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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. 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.

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,” 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:
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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.4

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.5

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." 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."

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." 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 cruciility 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. 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:

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 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."11

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.12

Notes


3Elliot, p. 79.


5Elliot, 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." 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.2

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.3 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.4 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.5 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.6 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
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only had he won the unanimous decision of the judges who presided over the debate but also five thousand new subscribers to his magazine. In Campbell’s own words, he was “fully persuaded that a week’s debating is worth a year’s preaching.”

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 tournamenets was Alexander Campbell.” 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. Once Campbell discovered his talent for debating, he seemed to exercise it whenever possible.

Even in his writing, Campbell utilized his argumentative skills. 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.

In substance, Jardine’s rhetoric was in the mainstream of Scottish theory along with George Campbell, Adam Smith, and James Beattie. The topics of his course, while covering all five rhetorical cannons, 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.

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.” 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.”

George Jardine’s course in rhetoric
seemed to have several direct and significant effects on Campbell’s career as a debater. By comparing the notes that Campbell took in the course and the outlines of the speeches he gave with the transcripts and reports of his major debates, one can distinguish at least three apparent lines of influence between the course and the career: first, concerning the ideal attitude of the debater towards both victory and truth; second, concerning the rules and procedures for debating; and finally, concerning the strategies and substance of specific lines of argument.

One of the foremost objectives of Jardine’s course seems to have been the development of a healthy attitude in his students towards the process of argumentation. Early in the course, he urged his students to follow the example of Socrates and to assume the character of a “humble learner” and not a “Teacher.”17 Jardine suggested that, if the attitude of a humble learner were assumed, specific strengths of mind would accrue. He proposed in fact that one could “sharpen his power of judgement,” learn to “call knowledge from every quarter,” and “develop a steady reflected sort of mind” and “a strength of memory.”18

If the students were not careful, however, Jardine warned, the taste of victory could create “an ascent of law to truth” and lead to “a breach of truth rather than a loss of argument.”19 According to Jardine two personality characteristics generally accompanied the desire for victory in public disputes. First, people in search of victory tended to demonstrate great “obstinacy of temper” which made them “a disagreeable companion and a torment to society.” Second, they also engendered in themselves a “skeptical state of mind” which causes them “to call everything into question . . . and even sometimes to call our Senses in question.”20

Throughout Campbell’s career as a debater, there were abundant signs of his attempt to maintain this “learner’s attitude” described by Jardine. Campbell did not hesitate, for example, to change his mind about an issue or to adopt a portion of his opponent’s point of view in the middle of a discussion if he thought it was correct to do so.21 To the charge that he was being inconsistent, Campbell would reply as he did in his debate with Nathan L. Rice: “Well, I confess, I am changing a little every day — I am always learning something. I think I am wiser today than yesterday, and I hope to be wiser tomorrow than today.”22 Only infrequently did either Campbell’s opponents or their followers ever complain that Campbell’s changes were motivated by a desire for victory. Rather, almost everyone who heard Campbell agreed with Bishop Purcell of Cincinnati, another of Campbell’s opponents, who said:

Campbell was decidedly the fairest man in debate I ever saw, as fair as you could possibly conceive. He never fought for victory, like Dr. Johnson. He seemed to be always fighting for the truth, or what he believed to be truth . . . . He never misrepresented his case nor that of his opponent; never tried to hide a weak point; never quibbled . . . . Rather than force a victory by underhand or ignoble means, he preferred to encounter defeat.23

Not only did Campbell appear to have learned the appropriate attitudes for debaters but also the proper rules and procedures for public controversy. By way of illustration, Jardine lectured that every dispute should have both a set of opponents and a “Præsis or Arbiter” who was to introduce and direct the controversy and to assist the debaters if they became “puzzled and disconcerted.”24 In every debate which Campbell arranged, such a judge or panel of judges was always present. Additionally, Jardine suggested that the respondent should present his prepared arguments on a given proposition first; that the opponent should then “in a polite manner thank the Respondent for the Information” and “in a modest manner oppugn” the respondent’s arguments; and finally that each of the debaters should have “time to make any amendments or alterations he thought necessary.”25 This organization of arguments Campbell also insisted upon in all the debates he helped to arrange. In these two ways, as well as in many others, Alexander Campbell’s knowledge and use of the rules and procedures of debate appeared highly influenced by the teaching of George Jardine.
Lastly, and perhaps most significantly, many of the lines of argument Campbell chose to employ, and even some of his key illustrations, appear to have been drawn directly from his lecture notes and written assignments for Jardine’s course. One method of attack for an opponent, for instance, was to use the same basic premises as the respondent. As Jardine explained, “In this manner the premises cannot be denied because they are the preconceptions of the antagonist himself, and if the conclusions be properly drawn there is not room left for future disputation.”

In developing in his students a deeper understanding of this argumentative strategy, Jardine required them to write a Socratic dialogue illustrating this particular line of attack. In fulfillment of this assignment, Campbell composed a dialogue in which the Socratic figure hears his friend argue that the world is flat, begins his own arguments with the premises of the friend, and finally convinces the friend that the world is round.

Both the strategy and this key illustration of one man convincing another that the world is round appear in Campbell’s debates. Against Robert Owen, for example, Campbell argued:

Mr. Owen may state his twelve facts [about the mental and physical faculties of man], and I may admit them all... If Mr. Owen had said that a man has two eyes, two ears, two hands... and such and such mental faculties; I would admit it. But when admitted, will it follow from these truths... that all religions are false.

When Owen, in reply to Campbell’s attack, simply restated his twelve facts over again, Campbell attempted to point out the logical fallacy in Owen’s case by comparing it to some men’s belief that the world is flat.

The objection my friend has been urging this morning against Christianity, reminds me of a certain objection which I have heard [to the statement] that this earth was round as a ball. They have replied that they are very sure this statement was untrue, because they perceived... a very uneven surface... Now, it is in a similar style of objection that my friend attacks the Christian religion. He perceives...

As this example illustrates, then, both in strategy and in substance, many of the arguments which Campbell relied upon throughout his career as a debater were apparently drawn directly from his assignments and lectures for George Jardine’s course in rhetoric.

Totally, the evidence from the transcripts of Campbell’s arguments seems to indicate that George Jardine’s course had a significant impact on Campbell’s debating. From Jardine, Campbell learned the attitude a debater should have, the rules he should follow, and the strategic moves he should make on specific occasions. In each case, the success of Campbell’s debating suggests that he learned his lessons well.

Alexander Campbell was an important figure in America who made a substantial contribution to the growth of the quality of life on the frontier through his ability to debate. The development of that forensic ability, in turn, was the product of a good teacher, George Jardine. In short, the life of Alexander Campbell is a case history of the value of instruction and practice in argumentation.

Whether any universal truth can be abstracted from this one case history is doubtful. Most probably, instruction and practice in argumentation are — like guns or automobiles or medicine — inherently neither good nor bad. They are, instead, what we make of them. But there are moments in history which should make us all pleased that we too are students and teachers of debate.

Notes
2For an example of the lack of such evidence see: James N. Holm, Sr., “A Rhetorical Study of the Public Speaking of James A. Garfield, 1851-1859,” Diss. Western Reserve University 1954, pp. 41-48, 61-64.
4There are a number of good biographies of Alexander Campbell which discuss in detail his contributions to life on the frontier. The most complete of these is Robert Richardson, Memoirs of Alexander Campbell, 2 vols. (Cincinnati: Standard Publishing Company, 1913).

(Continued on page 31)
THREE PI KAPPA DELTA LEADERS
SIGNIFICANT IN OUR

James Grissinger
Otterbein College

At a time when national leadership is one of our major concerns, it is interesting to consider a recent speech that may well have changed our leadership-to-be.

Let’s go back to the Democratic National Convention, New York City, July 1976. Senator-Astronaut John Glenn, amid the first evening convention hubbub, presented the keynote speech, long in preparation and rehearsal. Many observers felt that if this speech came off as expected, Glenn might indeed be lifted off into vice-presidential orbit. Mr. Carter had already been heard to announce (after the Glenn “job interview” in Plains, Georgia), “Glenn kind of fits in with our family.” The junior Senator from Ohio had already won a nationwide poll conducted by Carter’s Pat Caddell: statistics showed that Glenn would help the Party most (or hurt it least).

And so we listened and watched John Glenn and the keynote. What we saw and heard was unimaginative, unchallenging, trite, lacking in style and imagery, lackluster in delivery, and, greatest of keynote sins, deadly dull!

Three days later Glenn was passed over in favor of Mondale as the Carter vice-presidential choice. Newsweek of July 26, 1976, reported one Carter staffer speculating that Glenn’s speech “did him in” once and for all. Those of us who saw and heard would probably not disagree.

Now let’s fantasize — what would have happened if Glenn had presented a real barnburner? What would have happened, then, if Carter were elected? Taking the dream further, what would have happen-
ed if Glenn became the next President — by means of those accidental or purposeful processes that frequently seem to propel our Vice-Presidents to the stars?

We’ll never know what might have been, but this may be a stunning example of “for lack of a speech, an office was lost!”

Carroll B. Ellis
David Lipscomb College

Alexander Campbell at Cross Creek, Virginia, on September 1, 1816, delivered a sermon entitled “The Law.” He was not scheduled to speak; he spoke because one of the speakers was ill. And in spite of the fact that no more than 200 people were present, this speech, in my opinion, marked a vast change in American religious faith. Alexander Campbell was declaring his Declaration of Independence from the subjectivism and emotionalism that was engendered by the great revival started in Logan County, Kentucky, with the preaching of Calvinist James McCready in 1798.

In the sermon “The Law,” Campbell was not suggesting a mild reform but a cataclysmic break with human tradition and practice. This sermon marked the beginning of a movement of people who were concerned about being the New Testament church. It was a complete repudiation of all adjectival modifiers. It was not how can we be Baptist-Christians or Methodist-Christians or Presbyterian-Christians, but how can we be Christians, members of the church of Christ?

The movement started by Alexander Campbell and Barton W. Stone was to
result in the emergence of three present-day religious communities — the Churches of Christ, the Disciples of Christ, and the Christian Church. The impact, however, was wider than can be adequately explained by these groups. The ideas stated were to have an influence in all religious bodies.

Alexander Campbell (1788-1866) later gained worldwide acclaim through his preaching, writing, religious debates, and extensive travels. In my view, this speech was an attempt to say “Do not convert people by anecdote, shout, or denunciation but by a sincere, honest, study of the Word of God.” Simple, and yet complex, this speech marked a change in the lives of all Americans.

H. Francis Short
Kansas State College

On the morning of April 11, 1951, President Harry S. Truman released a statement which in part said, “with deep regret I have concluded that General of the Army, Douglas MacArthur, is unable to give wholehearted support to the policies of the United States. . . . I have decided that I must make a change in command in the Far East. . . . It is fundamental, however, that military commanders must be governed by the policies and directives issued them in the manner provided by our laws and constitution.” This release by the President set the scene for the April 19th speech to Congress by Douglas MacArthur.

This speech, in my opinion, concerned a vital issue of American history, not for the emotional impact of an old soldier retiring but for what it was unsuccessful in doing: proving the military is capable of forming foreign policy. The speech spelled out the inconsistency of the military deciding foreign policy. It contained many ethical ambiguities peculiar to the military when MacArthur urged America not to pursue “a course blind to reality that the colonial era is now past and the Asian people covet the right to shape their own free destiny.” He hardly had finished this statement when he declared that from our island chain between the Aleutians and the Marianas “we can dominate with sea and air power every Asiatic port from Vladivostok to Singapore,” a military concept.

Here was one of the great military minds of the twentieth century at work, but it was a military mind. His speech proved that when the military mind decides foreign policy it does so with the threat of war. This was noted by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey when he said of the speech “the basic issue involved in the controversy is one of the civilian versus military control over our foreign policy.” Senator Robert S. Kerr observed that “he sounded a call for an expanded war, a second front for sure, and a third front, if it came.”

After listening to the speech three more times before writing my reply, I feel that the political observer and literary critic of The New Yorker summarized my opinion when he said, “It does not leave me with the impression that a cool and candid mind has been at work on difficult matters of universal concern.”

In retrospect General MacArthur’s position as a statesman seems measurably lower than that of President Harry S. Truman. This dramatically proves why the framers of the Constitution were concerned that the formulation of foreign policy should be in the hands of the civilian, not the military.
FAMOUS SITES OF AMERICAN PAST

Built in 1713 and rebuilt in 1748, Boston's Old State House became the rallying place for John Adams, James Otis, John Hancock, and numerous other patriots who first opposed royal authority. On July 18, 1776, the Declaration of Independence was read from the east window. The state legislature met here until 1798.

Bruton Parish Church in Williamsburg, former Virginia colony, has been in continuous present. To coincide with the June 1, 1774 British of the port of Boston, the burgesses fasting, humiliation, and prayer and we Church "to implore the divine interposition in heavy Calamity which threatens destruction and the Evils of Civil War."

Carpenters' Hall in Philadelphia, erected by perhaps the oldest trade guild in the country, has been in continuous use ever since 1724. Within its walls the First Continental Congress met from September 5 to October 26, 1774. Some of the furniture used by that Congress may still be seen in the hall.
Bruton Parish Church in Williamsburg, former court church of the Virginia colony, has been in continuous use from 1715 to the present. To coincide with the June 1, 1774 date of closure by the British of the port of Boston, the burgesses sat aside a day of fasting, humiliation, and prayer and went to Bruton Parish Church "to implore the divine interposition, for averting the heavy Calamity which threatens destruction to our Civil Rights, and the Evils of Civil War."

In the House of Burgesses, sometimes called "Virginia's School for Patriots," George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Richard Henry Lee, Patrick Henry, and others debated constitutional issues. Here in May 1765, Patrick Henry presented his resolutions against the Stamp Act, and in May and June of 1776, George Mason served as the main drafter of the Virginia Declaration of Rights which later was embodied in the Bill of Rights of the federal Constitution.

Faneuil Hall, a gift to the people of Boston from Peter Faneuil, was built in 1742, rebuilt in 1763, and then dedicated by James Otis. The assembly room, located on the second floor above the market, provided a platform for many famous speakers, including Otis, Webster, Everett, Sumner, Parker, Channing, Beecher, Garrison, Phillips, and Blaine.
ON TO SEATTLE!

Evan Ulrey

It is evident to most Pi Kappa Deltans that the organization traditionally has attached great importance on attendance at the biennial national convention. Although chapters are asked to make this major effort only once in two years and although chapters have the opportunity to file petitions to be excused from attendance, some may yet feel that the expense and effort to attend may be justified with great difficulty, if at all. I can't hope to persuade everyone that such attendance is justifiable or even that it is desirable. Nevertheless, I hope to make some points for the consideration of those who have been doubtful. 1) Attendance at the biennial national meeting can be a worthwhile experience for every individual who participates wholeheartedly in the contests and convention affairs. 2) Participation in the democratic decision-making of the business meetings and participation in the tournament represent a high level of training in communication. 3) Many of the innovations in teaching debate and individual events have originated with the planning that has preceded and followed national Pi Kappa Delta tournaments. 4) Even though no “national winner” per se is selected in any event, a national tournament in high quality competition is engendered from standard speech programs in colleges and universities in thirty or more of the fifty states. 5) If the present manner of operating the organization is either undesirable or non-productive, the machinery for change exists within the organization and operates by the will of the majority assembled in convention.

While the premises which I have stated are open to discussion, they nevertheless represent some of the premises from which, I believe, the majority of Pi Kappa Deltans operates. They appear to be validated in the experience of many. If they are no longer valid, then the process for change is available to members. On to Seattle!

The National Council met July 28-31 in its traditional non-convention year meeting in Seattle at the 1977 convention hotel, the Olympic. A slightly revised time schedule was decided upon. We shall be going into Seattle on March 18th (Friday) with registration all day and the first general meeting that evening. The convention-tournament will conclude with the banquet on March 22nd (Tuesday).

Since these dates are now firm, you can make your schedule and your budget plans. The Council hopes that all chapters will plan to send one delegate or more. You will be receiving information on a special (ITX) flight plan that appears to be the best one available. It can save about one third the cost of air fare if you originate from certain designated points. (See page 22.) Province officers are already at work on group travel plans.

I have no doubt that Seattle is one of the best sites available for a convention. It has natural beauty, recreational facilities, waterfront area on Puget Sound, the City Center (still active from the World’s Fair), and varieties of food services. This combination has rarely been available at previous convention sites.

True, Seattle is a great distance for many chapters. Why not plan the trip for its educational value? Colleges and universities give credit for various types of tours. Student groups take a week or more from classes for enterprises which potentially are no more challenging and valuable than a trip to the Great Northwest of the U.S.A.

Sometime in October each chapter will receive a packet of materials with information on the area and ideas about raising money to make the trip, if the money is not available in the regular college budget. The Council wants to assist every chapter that may need help in planning for this year’s activities culminating in attendance at the National Tournament and Convention in Seattle, March 18-22, 1977.
On many pages of this issue there will be evidence that during the latter days of July the National Council met in Seattle. Most of the decisions will be spelled out to the readers. As you know, this is the start of the school year which once again involves us in a national convention.

This page will not take the space to reiterate these decisions but rather to discuss the things most germane to the office of secretary-treasurer.

Again I make my annual plea to return the Fall Report. This will be arriving shortly. It seems that although it has been designed to take only a few minutes to fill out, with no postage necessary to mail it back to this office, we are continually disappointed in the number of returns. The information is necessary to meet the requirements of the PKD Constitution, which demands that a directory be included in the January issue of The Forensic each year. The only way that this directory can be even partially complete is to hear from each chapter, giving us the names of the sponsor, chapter president, and the members. It also serves as an order blank for you to replenish supplies needed for the year without sending a special letter at a later date for a rush order and thus helps you avoid a possible delay in your activities. Another important reason for the report is to correct our mailing list for The Forensic. It is a waste of money to send twice as many copies to the chapter as it can use. Since the National Council instituted the rule of sending only half the number of copies as there are members, the report becomes even more important.

In this issue will be found the audited financial report of the secretary-treasurer. The fiscal year ended on July 31, and the report is to be included in the October issue each year. One of the most disappointing parts of this job is the necessary, almost constant request for consideration by the organization to improve the financial status for activities, services, and projects which the membership wants to engage in for future improvement. If you study the financial report, you will notice that the balance this past year showed a decrease of over three thousand dollars. This has come in spite of economizing and an increase of seventy-five regular memberships over the previous year. True, one of the reasons is that the Summer Council Meeting came in the 1975-76 fiscal year, rather than in the 1976-77 convention year as it has in the past. It will be necessary, however, to transfer at least $2,000.00 from the one savings certificate to the checking account in order to meet the expenses which will be incurred during this fall for supplies and printing for the National Convention in Seattle. This does not allow for any loss, such as the $2,000.00 loss experienced at the Philadelphia Nationals. The budget for that convention was based on an expected attendance of 700, while a little over 500 participated. The 1977 National Convention budget will be based on an anticipated attendance of 500 members. Since we do not make a practice of assessing chapters who do not attend, each convention must pay for itself.

As a result of these conditions, the National Council will ask the Convention in Seattle to consider the raising of

(Continued on page 30)
The National Council meets biennially to discuss PKD organizational matters and the upcoming nationals. Presiding at the head of the conference table in Seattle’s Olympic Hotel is Evan Ulrey.

The Council spent many hours discussing two difficult problems—how to deal with inactive chapters and how to keep PKD solvent. Here Jim DeMoux, chairman of the Charter and Standards Committee, and Ted Karl, secretary-treasurer, give serious consideration to the matters at hand.
When a national officer leaves for a Summer Council Meeting he may be told, "Have a nice vacation!" The "nice vacation 1976" included this meeting schedule with breaks only for meals: Wednesday, 1:15 PM—10:05 PM; Thursday, 8:35 AM—5:00 PM, followed by an outing to inspect the salmon bake facilities; Friday, 8:30 AM—12 midnight; Saturday, 12 midnight—1:15 AM, 9:00 AM—11:45 AM, with President Ulrey and Secretary-Treasurer Karl remaining for afternoon meetings with the hotel personnel. Pictured above after a long day are Council Members Phyllis Bosley and Tom Harte, flanking Editor Carolyn Keefe.

Past President John Baird (left) is shown with Jack Starr, Council member, and Jim Clymer and Tana Johnson, student members. Professor Larry Richardson (not pictured), one of the tournament hosts, conferred with the Council about arrangements and facilities. Ice water was consumed voluminously.
OUTCOMES AND COME-ONS
FROM THE 1976 SUMMER
MEETING OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL

General Business
* All schools with problem chapters, considered as such before or at the
Omaha Convention of 1973, not having been heard from as attending a
national or provincial convention or not having submitted membership
applications, the Charter and Stan-
dards Committee shall contact such
institutions with the intention of the
revocation of their charters.

* Subscriptions for The Forensic, starting
with the October 1976 issue, shall be
$7.50 per year and $18.00 for three
years. Unexpired subscriptions will be
honored at the old rate.

* All chapters on probation will be cut
to one copy per issue of The Forensic.

* In light of the financial situation of the
fraternity, the National Council will
recommend that the Seattle Conven-
tion enact a dues increase.

* The National Council will encourage
more alumni chapter involvement
with the national organization.

Seattle Convention Business
* The 1977 Nationals will run from
March 18-22.

* The topic for the speech to entertain
will be "Tall Tales."

* The discussion question will be: "What
should be the policy of the federal
government toward the development
of alternative sources of energy?"

* The general area for the Lincoln-
Douglas debate will concern the
selection process for the United States
Presidency.

* The general area for extemporaneous
speaking will concern United States
foreign policy, and specific questions
will focus on U.S. relations with the
Communist Block, the Third World,
and our Allies.

* The registration fee for the Conven-
tion will be $40.00 per person and will
include a boat trip, a salmon bake on
Blake Island, and the awards banquet.
Hotel costs will range from $8.00 per
person daily rate for a triple or quad
to $18.00 daily rate for a single, ex-
cluding tax.

* Specific details of the ITX flight plan
will be sent by the Seattle hosts.
Typical examples of savings over the
regular fare are $69.00 from Chicago,
$75.00 from Columbus, $76.00 from
Milwaukee, $91.00 from New York,
and $87.00 from Raleigh/Durham. For
these savings you must leave before 2
PM (local time), Friday, March 18.

The January Forensic will carry com-
plete details of the contest rules and
the schedule.

SEE YOU IN SEATTLE!
"How can our chapter finance the trip to Seattle in 1977?"

A crucial question with no easy answer. Unless your forensic program is among the fortunate few, your regular budget will not cover the tremendous expense involved in both reaching and attending our 1977 Convention/Tournament. Since the event is an attractive one that ought not be missed due to a lack of finances, many schools, particularly those east of the Mississippi, must resort to fund raising activities. The purpose of this column, then, is to present suggestions obtained from various PKD'ers, suggestions accompanied by some “editorial comment.” It is hoped that these ideas, presented in a fraternal spirit, will help you reach Seattle.

1) THE USUAL — Bake sales and car washes. Although probably not large money raisers, they can be helpful.

2) BOOSTER MEMBERSHIPS — Most merchants in college towns usually do ample business with students and faculty. They are, therefore, often willing to help support worthwhile student endeavors. So, why not contact them, explain your needs, and promise to publicize the fact that your participation in a national tournament was partially supported by them? Merchants love publicity. Athletic teams have tapped them for years, and several of our Pi Kap chapters have also reported success with this technique. Although not merchants in the business sense of the word, your local Bar Association or Lawyers Guild can make an excellent starting point. Some of your local lawyers might even be former forensic participants.

3) RAFFLE — Contact a local merchant and persuade him (for the same reasons listed above) to donate an appealing prize. Raffle it off.

4) 50-50 LOTTERY — Perhaps an even bigger fund raiser than the raffle. A local printer can usually be persuaded to donate your lottery tickets or to provide them at cost. Members of the forensic squad can sell tickets throughout their classes and door-to-door in dormitories. Coaches and sympathetic faculty members can solicit from their colleagues, friends, etc. The prize (50% of the sales) is an attractive one and people are usually willing to “gamble.” One final tip—try to sell your first ticket to your college president and have your campus newspaper cover it.

5) ALUMNI SOLICITATION — Ask your campus alumni director to publish an appeal for funds in a forthcoming alumni bulletin or newsletter. If you’re really energetic, go through alumni files and select targets for a direct letter campaign. Good targets are former members of your forensic program, lawyers, people in politics (at any level), and people in business. Such an approach gives you a chance to practice some of that persuasion which forensics teaches. If you succeed in finding someone who shows great interest in your program, why not “reward” your benefactor by making him/her an honorary member of your chapter? Our fraternity allows us honorary memberships, and we are often remiss by not using them for our own benefit.

Remember — no matter what fund raiser you try, one may not be enough.
WILKES COLLEGE JOINS FRATERNITY

The first tournament/convention of the Province of the Colonies was the occasion for the installation of Pennsylvania Omicron from Wilkes College. The installation team consisted of Governor Patrick Miller (California State), Lieutenant Governor Harry Strine and Professor Erich Frohman (Bloomsburg State), and students Debbie Bens and Mona Harper (California State). Representing the National Council was The Forensic editor, Professor Carolyn Keefe (West Chester State).

Wilkes' participation in intercollegiate forensics began almost at the time the college was founded in 1933. By 1955 Wilkes was ranked as one of the top colleges in national debate competition; however, from 1958-1973, the program was inactive. During the last few years forensics has been reactivated, and Wilkes College has once again begun to climb the ladder of success.

With inexperienced but very spirited students, Wilkes Debate Union in 1975-76 brought to the college thirty-two honors/trophies. The philosophy of the Union is that forensics provides students with an outlet for expression and teaches skills and techniques which will be useful after graduation. Learning and fellowship, along with discipline, are stressed. Winning of "hardware" is of secondary importance to the Wilkes debaters.

Bradford L. Kinney, sponsor of the new chapter, has been associated with Pi Kappa Delta from the days he sponsored North Carolina Epsilon at Appalachian State University. Professor Kinney received his undergraduate training at Florida Southern College in Lakeland, Florida, and just recently was awarded the Ph.D. from the University of Pittsburgh. In 1973 Professor Kinney was hired by Wilkes College to revive its program in intercollegiate forensics. He views membership in Pi Kappa Delta as a major step in the development of a strong forensic program.

Sponsor Brad Kinney, (back row right) with newly inducted members (left to right) Nina Maris, Harriet Smith, David Evans, Ann Wall, Kim Witherow, and Marcia Stratton.
MORE TOURNAMENT RESULTS FROM THE PROVINCES


Sweepstakes
Superior: University of Southwestern Louisiana, Southwest Baptist College, Evangel College, Harding College.
Excellent: Central Missouri State University, Stephen F. Austin State University, Henderson State University, William Jewell College, Louisiana Polytechnic University.

Debate (Standard)
Superior: Quimby and Gieringer (Central Mo. State University); Steinshover and Wallace (Southwest Baptist); Deslatte and Bowles (University of Southwestern La.); Myers and Smith (La. State University at Shreveport); Kebodeaux and Powell (Lamar University).
Excellent: Bakewell and Farmer (Southeast Mo. State University); Schmitt and Hill (William Jewell); Arrington and Collette (Stephen F. Austin State University); Paine and Cardot, White and Heed (Harding).

Debate (Cross Examination)
Superior: Arceneaux and Domingue, Berdages and Jordan (University of Southwestern La.); Kendrick and Bell (Henderson State University).
Excellent: Holt and Bershelt (Southeast Mo. State University); Biles and Pittman (La. Tech. University).

Oral Interpretation
Superior: Smith (Southwest Baptist); Jones (University of Southwestern La.); Kendrick (Henderson State University); Paine (Harding).
Excellent: Brimeyer (Evangel); Veitenko (Central Mo. State University); Haden (William Jewell); Winnfield and Jucas (University of Central Ark.); Govang (Northeast La. University); Reece and Merritte (Tex. A&I University).

Dramatic Duo Interpretation
Superior: Zilinski and Gideon (Evangel); Plech and Nibleck (Stephen F. Austin State University).
Excellent: Smith and Sublett (Southwest Baptist); Jones and Gay (Central Mo. State University); Morrow and Lindsay (La. Tech. University).

Oratory
Superior: Berra (Central Mo. State University); Syberg (Northeast Mo. State University); Klopfenstein (William Jewell); Arceneaux (University of Southwestern La.).
Excellent: Gideon (Evangel); Steinshover and Smith (Southwest Baptist); Judice (Northeast La. University); Heed (Harding); Benitiz (Southeastern La. University).

Informative Speaking
Superior: Gideon (Evangel); Arnett (Southwest Baptist); Klopfenstein (William Jewell).
Excellent: Farmer and Borchelt (Southeast Mo. State University); Brimeyer (Evangel); Dillahunty (Henderson State University); Pittman (La. Tech. University); Jones (Harding).

Extemporaneous Speaking
Superior: Arceneaux (University of Southwestern La.); Franklin (Evangel); Harris and Moore (Southwest Baptist).
Excellent: Cardot (Harding); Juneau (McNeese State University); Meyers (La. State University at Shreveport); Bowen (Evangel); Schmitt (William Jewell); Zepeda (Tex. A&I University); Hyden (Angelo State University).

Discussion
Superior: Travostro and Klopfenstein (William Jewell); McChesney (University of Southwestern La.).
Excellent: Patrick (University of Southwestern La.); Dye (Southwest Baptist); D'Angelo (Central Mo. State University); Delaney (Harding); Wolff (Northeast Mo. State University); Zepeda (Tex. A&I University).

PROVINCE OF THE LAKES

Sweepstakes
Superior: Clarion State College, Otterbein College.
Excellent: Northern Michigan University.

Debate
Superior: Northern Michigan University, Towson State College, Edinboro State College.

Oral Interpretation
Superior: Debbie Jackson (University of Akron); Virginia Kennedy (Defiance).

Persuasion
Superior: Sondra Tett (Northern Michigan University); Steven Black (Otterbein).

Extemporaneous Speaking
Superior: Becky Coleman (Otterbein).

After-Dinner Speaking
Superior: Jay Truxal (Clarion State).

Discussion
Superior: Steve Matthews (Defiance).

FREE OFFER
Bob Lyon, sponsor of Montana Alpha at Rocky Mountain College in Billings, writes: "We would welcome a few squads to stop off here at Rocky enroute West (or East). We'd give them free housing in return for a public debate or similar type of public program. Two interstates, an Amtrak train, two bus lines, and three airlines come through this city."
MORE ELECTION RESULTS

Province of the Lower Mississippi
Governor: Tony Allison, Cameron University; Lieutenant Governor: Dencil Taylor, Midwestern State University; Secretary-Treasurer: Donna Tobias, Texas A&I University.

Province of the Lakes
Governor: Don E. Hines, Otterbein College; Lieutenant Governor: James Sayer, Wright State University; Secretary-Treasurer: Elizabeth Roberts, Ohio Northern University.

The 1976-78 officers of the Province of the Lakes are Elizabeth Roberts, Don Hines, and Jim Sayer. For specific offices, see above.

FINANCIAL REPORT
AUGUST 1, 1975 — JULY 31, 1976

RECEIPTS

Fees, Certificates, and Decals ........................................ $8,270.15
Charter Fees ........................................................................ 175.00
Keys .............................................................................. 670.05
The Forensic ........................................................................ 173.50
Province Medals and Certificates ....................................... 611.12
Bank Balance, August 1, 1975 ............................................ 4,028.35
$13,928.17

EXPENDITURES

The Forensic ................................................................. $5,020.68
Keys .............................................................................. 549.81
Secretary-Treasurer's Office ............................................. 2,503.44
Printing and Postage ....................................................... 1,155.66
Questions Committee ....................................................... 541.23
Province Certificates and Medals ................................. 387.06
Audit .............................................................................. 35.00
NSF Checks ................................................................. 52.50
Refunds .......................................................................... 41.50
Summer Council Meeting ............................................... 2,604.68
Bank Balance, July 31, 1976 ............................................. 832.57
$13,724.13

Income from Medal Inventory Surplus ....................... 204.04
$13,928.17

STATEMENT OF ASSETS OWNED

Savings Certificate .......................................................... $12,000.00
Savings Certificate .......................................................... 3,390.96
Savings Account .............................................................. 33.22
Bank Balance on Hand, July 31, 1976 ............................ 832.57
$16,256.75

To Whom It May Concern:
This is to certify that I have examined the books and records of Pi Kappa Delta Forensic Fraternity for the period of August 1, 1975, to July 31, 1976, inclusive.

The foregoing statement is prepared in conjunction with Theodore O. H. Karl, according to established form, and is a true and correct report of the financial status as of this date.

Ann Walton, Accountant

BYD NATIONAL EVENT WINNERS
FROM PKD SCHOOLS
(Listing does not imply PKD individual membership)

Katina Cummings (Marshall University), Thomas A. Doyle (Baylor University), Ann Marie Goltz (Augustana College), William Holloran, Jr. (Old Dominion University), Dwight Maltby (Wheaton College), Dwight Rabuse (Macalester College), Robbi Rowe (Stetson University), Rudy Serra (Central Michigan University), Joel Steiner (Arizona State University), Patricia Whitman (West Chester State College), and Scot Wrighton (Sterling College).

Former National President Roy Murphy, head of the department of speech at the University of southwestern Louisiana, displays a plaque honoring him for his PKD service. With him is Ron McCrory, immediate past governor of the Province of the Lower Mississippi. Professor Murphy received his honor at the joint provincials held at his school.
SOUTHWEST BAPTIST COLLEGE
Reporter: Bob Derryberry

The Southwest Baptist College debate and individual events squad completed a rewarding 1975-76 academic year. The year, marked by new members and some new tournaments, involved seventeen students in some kind of intercollegiate forensic competition. Students competed in over 130 rounds of debate and 295 rounds of individual events.

Year highlights included two first place sweepstakes awards, two seconds, one third, and one fourth. The SWBC squad placed second in total sweepstakes points at the Biprovincial Tournament in Lafayette, Louisiana.

Missouri Sigma officers for 1976 are: Darrell Moore, president; Randy Arnett, vice-president; Sharla Boyce, secretary-treasurer; and Roger House, historian. Bob Derryberry is chapter sponsor.

SOUTHEAST MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY
Reporter: Susan K. Farmer

The Missouri Iota chapter at Cape Girardeau is looking forward to another productive and profitable forensic season. Last year the SEMO debaters were fortunate to accumulate over twenty awards and presumptuous enough to put the "hardware" on display at the main entrance to the campus library. Visibility has not been one of our problems. Perhaps the highlight of last season was the "short cut" which the squad made through New Orleans as the group returned from the PKD Biprovincial Tournament in Lafayette, Louisiana. The team loses one of the school's most outstanding debaters but gains an additional faculty sponsor. Leaving for Jefferson City where she and her husband (also a former SEMO debater) will coach high school forensics is Ketrina Bakewell; joining the staff is Brad Brann, a native Kansan, who will work with the debate program. This year also marks the start of an energetic recruiting and scholarship program aimed at promising high school seniors. The squad is looking forward to forensic progressions, student congresses, audience debates, and mock trials to complement the tournament format. One possibility being investigated is a debate with students in a foreign country via tape recordings.

HARDING COLLEGE
Reporter: Richard Paine

The past year was a successful one for Harding College, Arkansas Zeta chapter, as her debate and individual events squads won a total of about 100 awards, including such honors as first place sweepstakes at Louisiana Tech, first place sweepstakes at the University of...
Arkansas at Fayetteville, first place sweepstakes at Murray State, superior sweepstakes at the biprovincials, and sixth place sweepstakes in individual events at Bradley University. In debate, Harding teams took first place six times, were finalists four times, semifinalists eight times, quarterfinalists twice, and received two ratings of excellent at the biprovincials. Also in debate, Harding speakers were awarded six individual speaker awards. In individual events, Harding competitors won nine first places, six second places, six third places, one fourth place, and one fifth place. In addition, squad members reached final rounds sixteen other times, semifinals once, were rated superior eight times, and excellent twelve times.

Other activities of the squad included hosting the Annual Harding High School Invitational, sponsoring and intramural speech tournament on the campus, and attendance at the workshop of the University of Arkansas at Little Rock.

Next year will be a rebuilding year for Harding since only between four and six of this year's fourteen-man squad will be returning. We have some promising new prospects, however, and are looking forward to the National Convention and Tournament in Seattle.

LOUISIANA TECH UNIVERSITY

Reporter: Marty Beasley

Amidst water skiing, card playing, barbeque-supper eating, and other frivolity, Louisiana Delta chapter found time for important year-end chapter business. Meeting at the Louisiana Tech Camp on Lake D'Arbonne, active members and alumni initiated the following new members: Jim Biles, Mike Cook, Sherry Davidson, Vanessa Lindsay, Syrone Morrow, and Ron Pittman. Newly installed officers include Jim Biles, president; Gerald Page, vice-president; Vanessa Lindsay, secretary-treasurer; Sherry Davidson, historian; and Mike Cook, projects chairman.

Two state winners in the Bicentennial Youth Debates were from the Louisiana Tech squad: Jim Biles, Lincoln-Douglas debate, and Mike Cook, persuasive speaking.

Freshman winners of the T. C. Beasley Memorial Forensic Scholarship were recently announced. Joining the squad under scholarship this year are Lowell Davis and Dean Robertson.

Plans are already underway for Louisiana Tech's annual College and University Forensic Tournament, October 22-23. The tournament includes two divisions of debate and five open individual events contests. Anyone wishing further information may contact Dr. Marty Beasley, Box 4505 T. S., Louisiana Tech University, Ruston, Louisiana, 71270, after September 10.

MOUNT UNION COLLEGE

province of the lakes

Reporter: Sue Tiffany

The Ohio Mu chapter at Mount Union held its annual
awards banquet on June 3, 1976.

John Case, Randi Funkhouser, Joe Keyser, and Jeff Smith were initiated into the order of debate. New members who participated in individual speaking were: Karen Davis, Judy Helman, and Sue Tiffany. Davis participated in oral interpretation, Helman in persuasive speaking, and Tiffany in broadcast and impromptu speaking.

Dr. James Vincent, chairman of the speech and drama department, was named as Ohio Mu's honorary member. Vincent was cited for his contributions to the development of communication activities at Mount Union.

Current Ohio Mu members Ralph Jentes and Bob DeBula received the degree of honor. Dick Ingles was awarded the degree of highest distinction in individual speaking. According to Ohio Mu records, Ingles is the second person to receive this degree in the chapter's thirteen-year history.

Election and installation of officers was also conducted. Ed Barr, president during the 1975-76 school year, handed the gavel over to Bob DeBula. Sue Tiffany was elected vice-president and Judy Helman secretary-treasurer.

The members of Ohio Mu wish to thank their sponsor, Dr. Sam Geonetta, for his help and encouragement through the year.

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-
EAU CLAIRE

The University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire had to go in three different directions within a month when the debaters went to Boston, thirteen speakers attended the NFA at Cal. State in Los Angeles, and two orators went to the Interstate Oratorical Association in Gatlinburg, Tennessee.

The accumulation of eighty-seven trophies in one year and the following outstanding achievements made 1975-76 a year that Eau Claire will long remember. 1) The individual events students won every single IE tournament of the Twin City League, in most cases almost doubling the points of the nearest competitors. 2) The team won the Wisconsin Collegiate Association Championship which includes both debate and individual events, and this was the seventh consecutive year. 3) The two orators sent to Interstates took first and second places, thus bringing the number of Interstate orators coached by Grace Walsh to twenty and the number of her first placers to five.

Grace Walsh and Robert Lapp are expecting another big squad this year at Eau Claire. Their hope is realistic in light of the immediate past record and the loss of only two graduating seniors. Eau Claire has always had one of the largest PKD chapter memberships in the fraternity.

The chapter sponsors and cooperates on many campus projects: a forensic conference, a discussion clinic, a debate tournament, a district forensic contest, and a summer speech institute. In these ways and others PKD members help to serve the cause of forensics on campus.
The Chapter News deadline for the January issue is November 6. Any material received after that date will be held over for the next issue. Please type (double space) all reports. Clear black and white photographs are welcomed. Send chapter news to: Professor Ada Mae Haury, Associate Editor, The Forensic, Bethel College, North Newton, KS 67117.

Forensic Forum
(Continued from page 23)

you have a large amount of money to raise, you'll probably have to rely on a combination of approaches. At Edinboro, for instance, we are utilizing numbers 2, 4, and 5. Hopefully, your efforts will succeed. But whatever the financial outcome, there is almost certain to be one significant fringe benefit — publicity. From your fund raising efforts, people will know that a dedicated and enthusiastic forensic group exists on campus. And is there any forensic program anywhere that doesn't need such publicity?

Associate Editor Beagle welcomes questions on any aspect of forensics. Address him at Edinboro State College, Edinboro, PA 16444.

Secretary's Page
(Continued from page 19)

membership fees. In 1965 the Convention raised the fees from $7.50 to $10.00, and fees have remained at that level ever since. In this office, as in every area of the economy, inflation has set in with a vengeance. If one stops to think that Pi Kappa Delta has operated on a decreasing annual income during the past five years while the costs have increased tremendously, the problem is understandable. The increase in memberships during the past year has tempered the loss somewhat, but it is still a decrease of slightly over one hundred of the average for the last ten years. Please discuss this matter in your own chapter and with others in your province, and come to the Convention prepared to consider this issue. We hope for a decision that will be for the good of the fraternity.

We in the Northwest Province hope that each chapter will find it possible, even with some sacrifice of other things, to be represented in Seattle. We guarantee that you will leave the Great Northwest with many pleasant memories of the experience, that your trip will be worthwhile, and that you will want to return on your own at some future date.
Opposition to the Constitution (Continued from page 9)

6Nevins and Commager, p. 116.
8Heffner, p. 23.
9See Elliot, pp. 482-91.
10Ibid., pp. 482-91, 494-96, 503-505.
11Elliot, III, 652.

Alexander Campbell (Continued from page 13)

4Richardson, II, 13.
6Richardson, II, 90.
16Ibid., p. 74.
17Ibid., p. 75.
18Ibid.
19For a more complete discussion of the kinds of changes Campbell often made in his arguments see: James N. Holm, Jr., Alexander Campbell’s Debate With Robert Owen, April 1829: The Effect Of A Rhetorical Event On The Speaker (Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1976), pp. 73-80.
23Ibid.
24Ibid., p. 38.
25Ibid., pp. 38-42.
27Ibid., pp. 199-200.

Who will be the 50,000th member of PKD? Watch for him/her in a future issue. The January issue will carry an up-to-date list of new members.
A MESSAGE FROM THE TWO STUDENT MEMBERS ON THE NATIONAL COUNCIL

We enumerate a dozen Seattle Convention attractions:

1. Authentic Indian salmon bake at Blake Island
2. Seattle waterfront
3. Space Needle at Seattle Center
4. Pacific Science Center at Seattle Center
5. International Food Circus
6. Lunching with a Gooey Duck
7. Pioneer Square
8. Underground City
9. Ferry ride across Puget Sound to Bremerton
10. The Kingdome
11. Mt. Rainier, the tallest mountain in the Continental United States
12. The fun, fellowship, and competition that are part of every PKD national convention and tournament

SEE YOU IN SEATTLE!

Tana Johnson, Montana State University
Jim Clymer, Pacific Lutheran University

A Word From The Editor...

The other day as I was absorbing some authentic Bicentennialism in the exhibit area of The Pennsylvania Historical Society, I came upon a sign which read: “The Times are Dreadful, Dismal, Doleful, Dolorous, and Dollar-less.” An alliterating colonial editor typeset the sentence in a small stamp-shaped block, decorated it with a skull and crossbones, and ran it on the front page of his paper. This was his way, on the October 31, 1765 eve of the Stamp Act, of showing his disdain and alarm. Editor William Bradford of The Pennsylvania Journal and Weekly Advertiser chose to shut down his publication rather than to purchase the tested stamped paper. His last edition ran a front page banner: “Expiring in Hopes of a Resurrection to Life again.” Some editors who joined the boycott made dire predictions of how the action would affect their personal finances, and they begged their debtors to pay up.

In this Bicentennial year our fraternity has its own financial problems which have been brought on by an enemy every bit as recalcitrant as the British. We all know what the incessant demands of inflation have done to the cost of goods and services. Pi Kappa Delta has not escaped these effects, although the current low fees give the impression that we think it has. Ten dollars is totally incapable of stretching to pay for all the goods and services provided by the organization. That amount will not even cover the eight to twelve issues of The Forensic which a student receives during a two or three-year membership.

The action needed to cope with our “enemy” will not require the sacrifice of one’s fortune. A realistic fees increase and a stepped-up recruitment of new members will keep our fraternity from expiring with only the gloomiest hope of a resurrection to life again.

Carolyn Keefe