

# The FORENSIC of Pi Kappa Delta

OCTOBER 1976

## *The Bicentennial Year*



*Adams.  
Monroe.*

*Washington.  
Madison.*

*Jefferson.  
Adams.*



# The FORENSIC of Pi Kappa Delta

SERIES 62

OCTOBER 1976

NO. 1

## Table of Contents

Opposition to the Constitution ..... 3

We Too Commemorate Our Founders 8

A Study in Effective Rhetorical  
Training .....10

Three Significant Speeches .....14

Famous Public Address Sites .....16

The President's Message .....18

The Secretary's Page .....19

The National Council at Work .....20

Outcomes and Come-Ons .....22

Forensic Forum .....23

Wilkes College Joins Fraternity .....24

More Provincial Results .....25

More Election Results .....26

Chapter News .....27

New Members .....31

Student Members' Message .....32

EDITOR ..... CAROLYN KEEFE

ASSOCIATE EDITOR .....ROBERT BEAGLE  
Edinboro State College  
Edinboro, PA 16444.

ASSOCIATE EDITOR ....ADA MAE HAURY  
Bethel College  
North Newton, KS 67117.

Published four times a year in October, January, March, and May by Pi Kappa Delta. Subscription price is part of the membership dues. For PKD alumni and non-members, the rate is \$7.50 for one year and \$18 for three years.

Office of publication: West Chester State College, West Chester, PA 19380. Second Class postage paid at West Chester, PA 19380

Printed by Graphics Standard  
West Chester, PA 19380.

## DIRECTORY OF PI KAPPA DELTA

NATIONAL PRESIDENT—Evan Ulrey, Harding College, Searcy, AR 72143.

NATIONAL VICE-PRESIDENT—James DeMoux, Boise State University, Boise, ID 83725.

NATIONAL SECRETARY-TREASURER—Theodore O. H. Karl, Pacific Lutheran University, Tacoma, WA 98447.

NATIONAL COUNCIL MEMBERS— Phyllis Bosley, Towson State College, Baltimore, MD 21204; Tom Harte, Southeast Missouri State University, Cape Girardeau, MO 63701; Jack D. Starr, University of Wisconsin-LaCrosse, WI 54601.

STUDENT MEMBERS — Tana Johnson, Montana State University, Bozeman, MT 59715; James Clymer, Pacific Lutheran University, Tacoma, WA 98447.

IMMEDIATE PAST PRESIDENT—John E. Baird, California State University, Hayward, CA 94542.

HISTORIAN—Larry Norton, 1010 N. Heading Court, Peoria, IL 61604.

EDITOR OF THE FORENSIC—Carolyn Keefe, West Chester State College, West Chester, PA 19380.

## PROVINCE GOVERNORS

1. PROVINCE OF THE PLAINS — Michael Twedt, Ottawa University, Ottawa, KS 66067.
2. PROVINCE OF THE MISSOURI — Bob Derryberry, Southwest Baptist College, Bolivar, MO 65613.
3. PROVINCE OF ILLINOIS — Marie Robinson, Illinois Wesleyan University, Bloomington, IL 61701.
4. PROVINCE OF THE PACIFIC — Bud Zeuschner, California State University, Northridge, CA 91324.
5. PROVINCE OF THE SIOUX — James Zeman, Northern State College, Aberdeen, SD 57401.
6. PROVINCE OF THE LOWER MISSISSIPPI — Tony Allison, Cameron University, Lawton, OK 73501.
7. PROVINCE OF THE LAKES — Don Hines, Otterbein College, Westerville, OH 43081.
8. PROVINCE OF THE UPPER MISSISSIPPI — Bob Lapp, University of Wisconsin — Eau Claire, WI 54701.
9. PROVINCE OF THE SOUTHEAST — Terry W. Cole, Appalachian State University, Boone, NC 28608.
10. PROVINCE OF THE NORTHWEST — Leslie Lawrence, Montana State University, Bozeman, MT 59715.
11. PROVINCE OF THE NORTHEAST — Al Montanaro, State University of New York, Plattsburgh, NY 12901.
12. PROVINCE OF THE COLONIES — Patrick L. Miller, California State College, California, PA 15419.



# OPPOSITION TO THE CONSTITUTION: THE RATIFICATION BATTLE IN VIRGINIA

James Edward Sayer

## The Making of the Constitution

Soon after the outbreak of open hostilities with England, the leaders of Revolutionary America realized that a specific structure of government had to be established to avoid evils more dangerous than simple military domination by another power. While the First and Second Continental Congresses had performed admirably, their *de facto* nature was sufficient reason to believe that such an organization would not serve the country well in the long run. Thus, a plan of government called the Articles of Confederation was established on July 9, 1778, that called for individual states to "enter into a firm league of friendship with each other" in the creation of a Perpetual Union.<sup>1</sup> After almost three years of squabbling over the specifics of the document's thirteen major provisions, the Articles of Confederation were formally adopted by the United States of America in March of 1781.

While the Articles did provide for a system of government, their practical operation left a great deal to be desired. Some shortcomings included: no true national executive with any significant power; an absence of a national court system; amendments requiring unanimous vote of the states; and a unicameral Congress which could not levy taxes, enlist troops, punish those who broke its laws, make the states observe foreign treaties, or regulate commerce.<sup>2</sup>

The operative difficulties of the Articles were best demonstrated in the 1782-83 fiscal year when the Congress had sought some eleven million dollars from the states for operating expenses, but they contributed a total of only one and one-half million dollars. The Articles expressly stated that "each state retains its sovereignty, freedom, and independence,"<sup>3</sup> and these rights prevented Congress from imposing taxes to raise revenues. Because the national Congress had so little power,

its members showed little interest in their tasks.

This situation became so bad that making quorum for Congressional sessions was often impossible. The famous Ordinance of 1787, which provided a system for the creation of new states and public education in the new territories, was adopted by the vote of but eighteen members; total Congressional membership was ninety-one. Men such as James Madison vehemently argued that the Articles had to be amended in order to channel more control to the national government, especially in the areas of finance and commerce, if this Perpetual Union was to survive. Yet most people were hesitant to make such a move.

Many of the "Patriots of '76" were reluctant to reconstitute a government that they feared might take away everything gained after seven years of bloody struggle. While the shortcomings of the Articles of Confederation were obvious, it was argued that these were comparatively better than the disaster of a powerful national government structure that would subvert the will of the individual states.

Many other leaders, however, feared that the weaknesses of the Articles were more dangerous than the purported fears of a strong national government. Many felt that the lack of unity would culminate in the collapse of the Perpetual Union and make the states easy prey for foreign aggressors. General Washington expressed his fears in 1786:

I do not conceive we can exist long as a nation without having lodged somewhere a power, which will pervade the whole Union in as energetic a manner as the authority of the state governments extend over the several states.

And in 1787 Alexander Hamilton warned:

James Sayer sponsors the Ohio Sigma chapter at Wright State University. He also serves as the lieutenant governor of the Province of the Lakes.



The delinquencies of the states have, at length, arrested all the wheels of the national government. The frail and tottering edifice seems ready to fall upon our heads and to crush us beneath its ruins.

While it is true that the Articles of Confederation did provide many powers for the national government (many more than might have been expected considering the recent experience with the North Ministry in England), there was not enough centralization to allow for a truly viable national governmental structure. The perpetuity of the Union seemed in grave doubt, and incidents such as Shay's Rebellion in 1786 stood as proof that the system had to be changed.

One of the problems that affected the states centered upon land and water sovereignty. Since two or three states would claim the same body of land or water, there was continual turmoil as to who owned what land and for how long. By grant and by general agreement, Maryland held sovereignty over the Potomac River, the body of water that served as its boundary line with Virginia. Commercial interests in Virginia feared that Maryland might someday interfere with their navigation on the river and sought to reach an agreement that might allay these fears. So, in 1785, representatives from both Maryland and Virginia met with General Washington at Mount Vernon to discuss the navigation rights of both states on the Potomac and Chesapeake Bay.

Learning that the states of Delaware and Pennsylvania also were interested in such a discussion, Virginia issued a call to all the thirteen states for a trade convention to meet at Annapolis in September 1786. The man directly responsible for the issuance of this call was James Madison, whose motives are suggested by historians Nevins and Commager:

Madison...had been greatly depressed by the general disorder of commerce and believed that a larger conference should be held with the object of getting the states to vest its regulations in Congress.<sup>4</sup>

As has been mentioned before, the Articles of Confederation did not grant the power to Congress to regulate either intrastate or interstate commerce. Thus,

there was a great deal of confusion as various trade regulations differed from state to state. It appears that Madison saw the Potomac River issue as a means for providing Congress commercial regulatory power.

Nine states responded to Virginia's call for a trade convention, but delegates from only five states appeared at Annapolis. Obviously, nothing concerning the commercial activities affecting the entire country could be decided by less than forty percent of the states, and it appeared that the Annapolis meeting was a dismal failure. However, Alexander Hamilton of New York offered a resolution that was adopted by this group on September 14, 1786, and which was forwarded to the Congress. The following is the critical part of that resolution:

...it may essentially tend to advance the interests of the Union, if the states...would themselves concur, and use their endeavors to procure the concurrence of other states, in the appointment of commissioners, to meet at Philadelphia on the second Monday in May next, to take into consideration the situation of the United States, to devise such *further provisions as shall appear to them necessary to render the constitution of the federal government adequate to the exigencies of the Union.*<sup>5</sup>

The writer has underscored the most significant portion of the Hamilton resolution, that which called for a convention to amend the Articles of Confederation to make them more effective. His resolution did not call for a scrapping of the Articles, but several members of Congress feared that this might happen, so there was widespread distrust as to the intent of such a gathering. However, when the state of Virginia selected George Washington as one of its delegates, Congress agreed to the holding of such a meeting, setting the initial meeting date as the second Monday in May 1787. Whatever was accomplished had to be reported to Congress and alterations had to be accepted by the state legislatures. Importantly, Congress allowed the convention "for the sole and express purpose of revising the Articles of Confederation," virtually repeating Hamilton's resolution word-for-word.

The specifics of the struggles which were incurred between the first session



on May 25 and the last session on September 17 are not of importance to this paper; it should be noted, however, that the delegates were "a body of men who were overwhelmingly conservative in their general philosophy of politics and overwhelmingly nationalist in their views."<sup>6</sup> From this combination of conservatism and nationalism came an effective compromise between those who argued for or against states rights vs. federal government rights and those who favored or feared the democratic process. In the words of Rene Wormser, "many of the checks and balances in the Constitution were the result of the general fear of wide democratic power."<sup>7</sup>

Thirty-nine delegates signed the completed document on September 17, 1787. To secure implementation, the Constitution required that nine of the thirteen states give assent before it would go into effect. While most of those in the upper classes favored the new Constitution as a viable safeguard for wealth, property, and commerce, many of the lower classes feared that the strong national executive "smacked of despotism and class rule."<sup>8</sup> The struggle over ratification of the Constitution had begun, and it is with the rhetoric surrounding this struggle in Virginia that the remainder of this paper will be concerned.

### **The Ratification Battle in Virginia**

Although the Constitution required the ratification of but nine states to place it in operation, the practicality of the newly-proposed system of government hinged upon the reaction of four states: Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, New York, and Virginia. Even though the other nine states might agree to ratification, the prospects for Union were nonexistent without the presence of those four major states. After severe confrontations with the opposition, Pennsylvania and Massachusetts approved ratification as the second and sixth states, respectively. By May 23, 1788, with the affirmative vote by South Carolina, eight states had approved the Constitution.

The Virginia Ratifying Convention opened in Richmond on June 2, 1788. It was to be the scene of a tremendous

struggle between those forces who both opposed and approved the new Constitution. Toward the close of this gathering, New Hampshire voted in the affirmative and became the ninth state to ratify, thereby allowing the Constitution to take effect. Still, without the assent of Virginia and New York, the new system would have been meaningless and destined to failure. It is for this reason that historians have tended to emphasize the cruciality of the Virginia and New York ratifying conventions. The Virginia convention was doubly important because its eventual concurrence was a major factor in persuading the New Yorkers to grant their assent.

The confrontation in Virginia was most significant in its intensity of argument. For three weeks the delegates to the Virginia convention examined the proposed Constitution as carefully as any document could be examined, and arguments both for and against the new system of government covered every aspect of man's philosophy of governance. The main opponents were Patrick Henry, who spoke against the Constitution, and James Madison, who supported it. The presence of these two rhetorical giants has tended to overshadow the rest of the Virginia ratification battle, as well as the complexity and depth of the arguments offered within the contest.

In a broad overview of the ratification debate, it is possible to distinguish the major lines of argument advanced by both sides. The opponents of the proposed Constitution were principally concerned with the immense power given the federal government as they feared that despotism and tyranny would be the eventual result of this new system. Limited to mainly "future fact" hypotheses because of the Constitution's unknown operating qualities, men such as Patrick Henry, Edmund Randolph, George Mason, and Richard Henry Lee contended that the federal government would function at the expense of individual and states rights, thereby demonstrating the major overriding concern of those possessing a conservative philosophy of government. The supporters of the Constitution, led almost single-handedly by James Madison,



countered their opponents by maintaining that the new system of government was necessary for the security and perpetuity of the United States, additionally contending that rights were better guaranteed by the nationalism of this document than by the inefficiency and ineffectiveness of the Articles of Confederation.

Strategically the opponents to the Constitution attempted to deny ratification through the issuance of a large number of objections to the document, hoping that a delay would allow the people to arise in opposition to the document. Since there were so many defects, they claimed, the only rational solution was to allow the various state ratifying conventions to propose amendments to eliminate the perceived problems. Then, as Edmund Randolph and Patrick Henry urged, another general constitutional convention could be held to discuss the amendments suggested by the state conventions.<sup>9</sup> Although such an approach might seem to be reasonable, if not prudent, Madison and his fellow supporters of the Constitution said, no, the ratifying conventions had to vote upon the Constitution as it had been presented; there were to be no amendments, no second constitutional convention. Madison (as well as his *Federalist* colleagues, Alexander Hamilton and John Jay) feared that allowing amendments at that time would destroy any possibility of the Constitution's adoption, as people would spend an interminable time proposing countless numbers of amendments. Thus, the parameters of the ratification debate were carefully defined by Madison, believing that the Constitution could and should stand upon its own merits against the hypothetical arguments of "gloom and doom" of its opponents.

An examination of the principal objections to the Constitution reveals that many of these arguments contained both validity and farsighted perception. Specifically, five major arguments offered by Henry, Randolph, Mason, and Lee merit exposition in outlining the opposition to our now familiar form of government:<sup>10</sup>

1) *Lack of guaranteed rights.* George Mason contended that the Constitution

should have a specific declaration of rights for the individual, because "the declarations of rights in the separate states are no security" for every person. Eventually recognizing the strength and worth of this concern, Madison agreed to a compromise on this issue: approve the Constitution now and a specific declaration of individual rights will be added immediately thereafter. This compromise resulted in the Bill of Rights — a direct result of Mason's objection.

2) *Too much concentrated power.* All the opponents of the Constitution feared the new powers given the federal government, but the fear of power varied from individual to individual. Henry was mostly concerned with the powers of the presidency, claiming that the veto power, for example, would allow the President to become a tyrant like George III. Lee also objected to such powers and additionally questioned the powers given the Senate (e.g., the authority to ratify treaties). He believed that too little power was given to the House of Representatives, causing that branch to be of little effect in the operations of government. Mason and Randolph were particularly upset with the presidential power to pardon those convicted of crimes, especially the right to pardon individuals accused or convicted of treason. Although it can be seen that the objections varied, all opponents agreed that too much power was concentrated at the federal level.

3) *Judicial abuse.* Related to the general concern with too much federal power was the specific objection that a federal judiciary was unwarranted and dangerous. Randolph feared that, since the President had the power to nominate persons for judicial offices, the federal judiciary would become the tool of a tyrannical chief executive. Mason claimed that the federal judiciary was unnecessary because each state had its own judicial system. Moreover, he felt that a national courts system would eventually "absorb and destroy the judiciaries of the several states," thereby infringing upon fundamental state and individual liberties.

4) *Congressional abuse.* The Virginia opposition to the Constitution was concerned that various powers of the



Congress would work against the best interests of the individual states. Most specifically, Mason and Lee were convinced that the congressional power to regulate navigation and commerce would harm the South, creating "the most oppressive monopoly upon the five Southern states." All agreed with Edmund Randolph that a distinct line had to be drawn between the powers of Congress and individual states.

5) *Constitutional ambiguity.* The opponents to the Constitution were extremely unhappy with the vagueness that seemed to permeate the entire document. There was very little specificity relative to the actual operations of the federal government. Randolph feared that the ambiguity would eventually be resolved in favor of the federal level, and the states and the people would suffer as a result.

James Madison maintained a fairly simple line of straight defense in reacting to the numerous objections offered against the Constitution. To those arguments that condemned the powers given to the federal government, Madison responded that the system had a built-in network of checks and balances, a system that would prevent any one branch from becoming predominant over the other two. Moreover, the general powers of the federal government were carefully limited; the powers of the states to act and exist relatively independently were safeguarded. Thus, there was nothing of substance to fear; the Constitution was written to guarantee rights, and, further, the new form of government was infinitely superior to the chaos and dangers created by the Articles of Confederation.

### Analysis

In retrospect, it may be concluded that both forces within the ratification struggle in Virginia had worthy argumentative positions. Certainly Madison's greatest strength was the Constitution itself. The events of the past two centuries have given credence to Prime Minister Gladstone's opinion that the Constitution was "the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man." The revolutionary system of checks and balances has worked well in

the main, generally safeguarding individual liberties and providing, as Madison foretold, a much more viable governmental structure than the loose confederation that preceded it.

However, certain objections to the Constitution also contained historical validity. The lack of a clear line of demarcation between federal power and states rights became of paramount importance in the nineteenth century. The Webster-Hayne Debate, John C. Calhoun's "Compact Theory of the Constitution," and a major cause of the Civil War resulted from a lack of such careful delineation. Too much presidential power continues to be a major concern in the 1970's. The arbitrary use of the veto power, the commitment of troops to various military operations such as Viet Nam, the pardoning of Richard Nixon, and the overwhelming dominance of the executive branch in government: these concerns and others underscore the perceptiveness of men nearly two hundred years ago. Similarly, the growth of judicial power, especially Marshall's concept of "judicial review," has tended to support the fears of the Constitution's opponents. Even Madison would be surprised and dismayed by the actions of the "Warren Court," much as he was dismayed by the haughtiness of John Marshall. The contentions of the opposition had significant validity; they are supported by the events of history. Yet, all in all, the federal structure has worked well, probably much better than any of those in Richmond in 1788 would have imagined.

(Continued on page 9)

### The Cover:

Faced with a total lack of response in the Bicentennial Student Cover Contest (thrice advertised in *The Forensic*), the Editor herself had to supply a suitable cover for this issue. From the extensive print collection of The Historical Society of Pennsylvania, she selected an engraving by D. Edwin and G. Murray after Gilbert Stuart. Special thanks is given to James E. Mooney, director of the Society, for permission to reproduce the engraving.



# WE TOO COMMEMORATE OUR FOUNDERS

In this Bicentennial year we have turned our thoughts to the founders of the nation, to the basic ideals for which we stand, and to those individuals who, through the years, have worked to perpetuate those ideals. As Pi Kappa Deltans it is appropriate that we likewise pay tribute to our founders, to our purposes and ideals which are in harmony with the nation's principles, and to those leaders who have helped preserve and strengthen our organization.

The contributions of our founders have been pointed out at intervals during the past sixty-three years. Perhaps no one has done this more effectively than Sylvester Toussaint, past president and former secretary-treasurer, in his now famous tribute to Pi Kappa Delta entitled "This Is Our Heritage." In this speech, delivered upon the occasion of our fiftieth anniversary as a fraternity, he said, "Any organization receives its initial impetus from the imagination of its founders. Ten men are generally listed in the original group but the constitution, the key, and the magazine are basically the work of three men: John A. Shields of Ottawa, Egbert Ray Nichols of Ripon, and E.A. Vaughn of Kansas State. An early history of our society calls them a complementary team: Shields, the organizer; Vaughn, the imaginer; Nichols, the realist and promoter." Toussaint refers to Nichols, "who, through thirty-nine years lived and breathed debate and Pi Kappa Delta," as the one person to whom the organization is most indebted. Of George Finley, national secretary-treasurer for twenty-four of the fraternity's first fifty years, he says, "Two basic ideas were central in Finley's conduct of the office. The first was his constant concern for the welfare of the students and the local chapter. He believed that the entrance requirement should be low enough to permit students to enter



**Larry Norton, historian**

the organization and then progress through the various degrees as they participated more fully. In the second place he possessed absolute integrity." Toussaint continues with a special tribute to Alfred Westfall, "who held more national offices in the order than any other person: national historian, treasurer, secretary, president for four years and editor of *The Forensic* for fifteen." From 1920 to 1947 Westfall held a national office and during those early years of development did much to communicate the high ideals of Pi Kappa Delta, particularly through the pages of *The Forensic*.

When E.R. Nichols completed his service to the fraternity as president and editor in 1918 and assumed the role of elder and active statesman for many more years, he wrote, "Pi Kappa Delta has reached the place where its founders may safely relax their hold upon its leadership and turn the tasks that they have cheerfully and at times even wearily performed, over to new men who have caught the idea for which the organization stands, and are willing to put their shoulders to the wheel."

A study of the issues of *The Forensic* during the formative and developmental years indicates a general consensus by



founders and other leaders on several elements which comprise the idea to which Nichols refers. The idea seems to involve the following purposes or goals: 1) to provide recognition for orators and debaters in the smaller colleges, 2) to maintain a low entrance requirement with a progressive system of honors, 3) to remember that what happens at the local chapter level is of first importance, 4) to stress the importance of provincial and national conventions in order to enhance the values of the total forensic experience, 5) to establish the climate for ethical behavior in forensic competition, 6) to work continually for better standards and procedures of evaluation, 7) to combine in Pi Kappa Delta the best elements of an honor and a recognition society, 8) to make Pi Kappa Delta a working organization with broad educational objectives, and 9) to be forward-looking and innovative in promoting forensic activities. Each of the above purposes is a historical narrative in itself as it has unfolded over the years.

We have observed that George Finley and Alfred Westfall did indeed catch the idea and place their shoulders to the wheel. But there have been so many others who, in varying degrees, have done likewise: the members of the National Council and the editors of *The Forensic*. We expected them to serve as living examples of the ideals and purposes of Pi Kappa Delta because they were elected to serve following many years of demonstrated belief in those ideals. They have been recognized in their time, and we shall continue to salute them for their dedication to principles which continue to sustain our fraternity.

Then there are the sponsors and other members of the all-important local chapters who have received less recognition and never have held a national office in the order. Many of them have been most effective in conveying the values of Pi Kappa Delta from generation to generation of students. They are the ones who have demonstrated their integrity in such ways as initiating all eligible persons, updating all records in degree and order, and making the local chapter a vital, ethical, educational force on the campus

and in the community. The results of their activity may be found in the recorded chapter evaluations over many of the early years, the new membership lists, annual reports, convention participation records, and the Chapter News throughout all issues of *The Forensic*. At a later time it may be possible to recognize some of those individuals and chapters which have been influential in making Pi Kappa Delta the symbol of pride for all who have given of themselves to make it endure.

In this Bicentennial year our nation is finding strength in honoring its founders and their ideals, a strength which helps us to renew our faith in the future. Can we in Pi Kappa Delta do less, as we continue to perfect the dream of our founders?

---

## Opposition to the Constitution

(Continued from page 7)

On June 25, 1788, the Virginia Convention voted to ratify the Constitution, as written, by a vote of 89 to 79. Lee was not present; Henry and Mason voted against the final proposal; Governor Randolph, somewhat surprisingly, voted in favor of the Constitution, saying that the issue had become an either/or proposition — “the single question of Union or no Union.”<sup>11</sup>

Historian Clement Wood provides an appropriate conclusion:

...the ratification brought forth such a storm of jubilation over the length and breadth of the land as had not been known since the repeal of the Stamp Act. And there was justification for this, since the Constitution brought at last security and stability out of near anarchy and the probability of ultimate national disintegration and destruction.<sup>12</sup>

### Notes

<sup>1</sup>Jonathan Elliot, ed., *The Debates in the Several State Conventions on the Adoption of the Federal Constitution* (New York: G. P. Putnam, 1888), I, 79.

<sup>2</sup>Richard D. Heffner, *A Documentary History of the United States* (New York: The New American Library, 1952), pp. 20-21.

<sup>3</sup>Elliot, p. 79.

<sup>4</sup>Allen Nevins and Henry Steele Commager, *History of the United States* (New York: Washington Square Press, 1960), p. 115.

<sup>5</sup>Elliot, p. 118.

(Continued on page 31)



# Alexander Campbell: A Study in the Value of Effective Rhetorical Training

James N. Holm, Jr.

The question of whether instruction in rhetoric is either necessary or desirable in an academic curriculum has long provoked vigorous debate. From Plato's attacks on the Sophists to the latest issue of *Speaker and Gavel*, critics of instruction and practice in the forensic arts have contended that such instruction and practice "has lost its relevance to the real world" and now tends "to impede, if not prohibit, realistic debate."<sup>1</sup> Thus it would seem that the value of instruction in argumentation and debate is still not completely understood or accepted, even among those who teach or coach forensics.

In this Bicentennial year, it might therefore prove interesting to look back over the history of American public discourse in order to discover what effect, if any, the teaching of argumentation has had on the development of American civilization. Almost immediately, specific examples spring to mind. James Madison studied rhetoric under John Witherspoon at Princeton, and James Garfield studied under Mark Hopkins at Williams. Yet, in these two cases, as well as in many others, there is little evidence of the direct effect that the course of study had on the subsequent career of the speaker.<sup>2</sup>

In the case of Alexander Campbell, the founder of the Disciples of Christ Church, however, there is substantial evidence of the effect of his formal instruction in rhetoric upon his subsequent career. Recently, Campbell's notes from his course in rhetoric under George Jardine at Glasgow University have been discovered and published.<sup>3</sup> From the evidence provided by these notes, one can formally establish the impact of Jardine's instruction on Campbell's contributions in religion, education, and politics to the growth of the quality of life on the American frontier.

Although not as widely known as Daniel Webster, Patrick Henry, or Henry Clay, Alexander Campbell made a significant

contribution to the development of this country.<sup>4</sup> During the first half of the nineteenth century, he founded and led the Disciples of Christ Church, which became in his lifetime the largest Protestant denomination indigenous to America. He established Bethany College and was its president for over twenty years. He also inspired many other educational institutions, including Hiram College and Butler University. He wrote for and edited a religious magazine, *The Millennial Harbinger*, which for more than thirty years had a subscription list of over forty thousand addresses. Moreover, he won election to the Virginia Constitutional Convention of 1829 and there articulated in his debating the ideological foundation for West Virginia's later withdrawal from the ranks of the Confederate States.<sup>5</sup> In short, Alexander Campbell played an integral role in the development of civilization on the American frontier.

There can be little doubt that Campbell's effectiveness as a leader on the frontier was due in large measure to his success as a debater. Between 1809, when he first arrived in America, and 1820, Campbell followed the advice of his father to refrain from public controversy.<sup>6</sup> Consequently, during the first ten years of his life in America, Alexander Campbell had little impact on the direction of events on the frontier.

In 1820, however, Campbell finally accepted a challenge to debate publicly. He agreed to meet John Walker, a Presbyterian minister, in open discussion on the nature and meaning of baptism. At the conclusion of this dispute, it was clear that Campbell had developed somewhere a powerful means of presenting his own point of view in argument, for not

James N. Holm, Jr. is an assistant professor of speech communication at Muskingum College in New Concord, Ohio. His PKD membership is in the order of instruction from the University of Wisconsin-Platteville.



only had he won the unanimous decision of the judges who presided over the debate but also five thousand new subscribers to his magazine.<sup>7</sup> In Campbell's own words, he was "fully persuaded that a week's debating is worth a year's preaching."<sup>8</sup>

From 1820, then, until his death in 1866, Alexander Campbell assumed a position of leadership on the frontier primarily through his effective debating. In the view of historian W. H. Venable, "the clash of beliefs, and the ardor to establish innovating systems, gave rise to many public debates on religious subjects," and the "most distinguished champion in the lists of the theological tournaments was Alexander Campbell."<sup>9</sup> Not only did Campbell debate on religious questions but on political and educational issues as well. As mentioned above, he participated actively in the disputes over slavery, taxation, franchise, and education at the Virginia Constitutional Convention of 1829. In addition, he participated annually in the discussions on education held at the Ohio College of Teachers in Cincinnati.<sup>10</sup> Once Campbell discovered his talent for debating, he seemed to exercise it whenever possible.

Even in his writing, Campbell utilized his argumentative skills.<sup>11</sup> The vast majority of the articles published in his monthly magazine were extensions of the discussion of issues begun in his public debates. Furthermore, most of the books which Campbell wrote and published were either transcripts of his most-notable debates or collections of his speeches. In his written as well as oral discourse, therefore, Campbell emerged as an articulate and effective leader on the American frontier.

With the exception of Campbell himself, the man most responsible for Campbell's effectiveness in debate was George Jardine. Until Campbell began college in 1808, his only teacher had been his father, Thomas Campbell, who was strongly opposed to public controversy. When the young Alexander Campbell attended Glasgow University, however, he enrolled in a course in Rhetoric and Belles Lettres from George Jardine and there began to develop his forensic

talents.

George Jardine represented a long and reputable tradition of excellence in logic and rhetoric at Glasgow University. He taught there for over fifty years and was recognized by students and colleagues alike as one of the outstanding professors of the school. It was primarily because of Jardine, as Campbell himself pointed out, that "the art(s) of acquiring and communicating knowledge were highly appreciated and cultivated" at Glasgow.<sup>12</sup>

In substance, Jardine's rhetoric was in the mainstream of Scottish theory along with George Campbell, Adam Smith, and James Beattie.<sup>13</sup> The topics of his course, while covering all five rhetorical canons, were far-ranging. He began with the study of the human mind and from there progressed through investigations of language and logic to an analysis of Socratic dialogue and Aristotelian disputation. Jardine concluded his course with a discussion of taste and criticism.

In method, Jardine developed an educational technique quite different from that of his predecessor, Adam Smith, but quite familiar to the present generation of teachers of argumentation and debate. Jardine did not simply lecture to his students but required them to present orally their own ideas and to critique extemporaneously the ideas presented by fellow students. Following these student presentations, Jardine would offer "judicial and cheering criticism" of both the original speech and the critique.<sup>14</sup>

The quality of Jardine's teaching which his students seemed to remember most frequently, however, was his warm and hard-working nature. A review of Jardine's published lectures, appearing in *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* in 1818, suggested that among his students Jardine "was universally known throughout Scotland as a most zealous, unwearied, and enlightened teacher of youth."<sup>15</sup> In a tribute to Professor Jardine, Alexander Campbell wrote years after he left the University that his many achievements in life were due to "being introduced, quite contrary to expectation, to the University of Glasgow and to the literary advantages there."<sup>16</sup>

George Jardine's course in rhetoric