

# The FORENSIC of Pi Kappa Delta

JANUARY 1977

## The Sheriff and the Schoolmarm



Jim Clymer and Tana Johnson,  
Student Members of National Council

~~George Wilson~~  
Dir. of Forensics  
Speech Communication  
Gustavus Adolphus College  
St. Peter, MN. 56082



# The FORENSIC of Pi Kappa Delta

SERIES 62

JANUARY 1977

NO. 2

## Table of Contents

The President's Message .....	3
When the Convention Roll Is Called .	4
The Secretary's Page .....	6
PKD Highest Honors/ Special Distinction .....	7
The Cover:	
Student Members of Council .....	8
The Rhetoric of	
Two Equal Rights Debates .....	9
Convention Program .....	17
Convention and	
Standing Committees .....	18
Convention and Contest Rules .....	19
Proposed Constitutional	
Amendments .....	24
Interview with	
Vice-President DeMoux .....	25
United States Coast Guard	
Joins PKD .....	29
Membership Edges 50,000 .....	30
Pi Kappa Delta Directory .....	33
Editor's Word .....	39

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.



# The President's Message...

## Plan for Active Participation in PKD



Evan Ulrey

By the time the January *Forensic* is published, Pi Kappa Delta will have issued membership card number 50,000. The larger an organization becomes, the greater becomes the difficulty of keeping communication lines open. We are a communication fraternity, but that fact by itself does not guarantee successful communication among the membership.

"Many heads are better than a few" is an assumption behind the varied activities of Pi Kappa Delta. It takes many heads to produce a good tournament, an excellent individual events contest, a challenging debate, an attractive, relevant *Forensic*, and a functioning, democratic convention.

Good communicators realize that highly important ideas often come from sources that are not routinely consulted. To talk and to be listened to is therapeutic, even though some of our ideas may never be directly, or even indirectly, implemented. Nevertheless, we have known the satisfaction of having some input into and feedback from a situation in which we are vitally interested.

It is the intention of the Pi Kappa Delta Convention and Contest Committees to provide for open discussion and implementation of matters for the good of the order. As a member of Pi Kappa Delta, you may feel it your privilege, even duty, to provide guidance for the chairmen and members of various committees published in this issue.

Pi Kappa Delta does no one a favor, least of all itself, if it makes spectators, rather than active participants, of its members. As Carl Becker has said, "The chief virtue of democracy, and the whole reason for cherishing it is that with all its defects it still provides the most favorable condition for the maintenance of . . . dignity and the practice of . . . morality. The individual is the essential carrier of that dignity and the agent of that morality."

I believe that all responsible Pi Kappa Deltans would wish our organization to profit from the reasonableness and creative thinking of as many members as possible. I hope that our upcoming National Meeting in Seattle will be able to respond to its membership in an effective manner.



# WHEN THE CONVENTION ROLL IS CALLED

Larry Norton, Historian

As one looks back upon Pi Kappa Delta's sixty-four years, several basic beliefs emerge from the written and oral expressions which relate the purposes and ideals of the organization to the policy of convention attendance. These interpretations are drawn from many expressions in *The Forensic*, from Council and regional executive meetings, and from policy making sessions of the national and provincial conventions.

pertaining to chapter attendance. Amendments were submitted by George Finley and W. H. Veatch, followed by discussion from the floor, including supporting remarks by E. R. Nichols. The final wording of the convention attendance requirement read, "Any chapter failing to have a delegate at the first national convention after the granting of its charter, or any chapter failing to have a delegate at two consecutive conventions shall have its



Before attempting to express the philosophy underlying the attendance requirement at national conventions, let us review the constitutional history, glance at some registration figures, and repeat a few selected statements by early leaders.

It was Thursday, April 3, 1924, and the biennial business meeting of the Fifth National Convention of Pi Kappa Delta was being held on the campus of Bradley Polytechnic Institute in Peoria, Illinois. Upon the recommendation of the National Council, Secretary-Treasurer Alfred Westfall introduced resolutions

charter suspended. Any charter thus suspended can be regranted only by action of a national convention before which some delegate of the institution appears in person."

Twenty-nine years later, at the Eighteenth National Convention held at Kalamazoo, the word *probation* was substituted for *suspension*.

At the Twenty-eighth National Convention in Omaha, an amendment was passed opening the way for chapters to petition to be freed from this penalty for failing to attend some future convention. The alternative was provided by an amendment to



add to the long-standing rule the following sentences: "Under exceptional circumstances, chapters in good standing may petition to be excused from National Convention attendance. Petitions, available from the Chairman of the Charter and Standards Committee, must be filed prior to the National Convention and then approved by a majority vote of the National Council and by the appropriate Province Governor." This is the constitutional story of the attendance requirement for national conventions.

Appeals for better attendance at provincial and national conventions have filled many pages of *The Forensic*. Attendance has been a primary concern of the national officers from the time that Editor E. R. Nichols, prior to the First National Convention held at Topeka in 1916, wrote, "Don't give up because of distance or expense — raise the money and send a representative." Ten of the 14 active chapters answered roll call at Topeka. Over 70 percent chapter attendance has been recorded at 66 percent of the 29 national conventions. At 9 conventions less than 66 percent of the chapters were represented: 1918, 1924, 1942, 1947, 1955, 1965, 1971, 1973, and 1975. For 8 consecutive conventions following the adoption of the attendance rules in 1924, until the war influence in 1942, the percentage of chapters present never fell below 79 percent and ranged up to 88 percent. The best attendance in recent years was 187 chapters or 78 percent and a total registration of 1068 delegates and visitors at Tempe, Arizona, in 1969.

What are the reasons for an attendance requirement? In the May *Forensic* of 1924, following the adoption of the constitution attendance provision, the Editor explains, "We feel that this requirement is really justified. The chapter that cannot send a delegate to the convention at least once in four years has something radically wrong with it. Either the institution to which the chapter belongs is weak — too weak to have Pi Kappa Delta in it; or the officers of the chapter or the faculty members of the chapter have not an adequate realization of the meaning of the organization to which they belong, nor an appreciation of the value of atten-

dance at such a gathering in the stimulation of interest in forensics. In many cases we feel that the explanation is just plain and simple laziness on the part of chapter officers or faculty members. We grant that once in a while a chapter may be disappointed in its plans for the raising of money to send a delegate — when the chapter is a long way from the Convention — but most of the excuses which are given for the failure to be represented are weak and would not be given by chapter officers or faculty members who are thoroughly interested and alive."

Two years later another Editor was writing: "This (the attendance rule) was not voted in the sense that it was a penalty on any chapter, but out of the feeling that a chapter which does not attend the conventions misses the best that the society can contribute to the betterment of its forensic activities, and the conviction that the society could not be 100 percent efficient, unless each chapter was doing its share."

In January 1952, President Roy "Hap" Mahaffey wrote, "If Pi Kappa Delta is nothing more than an organization which gives recognition for the superior student who wins prizes; if Pi Kappa Delta is nothing more than a sponsoring organization for forensic programs; if Pi Kappa Delta is nothing more than a formality for granting memberships and keys; then Pi Kappa Delta is worth no more on the college campus than a platform with a public address system used for publicity purposes. Pi Kappa Delta should be the goad that pricks the lethargic portions of those who should be thinking and acting in the promotion of excellence in thought and leadership."

From varied sources, including personal experience, these are some of the basic beliefs which have guided the thinking of our leaders throughout the years as they have made the appeal for convention attendance. The Pi Kappa Delta convention-tournament serves valuable purposes in addition to the ordinary tournament. These conventions are designed to create a competitive climate in which ethical behavior is an integral part of all activities and where the primary concern

(Continued on page 7)



# The Secretary's Page. . . Theodore O. H. Karl



The 30th National Convention of Pi Kappa Delta will be held at the Olympic Hotel in Seattle, Washington, March 18 - 22, 1977. Our national conventions are not the usual tournaments, nor are they the usual conventions. They are instead unique experiences for the talented forensic student. A biennial convention is held for the purpose of fraternal fellowship, business of the fraternity, and the opportunity, not otherwise offered to most students, to meet for friendly competition. In almost all of the competition, members match wits and talent and exchange ideas with students from all parts of the country. This in itself is an experience not available to most forensic students. It is exciting, and the free time can be used to great advantage. There will be free monorail rides to the Food Circus, where the variety of good food at reasonable prices will not be matched at any other place to which you might travel. The experience of the salmon bake, which was the highlight of the 1965 Convention, will be one to be remembered.

**Convention Attendance:** Be aware of the constitutional requirements. Check Article V, Division A, Section 14. Don't let Seattle be the second consecutive nationals missed by your chapter. That will mean probation. Remember that attendance is defined as "answering present to

roll call at not less than two business sessions of the convention. One of these sessions must be the final session unless the chapter has been excused by the National President."

**Convention and Contest Rules:** Be SURE to read and reread the rules carefully. Changes have been made from two years ago. Be sure you understand the rules and formula regarding judges, number of entries, and the kinds of events. ALL CONTESTANTS MUST BE MEMBERS of Pi Kappa Delta.

**Entry Forms:** These will be mailed in late January so that you will be receiving them by February 1, 1977. If you haven't received them by February 5, please advise us. The entries MUST be returned to show a postmark of no later than March 1, 1977. Except for emergencies, these entries should be accurate. A confirmation of your entry will be returned within a few days of its receipt in this office.

**Registration:** The registration desks will be open on Friday, March 18, at 8:30 AM. Registration will close at 6:30 PM so that all delegates may attend the province meetings at 7:00 PM and the general meeting at 8:00 PM. If you cannot arrive in time to complete registration before 6:30 PM, please call long distance to permit the contest committees to make their final plans.

**Housing:** Housing reservations will be made directly with the Olympic Hotel. A reservation card will be enclosed with the entry forms. SEND THE HOTEL RESERVATION FORMS DIRECTLY TO THE OLYMPIC HOTEL. SEND THE REGISTRATION FORM TO THIS OFFICE.

**Voting Delegate:** Select your voting delegate soon, if you have not already done so. The voting delegate may be either a student or a faculty member but should be well informed on the purposes and ideals of Pi Kappa Delta. The chapter should instruct its delegate on positions to be taken on important issues, such as constitutional amendments and election of officers.

Several new chapters will receive their charters at the opening meeting on Friday



evening. Be present and welcome them.

Dr. Tom Harte, the contest chairman, suggested in a letter to the Council in September that he felt the selection of "Tall Tales" was a good one; he had just heard the first round of speeches in his classes! After reading the message from our student members on the National Council (see the October *Forensic*, page 32), I too feel that the topic was a good choice. Their item number 11 is truly a "Tall Tale." I fear that we in the State of Washington cannot claim the highest mountain in the Continental United States. No doubt we shall hear many more "tall tales" in Seattle in March! See you there.

---

## When the Convention Roll Is Called

*(Continued from page 5)*

of all participants is the development of educational values. If the winning of awards conflicts with these purposes, then winning must be given secondary importance. The leaders of Pi Kappa Delta have always believed that when one becomes a member of an organization, he assumes an obligation to further the purposes and ideals of that organization. Their respect for the values of Pi Kappa Delta membership serves to enhance this belief as it relates to participation in all the activities of the fraternity at all levels. As respected forensic directors, these leaders realize the tremendous influence of a director in developing the attitudes and values of students. Therefore, the director is primarily responsible when a chapter demonstrates either strength or weakness. These leaders know that the local chapter was chartered with the understanding that it assume definite obligations to the fraternity. Therefore, the school, the student members, and above all the sponsor have an ongoing responsibility to carry out their commitment to each other and to the national organization. When this pledge is not fulfilled, the ones who suffer are the students and the alumni members. Leaders are aware that indifference and ineffective budgeting are too often the real reasons for non-attendance at con-

ventions. They know from the feedback from former students that honors achieved in Pi Kappa Delta endure long after a win or loss has been forgotten. That is why Pi Kappa Deltans believe in established goals for achievement. And that is why Pi Kappa Deltans believe that the Constitution and Rituals should continue to direct and encourage these beliefs.

---

## PI KAPPA DELTA MEMBERS WHO HAVE ACHIEVED HIGHEST HONORS

*I-Instruction*

*CIS-Competitive Individual Speaking*

*D-Debate*

### Name, Chapter

Elizabeth Henderson, IL Mu (CIS)  
Jeanne Ellen Clark, IL Mu (CIS)  
Marjorie Schaer, WA Theta (CIS) & (D)  
Kathleen M. Mahoney, PA Lambda (CIS)  
Sally Maude Finley, PA Zeta (CIS)  
Scott C. McKenzie, PA Nu (D)  
Alan Dale Lane, SD Zeta (CIS) & (D)  
James V. Kilgore, AR Theta (CIS) & (D)  
Landis Kelly Magnuson, NB Alpha (CIS)  
David Potter, MN Mu (CIS)  
Mary Jo Juneau, LA Eta (CIS) & (D)  
David Quimby, MO Eta (D)  
Nina R. Olson, WI Delta (CIS)  
Jane Rudie, WI Gamma (CIS)  
Derald L. Harris, MO Sigma (CIS)  
James M. Nelson, WA Kappa (CIS) & (D)

## PI KAPPA DELTA MEMBERS WHO HAVE ACHIEVED SPECIAL DISTINCTION

Debra Levey, IL Mu (CIS)  
Dennis Bergvall, WA Theta (D)  
Catherine Colson, WA Theta (CIS)  
Michael Stewart Miller, WA Theta (CIS)  
David W. Nixon, PA Zeta (CIS)  
Michael McNabb, TX Alpha Epsilon (CIS)  
Jennifer Bergstrom, WI Gamma (CIS)  
Steve Spear, WI Gamma (I)  
Craig Cutbirth, WI Gamma (I)  
Susan Aloisi, NY Alpha (CIS)  
Teresa Ellen Carver Scifres,  
AR Theta (CIS) & (D)  
Dennis Mark Chauvin, LA Zeta (CIS) & (D)  
Celeste Michelle Condit,  
ID Gamma (D)



## THE COVER:

# The Student Members of the National Council out of Costume

### JAMES CLYMER

*Jim Clymer, a dean's list senior and campus leader at Pacific Lutheran University, has racked up a long list of forensic honors in debate, extemporaneous speaking, and impromptu. One of his most notable awards was a superior in extemp. at the last PKD Nationals. Jim, along with five other winners, debated in historic Congress Hall in Philadelphia.*

*To his PKD role Jim brings wide experience in committee work. Currently he is chairman of both the Campus Video Committee and the Entertainment Series. Last year he ran the Muscular Dystrophy Dance Marathon and was PLU Activities Vice-President. In 1975 he chaired his college's high school debate tournament.*

### Jim says:

I believe it is necessary for the student members on Council to express student opinions on forensic competition so that the benefits of such activities can be expanded and improved. The initiation of several new events for the Seattle Nationals indicates, I think, that students are looking for a change and that the National Council is willing to do whatever is necessary to benefit the students participating in Pi Kappa Delta.

I would hope that Tana and I can meet with as many students as possible so that we can get their feelings on forensic competition. I also hope that the social aspects of Pi Kap will give students the opportunity to meet with people from all areas of the country. This kind of fellowship is not found in many national organizations, and I think that we are fortunate to be able to meet as a group every two years.

If anything, Pi Kap has taught me that there is more to communication than a file box full of evidence and a first negative spread. Communication is people, and unless you try to relate to each person on

his level, any attempt at communication is useless. Pi Kap stresses the "Art of Persuasion, Beautiful and Just." I think we should look more carefully at the meaning of our organization's motto. The key to many social problems might be found if we attempted to communicate and understand one another.

### MONTANA JOHNSON

*Montana Johnson is a sophomore at none other than Montana State University in Bozeman. She hopes that eventually her major academic field of public relations will lead to a job with a United States company in France. But for the time being, she reports, "During the summer I work on the grounds crew at MSU, and during the winter I work on debate!"*

*Tana has spoken competitively for four years. In addition to debating, she has done extemporaneous speaking, impromptu, oral interpretation, and duo interpretation.*

### Tana says:

I'm really excited to be a part of the planning body for our Seattle National Convention and Tournament. During my time as student representative, I hope to do just that: bring the student view into PKD. We have a lot of great ideas in our student membership, and I hope to help bring these ideas together to make PKD better. I think that the schedule for Seattle should do this. We have provided time for the students to get together and meet some of their fellow Pi Kappa Deltans, and I urge everyone to make the most of this time. Also, if anyone has any ideas or suggestions, please feel free to write to Jim or to me. PKD has become a big part of my college experience, and I will always be proud to say I was in Pi Kappa Delta. Hopefully at Seattle everyone will be able to see just how great Pi Kap is.



# The Rhetoric of Two Equal Rights Debates

Judith S. Trent

On August 10, 1970, Congresswoman Martha W. Griffiths asked the House of Representatives to proceed immediately to the consideration of an article proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States. The first section of the article read:

Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex. Congress and several States shall have power, within their respective jurisdictions, to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.<sup>1</sup>

Although the ensuing debate led by Martha W. Griffiths was a critical moment in the history of women's struggle for equality and thus worthy of rhetorical consideration, the Equal Rights Amendment debate of August 10, 1970, is even more significant when examined within the historical and rhetorical context provided by another congressional debate on an earlier equal rights amendment.

On March 7, 1884, Susan B. Anthony presented the arguments for Article XVI, a constitutional amendment, to the Senate Select Committee on Woman Suffrage. The first section of the article read:

The right of suffrage in the United States shall be based on citizenship, and the right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States, or by any State, on account of sex, or for any reason not equally applicable to all citizens of the United States.<sup>2</sup>

The purpose of this paper is to compare the fundamental features which relate the equal rights debate in 1970 to the one in 1884. The comparison will be offered in three areas: the historical context, the rhetorical context, and the rhetorical strategies. This examination should provide a better means of understanding not only the rhetorical elements involved but should also contribute to our knowledge of the women's equal rights struggle. If each debate is seen in the context of the other, perhaps we shall better comprehend the salient

characteristics of the rhetoric of a 126-year struggle for equality.

## The Historical Context

Congresswoman Griffiths' 1970 debate in the House of Representatives occurred forty-seven years after the first presentation to Congress of a constitutional amendment guaranteeing equal rights to women. The first equal rights amendment was introduced in Congress in 1923, three years after ratification of the nineteenth (woman suffrage) amendment. During this ensuing forty-seven years, the resolution had been reported favorably by Senate committees in a number of Congresses and had been passed by the Senate twice but only after the addition of what were, in effect, nullifying clauses.<sup>3</sup> Finally, on May 5-7, 1970, the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Senate Judiciary Committee conducted hearings on the Equal Rights Amendment. The Committee, after hearing testimony from forty-two witnesses, compiled a hearing record of almost 800 pages (which the Committee failed to have printed), and then dropped the amendment.

While the amendment had been introduced, debated, nullified, and sent back to committee in the Senate, the House of Representatives had done virtually nothing with the resolution for forty-seven years. And for twenty years, Representative Emanuel Celler, Chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, had kept the resolution bottled up without hearings because he regarded the amendment as a "blunderbuss proposal that will wipe out all the good as well as the bad."<sup>4</sup> In July 1970, with the amendment trapped in the

Judith S. Trent is an associate professor of speech communication at the University of Akron. Portions of this essay were read at the Speech Communication Association Convention in Houston, December 1975.



Judiciary Committee, and patience with Celler exasperated, Martha Griffiths forced the amendment into the House for a vote by convincing 218 of her colleagues to sign a discharge petition.<sup>5</sup> With the first legislative hurdle thus eliminated, Griffiths (and a staff equipped with source material and pro arguments for cooperative legislators), initiated the first House of Representatives debate on the Equal Rights Amendment. And in less than one hour on August 10, 1970, the House, by a vote of 350 to 15, approved the amendment. Perhaps Gerald Ford, then another Representative from Michigan, best described Griffiths' rhetorical accomplishment when he remarked that the Equal Rights Amendment is a "monument to Martha."<sup>6</sup>

When Susan B. Anthony addressed the Senate Select Committee on Woman Suffrage in 1884, it was not the first time Congress had faced the issue of voting rights for women. The first measure providing for a woman suffrage amendment had been introduced in 1866 in connection with a bill designed to extend the vote to Negroes in the District of Columbia. Senator Cowan of Pennsylvania had offered an amendment to strike out the word "male," thus touching off the first debate on woman suffrage in the Senate.<sup>7</sup> But the legislative battle for woman suffrage, in and of itself, formally began in 1878 when Senator Sargent of California (a close friend of Anthony's) introduced the equal voting rights proposal. This bill, known as the "Anthony Amendment," became the battleground for a series of legislative and rhetorical maneuvers until it was finally passed in 1920 as the nineteenth amendment to the Constitution.

In 1882 both houses appointed Select Committees on Woman Suffrage, and both committees presented favorable recommendations to Congress. This action was repeated by the Senate Select Committee in 1884 (following a hearing in which Anthony, leading a delegation from the Sixteenth Annual Washington Convention of the National Woman Suffrage Association, presented the arguments for enfranchisement), and the bill was finally debated in the Senate on

January 25, 1887. And although Anthony did not physically lead the Senate debate, the proponents of the amendment requested that the full text of her 1884 speech before the Senate Select Committee be printed in the *Congressional Record* as part of the debate on the Woman Suffrage Amendment. And although the Senate eventually voted thirty-six to sixteen against the amendment, that the bill had even reached the Senate floor for a vote (the first and last Senate vote on woman suffrage in the nineteenth century) was a major accomplishment which was attributable, in part, to the rhetorical efforts of Susan B. Anthony.

### The Rhetorical Context

Despite the fact that the Griffiths and Anthony speeches were separated by eighty-six years of social, economic, and legal changes and that one woman addressed her congressional colleagues while the other spoke as a witness for a Senate hearing, there are sufficient similarities to suggest a common rhetorical context.

Historians have referred to Susan B. Anthony not as the "orator" of the suffrage movement but as the "incomparable organizer who gave the movement its force and direction for half a century."<sup>8</sup> Although ideologically committed to many social reforms, Anthony's primary effort revolved around extending the franchise to women. To achieve that goal, she organized dozens of conventions and state suffrage associations, published tracts, wrote articles, drafted resolutions, circulated petitions, edited a multi-volume history of the movement, established a national association in which she held numerous offices, traveled almost continuously throughout the country for fifty years giving an average of seventy-five to one hundred speeches a year, and lobbied and spoke before congressional committees in Washington.<sup>9</sup> As an article in *The Hearth and Home* of January 22, 1870, said:

She is the Bismark; she plans the campaigns, provides the munitions of war, organizes the raw recruits, sets the squadrons in the field. Indeed, in presence of a timid lieutenant, she sometimes heads the charge; but she is most