ABSTRACT

AN ANALYSIS OF THE APOLOGETIC RHETORIC OF TELEVANGELIST JIM BAKKER

By Gary Joseph Hobbins

The purpose of this study was to conduct a critical analysis of the apologetic rhetoric of televangelist Jim Bakker. Bakker's pre-trial apologia on two ABC Nightline programs (#1567 and #1677), and Bakker's apologia at his trial was described, interpreted, and evaluated. The method of analysis was the application of the apologetic theory of Ware and Linkugel (1973).

AN ANALYSIS OF THE APOLOGETIC RHETORIC OF TELEVANGELIST JIM BAKKER

By

Gary Joseph Hobbins

A Thesis Submitted
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of

Master of Arts in Humanities

Speech

at

University of Wisconsin Oshkosh

Oshkosh, Wisconsin 54901

December 1992

DEAN OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

Vicki Lord Larson

12-18-92 Date Approved

DATE	COMMITTEE APPROVAL		DATE	FORMAT APPROVAL
12/14/92	James A Benson	Advisor		
12/14/92	Anthony J. Palmi	Member		
12/14/92	S. Clay Willoughby	Member	11-18-92	Jane L Vieregge

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

In spring of 1987, Jim Bakker, the charismatic media evangelist and founder of the scandal-ridden PTL ("Praise the Lord," or People that Love") Ministries of Fort Mill, South Carolina, publicly confessed that he had an extra-marital sexual affair with his former church secretary, Jessica Hahn. There were also allegations that Jim Bakker was involved in bisexual activity. This led to investigations of Bakker and, in October of 1989, Bakker was convicted of twenty-four counts of fraud and conspiracy for diverting more than $4 million from his PTL church and related ventures to his family's use. This was said to be a modern day version of Sinclair Lewis's sinister novel, Elmer Gantry.

In the 1980's the rhetoric of televangelists has had a major influence on American culture. Televangelists have generated a massive audience. Little (1976) tells that Billy Graham, the most distinguished of contemporary televangelists, astounds observers with the claim that he "can preach to more people in one night on T.V. than perhaps Paul did in his whole lifetime" (Little, 16). Even more interesting is the claim made by Abelman and Nevendorf

(1985) that the lifetime listenership of Jesus was estimated at no more than 30,000 people (Abelman, 98). Hadden and Swann (1981) claim that millions of Americans tune in every week to the "electronic church" (Hadden & Swann, 8). Newsweek (1987) concurs with Hadden and Swann indicating that a University of Pennsylvania survey estimated that 13.3 million Americans are regular viewers of these media evangelists (God Money, 18).

Jim Bakker, with his boyish Howdy Doody grin and his claims that he possessed the spiritual gift of glossolalia (gift of tongues), along with his wife Tammy Faye with her irrepressible mop of hair and makeup so thick that it looked sculpted, were college sweethearts who worked their way up from back-road tent meetings to a slot on Pat Robertson's "700 Club." After leaving the "700 Club," the Bakkers built PTL in Fort Mill, South Carolina, from the ground up, starting a cable-TV network. The "PTL Club" was a daily talk and variety show distributed by satellite to stations and cable systems all over the country. The show emanated from a building at the PTL Network's multi-acre Charlotte, North Carolina, complex. On the outside the building looked like a huge colonial church. Inside was a multimillion-dollar television studio. Newsweek (1987) tells that in 1986 the PTL empire reported "$129 million in revenues" (Ibid, 16). The article also indicates that, in 1987, the

empire had assets of $172 million, including Heritage U.S.A., the 2,300 acres religious theme park which drew six million people (Ibid, 18).

The twenty-four counts of fraud and conspiracy charging Jim Bakker with diverting more than $4 million away from the PTL ministry centered on PTL's promotion of lifetime partnerships in the Heritage U.S.A. theme park. Under the program, donors who contributed more than $1000 could spend three nights a year for the rest of their lives at a PTL hotel free of charge. The government charged that PTL sold 153,000 partnerships from 1984 to 1987 - and raised $158 million - but had only 258 rooms available for partners and that one large hotel and other promised facilities were never completed. Christine Howe, a former PTL reservations supervisor, testified that, in every month during Bakker's last year at the PTL, as many as 3,700 lifetime partners were denied the accommodations they had requested at the theme park (A Guilty, 55).

Experts are claiming that scandals of this sort are detrimental to the purpose of televangelism. Jeffery Hadden, coauthor of Televangelism Power and Politics on God's Frontier, was asked how he thought Americans reviewed televangelism in general. Hadden retorted

> "The level of skepticism is high: Our image of evangelism is a legacy of Sinclair Lewis's Elmer Gantry. Even today, the TV image of an evangelist is that of a scoundrel who is cheating and lying to raise money" (As The Spiritual, 44).

There can be no question that this scandal, and others like it, have damaged all television ministries. Hadden and Shupe (1988) reported that, after the Bakker scandal erupted, "a March 1987 New York Times poll found that 65 percent of the American public had an unfavorable opinion of most televangelists" (Hadden & Shupe, 16).

Jim Bakker was in a position of having to defend himself. If found guilty of the twenty-four counts of fraud and conspiracy, his career would be over. More important, a failure to offer a valid defense for his actions could have a disastrous effect upon the entire televangelism industry.

To date, in the field of rhetorical criticism, there has been no published analysis of the apologetic rhetoric of Bakker. Ware and Linkugel (1973) explain that: "Apologetic discourse involves a rhetor attempting to reconcile a derogatory charge with a favorable view of his character." Thus, Bakker and his lawyers launched a spirited defense against the charges facing them. An analysis of the apologetic rhetoric of Jim Bakker would help legitimize the theory of Ware and Linkugel (1973) in the field of rhetorical criticism. Specifically, this study may help determine why Bakker and his defense team failed to gain acquittal for Bakker (Ware, 275).

Apologia of Ware and Linkugel (1973)

Since antiquity when Socrates delivered the "apology" - Socrates defended himself against charges that he was corrupting the youth of Athens - apologia has gained acceptance in the field of Speech Communication as a distinct form of public address.

In April, 1973, The Quarterly Journal of Speech debuted the article "They Spoke in Defense of Themselves: On the Generic Criticism of Apologia"; this was the pioneer effort of B.L. Ware and Wil A. Linkugel to give Apologia (the speech of self-defense) legitimate generic status in the field of rhetorical criticism.

The theory of apologetics is concerned with the "strategic," primarily verbal, response which the rhetor fashions to extricate himself or herself from a damaging situation. In other words, the rhetor hopes to build a rationale for his or her beliefs or behaviors that will purify his or her image in the perception of others. In this paper Ware and Linkugel used the psychological theory developed by Robert P. Abelson, pertaining to the "resolution" of belief dilemmas. Ware and Linkugel contended that Abelson's theory was a fruitful source for strategies pertinent to apologetic rhetoric. They then used examples from historical speeches to identify the four strategies that rhetors usually use when defending

themselves. The strategies are: (1) denial - disavowal of the action; (2) bolstering - identifying with something viewed favorably by the listeners; (3) differentiation - bringing the audience to view the act in a new and different light; and (4) transcendence - asking the listeners to move away from the particulars of the charge at hand, toward some more abstract, general view of the speaker's character.

Denial and bolstering are considered psychologically "reformative" strategies, and differentiation and transcendence are considered psychologically "transformative" strategies. "Reformative strategies are those which simply revise (**denial**) or amend (**bolster**) the cognitions of the audience" (Ibid [footnote 36], 276). Reformative strategies do not attempt to change the audience's affect toward those things with which the rhetor can identify himself (Ibid, 277). Transformative strategies are those which involve a change in meaning (Ibid, 280).

The first reformative strategy, that of denial is an instrument of negation and is easily imagined to be important to speeches of self-defense. One may deny alleged "facts, sentiments, objects, or relationships." Many rhetors rely upon **denial of "intent"** to achieve persuasiveness. The person who is charged with some despicable action often finds a disclaimer of "intent" as an attractive means of escaping stigma if the denial of the

existence of the action itself is too great a reformation of reality to gain acceptance (Ibid, 276).

The second reformative strategy, that of bolstering, is a source of identification. Bolstering refers to any rhetorical strategy which reinforces the existence of a fact, sentiment, object, or relationship (Ibid, 277). When rhetors bolster they attempt to identify themselves with something viewed favorably by the audience.

The first "transformative" strategy is that of differentiation. Differentiation subsumes those strategies which serve the purpose of separating (i.e., dividing) some fact, sentiment, object, or relationship from some larger context within which the audience presently views the attribute. In this sense differentiation is considered cognitively divisive. Differentiation is "transformative" in the sense that the division of the old context into two or more new constructions of reality is accompanied by a change in meaning. "In other words, any strategy which is cognitively divisive and concomitantly transformative is differentiation" (Ibid, 278). Ware and Linkugel cue the critic by explaining that:

> "An easily identifiable use of differentiation occurs when a speaker employs regenerative strategies. Regeneration is the assertion that one is now somehow fundamentally different and worthy of increased valuation than at some previous time" (Ibid [footnote 36], 279).

The second "transformative" strategy is that of transcendence. Transcendence includes any strategy which joins some fact, sentiment, object, or relationship with some larger context within which the audience does not presently view the attribute. This larger context is a broad tolerant perspective that should make the speaker appear of greater worth than the speaker's accusers. Some speeches of self-defense can exemplify the transcendence strategy resulting from a complex combination of strategies (which can include a combination of denials, bolsterings, differentiations, and other transcendental strategies), or from straight-forward attempts by the speaker to identify attributes with new contexts. Transcendence is also "transformative" in the sense that it involves a change in meaning (Ibid, 280).

Ware and Linkugel explain that the total import of these strategies becomes apparent only after the critic considers the ways in which speakers usually combine them to produce the behavior of self defense (Ibid, 282).

The authors explain that "speakers usually assume one of four major rhetorical postures when speaking in defense of their characters: absolution, vindication, explanation, or justification" and each of these postures results from a heavy reliance upon two of the strategies described above (Ibid, 282). Each of the four postures commonly involves

the combination of a transformative with a reformative strategy (Ibid, 282). Ware and Linkugel go on to clarify that: "Any speech of self-defense is likely to contain all four of the strategies of self-defense," but that speeches of self-defense usually rely most heavily for their persuasive impact upon two of the strategies of apologia (Ibid [footnote 49], 282).

The absolutive posture results from the union of the transformative strategy of differentiation, and the reformative strategy of denial, and is one in which the speaker seeks acquittal from the charges. This posture is in no way limited to legal proceedings; the accused may seek acquittal from public opinion (Ibid, 282-283). Ware and Linkugel delineate that:

> "the absolutive speech is one in which the accused denies any wrong (denial, denial of intent, or both are employed) and in which he <u>differentiates any personal attribute in question</u> from whatever it is that the audience finds reprehensible. In this self-defense stance, the speaker is primarily concerned with "clearing his name" through denying and differentiating the **particulars** or **specifics** (details of the charge" (Ibid, 283).

The posture of vindication is more **general** than that of absolution, which is more **specific.** Vindication relies on the transformative strategy of transcendence and the reformative strategy of denial. Vindication is more general than absolution because of its reliance on transcendental strategies that permit the accused greater ease in going

beyond the specifics of the given charge. The capacities of the strategy of transcendence that permit going beyond the specifics of a given charge, that create the broad tolerant perspective, and that create the appearance of greater worth than the accusers are the complex combining of strategies, and the straight-forward attempts to identify attributes with new contexts (Ibid, 274).

Ware and Linkugel explain that the distinction between the explanative and the justificative postures is similar to that made between the absolutive and vindicative postures (Ibid, 283).

The explanative posture results from the union of the transformative strategy of differentiation and the reformative strategy of bolstering. Bolstering identifies the speaker with things viewed favorable by the audience, and differentiation gives the posture its **specific** quality because it is answering the **specifics** or **particulars** of the allegations or charges. Ware and Linkugel inform:

> "In the explanative address, the speaker assumes that if the audience understands his motives, actions, beliefs, or whatever, they will be unable to condemn him" (Ibid, 283).

As was the case with the postures of absolution and vindication, the posture of justification is more general than that of explanation, which is more specific. Justification relies on the transformative strategy of

transcendence, and the reformative strategy of bolstering. Bolstering identifies the speaker with things viewed favorably by the audience, and transcendence gives the posture its general quality. The justificative posture asks not only for understanding, as does the explanative posture, but also asks for approval (Ibid, 283).

Purpose and Significance of the Study

The purpose of this study was to conduct a critical analysis of the apologetic rhetoric of ex-televangelist Jim Bakker. A study of this nature will help further establish the fact that the rhetoric of apologia does give insight into public address, and will help further legitimize the theory of Ware and Linkugel (1973) by contributing to the growing body of studies that have employed the Ware and Linkugel (1973) method of generic criticism.

This study was significant for three reasons: (1) to date there has been no published analysis of the rhetoric of Bakker, (2) past published analyses of communication using the apologetic genre have focused exclusively upon the discourse of speakers who have chosen to speak in defense of themselves (except for Nelson [1984]); this study took apologetic genre one step further, in that this study analyzed not only Jim Bakker's verbal defense of himself, but also defense statements made by Bakker's lawyers, and by

witnesses for Bakker's defense; and, finally, (3) this study examined a type of communication setting which differed from previous published studies. An analysis of communication in a trial setting provides a new type of discourse analysis to which the analytical theory can be applied.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

To depict the evolution of apologia, first pre-Ware and Linkugel (1973) studies will be reviewed, next Ware and Linkugel (1973) will be reviewed, and finally post-Ware and Linkugel (1973) studies will be reviewed.

Pre-Ware and Linkugel (1973)

Before Ware and Linkugel (1973), the apologetic genre lacked a systematic method of analysis. However, pre-Ware and Linkugel studies did shed light on apologia, and these attempts led Ware and Linkugel (1973) to map out the strategies and postures later used in studies of the contemporary genre of messages.

Since 1965, with the advent of Edwin Black's influential book, Rhetorical Criticism: A Study in Method, the term "genre" has gained an acceptance in the discipline of speech communication. Black used the term genre to describe congregations of rhetorical discourses that share similar effects, situations, and strategies.

Rosenfield's (1968) "A Case Study in Speech Criticism: The Nixon-Truman Analog," carried generic criticism one step

further than Black when Rosenfield "assumed" rather than "demonstrated" the existence of apologetic genre by comparing two speeches: Nixon's famous "Checkers" speech (1952), in which Nixon explained to an American television audience his use of a special campaign fund, and Truman's 1953 broadcast, in which he answered charges that, while President, he allowed a Communist agent to hold high government office. The generic resemblance of the two speeches invites what Rosenfield called analog criticism - comparing the speeches in such ways that each address serves as a reference standard for the other. This type of analysis was termed "mass media apologia" by Rosenfield, which was a contemporary adaptation of the traditional category (i.e., Apologia).

Rosenfield (1968) found that the following four occurrences might represent constraints in mass media apologia: (1) The broad case apologia is likely to be part of a short, intense clash of views. (2) A speaker who chooses to argue in his own defense via television is unlikely to limit himself to defensive remarks. (3) A preponderance of facts in the middle third of the speech seems to be characteristic of this genre. (4) The apology tends to resemble previously used arguments for presentation from the national rostrum (p. 449).

Aly's paper "The Gallows Speech: A Lost Genre" further developed the apologetic genre. Aly (1969) examined the remarks of condemned men who were making their last speech of self-defense prior to being hanged. Aly found that

> "no matter when or where delivered in the United States, gallows speeches were so set as to be predictable, within limits, for a given occasion. The condemned man could be expected to confess his crime or to assert his innocence. More often than not he admonished his hearers to take warning from the fate that had overtaken him and hence to lead a better life, marked by reading the Bible, abstaining from whiskey, and avoiding evil companions" (Aly, 215).

According to the Ware and Linkugel (1973) theory, this appears to be an example of the **regenerative** type of differentiation strategy by the condemned men because they were trying to appear to their listeners in a new and "different" light; they were making the assertion that they were somehow fundamentally different and worthy of increased valuation than they were previously. Aly, however, did not use the term differentiation or regeneration to describe the rhetoric.

1969 was also the year that Wil A. Linkugel (one of the primary scholars of focus in this study) and Nancy Razak did a case study of the rhetoric of self-defense by analyzing Sam Houston's Speech of Self-Defense in the House of Representatives, with the hope that such an inquiry would eventually lead to an understanding of the most productive positions of argument in the rhetoric of self-defense.

Linkugel and Razak depicted Sam Houston employing the posture of self-vindication (denial and transcendence) at his trial in the House of Representatives for physically assaulting William Stanberry, a member of the House from Ohio. Houston was a former member of the House of Representatives and former governor of Tennessee. Houston assaulted Stanberry because he was enraged over Stanberry's comment about Houston in a speech. Stanberry queried: "Was the late Secretary of War (John Eaton) removed in consequence of his attempt, fraudulently, to give to Governor Houston the contract for Indian ration?" Houston had felt himself deeply wronged because Stanberry would not explain his comment (Linkugel, 265).

Linkugel and Razak depicted Houston vindicating himself from the charges by <u>denial of intent</u>.

> "He admittedly had flogged Stanberry; but his action had not been wrong, for he was merely administering frontier justice. Intent, he claimed, should be the criterion for judgement" (Ibid, 270).

Linkugel and Razak also described how Houston used his posture of self-vindication in <u>transcending</u> the situation by associating his actions with the American flag that hung over the entrance to the chamber. Houston ended his self-defense on a note of patriotic eloquence.

> "But, sir so long as that flag shall bear aloft its glittering stars - bearing them amidst the din of battle, and waving them triumphantly above the storm of the ocean, so long, I trust shall the rights of American citizens be preserved safe and unimpaired, and transmitted as a sacred legacy from one generation to another, till discord shall wreck the spheres - the grand march of time shall cease - and not one fragment of all creation be left to chafe on the bosom of eternity's waves" (Ibid, 273).

Through the trial in the House, Houston's performance attracted national attention, and he was able to reestablish his ethos.

Linkugel and Razak (1969) did not use the critical vocabulary of Ware and Linkugel (1973), but the informed reader can sense the formation of the methodology which appears in the 1973 article by Ware and Linkugel. Denial of intent, differentiation, and transcendental strategies are obviously present.

Sherry Devereaux Butler (1971) contributed to the theory of apologia in her analyses of Senator Edward Kennedy's July 25, 1969, apology to the citizens of Massachusetts, where Kennedy explained the mysterious death of Mary Jo Kopechne when Kopechne was in Kennedy's company at Chappaquiddick. Butler used the standards defined by Rosenfield (1968) in explaining Kennedy's foiled attempt at "mass media apologia." Butler stated that Kennedy generally failed in his attempt at apologia because the audience of 1969 was much more sophisticated and less likely to place

automatic belief in the persuasive power of television as audiences did in 1952 and 1953. Butler noted that Rosenfield (1968) had forewarned that: "As men gain experience in the use of the electronic media the forms and styles of apologia will change" (Rosenfield, 450).

Dorgan's (1972) essay, "The Doctrine of Victorious Defeat in the Rhetoric of Confederate Veterans", examined speeches by Southerners in search of an apologia which would satisfactorily heal the South's wounded self-image and explain the sharp variance between pre-Civil war expectations and post-war realities. The strategies mapped by Ware and Linkugel (1973) were present in the ex-Confederate soldiers' attempts to justify their defeat, but a systematic methodological terminology for use in analysis of apologetic rhetoric had not yet surfaced in the literature of the field.

Ware and Linkugel (1973)

According to Jamieson (1973): "The human need for a frame of reference lures the mind to generic classification." Ware and Linkugel (1973) conducted the first study in the field of rhetorical criticism which actually mapped the "strategies" and postures used by rhetors in defending themselves. Ware and Linkugel present and illustrate a psychological theory of self-defense as an

aid that should help critics in analyzing rhetoric in various situations (Jamieson, 167).

The Strategies

Ware and Linkugel (1973) explain that the strategies of denial, bolstering, differentiation, and transcendence account for most of the approaches that apologists find useful in speaking in their own defense. Ware and Linkugel argue that "the explication of the genre should precede the criticism proper" (Ibid, 283).

Many researchers since Ware and Linkugel (1973) have employed the Ware and Linkugel theory. The extensive use of this theory in analyzing messages of apologia seems to endorse the theory as a valid approach for understanding apologetic discourse.

Post-Ware and Linkugel (1973)

The influence of Ware and Linkugel began to appear when Katula (1975) used their strategies in critiquing Richard Nixon's presidential resignation speech following Nixon's involvement in the Watergate scandal. In the paper Katula cited Ware and Linkugel as theoretical progenitors of contemporary apologetic genre. Katula explained the Ware and Linkugel critical vocabulary early in his paper and employed the terminology throughout the paper. He concluded

that: "Analysis of Mr. Nixon's address reveals that his strategies of denial of intent and transcendence to a larger context "were largely unsuccessful" in his attempt to "vindicate" himself before the American People (Katula, 1).

Katula explained that Nixon's "denial of intent" strategy (Nixon attempted to deny guilt for participating in the Watergate coverup) and "transcendence of the whole" strategy (Nixon attempted to transcend the whole issue by constructing a larger context - that he was resigning in the best interests of the nation) failed to achieve an important purpose of the apology: "Witnesses to such personal charges seem completely and most easily satisfied only by the most personal of responses by the accused." Katula argued that the Nixon response did not obtain closure with the audience because the address left the feeling of "unfinished business" - Nixon failed to address the questions that forced the speech (Ware, 274).

In 1973, Jamieson argued that, "Because a long-lived institution initiates a great body of rhetoric, a set of standardized forms for its rhetoric tends to evolve." A 1975 study by Ware, Linkugel, and Harrell contributed to such an evolution via an in-depth study of political apologia in the Nixon Watergate apologies (Jamieson, 162).

Ware et al., (1975) depicted the complex fashion in which Nixon used the strategies and postures of apologia in

his attempt to regain his ethos. They found that Nixon used each of the strategies and three of the postures - absolution, explanation, and justification - in his apologia. Nixon took the absolutive posture during the fall months of 1972 (his chief strategy was to draw a line of distinction between members of the White House and the street-level operatives who had been caught red-handed). On October 5th he combined the denial and differentiation strategies into one concept:

> "One thing that has always puzzled me about it is why anybody would have tried to get anything out of the Watergate. Be that as it may, that decision having been made at lower levels, with which I had no knowledge" (Ware - Harrell, 252).

In 1973 four members of the White House team were dismissed. This eventuality, combined with Nixon's earlier assertion of their innocence, forced Nixon into an explanative posture (bolstering and differentiation). Nixon's primary bolstering strategy was an attempt to remind the public of the powers which normally accompany the office, reminding them the "doctrine is rooted in the Constitution," which vests the Executive Power solely in the President. To emphasize the importance of the principle, he bolstered when he explained that:

> "Without such protection, our military security, our relations with other countries, our law enforcement procedures, and many other aspects of the national interest could be significantly damaged and the decision making process of the executive branch could be impaired."

In an effort to nullify the potential public fear that he was invoking his executive privilege to prevent relevant facts from coming to light, rather than to protect the presidency, Nixon differentiated regarding its use. "Executive privilege will not be used as a shield to prevent embarrassing information from being made available..." (Ibid, 254).

In August, 1973, a significant minority was calling for Nixon's impeachment. Nixon's August 15 apology was far more complex than his earlier speeches. Within the same speech the President assumed two separate postures, absolution and justification. Nixon continued his absolutive posture by denying that he had any part in illegal activities by stating:

> "it now seems that ... there were apparently wide-ranging efforts to limit the investigation or to conceal the possible involvement of members of the Administration and the campaign committee. I was not aware of any such efforts at the time."

Nixon differentiated by trying to make a distinction between what he had done and what he had not done:

> I was ... concerned that the Watergate investigation might well lead to an inquiry into the activities of the special investigations unit itself... I wanted justice done with regard to Watergate; but in the scale of national priorities with which I had to deal... I also had to be deeply concerned with ensuring that neither the covert operation of the CIA nor the operations of the Special Investigations Unit should be compromised" (Ibid, 256).

The second major posture of his August 1973 address was a justification (bolstering and transcendence) of his general conduct as the President. This began with Nixon's discussion of problems associated with releasing the White House tapes. Nixon addressed the issue from the standpoint of protecting the integrity and efficient operation of the executive office. He was bolstering his position when he exclaimed:

> "The principle of confidentiality of Presidential conversations is at stake in the question of these tapes. I must and I shall oppose any efforts to destroy this principle, which is so vital to the conduct of this great office."

The strategy seems to have been to indicate that protection of the presidency was the more important consideration to explain Nixon's action (Ibid, 258).

The final segment of Nixon's August 15, 1973 address reflects the use of transcendence. Nixon turned from the charges against him and asked the country to put Watergate behind them. Important domestic legislation was going unattended and national negotiations were taking place. "These are matters that cannot wait. They cry out for action now" Nixon told the nation. Nixon tried to transcend Watergate entirely by portraying himself as guardian of the public's interest and making his accusers appear as if they were in pursuit of a small matter at the expense of important political business (Ibid, 258).

This analysis of Nixon's communication contributed to a fuller understanding of the Ware and Linkugel theory by giving the reader clear examples of its application. The standardized form of the genre that Jamieson suggested was obviously evolving by this time.

Kruse (1977), in a paper, "Motivational Factors in Non-Denial Apologia," took a distinct psychological approach to the criticism of apologia. Kruse analyzed the "motives" of rhetors by applying three of psychologist Abraham Maslow's "hierarchy of needs" to her criticism and cited Ware and Linkugel (1973) as contributing to the idea of "motive" in apologetic criticism (Kruse, 13).

Kruse (1977) theorized: "the critic who comprehends the motives of the apologist will be better able to understand his message." Kruse claimed that this "insight, in turn, will allow the critic to make a more accurate assessment of the discourse in terms of the speaker's perspective" (Ibid, 21). Kruse further theorized: "Because the analysis and evaluation of apologia from the audience's perspective reveals only part of the story, then, the critic cannot afford to ignore the needs of the apologist" (Ibid, 22-23).

Kruse (1977) suggested that any example of non-denial self-justification (instances in which speaker admits his culpability, but shows that mitigating elements call for a

reassessment of the situation or his character, or instances in which the speaker avoids strictly admitting to the charges) will fall into one of the following of Maslow's groups: (1) Survival Responses - replies demonstrating that the speaker feels some aspects of his security or safety has been threatened; (2) Social Responses - replies in which the primary need is to restore or regain affection, status, mastery, prestige, or esteem; or (3) Self-Actualized Responses - replies produced when the speaker attempts to maintain, primarily for himself, an image consistent only with his idiosyncratic values and his personal sense of right and wrong (Ibid, 14).

Kruse (1977) claimed that a rhetor who utilizes a self-actualized response when employing non-denial apologia will be an inner-directed man who lives according to his own standards, rather than society's. Kruse used the example of Sir Thomas More, at his trial for treason in 1535 (More was tried for claiming that the King's second marriage was wrong), as an example of a self-actualized response. More implicitly differentiated his own values from those of society when he stated: "I confess I always told his Majesty my opinion of it, according to the dictates of my conscience" (Ibid, 15).

Kruse illustrated use of the social response with Robert Emmett's non-denial remarks made during his trial for

treason against England in 1803. Emmett was concerned with his social image (how he appeared to his country - Ireland) when he depicted his goals as the goals of the Irish. Emmett, in a strategic act of transcendence, was concerned with the fact that the greatest threat in the situation emanated from his fellow countrymen, rather than from his English judges, when he claimed: "That which interests me more than life," was that his "reputation should be rescued from the load of false accusation and calumny which have been heaped upon it" (Ibid, 17).

Kruse cited Butler's 1971 critique of Edward Kennedy's Chappaquiddick message, claiming that a motive analysis of Kennedy's apologia indicates that Kennedy was making a survival response; that his immediate need was the retention of his Senate seat, with the salvaging of his national political future as only a secondary goal (Ibid, 19).

Kruse concluded that apologists who employ strategies other than denial in their message do so to (1) maintain moral and ethical equilibrium; (2) secure or reaffirm status, mastery, or a place in the groups; or (3) preserve their lives, positions, fortunes, souls, or something of a similar nature contributing to their well-being (Ibid, 21).

Gold (1978) used the Ware and Linkugel methodology in analyzing apologetic strategies during the 1976 presidential campaign. She explained that the need for presidential

candidates to defend their character was especially strong in the 1976 campaign, partly because "trust" was a major issue in the campaign and partly because the media, reacting to their failures through most of the Nixon administration, were more aggressive.

Gold depicted how presidential candidates employed apologetic strategies in 1976. For example, Jimmy Carter employed the simplest kind of self-defense, denial, when Carter was accused that he "fibbed" about his position on federal revenue sharing his membership in Common Cause, and his policy advisers: "Although Mr. Evans and Mr. Novak are ordinarily very accurate, in this instance they were quite in error." Carter then cited evidence to refute each item (Gold, 311).

In the same campaign President Gerald Ford used an extraordinarily effective differentiation technique. The citizenry was angry because of the fact that Ford pardoned Nixon. Ford was searching for an opportunity to justify himself to the American people. Ford volunteered to appear before the House Subcommittee on Criminal Justice which had passed a lengthy resolution voicing its deep concerns. President Nixon had previously refused to appear before Congress, saying it was incompatible with the separation of executive and legislative powers. Ford's breaking of this precedent was a clever differentiation strategy which

emphasized the distinction between the "open" Ford administration and the Nixon regime (p. 310).

Gold concluded that: "Aspiring Presidents can literally be made or broken on their ability to practice the ritual of self-defense" (Ibid, 316).

In her 1973 analysis of genre, Jamieson stated: "Genres should not be viewed as static forms but as evolving phenomena" (Jamieson, 168). Jamieson meant that critics should approach the study of genres with a Darwinian (evolving) rather than a Platonic (distinct form) perspective. This was obviously the case in 1984, when the Nelson paper, "The Defense of Billie Jean King" surfaced. Nelson (1984) analyzed Billie Jean King's defense of her character for having had a homosexual love affair with her former secretary. Nelson advanced the application of contemporary apologetic genre by using the Ware and Linkugel methodology to analyze not only Billie Jean King's defense statements, but also support statements made for her by others - her peers, and the media. This was the first published use of the Ware and Linkugel methodology to analyze apologia of persons other than the accused.

Nelson also applied Kruse's use of Abraham Maslow's criteria. He determined that King's own apologia demonstrated that the tennis star was motivated mainly by a survival need because she had a primary concern with her own

emotional, environmental, and situational well-being. Nelson concluded that an analysis of King's peers' apologia demonstrates their interest in her social needs, or other needs to feel appreciated and liked by her fellow human beings. The media also placed the greatest emphasis on the social motive (Nelson, 97).

Nelson illustrated how King, through bolstering and differentiation strategies, attempted to show the American people that, if they understood her true feelings, beliefs, and motives, they would refrain from condemning her.

King effectively bolstered herself by having her husband Larry constantly by her side at her appearance on the 20/20 television program. This was an effective bolstering strategy because Americans hold marriage in high regard. King was found to use a clever differentiation technique by separating herself from homosexuals and by a rhetorical question. King stated: "I hate being called a homosexual because I don't feel that way. It really upsets me... If you have one gay experience does that mean you're gay?" (Ibid, 95).

Nelson described how King's peers used bolstering and transcendental strategies. In their bolstering strategy, the peers chose to emphasize one very positive trait of the tennis star which she herself did not stress "the tremendous good she had accomplished not only for women in tennis but

in all walks of life" (Ibid, 95). King's peers employed a transcendental stance by stating:

> "Your sex life seems to me to be the most private thing in your life. It can be funny, it can be embarrassing, it can be so many things, but it should be something that remains entirely your own" (Ibid, 96).

Nelson (1984) showed that the media cooperated by using bolstering and transcendental strategies. The editors of the New York Times bolstered King's ethos by emphasizing that King had shown other women that they could compile a record of achievement just as strong as that of any male. In asking for understanding and tolerance by the American people for King, the media offered four transcendental strategies: the first argument centered around the right to privacy; the second emphasized that gays deserve the same respect shown others; the third argument was that the pride and honesty displayed by gays should be considered an asset, not a liability; and the fourth argument decried the lack of research in homosexuality (Ibid, 98).

This section has been a review of the literature for the evolution of contemporary apologia. This section traced contemporary apologetic genre from its inception in Black's (1965) Rhetorical Criticism, through Ware and Linkugel (1973) - the primary study of focus - to the present. Apologia has evolved in the last nineteen years and the next section will show how this study will take apologia even farther in its evolution.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Nelson (1984) advanced the application of Ware and Linkugel's methodology one step further than prior scholars. Nelson not only analyzed Billie Jean King's apologia, but also analyzed statements for King's support made by her peers and by the media. This study will extend the application of apologia, as well. Using the methodology mapped by Ware and Linkugel, the critic will analyze newspaper accounts of defense statements made during Jim Bakker's trial by Jim Bakker, by his attorneys, and by his defense witnesses. The use of apologia in courtroom communication has not been studied to date. In addition, this study analyzed apologetic statements by Jim Bakker and his wife Tammy Faye when they appeared on two of the ABC Nightline programs.

Newspaper accounts from the Charlotte Observer during Bakker's trial (8/29/89 - 10/7/89) will be screened to determine what examples of apologia, as defined by Ware and Linkugel, are present. The observable strategies will be

identified before each section to assist in clarifying the analysis for the reader.

Two transcripts from ABC's Nightline when Jim and Tammy Faye Bakker appeared will also be analyzed and critiqued by the aforementioned criteria to observe if the Bakkers' television apologia is consistent with the Bakker newspaper apologia. These observable strategies will also be placed before their respective sections to give the readers of the paper a clear picture of the employed apologia.

The apologetic statements that will be taken from the newspaper accounts and the Nightline programs, with the host of the program Ted Koppel, will then be described, interpreted, and evaluated. The description portion of the paper will describe what strategies and postures were found in the newspaper accounts, and the Nightline programs. The interpretation portion will discuss how the strategies and postures worked at Bakker's trial in Charlotte, North Carolina. The evaluation portion will assess whether the apologia employed by the rhetors was appropriate and effective.

Only apologia that was relative to the allegations and charges made toward Bakker will be codified.

CHAPTER IV

DESCRIPTION OF DATA

Jim Bakker was in a position of having to defend himself. If found guilty of the twenty-four counts of fraud and conspiracy, his career would be over. Bakker would appear as a hypocrite to the American public, and Jim Bakker would become a contemporary version of the sinister character, Elmer Gantry.

Jim Bakker on Nightline - Program #1567

When Jim Bakker appeared on the Nightline program, #1567, on 5/27/87, it appears that his primary posture was that of Absolution. Bakker denied (denial of intent was also employed) and differentiated the acts of which he was accused, including his alleged rape of Jessica Hahn, his homosexual advances, and PTL's fiscal irregularities.

In addition, Bakker used secondary postures of Explanation, Justification, and Vindication. Jim Bakker's wife, Tammy, was also present during this interview. The paper is only concerned with Bakker's apologia here, however.

Strategies

On 5/27/87 there were: nine instances of denial; 25 instances of differentiation; 20 instances of bolstering; and 11 instances of transcendence.

Examples

Ted Koppel queried Bakker concerning Jerry Falwell's accusation that Bakker was involved in making homosexual advances going back to 1956 and to this Bakker responded with a simple denial - Bakker (denial): "Yes, that's true, that's a lie." Koppel: "That's a lie. All right, now." Bakker: "Yes, and that's why I've invited those people to come public and prove these things" (PTL, 11).

Koppel queried Bakker concerning Jerry Falwell's remarks about Bakker's alleged rape of Jessica Hahn, telling Bakker that Falwell claimed that Hahn had to protect herself against the attack of an anonymous third man. To this Bakker responded with another simple denial - Koppel: "You are saying that's a lie?" Bakker: (denial) "Yeah." "The story just seems to get bigger and bigger, and I'm just sorry about it" (Ibid, 11).

As the interview ensued, the Bakkers found Koppel sending interrogatories to them containing accusations that Jerry Falwell had made the night before on the Nightline program. The accusations dealt with the fiscal irregularities at PTL, a Bakker allegation that Falwell had

attempted a hostile takeover of PTL in Bakker's absence, Bakker's alleged rape of Jessica Hahn, and Bakker's alleged homosexual advances dating back to 1956. In response to these allegations the Bakkers relied on lengthy co-denial and co-differentiation strategies. The Bakkers debated with Koppel, refuting each allegation in point/counterpoint fashion. In lengthy discussion of each accusation Koppel led the Bakkers along, making them respond more specifically as Koppel probed deeper and deeper to achieve clarity. Koppel would state an allegation that Falwell made, the Bakker's would make their denials, then Koppel would lead into the specifics (details) of the accusation, and, as each specific was brought out, the Bakkers then relied upon strategies of co-differentiation to make their refutation - this was the point/counterpoint style. These generally lengthy co-differentiations appeared to contain specific instances of differentiation which were cognitively divisive and concomitantly transformative in their own right.

Bakker employed a regenerative differentiation strategy by differentiating the old Jim Bakker from the new Jim Bakker when he explained his relationship with Jessica Hahn. Bakker: "And there was a situation that was 15 or 20 minutes long, and we repented. I repented before God seven years ago, and we put our marriage back together again" (Ibid, 7).

Bakker was employing a regenerative differentiation strategy that also contained an implied denial of intent strategy when he differentiated the old Jim Bakker from the new Jim Bakker by responding about the bonuses the Bakkers received - Bakker:

> "Well as I said, the board of directors voted those, and I feel we've made a mistake, and we're sorry about it. And I feel that if I had to do it over again, you know, we would just say, 'no,' and we would not do it, but that can't change it now."

Jim Bakker employed another regenerative differentiation strategy which also implied denial of intent. Bakker responded to Koppel's remark that concerned Tammy Bakker's exclamation "I don't know how much money I make." Bakker differentiated with:

> "I did not handle my check book, I did not handle even my own finances. I was busy doing these things, and I neglected that, and it's a - it's a flaw, and I should not have done so, but I did it and I've repented, and I don't know what else to say about it" (Ibid, 10).

Bakker was bolstering himself when he identified himself with the "favorable" subject of work when he stated:

> ... "and never stopped, and if you've ever seen Heritage U.S.A., you know that was not built by a guy who just sat around and did nothing. We worked day and night. And daily television, I pastored the church, and I was just very, very busy" (Ibid, 10).

Jerry Falwell had made accusations that Bakker was a rapist, an adulterer, and a fraud. In an attempt to transcend his dilemma of a spiritual man versus an immoral

man and make himself appear as if of greater worth than his accuser, Bakker replied with a transcendental abstraction: "... it's just such unscriptural activity for all of us to be debating back and forth publicly, and we're supposed to do this privately and quietly and with love" (Ibid, 5).

Jim Bakker on Nightline - Program #1667

When Bakker appeared on the Nightline program, #1667, on 10/27/87, it also seems that his primary posture was that of Absolution. Bakker again denied and differentiated allegations of which he was accused. He also took a secondary posture of Explanation.

Strategies

On 10/27/87 there were: six instances of denial; 32 instances of differentiation; 14 instances of bolstering; and one instance of transcendence.

Examples

Koppel queried Bakker concerning a man who claimed that Bakker, while in a men's locker room with the man, made a homosexual advance toward the man, by reaching for the man's trouser zipper. To this Bakker replied with a simple denial "That's simply not true" (Jim Bakker, 8).

Koppel probed Bakker concerning his alleged misuse of PTL funds. To this Bakker responded by combining denial and

differentiation strategies. Koppel: "But you acknowledged that you're not a good money manager, right?" Bakker:

> (Denial) "I did not misuse funds. And that's why I'm anxious for a court to be able to document this. I think you heard the representative of the bankruptcy court make that statement. There is no money missing at PTL. (Differentiation) This was a hoax perpetrated by Jerry Falwell, the $92 million missing and all these other things" (Ibid, 13).

Koppel confronted Bakker with the proposition of opening communication with his accusers and, to this, Bakker bolstered himself by identifying himself with "favorable" responses which showed that Bakker was willing to be honest and open by dealing with the charges directly. Koppel: "To be confronted by you directly. Would that not be a desirable thing to do?" Bakker: (bolster) "Yes, yes, very much so." Koppel: "Will you do it?" Bakker: (bolster) "Yes. I'd be very happy to" (Ibid, 9).

Tammy Bakker as Witness on Nightline #1567

When Tammy Bakker appeared at the Nightline program, #1567, on 5/27/87, it appears that her primary posture was that of explanation, with secondary postures of justification, vindication, and absolution.

Strategies

In Tammy Faye Bakker's apologia there were: four instances of denial; 17 instances of bolstering; 30

instances of differentiation; and nine instances of transcendence.

Examples

Nelsen (1984) depicted Billie Jean King using a clever bolstering strategy when King was answering allegations rendered against her that she was a homosexual. Nelsen claimed that King was bolstering herself on the 20/20 program by having her husband Larry by her side. Since King was accused of homosexuality, this strategy bolstered her by identifying her with marriage, which Americans hold highly. Jim Bakker had allegedly raped Jessica Hahn and made homosexual advances to men for years. Since Tammy Faye Bakker appeared with Jim Bakker on this first Nightline appearance, this paper reasons that Jim Bakker was rhetorically attempting this same type of bolstering strategy, since Bakker was accused of homosexuality and adultery. Bakker was most likely dependent on his wife to give favorable responses and affect displays which would, in effect, bolster Bakker and their marriage.

In discussing the Bakkers going back to minister at PTL, which was in the hands of Jerry Falwell, Mrs. Bakker identified with the favorable subject of "the people" when she bolstered with, "It's the peoples' ministry, Jim, it's not Jim and Tammy's. PTL belongs to the people" (PTL, 13).

In an attempt to counter Jerry Falwell's accusation of the night before, that Jim Bakker made homosexual advances to men, Tammy Bakker combined the strategies of denial and differentiation into one statement to claim Jim Bakker's heterosexuality:

> (denial) "I've been married to this man for twenty-six years, and I can tell you one thing, he's not a homosexual or bisexual. (differentiation) He's a wonderful loving husband" (Ibid, 8).

Ted Koppel accused Mrs. Bakker of being an extravagant "shopping machine." Here Koppel was insinuating that Mrs. Bakker was partially responsible for Jim Bakker's fiscal irregularities. Mrs. Bakker countered this insinuation by differentiating:

> "I don't shop for cars, and I don't shop for mink coats. I do a lot of my shopping at places like T.J. Maxxes and the outlet stores. I shop outlet stores an awful lot, and I enjoy shopping. It's kind of a hobby to calm my nerves."

Here Mrs. Bakker differentiated the old context (i.e., accusation of extravagance) into the new context or construction of a supposed reality of being frugal. The remark was intended to put Mrs. Bakker's behavior in a new and different light and was meant to transform the meaning of the old context into that of the new context (Ibid, 6).

Ted Koppel claimed that whenever the Bakker's get into trouble, the Bakker's seem to "wrap themselves in the Bible." Mrs. Bakker attempted to go beyond this allegation

by maintaining the Bakkers' broad perspective that they were agents for Christ, which identifies them with the favorable subject of Christ or God, and which carries the implication of the Bakker's greater worth than their accusers, when Mrs. Bakker transcended with the statement:

> "Well, the Bible is a protection. It's a very good protection It's a comfort. That's, I think, the biggest reason we wrap ourselves in the Bible - it's so comforting. Jesus said, "When I go away, I'll send a comforter to you," and he has, and that's been our comfort during this" (Ibid, 3).

Jim Bakker at the Trial

Jim Bakker's trial in Charlotte, North Carolina, extended from August 29, 1989 to October 7, 1989. Throughout the trial, the prosecution portrayed Bakker as a liar and a cheat, while Bakker's defense portrayed Bakker as a man of God and saver of souls. On day 21 of the trial, Jim Bakker finally took the stand in his own defense. Talking of management by faith, not facts, a composed Jim Bakker challenged the heart of the government's case - that he oversold his PTL ministry's offer of free lodging to donors. Bakker, in all-day testimony at his fraud and conspiracy trial, said PTL's Heritage U.S.A. retreat had enough rooms to house as many as 211,000 donors, or "lifetime partners". That figure was more than three times the capacity prosecutors cited.

Between 1984 and 1987, PTL issued more than 150,000 lifetime partnerships, typically promising three free nights' stay annually for life, in exchange for a $1000 donation. Prosecutors tried to show PTL could not house all the partners who wanted to visit. But Bakker denied committing any crimes.

When Jim Bakker appeared in court on day 21 of the trial, his primary posture was that of Absolution. Bakker denied and differentiated all of the prosecution's charges that he had mismanaged PTL. Bakker also used a secondary posture of Explanation.

Strategies

On 9/29/89 (day 21) there were four instances of denial; eight instances of differentiation; seven instances of bolstering; and one instance of transcendence in Jim Bakker's trial communication.

Examples

Davis: (Bakker's lawyer) "Did you ever deceive or mislead the partners?" Bakker: (denial) "Absolutely not" (Bakker, 1a).

Davis asked whether Bakker had "made a statement, participated in a statement or in any way encouraged a statement ... intentionally committing or trying to commit a criminal act?" Bakker: (denial) "Absolutely not." Davis:

"Did you ever conspire with the people named in the indictment?" Bakker: (denial) "No, I did not" (Ibid, 1a).

Federal prosecutor, Debra Smith, suggested that Bakker continued to issue lifetime partnerships without informing donors that he was "whittling away" at their opportunity to use the free lodging. To this Bakker snapped back with a combined denial and differentiation statement: (denial) "I was not whittling away their opportunity. (differentiation) I was expanding their opportunity each year." Here Bakker differentiated the old context that he was "whittling away" the donors' opportunity to use free lodging, into the new construction of reality, that he was "expanding" the donors' opportunity to free lodging. Bakker's response that he was "expanding the donors' opportunity" attempted to transform the meaning of Smith's statement (Ibid, 1a).

Bakker attempted to differentiate himself from the charlatan that prosecutor Smith was making him out to be when he stated: "I don't believe it's ever right to deceive the people." Bakker then interjected a denial of intent strategy when he stated: "believed with all my heart" that PTL's Heritage Grand Hotel was paid in full. Bakker had stated this previously on Nightline. Bakker then employed a **regenerative** differentiation strategy by differentiating the old Jim Bakker from the new, when he stated: "...If I had

to do it all over again, I wouldn't allow the board to give as large bonuses" (Ibid, 1a).

Jim Bakker bolstered himself by trying to identify himself with God (something favorable) when he stated that God helped him design Heritage U.S.A.: "In the middle of the night I woke up. It was like a dream. I don't know. God gave me the concept of the Heritage Grand Partner Center, so I began to sketch." At that, Davis asked: "Did you have confidence in your ability to raise money?" and Bakker bolstered with: "I had confidence in God to supply it" (Ibid, 1a).

In an attempt to transcend his dilemma of a spiritual man versus a fraud, Bakker attempted to manipulate the jury to see him from a broad tolerant perspective, which implies his greater worth than his accusers - Baker:

> "You live by faith in God, not by fact. You say, I'm going to build because I feel this is what God tells us to do. Faith is what you have in your heart. We believe God is going to bring us through, because we have faith in him" (Ibid, 1a).

Bakker's Attorneys at the Trial

The attorneys that Jim Bakker selected to defend him were George T. Davis of Hawaii and Harold Bender of Charlotte, North Carolina. These two men had the arduous task of defending a man, who, if found guilty, could negatively affect the gross income of the entire televangelism industry for a long time to come.

Strategies

During Jim Bakker's trial in Charlotte, North Carolina, there were: zero instances of denial, zero instances of bolstering, five instances of transcendence; and seven instances of differentiation in George T. Davis' and Harold Bender's trial communication.

For the first three weeks of the trial, prosecutors took the federal jury into the secret world of Jim Bakker's PTL, trying to expose Bakker as a liar and a cheat and to destroy whatever reputation he had left as a minister. The prosecution attempted to prove that Jim Bakker was in total control of PTL and that Bakker committed fraud in the name of religion.

Jim Bakker's attorney opened their defense as government prosecutors had closed - with videotapes of the television evangelist at work. The videotapes aired by government prosecutors depicted Jim Bakker as, first and foremost, a fast-talking salesman, hawking his offer of free lodging for donors to keep his cash-starved PTL ministry alive. The defense countered with videotapes of Bakker, minister to common folk and to celebrities, arguing that Bakker's motives were spiritual.

This study has discovered that the videotapes that were presented by the defense contained all of the strategies and postures delineated by Ware and Linkugel. As Ware and

Linkugel note, transcendental abstraction can result from complex combinations of strategies. The critic contends that the defense videotapes were transcendental in nature, and contained complex strategies within them. The broad general transcendental overview of the tapes was that Bakker was a spiritual man working for God. This also makes Bakker appear as if he is of greater worth than his accusers. These tapes are also an attempt at denial because the tapes were attempting to revise the jurors' cognitions from guilt to innocence and also to possibly imply denial of intent. This could also be considered a differentiation strategy because it was differentiating the previously viewed videotapes of the prosecution. The prosecution depicted Bakker as a fast talking businessman, while the defense differentiated Bakker into a man of God and saver of souls. This type of verbal/visual strategy qualifies as differentiation under Ware and Linkugel's criterion because the defense's tapes attempted to split apart or cognitively divide the prosecution's depiction of Bakker as a fast-talking salesman into the new context that Bakker was a man of God and saver of souls. This strategy is also meant to be transformative in meaning, and is intended to render Bakker into a new and different light (Ibid, 278). These tapes contained examples of Bakker, common people, and celebrities bolstering Bakker. Since it appears that all of

the strategies are present, this apologia would also include use of all of the postures.

Examples

Here is an example of a transcendental strategy through the use of videotape on day 18 of the trial which differentiates the prosecution's view of Bakker, implies denial of intent, and bolsters. Bakker: (bolster) "There's something about stubborn faith. You don't give up easy... Don't let anybody steal your dream." At Bakker's side that day was Robert Schuller, the TV preacher. Schuller was bolstering Bakker's purported ideals when he stated: "If you don't have faith, you're not going to be pursuing God's glorious, impossible dream" (Defense, 1a).

During the hour long broadcast Gavin Macleod (of Love Boat fame) and his wife Patty talked about their divorce, spiritual rebirth and remarriage. This could be taken as bolstering Bakker and his work (Ibid, 1a).

On day 15 of the trial, the defense entered a 1986 broadcast of PTL, which was intended to display denial of intent as Bakker's strategy. These strategies were part of the complex transcendental overview of that videotape. Bakker: (denial of intent) "This is a deal of a lifetime. This is not a profit-making organization. We're just trying to pay the bills and get by." Later in the broadcast, "We're not trying to make money" (Bakker's Defense, 1a).

Bakker's lawyer Harold Bender made an attempt to transcend the "particulars" of the case and make Bakker appear of more worth than his accusers when he stated: "For the government to come in here and impose its laws and regulations on a ministry... violates the constitution" (Ibid, 1a).

Defense Witnesses at the Trial

The witnesses that Davis and Bender selected for the defense of Jim Bakker needed to uphold Bakker's testimony by bringing forth evidence that would confirm the testimony of Jim Bakker.

By the 19th day of Bakker's fraud and conspiracy trial, the defense had called more than two dozen witnesses who testified, essentially, that they supported Bakker's ministry at PTL and freely donated money for him to use as he wished.

Strategies

The witnesses for the defense at Jim Bakker's trial in Charlotte, North Carolina gave: zero instances of denial; five instances of bolstering; six instances of differentiation; and three instances of transcendence.

Examples

Frances Moore, of Barbourville, Kentucky, was bolstering Bakker when she testified she had taken her

nine-year-old grandson to Heritage U.S.A.: "My grandson is a Christian today because of PTL and Rev. Bakker" she said (Judge complains, 1A).

Bea Marten, the Bakker's former housekeeper, gave her opinion of the man who built PTL with this combined bolstering and differentiation statement:

> (bolster) "That man is giving more than anybody in the world I know of... Jim was PTL. What he got went back to PTL. They were always giving. (differentiation) They weren't taking. It was give, give, give" (Ibid, 1a).

Under cross-examination, Samuel Sandifer of Wilson attempted to differentiate the prosecution's version that Bakker and PTL officials misused PTL funds when they paid Jessica Hahn $265,000 to remain silent, when Sandifer exclaimed: "I have no objection to them spending money on the Heritage Grand Hotel, Jessica Hahn, unwed mothers... It was their money to spend as they saw fit." This statement appeared to be a weak attempt by the defense to make the act appear in a new light (Ibid, 1a).

Arnold Santjer, under cross-examination, created a stir in the courtroom when he said he owned 76 lifetime partnerships costing $76,000. Prosecutor Harold Miller pointed to a water pitcher on a table and asked Santjer: "If Mr. Bakker told you he could put me in this pitcher, would you believe him?" and Santjer remarked with a bizarre transcendental abstraction which made Jim Bakker appear as

if he were a living deity: "I imagine he could put you in there, yes" (Ibid, 1a).

In the book, Prime Time Preachers, Hadden and Swann consider the phenomenon of audience members relating to television personalities. Hadden and Swann explain:

> "the devotee - the 'fan' - comes to believe that he 'knows' the persona more intimately and profoundly than others do; that he understands his character and appreciates his values and motives... The persona may be considered by his audience as a friend, counselor, comforter, and model." This quote possibly explains Santjer's and other defense witnesses devotion to Bakker (Hadden & Swann, 65).

This section **described** what strategies and postures were found employed by Jim and Tammy Bakker when they appeared on Nightline program #1567, and what strategies and postures were employed by Jim Bakker when he appeared on Nightline program #1677. This section also depicted what strategies and postures were found in newspaper accounts, taken from The Charlotte Observer, at Jim Bakker's trial in Charlotte, North Carolina, for Jim Bakker, for Bakker's attorneys, and for Bakker's defense witnesses.

The next section will **interpret** how suitable these strategies and postures were at Bakker's trial, compared to Bakker's pre-trial apologia on the Nightline programs.

CHAPTER V

INTERPRETATION OF DATA

On October 5, 1989, in Charlotte, North Carolina's Federal District Court, Jim Bakker was convicted on all twenty-four counts of fraud and conspiracy. On October 24, 1989, in the same court, Jim Bakker was sentenced by Judge Robert Potter to forty-five years in prison and fined $500,000 (Bakker convicted, 1a).

In December 1989, Jim Bakker was quoted in Time saying, "I'm deeply sorry for the people who have been hurt." Bakker told U.S. District Judge Robert Potter just before the sentencing "I have sinned. I have made mistakes. But never in my life did I intend to defraud anyone." That last bid for leniency, while again sticking to a denial of intent strategy, made little impression on the judge, known as "Maximum Bob" because of Potter's penchant for stiff sentences. "Those of us who do have a religion are sick of being saps for money-grubbing preachers and priests," Potter angrily told Bakker (The Wrath, 62).

Judges like Robert Potter are presently being monitored more closely. In 1984, following numerous complaints about

sentence disparities, Congress created the U.S. Sentencing Commission. Its task was to develop for each type of federal crime a uniform punishment grid, carefully weighted to take into account such variables as the use of a gun, the amount of money stolen, and the age of the victim. Federal judges whose sentences deviate from these guidelines must state their reasons in writing, and their rulings are subject to appellate review.

Time (1989), also indicates that the new federal system, which took effect in 1987, appears thus far to be an improvement over most state systems. For one thing, says Samuel Alito, the U.S. Attorney in Newark, NJ, "We don't know how courts of appeals will treat departures from the guidelines." Other experts, such as Columbia University law professor Gerald Lynch, argue that the process of adjusting to the new procedures can be beneficial "if it forces judges to articulate what they are doing." The U.S. Sentencing Commission can then analyze whether any changes in its grid of punishments are called for (Ibid, 62).

The August 24, 1991, New York Times revealed that Jim Bakker did get a sentence reduction; this was due to the biased remarks made by Judge Potter at Bakker's trial. In August of 1991, Bakker appeared back in Federal court, with his new attorney, Alan Dershowitz, to hear Judge Graham Mullen sentence Bakker to an eighteen-year prison sentence,

far less than Bakker's forty-five year term that was thrown out by an appeals court. Bakker will most likely serve a least four more years in prison, starting in August 1991 (sentence, 1, 10:1).

For Jim Bakker, however, federal sentencing reforms came too late. The crimes for which Bakker was convicted were committed before the federal guidelines went into effect. Had the federal sentencing reforms been applied in Bakker's case, Bakker would have received a maximum prison term of only six years, say most experts. Through the idiosyncratic arbitration of Maximum Bob, Bakker received seven times that much (The Wrath, 62).

Grant Wacker reasoned in a Christian Century article that Jim Bakker's sexual irregularities, more than Bakker's financial irregularities, were the causes of Bakker's downfall among his Pentecostal and evangelical constituency (Bakker revenue, 1053). This paper speculates that this could also be part of the explanation for Bakker's conviction, since Bakker's two Nightline appearances (appeared on the Nightline before the trial) were glutted with allegations that Bakker was a homosexual and a rapist. These allegations seemed to over-shadow Bakker's financial irregularities, especially the May 27, 1987, broadcast (program #1567), where excerpts taken from a broadcast the

night before, by Jerry Falwell, at the Heritage Grand Hotel, in Fort Mill, South Carolina, were aired.

Jim Bakker put himself on trial before the bar of public opinion regarding the propriety of Bakker's public and private actions. The data for Bakker's Nightline appearances (program #s 1567 and 1677) indicate that Jim Bakker's primary concern was that Bakker was attempting to clear his name by taking the posture of absolution. Bakker, as was expected on both shows, denied all wrong-doing, by employing denial and denial of intent strategies, and differentiated all of the personal attributes in question, in hopes of clearing his name.

Consistent with Ware and Linkugel's theory, throughout the denial portion of the posture of absolution, Bakker was attempting to psychologically "reform" the national collective listening consciousness through the denial strategy, by dividing the auditors' cognitions from possible guilt/to innocence, and attempting to psychologically "transform" the auditors' meanings concerning Bakker through the use of differentiation strategies.

Jim Bakker on Nightline Program #1567

On 5/27/87 there were: nine instances of denial; 25 instances of differentiation; 20 instances of bolstering; and 11 instances of transcendence.

This data indicates that Bakker was primarily concerned with absolving himself, and that, to lesser degrees, Bakker was also attempting the postures of explanation, vindication, and justification. Thus, this paper argues that Bakker chose to use all of the culturally acceptable stances that rhetors might choose to speak on their own behalf on this program. Ware and Linkugel label this the "complete apologetic form." After examination of the aforementioned data, it appears that Bakker's main concern at that point in time (well before Bakker's trial) was primarily to clear his name by using the rhetorical force that the posture of absolution can render; secondarily, Bakker tried to induce the audience to understand his motives, actions, and beliefs by defending himself through the use of the explanative posture; thirdly, Bakker sought not only understanding but also approval from his rhetoric which the justificative posture provides; and fourthly, he used the persuasive force of the posture of vindication to make himself appear of greater worth than his accusers (Ware, 282).

Ware and Linkugel expound that each posture "represents a locus within the form (apologetic form) around which similar, not identical, apologia tend to cluster." According to the data for program #1567 Jim Bakker exhibited

Ware and Linkugel's "complete apologetic form" with the heaviest reliance on Absolution (Ware, 282).

Jim Bakker on Nightline Program #1677

On 10/27/87 there were: six instances of denial; 31 instances of differentiation; 14 instances of bolstering; and one instance of transcendence.

This data indicates the Bakker's primary posture was that of absolution. Secondarily the data indicates Bakker took the posture of explanation, which is the next most defensive posture, because it also arms the rhetor with the potentially potent transforming force that differentiation can render.

Interestingly, the data for program #1677 does not depict Bakker articulating the postures of vindication or justification. Part of the reason for not using the transcendence strategy in this program could be due to the fact that, on program #1567, Ted Koppel warned the Bakkers not to continually wrap themselves in the Bible. On program #1567 the Bakkers, through their use of the posture of vindication, were attempting to depict themselves within a "broad tolerant perspective," which is part of the rhetorical intention of the transcendence strategy. By the time the Bakkers finally appeared on program #1567 to defend themselves, Nightline had already devoted eleven full

programs to the scandal. Most of Bakker's transcendental strategies either dealt with Bakker wrapping himself in the Bible, speaking about his ministry, or Bakker trying to make himself appear as if he was of "greater worth than his accusers" (e.g., claiming that Bakker would face his accusers in debate). Five months later, when Bakker appeared on program #1677, he had to contend not only with the media hype about Bakker's sexual misbehavior, but also with rumors of investigations of PTL by the Internal Revenue Service, the FBI, the U.S. Postal Service, the South Carolina Tax Commission, Congress, and others. So, at the time of program #1677, Bakker had probably exhausted his references to the Bible; it was also unwise for Bakker to suggest he would face his accusers before his up-coming trial.

This paper argues that Jim Bakker exhibited the complete apologetic form on program #1567. However, on program #1677 Bakker had to modify his apologetic stance because of circumstances that were inhibiting Bakker's use of the complete apologetic form.

Tammy Bakker as Defense Witness on Nightline Program #1567

On 5/27/87, there were: four instances of denial; 17 instances of bolstering; 30 instances of differentiation; and nine instances of transcendence.

This data indicates that Tammy Bakker predominantly postured herself in the explanative stance in her effort to help Jim Bakker clear his name. Tammy mainly defended Jim Bakker by bolstering Bakkers's persona and differentiating with Bakker. The data for Tammy also displays use of the complete apologetic form.

Instances of Tammy's predominate explanative stance were when Koppel mentioned Falwell's allegations from the night before, dealing with Jim Bakker being a rapist. Tammy differentiated and bolstered the allegation in the same statement with:

> (differentiation) "In fact,the marriage workshops came out of those - those problems that Jim and I had seven years ago (bolstering) - and probably many hundreds or maybe even thousands of marriages are back together again as a result of what happened to us" (PTL Club, 7 & 8).

Tammy used an absolutive stance to a lesser degree. Tammy displayed an absolutive stance in this combined denial and differentiation statement:

> (denial) "The reason we're doing it, Ted, is because most of the accusations are not true. Truth doesn't bother me, I'll face the truth. (differentiation) But I have a hard time when people tell lies about us" (Ibid, 12).

The posture of vindication was used to an even lesser degree than absolution - but it is present. Tammy displayed a vindicative stance by denying and transcending (showing the Bakkers were better than their accuser - Falwell in this

single statement when she stated: (denial) "He is wrong, (transcendence) but we aren't going to wreck him" (Ibid, 7).

The justificative stance is also present. Tammy displayed the justificative stance with this combined transcendence and bolstering statement:

> "I'm the oldest of eight kids. We had an outdoor bathroom all the time I was growing up. I mean, me, just the normal of normal people that this happened to."

Here Tammy transcended by creating the broad perspective that she came from poverty and bolstered by identifying with the favorable subject of normality (Ibid, 16). This was Ware and Linkugel's complete apologetic form.

Thus, it is apparent that all of the psychological rhetorical force of the Ware and Linkugel theory is present in Tammy Bakker's apologia.

Jim Bakker at the Trial

On 9/29/89 there were four instances of denial; eight instances of differentiation; seven instances of bolstering; and one instance of transcendence.

This data indicates that Jim Bakker's trial apologia was consistent with Bakker's two Nightline appearances, to the extent that Bakker remained in the absolutive and explanative postures. Bakker, as he did on the two Nightline programs, primarily stayed in the posture of

absolution. In this absolutive stance Bakker was found to deny (denial and denial of intent) and differentiate the incriminating statements rendered against him - that he oversold PTL partnership. These incriminating statements came, on day 13 of the trial, from Bakker's right-hand men - Richard Dorch, David Taggart, Steve Nelsen, and Peter Baily. Dorch's testimony was said to be the most devastating. "Not a blade of grass at Heritage U.S.A. was not known to Mr. Bakker" said Dorch. Taggart provided details of his nearly seven years as Bakker's personal aide. Nelsen's testimony produced damaging evidence that Bakker mislead donors. Baily's testimony produced damaging evidence that he wrote more than 70 memos toward Bakker about PTL's worsening financial condition (What did, 1a).

On trial day 21, Bakker steadfastly clung to his absolutive stance, making explicit denials, and denying that he ever intentionally misled donors. Bakker differentiated with statements such as "I believe there's a lot of people lying because they have motives behind it." Here Bakker was referring to the reduced prison sentences that Dorch and Taggart received for cooperating with the prosecution and this statement was meant to transform the meanings of Dorch and Taggart's testimony (Bakker challenges, 1a).

Secondarily Bakker defended himself through the use of the explanative posture. Bakker displayed instances of

explanative data when the issue of raising money and issuing too many lifetime partnerships came up. George T. Davis asked Bakker if he had confidence in his ability to raise money, and to this statement Bakker bolstered by identifying himself with the favorable subject of God, (bolster) "I had confidence in God to supply it." Prosecutor Debra Smith claimed that, in a PTL broadcast, Bakker claimed that a statue of David defeating Goliath was then being given to donors for $1000 when it in fact cost $10, Smith asked: "That's a bit of an overstatement, wasn't it, Mr. Bakker?" and Bakker differentiated the statement with: "I believed that, when said it. It's hard to place a value on a statue inspired by the Bible" (Bakker challenges, 1a).

Possibly part of the reason why the data does not depict Bakker in the vindicative or justificative postures, both of which heavily rely on the strategy of transcendence, is because, when Bakker finally took the stand, he had to answer the specifics (details) of the charges. Bakker, of course, countered with specifics by using denial (some denial of intent strategies). Bakker's remarks needed to hold up to logical analysis for the jury to give Bakker the benefit of the doubt. The use of transcendental strategies would have been too general at this time. If Bakker would have ignored the specifics (the prosecution's evidence and testimony against him) by constructing a broad perspective,

he never would have answered the charges and allegations, and would have appeared as if he was not functioning within the reality of the situation. Bakker's freedom was on the line; this forced Bakker to differentiate the specifics. Bakker's lawyers were the rhetoricians who should have been constructing Bakker's transcendental overview by directing Bakker's, the witnesses', and their own rhetoric in general.

Thus, Jim Bakker's trial apologia was consistent with his television apologia, to the extent that Bakker used the absolutive and explanative postures, attempting to cast Bakker as managing by faith, struggling to save souls, and the victim of many misunderstandings who never **intentionally** defrauded anyone.

Defense Witnesses at the Trial

The witnesses for the defense at Jim Bakker's trial gave: zero instances of denial; five instances of bolstering; six instances of differentiation; and three instances of transcendence.

By the 19th day of Bakker's trial, the defense had called more than two dozen witnesses who testified, essentially, that they supported Bakker's ministry at PTL and freely donated money for him to use as he wished. U.S. Justice Department prosecutor Deborah Smith asked Judge Potter to stop the parade of witnesses - saying that the

witnesses were saying the same thing over and over. Potter made it plain that his patience was wearing thin.

It may have strengthened the Bakker defense if Davis and Bender had obtained witnesses who could exhibit all four apologetic postures because, along with the complete form, comes the entire intended rhetorical force of Ware and Linkugel's theory. Davis and Bender could direct the witnesses' apologia to absolve, vindicate, explain, and justify Bakker in a fashion that, according to the theory, would have the psychological "reforming" faculties of the strategies of denial and bolstering, and the psychological "transforming" faculties of differentiation and transcendence. In a case like this, perfectionistic rhetoric was needed.

The data indicates there were no instances of denial. There were instances of bolstering, differentiation, and transcendence. Denial was needed here to confirm Bakker's denials, since Bakker denied the incriminating testimony of his right-hand men - Richard Dorch, David Taggert, Steve Nelsen, and Peter Baily. With no one else backing Bakker's denials, it makes it appear that Bakker may be lying.

The defense witnesses apologia did factor together to form the explanative and justification postures. The explanative posture, through the strategies of bolstering and differentiation, asks for understanding, and the

justificative posture, through the strategies of bolstering and transcendence, asks not only for understanding, but for approval. These two postures seem to be all Davis and Bender could come up with for the witnesses - a weak manifestation of Ware and Linkugel's theory.

Bakker's Attorneys at the Trial

During Jim Bakker's trial there were: zero instances of denial; zero instances of bolstering; five instances of transcendence; and seven instances of differentiation.

The data does not depict a Ware and Linkugel posture. The data depicts instances of differentiation and transcendence, both considered psychologically "transformative" strategies, according to Ware and Linkugel. However, denial, with it's psychologically "reformative" faculty, had to be employed by Davis and Bender to show belief in Bakker's innocence and for the attorneys to portray a believable defense attitude.

Most likely, Davis and Bender were functioning under the handicap of constraints that were not visible to the general observer. It is likely that Davis and Bender were aware that Bakker was at least partially guilty or negligent and were laboring for an appeal down the road. History proved this point to be true. The attorneys' social survivals were at stake, so, conceivably, the lawyers could

preserve their own reputations by avoiding direct denials themselves.

Harold Bender used the strategy of differentiation on trial day 19 when he countered prosecutor Smith's complaint that the witnesses which the defense were parading one after the other in front of the jury had nothing to do with whether Bakker had lied to his supporters. Bender differentiated this with: "They're not being used as character witnesses. They're talking about what they did, their donations and benefits. It's clearly relevant" (Bakker expected, 1a).

When prosecutor Smith (on trial day 21) questioned Bakker, he used a technique of rapidly asking of Bakker one question after another. George T. Davis objected to this with a transcendence strategy, which was intended to make Bakker and Davis appear as if they were better than their accuser. Davis (transcendence): "It's bordering on prosecutional misconduct" (Bakker challenges, 1a).

The most convincing transcendental strategy appeared to be the combining of strategies in the videotapes that Davis and Bender used to counter the prosecution's videotape images of Bakker. This study argues that the defense made use of the "complete apologetic form" in the defense's use of videotapes. This was a complex combination of strategies

that factored together to form a transcendental overview (i.e., broad perspective) on the part of the defense.

What the critic does not understand is why Davis and Bender did not combine some of the apologia of Bakker and the witnesses, with their own apologia, in their closing discourses at the end of the trial. This would have been an effective strategy of transcendence - the "complex combination of strategies" that Ware and Linkugel write about. This could have provided a transcendental overview to encourage the jury to form a "newly-realized identification" with Bakker. This would have ended the trial with the "complete apologetic form" - the entire rhetorical force of the theory. Especially since Bakker was the only speaker who made denials, this combination of strategies would have made sense. Such an apologia may have given the defense a better change at exonerating Bakker from guilt.

The October 4, 1989 issue of the New York Times depicts George T. Davis making closing statements. He encourages jurors with doubts to "hold out," suggesting that the government built a case that intruded unfairly into church activities, and that 95% of the government's case was based on circumstantial evidence. In his closing statement, Harold Bender asked jurors to imagine their own preacher

under a similar microscope, portrayed in videotapes taken out of context (PTL fraud, 6).

In the October 6, 1989 issue of the New York Times, jury foreman, Ricky Hills, stated that he had no problem deciding that Bakker defrauded his followers. "We kept looking for something from the defense and couldn't find anything. The only thing I believed about his testimony was that, when he started out, he was earnest" (Bakker convicted, 1). Hill is quoted in the October 16, 1989, issue of Macleans, giving this same viewpoint. Said Hill: "He didn't become a man of God." In fact, Hill claimed that the jury did not believe any of Bakker's testimony. He added, "we kept looking for something from the defense and we never saw it" (A guilty, 55).

So it is argued that Davis and Bender did not portray a convincing defense attitude.

This section interpreted the strategies and postures used at Jim Bakker's trial in Charlotte, North Carolina. The next section will evaluate if the strategies and postures employed by the rhetors were appropriate and effective at the trial.

CHAPTER VI

EVALUATION OF DATA

History has shown that, on October 5, 1989, in Charlotte, North Carolina's Federal District Court, Jim Bakker was convicted on all twenty-four counts of fraud and conspiracy. Bakker was sentenced by Judge Robert Potter to forty-five years in prison and fined $500,000 (Bakker convicted, 1a).

After the sentencing Bakker was fortunate enough to receive a sentence reduction that was based on Judge Potter's biased remarks during Bakker's trial. In August, 1991, in the same Federal courtroom, Bakker was sentenced to an eighteen-year prison sentence.

Wacker (1989) posited that Bakker's sexual irregularities, more than Bakker's financial irregularities, were the causes of Bakker's downfall. Judge Potter very possibly was influenced by the propaganda and innuendoes displayed on the Nightline programs, and/or other extensive media attention given to the over-all scandal. It is very likely that Potter's biased remarks during the trial had an effect on the jury.

It is the opinion of this student of apologia that Bakker's attorneys did not construct Bakker's defense in a manner that would display effective apologetic rhetoric, according to the theory of Ware and Linkugel (1973). This poorly constructed rhetoric, coupled with Potter's biased remarks, surely may have made a negative impression on the jury.

Bakker's Nightline Appearances

Programs, #1567 and #1677 were the two Nightline appearances by Bakker profiled in this study. Bakker's pretrial self-defense on the two Nightline programs was detrimental to Bakker's upcoming trial. This paper reasons that Bakker was naive in his choice to go public and defend himself. In a scandal of this magnitude Bakker should have remained taciturn and saved everything for the trial - **giving nothing away.**

The data for program #1567 depicts Bakker displaying the "complete apologetic form," with Bakker's heaviest reliance on the posture of absolution (i.e., because Bakker denied and differentiated all aspects in question). Within this absolutive posture Bakker differentiated some of his behavior through the use of "regenerative" strategies on three different occasions. Through these regenerative strategies Bakker admitted guilt and negligence. Bakker

admitted taking part in the Jessica Hahn affair and regenerated the incident into saving his marriage. Bakker admitted taking too many bonuses and regenerated that problem into the new construction of reality that he would not do it again. Bakker admitted that he did not handle his own finances and regenerated that personal problem into being a flaw for which he had repented. Bakker differentiated all other aspects in question which made it appear as if he were lying. Tammy Bakker also gave away too much on this program. Tammy's responses concerning Bakker's homosexuality and Tammy's extravagant spending contributed to a negative image.

The Bakkers gave away too much character damaging information on this program. The Bakker's did not need to answer these allegations, especially the sexual allegation, as Bakker was eventually tried on just the twenty-four counts of fraud and conspiracy. It was poor future planning.

The data for program #1677 depicts Bakker primarily in the posture of absolution (i.e., because he denied and differentiated all aspects in question) and, secondly, in the posture of explanation. Once again, unnecessary information was given away on this program. Bakker's supposed homosexual advances were again exploited, in addition to the subject of Baker's misuse of funds.

Bakker's appearances on programs #1567 and #1677 were naive and vain efforts to defend himself and these efforts certainly had to contribute, in part, to Bakker's downfall. Bakker's Nightline appearances broadened the number of topics for which Bakker needed to prepare apologetic responses. Bakker should have remained taciturn, saving everything for the trial while **giving away nothing.**

The Trial

Jim Bakker's trial in Charlotte, North Carolina, lasted from August 29, 1989 to October 7, 1989. Throughout the trial, the prosecution portrayed Bakker as a liar and a cheat, while Bakker's defense portrayed Bakker as a man of God and saver of souls.

It is the opinion of this student of apologia that Bakker's attorneys did not construct Bakker's defense in a manner that would display effective apologetic rhetoric according to the theory of Ware and Linkugel (1973). This poorly constructed rhetoric, coupled with Judge Potter's biased remarks, may have negatively impressed the jury.

Jim Bakker

There seemed to be no other recourse for Bakker than to cling to the predominate posture of absolution which Bakker fashioned for himself on the Nightline programs. Bakker, as he did on the Nightlines, also displayed a secondary posture

of explanation. Bakker denied, differentiated, and bolstered himself in his effort to uphold his idealized image as a man of God, a saver of souls, a poor businessman who was depending on God to provide the direction, a victim of many misunderstandings, and a victim of liars.

In viewing Bakker's trial data separately, one can come to the conclusion that Bakker displayed use of all modes of apologia. Bakker attempted absolution by denying (denial and denial of intent) and differentiating the charges. Bakker attempted explanation by bolstering and differentiating. This apologia was colored with pathos that Bakker was a man of God who never intentionally committed crimes. But Bakker's own defense was only part of the apologia being presented. Bakker's apologia needed to be cleverly combined with the apologia of the witnesses and with the apologia of the attorneys.

Witnesses

The witnesses that Davis and Bender selected for the defense needed to uphold Bakker's testimony by bringing forth testimony which would confirm the testimony of Jim Bakker and disconfirm the testimony of key prosecution witnesses. Unfortunately for Bakker and his defense, this condition did not transpire. The defense was unable to produce witnesses who could confirm Bakker's denials against the incriminating statements made by Bakker's right-hand men

- Richard Dorch, David Taggart, Steven Nelsen, and Peter Baily. Instead, the defense paraded character witness after character witness in front of the judge and jury, seemingly attempting to affect the jurors with pathos, rather than logic.

As the data for the trial witnesses depicts, the witnesses presented apologetic postures of explanation and justification. The defense needed denials from these witnesses: denials that would match Bakker's denials; denials that would "logically" refute the testimony of key prosecution witnesses; and denials that could be combined with the overall pathetic appeal of the entire case. The witnesses presented apologia which stressed emotion over logic and which was not consistent with Bakker's apologia. This left Bakker standing alone denying that he never **intentionally** defrauded anyone.

Attorneys

In order for Davis and Bender to create a credible rhetorical vision to the judge and jury, the attorneys needed to construct rhetoric containing a balance of logic and pathos that would, in the end, bolster Bakker's ethos. It is the opinion of this student of apologia that Davis and Bender could have constructed a more effective rhetorical vision of Bakker's innocence, if the attorneys had only made broader use of the strategy of transcendence by combining

strategies. Thus, it is the conclusion of this paper that the apologia employed by Bakker's defense was ineffective, and was a poor execution of apologia.

The rhetoric for Jim Bakker's trial was under the directorship of Davis and Bender. The reader can see Bakker was the only speaker for the defense who made denials during the trial. Bakker presented the postures of absolution and explanation, which are considered the most defensive. The witnesses made no denials. Instead, the witnesses were found in postures of explanation and justification, asking for understanding and approval of Bakker. The attorneys made no denials. The attorneys relied on the "transformative" strategies of differentiation and transcendence. Since the attorneys did not posture themselves verbally (plausible postures were discovered in the defense's videotapes), this suggests that Davis and Bender displayed a poor grasp of apologia according to Ware and Linkugel's theory.

The "complete apologetic form," which is the entire united rhetorical force of the theory, was needed in this case. Since the data for the attorneys depicts no posture at all (because the attorneys were not found to deny or bolster), the attorneys' rhetorical choice lost the potential "name clearing" capacity of the posture of absolution, and lost the potential "preservation of Bakker's

reputation" that the posture of indication can generate. By not using bolstering, the attorneys lost the potential element of "understanding" that the posture of explanation can provide, as well as the potential element of "approval" of the posture of justification.

The Future of Televangelism

Hadden and Shupe (1988) suggest that the aftermath of the scandal touches upon two significant issues that could have profound, lasting importance for American culture and the future of evangelism in America. The first issue deals with the First Amendment. The second issue is the impact of scandals of this nature on all religious broadcasting.

In October, 1987, the House Ways and Means Subcommittee on Oversight launched an inquiry into the financial accountability of religious organizations and the role of the IRS in overseeing them. The real significance of the inquiry was not the consequences for Jim and Tammy Bakker, but the First Amendment and the fragile line between church and state. At issue in the inquiry was not only the tax-exempt status of PTL and Heritage U.S.A., but, ultimately, the tax exempt status of all religious organizations. Efforts to guard against future abuses by religious broadcasters could result in regulation that would restrict all broadcasters (Hadden & Shupe, 15-16).

The second significant issue, according to Hadden and Shupe, is the impact of the scandal on all religious broadcasting. The negative image of televangelists did not emerge overnight. A July, 1989, Los Angeles Times poll demonstrated solid negative sentiment before the scandal broke. The poll was repeated after the scandal and found that every television preacher lost ground in terms of public approval. A March, 1987, New York Times poll found that 65 percent of the American public had an unfavorable opinion of most televangelists, and of those who reported having contributed to televangelists, 35 percent expressed generally unfavorable views about televangelists. An April, 1987, USA Today poll found 90 percent of Americans disapproving of the fund raising techniques of televangelists (Ibid, 16).

Hadden and Shupe report that, after the scandal, ministries reported sharp declines in contributions. Jerry Falwell reported income losses of $2 million monthly, while Jimmy Swaggart reported a monthly decline of $2.5 million. On June 5, 1987, Pat Robertson announced on "The 700 Club" program that the Christian Broadcasting Network was laying off 470 employees. Since news of the Bakker scandal had broken in March of 1987, Robertson told his viewers, CBN's revenues were down $28 million by year's end. Robertson stated, "In the history of American Christianity we have never seen anything like this" (Ibid, 17).

REFERENCES

Abelman, R. & Neuendorf, K. (1985, Winter). "How religious is religious television programming?". Journal of Communication, 98.

"A guilty evangelist." (1989, October). Macleans, 16, 55.

Aly, B. (1969). "The gallows speech: A lost genre." Southern Speech Journal, 34, 204-213.

"As the spiritual soap opera plays on..." (1987, April 13). People Weekly, 13, 44.

"Bakker challenges charge he oversold partnerships." (1989, September 30). Charlotte Observer, 1a.

"Bakker's defense counters with it's own tapes." (1989, September 21). Charlotte Observer, 1a.

"Bakker expected to testify today in own defense." (1989, September 28). Charlotte Observer, 1a.

"Bakker is convicted on all counts; first felon among TV evangelists." (1989, October 6). New York Times, 1, 4.

Black, E. (1965). Rhetorical criticism: A study in method, Macmillan, NY, 176-177.

Butler, S.D. (1971). "The apologia, 1971 genre." The Southern Speech Communication Journal, 281-289.

"Defense team presents Jim Bakker as man of faith." (1989, September 27). Charlotte Observer, 1a.

Dorgan, H. (1972). "The doctrine of victorious defeat in the rhetoric of confederate veterans." The Southern Speech Communication Journal, 38, 119-130.

"God and money." (1987, April 6). Newsweek, 18.

Gold, E.R. (1978). "Political apologia: The ritual of self-defense." Communication Monographs, 45, 306-316.

Hadden, J.K. & Shupe, A. (1988). Televangelism power and politics on God's frontier, Holt, NY.

Hadden, J.K. & Swann, C.E. (1981). Prime time preachers. Addison-Wesley, Reading.

Jamieson, K.M.H. (1973). "Generic contraints and the rhetorical situation." Philosophy and Rhetoric, 1, 162-170.

"Jim Bakker." (1987, October 27). ABC News - Nightline, #1677, 1-13.

"Jim Bakker and the eternal revenue service." (1989, November 15). The Christian Century, 1053-1055.

"Judge complains defense testimony is too repetitive." (1989, September 28). Charlotte Observer, 1a.

Katula, R.A. (1975). "The apologia of Richard M. Nixon." Today's Speech, FL, 1-5.

Kruse, N. (1977). "Motivational factors in non-denial apologia." Central States Speech Journal, 28, 13-23.

Linkugel, W., & Razak, N. (1969). "Sam Houston's speech of self-defense in the House of Representatives." Southern Speech Journal, 34, 263-275.

Littell, J.F. (Ed.). (1976). Coping with the mass media. Evanston, IL: McDougal, Little, 16.

Nelsen, J. (1984). "The defense of Billie Jean King." The Western Journal of Speech Communication, 48, 92-102.

"PTL Club (6): Jim & Tammy Faye Bakker." (1987, May 27). ABC News - Nightline, #1567, 1-18.

"PTL fraud case goes to jury." (1989, October 4). New York Times, 1, 26, 1.

Rosenfield, W. (1968). "A case study in speech criticism: The Nixon-Truman analog." Speech Monographs, 35, 435-450.

"Sentence reduction." (1991, August 24). New York Times, 1, 10:1.

"The troubles and triumph of Billie Jean." (1981). [Editorial]. New York Times, (a) 30.

"The Wrath of Maximum Bob." (1989, November 6). Time, 62.

Ware, B.L., Linkugel, W.A., & Harrell, J. (1975). "Failure of apology in American politics: Nixon on Watergate." Speech Monographs, 42, 245-261.

Ware, B.L. & Linkugel, W.A. (1973, October). "They spoke in defense of themselves: On the generic criticism of apologia." Quarterly Journal of Speech, 59, 273-283.

"What did Bakker know?" (1989, September 19). Charlotte Observer, 1a.