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On January 27, 1977, two weeks after his inaugural address, President Jimmy Carter spoke to the 25th Annual National Prayer Breakfast. Neither the speech nor the event would appear worthy of attention. Appearances at such gatherings are routine in the lives of chief executives. Speeches delivered on these ceremonial occasions seldom contain important policy statements or comments of interest to the larger public. This speech would be no exception, save for an anecdote in which Carter revealed a conflict with his staff over the religious orientation of his inaugural address. In the Prayer Breakfast address, Carter tells of the disagreement and relates his desires for the inaugural.

Comparison of the Prayer Breakfast address and the Inaugural reveals a man caught between conflicting forms of religious expression. The speeches feature two verses of scripture depicting very different relationships of God and Nation. II Chronicles 7:14, the verse in the Prayer Breakfast address, casts God as Father and Judge, with national blessing based on public humility and acknowledgement of sin. The Inaugural uses Micah 6:8, which presents God and Nation as partners. Repentance is unnecessary; God's blessing is assumed by virtue of the partnership. Carter's personal religious convictions led him to favor the repentance formula, while his staff believed the partnership metaphor more suitable for the inaugural occasion. The President's compromise with his convictions produced an inaugural that was colorless and uninspiring, adjectives that aptly describe Carter's presidential image in the four years following the occasion.

Carter's remarks to the Prayer Breakfast audience of four thousand—members of Congress, Justices of the Supreme Court, and prominent business and civic leaders from throughout the nation—followed a stirring introductory sermon by House Majority Leader James Wright of Texas. Wright spoke of the need for personal conversion, humility, and a "new beginning in national life." Moved by Wright's remarks, Carter led the crowd in a

Mrs. Japp is a Ph.D. candidate at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln.

1 Both are forms of American civil religion, defined by Novak as the "public perception of our national experience, in the light of universal and transcendent claims upon human beings, but especially upon Americans; a set of values, symbols, and rituals institutionalized as the cohesive force and center of meaning uniting our many peoples." Hart distinguishes between "official" civic piety, the political-religious language of state occasions, and "unofficial" civic piety, that of subgroups on the political scene. See also Novak's "high church" and "low church" forms of civil religion. Michael Novak, Choosing Our King: Powerful Symbols in Presidential Politics (New York: Macmillan, 1974), p. 127; 131–32; Roderick P. Hart, The Political Pulpit (West Lafayette, Ind.: Purdue University Press, 1977), pp. 18–22.

2 Edward E. Plowman, "New Church Member in Town," Christianity Today (Feb. 18 1977), 54; Program of the 25th Annual National Prayer Breakfast.
standing ovation and, in an apparently spontaneous response, began by relating an incident involving his inaugural address:

I thought, in response to some of the things Jim said, I would talk about humility this morning. The first draft of the inaugural speech did not include the reference to Micah's admonition about justice and mercy and humility. But I had chosen instead First [Second] Chronicles 7:14, which Congressman Wright quoted this morning: "If my people who are called by my name shall humble themselves and seek my face and turn from their wicked ways, then will I hear from Heaven and forgive their sins and heal their land."

When his staff read the draft, Carter related, "they rose up in opposition to that verse." He rewrote the speech, but retained II Chronicles 7:14 in the second draft. His staff, he recalled:

came to me en masse and said: "The people will not understand that verse. It's as though you, being elected President, are condemning the other people of our country, putting yourself in the position of Solomon and saying that all Americans are wicked."

Yielding to their pressure, Carter replaced II Chronicles 7:14 with Micah 6:8 ("He hath showed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God.") , thereby altering the tone and direction of his inaugural address.*

Apparently still disturbed by the substitution and its implications, Carter told the Prayer Breakfast audience:

So correctly or wrongly, I changed it to Micah. And I think this episode, which is true, is illustrative of the problem that we face. Sometimes we take for granted that an acknowledgment of sin, an acknowledgement of the need for humility permeates the consciousness of people. But it doesn't.

Whereupon he discarded his prepared text for the occasion and in the spirit of II Chronicles 7:14 delivered an extemporaneous sermon calling for national humility and repentance, drawing, one suspects, from thoughts he had hoped to include in his inaugural address.

Carter could not have chosen a more fitting occasion for the repentance theme of II Chronicles 7:14 than the National Prayer Breakfast. The breakfast is sponsored by "the fellowship," formerly International Christian Leadership, a little-publicized "underground network" of prominent evangelicals dedicated to the service of America's holy trinity—God, Individual, and Nation.® The group's dedication to Piety, Capitalism and Nationalism is beautifully symbolized by the trio who inaugurated the first Presidential Prayer Breakfast in 1953—Billy Graham, America's prophet; Conrad Hilton, her

---


® The prayer breakfast formula was the inspiration of a Norwegian immigrant, Abraham Veriede. Distressed by corruption of local government in Seattle, Veriede persuaded the major and prominent business leaders to meet for prayer and Bible study. Veriede and his converts spread the idea across the nation and founded "the fellowship," now located in Washington, D.C. See Norman Grubb, The Modern Viking (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan Press, 1961).
ultimate entrepreneur; and Dwight Eisenhower, her soldier-president. From its inception, the fellowship has promoted a smooth blend of religion and politics, exhorting prominent public officials to humble themselves and repent in the company of other penitents, in order to assure God's blessing on their collective endeavors, from the battlefield to the corporate boardroom.

Although prayer breakfasts are held weekly in numerous cities throughout the country, the Washington groups, close to the hallowed halls of Government, epitomize the goals of the fellowship. A number of groups meet each week on Capitol Hill. One observer describes the breakfasts:

Removed from the noise and numbers of the clamorous world in which they move, they seek to hear the voice of God rather than that of vox populi. The welfare of America, always precious in their sight, becomes more so as its realization is interpreted by a member of the Group who, from their study of the Scriptures, knows that national longevity, prosperity and happiness are conditioned by sound morality stemming from obedience to divine laws.*

Whatever their personal religious convictions, many legislators attend these sessions. The repentance theme figures prominently in the language of group gatherings, although members seldom retain that emphasis in public statements on the floors of Congress or for the media.

The occasion of the National Prayer Breakfast, with members of the fellowship and others in attendance, called forth Carter's frustrated desire to lead the nation in a public ritual of national repentance, a mission he had hoped to accomplish in the Inaugural. His message to this group, in fact, employs the formula of the classic Puritan jeremiad. As summarized by Kurt Ritter, the Jeremiad features a sin-repentance-reform theme which is developed in the address, applies religious doctrine to political affairs, and views Americans as "God's chosen people with a special mission and destiny." The Jeremiad is delivered by a "scolding prophet" who is also "at the same time a part of the community."*

Carter introduces the repentance theme with II Chronicles 7:14 and develops that theme throughout the address:

Sometimes we take for granted that an acknowledgement of sin, an acknowledgement of the need for humility, permeates the consciousness of our people. But it doesn't. But if we know that we can have God's forgiveness as a person, I think as a nation, it makes it much easier for us to say, "God, have mercy on me, a sinner," knowing that the only compensation for sin is condemnation.

Repeatedly referring to America's mission and destiny as leader of the free world, Carter reminds his audience that America is respected throughout the world "because of the vision of our forefathers that has inspired us," but that we also have caused in the world "a deep sense of disappointment that we don't live up to those original hopes and expectations and ideals."

Carter expounds at length on humility—individual and collective— remarking that it is often "easier for us to be humble as individuals than it is

---

* Grubb, p. 113.
for us to admit that our nation makes mistakes.” Dwelling on our national shortcomings, the President continues:

We can indeed be strong enough and sure enough to admit our sinfulness and our mistakes. We can indeed be constantly searching for a way to rectify our errors and let our Nation exemplify what we as individuals ought to be in the eyes of God. But it’s a hard thing to do.

At times, Carter approaches the air of scolding prophet, quite probably the tone his staff had perceived in the rejected drafts of the Inaugural. Yet even as Carter chides the nation, he remembers that he is one of us, our servant, and as prone to pride and error as we. He demonstrates his personal humility by his willingness to be our leader: “Whosoever would be chief among you, let him be His servant.” As President, Carter fulfills this demand; he is the “chief public servant.”

Appropriate though this message was for the Prayer Breakfast, why did Carter, if his revelation about the first drafts of the Inaugural was truthful, feel that II Chronicles and the language of repentance were suitable for an inaugural address? Surely the President realized that, whatever its usefulness in the past, the Puritan jeremiad no longer controls the politico-religious rhetoric of state occasions. Modern America prefers a modern jeremiad, one which affirms America’s mission without the sting of sin or the necessity for repentance. Carter’s staff convinced the President that the inaugural occasion would not be served by a Puritan jeremiad. Especially on such occasions, America appears to demand a different, more secular sermon addressing national destiny.

American presidents call upon God in their inaugurals, of course. In recent years, however, Carter’s God of Justice was seldom invited to the event. Rod Hart delineates the pantheon of Presidential inaugurals: God the Inscrutable Potentate, God the Witnessing Author, God the Wise and Just, God the Genial Philanthropist, and God the Object of Affection, and notes:

From the standpoint of the inaugurals, at least, God the Wise and the Just was a rather reluctant wellspring of justice . . . More often, He contented Himself with enlightening the minds of His servants and left the business of justice to human agents.

The Puritan god has been replaced by a god who “is not vengeful, nor does he typically punish those who transgress his laws.”

Although the God of Justice may have vacated the temples of Washington, he is firmly in residence in the country churches of Carter’s Georgia as well as in many other parts of the land. A neophyte on the Washington scene and unskilled in the rhetoric of the dominant civil religion, Carter brought with him his own form of civic piety. Throughout his campaign, Carter had skillfully woven his personal religion into his public discourse. His candidacy reactivated an older form of civic piety, a form no longer vocalized on political occasions, but a form which remains latent in Amer-

---

10 Hart, p. 74.
ica's liberal religions and continues to be active in her fundamental-evangelical churches.\footnote{Novak, pp. 131-35.}

For Carter, the Prayer Breakfast evangelicals, and many other Americans, the sin-repentance-blessing sequence is a necessary ingredient in expressions of private and public piety. Never deeply concerned with maintaining the distinction between church and state in public rhetoric, this form of civic piety uses Israel as its archetype. "It sees faithfulness to national mission as obedience to God. National success and national righteousness are intertwined."\footnote{Novak, p. 135.} Success cannot be achieved unless righteousness prevails. As with the jeremiads of old, however, the act of repentance is not an act of despair, but a reaffirmation of chosen status. Man, or nation, does not repent to become the chosen people, but because they are the chosen. Indeed, Carter equates confession and repentance with strength, not with weakness: "We can be strong enough and sure enough to admit our sinfulness and our mistakes."

Carter's form of civic piety demanded that he begin his term of office with confession and repentance in order to insure the blessing and partnership of his God. Personal humility alone was not sufficient, however. He felt called to lead the nation through the sin-repentance-reform sequence to cleanse America of her sins. The collective guilt of Watergate appeared to be much on Carter's mind, expressed in the repeated references to "sins", "errors", and "mistakes" contained in the Prayer Breakfast address.\footnote{See Keeping the Faith: Memoirs of a President (Toronto: Bantam, 1982), p. 20.} By the requirements of Carter's civic piety, America had yet to confess collective guilt. If Israel of old had sinned by unknowingly harboring a thief, so post-Watergate America was contaminated by association with a dishonest leader.\footnote{See Joshua 7: 1-26. Even if only one of the chosen people had sinned, the entire community shared in the guilt and God's blessing was withheld until the sinner was punished and the repentant community restored to favor.} True, the sinner himself had been humbled. But the ritual process of public repentance seemed prematurely aborted by President Ford's pardon of the transgressor.\footnote{James F. Klumpp and Thomas Hollihan describe the ritual of sociodramatic sacrifice as follows: "Piety or belief in a given order begins the process; from negation of the piety comes an embarrassment that rhetorical attention heightens into pollution; which in turn demands designation of the guilty; who are then sacrificed in the ritual of purification; which establishes redemption." See "Debunking the Resignation of Earl Butz: Sacrificing an Official Racist," Quarterly Journal of Speech 65 (1979), 4n.} Had purification been accomplished? Not according to II Chronicles 7:14, which demands a collective acknowledgement of guilt for restoration and blessing.

Carter's desire to use II Chronicles 7:14 in the Inaugural was grounded in his conviction that he must lead the nation through the ritual of repentance and renewal into the "new beginning" he wished to characterize his term of office. Carter's staff understood precisely what he had in mind. Rightly interpreting his attempt to assign collective guilt for past sins, they objected that he was "condemning the other people of our country... saying that all Americans are wicked." More attuned than he to the winds of Washington, they perceived II Chronicles as a discordant note in the harmony of...
inaugural piety. The guilt-repentance theme of Carter’s civic piety, they felt, would be unacceptable within the framework of an inaugural address.

Apparently convinced, Carter abandoned his choice and substituted a more acceptable God, the God of Micah 6:8. He could not merely switch scripture references, however. The substitution called for a corresponding change in language: a different perception of the relationship of God and Nation. When we turn to the Inaugural, we find America not sick, wicked, and in need of repentance, but whole and strong. There is no call for sacrifice or reconciliation. Instead, Carter thanks his predecessor “for all he has done to heal our land.” He defines the purpose of the Inaugural, not as a repentance ritual, but as a confirmation of strength and purpose: “In this outward and physical ceremony we attest once again to the inner and spiritual strength of our nation.” Quoting the maxim of his high-school teacher—“We must adjust to changing times and still hold to unchanging principles”—Carter embraces the more modern form of politico-religious expression.

Watergate and other failures are no longer sins to be confessed, but “recent mistakes.” He calls not for an acknowledgment of guilt but for a “resurgent commitment to the basic principles of our nation.” Gone are the embarrassing references to wickedness, the threats of judgment and calls for repentance. Carter declares his personal humility but presents America as wise and strong: “Your strength can compensate for my weakness, and your wisdom can help minimize my mistakes.” America will be born again, without the ritual of repentance: “This inauguration ceremony marks a new beginning, a new dedication within our government and a new spirit among us all.” The God of Micah 6:8 requires only token humility. Man walks with God, careful to remain deferential. Unthreatened, the American dream endures. We must once again have faith in our country and in one another. “America can be better. We can be even stronger than before.” Our task is to “shape a just and peaceful world that is truly humane.” The Nation is united, not by the repentance ritual, but by “our belief in an undiminished, ever-expanding American dream.” Focusing upon America’s future, the Inaugural de-emphasizes past wrongdoing. The God of Micah asks only that America rededicate herself to her purpose and walk confidently but humbly into the future with Him.

Thus Carter’s Inaugural forsook the God of Justice and embraced God in the role of affectionate senior partner. Seeking expressions of faith which would unite fundamentalist and liberal, Christian and Jew, Carter turned to the non-judgmental God of Micah 6:8. This was not Jimmy Carter’s personal God, however. He was uncomfortable with this deity. Nor was this the God Americans had come to associate with Carter. In his campaign, Carter offered America a skillful blend of conservative religion and liberal politics. Early in the campaign, Carter’s team decided that the Nation would respond

17 Carter, “Inaugural Address”, p. 163. This and subsequent quotations are from Election of 1976.
favorably to such a political-religious mixture and fashioned the candidate's language accordingly. Carter's references to his faith were not accidental, but were strategically used to create an image of religious character. Public expressions of piety, Carter's advisors believed:

(1) communicated trustworthiness, (2) served as a source of identification with evangelicals, and (3) generated media exposure. Carter's expressed religiosity reflected his awareness of the public's lack of trust with politicians.

True, Carter's religion was embarrassingly personal. It was disclosed in language long since dropped from the everyday religious vocabulary of liberal Protestants, Catholics, and Jews, although such language remained captive in the rituals of these faiths. Gradually, people who would themselves never speak of being "born again" began to see Carter as a candidate who could "heal the spiritual wounds of America." According to Newsweek, Carter's piety came "as close as any style to being the folk religion of the nation."

Kurt Erickson concludes:

Perhaps no other candidate could have so articulately woven together civic piety, religious disclosures, and politics. Imitators would have been guilty of willfully distorting their character in order to project an image consonant at that point in time with the national mood. Carter's religiosity legitimized his transcendent appeals, his use of religious and biblical allusions, and his reduction of contemporary problems to matters of faith and their spiritual underpinnings. His rhetoric bolstered faith in America and drew together the electorate.

Such appraisals suggest that Jimmy Carter was elected, in part, because of his evangelical religious language, not in spite of such language. Erickson's conclusion raises intriguing questions: Did America, having elected Carter and his evangelical God, expect the President to reintroduce his form of civic piety to Washington circles? Carter, certainly, firmly believed that without repentance there could be no forgiveness, and was loath to begin his term of office without the public ritual which would assure him that he was leading the nation back to the paths of righteousness. There is no question that Carter himself needed the God of II Chronicles. Did the Nation also need to revisit that God after the trauma of Watergate? Did the Nation elect Carter to voice the archaic and comforting form of repentance and remorse which we associate with past blessing and lost favor? Had Carter been given the task of elevating the God of America's "folk religion" into rhetorical prominence at the Inaugural?

Certainly the Prayer Breakfast disclosure of his intentions for the inaugural address suggests that Carter believed this to be his task.

One wonders how his Presidential image might have fared had he remained true to his convictions. Certainly the revised inaugural roused no sentiment in the American public. William Safire's remarks accurately sum up the address:

20 Barber, p. 204.
21 Erickson, p. 235.
The keynote of the Carter Presidency turned out to be a themeless pudding, devoid of uplift or insight, defensive in outlook and timorous in its reach, straining five times to sell its "new spirit" slogan in the absence of a message.... The speech was mercifully brief, not because he strove for brevity, but because he seemed to have not much to say. He appeared to think he was still unchosen, and was reluctant to define his own version of the American Dream lest he lose support.23

Of course, public confidence in Carter did not rest solely on his selection of Biblical passages for the Inaugural nor is it suggested that his choice of religious expression necessarily affected subsequent actions during his term of office. However, his inaugural-day defection from the God of II Chronicles 7:14 shows a man of wavering convictions, an image which increasingly characterized public perceptions of the Carter presidency. If, as Erickson suggests, the public accepted Carter-the-candidate as a man of strong personal religious conviction, he and his staff should have been wise enough to express those convictions in the Inaugural and set a corresponding religious tone for his Presidency. Carter, himself, knowing the scriptures so well, should have realized the truth of Christ's admonition that "No man can serve two masters" and insisted on the form of religious expression that epitomized his personal faith, a form that served him so well during his campaign.24

THE USE OF "TURNAROUNDS" IN ACADEMIC DEBATE: A THEORETICAL RATIONALE AND STANDARDS FOR THEIR EVALUATION

Thomas A. Hollihan

One of the best remembered and most widely quoted exchanges from the first presidential debate between incumbent Ronald Reagan and challenger Walter Mondale was when Reagan asserted: "I promised myself that I wasn’t going to say this, but there you go again." The line, which Reagan had used in his 1980 debate against then President Jimmy Carter, had proven very successful, and it evoked much laughter from the Reagan partisans who were watching this debate live. Reagan’s supporters soon found their laughter cut short, however, as Mondale adeptly used Reagan’s argument to support his own claim. Mondale looked the President in the eye and asked him if he recalled the last time that he had used that line. Reagan appeared somewhat uncomfortable with this direct confrontation, but he nodded that he did indeed remember the last time he used the line. Mondale then pointed out that Reagan used the quip after Carter had accused him of planning to cut Medicare benefits to elderly Americans. Mondale further pointed out that soon after taking office Reagan did precisely what he had promised that he would not do, he proposed a $20 billion cut in the Medicare program.

The Mondale response to Reagan is a classic example of the argument strategy known as “turning the tables,” and the argument clearly made for good television. Indeed, Mondale’s quick and pointed response caused many political commentators to observe that Mondale had a better command of the issues than did the President, and was often cited as a reason why Mondale could be regarded as the winner of this first debate.1

"Turning the tables" has long been recognized as a useful and effective argument strategy. McBath observed in 1963: “Occasionally a debater can accept the arguments and evidence of his opponent and then interpret those materials in such a manner as to help prove his own case. It is not an easy technique to employ, but when it is used successfully it is highly effective."2 In the 1971 edition of his argumentation and debate text Freeley encouraged debaters to look for opportunities to “turn the tables,” but commented that “the opportunity … usually comes only when a speaker

Mr. Hollihan is Assistant Professor and Director of Forensics, Department of Communication Arts and Sciences, University of Southern California. An earlier version of this paper was presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention, Chicago, IL, November, 1984.
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has not fully thought through the implications of his argument." Mills provided debaters with advice on how to respond to "table-turning" in his 1964 argumentation text, urging them to consider "attacking the opponent's frame of reference or his interpretation of the point, showing that he admits the point, or pointing out that he has shifted ground."

"Turning the tables" is an effective argumentative strategy for it not only refutes or minimizes the impact of an opponent's argument, but it enables an advocate to claim it as an additional argument in support of his or her own position. This strategy has the additional benefit of making all of the opponent's arguments suspect, and of enhancing the credibility of the advocate's own claims.

The strategy of "turning the tables" has become very common in competitive debate. Contemporary debaters frequently "turn the tables" on their opponent's arguments, and then claim the other teams' significance as an added voting issue for their own case. Debaters, who have a high regard for jargon, have taken to calling these arguments "turnarounds." While it is difficult to determine exactly when this practice began, it is safe to say that it has been an accepted refutational strategy for several years now, and that most judges are not only willing to vote on turnarounds, but actually encourage teams to look for them.

The increased use of turnarounds is the result of several changes in academic debate theory which have been underway since the mid-1960's. The first change, and probably the most significant, has been a change in our understanding of the concept of inherency and in the burdens of significance which affirmative teams are required to meet in order to justify the adoption of the resolution. Newman argued in his landmark 1965 essay:

Before an advocate of a change from the status quo is conceded to have made his case, he is required to show an inherent and compelling need for change. Such a requirement is artificial and unreasonable. In the real world, we do not demand that a proposal meet such stringent conditions before we are willing to adopt it, unless we are extremely reactionary; and there is no reason why debaters, whose time limitations impose enough of a straitjacket on them, should be required in addition to carry an unrealistic burden of proof.

While the debate community did not unanimously concur with Newman's assessment of the obligations debaters must meet to establish significance and inherency, his position has by and large been embraced by most contemporary debaters and their coaches.

Most debaters and coaches now believe that the affirmative team has met its significance and inherency burdens if it has offered at least one independent advantage to the adoption of the resolution. This conviction is, of

---

course, consistent with the "comparative advantage" perspective of debate.8

The use of turnaround advantages also seems consistent with the two dominant debate "paradigms" currently guiding debaters' practices.9 Lichtman and Rohrer did not discuss turnarounds directly, but their theory for how judges should weigh arguments in support of or against the resolution would seem to suggest that turnarounds are an appropriate argumentative strategy:

The benefits of any policy system must be measured by considering both the probability that the system will achieve certain results and the value or worth of those results. A rational decision maker seeks to determine which policy alternative offers the greatest chance of achieving the most desirable consequences. Debaters and judges must determine the likelihood that a policy system will yield certain outcomes and then must assess the values of those results . . . . Decisions should be based upon a comparison of the net benefits of policy systems proposed by the affirmative and the negative.10

Obviously, the assessment of the potential outcomes of a proposed policy change requires that judges examine not only the initial arguments offered in support of or against a proposed policy change, but also any turnarounds which the advocates may discover. Indeed, as the policies being compared become more complex, and the potential consequences of policy change become more difficult to assess, the consideration of turnarounds becomes even more necessary. Some advocates of policy making argue that this perspective is beneficial precisely because it facilitates in-depth analysis of the consequences of policy choices—precisely the kind of analysis which demands a consideration of turnarounds.11

Advocates of the hypothesis-testing paradigm have been even more supportive of the legitimacy of turnarounds. Patterson and Zarefsky introduced the concept in their debate text declaring:

Disadvantages may be 'turned around' in either of two ways. The affirmative can grant that the disadvantage really is an evil but argue that the same evil will be present to a greater degree if the resolution is not affirmed—hence providing an on-balance argument in favor of the resolution. Or the affirmative can argue that the alleged evil really is a benefit and hence an additional reason to support the resolution. Being able to demonstrate that a disadvantage is turned into an additional benefit of the resolution is the most desir-

---

8 Bernard L. Brock, "The Comparative Advantages Case," *Speech Teacher* 16 (1967), 118-123.
9 I should make clear at this point that I am not entirely pleased with the choice of the term "paradigm" to describe these individual judging perspectives, and in fact, I believe that this term confuses rather than clarifies what debaters do when they appeal to different judging models. See: Patricia Riley and Thomas A. Hollihan, "Paradigms as Eristic," a paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention, Louisville, KY, November, 1982.
able way to demonstrate that the resolution is relatively free of disadvan-
tage.\textsuperscript{12}

The use of turnarounds was also supported by the authors of the relatively
cfew studies which have been written regarding them. For example, Ulrich,\textsuperscript{13} Allen and Bourhis,\textsuperscript{14} Herbeck,\textsuperscript{15} Olson,\textsuperscript{16} and DiPaoli-Congalton,\textsuperscript{17} all con-
cluded that turnarounds are an acceptable and in some cases even desirable
argumentative strategy. Given this somewhat surprising agreement among
debate theorists, it is not surprising that turnarounds are often claimed by
debaters or frequently cited by judges as reasons for their decisions. We
should be pleased that debaters are making liberal use of such an intrinsi-
cally reasonable and compelling argument form, and we should reward them
for the cleverness and insight which is often required to actually win a
turnaround. The use of this form of refutation demonstrates that we are
Teaching our students how to think critically. Despite the merits of turn-
around, however, the way they are used too often serves to confuse rather
than to clarify the issues in contemporary debates.

We have all heard debates where novice or junior varsity debaters dem-
onstrate their lack of understanding of argument theory when they label
their argument a turnaround, but then merely refute a causal link in an
opponent’s argument. But even very experienced and talented varsity de-
baters sometimes use turnarounds in a way which does not enhance the
careful and systematic consideration of complex policy issues. In order to
illustrate my claim I would cite an example from the final round of the
National Debate Tournament in 1983. The debate pitted the University of
Kansas on the affirmative against Dartmouth College on the negative. While
this round contained four of the best debaters in the nation, and was no
doubt better than most of the debates which occur in any given year, the
round suffered from what I believe to be some of the primary problems
associated with the way turnarounds are most often argued in contemporary
debates.

In order to illustrate the example I will need to briefly summarize the
debate. The affirmative case prohibited military intervention into the in-
ternal affairs of Cuba. The first negative argued that the U.S. hardline toward
Cuba was alienating our European allies, and that softening our position
would help preserve the NATO alliance. The negative then argued that only
the collapse of NATO could avert World War III, because if NATO collapsed
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the “Finlandization” of Europe would be inevitable. The second affirmative made many different responses to this disadvantage, including pressing its impact, and attempting to minimize the likelihood that their policy change with regard to Cuba could have such an effect upon European perceptions. Then the affirmative argued a turnaround, and claimed that the collapse of NATO would cause West Germany to proliferate and would lead to a Soviet first-strike. The second negative acknowledged that West Germany might get the bomb, but he claimed that the Soviets would respond only by deploying an ABM system to protect themselves from the West German weapons. The first affirmative rebuttalist extended almost all of the second affirmative arguments against this disadvantage, thus choosing to again attack the impacts, the causal links, and to claim the turnaround. The second negative rebuttalist was also obliged to attempt to win all of these arguments. In the second affirmative rebuttal, however, the strategy changed, as this speaker granted the links to the negative disadvantage, granted the impacts to the argument, and claimed that West Germany would certainly proliferate and that the ABM system would not prevent a Soviet attack because there would be a time lag between when West Germany could get the bomb and when the Soviets could deploy their ABMs. The second affirmative then argued that they should win the round on the basis of this turnaround.18

While four of the five judges in the round agreed that the affirmative won the debate, either partially or primarily as a result of this turnaround, all four of them expressed some concern about the way in which this argument was developed in the round. Herbeck protested that the turnaround was confusing and that the evidence on the effectiveness of the Soviet ABM system had little probative value.19 Hemphill also found the round confusing and expressed disappointment that this disadvantage was not more carefully debated.20 Solt in discussing the disadvantage and the turnaround lamented:

> current debate neglects, to its severe detriment, sufficient emphasis on presentational clarity or analytical thoroughness in issue assessment. The result is debates filled with half understood and half processed information, a defect from which this in many ways excellent debate also clearly suffers.21

The final critic who voted with the majority in the debate, Ziegelmueller, was also unhappy with the way the arguments on the disadvantage and the turnaround were developed. He declared:

> This particular debate demonstrated both some of the major strengths and major weaknesses of current debate practice. The major strengths demonstrated in this round were the debaters’ breadth of understanding of the topic and their ability to draw complex relationships among the issues. While such breadth of analysis is commendable, it also contributed to the major weakness of the debate: the tendency to develop arguments linearly rather

than in-depth. The NATO disadvantage is perhaps the best example of this. The affirmative gave a number of responses to this disadvantage, but none of them explored very deeply the initial causal link or the predicted impact. The primary effect of the second affirmative’s response was to shift the focus of the analysis to a consideration of the possible effects of West German proliferation. The negative in turn gave literally dozens of responses to the affirmative responses, but once again, the analysis was extended linearly by adding the anti-ballistic missile turnaround to the West German proliferation turnaround. Thus the linear development of the argument gained precedence over the in-depth analysis of the original issue.

While the objections of these four critics were by no means identical, or for that matter equal in their intensity, they do reveal that these judges had serious concerns about how turnarounds were argued in this round. Clearly, this round was not unlike many others in which turnarounds become the critical voting issues. If anything, this round was much better than most debates. The lack of clarity and argumentative development in the West German proliferation turnaround would probably characterize most of the turnarounds that our debaters argue in any given year. The critical question to consider now is, how might we improve the use of turnarounds by contemporary debaters? What standards for the evaluation of turnarounds might be employed to improve academic debates?

First, I believe that debaters should be required to claim turnarounds at their first opportunity. While it might indeed be true that the potentiality for turnaround links may not be clear until after arguments are extended in the rounds, debaters should always signal their intention to try to win a turnaround on an opponent’s argument in their next speech after that argument is introduced. Arguments take on far greater impact in rounds once they become turnarounds, and in fairness to the other team there should be as much prior notice as possible. Turnarounds should not be able to first appear in the second affirmative rebuttal under any circumstances, for it is obviously impossible for the negatives to respond to such arguments.

Second, debaters should have to choose whether they are going to go for a turn or attack the links and the impacts in their opponent’s argument. One of the reasons that the turnaround in the example offered from the 1983 NDT final round was troublesome was that the affirmative attacked the causal links and sought to minimize the impacts of the disadvantage in the earlier speeches, only to grant out those positions in the last rebuttal. I believe that this strategy fails to encourage in-depth analysis of issues and also tends to confuse the issues in the debate. If debaters are going to argue turnarounds they should be willing to do so with conviction. Turnarounds should not be claimed frivolously, but only when debaters are convinced that they have the evidence and analysis to actually win the argument and capture their opponent’s significance.

Third, I believe that judges need to be very cautious in giving debaters the right to cross-apply arguments in rebuttals, particularly in the last affirmative rebuttal. Permitting debaters to cross-apply responses in order to

23 Ulrich also addresses this issue and refers to it as giving one’s opponent “adequate warning” that a disadvantage has been turned, see: Ulrich, p. 75–76. The key distinction between his position and my own is that I do not believe warning an opponent is sufficient. I believe turnarounds must be claimed at first opportunity and that advocates ought to “lay all of their cards out on the table.”
claim or to refute turnarounds is especially troublesome because it also fosters a situation where complex arguments are dealt with in a superficial way. I am not suggesting that all cross applications are illegitimate. On the contrary, some cross applications are appropriate and should be encouraged as a strategy for dealing with a “spread” attack. I am arguing, however, that all cross applications should be fully explained by the debaters and should contain analysis which justifies the claim being made.

Fourth, I believe that turnarounds should be more than mere assertions or single sentence evidence blurbs. At a minimum, judges should expect that turnarounds be explained, supported by analysis and evidence, and consistent with the policy objectives of the team claiming them. When judges accept turnarounds, particularly affirmative turnarounds, they are accepting them as reasons to vote for a particular policy. In such cases, turnarounds should be likened to affirmative advantages, and should be as well developed as are most advantages. Furthermore, affirmative turnarounds should come from a topical action in the plan. Debaters and judges should be especially wary of turnarounds which come from extra-topical portions of the plan which are intended merely to spike out disadvantages.

Fifth, those turnarounds which seem to be counter-intuitive to the common sense expectations of listeners should be subjected to a more rigorous standard of proof than should arguments introduced in the round which do not have these same problems. Turnarounds often fall into the category of arguments which “go against the grain” of accepted beliefs precisely because the opponent has taken an unusual position in order to surprise the other team. An illustration might be the debater who finds evidence to support the position that a nuclear war between two Third World countries would be desirable because it would serve as a warning to the Superpowers and prevent them from using their nuclear weapons. There may indeed be some demented souls out there who believe that a nuclear war would be a good way to prove such a point, but certainly the vast majority of reasonable people in the world believe otherwise and are intent on avoiding such a catastrophe. Yet we hear analysis such as this claimed as turnarounds in debates all the time, and because they often come late in the round when there is little time available for in-depth analysis, the preposterous evidence and reasoning is not challenged in depth and is given undue credibility. I believe that judges should be willing to assert themselves and declare that such arguments have not met the burden of proof required to support a belief. Such arguments are not compelling anywhere but in debate rounds, and I submit that they should not be considered very compelling in debate rounds either.

As I hope has become clear, turnarounds can be a very effective form of argument, and I would encourage debaters to develop substantive and carefully thought out turnarounds. Unfortunately, however, I have found that far too many of the turnarounds which I am called upon to evaluate as a critic are not very compelling arguments and do not further the careful deliberation of complex issues. Debaters must be taught how to argue turnarounds convincingly, and judges must use their ballots to instruct them in this endeavor.

Clearly I am not alone in making this demand. Ulrich, Allen and Bourhis, Herbeck, Olson, and Congalton all make similar demands in their essays.
FROM CHECKERS TO WATERGATE: RICHARD NIXON AND THE ART OF CONTEMPORARY APOLOGIA*

Robert A. Vartabedian
Wichita State University

Isolated public utterances of Richard Nixon provide an excellent focal point for the study of the contemporary apologetic genre. Considering the critical rhetorical demands of the apologetic situation, Nixon was certainly a rhetor capable of "rising to the occasion." Jablonski regards Nixon as having a reputation for being "unflaggingly combative in crisis situations." Gibson and Felkins observe that Nixon's "concern through life has been to master the panic stirred within him by crisis, to be, when the moment arrived, calm, balanced, objective." In deference to Nixon's mastery of crisis rhetoric, Hart refers to him as "one of the coolest rhetorical customers this nation has known." I contend that Nixon is as well equipped an apologist as one will find in recent history.

Rhetoric, particularly self-defense rhetoric or apologia, was crucial to the political career of Richard Nixon. Moreover, his long and influential national political career was greatly affected by the successes and failures of his self-defense discourse. Referring to Nixon's 1952 apologia, the "Checkers" speech, Rosenfield states that "with a single speech Richard Nixon won a decisive initiative for his party." In 1957, Baskerville observed that Nixon was regarded by many as the best political speaker in America. Furthermore, Baskerville believes that Nixon's popularity—or lack of it—was based largely on his speaking ability. White advances a somewhat more critical evaluation of Nixon's rhetoric: "Already by the late fifties his stump ferocity had made him an object of hatred to millions of liberals." In reference to a time much later in Nixon's political career, Harrell, Ware, and Linkugel imply that if anyone could conceive of a successful apologia for Watergate it would be
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Nixon, "who used apologia on a scale unprecedented in the history of American politics." 

Although Nixon's prowess and extensive experience with apologia have been noted by many scholars, a systematic analysis of his recurring self-defense strategies is lacking in the communication literature. Such an investigation could be revealing of Nixon the man, the history he affected, and the art of contemporary apologia. The purpose of this essay is to offer a systematic analysis and comparison of Nixon's rhetoric in two critical self-defense situations, that is, "Checkers" (1952) and "Watergate" (1973).

Method of Analysis

The method of analysis employed in this essay is the self-defense criteria explicated by Ware and Linkugel. Ware and Linkugel define apologia as a personalized defense by an individual of his or her morality, motives, and reputation. This critical system attempts to accomplish two goals: "to discover those factors which characterize the apologetic form" and "to discover the subgenres or the types of discourses within the genre." Ware and Linkugel acknowledge that they borrow concepts and terminology from Abelson's psychological theory pertaining to the resolution of belief dilemmas. However, they note that they have freely adapted Abelson's meanings and terms for more appropriate usage in speech criticism.

Ware and Linkugel posit that four primary "factors" or strategies consistently appear in self-defense rhetoric: denial, bolstering, differentiation, and transcendence. The denial strategy amounts to a disavowal by the speaker of any participation in, relationship to, or positive sentiment toward that which has repelled the audience. Bolstering efforts are the speaker's attempts to identify with something viewed favorably by the audience. The differentiation strategy is the speaker's particularization of the charges at hand—moving the audience toward a new and less abstract perspective. Finally, transcendence is the speaker's means of moving the audience away from the particulars of the charges at hand while at the same time moving toward a more abstract and general view of their character. Identifying these strategies and noting their frequency and implications in selected apologia thus constitutes the foundation of this analysis.

Ware and Linkugel assert that the self-defense rhetor combines reformative and transformative strategies in his or her discourse. Reformative...
strategies involve merely revising the cognitions of the listener. Conversely, transformative strategies attempt to change the cognitions of the listener. The two reformative strategies of apologia are denial and bolstering. The two transformative strategies are differentiation and transcendence. Ware and Linkugel believe that the speech of self-defense needs to contain both reformative and transformative elements and thus results in any combination of one strategy from each category. Consequently, this method of analysis requires that the rhetorical critic discern the most crucial reformative and transformative strategies operating in the selected apologia. These combined strategies result in four “sub-genres” or discourse types within the genre of apologia: (1) absolution—combining primarily denial and differentiation strategies, (2) vindication—using essentially denial and transcendental strategies, (3) explanation—highly dependent upon bolstering and differentiation strategies, and (4) justification—based mostly on bolstering and transcendental strategies. 

Selected Apologia

Two critical rhetorical situations in the national political career of Richard Nixon produced especially noteworthy examples of self-defense rhetoric: “My Side of the Story” (1952) and “The Watergate Affair” (1973). Although a number of rhetorical analyses have been done on both of these famous speeches, developed self-defense criteria have not been applied to them to note patterns and recurring apologetic strategies. A brief rationale for using each of these self-defense discourses follows.

“My Side of the Story” was delivered by Nixon on September 23, 1952 and is often referred to as the “Checkers” or “Fund” speech. In this famous speech Nixon, then the Republican Vice-Presidential candidate, explained his use of an $18,000 special campaign fund. Rosenfield labeled this apologia “one of the most controversial public addresses of modern American history.” Nixon went so far as to refer to this self-defense as the event which made possible his election as vice president. This discourse was successful in ending the controversy at hand, and represents a classic example of seemingly effective apologia. Moreover, it reveals a number of detailed strategies to cope with exigencies of the moment. This early address provides a good starting point for assessing Nixon’s approach to apologia.

“The Watergate Affair” was delivered by Nixon on April 30, 1973, and was followed by a series of similar apologetic discourses ending only with his resignation from the Presidency on August 8, 1974. This speech was in response to mounting pressure on Nixon to finally confront the Watergate
affair by explaining his role in the scandal to the American people. Much of this pressure resulted from the fact that four key members of the White House staff—Haldeman, Ehrlichman, Kleindienst, and Dean—were implicated by March of 1973 in this scandal. Watergate events had unfolded in such a way that Nixon’s earlier blanket claims of White House innocence could not be supported. This address was an attempt to explain all of these seemingly incriminating events to the satisfaction of the American people. Although Nixon made apologetic-like statements prior to this discourse, Ling observes that this was “Nixon’s first public address specifically directed to the issues of Watergate.” Furthermore, Chesebro and Hamsher state: “In this speech, the foundation for perceiving all strategies used by Nixon can be discerned.” This address was, perhaps, Nixon’s most crucial Watergate self-defense.

These discourses represent two of Nixon’s most significant self-defense efforts, and they provide an interesting cross-section of his apologia—from early in his political career to nearly the end of his presidency. Additionally, both of these addresses represent classic mass-media apologia. The common exigencies of these apologetic situations can provide a good basis for strategic comparisons. As noted by Rosenfield, such surface similarities allow the critic to compare the speeches “in such ways that each address serves as a reference standard for the other.” This essay thus analyzes and compares these important examples of Nixon’s self-defense rhetoric.

My Side of the Story

There have been several rhetorical analyses of Nixon’s 1952 address. However, previous rhetorical critics have not assessed this speech in terms of developed self-defense criteria. An examination of Nixon’s apologetic

strategies in this address reveals that denial and differentiation are crucial here. After delineating the charges against him, Nixon attempted to deny the charges of impropriety directly:

And now to answer those questions let me say this: Not one cent of the $18,000 or any other money of that type went to me for my personal use . . . . It was not a secret fund . . . . And third, let me point out, and I want to make this particularly clear, that no contributor to this fund, that no contributor to any of my campaign, has ever received any consideration that he would not have received as an ordinary constituent. 25

Although these denials encompassed only one section of Nixon’s address, they were a definite negation/denial of the charges and thus constitute the essential reformatory strategy of this discourse. Whenever there is a clear denial in a self-defense speech, such an obvious confrontation of the charge necessitates its role as the main reformatory strategy.

The crucial transformative strategies of this address are found in Nixon’s use of differentiation. These differentiation efforts demonstrate that Nixon rhetorically separated himself from certain elements, such as the opposing Democratic party. In the second sentence of this address Nixon clearly began to draw the battle lines between himself and the Democrats. He specifically challenged the integrity of the Truman Administration:

The usual political thing to do when charges are made against you is to either ignore them or to deny them without giving details. I believe we’ve had enough of that in the United States, particularly with the present Administration in Washington. 26

In contrast to this, Nixon stated, “The best and only answer to a smear or to an honest misunderstanding of the facts is to tell the truth.” 27 Subsequently, Nixon told the audience his “side of the case.”

Nixon became even more specific in his use of differentiation strategies as he distinguished between his conduct and that of his Democratic counterpart, John Sparkman. In discussing how politicians pay for their political expenses, Nixon stated:

Another way that is used is to put your wife on the payroll. Let me say, incidentally, my opponent, my opposite number for the Vice Presidency on the Democratic ticket, does have his wife on the payroll. And has had her on his payroll for ten years—the past ten years . . . . And I’m proud to say tonight that in the six years I’ve been in the House and the Senate of the United States, Pat Nixon has never been on the Government payroll. 28

It is interesting to note this differentiation/counterattack strategy that Nixon somehow alluded to in the midst of his own self-defense. The Democratic Presidential candidate Adlai Stevenson was also subjected to such differentiation techniques. In fact, Stevenson was Nixon’s most frequent target. The wealth of the Stevenson family and his affiliation with the Truman Administration made him a particularly attractive subject for Nixon’s differentiation purposes. After disclosing his own rather modest financial situation, Nixon took a passing differentiation shot at Stevenson:

I believe that it's fine that a man like Governor Stevenson who inherited a fortune from his father can run for President. But I also feel that it's essential in this country of ours that a man of modest means can also run for President.29

Furthermore, Nixon distinguished the actions that an Eisenhower-Nixon Administration would take from those which Stevenson and Sparkman would pursue relative to their ties with the Truman Administration:

You wouldn't trust a man who made the mess to clean it up—that's Truman. And by the same token you can't trust the man who was picked by the man that made the mess to clean it up—and that's Stevenson. And so I say, Eisenhower, who owes nothing to Truman, nothing to big city bosses, he is the man that can clean up the mess in Washington.30

Considering the significance of the issue of Communism in the early 1950's, Nixon certainly was not going to pass up the opportunity to make distinctions between Stevenson and Eisenhower on that subject:

I say that a man who like Mr. Stevenson has pooh-poohed and ridiculed the Communist threat in the United States—he said that they are phantoms among ourselves; he's accused us that have attempted to expose the Communists of looking in the Bureau of Fisheries and Wildlife—I say that a man who says that isn't qualified to be the President of the United States. And I say that the only man who can lead us in this fight to rid Government of both those who are Communists and those who have corrupted this Government is Eisenhower, because Eisenhower, you can be sure, recognizes the problem and he knows how to deal with it.31

The last differentiation strategy relative to Nixon's opposition is contained in his challenge to his opponents. After disclosing his own complete financial history, Nixon questioned the propriety of some of Stevenson's and Sparkman's financial matters. Consequently, Nixon made the following recommendation to his Democratic counterparts:

I would suggest that under the circumstances both Mr. Sparkman and Mr. Stevenson should come before the American people as I have and make a complete financial statement as to their financial history. And if they don't it will be an admission that they have something to hide.32

Nixon thus differentiated his actions from the actions that his opponents should pursue. Overall, Nixon's differentiation strategies separated him from his Democratic rivals in four essential aspects: (1) they are affiliated with the ineffective Truman Administration, while he and Eisenhower are not; (2) they (especially Stevenson) are wealthy while he is of modest means; (3) they are soft on Communism while he and Eisenhower are not; and (4) they refuse to answer charges of impropriety while he had the courage to do so.

In sum, this 1952 apologia can be categorized as an address of absolution in which the speaker seeks acquittal of those charges levied against his character. Although bolstering and transcendental devices were used in this speech, Nixon relied primarily on denial and differentiation strategies. After differentiating the charges against him, Nixon denied them rather directly.

After these initial denials, Nixon used a series of differentiation strategies that separated him from the charges and especially his Democratic opposition. The most noticeable device of this address appeared to be that of differentiation through comparison, that is, they are in the wrong while we are in the right.

The Watergate Affair

With the exception of the Harrell, Ware, and Linkugel (1975) research, previous analyses of this instrumental 1973 Watergate address are the result of diverse methods of analysis rather independent of the genre of apologia. The 1975 findings of Harrell et al. are in conjunction with developed self-defense criteria; however, they encompass only a brief and somewhat conclusionary section of the article. My analysis attempts a more thorough explication of this discourse relative to standards of apologia. Since there are no personal denials of charges in this address, the key reformative strategy is clearly bolstering. Although somewhat more difficult to pinpoint, the most crucial transformative strategies are apparent in Nixon’s use of differentiation. Nixon’s transcendental strategies are worth noting, but his use of differentiation offers the critic the best insight into his strategic focus.

Nixon’s fundamental reformative strategy of bolstering serves the sole purpose of identifying Nixon with the office of the Presidency. As this address unfolded, Nixon’s bolstering strategies attempted to build this identification to the point of conceptualizing Nixon as inseparable from his powerful office. Thus, Nixon’s first bolstering effort emphasized the sanctity of his office: “This office is a sacred trust, and I am determined to be worthy of that trust.” Furthermore, Nixon believed that the tremendous responsibilities of this “sacred trust” often go above and beyond mere campaigning for an election: “And that is why I decided as the 1972 campaign approached that the Presidency should come first and politics second.” Herein lies Nixon’s crucial explanation for Watergate. He explained that his overwhelming presidential obligations necessitated his delegating authority for his 1972 campaign to others. Nixon insisted that he “sought to delegate campaign operations to remove the day-to-day campaign decisions from the President’s office and from the White House.” These subordinates “may have done wrong in a cause they deeply believed to be right.” In sum, these initial bolstering devices attempted to so strongly identify Nixon with his office that any wrongdoing by his subordinates was actually beyond his control—since he was so dedicated to his more important task of lead-


ership. Nixon wanted his audience to conclude with him that he was not to blame for Watergate, and that he was merely trying to remove politics from his sacred office.

The most significant transformative strategies of this address are found in Nixon's use of differentiation. Nixon's first differentiation efforts were directed toward separating himself from any alleged improprieties. Specifically, Nixon's initial strategic focus was on distinguishing between the early reports he received about Watergate and those he received later:

Until March of this year, I remained convinced that the denials were true and that the charges of involvement by members of the White House were false ... However, new information then came to me which persuaded me that there was a real possibility that some of these charges were true ...

Nixon's differentiation of the information he received on Watergate is worth noting. This strategy helped to portray Nixon as being just as surprised and appalled by these "senseless, illegal actions" as were the American people. Nixon thus became the typical outraged citizen who could not have been a part of these crimes since he found out about them at the same time that everybody else did. Additionally, Nixon used this differentiation to explain his earlier claims of blanket White House innocence which now could not be supported. The ultimate purpose here was to persuade the audience that he had not consciously lied to them in his earlier statements, for he had been misinformed.

Another important device relative to Nixon's attempts to remove himself from actual improprieties can be found in his differentiation of the 1972 campaign from his previous campaigns:

Political commentators have correctly observed that during my 27 years in politics, I've always previously insisted on running my own campaigns for office. In both domestic and foreign policy, 1972 was a year of crucially important decisions, of intense negotiations, of vital new directions ... And that is why I decided as the 1972 campaign approached that the Presidency should come first and politics second. To the maximum extent possible, therefore, I sought to delegate campaign operations ... 

An important distinction that is alluded to in the preceding passage is that Nixon was not the President during his previous campaigns and thus could afford to spend time on campaign operations. The implication here is that Nixon could not really be held accountable for illegal campaigning actions committed while he was in the midst of pursuing his presidential responsibilities. The President was obviously a very busy person who simply cannot do and see everything. Nixon's priorities were such that the 1972 campaign operations were delegated to others. Having made this distinction clear, Nixon turned around and stated that he is ultimately responsible for his subordinates' actions:

For the fact that alleged improper actions took place within the White House or within my campaign organization, the easiest course would be for me to blame those whom I delegated the responsibility to run the campaign. But that would be a cowardly thing to do. I will not place the blame on subordinates, on people whose zeal exceeded their judgment ... In any orga-

---

nization the man at the top must bear the responsibility. That responsibility, therefore, belongs here in this office. I accept it.

Nixon resorted to his familiar differentiation of the easy or cowardly action versus the proper action. On the surface, this self-imposed courage appears to be an admirable and selfless trait. However, closer scrutiny demonstrates just the opposite. Prior to this "acceptance of responsibility" Nixon had already placed the real blame for Watergate elsewhere with his only fault being his preoccupation with the duties of his office.

In summary, this crucial 1973 speech on Watergate can be categorized as an explanatory address in which the speaker sought to eliminate condemnation by providing a clearer understanding of the situation. Although Nixon's transcendental strategies interestingly alluded to his sincere efforts to deal with Watergate while not neglecting his presidential obligations, Nixon relied primarily on bolstering and differentiation strategies. Nixon's fundamental reformatory strategy of bolstering served the sole purpose of identifying Nixon with the office of the Presidency. Within this strategy was Nixon's essential explanation for Watergate. His presidential responsibilities necessitated his delegating authority for his 1972 campaign to others who, in turn, "may have done wrong." Nixon's most significant transformative strategies of this address are apparent in his use of differentiation. These strategies functioned to separate Nixon from actual wrongdoing and to differentiate his acceptance of responsibility from cowardly blame-placing. Overall, this Watergate defense was dependent upon a presidential association and a very unconvincing separation of facts. The ultimate failure of this address—as well as subsequent Watergate apologia—can be attributed to the audience's unwillingness to accept the notion of presidential omnipotence and the contradictory and highly incriminating testimonies that would continue to surface.

Apologetic Implications

Although the "Checkers" speech made use of bolstering, its essential strategies were focused on denial and differentiation and thus was categorized as absptive apologia. This speech was the result of a very specific charge against Nixon's character, that is, he was accused of illegal use of campaign funds. Nixon viewed his alternatives as either being removed from the Republican ticket or denying this charge directly. His use of differentiation in this address attempted to reinforce his denial by particularizing the charge and those who probably made it.

Nixon's 1973 Watergate address relied essentially on bolstering and differentiation strategies resulting in a seemingly evasive explanatory address. However, the charge that necessitated this speech was quite clear. In fact, Nixon admitted that the charge at hand was involvement of his staff in the Watergate affair. Thus, the specificity of the accusation was similar to that of the "Checkers" speech. Nixon's strategic approach, however, was no-

noticeably different. Instead of attempting a confrontation or denial of the charge, Nixon chose to seek refuge in bolstering by clearly identifying himself with his office. In addition to this strategy, Nixon sought to reinforce this identification by particularizing his presidential responsibilities.

Nixon's use of bolstering and differentiation strategies in his crucial Watergate speech resulted in particularly ineffective apologia. His administration was accused of fairly direct and incriminating deeds. Rather than confronting these accusations, Nixon chose to reassert his presidential position through bolstering and differentiation. In assessing Nixon's Watergate apologia, Harrell, Ware, and Linkugel state: "Rhetorical critics face the task of explaining why in the case of Richard Nixon, who used apologia on a scale unprecedented in the history of American politics, apologia failed." Perhaps Nixon's decision essentially to bolster his presidential image as opposed to a direct confrontation of the charges contributed to the ultimate failure of his apologia.

If Nixon would have carefully analyzed his previous apologia efforts he might not have made this decision. The situation and specificity of the charges surrounding the "Checkers" speech demanded a direct confrontation without which Nixon faced the strong possibility of being removed from the Republican ticket. In his 1973 Watergate address, Nixon seemingly failed to recognize the specificity and incriminating nature of the charges at hand. Additionally, Nixon seemingly failed to realize that the Watergate scandal, like the "Checkers" case, could be an either/or situation: either confront the charges directly or lose your office. If one truly seeks to retain an office in such a rhetorical situation, the strategic alternatives are severely limited. Nixon's strategic choices imply that either he was unaware of the necessity of a definite rhetorical confrontation through denial or simply unable to support such denials because the available facts could contradict them.

In light of this second set of circumstances, apologia appeared nearly doomed to failure. Specifically, the self-defense rhetor attempts to extricate himself from wrongdoing by illuminating the situation. If such an illumination is unavoidably self-incriminating, the rhetor will find himself "hoisted on his own petard." I can view only two possible exceptions to this rule. First, the rhetor may convincingly obscure the facts and thereby diminish the charges. Second, the charges themselves may not be so severe in the eyes of the public as to provoke their condemnation. In the case of Richard Nixon, both of these exceptions also failed.

From "Checkers" to "Watergate," regardless of the success factor, Richard Nixon was a fascinating apologist. I would suggest, however, that the ramifications of this essay transcend the individual apologist, Richard Nixon, and strategic comparisons made in reference to his isolated apologia. There will always be those persons who must defend their integrity in the public arena. A strategic understanding of the art of apologia will, perhaps, decide their fate, as ultimately it may have determined the fate of Richard Nixon.

"Rhetorical discourse comes into existence as a response to situation" in the same way that an "answer comes into existence as a response to a question." In the United States, rhetorical discourse transcended the 1980 elections. The parturient situation for the discourse has been one of fear, "born of crises and uncertainties of our age." As Senator George McGovern has observed:

We have lived, over the past 50 years, in a condition of more or less permanent crisis: the Great Depression and the Second World War, the divisive and unsuccessful war in Vietnam, recurrent confrontations with the other superpowers set against the threat of nuclear war, the unanticipated energy crisis, and now, largely as a result of those other strains, the gradual slide of our economy into diminishing productivity, declining living standards and apparently permanent inflation.

From Plato to the present, reality has been viewed as relative, and thus "is easily defined in many different ways, with many different persuasive effects." Therefore, the "climate of uncertainty" which has been extant in American society has been addressed by a variety of rhetors who relate the situation to the objective reality of their audience.

One group, the Fundamentalist sect of the Protestant Faith, view the prevailing situation as uncertainty for the future of the United States, internally and externally. Because of the prolonged "crisis-state," a Fundamentalist conviction has egressed that "events are out of control," and that the nation is "racing headlong toward the wrath of Almighty God." "Crisisitis" is the resultant reality of the Fundamentalists.

Numerous Fundamentalist rhetors have emerged to address the situation of "Crisisitis," including, in the words of Frye Gaillard, "some of the biggest names." Probably one of the most notable is Dr. Jerry Falwell whose following consists of a hometown church which claims 17,000 members and an "estimated" 21 million others who listen to his broadcast sermons weekly on the "Old-Time Gospel Hour." Falwell, who raises an estimated one...
million dollars weekly through his ministries, operates a children’s academy, a Bible institute, a correspondence school, a seminary, a college, and a political-action organization. Consequently, Falwell is credited with the formulation of his own “Christian Denomination.”

Undoubtedly, Falwell surpasses the family tradition of success in business established by his father and sustained by his brothers. But how successful will Falwell be either as a religious or political rhetorician? The purpose of this essay is to seek an answer to the question in terms of the appropriateness of Falwell’s rhetoric in aligning his intent with the needs of his audience.

Fundamentalists view God as the determinative of the universe. The “Will of God” is the direct result of people’s adherence to the “Word” as manifest in the Bible and as revealed by His ministers. If an individual or a nation follows the teachings of the “Word,” the effect will be prosperity. However, if the dicta are refused, God “will judge, make war, and pour out the thunderbolts of His wrath.” According to this “cause and effect” philosophy, the “Crisisitis” is the result of the disobedience of the American people to the principles of God.

America, through the eyes of the Fundamentalists, is a “vast vacuum of truth, morality, and righteous purpose.” “Crisisitis” is a warning from God of the “sinful” condition, and unless America “repents and turns from her sins she will be destroyed.” Thus, according to this aggregate perception, the only solution to the situation facing America is revival.

Falwell seemingly embraces the concept of revival as the singular answer to the current problems now facing America. Falwell states:

“America’s only hope for survival is a spiritual awakening that begins in the lives of her individual citizens. I am convinced that we need a spiritual and moral revival in America if America is to survive the twentieth century.”

Furthermore, in his authorized biography, Falwell’s “motive” is stated to be “reaching people with the gospel” and to be another “Billy Sunday,” who was a great revivalist. Since “revival in America is priority,” according to Falwell, his motive is one of reaching people, and his personal model is of a revivalist; the assumption can be made that the “intent” of Falwell’s rhetoric is revival. If this first assumption is correct, the next logical assumption is that the audience would be one that could be converted or regenerated, and the message would be designed for that suasive end-result.

If these suppositions are accurate, based on the history of revivalism in the United States, Falwell’s rhetoric of revival would be a “fitting” response to the situation of uncertainty extant in American society. Evidenced by history, major revivals arise in times of social uncertainty when events call
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accepted political tradition into question. Consequently, major revivals are the result of "critical disjunctions" in self-understanding when faith is lost in the legitimacy of norms, the viability of institutions, and the authority of leaders in church and state. The first major revival, the Great Awakening, occurred in the United States in the middle 1700s when the viability of the colonial system came into question. The second, occurring in the middle 1800s, was characterized by a severe depression and the Abolition issue. The lineaments of the third American revival period in the 1870s were a depression and social injustices. Finally, the fourth period, 1910 through 1918, was typified by unemployment, depression, and war. Obviously, the situation existing in the 1980s is similar to those of the four major revival periods in the United States. Therefore, if previous revival rhetoric produced positive results or met the needs of the audiences in the past, a revival rhetoric of Falwell designed to meet the demands of the current situation could be described as "fitting."

For revival rhetoric to have positive effect, political influence must be exerted as an end to the discourse. The opinion is held by many that religious or revival rhetoric is not intrinsic to the sphere of American politics since the Constitution, traditionally, has provided for separation of church and state. Thus, the sentiment prevails that religion affects politics nominally at best. However, religion and politics, for the most part, cooperate mutually in the decision making process. The coadjuvancy occurs because many public issues have religious or ethical dimensions.

The influence of religious rhetoric on politics is more discernable than that of revival rhetoric because of frequency of occurrence. In his recent study of the influence of religion on politics, Menendez concludes that religious rhetoric has had substantial effect in an average of one of every three presidential campaigns. In contrast to religious rhetoric, revival rhetoric emerges only when a situation of uncertainty allows issues to crystalize with the mood of the country. Thus, revival rhetoric can serve to provide possible purposive action making the ambiguous situation meaningful. Due to the sporadic nature of the rhetorical situation, most revivals have not established a direct relationship with American ideas and consequently, have not formed national movements. However, the four major revivals have been able to identify the issues of Christianity with the extant mood of the country and have developed into national revivals.
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When the major revivals have occurred, they have been a "shaping" force in American culture and politics. During the Great Awakening, revival rhetoric served as a response to the tension created by the rebellious mood of the colonies. The revival rhetoric removed the tension of the people. Rebellion was rationalized as a "work of God," since the revivalist effectively established and related the "principle" of God allowing America to be discovered and populated in order that a new spiritual world could be established.

The rhetoric of the second revival period was introduced to give direction and meaning to people suffering in various degrees from the societal strains of a new nation on the move into new political, economic, and geographical areas. From this period, many symbolic values rose to central importance, to unify the people. These included: the chosen nation concept, derived from the Great Awakening; the covenant with God; the millennial manifest destiny; Biblical law, the Ten Commandments, against which behavior is judged; the work ethic; moral superiority; and the frailty of women. The rhetoric of the period stressed that through personal effort and responsibility, individuals could cope with the many social ills of the times.

The rhetoric of the third American revival period originated primarily from Dwight L. Moody. An urgency existed for the solution of the crisis caused by overcrowding, poor sanitation, crime, and inferior education. The crisis was regarded as proof that the people had drifted from "God's Will." Moody's rhetoric endorsed the Protestant ethic of individual responsibility, hard work, and personal piety. Moody sought converts by assuring the people that prosperity at home and abroad was the promise for following the "Will of God." Again, as in the previous revival period, the discourse stressed that America was "special" in God's providence and consequently, had a mission to extend the national beliefs to the "less fortunate" peoples of the world.

Finally, Billy Sunday served as the "prophet" rhetor of the fourth revival period in the United States; directing a nation "wracked" with complex problems, Sunday became the first evangelical revivalist to "openly" discuss national and world politics and social and economic questions. Sunday's rhetoric personified the "American Christian"; an individual for whom conversion begat decency and patriotism. The unifying symbols of Sunday's rhetoric, as well as the rhetoric for the period, were: womanhood, cleanliness, motherhood, hard work, and "America." According to Sunday, patriotic American ideas were "harmonious" with the "Will of God." Sunday, as had Moody, urged his audiences to be personally responsible—a condition which would result in the solution of social ills in America and in the world.

In summary, the four revival periods which have occurred in the United
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States had points of commonality. The major revivals occurred because identification was made between principles of Christianity and the mood of the country. The revival rhetors did not celebrate the condition of the American situation, but judged it and "found it wanting." Discourse was introduced so that people could be regenerated or converted and thus, make the country reflect the "Will of God." As a result of the major revivals, loyalty was rekindled to both the evangelical Protestant teaching and respected American ideals, thus influencing both culture and politics in America.

Conditions in the United States appear suitable to spark another major revival period should the rhetorician emerge who could provide the appropriate response. Appropriateness can be judged according to the following criteria which are based on the "points of commonality" of the preceding major revival periods:

1. Have Christian principles been identified with the mood of the country?
2. Is judgment rendered showing the nation in need?
3. Is discourse introduced so that people could be regenerated or converted and thus make the country reflect the "Will of God?"

First, Falwell identifies principles with the current mood of the country. According to Falwell, the political, economic, and military positions of the United States are related to Biblical principles. These principles, when related to a moderate audience, are referred to as "Issues" and include: Pro-life, Pro-traditional-family, Pro-morality, and Pro-America. When the audience is more disposed to religious rhetoric, the principles are extended to seven. The principles which Falwell calls "Judeo-Christian ethic" or "ethic based upon Old Testament and New Testament Law," have affirmed America's greatness. The principles are: 1) the dignity of human life, 2) the traditional monogamous family, 3) common decency, 4) the work ethic, 5) the Abrahamic Covenant, 6) God-centered education, and 7) divinely appointed establishments. Since Falwell provides identification between the "Judeo-Christian ethic" and the situation of the country, his revival rhetoric can be judged appropriate according to the first criterion.

Falwell also succeeds in fulfilling the second criterion: rendering a judgment demonstrating the need of the country. According to Falwell, the United States is no longer the "military might" of the world, is in desperate economic trouble, and is faced with a vacuum of leadership. Consequently, Falwell states that the 1980s may be the last decade for America as a free nation and is currently experiencing the "eve" of the loss of freedoms and liberties. Falwell argues that the United States needs to "be turned around" or face inevitable destruction.

Although the revival rhetoric of Falwell meets two criteria, his rhetoric fails to satisfy the requirements of the third. If the third criterion were to
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be met, Falwell's rhetoric would be of conversion. However, his rhetoric is one of political action. According to Falwell, to change America, three areas of political action must be taken. First, people should register to vote. Second, "moral" Americans must examine the "real issues" and gain information. Third, Americans should mobilize and exert influence in business, in the home, and in the community as well as in the church. Apparently, Falwell is suggesting that the change in America will first come in the political spectrum making the nation "moral" which will filter down eventually to the citizenry. This concept stands in direct opposition to the rhetoric characterized in the four major revival periods.

As stated above, political influence should be an end-result of revivalist discourse. First, the auditor must receive salvation or the assurance of salvation from an exhortatory message which results in repentance or conversion. The "obligation of benevolence," the obligation of eliminating sin, would follow. Thus, those who received salvation would be forced by the "compulsion" of their "new life" to make the country reflect the "Will of God" by necessary political action.

In order to be successful, it is essential that a rhetor's message mesh with its audience's psyche. This task is rendered more difficult for Falwell since he is, in essence, confronting three different, yet often intermixed, audiences: the exhortatory, the mimetic, and the skeptical. Since political action occurs before conversion, the auditors capable of influencing politics are those who are susceptible to Fundamentalist doctrine, the exhortatory audience; those who already adhere to the doctrine, the mimetic audience; and those who, for all practical purposes, reject the doctrine, the skeptical audience. Falwell, due to his approach, must meet the needs of all three.

Falwell is successful in fulfilling the needs of the first two. The exhortatory audience demands a strong emotional experience to induce the political action desired by Falwell. The mimetic audience is already convinced and needs only to have the conviction reflected and confirmed by the discourse. Falwell provides the emotional experience and the convictional confirmation by employing two rhetorical conventions: fear appeals and emotive words. First, anxiety is generated in the minds of the auditors by threatening their psychological need of safety which encompasses security, stability, protection, and strength. Falwell accomplishes the task by portraying America as "approaching the brink of disaster" at the hands of the "godless Communists" who are "dedicated to world conquest." Accordingly, the United States is in danger of "becoming another Poland, Afghanistan, or a modern day Sodom and Gomorrah." As such, the auditors would be faced with either execution or solitary confinement. "Little children" would be "assaulted and proselytized into the camps of the deviates."
Falwell professes that the “capitulation” will occur because “God is angry with this nation”\textsuperscript{52} and “has pushed the ‘panic button’.”\textsuperscript{53} The exhortative audience through appeals to loss of safety is “scared” into action while the mimetic audience hearing a repetition of the “truth” is motivated to, or a continuance of, action.

Second, Falwell employs emotionally charged god-terms and devil-terms to arouse and enhance the sentiment of the two audiences. Typical of these are:

\begin{tabular}{|l|l|}
\hline
\textbf{GOD-TERMS} & \textbf{DEVIL-TERMS} \\
\hline
Wives, Mothers, Girls & Feminists, Lesbians, ERA \\
God-fearing Americans & Godless Humanists, Communists \\
Free Enterprise System & Socialism \\
Christians & Liberals \\
Majority & Minority \\
Morality & Darkness \\
Heterosexuality & Homosexuality \\
Moral Americans & Pornographers, idolaters \\
Pregnancy, childbirth & Abortion, murder, genetic manipulation \\
Full-time housewives & Feminists\textsuperscript{54} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Thus, through fear appeals and emotive words, Falwell’s rhetoric aligns with the needs of his exhortative and mimetic audiences.

The skeptical audience, however, provides difficulty for Falwell. The audience is characterized by its need for rational discourse. If the message is to be suasive for the audience, the discourse must rely on rational constructs. Falwell, because of his religious beliefs and the nature of his rhetoric, meets the demands of this audience with little or no success. His rhetorical shortcomings are engendered by two general faults: the absence of proof and the presence of contradiction.

Jerry Falwell is a “militant” Fundamentalist, one who interprets the Bible literally, and one who “must tell the truth” about the Bible.\textsuperscript{55} According to Falwell:

\begin{quote}
We have one basic document on which we predicate everything we believe, our faith, our practice, our life-style, our homes, et cetera, government—is the inherency of scripture, not only in matters of theology but science, geography, history, et cetera—totally and entirely, the very word of God.\textsuperscript{56}
\end{quote}

Because of this background, Falwell’s proofs are intrinsic to his faith. Simply stated, Falwell believes that God is the authority and that he (Falwell) possesses the knowledge of “what is right.”\textsuperscript{57} Falwell states that he has not
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questioned his omniscient power of “truth” since his conversion in 1952. According to Falwell, “if everyone accepts the same theses and the same equations, they will arrive at the same answer.”

The skeptical audience, however, is outside the Fundamentalist universe and rejects at “face value” the theses of that doctrine. Consequently, the indictment has been leveled at Falwell that:

He uses slanted language, presents opinions as facts, grounds highly questionable assertions on the authority emanating from a Southern Baptist pulpit.

Evidence is said to work “because the audience permits it to work within their framework of experience.” Subsequently, Falwell’s assertions, to a large degree, are not acceptable by the skeptical audience for their view of reality is different from that of the Fundamentalist.

Contradiction, in Falwell’s rhetoric, also hinders the ability to meet the needs of the skeptical audience. The inconsistencies are of two types: incidental and intrinsic. The first category of contradiction, incidental, occurs in the message because of Falwell’s own desires. For instance, during the 1980 presidential campaign, Falwell was supportive of Ronald Reagan. Therefore, he was faced with a dilemma: to support a “professed” born again Christian, Jimmy Carter, or to support a conservative Republican candidate, Ronald Reagan. Falwell, a conservative, decided on the latter and had to reconcile his choice between a born again Christian and someone who, at the time, had not made his convictions public. Falwell solved the problem by telling his audience:

If I had to choose as a leader between a born again Christian who does not follow godly and Biblical principles, and an unsaved man who does, I would choose the unsaved man any day.

It would seem that “a born again Christian” by definition would have to follow Biblical principles. Therefore, the message is not logical. The contradiction is more apparent when Falwell argues:

If a man is not a student of the Word of God and does not know what the Bible says, I question his ability to be an effective leader. If a person is not a Christian, he is inherently a failure...

Another example of a dilemma solved by contradiction is Falwell’s view of “separation of church and state.” Falwell indicates that he has a strong belief in the separation of church and state and that a “misconception” about Moral Majority is that it is a religious organization. However, Falwell also says that he does not believe that the “Founding Fathers” ever intended
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the church to be separated from the government, and that Moral Majority is a coalition of "religious" people.65

The above examples are indicative of the contradictions within Falwell's message which are resultant of his particular aspirations. By these and similar refutative statements, Falwell's rhetoric fails to provide rationality.

Falwell's rhetoric also proves irrational to the skeptical audience due to intrinsic contradictions which are necessary for the success of his rhetoric to the exhortatory and mimetic audiences. As stated above, Falwell utilizes strong fear appeals. Research indicates that for persuasive discourse which evokes a high degree of emotional tension to have greater over-all effectiveness, it must also adequately satisfy the needs of reassurance.66 Falwell provides the reassurance(s) needed to alleviate the tensions created through his discourse, but in so doing, he places himself in a quandary.

As stated, Falwell portrays America as "approaching the brink of disaster." However, to relieve the anxiety of the exhortatory and mimetic audiences, he either exceeds the scope of the amelioration and contradicts the importance of his message, or he contradicts his stated intent, revival. In the first instance, Falwell suggests that the fears are unwarranted because:

America cannot fail. There is a hedge around America, a high fence. God will breathe fire on Russia. God will cause their missiles to blow up on the pad. Because America, per capita, has the largest number of Christians than any nation on earth.67

If the above is true, the significance of Falwell's message is lost. The need for repentance and conversion is dissipated.

In the second instance, America is portrayed as being in jeopardy, but Falwell assures the audience:

But there is hope. God will again bless us if we will turn back to him as individuals and as a nation. There is power in the name of Jesus Christ, and this is is the only power that can turn back godless Communism. If God is on our side, no matter how militarily superior the Soviet Union is, they could never touch us. God would miraculously protect America power.68

Falwell apparently is calling for revival; however, as mentioned earlier, his rhetoric is one of action. Accordingly he fails to seek new converts but instead calls for political action. Christians, in the Gospel according to Falwell, are to keep America great by getting laws passed which will protect the freedom and liberty of her citizens.69 Subsequently, Falwell contradicts his stated intent.

As evidenced in the preceding examples, Falwell fails to provide rationality for the skeptical audience due to contradictions which occur necessarily to alleviate the anxieties purposefully created by the discourse. These along with incidental contradictions and the audience's alienation with the Fundamentalist doctrine prevent Falwell from meeting the needs of the skeptical audience.
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The purpose of this essay has been to determine the "appropriateness" of Falwell's rhetoric in terms of the alignment of his intent with the needs of his audience. As stated, Falwell suggests that his is a rhetoric of revival. This genre of rhetoric is a "fitting" response to the current situation now existing in the United States based on past revival periods and the situations which promoted them.

A criterion was proposed using "points of commonality" derived from the past major revival periods for evaluative purposes. Falwell's rhetoric succeeds in meeting the first two: the identification of Christian principles with the mood of the country and a rendering of judgment to show the nation's need. However, Falwell fails to meet the third criterion: the introduction of discourse for regeneration and conversion.

Falwell's rhetoric was demonstrated to be a rhetoric of action whereby the extant "moral" auditors are convinced to take political steps to make the country moral which will eventually lead to a more spiritual citizenry. Subsequently, the argument has been made that the approach Falwell is taking requires him to meet the needs of an audience which requires rational constructs. For the most part, this is an impossible task for Falwell due to his background and the requirements of the other existing audiences which he also must fulfill. Therefore, Falwell's rhetoric is, as currently practiced, inappropriate for his stated intent and likewise for his audience.

Thus, Dr. Jerry Falwell, though undoubtedly influential in the 1980 presidential elections, will not be regarded in history as a major revivalist and his future influence on the American political system will be limited.

In the light of this conclusion, it should be noted that the rhetoric of Falwell is in process at this writing. Should his strategies alter, the above conclusion could change, but the criteria for its assessment would nevertheless remain intact.
DSR-TKA: A DIVERSE YET FINANCIALLY FEASIBLE NATIONAL TOURNAMENT

Shawn L. McGee

In 1975, as a student congresswoman at the National Forensic League national tournament held at Ben Davis High School in Indianapolis, I was first exposed to Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha (DSR-TKA). I remember that some "old guy" (aka Mac Cripe from Butler University) came before the assembly, told us we were all champions, said Latin words like Delta, Sigma, and Kappa, gave away a trophy or other such award, and sent us on our way . . . awe inspired of course. At that time, I thought that DSR-TKA was sort of like the National Forensic League (NFL) for grown-ups, complete with lapel pins.

In 1977, I was invited to join the Ball State University chapter of that same organization. After a rather memorable initiation ceremony at the Muncie Reservoir and after attending my first national conference of DSR-TKA at the University of Illinois, I began to realize that DSR-TKA is much more than just another lapel pin. DSR-TKA had become a vital part of my college forensics career. As a coach, several years later, my philosophy has not changed. With each initiation ceremony is a reaffirmation of the goals of the organization—to strive for excellence in public speaking.

Unfortunately, in these financially turbulent times, many forensics programs seem unable to support a multitude of national tournaments. I believe that such a situation is unfortunate. The Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha national conference offers a diverse national tournament which is financially feasible.

I realize that some of us may not be DSR-TKA members. Therefore, I will briefly consider the background of the organization and its national tournament; I will then consider the diversity of the national conference and the opportunities which are offered; and finally, the financial advantages of attending the DSR-TKA national conference.

Background of DSR-TKA

Delta Sigma Rho was founded on April 13, 1906, when eight Midwestern universities met to organize a college honorary forensic society. DSR sought to promote the goal of encouraging effective public speaking. In 1911, this effort was furthered when the general council of the organization moved to publish a quarterly magazine called The Gavel.

Shawn L. McGee is former Director of Individual Events, Wayne State University. This essay is based upon a paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention, Washington, D.C., November, 1983.
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Tau Kappa Alpha, dedicated to the cultivation of effective, intelligent, and responsible speaking, was born in the State House of Indiana, May 13, 1908. In the late 1930s, this organization instituted a student council and a yearly tournament conference. Tau Kappa Alpha also recognized a public figure as speaker of the year and published its journal, The Speaker, beginning in 1914.

In the late 1950s, the leaders began to realize that in the light of rapidly changing times, one strong, national honor society in forensics with chapters in leading colleges and universities in every section of the country was desirable. The actual merger occurred on August 18, 1963 in Denver, Colorado.

Before 1959, the Biennial National Conference of Delta Sigma Rho was exclusively a national conference, with no activities in competitive debate or individual events. Beginning in 1959, a Biennial Forensic Tournament was added, so that each year students could attend a national DSR event: one year a forensic tournament, the next a congress. The First Annual DSR-TKA National Conference in 1964 included all three elements of the previous Biennial events: debate, individual events, and student congress. Over the following years this national conference reflected the state of the art in current forensics practice. Off-topic debate was added to the list of events offered. As CEDA emerged, off-topic debate became CEDA at the national DSR-TKA conference. In 1979, DSR-TKA adopted the event descriptions of AFA-NIET, bringing the number of individual events offered to ten. Thus, every year the DSR-TKA national conference offers competition in NDT and CEDA debate, student congress, and individual events.

The Diversity of DSR-TKA

The variety of events offered at the DSR-TKA national conference is the first element of diversity which I would like to address.

It is not unusual for some of the finest debate teams in the country to compete at the national conference in NDT debate. Teams from the University of Kansas, Butler University, University of Utah, Mercer University, Emory University, and Wayne State University have consistently fared well at the tournament. For many it offers quality debate comparable to that encountered at the National Debate Tournament of the American Forensics Association. An advantage, however, is that schools may enter more than just their two top teams at the DSR-TKA conference tournament. This offers an excellent opportunity for the third, fourth, and even fifth teams of schools to encounter excellent debate competition. Of course, the national college topic is debated and a variety of presentation and argumentation styles are apparent.

What was once considered "off-topic" debate—with greater emphasis on the rhetorical nature of argument presentation—has become CEDA debate at DSR-TKA. The second semester CEDA topic is debated at the national
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conference. Teams from Vanderbilt, Murray State, Duke, Weber State, Texas Tech, the University of Utah, to name just a few, have offered excellent rounds of CEDA debate competition. When judging an elimination round at the national conference held at Texas Tech University in 1982, it was apparent to me that off-topic debate had come of age. I remembered my DSR-TKA file on pornography (my partner and I were for it) from 1978... a far cry from the quality which is now witnessed at DSR-TKA.

The Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha national conference has long been recognized as the best forum for student congress competition. Students elect party officers, a speaker, and clerk of the assembly and form committees and caucuses for the various positions represented by members of the assembly. Debating, or should I say legislating current issues of the day, familiarizes students not only with those issues, but also with governmental structures and valuable tools of parliamentary procedure. Students from the University of Illinois, DePauw University, University of Florida, Auburn University, Murray State University, and Wayne State University have proven to be, among others, excellent young legislators.

Until 1979, only three individual events were offered at the DSR-TKA national conference: extemporaneous speaking, persuasion speaking, and oral interpretation. In that year, all ten AFA-NIET events replaced the three previous categories. Students from the University of Mississippi, Mankato State University, Wayne State University, Auburn University, the University of Nebraska, and Ball State University have consistently been among the champions (again, just to name a few).

To have a national tournament which offers so many different competitive activities is in itself diverse and unique. When one adds the quality of performances witnessed at the conference, it becomes even more laudable. But diversity in events is not the only advantage. Students are encouraged to enter more than one of the activities. Schedules for the conference allow students to participate, for example, in debate and some individual events or to compete in student congress and individual events, etc. Student cross-entering often allows for judges to cross-enter as well. Though this can create a few grumbles in the four different tabulation rooms, it is often a welcome relief to escape from the land of poetry and persuasion to the fast-talking mecca of debate.

It is also appropriate to recognize the opportunity for a number of students from each school to enter competition at the national conference. Though there have to be some limitations—scheduling would be a nightmare if a university were to bring 23 teams in CEDA debate—the conference does allow for a more open forum of competition than do the other national tournaments. Because the only prerequisite of entry is school membership in DSR-TKA, the element of "getting qualified" does not become an issue.

However, the advantages and diversity of the DSR-TKA national conference are not limited to competition. After all, Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha is an honorary fraternity, and this fact alone justifies, in my mind, the need for attending the national conference. Students and coaches are given an excellent opportunity to socialize with their peers within the organization. There is a lot to be said for pomp and circumstance. Call me emotional, but certain founding traditions must be preserved in the forensics activities.
Forensics offers opportunities for social growth and maturity; the DSR-TKA national conference offers an excellent forum for that development.

To offer specific examples is an easy task when one considers the many fraternity fellowship opportunities at the national conference. The Initiation ceremony held at every national conference not only provides a model for local chapters to follow, but also allows students to become members of the national organization in the truest sense of the expression. Student officers are elected each year. Business meetings permit students to express their concerns to the general body. There are often organized parties for the students and, of course, the banquet where special awards are given. Each year the students select a student speaker of the year, an honor considered by many to be the high point of a student’s forensic career. The evaluation process is an opportunity for the students to step back from competition and assess their peers in a light of respect and admiration. Finally, the organization awards recognition to those who have given distinguished service to DSR-TKA and to those alumni who are now excelling in “the real world.” In addition, a speaker of the year is selected by Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha. Among the recipients have been Martin Luther King, Barbara Jordan, Walter Cronkite, Hubert Humphrey, Walter Mondale, and, yes, Ronald Reagan. All of these awards help the students to understand their forensic heritage, to set goals, and to strive for excellence in communication. Although the students might not immediately forget about the next round of prose, or their legislative committee, or value propositions, or counterplans one through four, the spirit of the moment, the lasting impression of the many honors of their affiliation will remain . . . even after the trophy tarnishes and the little man falls off the top.

We are still faced with the financial dilemma of supporting yet another national tournament. Why should we do it? How can we do it?

Financial Feasibility of DSR-TKA

“Why should we do it?” is a question which I hope I have already answered. For each individual program it becomes a question of priority. Wayne State University, which I represent, has been an active member of DSR-TKA since May 1937 and is a school which has a tradition of preserving tradition. As a forensics educator, each of us must set priorities. Though I am not going to try to set your priorities for you, I would encourage each of you to consider support of one of the national forensic honoraries. Do not dismiss attendance at the Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha national conference or the Pi Kappa Delta national tournament as simply as an issue of economics.

But how can we afford participation at yet another national tournament? It is quite simple. First, as a coach, consider DSR-TKA to be more than “just another tournament.” If program directors promote the conference as something special, that attitude will surface in the students who are an excellent support mechanism for fund raising, especially when motivated to raise money for their national conference. The students’ goal will be reached when they are able to attend the conference in March of each year. Second, do not hesitate to tap alumni sources for economic support.
In the “old days,” DSR-TKA may have been viewed more fondly and with more prestige. Alumni who were inspired by the conference in 1959 may be willing to sponsor a speaker in 1984. Of course, as always, university special funding may be an option. With an organization as rich in heritage as DSR-TKA, attendance and travel justification is not problematic.

Conclusion

Rarely does a tournament offer the opportunity for the debate, individual events, and student-congress people to travel together. In and of itself, this is a money saver. Teams have chartered buses, rented recreational vehicles, and found special group rates for their teams. Students can begin to realize a shared respect for the activities of their fellow students.

In these tight economic times, no one has all of the answers. However, the Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha national conference is a product which sells itself. As consumers and producers of quality forensic programs, we need to look at the “bottom line.” DSR-TKA is a diverse, yet financially feasible national tournament.

CALL FOR PAPERS

SPECIAL EDITION OF
SPEAKER AND GAVEL ON THE
1984 PRESIDENTIAL DEBATES

*Speaker and Gavel* will publish a special edition devoted to the 1984 general election Presidential debates. Qualitative and/or quantitative analyses, as well as position papers, are invited. Submitted manuscripts will be competitively selected for publication. The deadline for submission is September 15, 1985.

Authors should submit three double-spaced, typed copies of a manuscript, documented with endnotes beginning on a separate page at the conclusion of the text. Manuscripts should conform to the latest edition of the *MLA Handbook* and should use nonsexist language. Include a cover letter identifying author(s) and affiliation, but remove all such references in the manuscript in order to facilitate blind reviewing. Manuscripts should normally be in the 1,500–3,500 word range.

Manuscripts and correspondence should be directed to the editor at the following address.

Professor Jack Kay  
Department of Speech Communication  
432 Oldfather Hall  
University of Nebraska–Lincoln  
Lincoln, NE 68588-0329
SUBSCRIPTION INFORMATION

The Delta Sigma Rho–Tau Kappa Alpha National Council has established a standard subscription rate of $5.00 per year for Speaker and Gavel.

Present policy provides that new members, upon election, are provided with two years of Speaker and Gavel free of charge. Life members, furthermore, who have paid a Life Patron alumni membership fee of $100, likewise regularly receive Speaker and Gavel. Also receiving each issue are the current chapter sponsors and the libraries of institutions holding a charter in the organization.

Other individuals and libraries are welcome to subscribe to Speaker and Gavel. Subscription orders should be sent to Allen Press, P. O. Box 368, Lawrence, Kansas 66044.

TO SPONSORS AND MEMBERS

Please send all communications relating to initiation, certificates of membership, key orders, and names of members to the National Secretary. All requests for authority to initiate and for emblems should be sent to the National Secretary and should be accompanied by check or money order. Inasmuch as all checks and money orders are forwarded by the Secretary to the National Treasurer, please make them to: “The Treasurer of Delta Sigma Rho–Tau Kappa Alpha.”

The membership fee is $15.00. The official key (size shown in cut on this page) is $15.00, or the official key-pin is $17.00.

Prices include Federal Tax. The names of new members, those elected between September of one year and September of the following year, appear in the Fall issue of Speaker and Gavel. According to present regulations of the society, new members receive Speaker and Gavel for two years following their initiation if they return the record form supplied them at the time their application is approved by the Executive Secretary and certified to the sponsor. Following this time all members who wish to receive Speaker and Gavel may subscribe at the standard rate of $5.00 per year.