THE JOURNAL OF THE
TENNESSEE SPEECH COMMUNICATION ASSOCIATION

Fall 1981

CONTENTS

A SURVEY OF STUDIES OF
BROADCAST COVERAGE OF THE PRESIDENCY

by

Kenneth Kane

Since Warren G. Harding first spoke over a Presidential radio network in 1923, the nation's Chief Executives have utilized the broadcast media to announce, persuade and muster support.[1] Franklin D. Roosevelt raised persuasive broadcasting to an art with his "Fireside Chats," and brought Presidential press coverage (both print and broadcast) into the modern era with his appointment of Stephen Early as Press Secretary.[2] Early was the first aide whose primary responsibility was media relations. For nearly half a century, Presidents have broadcast direct appeals to their constituents, and have had their words analyzed and edited by electronic journalists.

The work of these reporters, and their relationship to the Chief Executive have been increasingly analyzed in recent years as well. Scholars, governmental officials and journalists themselves have all contributed to the discussion and study of broadcast coverage of the American Presidency.

PRESIDENTS AND THE PRESS

The broadcast media have made the Presidency even more a "Bully Pulpit" than Teddy Roosevelt imagined. With the growth of the electronic press, the fourth estate has also developed a larger, national audience. Because broadcasting

can provide instantaneous national coverage, former F.C.C.
Chairman Newton Minow has said, "Far more than print, broad-
casting is intimately connected with Presidential politics."[3]

Roper opinion polls have reported that television is the
medium from which most Americans get most of their news.[4]
But Stevenson and White have argued that these polls have
inflated the importance of television. They have claimed
that Roper's methods are too vague, thereby invalidating
the results.[5] Without a detailed survey of just what
viewers, listeners and readers choose to digest (sports,
local news, comics, national news, ads, etc.), source com-
parisons are impossible to make. Still, television and
radio are important sources of news about American govern-
ment for the American people.

Some Chief Executives, particularly Nixon and Johnson
in the recent past, have blamed their political demises on
the press.[6] Political scientist Thomas Cronin identifies
"blaming the press" as a basic defense strategy of all
modern Presidents.[7] Another political scientist, William
Spragens, says Presidents may blame the press, but in fact
only the Chief Executive can provide the ammunition for
their downfalls:

> It is still Presidents themselves who make
> or break their own political reputations,
> despite the magnifying impact of the news
> media.[8]

Johnson's Press Secretary, George Reedy, has written that
the White House press is essentially a messenger, rather
than a creator of news. While reporters can rearrange and

interpret facts, their "ability to change facts is severely limited as long as any degree of competition [among the media] remains."[9] Reedy has called the press the President's most effective link to reality--the only force within the White House which "cannot be softened by intermediary interpreters or deflected by sympathetic attendants."[10] However, the broadcast press has certain internal constraints which tend to soften its message for the viewers/listeners.

PRESSURES ON THE BROADCAST PRESS

Foremost are the pressures of daily (or in the case of radio, hourly) deadlines, and the tendency toward short story treatments. In his study of television coverage of the 1976 election, Swanson blamed deadlines and one-to-two minute story length for the medium's reliance upon verbal imagery. Such labeling enhances viewer comprehension. But it simplifies a candidate's stand and denies the viewer the depth of meaning essential to informed voting.[11] Swanson also cited the networks' desire for large audiences, which is manifest in even-handed, bland coverage of all major Presidential candidates. Such balanced reporting insures that followers of a particular candidate will not become offended to the point of changing channels.

But Swanson called the most serious constraint to television's coverage the "Melodramatic Imperative."[12] He cited the pressures placed upon journalists to assure that their stories are both entertaining and informative. The Melodramatic Imperative suits this purpose at the expense of educating viewers about the candidates and issues. But

in his analysis, Swanson failed to identify the <u>source</u> of these pressures. Whether they come from the networks (in pursuit of ratings), or from the audience itself, is unclear. Various researchers attribute these pressures to different sources, so there is no concensus on this point.[13]

THE PRESS AND CAMPAIGNS

Most studies of television coverage of the President have focused, like Swanson's, on election campaigns. While this research provides some insights into the ways the medium treats the Chief Executive, it only explains coverage of the <u>pursuit</u> of the office. Myers, Newhouse and Garrett examined the subject of momentum, and seemed to confirm Swanson's conclusion that the networks care more about who is gaining or losing than who is ahead.[14] But their study showed that the three networks reported momentum in different ways. Using content analysis, they found that CBS focused on momentum more than its competitors did. In CBS and NBC stories, such momentum statements were made by the candidates or their surrogates. At ABC however, reporters rather than political figures often told the audience who was gaining or losing. The researchers postulated that the audience can put such momentum statements into perspective when they come from politicians, whose job it is to boost one candidate or another. But coming from reporters, these statements could cause viewers to question the objectivity of the correspondent.[15]

EYEWITNESS vs. PRESS-GENERATED PERCEPTIONS

The classic study by Lang and Lang of MacArthur Day exemplifies the frustrated storyteller's lament, "I guess you had to be there!"[16] They found that the television audience viewing the live broadcast of General Douglas MacArthur's visit to Chicago in 1952 waw a tumultuous hero's welcome for the "old soldier." Along the parade route, however, according to the researchers' observers on the scene, the crowd was tepid. Both those assembled and those watching television saw MacArthur. But their perceptions of his visit, said Lang and Lang, hinged on whether they were on the street or in front of a TV.[16]

Their results were replicatated in a Presidential context 22 years later in a flawed, yet interesting study by Kaid, Corgan and Clampitt.[18] They found that those people attending a 1974 speech by President Ford knew more about it than did those who read, heard or saw accounts of the speech.[19] The study concluded that the media left their audiences with different messages than Ford left with his. The conclusion drawn was at once obvious and subtle: journalists are interpreters rather than chroniclers. Little more can be generalized from the study, though, because of serious biases resulting from its methodology.[20]

A serious problem with all of the studies cited is that none of the authors makes an attempt to clearly or operationally define "distortion." Without operationalizing this variable, neither reader nor researcher can identify it with confidence.[21]

PRESIDENTIAL PRESS CONFERENCES

Another subject of much interest, if not research, is the Presidential press conference. Reedy felt that the President firmly controls such sessions, especially those which are televised. Reporters amount to "supporting players rather than information seekers" and mere "props."[22] Orr agreed that the press conference is a President's proceeding, but said that it is also a _press_ event where reporters can critically confront the President.[23] Orr observed that the press plays an _unofficial_ role as guardian of the public trust. So, journalists are both neutral observers and participants--adversaries to the government, yet allies to officials. Orr said the press goes to great lengths to maintain this "counterpoised situation."[24]

Veteran White House correspondent Edward P. Morgan believed "the actual confrontation is important," but conceded that the President "is the master of the news conference."[25] Morgan's sentiments were echoed by McGuire in his survey of White House journalists and administration representatives, including former President Eisenhower. Those questioned agreed that the Preseident sets the form and rules for such gatherings, but that the press has the right to confront him.[26]

SUMMARY

Research of media coverage of the President has been surprisingly limited. Studies of television coverage have

en published in recent years involve coverage of cam-
igns and elections more than the President's duties once
office. The one exception to this pattern has been
udies of Presidential press conferences.

Journalism often focuses, if not on things going
rong (as Spragens has suggested), then on the unusual.
ut for each good "newsday" there are numerous bad ones,
hen only routine matters occur. Coverage of the Presi-
ent is certainly no exception. Still it is the responsi-
ility--and the practice--of the White House press to report
he mundane as well as the unique. Perhaps in the future,
esearchers will follow the journalists' example, and will
ot restrict their observations of broadcast Presidential
coverage to the quadrennial hoopla of the campaign trail.
(After all, Presidential policy can be initiated only after
Inauguration Day, not prior to Election Day.) Scholars
should scrutinize the electronic media's daily coverage
of the incidental, as well as the monumental, events which
are the American Presidency.

NOTES

Kenneth Kane is a graduate student at Memphis State University. He is also a reporter for WHBQ-TV in Memphis.

[1]Samuel L. Becker, "Presidential Power: The Influence of Broadcasting," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 47, (February 1961): 11.

[2]William E. Spragens, The Presidency and the Mass Media in the Age of Television, (Washington: University Press of America, 1979), p. 249.

[3]Newton N. Minnow, John B. Martin, and Lee M. Mitchell, Presidential Television, (New York: Basic Books, 1973), p. 26.

[4]Robert Stevenson and Kathryn P. White, "The Cumulative Audience of Network Television News," Journalism Quarterly 57 (Autumn 1980): 477. Television overtook newspapers in the early 1960's. By the mid-1970's, 64% of those asked the question: "Where [do] you usually get most of your news about what's going on in the world today--from the newspapers or radio or television or magazines or talking with people or where?" answered television.

[5]Stevenson, 477-8. They criticized the question used in the poll. They claimed the question was improperly asked, inappropriate, ambiguous and could not be accurately answered.

[6]Nixon's parting shot at the press following his California gubernatorial defeat in 1962 was a classic example: "You won't have Nixon to kick around anymore." _____.

[7]Rexford G. Tugwell and Thomas E. Cronin, The Presidency Reappraised, (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1974), p. 180.

[8]Spragens, p. 28.

[9]George Reedy, The Twilight of the Presidency, (Cleveland: New American Library, 1970), p. 100.

[10]Reedy, p. 100.

[11]David L. Swanson. "And That's the Way It Was? Television Covers the 1976 Presidential Campaign," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 63, (October 1977): 241. Another restricting force

is the half-hour format of the national news programs. As Steinberg learned in his affiliate station poll, there seems to be little chance of an expansion of the traditional early-evening network newscasts. Charles S. Steinberg, "Network Affiliate Opinions on Five Critical Issues Facing the Broadcaster and the Government," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 62, (February 1976): 58.

[12]Swanson, 241. Swanson says the Melodramatic Imperative requires classification of "winner-types" and "loser-types" and focuses upon the "meta-campaign"--the tactics and strategies employed in the pursuit, not of victory, but of momentum. Gregg also noted a preponderance of momentum stories in his research. Richard B. Gregg, "The Rhetoric of Political Newscasting," Central States Speech Journal, 28, (Winter 1977): 226.

[13]Smith noted a tendency for the public to desire a certain approach to the news, which stations and networks frequently deliver. But he has also identified an organizational pressure resulting in simplistic and pre-determined coverage of events: the network news departments' internal communications. In a study of election night and convention broadcasts on CBS, Smith and Arntson found that the more layers of organization through which a message has to pass, the greater chance that some bit of information would be lost, particularly if it updated or contradicted earlier research done by CBS news. Craig R. Smith, "Television News as Rhetoric," Western Journal of Speech Communication, 41, (Summer 1977): 151. Paul H. Arntson and Craig R. Smith, "News Distortion as a Function of Organizational Communication," Communication Monographs, 45, (November 1978): 371.
     In their MacArthur Day study, Lang and Lang found that the television audience had a set of expectations (which were implanted because of press coverage) which turned out to be wrong. Still, television supported these misconceptions rather than challenged them. This research predates Swanson's study by a quarter of a century. Even so, Lang and Lang's conclusion operationalizes the Melodramatic Imperative quite well:

> Newsmen, in planning the coverage of a public event, make certain assumptions about their medium, about what viewers expect, and about what will hold their attention. An industry that puts great stock in audience ratings wants to assure steady interest. So the MacArthur Day telecast was made to conform to the newsmen's notions of viewers' expectations. In line with the assumed pattern, the commentators steered clear of political issues and avoided offending any viewer. Viewers were expecting a dramatic occasion, so drama it had to be, even at the expense of reality.

[14]Renee A. Myers, Thomas L. Newhouse and Dennis E. Garrett, "Political Momentum: Television News Treatment," Communication Monographs, 45, (November 1978), p. 76.

[15]Myers, 368. It is conceivable that the day-in-day-out coverage of one candidate could cloud the perceptions of some reporters. Familiarity can breed admiration as easily as contempt on the campaign trail. Reporters do like a winner, after all--if for no other reason than the additional air time such "winner-types" often receive. Myers, Newhouse and Garrett did not differentiate between gain and loss statements made by reporters. It would have been interesting to see if correspondents made more positive than negative momentum statements. Such might be the case, to keep one's candidate and oneself on the air, particularly during primary campaigns. It is a hypothesis worth exploring.

[16]Lang and Lang, pp. 36-77.

[17]Lang and Lang, p. 51. "The video treatment of MacArthur Day preserved rather than upset previously held expectations... Viewers received no hint of any disappointment or let-down experienced by the crowd."

[18]Lynda Lee Kaid, Craig Corgan and Phil Clampitt, "Perceptions of a Political Campaign Event: Media vs. Personal Viewing," Journal of Broadcasting, 20, (Summer 1976): 304.

[19]But there was relatively little difference in perceptions among those not at the event who got their information from radio, television or newspapers. (The speech was made on behalf of Republician gubernatorial and senatorial candidates in Oklahoma.)

[20]The study compared immediate recall of issues mentioned during the speech for those at the rally, with recall up to 72 hours after the speech for those in the media group. Those at the rally were primarily Republicians, while those contacted by phone (the media group) were more evenly distributed among Republicans, Democrats and independents. Both incongruities seriously reduce the valididty of the results.

[21]Perhaps such a definition is impossible to pin down. Arntson and Smith found that the "newsworthiness" of an item determined whether it would be broadcast. The researchers found the definition of newsworthiness confusing. But CBS' description: that which is "important to history," "current or on-going," "exciting," "concise," or "capable of being broken into concise units" or something which "had impact" (Arntson, 376) would probably not be misunderstood by the network's journalists, or reporters in general. It may be

vague, but it is right. On the other hand, Spragens' explicit definition of news as "something that happens when things go wrong" (Spragens, p. 270) is too specific. It is right as far as it goes, but it does not go far enough. Distortion may be easier to explain by example than to define, but the researchers should have made an attempt to conceptualize the term.

[22]Reedy, pp. 162, 164.

[23]C. Jack Orr, "Reporters Confront the President: Sustaining a Counterpoised Situation," <u>Quarterly Journal of Speech</u>, 66, (February 1980): 19-20.

[24]Orr, 18. The author gives numerous examples of reporters' attempts to couch damaging questions to the President in deferential language; at once being courteous, yet challenging. But Orr contends that the counterpoised situation demands that reporters show respect. Otherwise, he implies they would play judge, prosecuter and jury. These correspondents are professionals--steeped in journalistic tradition and polished over the years by their own experience. This, not Orr's hypothesis, has taught them to look before they leap to their feet at a press conference to condemn the President without warrant.

[25]Edward P. Morgan, Max Ways, Clark Mollenhoff, Peter Lisagor, Herbert G. Klein, <u>The Presidency and the Press Conference</u>, (Washington: American Enterprise Institute, 1971), pp. 43, 33.

[26]Delbert McGuire, "Democracy's Confrontation: The Presidential Press Conference, II," <u>Journalism Quarterly</u>, 45, (Spring 1968), 32.

KING DEPOSED:

NEW RELIGIOUS RHETORIC

REIGNS ON AMERICAN FRONTIER

by

Carl Wayne Hensley

The original religious rhetoricians in America were Puritan preachers. Rhetoric was their central task and was a formidable force in their culture. Moreover, since "the sermon was the most typical and influential of ... early American culture-shaping institutions,"[1] their practices primarily determined religious rhetorical patterns for almost three centuries. Thus, we can assert that the king of American rhetoric until the beginning of the nineteenth century was Puritan rhetoric. Although, this king's reign was an extended one, it was not without challenges. By the middle of his first century, the king was being challenged by some of his once-loyal subjects through the rhetoric of the Half-way Covenant. Later, as his reign entered its second century, challenges came both from within his ranks and from outside his ranks through the rhetoric of the Great Awakening. Each challenge weakened Puritanism's rule over rhetoric, and when the final challenge came during the Second Great Awakening, the king could no longer sustain his power. Thus, a new rhetoric took the throne and ruled America, especially on the western frontier.

This paper sketches the nature of the original Puritan rhetoric, examines the early and middle challenges, and sets forth the details of the confrontation leading to the ultimate downfall of the once mighty rhetorical ruler. It then demonstrates how one native rhetoric, that of the Disciples of Christ, played a dominant role as the king was finally deposed.

Among the influences that gave Puritan rhetoric its form, theology was foremost and is the primary concern in this discussion. Puritan theology, derived primarily from John Calvin and with the absolute sovereignty of God as its foundation, set forth five emphases which dominated the rhetoric: (1) total depravity, (2) election and predestination, (3) limited atonement, (4) the irresistibility of God's grace, and (5) the perseverance of the saints. The first two emphases set up an impossible situation in which man was inherently, totally sinful and needed to be reconciled to God. However, God was so holy and sovereign that He was inapproachable. Since man was totally depraved, he could not develop saving faith; he was completely helpless. Saving faith, like grace, was the gift of God to those whom God had arbitrarily elected and then predestined to be saved. Once God revealed to an individual that he was elect, the person could not reject the gift of grace; and having received the gift, he could never lose it. The primary instrument in aiding men to discover if they were among the elect, and hence to receive

saving grace, was the sermon. Using this instrument extensive-
ly, as well as intensively, Puritan preachers pointed to the
conversion process: (1) knowledge and understanding of
biblical doctrines, (2) acceptance of the righteousness of
God revealed in the doctrines, (3) conviction of one's own
unrighteousness and sinful condition in contrast to God's
righteousness, (4) fear because of one's damnation, (5)
awareness of the possible presence of saving faith, (6) an
unsettling, agonizing struggle between doubt and faith and
fear and confidence, (7) and, finally, if God had chosen, the
overwhelming assurance of election and saving grace. This
led the Puritans to accept into the church membership only
those who could demonstrate election by relating a satisfactory
experience of saving grace. Thus, church membership was re-
strictive since it was equivalent to election and salvation and
emphasized a unique, mystical experience.

This theological position was strongly responsible for
determining the form and purpose of the rhetoric. In order for
listeners to know and understand doctrine the sermon first had
to be directed to the intellect. Only after the intellect had
been addressed sufficiently could the sermon rightly address
the emotions. "Religion was personal and emotional; but it was
first reasonable and reasoning!"[2] So, Puritan rhetoric took
as its dominant pattern a two part structure, the first part
focusing on application of doctrine and motivational appeals.[3]
Preachers of the first generation strove to maintain a strict
balance between the two parts of the sermon and to balance the
purposes of the parts. Since true faith was based on knowledge,

it must be the result of understanding biblical doctrines and rational acceptance of them. The personal experience of faith followed this understanding, and only in this order should the affections be evoked. In other words, the intellect accepted the understanding of doctrine, the will embraced it, and finally, the emotions were challenged and allowed to be expressed. Through participation in this rhetorical activity the elect would eventually experience saving grace and faith, while the non-elect would seek the experience in vain. Because this was the primary path to assurance of election and thus to salvation, everyone had to participate.

An early challenge to this ruling rhetoric came from within the king's own community in the form of the Half-way convenant. This covenant resulted over concern for the spiritual status of the children of church members and a decline in church membership following 1650. As children of the elect, they had been baptized. However, when they grew up, many failed to relate a saving experience and enter membership. Then, as they had children, the crisis increased because their children were not entitled to baptism. Thus, church membership declined. In 1662, the issue was addressed by the Half-way Covenant which stated that "the baptized but unregenerate children of the founders would continue to be considered partial church members and their own offspring would be eligible for baptism and partial membership."[4] Partial membership meant that they were enrolled in the

church but could not partake of the Lord's Supper, vote in the church, or have the civil franchise until they demonstrated election. "An immediate effect . . . was to rend the uniformity of New England thought."[5] In addition, this Covenant led to a division in the uniformity of the rhetoric. While some continued to preach in the traditional mode of bringing about the assurance of election, others began to extend half-way membership to any individual who gained knowledge of Scripture and its doctrines, led a moral life, and professed faith. As baptised but unconverted people came into the churches, some preachers began to address them as though their faculties had been freed from the paralysis of original depravity. Then, motivational appeals began to intrude upon the doctrinal section of the sermon rather than being restricted to the application section. The once-seamless robe worn by our rhetorical king began to come apart as numerous subjects of his realm pulled in different directions, while bidding the king to sanction their particular rhetorical practices. In an effort to keep their king looking respectable, Puritans attempted to repair his rhetorical robe by sewing it together with three distinct seams in the form of three rhetorical emphases: (1) the anti-rational, anti-intellectual emphasis stressing emotional zeal typified by Solomon Stoddard, (2) the anti-emotional emphasis stressing the rational approach typified by Thomas Brattle and Benjamin Coleman, and (3) the moderate emphasis stressing a balanced

retention intellect and emotion typified by Increase and Cotton Mather. A critical insight at this point is that each emphasis still kept Calvinism at its center, even if in a modified form, and the king continued to sit in the throne (even though he now wore a royal robe tattered by the tribulations of rhetorical rebellions). However, his power was less secure than it had been.

The coming of the Great Awakening in the 1700's confronted Calvinistic rhetoric with a new and stronger challenge to its reign. George Whitefield, the preacher who epitomized the Great Awakening, was a committed Calvinist. However, even as he stressed depravity, justification by faith, and election, he set up a theological and rhetorical conflict: either one is elect and his salvation is predestined or one can actively participate with God for salvation. If the former is true, why preach to the masses and urge them to strive for justification? If the latter is true, why talk about predestination and election? Thus, Whitefield and other revivalists unwittingly opened the gates of the royal grounds for the entry of Arminian theology and its rhetorical pattern, and this eventually led to the downfall of Calvinism as king of American religious rhetoric.

The Great Awakening was an intimate part of a cultural revolution that swept America in the second half of the eighteenth century and the early years of the nineteenth century. Politically, disestablishment centered in the Revolutionary War. Religiously, disestablishment began with the Revolution and continued during the decades following the

American victory, thus in part becoming a religious express-
ion of democracy in action. Economically, free land and
opportunity in the West spurred the growth of democratic
individualizm. Those who joined this cultural revolution
were looking for opportunities to improve their lives.
"They were full of courage, impatient of restraint, lovers of
liberty, and firm believers in the doctrine of equality,"
according to William Warren Sweet.[6] They were quite willing
to accept new ideas in order to build a thoroughly democratic
society; and as they experienced political and economic
liberty, they desired the same in religion.

Therefore, while the democratic spirit increased in
influence, Calvinistic rhetoric decreased in influence as it
lost its appeal for numerous people who participated in the
intense individualism of secular rhetorics. Calvinism's
five points had developed into rhetorical dramas depicting
individuals as totally helpless to act in behalf of their
salvation. These dramas appealed to those who originally
participated in them, at least in part because they lived
in a social system based upon a hereditary class structure
in which the only hope for commoners to reach a position of
eminence was to do so in the world hereafter. The dramas
were further validated because those early participants
lived in a religious community which based status on divine
right rather than on human or inherited privilege. However,
these appeals lost their sanction in a culture of yeoman
farmers on the American frontier. In this culture the

Calvinistic dramas were challenged by democratic depictions of faith in natural reason, individualism, personal worth and equality, right of private judgment, and the value of voluntary organizations. For most American westerners the Calvinistic rhetorical emphasis became, in the words of Authur Schlessenger, Jr., "unreasonable. . . and unbearable."[7] Furthermore, it was simply incompatible with secular rhetorics which arose to explain the reality of the new Western culture. Thus, the conditions of the frontier created a propitious time for the emergence of new rhetorical patterns to celebrate the culture's new conditions.

Arminianism, which infiltrated American religious rhetoric during the Great Awakening, became a full-grown force in the early nineteenth century during the Second Great Awakening. Arminian theology fostered a rhetoric which dramatized listeners as men of free will, fully capable of participating with God in salvation. Instead of being antagonists who were totally unable to act in behalf of their own salvation, listeners were challenged to picture themselves as leading characters in a drama which depicted them as extremely valuable to God, the objects of a plan to salvation for all men, and people who were fully free to cooperate with God in working out their salvation. Arminian theology and rhetoric replaced Calvinism's abstruse and complex concepts with simplicity and intelligibility, replaced the most significant character in the drama

of salvation, the God of wrath, with a God of love, and re-
placed man as a helpless creature with man as an active
agent in the process of salvation. Arminianism tended to
become "the theology of the common man, since its principal
tenets jibed with his . . . experience."[8] Therefore, the
scene was set for the ultimate clash between the two rhetorical
approaches and for the final defeat of Calvinism as king of
American religious rhetoric.

One pertinent force which joined the battle and fought
vigorously to overthrow the king was the Disciples of Christ,
a religious movement born and bred on the American frontier
during the early decades of the nineteenth century. The
rapid growth of the Disciples during their early decades
testifies to the power of their persuasion. Although they
did not exist as a movement until 1809, by 1850 they numbered
118,000 members and constituted the sixth largest Protestant
body in America.[9] Early Disciples' leaders had been Pres-
byterian subjects of King Calvinism who revolted and developed
a rhetoric dramatizing the value and dignity of man and the
place of common sense in conversion. Their rhetoric insisted
that man was not inherently depraved and thus not under an
inevitable necessity to sin. Rather, man was prone to evil
and easily seduced to sin, but he was free to yield to sin
or refrain from it. Moreover, in his freedom of will, man
had a responsible part to play in God's plan of salvation.

The Disciples' rhetorical practice was shaped by claims that assumed that "God was no less reasonable than the best men" and that he had set forth a reasonable plan of salvation.[10]

The Disciples came into the rhetorical scene at a time when the most popular rhetorical approaches, whether Calvinistic or Arminian, "saw the upheaval of emotional experience as God's sign of His sovereign act by which he did what no man could do."[11] Charles Grandison Finney, the revivalist in the first half of the nineteenth century, was typical in regarding overt, emotionalistic experience as essential to conversion, and consequently he made the "mourner's bench" or "anxious seat" a vital part of the conversion process. "Praying through" to assurance of salvation seems to have been the nineteenth century remnant of traditional Calvinism's experience of the assurance of election. The psychological (i.e., emotive) experience which followed the intellect's acceptance of doctrine in the original rhetoric was now the central focus of conversion, and little, if any, emphasis fell on the role of the rational. So, a rhetoric which rushed to the front lines to claim the listener's allegiance and bring him to the necessary emotional upheaval was "ungenteel, rough and ready rhetoric" which consisted of barnyard metaphor, sarcasm, ridicule, invective, virtuperation, use of the vernacular and vulgar speech of the audience, shouting, loose structure, and extemporaneous delivery

(which to the frontiersman meant no advance preparation.)[12]
Organization was unimportant, and close reasoning was de-
precated. "If a minister appealed to logic or used notes
or prepared his sermon, he was only standing in the way of
direct confrontation with God."[13] Such rhetorical practices
sought emotionalistic responses as signs of strong spiritual
experiences.

The Disciples' rhetoric was dramatized so that it
possessed emotional appeal, but Disciples opposed the overt
emotionalism common to frontier revivalism. A partial ex-
planation of the persuasive power of the rhetoric may lie
in the way it appealed to the frontiersman's faith in the
average man's natural reason, common sense, and God-given
ability and right to help determine his own destiny. So
the conversion dramas were usually presented in the rational
mode. Disciples insisted that the New Testament contained a
clear plan of salvation and that any intelligent person,
using his God-given common sense, could find this plan,
follow its "logical steps," and be saved. On the one hand,
God acted in the completed historical revelation in Jesus
Christ to establish the means of salvation for every in-
dividual; on the other hand, man was free to respond to
God by gratefully accepting God's forgiveness, participating
in it through the ordinances (specifically, baptism of a be-
liever by immersion and weekly observance of the Lord's
Supper), and growing in Christian character and witness.

The dramas set forth the Messiahship of Jesus as the central "fact" of the gospel. After this "fact" had been "proved" by appeal to the Bible, the rhetoric challenged the listener to believe, repent, and be immersed. When the listener acted as the rhetorical drama suggested, he was assured of "an immediate and personal acquittal from sins, . . . a prompt salvation from the guilt and power of sin. . . and a being filled with joy and the Holy Spirit."[14] Walter Scott, premier first generation evangelist, was predominant in producing this rhetorical stance, and he triumphantly termed it "the gospel restored."[15] Scott popularized this emphasis among Disciples while laboring as a traveling evangelist. He is credited with at least one thousand con-versions each year for thirty years and with leading Disciples in their "amazing expansion" as a people in frontier America through the use of this rhetorical emphasis.[16] So, the rhetoric stressing assurance-of-salvation-through-willing-cooperation-with-God reached thousands of Americans and contributed generously to Calvinism's downfall.

One of the clearest expressions of the conversion drama is found in Elijah Goodwin's "Funeral Sermon of Florence Mathes."[17] Like most Disciples' preachers Goodwin begins with a biblical text, Revelation 22:14: "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have the right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city." After a few opening comments regarding

Mrs. Mathes (comments which became crucial to his drama later on) Goodwin enters a lengthy section explaining the text in its context. He concludes that "the city" of the text is not a literal heavenly city but represents "the glorified state of the redeemed."[18] The "departed sister" has entered that glorified state, and the key question in contemplating the New Jerusalem is, "Lord, who shall enter that happy state? Who shall dwell in the holy temple?"[19] Goodwin's reply is his proposition and forms the basis for the conversion fantasy, "Still, he has prepared for them a city, and has suspended their admittance into it upon obedience to his revealed will."[20] He then quotes several scriptures to reinforce the duty of obedience (Matt. 7:21 and 12:15, John 15:10, 2 Peter 1:10, I Peter 3:10-11), and alludes to two of Jesus' parables.[21] He asserts that one can fail to enter the eternal city, not merely by gross sins and vice, but by not actively obeying Christ's commands. He supports this with references to the account of final judgment in Matthew 25 and the incident in King Saul's life when he spared King Amalek. Thus, he enforces his proposition regarding the necessity to obey all of Christ's commands.[22]

Goodwin then moves to the basic commands which "may be regarded as the head of a class."[23] The first character in the drama is "the sinner who has never made his peace with God," whom he dramatically takes through the process of conversion. The character acts out his role as he obeys each command in God's plan of salvation: (1) "to harken to the

voice of God;" (2) "to believe, to receive the divine testimony as true, and thus to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ with all the heart" as Son of God and Savior: (3) to repent, "which implies sorrow for sin, confession of sin, and a turning away from sin:" and (4) "to be immersed in the name of the Lord Jesus."[24] Obedience to these commands makes one a Christian, changing his role in the drama from antagonist to protagonist. Having become a Christian, the character's role broadens into "new duties and responsibilities."[25] He must incorporate into his life the Christ-like qualities of 2 Peter 1:5-7: virtue, knowledge, temperance, patience, godliness, brotherly kindness, and charity; and Goodwin defines and describes the essence of each quality for his dramatic character.

Goodwin then brings "our departed sister" into the dramatic action. He had prepared for her role in the drama in the opening paragraphs of the sermon when he characterized her as "an aged mother in Israel" who spent "more than sixty years of her life in the service of our common Lord and Master."[26] She was a faithful member of the Baptist church for twenty years; then, "becoming acquainted with a people who discarded all human creeds, and unscriptural names, she united with them, taking the name Christian, as her only church name, and the Bible as her only religious creed."[27] She was among the first in Indiana to identify with "the great reformatory movement of the nineteenth century."[28]

The drama presents the Disciples' movement as God's movement, and Goodwin concludes his opening dramatization of Mrs. Mathes' Disciplehood, stating, "Thus she served the Lord faithfully and died triumphantly in full hope of eternal life."[29]

In the closing portion of the sermon Goodwin continues to characterize Mrs. Mathes as the dramatic model of conversion. She heard the voice of God, she believed, repented, was immersed into Christ, and became "a member of his mystical body."[30] She demonstrated the desired life-style of a Christian: she was "noted for her benevolence and kindness to the poor and needy;" she possessed an abundance of charity, generosity, and forgiveness; she reared her family of eleven children "in the right ways of the Lord," so that all were members of the Christian Church and three were preachers; she was a good citizen and patriot; she was a true and faithful wife and mother; she was faithful and punctual in church attendance; and she looked forward to eternity in heaven.[31] Therefore, "having spend a long life in doing the commandments of God, who had a right--yes, a constitutional right to the tree of life, which right also gives the privilege of entering in through the gates into the city of God."[32]

Following the dramatization of the conversion process Goodwin speaks briefly to the children of Mrs. Mathes. He depicts Mrs. Mathes as speaking "from that far-off land." First, he had her speak a word of comfort, "Weep not for me, I now rest from all my labors, and am comforted. . . " Then,

he has her speak a word of exhortation to the children,
"Children, come home. Do the commandments, that you may
also enjoy the honors that cluster around the throne of
God." Next, Mathes directly exhorts all listeners to make
it their "life-business to do the commandments" in order
to enter the "heavenly state." Finally, he makes an
appeal to the unconverted, "Sinners, come to Christ, and
commence to obey the commandements."[33] With this rhetorical
approach dramatizing an Arminian perspective on conversion,
the Disciples of Christ attracted thousands of converts and
contributed significantly to the final defeat of Calvinism
as king of American religious rhetoric.

SUMMARY

By the time Goodwin preached his funeral sermon for
Mrs. Mathes, Calvinsim, established by Puritan preachers as
the once formidable king of American religious rhetoric, was
a monarch whose subjects had been won away gradually by more
attractive aspirants for their loyalty. His position had been
too seriously weakened by the Half-way Covenant, the Great
Awakening, and cultural and societal transitions to withstand
the assault. When the Disciples of Christ arrive to join the
battle, their rhetorical drama, especially its focus on salva-
tion, added a crucial weapon to the arsenal of the king's
enemies. The Disciples of Christ and their rhetorical allies,
together with the cultural forces of individual freedom, per-
sonal worth, human equality, and human capability, finally
deposed King Calvinism and completed the religious and rhetori-
cal revolution which began many years before their inception.

FOOTNOTES

Carl Wayne Hensley, Ph.D., is Professor of Speech-Communication at Bethel College in St. Paul, Minnesota. This paper was presented to the Fall, 1981, Conference on Rhetoric and Public Address at Austin Peay State University, Clarksville, Tennessee.

[1] Robert T. Oliver, History of Public Speaking in America (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Incorporated, 1969), p. 9.

[2] Eugene E. White, "Puritan Preaching and the Authority of God," in Preaching in American History, ed. DeWitte Holland (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1969), p. 72. Faculty psychology also had a strong impact on Puritan rhetoric. White discusses this briefly on pp. 60ff.

[3] Although preached during the great Awakening rather during the first generation, Jonathan Edwards' sermon, "Sinners in the Hands of An Angry God," is an excellent example of the original Puritan rhetorical pattern. This pattern is quite evident in the arrangement of the sermon in A. Craig Baird, ed., American Public Addresses, 1740-1952 (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co, Incorporated, 1956), pp. 15-28.

[4] White, p. 54. For a thorough examination of the Half-way Covenant see Robert G. Pope, The Half-way Covenant: Church Membership in Puritan New England (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969).

[5] Ibid.

[6] The American Churches: An Interpretation (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1948), p. 34.

[7] "The Age of Jackson," in The Sage of Bethany: a Pioneer in Broadcloth, compiled by Perry E. Gresham (St. Louis: The Bethany Press, 1960), p. 26.

[8] Sweet, p. 132.

[9] Ibid., p. 42.

[10] Alfred T. DeGroot, Disciple Thought: A History (Fort Worth: Texas Christian University, 1965), p. 76.

[11] Ibid.

[12] Ernest G. Bormann, "The Rhetorical Theory of William Henry Milburn," Speech Monographs, 36 (March 1969), 28.

[13] Edward M. Collins, Jr., "The Rhetoric of Sensation Challenges the Rhetoric of the Intellect: An Eighteenth Century Controversy," in Preaching in American History, p. 115.

[14] Walter Scott, "Circular Letter," Evangelist, 1 (1832), 18.

[15] See Scott's comments in The Evangelist, 2 (1833), 160-62. For a more extensive exposition see his book, The Gospel Restored: a Discourse of the True Gospel of Jesus Christ, in which the Facts, Principles, Duties, and Privileges of Christianity are Arranged, Defined, and Discussed, and the Gospel in its Various Parts Shewn to be Adopted to the Nature and Necessities of Man in his Present Condition (Cincinnati: O. H. Donough, 1836).

[16] Dwight Stevenson, "Walter Scott and Evangelism," in Voices from Cane Ridge, ed. Rhodes Thompson (St. Louis: The Bethany Press, 1954), pp. 176-77.

[17] In The Western Preacher, ed. James M. Mathes (2nd ed., Cincinnati: Moore, Wilstach, Keyes, and Company, Printers, 1859), pp. 40-58.

[18] Ibid., p. 46.

[19] Ibid.

[20] Ibid., Italics mine.

[21] Ibid., pp. 48-49.

[22] Ibid., pp. 49-52.

[23] Ibid., p. 53. Each command is "proved by biblical references.

[24] Ibid., pp. 53-54.

[25] Ibid., p. 54.

[26] _Ibid._, p. 40.

[27] _Ibid._, p. 41.

[28] _Ibid._

[29] _Ibid._

[30] _Ibid._, p. 56.

[31] _Ibid._, pp. 57-58.

[32] _Ibid._, p. 58.

[33] _Ibid._

THE RHETORIC OF THE RESTORATION
MOVEMENT: 1800-1832

David Walker

In the early nineteenth century, a number of preachers
were dissatisfied with the religious aspect of their
environment; they were opposed to some teachings and
practices of existing religious bodies for which they
found no Scriptural authority. According to Garrison and
DeGroot, two basic principles guided these men:

> The first was that the church ought to be
> one, without sectarian divisions. The second
> was that the reasons for its divisions were
> the addition of "human opinions" to the simple
> requirements of Christ and his apostles as
> tests of fitness for admission to the church,
> and the usurpation of rule over the church by
> clergy and ecclesiastical courts unknown in
> the days of its primitive unity and purity.[1]

These preachers attempted, at first, to reform existing
religious bodies; as this effort progressed, however, the
emphasis shifted from the idea of "reformation" to
"restoration."[2] Alexander Campbell, writing in the Christian
Baptist in 1825, is credited with being one of the first to
emphasize the idea of restoring "the ancient order of things."[3]
The Restoration Movement spread rapidly until the 1850 census
showed its adherents to be consituting the fourth largest
church in the nation.[4]

In commenting on the significance of the Restoration
Movement, William Warren Sweet states that the combined
Disciples of Christ, Christian Church, and Churches of Christ

are now "generally recognized as . . . constituting the largest indigenous American church."[5] This paper will confine itself to a telescoped view of a few aspects of the rhetoric of the movement during the first thirty-two years of the nineteenth century.

Historical Background

Several conditions present in America at this time had their impact on the Restoration movement. The nation was very young, with a small population. Furthermore, thought regarding Christianity was extremely divided; only a small portion of the population was affiliated with any church. A high degree of religious liberty was enjoyed by Christians.[6] The democratic spirit beginning to envelope the country also had a significant influence on the progress of this movement. Although Calvinism remained the heart of most religions at the beginning of the century, it was losing ground in a nation stressing the individual importance of a person.[7] Finally, lax moral conditions are described as being present at this time.[8]

The bulk of the activity of the Restoration Movement took place in the American frontier. This area began about fifty miles back from the seacoast where the young nation became less civilized and settled. Several basic characteristics typified the frontiersman. First, he was a strongly individualistic person.[9] He was, however, one who enjoyed and craved companionship. A gathering to hear a traveling preacher really became more of a social activity than a religious one, in which the loneliness of the frontier was relieved.[10]

Secondly, he was highly responsive to emotional stimulus. As Niebuhr has discussed: "The isolation of frontier life fostered craving for companionship, suppressed the gregarious tendency and so subjected the lonely settler to the temptations of crowd suggestion to unusual degree."[11] Thirdly, the frontiersman was gullible. Removed in time and miles from more settled cultures, he was given to acceptance of primitive notions and superstitions which either had been learned from the Indians, or else had grown up among themselves.[12]

Fourthly, his thinking was basically and chiefly influenced by the Bible.[13] However, the moral standards of the frontier often indicated that the ideas of the Bible had little impact upon his actions. Many places on the frontier became "notorious for lawlessness, rowdyism, Sabbath breaking, gambling, swearing, drinking, and fighting."[14] Sweet contends that the rough character of a large portion of the frontier population and the rather general tendency of moral standards to break down on the frontier has long been accepted as historical fact."[15]

The Speakers

The spokespersons in the Restoration Movement conducted their activity in a number of different arenas. James O'Kelley, a Methodist, led a movement in the last decade of the eighteenth century against the authoritarian policies of Francis Asbury and established in North Carolina a "Christian Church."[16]

Abner Jones, a Baptist preacher in Vermont, organized a
"Christian Church" in Lyndon, Vermont in 1801 after becoming
greatly disturbed over sectarian names and creeds.[17] Elias
Smith, another Baptist, adopted similar beliefs in his
preaching in Portsmouth, New Hampshire about the same time.[18]

About 1800, Tennessee and Kentucky were experiencing
the Great Weatern Revival. This revival produced highly
emotional responses from audiences; a favorite vehicle for
this revival was the use of camp-meetings. These camp-meetings
were opposed by some Presbyterians because (1) they allowed
preachers without education or proper ordination to preach;
(2) they produced disorderly and uncouth scenes as a result of
the highly emotional responses; and (3) the evangelistic
appeal was made that "Christ died for all," contrary to the
Calvinistic teaching that only a limited number were the
objects of redeeming grace. As a result of these charges,
a trial was conducted by the Synod of Kentucky against some
of the leaders; during the trial, a number of key leaders
withdrew from the jurisdiction of that body. One of these
men was Barton W. Stone, who became the strongest spokes-
person for the Restoration Movement in the eastern part of
Kentucky.[19] Leaders in this area of the movement decided to
call themselves " Christian" with no sectarian name.[20]

Other spokespersons included John Wright, his father,
and his brother in Washington County, Indiana.[21] The Scotch
Baptists were another influential group in New York,

Baltimore, Philadelphia, and Pittsburg.[22] Walter Scott was
a highly successful evangelist.[23]

Thomas and Alexander Campbell immigrated to this
country in 1807 and 1809 respectively, from their native
Ireland. Thomas Campbell gave to the Restoration Movement the
slogan "Where the Scriptures speak, we speak; where the
Scriptures are silent, we are silent."[24] Alexander, his son,
is perhaps the best known figure of the movement. Successful
as a speaker, debater, editor, and teacher, he influenced
those who influenced others.

Other spokespersons in the early years of the movement
included Jacob Creath, Jr., D.S. Burnet, Herman Christian
Dasher, John T. Johnson, John Smith, Philip Slater Fall,
and William Kincaide. The work of the movement was
not just the work of a couple of individuals, but bore its
stamp from many spokespersons.

Principles of Biblical Interpretation

Although there were a number of speakers, they seemed
united for the most part on their beliefs. One of the most
fundamental aspects of a Christian rhetoric has to be
concerned with one's principles of Biblical interpretation.
Basically, there were five key ideas.

1. The Bible is the word of God. There are several re-
ferences to this principle, but for the most part, the
Restoration speakers did not feel the need to develop this
principle fully; the great majority of the audiences to

whom they spoke accepted it without question. A simple appeal to the Scriptures was considered to be final authority on all matters with which the Bible dealt.[25]

2. Human creeds must be rejected: the Bible alone is sufficient. Unlike the first principle, this attitude was not accepted by all the audiences. Attitudes toward human creeds constituted the reasons, in many instances, for various leaders withdrawing from churches. One of the earliest documents denouncing human creeds was the Last Will and Testament of the Springfield Presbytery, written in 1804. The authors of the document included Barton W. Stone. In abolishing themselves as a presbytery, they wrote:

> We will, that our power of making laws for the government of the church, and executing them by delegated authority, forever cease; that the people may have free course to the Bible, and adopt the law of the spirit of life In Jesus Christ. . ..
>
> We will, that the people henceforth take the Bible as the only sure guide to heaven; and as many as are offended with other books, which stand in competition with it, may cast them in the fire if they choose; for it is better to enter into life having one book than having many to be cast into hell.[26]

Creeds were described by various spokespersons as responsible for division among churches, homes, and closest friends.

3. The New Testament is the authority for beliefs and practices of the church. Restoration speakers saw Bible history as being divided into three dispensations called Patriarchal, Jewish, and Christian; the Old Testament

contained God's laws for the first two dispensations, and the New Testament revealed God's commands for the Christian dispensation. Although they recognized that the Old Testament was inspired and could be profitably studied, the Restoration speakers contended that its teachings were not binding upon the church; rather, the authority for the church rested in the teachings of the New Testament. Alexander Campbell, in his debate with W. L. MacCalla in 1823, compared the Patriarchal age to starlight, the Jewish to moonlight, and the Christian age to sunlight. The idea was that light increased with each dispensation.[27]

4. Authority for beliefs and practices must be demonstrated by Express Command or Approved Example. The spokespersons argued that one must find within the New Testament either an express command or an approved example as authority for his religious beliefs and practices. Thomas Campbell argued that nothing could be enjoined upon the Christian Church "for which there cannot be expressly produced a 'Thus saith the Lord,' either in express terms, or by approved precedent."[28] Walter Scott, in attacking the position of someone who sustained an argument by "lawfully inferring" a conclusion, responded: "Lawfully inferred! pray, who is to decide when a thing is lawfully inferred."[29]

5. Everyone has the right to interpret the Scriptures for himself. The fifth principle of Biblical interpretation is

a familiar Protestant one. Elias Smith wrote that "in all things essential to the faith and practice of a Christian, the Scriptures are plain and easy to be understood, by all who will diligently and impartially read and study them. . . . I do further assert, that every Christian is under an indispensable obligation to search the Scriptures for himself."[30]

The leaders of the Restoration movement thus saw their ideas proceeding from five principles of Biblical interpretation. The Bible is the Word of God. Human creeds must be rejected; the Bible alone is sufficient. The New Testament is the authority for beliefs and practices of the church. Authority for beliefs and practices must be demonstrated by express command or approved example. Everyone has the right to interpret the Scriptures for himself.

The Role of the Speaker

As the Restoration movement progressed to "restore the ancient order," what, exactly, was the task of the Restorationist as he stood before his audience? They contended that the motivation for the minister was not the gaining of any personal popularity, but rather the acceptance of Christ, on the part of the audience, as Savior from sin. A second goal on the part of the speaker was to correct erroneous religious doctrines which the Restoration leaders believed to be taught by many existing churches. As

they sought these goals, these speakers had the obligation,
they believed, of demonstrating themselves to be worthy of
their mission by living upright lives, both in and out of
the pulpit.

Writing in 1829, Alexander Campbell charged that:

> Some men speak merely for the sake of speaking
> It is their object to speak. Others speak for the
> sake of some point to be gained. Their object is
> to gain that point. . . . But he who speaks for
> some great, or good, or interesting object, loses
> himself in the subject; forgets almost his own
> identity, and sees or feels nothing but that for
> which he speaks. . . . The great end and object
> of all who teach or preach Jesus to men, should
> be to gain the hearts of men to him. Not to
> gain popularity for themselves, but to woo men
> to Christ.[31]

In a biting, satirical article published several years
earlier, Campbell had denounced the type of speaker who spoke
for the sake of personal advantage. His article, "The Third
Epistle of Peter," attacked what he considered to be the
standards followed by some rulers of congregations and their
preachers:

> When you go to the church to preach, go not by
> the retired way where go those that would shun the
> crowd, but go into the highway where go the multitude,
> see that ye have on the robes of black, and take heed
> that your pace be measured well, and that your march
> be stately.
>
> Then shall your "hearers be lifted up," even as
> the hearts of mighty men shall they be lifted up.
> And ye shall be gazed upon by the multitude, and
> they shall honor you; and the men shall praise you,
> and the women shall glorify you, even by women shall
> ye be glorified.

Campbell denounced the minister who preached for the purpose of making money.

> "In all your gettings" get money! Now, therefore, when you go forth on your ministerial journey, go where there are silver and gold, and where each man will pay according to his measure. For verily I say ye must get your reward.[32]

Included in the task of preaching to mankind was a second goal. The speaker must, Campbell contended, advocate reformation of existing religious conditions and bodies:

> Were Paul on earth now, he would proclaim reformation. He would from the acknowledgments, and from the behavior of our contemporaries, denounce the judgments of God upon them if they reformed not. He would show them that sects, opinions, speculations, and doctrines, were not the religion of Jesus Christ; and if they reformed not, into the kingdom of glory they could not enter.[33]

Barton W. Stone echoed similar thoughts in his Christian Messenger. The man who "points the proper way of reformation must certainly be engaged in a work pleasing to God, and profitable to man," he declared.[34] Stone believed that the minister must be motivated by his love for mankind. Writing to a young minister, he contended that the minister should avoid preaching as much as possible on controversial subjects. Furthermore, he should show his love for mankind by not wounding the feelings of anyone. He finally concluded that the minister's love for man must be so great, that he must be willing to give up everything, if necessary, in order to fulfill his goal as a Christian preacher.[35]

D. S. Burnet, writing in his Evangelical Inquirer, commented:

> Every orator should have something to say. . . .
> He that makes no communications, has no claim upon
> public attention. I should neither write nor speak,
> if I had not something of importance to present to
> the eye and ear, and through these media to interest
> the mind.[36]

The Restoration spokespersons envisioned a demanding life for the minister--one that required him to demonstrate in his life the objectives of his ministry. He had the obligation to live a life of example to others, both in and out of the pulpit. Stone declared that preachers must first "experience the force of that truth we deliver to others."[37] Stone, in writing his "Letter to J.C.," concluded:

> Be careful that you live and walk in the spirit
> every day. Your addresses will then be spiritual
> and profitable to your hearers. A dead, worldly and
> spiritless ministry, is a curse to the world. Such
> a ministry is a ministry of death.[38]

Alexander Campbell also demanded high standards for his minister. He adopted, early in his life, some rules which guided his life as a preacher. Among these rules were:

1. The preacher must be a man of piety, and one who
   has the instruction and salvation of mankind
   sincerely at heart.
2. A man of modest and simple manners, and in his
   public performance and general behavior must
   conduct himself so as to make his people sensible
   that he has their temporal and eternal welfare
   more at heart than anything else.[39]

As a minister attempted to reflect the objectives of his ministry, he had to demonstrate the virtue of humility. Elias Smith attacked the "titles and dresses of our fashionable

clergy," saying that they made him "ashamed of them as they pass along the streets on the first day of the week. The Reverend Dr.'s -- or Rabbis, with their long robes, and greetings which they love."[40] Alexander Campbell, in his "Third Epistle of Peter," already mentioned in this paper, satirized the lack of humility present in many ministers by attacking the style and manner of living to which many had become accustomed.

> And let your dwelling places be houses of splendor
> and edifices of cost; and let your doors be decked
> with plates of brass, and let your names, even your
> reverend titles be graven thereon; so shall it be
> as a sign. . . .

> Let the houses in which you preach be called
> churches, and let them be built in manner of great
> ornament without, and adorned with much cost within;
> with rich pillars and paints, and with fine altars
> and pedestals, and urns of precious stones, and
> clothes of velvet and scarlet, and vessels of silver.[41]

The demand for high ethics in the preacher's life also carried over in certain aspects of the preaching style. Articles attacked the plagiarist of other's sermons, the person who pretended to be speaking without notes when actually he was using them, and the person who spoke in an affected manner of delivery.[42]

Standing before his audience without clerical titles or garments, but rather as a humble student of the Bible, the Restoration spokesperson attempted to persuade his audience to accept salvation--he was not seeking the praise of the audience. He further tried to demonstrate, in his daily life, the message he was preaching from the pulpit.

This paper has looked briefly at two aspects of the rhetoric of the period of the Restoration Movement. Other aspects of that rhetoric which are vital to an understanding of that movement include their methods of speech preparation, their basic stock of ideas and logical development, and their motivational techniques.[43] A study of rhetorical movements should contribute to our understanding of rhetorical theory. These various spokespersons, reacting against religious conditions with which they were dissatisfied, practiced a viable rhetoric that exerted a powerful influence upon the American frontier.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Windred Ernest Garrison and Alfred T. DeGroot, The Disciples of Christ: A History, (St. Louis, 1964), p. 11.

[2] Earl Irwin West, The Search for the Ancient Order, (Nashville, 1964), I, 70-71.

[3] "A Restoration of the Ancient Order of Things, No. I," Christian Baptist, II, (February 1825). 132-136.

[4] West, p. XI.

[5] "Campbell Position in Church History," Christian Evangelist, LXXVI, (September 1938), 970.

[6] Garrison and DeGroot, pp. 59-60. Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., "The Age of Alexander Campbell," The Sage of Bethany, comp. Perry E. Gresham, (St. Louis, 1960), pp. 29; 59-60.

[7] Schlesinger, pp. 25-27.

[8] Winfred Ernest Garrison, Religion Follows the Frontier, (New York, 1931), p. xi.

[9] Rodney L. McQuary, "Social Background of the Disciples of Christ," College of the Bible Quarterly, XIII, (March 1924), 7.

[10] Frederic L. Paxson, History of the American Frontier 1763-1893, (Boston, 1924), p. 114. Oliver Read Whitley, Trumpet Call of Reformation, (St. Louis, 1959), p. 36.

[11] H. Richard Niebuhr, The Social Sources of Denomination-alism, (Cleveland, 1957), pp. 142-143.

[12] Merrill E. Gaddis, "Religious Ideas and Attitudes on the Early Frontier," Church History, II, (September, 1933), pp. 156-157.

[13] Bower Aly and Grafton P. Tanquary, "The Early National Period: 1788-1860," History and Criticism of American Public Address, ed. William Norwood Brigance, (New York, 1943), I, 60.

[14] Ross Stafford North, "The Evangelism of Walter Scott," (M.A. Thesis, L.S.U., 1952), p. 9.

[15]William Warren Sweet, Religion on the American Frontier (New York, 1964), IV, 640.

[16]West, p. 10. [17]Garrison and DeGroot, p. 89.

[18]Walter Wilson Jennings, Origin and Early History of the Disciples of Christ, (Cincinnati, 1919), p. 65. Garrison and DeGroot, p. 88.

[19]Garrison and DeGroot, pp. 98-104.

[20]Ibid., pp. 111-114.

[21]James DeForest Murch, Christians Only, (Cincinnati, 1962), p. 91.

[22]Harold W. Ford, A History of the Restoration Plea, (Oklahoma City, 1952), p. 10.

[23]Millennial Harbinger, II, (October, 1831), 480. North, pp. iv, v, 3.

[24]West, pp. 44-49.

[25]Paul Southern, "Principles of Biblical Interpretation in the Restoration Movement," Restoration Quarterly, I, (Winter, 1957), 9-11.

[26]F. L. Rowe (comp.), Pioneer Sermons and Addresses, (Cincinnati: F. L. Rowe, 1925), pp. 8-12.

[27]Alexander Campbell and W. L. MacCalla, Debate on Christian Baptism, (London: Simplin and Marshall, 1842), p. 107.

[28]Rowe, p. 18.

[29]"Sacred Colloquy," Evangelist, I, (July, 1832). p. 147.

[30]The Life of Elias Smith, (Boston, 1840), pp. 352-353.

[31] "Sermons to Young Preachers, No. II," _Christian Baptist_, VII, (December, 1829), pp. 105-106.

[32] "The Third Epistle of Peter to the Preachers and Rulers of Congfegations," _Christian Baptist_, II, (July, 1825), pp. 245-246.

[33] "Sermons to Young Preachers, No. I V," _Christian Baptist_, VII, (April, 1830), pp. 215-216.

[34] _Christian Messenger_, I, (December, 1826), 1.

[35] "Letters to J.C.," _Christian Messenger_, IV, (September, 1830), p. 225. _Christian Messenger_, I, (December, 1826), pp. 3-4.

[36] "A Thorough Hearing," _Evangelical Inquirer_, I, (June, 1830), pp. 13-14.

[37] Evan Ulrey, "The Preaching of Barton Warren Stone," (Ph.D. Thesis, L.S.U., 1955), p. 185.

[38] "Letter to J.C.," pp. 225-226.

[39] Thomas W. Grafton, _Alexander Campbell_, (St. Louis, 1897), p. 64.

[40] "The Pulpit," _Morning Star and City Watchman_, I, (August, 1827), p. 55.

[41] "The Third Epistle of Peter," p. 224.

[42] _Millennial Harbinger_, I, (February, 1830), pp. 95-96. "Pulpit Honesty," _Christian Baptist_, I, (May, 1824), pp. 201-202, "The Pulpit."

[43] See David Ellis Walker, Jr., _The Rhetoric of the Restoration Movement: The Period of Inception: 1800-1832_, (Ph.D. Thesis, University of Florida, 1969).

TSCA BUSINESS MEETING

Saturday, September 26, 1981

12:00 Noon

The Meeting was convened by Walt Kirkpatrick.

Ralph Hillman (Pres-elect) led a discussion of the '82
Conference planning committee recommendation to return to
Montgomery Bell and entertained a consideration of possible
dates. He also raised the question of a conference re-
gistration fee in addition to the basic membership fee.

Motion was made and seconded that the '82 TSCA Conference
be held at Montgomery Bell State Park. Motion carried.

Motion was made and seconded that the '82-83 basic member-
ship fee be $10.00 for professionals, $15.00 for sustaining
memberships, and $5.00 for student memberships. Motion
carried.

Kirkpatrick appealed for a broader representation in
membership and encouraged those present to recruit additional
members. A discussion of the nature and future of the TSCA
followed.

Richard Dean discussed the state representation to the
Southern Speech Communication Association and would that
the TSCA recommend to the SSCA that the TSCA President become
the Tennessee State Representative to the SSCA. Motion
carried.

Discussion ensued concerning the TSCA relationship with
the Tennessee Theatre Association and the appropriateness
of the motion in light of the TTA. Motion passed; see attached
correspondence with the SSCA President.

David Walker presented the status and need of the TSCA Journal which is funded by Patron Institutional Memberships.

Ralph Hillman gave additional information concerning the '82 conference and plans for future TSCA activities.

Reece Elliott (TN State Rep. to SSCA) presented the need for stronger representation in the regional association.

Meeting adjourned at 12:40 P.M.

1981 Speaker of the Year presentation - Bob Clement

1981 Teacher of the Year - Frank Bluestein

Recorded by,

JIM QUIGGINS
Executive Secretary

Friday, November 14, 1980 SCA Convention, New York

Basic Course Workshop reports, the Southern Region

by

Ralph Hillman

This paper will consist of two parts: the first, a
brief overview of the workshop activity in the south and
second some personal reactions to this first year of Basic
Course Workshop activity.

This has been a year of organziation for the Southern
Speech Communication Association Basic Course Ad Hoc com-
mittee. Interested people throughout the South have been
contacted and invited to participate with our Committee.
Many individuals and institutions have committed themselves
to various forms of involvement. These names and addresses
were shared through various mailings; to identify those people
who would be interested in serving as a Director of a Workshop
on the Basic Course. Basically, a Workshop Director will
1) identify a working committee to survey the area (within
2 or 3 hundred miles) to determine interests and preceived
needs of those who would be interested in participating;
2) assign sessions; 3) actually, hold the workshop; and
finally, 4) prepare a detailed workshop evaluation to help
all of us prepare for the next one.

The Basic Course Committee will coordinate so that the
workshops are spread out both in time and in geography; dis-
seminate outlines of previous workshops, names of previous

workshop directors and participants (where available) as well as workshop evaluation data; assist in establishing major criteria for the on going unity of all the workshops; and keep lines of communication open among all interested Basic Course people especially SSCA and SCA personnel.

The Basic Course Committee is currently operating under these assumptions: 1) a full day (Friday) and a half (Saturday) will probably best serve the majority concerned. This pattern preference does not rule out other possible days or arrangements. The day and half seems to best encourage the kind of interaction to maximize the learning possible from the workshop. 2) Locally prepared and conducted work-shops appear to best serve the needs of specific areas. The Basic Course Committee will be very involved in the planning for every workshop in an attempt to help the Director keep quality at a high level. 3) Each workshop must strive to meet the needs of all applicable educational institutions in the area. Universities seek assistance with the Basic Course as do secondary schools.

This spring, Austin Peay was the sponsor of the first Basic Course Workshop to be held since this Ad Hoc Committee was appointed by Carl Kell a year ago. Reese Elliott and Jim Holm walked us through much of the following agenda. The group was small but those in attendance all felt the workshop was a valuable learning experience.

Basic Course Workshop: Morning Session   May 25, 1980

"Course Content, Methods, Media"

10:30 A.M.   Joe Morgan University Center

1. Trends in Basic Course Designs

2. Constraints on Course Designs

3. Course Purposes/goals

4. Course content

   a. types of courses currently offered

   b. theory or performance orientation

   c. basic content areas

5. Methods of Teaching

   a. typical assignments

      (1) first day

      (2) written assignments

      (3) oral assignments

      (4) tests, quizzes

   b. assignments for research purposes

6. Media in the basic course

   a. use as audio/visual aids

   b. use in recording and evaluating performances

Afternoon Session

"Speech Evaluation and Competency"

1:00 P.M.

1. Methods of Evaluation

   a. written

   b. oral

   c. peer evaluation

      d.   self evaluation

      e.   recorded critique

      f.   videotaped/recorded critique

2. Criteria for evaluation

      a.   value emphasis

      b.   criteria

          (1)   organization

          (2)   style

          (3)   delivery

          (4)   etc.

3. Competency standards

      a.   state requirements

      b.   personal standards

          (1)   performance

          (2)   theory

An interesting question came out of the workshop: How many of us as instructors use the grades given for initial speeches in the Basic Course as an attempt to stroke the student and encourage him/her? By so doing we later find it difficult to hold to our standard? The discussion concerning this honesty-on-the-standard was a most interesting one. What are your thoughts?

My personal reactions to this year of work as Director of the Basic Course Committee in the South will cover these points. . . . First, far too many teachers who are now

responsible for Basic Course Sections really are not very responsive to learning more or sharing what they know about the Basic Course. Although I gathered most of my data from the Southern Region, there does seem to be considerable support for the notion that the problem is nationwide. Inherent in this notion is my growing belief that these instructors aren't very clear about what they want their students to learn or how they should go about learning it. What this all boils down to is that a very small number of Basic Course instructors must ultimately take the responsibility for organizing the area, setting standards and disseminating information.

Secondly, the quality of students which we see in our classrooms has continued to drop. As Basic Course instructors we can no longer assume that the large majority of our students can write a simple sentence, or for that matter say an appropriate sentence. Five years ago, one or two students per class could not deal with the above, now that number has grown. Instructors find themselves being more redundant, spending more time on basics, expecting less from students and having their standards for a good competent speaker seriously challenged.

Thirdly, state funding agencies for Universities have already begun to develop formulas which have a component for reflecting quality of instruction. We are ultimately going to be forced to show that our students can do what we say

we have been trying to teach them. Thus, we are between a rock and a hard spot. On the one hand we want and need students so that we can get funding by having large numbers of students. On the other hand we must show that our students can perform better than students in comparable schools so that we can get the quality funding. The bottom line indicates that we must greatly improve our instruction so that we may remain employed.

Fourthly, the work of evaluating a workshop must begin before the workshop begins. When evaluating the actual workshop make sure that the evaluative instrument is administered before the participants leave the workshop. You'll save time and frustration by securing the data early.

Finally, individuals are not necessarily jumping at the opportunity to Direct a Basic Course Workshop. The next workshop in the South will be held at the University of Alabama/Huntsville, in February or March. Dr. Carol Roach will be the workshop Director.

PUBLICATION INFORMATION