He faced thirteen separate indictments for murder. An Asheville, North Carolina, jury acquitted him on 9 December of the killing of one victim.³ But the next day he was charged with a second murder and the day after with a third murder.⁴ The

1 Personal interview with Roy Keith, 24 January 1987.

2 Ibid.

3 Buncombe County Superior Court, Docket Book, Fall Term 1868, pp. 426-427.

4 Ibid.

pattern was clear. While his lawyers fought on appeals of his charges, Keith changed his course.¹ On the night of 21 February 1869, he escaped from the Buncombe County jail in Asheville and vanished from North Carolina.² Nine years later, J. Allen Keith was serving as representative in the Arkansas State Legislature. Lt. Col. James A. Keith's middle name was "Allen."³ Family tradition insists that this was the same man. For him, revenge had caused the war to last for decades beyond when it should have ended.

Col. Allen's life changed forever also. He and his family moved to Benton County, Arkansas, in 1865.⁴ He returned to North Carolina on only one occasion, more than twenty years later, to sell some land which had been inherited by his wife.⁵ Because of this and other incidents of guerrilla warfare in the mountains, the county gained the nickname of "Bloody Madison," which it

1 State v. Keith, 63 North Carolina Reports, 140-145.

2 The Asheville Citizen, 22 February 1869, p. 1, Cols. 5-7

3 Personal interview with Roy Keith, 24 January 1983.

4 O. H. Bell, Partisan Campaigns of Col. L. M. Allen (Raleigh: Edwards and Broughton, 1894), p. 19.

5 Personal interview with J. Dewey Phillips, 23 January 1983.

This Indenture made and agreed this the
 25th day of November 1989 between L M Allen
 and wife Polly M Allen of the first part and
 J L Phillips of the second witnesseth
 that the said Parties of the second part for and
 in consideration of the sum of twenty five Dollars
 to them in hand paid by the party of the second
 the receipt whereof is hereby acknowledged have
 Bargained - sold conveyed released and forever
 quitclaimed and by these presents do bargain
 sell convey remise and forever quitclaim unto
 the said J. L. Phillips Party of the second Part
 and his heirs and assigns forever all the right
 title & interest Estate claim and demand of the
 said Parties of the first Part in and to that certain
 tract or parcel of Land situate in the county of
 Madison and State of North Carolina on the
 waters of Gabriels Creek Beginning on a small
 Black Oak on the top of a Ridge at the NW corner
 of J W Andersons 50 acre Baily tract running north
 with the line of said Baily 50 acre one hundred and
 twenty seven Poles to a forked Black Oak then ~~to~~
 64 poles to the ~~beginning~~ ^{beginning} ~~containing~~ ^{containing} fifty ~~acres~~
 To have and to hold the above said tract of Land and
 all privileges improvements and Appurtenances thereto
 belonging to the said Party of the second Part and
 unto his heirs and assigns forever.

In testimony whereof the said Parties of the
 first Part have hereunto set their hands and
 seals Date above written

L M Allen
 Polly M Allen

carries to this day, although most younger generations have long since forgotten the reason. Such are the fortunes of war, especially when revenge becomes a major factor.

B. Withheld Revenge

"My sword I give to him that shall succeed me in my pilgrimage, and my courage and skill to him that can get it. My works and scars I carry with me, to be a witness for me that I have fought his battles who now will be my rewarder."

So he passed over and all the trumpets sounded for him on the other side.

- Pilgrim's Progress

Some of the best examples of revenge that has been withheld are those in which this strategy was averted in favor of higher goals. If one looks at an example of "revenge" and can see a logical objective that the act is intended to accomplish, then he can assume that it was probably not "revenge" in the first place, the exception being cases where actions have multiple objectives.

Wise leaders, therefore, do not consider revenge a viable strategy. Aside from securing the basic necessities of life, most people spend a large portion of their time seeking relatively unimportant things. The reason is that they fail to realize that it is people and personal relationships that give quality to life. A vindictive attitude may well destroy the best part of people's lives. An attitude of revenge is too costly to the leader. In all fields from education to business, revenge is self-defeating and destructive of

the ends that leaders hope to accomplish. One encounters all kinds of people, most of whom can be led in some way to be a functioning part of an organization because they also want to belong. Most people, even the "weaker" ones, at least sometimes do something right. A good leader will recognize that they have done so and build on it. Success is usually built on prior success.

After Germany and the Central Powers were defeated in World War I, many allied leaders insisted on punishing Germany. Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States at that time, was opposed to the idea and instead proposed his famous Fourteen Points. In these Fourteen Points, Wilson attempted to wipe out the grievances which had helped bring on the war, for example, abolishing secret treaties, and stopping races in armament production. His Fourteen Points also included the establishment of the League of Nations. Many of his proposals were ignored in favor of punishing Germany and the Central Powers. Germany was declared solely responsible for World War I, and:

Her size was reduced by one-eighth and her population by 6,500,000. The treaty took away all of Germany's colonies and overseas investments, one-sixth of its farm land, one-eighth of its livestock, and one-tenth of its factories. Its merchant fleet was reduced; its navy was abolished,

and its army greatly reduced. Armament production was severely restricted, and certain aspects of its government were to be changed. One of the worst conditions to be met was that Germany, and the former Central Powers were to make annual payments to the Allied Powers to pay for damages and the cost of the war. These payments were called 'war reparations,' and were hated by the Germans.¹

In reality, the reparations meant little after 1919, because by then the German economy was in shambles.

Thus one can see that conditions in Germany were very bad not only because of losing the war, but because of the insistence of some allied leaders upon revenge against the nation of Germany.

The feelings of revenge on the part of these leaders played a part in bringing about a new war after the fall of Germany in World War I. Revenge, therefore, not only failed to accomplish its purpose but also to a great extent, caused World War II. Inflation and economic collapse in Germany, followed by the effects of the Great Depression, brought Adolph Hitler and the Nazi Party to full power by 1933. Hitler and his Nazis had such ruthless and aggressive objectives and ambitions that they could not be submitted to any tribunal short of war. He could never win by appeal to reason. He had to win by war, if at all.

¹ A. J. Taylor, Illustrated History of the First World War (New York: Putnam, 1964), p. 379.

The situation was different after World War II. The world wanted revenge just as before, but there was leadership. Woodrow Wilson had the proper attitude in 1919, but he did not have the support. In contrast, as the end of World War II approached, Franklin Roosevelt was almost without challenge in his position at the head of the most powerful nation on earth. America had armed herself and her allies via her mighty industrial strength. More than twelve million Americans were in uniform.¹ The American Navy controlled the seas. The American Army Air Corp (U.S. Air Force) controlled the skies. The American Army and Marines roamed almost at will from the Balkans to Japan and the China-Burma-India Theatre. In addition, America was the sole possessor of the atomic bomb.

America's allies, and some American leaders, wanted to visit destruction on Germany. Secretary of the Treasury Henry Morgenthau proposed that the Ruhr and surrounding industrial areas be stripped of all industries and that all mines in the area be wrecked so that Germany could be reduced to agriculture only.²

1 World Book Encyclopedia, 1986 ed., s.v., "World War II."

2 Whitney R. Harris, Tyranny on Trial, (Dallas: Southern Methodist University Press, 1954), p. 7.

Reflecting this viewpoint, President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill initialed a memorandum which called for the elimination of war-making industries in the Ruhr and in the Saar, "looking forward to converting Germany into a country primarily agricultural and pastoral in its character."¹ This plan was never put into effect, but the fact that it was considered at this level indicates the sense of outrage against Germany held in the minds of the people.

Such desire for revenge is understandable. In this great war, at one time more than seventy million men were in uniform. Thirty-four million combatants were wounded and twenty-two million were killed.² All these were far surpassed by the untold millions of civilians who were killed because "war" now meant "total war." More than six million Jews were slaughtered for no other reason except that they were Jews.

More than half of all Americans living in 1987 were yet unborn in 1945. Fewer still even come close to an appreciation for the fact that only by the narrowest of margins and largely because of his own blunders did Hitler lose this great war. But lose he did, and there

1 Ibid.

2 Ibid., p. 9.

arose "an insistent and world-wide demand for immediate, unhesitating, and indiscriminating vengeance."¹

Stalin proposed to line up and shoot fifty thousand high-ranking German leaders.² The British wanted to take the top Nazi leaders out and "shoot them without warning one morning and announce to the world that justice had been done."³ Secretary of State, Cordell Hull stated, "If I had my way, I would take Hitler, Mussolini, and Tojo and their arch-accomplices and bring them before a drumhead court-martial, and at sunrise on the following day there would occur an historic incident."⁴

A Chicago Tribune editorial stated: "What they should have done is to set up summary courts-martial, placed these criminals on trial within 24 hours after they were caught, sentenced them to death, and shot them in the morning."⁵

The Nation stated editorially: "In our opinion

1 Ibid., p. 32.

2 Ibid.

3 Ibid.

4 Ibid., p. 23.

5 Ibid.

the proper procedure for this body would have been to identify the prisoners, read off their crimes with as much supporting data as seemed useful, pass judgment upon them quickly, and carry out the judgment forthwith."¹

Probably the most difficult attitude to understand now is that of Chief Justice Stone of the United States Supreme Court, who in writing about the power of the victor over the vanquished said,

It would not disturb me greatly if that power were openly and frankly used to punish the German leaders for being a bad lot, but it disturbs me some to have it dressed up in the trappings of the common law and the Constitutional safeguards of those charged with crime.²

How completely inconsistent with the requirements of elementary justice! How was Chief Justice Stone to know which individuals should be included in the "bad lot?" For that matter, when did it become a crime to be one of a bad lot? Would it not be more right to punish for specific acts such as murder, a crime since the days of Adam, than to punish on the vague charge that an enemy is bad?³

1 Ibid.

2 Ibid.

3 Ibid., p. 24.

This type of action had actually been going on in Europe before Nuremberg. The Minister of Justice in Paris reported that 8348 collaborators were executed without trial by members of the Free French Resistance.¹ It should be noted here that something over ten percent of those accused at Nuremberg, on what was believed to be reliable information, were not proved guilty.²

Fortunately President Roosevelt not only believed in the wisdom of suppressing revenge, but he had the power to back his belief. He had steadily and insistently favored a speedy but fair trial for the enemy leadership,

Fearful that if they were punished without public proof of their crimes and opportunity to defend themselves there would always remain a doubt of their guilt that might raise a myth of martyrdom. Secretary Stimson, and those associated with him in the War Department, had strongly supported President Roosevelt's policy of no punishment except for those proved guilty in a genuine good-faith trial. The British and French were persuaded eventually to that view. Churchill later acknowledged, "Now that the trials are over, I think the President was right and I was wrong."³

Thus the guilt of certain enemy leaders was established and documented. There was no plea-bargaining and no deals. No verdict was clouded by

1 Ibid.

2 Ibid.

3 Ibid.

someone's being allowed to save himself by helping to convict another. The use of witnesses was depended upon as little as possible.¹

Although documents were dull and boring to deal with, and although the press would not report them, documents were used to a maximum because of reliability.

But, "witnesses, many of them persecuted survivors, hostile to the Nazis, would always be chargeable with bias, faulty recollection, and even perjury," for reasons of revenge. Documents could not "be accused of partiality, forgetfulness, or invention."² The result was that the Tribunal declared, in its judgment, "the case against the defendants rests in large measure on documents of their own making, the authenticity of which is almost completely unchallenged."³

The question then is how to determine who of the enemy deserved punishment. Should decisions be politically determined and based on the questionable satisfaction of revenge, or would it be better to turn to the techniques of trial to determine justice, with its resulting documentation for history?

1 Ibid.

2 Ibid.

3 Ibid., p. 26.

C. Bushwhacker's Revenge

Bushwhacker's revenge is expressed revenge, as has already been implied. It is active but it is generally thought of as being taken in secrecy and to the surprise of the person against whom revenge is sought. It is said to be taken in secrecy, not because the action is hidden, but because the result will be due to a preponderance of reasons not at all evident to the party of the second part (victim). This victim, or victims, may never know these reasons, but he will know the result, which is almost always a surprise. An example would be decisions that are made for reasons other than those given as justification for said decisions. Employment decisions and civil court decisions would be occasional examples, although this is not set forth as a model of good decision making style. What really sets "bushwhackers revenge" apart from other expressed revenge is not its cowardliness, but its secrecy. The earmark seems to be that the act of revenge would not succeed unless secrecy could be maintained (secrecy can be part of a plan of escape after the act) and also the two reasons for the action will not stand up to close scrutiny.

George Gordon Liddy gives two examples which he says occurred during his legal battles following the much-publicized Watergate investigation of 1973 and subsequently in 1975.

Liddy refused a plea-bargain offer in 1973 and in fact refused to cooperate in any way with or provide assistance to governmental investigating units. A real mission of the Federal District Court Judge became one of punishing Liddy, not for the crime committed, because Liddy at no time denied responsibility, but for his refusal to cooperate in the incrimination of others.

The Judge in Federal Court took a dim view of this lack of cooperation and, in his haste to seat a jury for the trial of six defendants, ruled in favor of group questioning of potential jurors, rather than individual screening. Pretrial publicity was the issue in question. Using this method, the judge had inadvertently allowed a juror to be seated who could not speak English.¹ According to Liddy, the judge sealed the record of everything that had transpired with respect to the entire incident up until the time that the juror was replaced, which was on the second day of the trial.¹ Otherwise, a mistrial was almost certain.

¹ G. Gordon Liddy, Will (New York, Dell Publishing, 1980), p. 385.

The other incident involved the fact that five defendants who were tried with Liddy were encouraged to cooperate with the Federal Grand Jury and with the Senate Select Committee on Presidential Campaign Activities. The five were then allowed to plead guilty to all charges. Liddy was not informed of their guilty pleas or that the five had been admonished to cooperate with federal officials. Had this become immediately known, that Liddy had been "singled out," his conviction might well have been overturned on appeal. Ironically, the sealing of the record in the matter of the Spanish speaking juror had also hidden this "singling out" from possible judicial review.

Two years later, on a motion by Liddy for reduction of sentence, the same judge read directly from his 1973 admonition in reaching a conclusion, and ruled that Liddy's sentence should not be reduced. He then struck from the record that part of his reading of the 1973 proceeding which revealed his singling out of Gordon Liddy from the other five defendants.¹ Then, in an apparent lapse of memory and reasoning, the judge ordered that the 1973 transcript be added as an appendix to the record of the 1975 hearing, but he left the transcript in its original form. Eventually, Liddy was

1 Ibid., p. 386.

also found guilty of Contempt of Court for refusing to testify before a Federal Grand Jury and of Contempt of Congress for refusing to testify before the "Senate Watergate Committee."²

While the courts are concerned with justice, they also are concerned with order, perhaps more so at times.

Revenge can indeed take many forms. G. Gordon Liddy served almost as much prison time as all the other conspirators combined.

In order to receive understanding from his fellow man, one must be willing to extend the same respect. In more modern terms, a person must be willing to give a co-worker a "break" if reciprocity is to be expected when the "shoe is on the other foot."

Chapter 3 gives some examples of revenge and where revenge lead although they do not directly involve education. "Expressed Revenge" showed a national leader, Kaddafi, taking revenge on a Libyan defector, but the revenge ricocheted when the tables were turned. Several brief examples were given of more "normal" circumstances. Colonel L. M. Allen took revenge on some guerrilla soldiers during the Civil War and was forced to migrate to another part of the country, losing all

1 United States of America v. George Gordon Liddy et. al. 397 F. Supp. 963.

2 Ibid., p. 951.

of his land except fifty. Twenty-four years later, upon returning to dispose of the property, he sold it for twenty-five dollars and was forced to leave home again, never to return.

Taking revenge on Germany after World War I helped cause World War II, twenty years later. The lesson had been learned and this time revenge was withheld.

G. Gordon Liddy, one of the watergate conspirators, was both a victim and a perpetrator of revenge in the years following the Watergate break-in in Washington D.C. Nothing accomplished by either. Perhaps Liddy did not receive far and equal treatment, but then he would not have been a likely candidate for co-operation with the prosecution anyway, therefore, Judge John Sirica was probably correct in his assessment of Liddy's iron will.

In this chapter, revenge in four areas has been considered: (1) international politics, (2) war, (3) international politics following a war, illustrating the difficulty of winning the peace after winning a war, and (4) revenge in everyday life. Again, to determine whether or not an action constitutes revenge, one must take into consideration the motive for the action as well as the results.

In Chapter four some examples are given of people who did not bother themselves with revenge feelings, but who marched on to outstanding accomplishment.

Chapter 4

Introduction

"People are people" is a common expression heard from time to time. Another which means much the same is, "It takes all kinds of people to make a world." It might be slightly more accurate to say, "It takes all kinds of people to make a world like we have." If the mix should get out of balance the effect upon the world might be an improvement or a decline.

Very seldom does one person make a significant difference in the continuing saga of mankind. A list of "nominees" of such people could be compiled, but there is agreement on few if any, due to our man's human tendency to "major on minors." Nevertheless there have been a few individuals who have made things different.

Groups of people, as such, have been even less likely to bring about significant change, aside from changes brought about by sheer numbers. The only group contributions that have been made may have been made not because of the group but because of its leadership, which comes back to individuals again. One might argue that "the circumstances" and "the times" make the individual, and this is admittedly true to an extent. But the circumstances and times were the same for a lot

of other people who did not emerge clothed in greatness. Thus one must admit that although down through the years the world has spawned her teeming millions, there have been only a few who, in one way or another, were really special.

Only a few times has the history of mankind taken a turn in its long march through the ages. From time to time history did turn, however, and upon close study one finds that when it did so, history turned on an idea. An idea is not born in a group.¹ Individuals have ideas. Turns in history have occurred when conditions were right to nourish ideas; but the moment of birth for the turn was when an idea flashed to life within the mind of some individual.

So while one hears over and over that with this world's masses and with its complications, no individual can make a difference, one can set forth as a postulate the idea that a significant difference can be made only by an individual.

In the modern world, individuals are prepared by institutions of education. Admittedly, however, preparation comes from other areas also, and for a much longer period of time.

¹ Telephone interview with Joseph Godwin, Professor of Religion, Mars Hill College, 25 May 1987.

The largest single contribution to these individuals is made by schools, however, for that is where the basic tools are learned. If the march of mankind is to have any semblance of order, justice, and majesty, therefore, education must lead the way.

From the beginning, the subject under discussion here has been the attitude of revenge, with an emphasis on "revenge." Slowly the emphasis is being shifted to "attitude" in leadership, and it will proceed to a point where we have developed a position relative to "attitude" in educational leadership.

To study attitude, one must study portraits of character and culture from any field related to attitude, revenge or potential for revenge, with implications for administrative leadership.

Sara Lawrence Lightfoot's qualitative methodology known as "portraiture" seems to be a very satisfactory way of presenting empirical evidence about pace-setting people who seem to be effective leaders because they have achieved "success" in educational organizations. In fact, this is a very effective way of teaching about people in any field. If one is talking with someone who served in the Third Army in World War II, he will want to tell about General George Patton. He will give no charts, graphs or statistics. He will tell stories about Patton. He will not be able to document

all of them. He may secretly question whether they are one hundred percent factual in every case. But he has heard them and told them over and over again. These stories are a part of a certain "mythology" that has grown up around the great Patton. Facts in the usually documented form do not really matter. Sometimes even the truth does not matter. What matters is the stories, the mythology. The body of little stories surrounding a person constitutes a portrait of that person.

Lightfoot has chosen this method of portraiture in The Good High School, using stories based upon her observations of her subject (six schools). This method may be the best of all in giving a picture to someone who is interested, regardless of the subject.

4.1 Personality Types

Even though almost everyone frequently uses the term "personality," there is little agreement on what it actually means. Over the years, people have defined "personality" in various ways. Some have classified the term by (1) outward appearance, (2) role in life, (3) behavior pattern, (4) individual differences, or some other identifiable trait. The Greek physician Hippocrates classified "personality" by one of the four body fluids. Although the theory is no longer taken seriously, the terminology survives as a way of describing people. There was a time when facial characteristics were used to classify personality types, and to this day blondes are said to have more fun and criminals have close-set beady eyes.

Each person on earth has begun with a set of inherited traits and abilities. He has had factored in the elements of his own unique environment and his learned responses to stimuli with their reinforcements. These have led to the development of that individualized pattern of behavior which is referred to as "personality." Well-known psychologist B.F. Skinner

does not agree because he views personality entirely as learned.¹ But it seems one should give at least some weight to genetic factors.

There are many kinds of leaders and many different kinds of organizations or groups, both involved in circumstances of every description. It is a natural process of society for groups to form and leaders to emerge. This may be by design or by natural "evolution," but each leader has his own style based on his value system and his personality. An organization develops when a group forms with a consensus of motives mobilizing power and influence to cement a percentage of participants large enough to maintain the order which allowed the group to form. Andrew McFarland, in his textbook on leadership, says, "If the leader causes changes that he intended, he has exercised power; if the leader causes changes that he did not intend, he has exercised influence, but not power."² Since things have no motive, controlling them is power but not necessarily leadership. Genuine leaders do not obliterate followers' motives, though they may ignore some of them.

¹ Lyle E. Bourne, Jr., and Bruce R. Ekstrand, Psychology: Its Principles and Meanings (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976), p. 333.

² Andrew S. McFarland, Power and Leadership in Pluralist Systems (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1969), p. 174.

While there have been power wielders who have treated people like things, it is a perilous exercise and usually destructive of long-term goals. In addition, such action may prevent the power wielder from ever becoming a leader, because the power of a real leader must be relevant to people's values.

People act the way they do as a result of their feelings and desires and of the pressures they perceive as being placed upon them. In other words, they act in accordance with their personality which has been defined as "one's predisposition," or even as "disposition." An understanding of revenge, therefore, must include an understanding of personality, and for the sake of analysis personality is being considered in terms of power, authority, and leadership, which are not necessarily synonymous.

A person seeks to control his hopes, feelings, and desires through the use of counterbalances that have been learned. For example, he may not take another martini because he knows he must drive home afterwards. He knows he might arrive safely, as usual, but he also knows several other possible eventualities. In all probability he will encounter one of these four circumstances: (1) home as usual; (2) jail; (3) hospital; or (4) the morgue. His problem is simply

a matter of calculating the odds and making decisions as to their acceptability. Of course, there are other possibilities, such as becoming a paraplegic from a flaming head-on crash with an escaping Chinese groom in a rickshaw, but the mathematical chances of such an event would be remote, to say the least, and not worth considering.

In their day-to-day actions and in their reactions to others people tend to behave in somewhat similar ways from one occasion to the next. This pattern of behavior is sometimes referred to as personality. The pattern may even be used as an adjective to describe personality.

Another factor to be considered in a study of behavior is belief. People behave in ways that coincide with their beliefs. Any human belief is supported by what its possessor considers to be relevant valid knowledge. One's beliefs are developed from birth and may be based upon knowledge, impression, fact, myth, falsehood, study, education, trauma, deprivation, disaster, or any other sources which the possessor considers reliable. Whether or not the individual can give a coherent account of why he believes what he does is immaterial. Folklore, wishful thinking, and philosophical expectations also intermingle with these beliefs. When all these beliefs are set, personality is

also set and a very large part of life along with it.

Some leaders are very authoritative, demanding, and even abrasive. They are often thought of as being "tough" and no one challenges their "authority." Other leaders are thought of as friendly and encourage other people to take the lead. They work as part of a team. This allows those in subordinate roles to grow in their abilities as sub-leaders and innovators. Handled correctly, this style of leadership can build a strong team.

Leaders vary in style to fit their own times and circumstances. In general terms, they accumulate as much power as they can or as much as their system will allow. Then they use as much of this power as they need to maintain their "status quo," and usually more.

To a great extent, then, leadership style is determined by what is referred to as personality. The kind of leader one is will be determined by what kind of person he is. One's personality characteristics set the tone for problem solving, especially in personnel and public relations. This is all true in both education and industry.

Most people have their own ideas about which leadership style is best. Probably, however, one needs to understand that there is no "best" style, because each set of circumstances and each power structure is

different. Therefore, the best results will be obtained when circumstances and style are matched. The leader who can adjust his style, to the extent that this is possible, will be at a tremendous advantage. The following pages contain a portraiture of three leadership types. John Wooden, former coach of basketball at UCLA, is a grand example of what leadership without revenge or other bad feelings and attitudes can accomplish by following the protestant ethic. Samuel Pizar gives a good example of one who had every excuse to involve vengeance in his life. He hesitated seeking revenge to the extent that he appears to have overcome feeling of hatred. It is highly unlikely, however, that he is free from the wars of the burning hatred he knew for so long. Dr. Grover Angel is the example that represents contemporary educators. He rose above the infighting and saw that the key was in preparing himself for higher levels of leadership. He demonstrates that an effective educational leader must operate on a level above partisanship.

4.2 Portraiture of Case Studies

A. John Robert Wooden

"You cannot live a perfect day
Without doing something for someone
Who will never be able to repay you."

-John Robert Wooden

John Wooden has been chosen as a subject of portraiture for reasons which are rarely discussed. He is and has been many things. He is portrayed here for two reasons. First, he was always associated with education, not as all those who barnacle themselves around the hull of education, but as a genuine educator. Usually more notable and more exciting aspects of his great career are mentioned. On the day he retired, Wooden stated, "I always thought of myself as wanting to be remembered first as a teacher and a gentleman."¹ Secondly, John Wooden is probably the single most admirable sportsman of modern times, and yet at the very pinnacle of success, when his autobiography was written, he gave credit to everyone except himself. In the preface to his book, he perhaps expressed his philosophy best: "Hopefully, things will come to life in this book that will enable you to participate in the way young

¹ John Wooden, They Call Me Coach (New York: Bantam Books, 1973), p. 55.

America makes our way of life so marvelous, that in these pages you will get some insight into the wonderful people who have walked with me."¹

Briefly stated, John Wooden's career was very colorful, similar in some ways to the life of Jesse Stuart, especially in its very human aspects. He graduated from Purdue University, where he was three times an All-American. As a high school teacher he taught five classes of English; was head coach in football, basketball, baseball, and track; supervised the total physical education curriculum from the first through the twelfth grades; cleaned the dressing rooms, repaired equipment, treated injuries, sold tickets, and did anything else that needed to be done, and at a salary of one hundred fifty dollars per month for the nine-month term.²

John Wooden later coached at Indiana State and, of course, UCLA. He is the only person that has been elected to the Basketball Hall of Fame as both a player and as a coach.³ From 1964 through 1975, UCLA won ten NCAA Division 1 National Championships, a record of 335 wins and 22 loses, and John Wooden was Coach of the Year

1 Ibid., p. 1.

2 Ibid., p. 50.

3 Ibid., p. 66.

six times, coaching such players as Sidney Wicks, Bill Walton, Walt Hazzard, Gail Goodrich, Curtis Rowe, and Kareem Abdul Jabbar.¹ "A good leader," he often said, "is interested in finding the best way, not in having his own way."² John Wooden had no time and little reason to think about revenge. Obviously, anyone who achieved as much as he did must have had a generous helping of good luck. But good luck is much more common than great accomplishment. If there had been a place for revenge, it would have been a waste of time. Wooden had rules by which to seek excellence, and his rules had no place for revenge. Furthermore his rules are just as important in educational administration as in athletics. He loved his people but insisted that they do their job and do it extremely well. Likewise, he insisted on doing his own job and also doing it well. He believed in being super-prepared and in super-condition. He believed in fundamentals and firm discipline. He believed in having character, not in being a character. "There is a very fine line between championship and runner-up; therefore spend your time in preparation," he said. "Don't mistake activity for achievement. People can have great aspirations and dozens of beautiful

1 Ibid., p. 151.

2 Ibid., p. 117.

goals then waste all their time trying to design easy or painless ways to get there. If one is not willing to pay the price, someone else will be willing. There is no easy path to really outstanding achievement."¹

¹ Ibid., p. 131.

B. Samuel Pizar

Man is a pliable animal, a being
who can become accustomed to anything.

- Dostoevski

A second example of one who might have sought revenge but instead acted positively is Samuel Pizar. Pizar's life story is one of the world's most dramatic. Originally from Poland and from an old established family, he has every reason to be eaten inside by the desire for revenge. It seems almost a protection for him that he has so many potential objects of hatred and vengeance. If he could choose and destroy, who would be the first to go? Who deserved to die first, or who more than others?

Pizar is a Polish Jew who is the youngest known survivor of Auschwitz. His mother had wanted the family to leave Poland. Her brothers had already emigrated to Australia. But his father did not wish to leave the homeland. No one had the right to force them to go. One day, after the Nazis had taken Poland, his father went off to work as usual, and he never returned.

In the summer of 1975 Giscard d'Estaing, with whom Pizar had enjoyed a long friendship, invited his

American (Polish-American) friend to accompany him on a pilgrimage to Auschwitz. After he had become a free man, at the age of sixteen, and had begun his slow and difficult climb back to life, he had tried to turn away from all the filth, death, and unspeakable horror that had been all of every day to him for four years. He had always refused to return to those places where he had seen his world, his people, his family, friends, and identity systematically destroyed. When he arrived in Warsaw as the Western chairman of an international conference on economic cooperation, the Polish government suggested that he lay a wreath at the Auschwitz memorial. Respectfully but without hesitation, he declined.

Suddenly, I understood that for me the Holocaust was no longer only a lament; that I had to revisit my nightmare, to come to terms with it, so I could draw the poison of its hatred and desire for revenge and learn to use it as a warning and as a cure. And that meant a reincarnated Samuel Pisar, clothed snugly in his respectable attire of American citizen, international lawyer and scholar, had to step into the light and avow that once, not so long ago, he had crawled in the pain, hatred, filth, and degradation of the factories of death.¹

Pisar then found himself standing before the monuments and before the preserved death camp itself, the President of France on his right and the President of Poland on his left. He stood to speak and struggled

¹ Samuel Pisar, Of Blood and Hope (New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., 1979), p.6.

to get hold of himself. He hesitated. Portraits of his life were flashing through his mind.

1. Pizar and his classmates at school were ecstatic when they heard in 1938 that the black boxer, Joe Louis, had knocked out the Nazi Max Schmeling for the heavyweight championship of the world. So much for the "Master Race."¹

2. At the movies they stared in disbelief at newsreels showing helmeted Nazi soldiers goose-stepping into the Ruhr, then Vienna, then Prague, as masses of grown-up people, refusing to stand up to reality stood numbly with raised arms, shouting "Heil Hitler, Heil Hitler, Heil Hitler!"²

3. Little sister Frieda began school in September, 1939.³

4. Gas masks had been issued to all children in the neighborhood and they were drilled daily in preparation for air raids. But when the German bombs began to fall, the sirens that had wailed so often during the drills were not even heard.⁴

1 Ibid., p. 15.

2 Ibid., p. 16.

3 Ibid.

4 Ibid., p. 22.

5. In little Samuel's town of Bialystok, on the first Friday after the Nazi troops took over from the Russians, over a thousand Jews were herded into the Great Synagogue, which was then set aflame. Two days later, ten thousand men of Jewish families, including three of Samuel's cousins, were herded together in a field and then cut down by machine-gun fire.¹

6. A storm trooper demanded his grandmother's engagement ring. It would not slip off so the SS man pulled out his bayonet and cut off the finger, bringing forth screams and tiny fountains of blood.²

7. The people were brought together one morning and separated into two groups. His mother pushed him into the group with the men. As Samuel's group began walking the other way, he looked back helplessly, his eyes glued to the two frail shapes as they moved off in the distance. With one hand his sister held on to his mother; with the other she clutched her favorite doll. They looked over their shoulders to get a glimpse of the destination of his group. "That moment when I saw my mother for the last time pursues me to this day with its load of agony and guilt and unquenchable anger."³ Then

1 Ibid., p. 23.

2 Ibid., p. 30.

3 Ibid., p. 31.

when the lines had marched a short time, and Pizar could "see them no longer, a rage against man and God tore through my breast." Choking with tears, he raised his fist to heaven in a blasphemous cry against the Almighty. "Gazlen! Monster! How dare you!" Pizar knew that his sister and mother would both be in the ovens before nightfall.¹

8. Samuel remembered his first night behind the wire before boarding the cattle cars for Auschwitz. He slept on the ground back to back with a man who never seemed to move. When morning came Pizar found the reason. The "companion" had been dead the entire time.²

9. Pizar remembered the cattle cars stopping at Treblinka, where some cars containing women and children were disconnected. Only during February and March of 1987 was John Demjanjuk of Cleveland, Ohio, who had emigrated to the United States after the war and retired as an auto worker, been extradited to Israel and charged with the deaths of 850,000 Jews at Treblinka in 1942-43.³ Defense lawyers contend that those charges are a result of mistaken identity. Demjanjuk claims he

1 Ibid.

2 Ibid., p. 40.

3 Associated Press dispatch, Asheville (North Carolina) Citizen, 23 February 1987, p. 7, cols. 1-3.

was never at Treblinka. A stream of Jewish survivors have identified him as the notorious Ukrainian guard known to Jewish captives as "Ivan the Terrible."¹ Yitzhak Arad, a survivor of Treblinka whose entire family was killed in the Holocaust, testified that Ivan and other Ukrainian born guards "used to stand near the entrance of the gas chambers driving the Jews to their deaths under a shower of blows and beatings, using bayonets or metal bars or whatever was available."² Their assignment, according to records, was to operate the motors of the gas chambers.³

Another survivor, quivering with emotion testified that Demjanjuk was "Ivan the Terrible" who clubbed prisoners, gouged out their eyes and turned on the gas. "This is the man, the man sitting over there," Pinchas Epstein shouted in the courtroom, pointing at the retired Cleveland auto worker and pounding repeatedly on the witness stand.⁴

Epstein's parents, sister, and two brothers perished at Treblinka.⁵ His voice shook as he continued.

That's him all right. Age has of course changed him but not so that he would become unrecognizable. There are certain features which after so many years are marked in one's memory. I see Ivan every night. He is imprinted in my mind.

1 Ibid.

2 Ibid., 24 February 1987, p.8, cols. 6-7.

3 Ibid.

4 Ibid.

5 Ibid.

I cannot rid myself of these impressions. I remember the round face, the very short neck, the broad shoulders, the slightly protruding ears. This is Ivan.¹

While imprisoned at the camp, Epstein was responsible for removing corpses from the gas chambers.

"One time a little girl, she was no more than twelve, came out alive from the gas chamber." Her words still rang in his ears. She said, "I want my mother." "She just wanted her mother," Epstein said. After a pause, he continued. "Ivan ordered a prisoner to rape the child before she was taken away and shot," he testified, then lowered his head and wept.

The witness recalled "pregnant women who were stabbed in the abdomen, people who had their eyes gouged out, and people who had their ears chopped off. Old people and babies were taken directly from the trains to an area where they were shot and their bodies thrown into a pit to be burned later."

Repeating his testimony on the next day, Epstein said, "I am convinced that opposite me sits Ivan the Terrible who was in Treblinka." Asked by the presiding judge how he could be so confident, Epstein said: "I saw Ivan every day at all hours. I rubbed shoulders with him practically as part of my work, he was there all the time... gouging eyes, cutting off girls' breasts, lopping off ears, then standing back and enjoying his handiwork. He looked at it with such enjoyment: the crushed skulls, the smashed faces, looking as though he had done such a tremendously good job."²

Eliyahu Rosenberg testified the day after Epstein's testimony. His mother and two sisters perished at Treblinka. Rosenberg described the screams of the victims on their way to the gas chambers. and also

1 Ibid.

2 Ibid.

described a 1943 camp uprising, during which he escaped to hide out in the forests outside Treblinka.¹

From all indications, Treblinka was probably the final destination of the mother and sister of Samuel Pizar.²

One evening in June 1967 when I returned from the office, I saw an unbelievable, and unimaginable sight on my television screen: Israeli soldiers, white prayers shawls covering the machine guns on their backs, steel helmets serving them as yarmulkes, praying at the foot of the Wailing Wall in Jerusalem. Suddenly, I burst into uncontrollable sobs, sobs of which my children never thought their father was capable. The memory of what I had lived through, of what a people had lived through for a millennia, had broken the emotional dam in front of this eternal symbol of sorrow and hope.

Yes, on that 1967 day, the trains headed for Treblinka, Maidanek, and Auschwitz had finally reached their destination.¹

10. Pizar remembered being marched to a wall in the darkness and ordered to undress for a shower. "Then I recognized Dr. Kaplan, our family doctor who had brought me into the world." Before Pizar even had a chance to speak, they were lined up, naked. They filed past an SS officer sitting at a desk, who cast a quick eye over each man and gave him one of two orders, "Left," or "Right." Pizar was just behind the doctor, who was a frail man of about sixty. The man held a long, broad elastic bandage in his hand.

¹ Ibid., p. 47.

"What is that?"
"For my hernia, sir."
"Leave it here and go left. You will get it
back when you come out."

Then the SS officer looked at Pissar.

"How old are you?"
"Eighteen," I lied.
"Go right."
"Can't I go with Dr. Kaplan?"
"Go right!"

Pissar soon realized that was the end of Dr. Kaplan.

11. He remembered a man of about forty-five, a dignified man in spite of his emaciated state, educated, who was in Pissar's barracks when the group was transferred to Blizin Work Camp, to repair German military uniforms. He had a son of about twenty years of age. One evening the son ate his own piece of bread, while the father placed his under a crumpled piece of cloth that served for a pillow. The next morning the father let out a stricken cry: his bread was gone. It was easy to see what had happened. The son, lying next to him, had eaten it during the night. Strange, how an organism that can go beyond the limits of physical endurance will often give up under a blow against the mind. The father was plunged into a inconsolable depression. That his own son could do such a thing to him - the knowledge was shattering. The next morning he was dead.¹

1 Ibid.

12. When the Allied troops landed on the beaches of Normandy against Nazi cannon and machine-gun fire, on June 6, 1944, "it was a day like any other for us." The day's dead in the gas chambers of Auschwitz was greater in number than the invaders' casualty list on this their longest day.¹

13. When Samuel and a few of his friends escaped during an allied air raid, and the American Army liberated them, they began to raid German homes for food, clothing, or anything else they wanted, including revenge on former SS troops. But they soon lost their enthusiasm for these raids. "Along with the initial exuberance, we began to get an inkling of the emptiness of victory and revenge."²

14. On entering Harvard, Pizar was having a very difficult time at first, especially in writing and speaking. The survival skills that he had developed to near-perfection were not at all relevant to this situation. His uncle asked if he wanted to "throw in the towel."

"Suddenly I remembered a fellow prisoner at Maiadnek Prison who, when I was given my first bowl of foul-smelling gruel, said: 'Son, you listen. Do you want to eat that soup or do you want to croak?'

1 Ibid.

2 Ibid.

My answer hasn't changed." Pizar returned to his classes, accompanied by his roommate, Sheikh Ahmed Zaki Yamani of Saudi Arabia.¹

The flashing portraits stopped and Pizar realized with a start that he must mentally control himself. But the hypnotic trace returns. In the pale sunlight, dark business suits blur into the prison garb that once covered him and his comrades behind the same gate in front of him with its obscene slogan: "Work Brings Freedom."²

"I must get hold of myself. Because of all those television cameras, millions are watching."³

From here we speak to generations, to nations, to creeds, to black and white, to rich and poor, to young and old. For the spot on which we stand is the deepest wound ever inflicted upon human civilization, the place where Eichman's grim reality eclipsed Dante's vision of hell. On this I bear you the testimony of a rare survivor, the youngest survivor of all."

If such horrors seem relevant today, it is because we dare not forget the past can be prologue, that amidst the ashes of Auschwitz we can discern a specter of doomsday, a warning to mankind of what might still lie ahead. It is to this barbed-wire fence, therefore, that man must come, in emulation of this example, to bow his head and meditate on peace, justice, tolerance, and human rights.

In this cursed and sacred place you face your greatest audience. Here you stand in the presence

1 Ibid., p. 139.

2 Ibid., p. 4.

3 Ibid.

of millions of innocent souls. In their name, and with the authority of the number engraved on my arm, I say to you that if they could speak, they would cry out: "Never again!" 1

Liberated by the Americans, at the end of the war, Pizar went to Australia to his uncle, who soon died from a heart attack. Pizar then received a fellowship to Harvard. He has earned a Ph.D. from the Harvard Law School and another Ph.D. in International Law from the University of Paris.² He has worked as a consultant for international firms, for the United Nations, and for every President since John F. Kennedy, including Ronald Reagan.

Strangely, Pizar's idea is one of peace and coexistence. The horror and the revenge ideas must be forgotten. "Wars," he says, "are economic in nature. The world cannot be tied together with chains, but it can be laced together with common economic interests."³ It is an interesting theory but yet to be tried on such a grand scale. Pizar's fellow survivor, Henry Kissinger, does not agree. He believes in a balance of power and a strong defense. But they do agree that dwelling in the past (revenge seeking) is no solution for problems of the future.

1 Ibid., p. 5.

2 Ibid.

3 Ibid., p. 241.

C. Grover LaMarr Angel

The third person chosen for portraiture is Grover L. Angel, who was a public school person and with whose career school people can easily identify. Grover L. Angel began his career as a teacher in the public schools of Madison County, North Carolina, after two years in Davidson County.¹

During his early years, Mr. Angel taught for eight years in Spring Creek , Beech Glen, and Marshall schools in Madison County. Then in 1939, he became Principal of Hot Springs High School, where he remained for three years. Politics in the mountain counties has been serious business since the counties were formed prior to the Civil War. This was probably more true in Madison than in most counties. Faced with the proposition of replacing one of his most talented teachers with the relative of a local political precinct official, for patronage, Angel adamantly refused, and war began. Later an argument with the county superintendent became so heated that the county sheriff intervened. The superintendent was indicted by a Grand Jury on charges resulting from the incident. He left the county to

¹ Personal interview with Grover L. Angel, 6 March 1987.

avoid trial and died in nearby Asheville of a heart attack.

Having already resigned, Grover Angel left Madison County in 1942 and moved to Washington D.C., where he was employed the day after his arrival by the firm of Dunn and Bradstreet.¹ Part of his duties were to co-ordinate security clearance investigations for the Provost Marshall's Office in the War Department. The FBI could not handle the volume of these "citizen loyalty investigations" because of the war mobilization effort.² His wife, Nell English Angel, worked in the Office of Research and Development, which was primarily responsible for the Manhattan Project. Later Mr. Angel became manager of the Washington Office of Dunn and Bradstreet. Then after being out for a year due to a near-fatal street car accident, Mr. Angel was appointed Administrative Assistant to the Dean of the College of General Studies of George Washington University. By this time, Mr. Angel had begun work on his doctorate, which was completed on May 12, 1952.³

Rather than hold on stubbornly in order to gain

1 Ibid.

2 Ibid.

3 Grover L. Angel, "The Management of Internal School Finance." (Ed.D. diss., George Washington University, 1952), p.1.

possible retribution in local politics, Grover Angel became Doctor Grover Angel, Dean of George Washington University.

Upon his retirement in 1975 Dr. Angel returned to Madison County. Dr. Angel agreed to chair a large rural community development organization; then he became Recreation Director for Madison County. Next Dr. Angel represented Madison County on the Land-of-the-Sky Regional Council, serving there in several capacities. Under his direction several community development projects have been completed in his home community of Greater Ivy, Inc., which seven times in the last ten years has been judged "first" in community beautification in the twenty-seven counties of Western North Carolina. Three times the community has won this award statewide, and on two occasions, the community has ranked in the top three in the United States.¹

Hopefully, Doctor Angel will have many more opportunities to serve his home area. Instead of coming home to get even, Dr. Angel came home to help build a better community, and in this he has been immensely successful.

¹ Personal interview with Grover L. Angel, 6 March 1987.

D. County Z

County Z is a large county in North Carolina which is congruent with one of the state's school units. A city located within that county constitutes another system.

A number of years ago, this county's school superintendent began to develop communication problems with school employees and the public in general. Staff members gradually came to feel that while Mr. Z ran a "tight ship," he was a publicity seeker who enjoyed having the reputation of a military drill instructor. He did not hesitate to "chew his people out" in ways that publicly embarrassed them. He also seemed to appear on radio and television at every opportunity.

As is sometimes the case with school superintendents, when enough enemies accumulate, pressure begins to mount for "something to be done." Suddenly there was a vacancy in the local superintendency.

Because of the problems with Mr. Z, the board of education hired a new superintendent, who was of the opposite extreme. He was a quiet, soft spoken gentleman who attempted to offend no one.

The net result has been that the system is no longer a "tight ship," merely a limping ship that some believe may be about to sink.

"Which was better?" we ask. In this case, Mr. Z was without doubt the better superintendent. He knew what needed to be done, if only he had been able to do the job without deterioration of his public relations, especially with school people who were meeting the public daily. This does not mean that he could not continue to get the job done. It is merely a question of treating people with respect and dignity.

E. County Y

County Y is a medium-size county school unit in the state of North Carolina.

For some time there had been friction between the superintendent, Mr. Y, and Mr. Jones principal of the local high school. After a very tiring day in the spring, Mr. Jones, turned in his resignation. The next morning, he had changed his mind and, upon arriving early at the superintendent's office, asked to have his resignation returned. Mr. Y refused, stating that it was his policy to present all resignations to the school board.

Mr. Jones' resignation was accepted and his position was filled. Mr. Y had the strategic position. But a primary election was approaching, so Mr. Jones filed for the school board.

Mr. Jones was elected and so were two other members who shared his philosophy and many of his positions on issues. What kind of return does this bring Mr. Y for his initial feelings of revenge?

4.3 Administrative Leadership and Attitudes of Revenge

There are many different jobs that must be performed and must be coordinated in order for a school to function. There are teachers, administrators, maintenance people, janitors, cooks, bus drivers, mechanics, instructional aids, secretaries and others. The work of each of these people must be coordinated or the whole operation loses effectiveness and efficiency. They are all important. If one has an impression that bus drivers are not important, just wait until a bus goes bottom up at the foot of a high embankment. If one thinks that cooks are not important, just wait until lunch is twenty minutes late. If one believes the secretary is not important, just try running the school a day or two without a secretary being present. Small wonder that a secretary gets roses on special occasions. The teacher is critically important to the class; without the teacher there would be no class. The principal is probably less important than any of these, if one looks strictly on a short-term basis. But long-term decisions and appointments are made which will be very important at a later time. The aggregate of these

events plus the leadership exerted day to day and week to week will determine whether the result is a school or a polyglot of confusion.

A good school administrator is indeed a strange mixture. One must be a lot and know a lot. One must strike a balance between being "too friendly" and being a "dictator". One must have both sight and vision. One needs to see a problem before it becomes a problem. One must be able to judge people and know how to handle them, because this is the reason the administrative job exists. One must keep the wheels of education turning and everyone performing assigned tasks with a maximum of encouragement and a minimum of force. One has to remember that it is much easier to lead than to drive. Attitude says a lot about a person's behavior and belief. If an administrator is doing a good job, then that individual should be working themselves out of a job.

Of course, an effective school administrator must have characteristics that should be a part of anyone in a position of administrative responsibility. For example, a truly successful school administrator should be academically prepared, demonstrate "command presence," and have "common sense." This individual should be able to meet and communicate with all kinds of people from the "outhouse" to the statehouse. Some of

these people send financial support to the school. Some of them send their children. But they are all worthy of the very best.

A school administrator must know how to deal with revenge. Revenge will in most cases be just what it has been called: "revenge feelings." If they are directed at the administrator, communication, patience, and time will usually take care of the problem. If the revenge feelings are held by the administrator, the best advice is for the administrator to rise above it and forget it, even if the individual has to enroll in a doctoral program.

Chapter 5

5.1 Summary

The reader of a dissertation should be able to get a good idea of the subject to be covered just by reading the title. A feeling of revenge in administration usually arises out of feelings of guilt or insecurity. This dissertation is a study of the effects upon administrators, as well as upon those under their supervision, of feelings of revenge. How do these feelings cause people to react? How will the setting (school in this case) be affected? Is a vengeful administrator an effective administrator?

To answer briefly, please recall the new definition of "revenge" which describes the term as: an action for no purpose other than "hurt in return for hurt." It stems from an unreasoned sense of insecurity, emotionally motivated rather than cognitively motivated. It is selfish, has little or no element of justice, and has no trace of remediation or rehabilitation. Also revenge is self-defeating and self-destructive.

The impulse toward revenge comes from the inner recesses of the mind. The causes of these feelings are different from person to person, and the feelings will tend to manifest themselves differently in each case.

Reality and perception are not always the same. In the creation of a setting, sometimes perception is more important. In fact, to each person the perception is that individuals reality.

The purpose in this dissertation was to take a look at certain personality traits and how these traits can be used to effectively lead an organization such as a school. Some of these traits are: self-confidence, ability to gain confidence of other people, integrity, character, pride, comfort, the ability to listen to what is said and what is not said. "Insecurity" is the most glaring weakness in a leader, who will usually be on the defensive. A good leader will operate from a position of self-confidence, which comes mostly from preparation and competence. Revenge has no place in the leadership style of an effective leader.

In Chapter two, the certain aspects were discussed; both from an historical perspective and from a current view. Also, some examples were given of revenge gone wrong.

Chapter three gave more portraits of revenge, showing where the impulse led. Chapter four, which gave portraits of some individuals who put aside feelings of revenge, should enable one to see the increased potential for these people as they handled the feelings of revenge.

5.2 Conclusions

One might say that feelings of revenge can lead to disaster for an organization because they tend to bring on similar feelings on the part of other people. "Life" tends to seek a balance and to seek its own level, and if a person "takes it out" on someone, there is a price that will eventually have to be paid. Even if the victim does not try to retaliate and does not wish to carry the matter further in any way, a certain amount of good will is lost. At least some willingness to help and cooperate has been allowed to die. Seymour Saranson, in his book on the creation of settings, pointed out that one cannot create the conditions which enable others to change unless those conditions exist for him also.¹ Group members must have mutual respect and a perception of fairness. A person who feels he has been unfairly treated or embarrassed may not get a chance to "scuttle the ship" but what may he do when the leader needs his very best, his willingness to "bend over backward," to "go the second mile?" He could "drag his feet" not caring whether he did his very best.

¹ Seymour B. Sarason, The Creation of Settings and the Future Societies (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1972), p. xiv.

After all, he has been shown that he is not part of the "top crust" anyway. Or, in a "worst case scenario," he could "blow the powder magazine" just when the "ship" gets in shallow water.

Educational leaders may feel that they we will be "forgiven" by those to whom they have been unfair, and perhaps this is true, if it is earned. Offenders will not "get off scott-free," however, because Jesus was the best who ever lived, but even he said of the one who betrayed him: "Woe unto that man by whom the son of man is betrayed! It had been good for that man if he had not been born."¹

A list of conclusions from this research, therefor, might read in part:

1. A administrator inevitably produces reaction in other people. If his actions are constructive, their reactions will tend to be the same.

2. A administrator must have self-confidence based upon preparation and planning. It is much easier to lead than to drive.

3. A administrator must understand the fact that "getting even" itself often calls for retaliation! It can end only when the strongest character relizes the importance of going on to bigger and better things.

1 Matt. 26:24.

4. An effective administrator will surround himself with the best people available, if the maximum potential is to be reached. Some of these people will know more than the administrator but that will not make the administrator uncomfortable.

5. A good administrator knows what to fight for and that some item may cost more in a fight than it is worth.

6. A good administrator is a student of human nature.

7. A good administrator is not insecure and does not waste time protecting a personal job position.

8. A good administrator is one who can clear the perceptions and shape the attitudes of other members of the organization.

5.3 Recommendations for Further Study

Whatever takes you far
and gives you much,

Also makes you
leave much behind!

There is a good possibility that one of the main problems in public education is that the people of the front lines have too little input into the educational process while those from several positions up the line have a disproportionate amount of influence in design. It would improve the system if some method could be designed to gauge periodically their feelings about issues and in ways that were free of undue influence from any source except their own best thinking. For this gauging to be of practical value, it should be done before the fact, not after millions of dollars have been spent finding out that an idea was unsound in the first place.

The following are areas that an individual could study further:

1. The development and use of the five high "C's" of control, (communication, coordination, cooperation, correlation, correction).
2. How might one research ways of coping with anger, frustration, and revenge in the schools, from each type of position?

3. How can teaching standards be raised over the objections of those already entrenched?

4. How can one research the development and use of the "silent" skill (the ability to listen)?"

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Angel, Grover LaMarr. "The Management of Internal School Finance." Ed.D. dissertation, George Washington University, 1952.
- Ayers, Edward R. Vengeance and Justice. New York: Oxford University Press, 1984.
- Bell, O.H. Partisan Campaigns of Col. Lawrence M. Allen. Raleigh: Edwards and Broughton, 1894.
- The Bible. King James Version
- Bourne, Lyle E., and Bruce R. Ekstrand. Psychology: Its Principles and Meanings. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976.
- Bradley, Omar N., and Blair, Clay. A General's Life. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1983.
- Bronowski, Jacob. The Ascent of Man. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1973.
- Brown Miller, Susan. Against Our Will. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1975.
- Brubaker, Dale L. Creative Leadership in Elementary Schools. Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company, 1976.
- Burns, James MacGregor. Leadership. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1978.
- Cohan, Herb. You Can Negotiate Anything. Secaucus, N.J.: Lyle Stuart Inc., 1980.
- Darling-Hammond, Linda. Beyond The Commission Reports. Santa Monica, California: The Rand Corporation, 1984.
- Dean, John. Blind Ambition. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1976.
- DeBruyn, Robert L. Causing Others to Want Your Leadership. Manhattan, Kansas: R.L. DeBruyn and Associates, Publisher, 1976.

- Devine, Phillip E. The Ethics of Homocide. London: Cornell University Press, 1978.
- Dobb, Leonard W. Personality, Power, and Authority. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1983.
- Dunnigan, James F. How To Make War. New York: William Morrow and Company, 1982.
- Emery, F.E. Freedom and Justice Within Walls. London: Tavistoc Publications, 1970.
- Finks, David P. The Radical Vision of Saul Alinsky. New York: Paulist Press, 1984.
- Finn, Chester E. Against Mediocrity. New York: Holmes and Meier, 1984.
- Fisher, Roger, and Ury, William. Getting to Yes: Negotiating Agreement Without Giving In. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1981.
- Goffman, Erving. The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday and Company, 1959.
- Goodlad, John I. A Place Called School. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1984.
- Gupte, Pranay. Vengeance. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1985.
- Hall, Edward T. The Silent Language. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1959.
- Harris, Whitney R. Tyranny on Trial. Dallas: Southern Methodist University Press, 1958.
- Helmstadter, G.C. Research Concepts in Human Behavior. New York: Appleton-Century-Crafts Educational Division, 1970.
- Iacocca, Lee, and Novac, William. Iacocca An Autobiography. Toronto: Bantam Books, 1984.
- Jackson, Bruce. Law and Disorder. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1984.
- Jacoby, Susan. Wild Justice: The Evolution of Revenge. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1983.

- Jonas, George. Vengeance. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1984.
- Keats, John. The Sheepskin Psychosis. New York: Dell Publishing Co., 1972.
- Kramer, Jerry, Ed. Lombardi, Winning is the Only Thing. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1970.
- Liddy, G.Gordon. Will, The Authbiography of G. Gordon Liddy. New York: Dell Publishing Co., 1980.
- Lightfoot, Sarah Lawrence, The Good High School. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1983.
- Littell, Robert. The Amateur. New York: Dell Publishing Co., 1981.
- Machiavelli, Niccolo. The Prince and Other Works. Ed. Walter Hendricks. New York: Hendricks House Inc., 1964.
- Malcolm, Andrew H. Final Harvest. New York: Random House, 1986.
- Malone, Dandridge, M. Small Unit Leadership A Common Sense Approach. Presidio, Texas: Presidio Press, 1983.
- McAshon, Hildreth H. Elements of Education Research. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1963.
- McFarland, Andrew S. Power and Leadership in Pluralist Systems. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1969.
- Naisbitt, John. Megatrends. New York: Warner Books, 1982.
- Page, Edward C. Political Authority and Bureaucratic Power. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1985.
- Patton, George S. War A I Knew It. New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1947.
- Peters, Tom, and Austin, Nancy. A Passion for Excellence. New York: Random House, 1985.
- Peters, Thomas J. and Walter, Robert H. In Search of Excellence. New York: Warner Books, 1982.

- Pisar, Samuel. Of Blood and Hope. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1979.
- Pontell, Henry N. A Capacity To Punish. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1984.
- Powell, Arthur G.; Farrar, Eleanor; and Cohen, David K. The Shopping Mall High School. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1985.
- Rothberg, David L. Insecurity and Success In Organizational Life. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1981.
- Sarason, Seymour B. The Creation of Settings and the Future Societies. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1978.
- Sheetz, Ann Kindig. Someone Has to Pop The Corn. New York: Christian Herald Books, 1981.
- Silberman, Charles. Crisis In The Classroom. New York: Random House, 1970.
- Solomon, Ben. Leadership of Youth. Mount Kisco, N.Y.: Merritt Printers, 1950.
- Summers, Harry G. On Strategy. New York: Dell Publishing Co., 1982
- Talbot, Gordon. The Breakdown of Authority. Old Tappan, N.J.: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1976.
- Taylor, A.J. Illustrated History of the First World War. New York: Putnam, 1964.
- Taylor, Robert L., and Rosenback, William E. Military Leadership In Pursuit of Excellence. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1984.
- Timmerman, Jacob. Prisoner Without a Name, Cell Without a Number. trans. Toby Talbot. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1981.
- Tucker, Robert C. Politics as Leadership. Columbie, Missouri; University of Missouri Press, 1981.
- Valente, Willaim D. Law in the Schools, 2nd. ed. Columbus, Ohio: Merrill Publishing Company, 1987.

Weber, Max. The Protestant Ethic. Trans. Talcot
Parsons. new York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958.

Wellman, Manly Wade. The Kingdom of Madison. Chapel
Hill: The Univesity of North Carolina Press, 1973.

World Book Encyclopedia, 1986 ed. s.v. "World War II."

MAGAZINES

- Allen, Jennifer. "Sweet Revenge." Mademoiselle, April 1983, pp. 196-197, 283.
- Berman, Paul. "The Next Step: The Minnesota Plan." Phi Delta Kappan, November 1985, pp. 188-193.
- Brodinsky, Ben. "The New Right: the Movement and Its Impact." Phi Delta Kappan, October 1982m pp. 87-94.
- Brubaker, Dale and Reynolds, Royce. "The Case Against Selfishness." Michigan Christian Advocate, 113, No. 7 (3 March 1986): 8.
- Brubaker, Dale L. and Simon, Lawrence H. "Emerging Conceptions of the Principalship." Journal of Instructional Psychology XIII, No. 4 (1986): 2-26.
- Brubaker, Ellen A. "Capital Punishment Shows Need for Revenge." Michigan Christian Advocate, 113, No. 20 (11 Aug. '86): 5.
- Burton, Sandra. "Cory: Woman of the Year." Time, 5 January 1987, pp. 18-33.
- "Cry for Revenge." Time, 12 August 1985, p. 29.
- Cryan, John R. and Smith, Jamie C. "The Hick'ry: It's Time to Change the Tune." Phi Delta Kappan, February 1981, pp. 433-435.
- Cunningham, Luvern L. "Leaders and Leadership: 1985 and Beyond." Phi Delta Kappan, September 1985, pp. 17-20.
- Deming, Angus, and Stanger, Theodore. "A Clamor for Vengeance." Newsweek, 12 August 1985, p. 43.
- Ehrlichman, John. "The Taste of Ashes." Newsweek, 8 December 1986, pp. 51-52.

- Goldberg, Milton, and Harvey, James. "A Nation At Risk: the Report of the National Commission On Excellence in Education." Phi Delta Kappan, September 1983, pp. 14-18.
- Greenburg, Dan. "The Sweet Grapes of Wrath." Esquire, June 1977, pp. 100-103.
- Horn, Jack. "The Many Faces of Revenge." Psychology Today, April 1984, pp. 76-77.
- Horn, Jack. "Sweet Revenge." Psychology Today, January 1984, p. 48.
- "How Some Are Winning War With Terrorists." U.S. News and World Report, 26 November 1984, p. 31.
- Johnson, Perry. "Capital Punishment-Consider Carefully This Deadly Myth." Michigan Christian Advocate, 113, No. 13 (5 May 1986): 5.
- Langstern, Barbara. "Seeking Revenge: What Happens When You Try To Get Even?" Vogue, April 1986, p. 400.
- Lyons, Gene. "Why Teachers Can't Teach." Phi Delta Kappan, October 1980, pp. 108-112.
- Masello, Robert. "The Ethics of Getting Even." Mademoiselle, July 1981, p.27.
- Masello, Robert. "Revenge, How To Get It and Why You Should." Mademoiselle, January 1980, pp. 113, 150.
- Melvin, Mary P. "How They Do Learn." Phi Delta Kappan, December 1985, pp. 306-307.
- Menninger, Karl. "Punishment Is A Crime." Saturday Evening Post, 5 October 1968, pp. 16,22.
- Morrow, Lance. "The Temptations of Revenge." Time, 12 May 1980, p. 84.
- "Problems With Retribution." Time, 8 July 1985, pp. 18-19.
- "Radical Saul Alinsky: Prophet of Power." Time, 2 March 1970, pp. 21-22
- Shanker, Albert. "Want Better Teachers? Raise Pay, Stop Classroom Violence." U.S. News and World Report, 2 August 1983, p. 41.

- Sheridan, Thomas L. "The Mythology of Self Defense." America, 23 February 1985, p. 139.
- Stein, Harry. "Ah, Sweet Vengeance!" Esquire, May 1981, pp. 11-16.
- Stone, Marvin. "An Eye for an Eye." U.S. News and World Report, 19 November 1984, p. 108.
- Sullivan, Scott. "A 'Stray Dog' Springs a Trap for Kaddafi." Newsweek, 26 November 1984, p. 69.
- Sykes, Gary. "Teacher Preparation and the Teacher Workforce." American Education, March 1983, pp. 23-27.
- Toch, Thomas. "The Dark Side of the Excellence Movement." Phi Delta Kappan, November 1984, pp. 173-176.
- Wilson, Robert E. "The Anatomy of Success In the Superintendency." Phi Delta Kappan, September 1980, pp. 20-21.

Government and Other Official Documents

Headquarters Department of the Army, Washington.
Military Leadership. Field Manual 22-100.
[Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office,
1983].

Keith v. The State of North Carolina, 63 North Carolina
Reports, 140-145.

Newspapers

The Asheville Citizen, 22 February 1869, p. 1, cols. 5-7.

Greensboro News and Record, 3 August 1986, p. E3, cols. 4-7.