

1969

# A General Semantics Model for Speech Evaluation

Harold Lee Drake  
*Eastern Illinois University*

---

## Recommended Citation

Drake, Harold Lee, "A General Semantics Model for Speech Evaluation" (1969). *Masters Theses*. 4100.  
<https://thekeep.eiu.edu/theses/4100>

This is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Theses & Publications at The Keep. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses by an authorized administrator of The Keep. For more information, please contact [tabruns@eiu.edu](mailto:tabruns@eiu.edu).

PAPER CERTIFICATE #3

To: Graduate Degree Candidates who have written formal theses.

Subject: Permission to reproduce theses.

The University Library is receiving a number of requests from other institutions asking permission to reproduce dissertations for inclusion in their library holdings. Although no copyright laws are involved, we feel that professional courtesy demands that permission be obtained from the author before we allow theses to be copied.

Please sign one of the following statements.

Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University has my permission to lend my thesis to a reputable college or university for the purpose of copying it for inclusion in that institution's library or research holdings.

May 13, 1969  
Date

I respectfully request Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University not allow my thesis be reproduced because \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Author

A GENERAL SEMANTICS MODEL

FOR SPEECH EVALUATION

(TITLE)

BY

Harold Lee Drake

THESIS

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS  
FOR THE DEGREE OF

Master Of Arts

IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL, EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY  
CHARLESTON, ILLINOIS

1969

YEAR

I HEREBY RECOMMEND THIS THESIS BE ACCEPTED AS FULFILLING  
THIS PART GRADUATE DEGREE CITED

May 6 1969  
DATE

May 6 1969  
DATE

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
Purpose Of The Study	
Limitations Of The Study	
Justifying General Semantics In Evaluating A Speech	
Justifying Use Of A Churchill Speech For Evaluation	
Summary	
II. REVIEW OF MATERIALS .....	11
Sources For Establishing Methodology	
Some Other General Semantics Sources	
The Speaker	
The Speech For Illustration	
Summary	
III. ESTABLISHING GENERAL SEMANTICS CRITERIA FOR SPEECH EVALUATION .....	25
Allness Statements	
Multi-Valued Orientation	
Multi-Ordinal Orientation	
Indexing And Dating	
Facts Versus Inferences	
Symbol Reactions Versus Signal Reactions	
The 'Etcetera' Attitude	

Chapter	Page
Conclusion	
Summary	
IV. AN ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION OF 'THE SINEWS OF PEACE,' A SPEECH DELIVERED BY WINSTON LEONARD SPENCER CHURCHILL IN FULTON, MISSOURI, U.S.A., ON MARCH 5, 1946 .....	52
The Speech Analysis	
Quantitative Analysis Chart	
V. EVALUATION AND CONCLUSIONS .....	78
The Speech Evaluation	
Conclusions	
The Model	
Recommendations	
BIBLIOGRAPHY .....	101

## CHAPTER ONE

### INTRODUCTION

Purpose of the study. This thesis is produced with four basic purposes in mind.

First, criteria for evaluating a speech will be established from certain general semantics formulations. Hopefully, it will show that anyone with a basic knowledge of general semantics will be able to apply the criteria in order to produce valid judgments concerning an "initial" evaluation.

Second, as a result of setting-forth the evaluative criteria, a general semantics model will be constructed for an "initial" evaluation. This model, it is hoped, will act as an aid to any teacher or student who wishes to carry out such an "initial" speech evaluation as explained in this study.

Third, an evaluation will be conducted to test the model. Winston Leonard Spencer Churchill's Fulton, Missouri, U. S. A. speech of March 5, 1946 will be used for the evaluation.

Fourth, from the "initial" evaluation will come conclusions and recommendations based upon what is found after applying the general semantics model to the speech.

Limitations of the study. This study is concerned only with an "initial" general semantics analysis and

evaluation. Such an "initial" evaluation is to be considered as being produced without pre-or-post-speech referents. Thus an "initial" indication is arrived at showing specific areas for further investigation and more in-depth analysis and evaluation if so desired. It is maintained by this investigator that the "initial" evaluation itself will stand alone as a valid means whereby communication may be judged worthy of consideration or not and to what degree.

The tools to be used in establishing criteria for evaluating and the subsequent general semantics model are only some of the formulations of the general semanticist. It will be explained in the chapter on criteria that in the opinion of the investigator only some of the basic or key formulations are used in setting-up the criteria and model. The rationale behind this approach is that since the general semantics discipline considers life as a dynamic phenomenon in constant flux, it therefore as a discipline is also involved in constant change. It would seem then, that a model having to do with only basic formulations would be apropos to allow for modifications according to each individual involved in an evaluation. In other words, the model to be constructed in this study will hopefully be one which can be used in a non-static, constantly changing semantic and physical environment.

This study does not purport to be a defense of general semantics. What is hoped is that through this paper and the criteria with a model it will be shown that an "initial" general semantics analysis and evaluation is a valid means of speech criticism. In addition it is maintained that such an analysis and evaluation will indicate specific areas for further investigation.

It is felt that an historical perspective per se is of no value to this study since the emphasis is upon criteria and how to apply it but not upon the person or his speech being used for illustrative purposes. Therefore, no historical background will be produced concerning the speech or rhetor being used for illustration of the "initial" model.

Conclusions will be based upon the apparent results of the evaluation and the tools used. Speaker ideology and purpose, for instance, will be excluded.

Only one speech will be evaluated. It is hoped that future evaluations will be forthcoming using the criteria and model established in this study. Speech evaluating as such, is not the primary concern in this paper as pointed out earlier. The primary objective is to setup general semantics criteria and a model of that criteria for "initial" evaluative purposes. It is suggested that extensive evaluation of speeches would be better suited for another study.



As will be explained in further detail in the chapter establishing criteria, only a selected number of sources are being used for this study. Once again, it will be stressed that the purpose of this work is not to conduct a defense of the formulations of general semantics, but rather, to synthesize from certain established authorities in the field. Heading those sources is the "father of general semantics," Alfred Korzybski and his book, Science and Sanity.<sup>1</sup> A complete listing of sources used for this paper will be found in Chapter Two.

Justifying general semantics in evaluating a speech: It is suggested that general semantics is a valuable aid in inter-and-intra-personal communication. Wendell Johnson maintains general semantics is a scientific approach to language and man's use of it:

What the men of science have learned to do with such unprecedented effectiveness in their technical laboratories, general semantics would prepare all men to do as well as they may from moment to moment in their daily lives, and from day to day in their handling of the social problems by which they are all affected.<sup>2</sup>

Academicians who have made communications their life's work have advocated general semantics as an excel-

---

<sup>1</sup>Alfred Korzybski, Science And Sanity, (3rd ed.; Lakeville, Connecticut: International Non-Aristotelian Library Publishing Company, 1950).

<sup>2</sup>Wendell Johnson, People In Quandaries: The Semantics Of Personal Adjustment, (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1946), p. 34.

lent approach to better understanding of oneself as well as others.<sup>3</sup>

A review of abstracts of Masters Theses and Doctoral Dissertations completed from 1934 through August, 1968---as published by Speech Monographs<sup>4</sup>---lists apparently only one person as exclusively applying general semantics tools to speeches.<sup>5</sup> One other person has used general semantics to evaluate the teachings of Jesus Christ,<sup>6</sup> while certain formulations of general semantics have been applied by another person to plays.<sup>7</sup> Yet another study has been done using one basic general semantics formulation to speeches.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup>A listing of these academicians will be found in chapters Two and Three reviewing materials and criteria.

<sup>4</sup>Speech Monographs, (New York: Speech Association of America). Volumes I through XXXVI were checked. Volume II, October, 1935 includes these abstracts in the field of speech from 1902 to 1934.

<sup>5</sup>W. Paul Gormley, "A Critical Analysis and Evaluation of Ten Major Addresses Delivered Before Joint Sessions of Congress During the Period 1941-1951 by Means of General Semantics Criteria Of Rhetorical Criticism" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Denver, 1952).

<sup>6</sup>E. Debs Smith, "A relating of the principles of General semantics to certain teachings of Jesus and to the nature of His instruction appearing in the Four Gospels" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Denver, 1952).

<sup>7</sup>Robert G. Johnson, "A General Semantics Analysis of Three of Arthur Miller's Plays: Death of a Salesman, The Crucible, and All My Sons. (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Denver, 1963).

<sup>8</sup>Clifford Osborn, "An Appraisal of Three Methods of Studying Semantic Reactions in Speech Situations" (unpublished Master's thesis, University of Denver, 1942).

In his search, the investigator limited himself to theses and dissertations indicating through their titles that general semantics is included in the study. There appears to be room for more studies using general semantics and this paper's aim is to contribute to this area in the field of speech. S. I. Hayakawa---in reply to a letter from this investigator---maintains "there are many dozens of theses" which have been written concerning general semantics and general semantics criteria for evaluation.<sup>9</sup>

Justifying the use of a Churchill speech for evaluation: According to the Speech Monographs listing previously cited, Winston Leonard Spencer Churchill's Fulton, Missouri speech has apparently been used exclusively in a study only twice. It was used once as an historical approach,<sup>10</sup> and once as a rhetorical analysis and evaluation.<sup>11</sup> It would seem that the speech has been included in one form of anthology or another in about a half-dozen other studies.

Not only is this present study contributing another evaluation to the limited list of studies con-

---

<sup>9</sup>This statement is included in a note from Hayakawa and in the possession of the investigator and dated April 9, 1969.

<sup>10</sup>Lawrence W. Grosser, "Winston Churchill's Fulton, Missouri Speech" (unpublished Master's thesis, University of Michigan, 1946).

<sup>11</sup>Sharryl H. Hawke, "A Rhetorical Analysis of Winston S. Churchill's 'Iron Curtain Address'" (unpublished Master's thesis, University of Kansas, 1967).

cerned with Churchill's Fulton, Missouri speech, but it would appear this is the first general semantics approach to that particular speech in a thesis or dissertation.

For further justification for using Churchill and his Fulton speech in this study it is pointed out that Churchill was known for his speaking ability. His oratory during the Second World War, for instance, reached peoples all over the world. Henry Grunwald has written of Churchill:

**[His] most important service to his nation, and to the free world, was inspirational. Throughout World War II, he spoke for Britain in a way in which no statesman had ever expressed the courage of a people.<sup>12</sup>**

Grunwald goes on to maintain that Churchill's speeches during World War Two were an "essential contribution" to the war effort on behalf of the Allies:

**Nothing else and no one else could so surely buoy up flagging hopes or restore confidence---in Britain and in oneself. As the Swedish Academy put it when he won the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1953, he had 'mobilized' the language.<sup>13</sup>**

As the late and former United States President Dwight D. Eisenhower has written: "Seldom in history has one man so greatly symbolized a race of men and women, their strengths and their loyalties."<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup>Henry Anatole Grunwald, "Man Of The Century," Churchill The Life Triumphant: The Historical Record Of Ninety Years (New York: The American Heritage Publishing Co., Inc., 1965), p.8.

<sup>13</sup>Ibid.

<sup>14</sup>Dwight D. Eisenhower, "Sir Winston Churchill A Personal View," Churchill The Life Triumphant: The Historical Record Of Ninety Years (New York: The American Heritage Publishing Co., Inc., 1965), p.5.

In an article written in 1942, Joseph Miller described Churchill:

Speaking as Prime Minister of England, Winston Churchill has become world famed for his leadership of the British Empire in its war to annihilate Nazism---a leadership involving, if not largely based upon supreme ability in public address.<sup>15</sup>

Charles Lomas wrote of Churchill:

[His] writing and speaking can hardly fail to be a better understanding of the 'human story, with all its sadness and with all its unquenchable hope.'<sup>16</sup>

Time magazine once noted Churchill's oratory:

Britons do not mind being told the worst but refuse to believe anything but the best. Winston Churchill knows this well, and one of the qualities which make his words reverberate with heroism is his ability to tell bad news and make it seem somehow good---to make gloomy sentences add up to buoyant paragraphs.<sup>17</sup>

Thus, it is maintained that Churchill is a worthy speaker to use for an illustration in this study.

Summary. In summary, there are four main objectives in this study: (1) certain general semantics criteria will be established for the purposes of producing "initial" communication evaluations; (2) with the

---

<sup>15</sup>Joseph W. Miller, "Winston Churchill, Spokesman For Democracy," Quarterly Journal Of Speech (April, 1942), p. 131.

<sup>16</sup>Charles W. Lomas, "The British Orators, III---Winston Churchill; Orator-Historian," Quarterly Journal Of Speech (April, 1958), p. 160.

<sup>17</sup>Time, XXXVI (October 21, 1940), p. 36.

criteria, a model will be constructed as a guide to such "initial" evaluations; (3) the model will be applied to a speech by Winston Leonard Spencer Churchill, as an example of how it may be used; and, (4) certain conclusions and recommendations will be presented from the evaluation according to the general semantics criteria set forth.

It is to be kept in mind at all times that the general semantics criteria and model are constructed to allow for further development and refinement according to individual needs and desires. Since the formulations of general semantics are considered to be dynamic, or in constant flux, so too are the criteria and model established in this paper.

A defense of general semantics is not intended in this study. It is felt that since Alfred Korzybski began making public his formulations circa 1922, there is room for more considerations of general semantics tools for speech evaluations.

The author of this paper finds Winston Leonard Spencer Churchill's life to be one generating considerable inspiration and interest. Much of Churchill's life involved public speaking. With the investigator's personal interest in Churchill, it is felt that a Churchill speech delivered not far from the university where this paper is being written, is apropos in this study.

According to theses and dissertation abstracts published from 1934 to August of 1968, it would seem that there is considerable room for more general semantics formulations and studies to be used in the area of communication evaluation. It is hoped this paper will contribute significantly in this respect.

## CHAPTER TWO

### REVIEW OF MATERIALS

Summary. In Chapter One, the purposes and limitations were presented. Justifications for using a general semantics approach and a speech by Winston Leonard Spencer Churchill were also discussed.

This chapter will consider the materials used and investigated in connection with writing this paper. First to be considered will be establishment of a methodology through looking at general semantics as an evaluative tool. Next, information concerning the Churchill speech will be mentioned.

Four main categories of material were considered: (1) material used for establishing a methodology; (2) other materials available on general semantics; (3) others who have used general semantics as a tool for speech evaluation in studies; and, (4) what role this paper apparently has in the field of speech dealing exclusively with the area of general semantics as a basic "initial" communication between two or more people.

Sources used for establishing methodology. Certain basic texts on general semantics were used in setting-up the criteria for evaluation. Alfred Korzybski's two



books, Manhood Of Humanity<sup>18</sup> and Science And Sanity were the two basic works used with a concentration on the latter. The rationale for the use and concentration on certain Korzybskian formulations is that Korzybski is considered the "father of general semantics" and particularly in Science And Sanity will be found the basis of the discipline. From Manhood Of Humanity one derives much concerning the "time-binding" formulation.

From Korzybski, others have abstracted the basics. In some cases, it seems, the abstracts have undergone emendation. But, this investigator maintains that certain of the Korzybskian formulations are agreed upon by individuals interested and involved in general semantics. It is hoped that some of these basics were adhered to in this study in establishing the criteria and model for evaluation. In the area of somewhat different abstractions from the Korzybskian formulations, it is noted that S. I. Hayakawa seems to have taken Korzybski's Structural Differential and turned it upside down giving it the label of Abstraction Ladder.<sup>19</sup> Another case in point, is that Wendell Johnson seems to enlarge the Structural Differential formulation and his abstractions apparently see

---

<sup>18</sup>Alfred Korzybski, Manhood Of Humanity (Lakeville, Connecticut: International Non-Aristotelian Publishing Company, 1922).

<sup>19</sup>S.I. Hayakawa, Language In Thought And Action (New York: Harcourt, Brace & Company, 1949).

the Differential as a revolving, chain-reaction-type phenomenon.<sup>20</sup>

It would seem that "indexing and dating" come into play here with what Hayakawa and Johnson abstract from the Korzybskian Structural Differential. That is, both authors have, it would seem, considered Korzybski's Structural Differential 1933, and in formulating for their contemporary audiences set up a Structural Differential their year. It seems this is one of the premises of general semantics and one followed in this paper. This will be more fully discussed in the chapter establishing criteria. But in essence, the author of this study, in establishing a general semantics model for evaluation 1969 would think it not at all unusual but rather "sane" for the model to be emended at some other time. This is the investigator's "dynamic modelization" formulation to be mentioned as this study continues.<sup>21</sup>

Wendell Johnson's formulations concerning "symbol"

---

<sup>20</sup>Johnson, People In Quandaries.

<sup>21</sup>The investigator cannot stress too often the personal formulation guiding this entire study; i. e., that the criteria and subsequent model are to be considered as being in constant "flux" or, "dynamic," to be emended at any time. This author's abstractions of Korzybski accepts constant change as one of the basic precepts in general semantics. A "static" model, in other words, was not wanted in the production of this study.

and "signal" reactions were found to be of great help and also those on the same subject by Irving J. Lee in his book, Language Habits In Human Affairs.<sup>22</sup> Lee also devotes a good amount of space to the formulations of "indexing and dating" which aided in the construction of this study's evaluative model.

Anatol Rapoport's article "What Is Semantics,"<sup>23</sup> was found to be helpful in explaining and sorting out the precepts that make general semantics different from other related disciplines such as semantics and logic.

Harry L. Weinberg's book, Levels Of Knowing And Existence<sup>24</sup> is another reference used in this study. Weinberg's examples of "allness" for instance, were of benefit when writing of that formulation in conjunction with the criteria portion of this paper. Weinberg's book, it is felt, adds much pertinent data regarding general semantics.

Another work referred to was Wiseman and Barker's book, Speech---Interpersonal Communication<sup>25</sup> which con-

---

<sup>22</sup>Irving Lee, Language Habits In Human Affairs (New York: Harper And Brothers Publishers, 1941).

<sup>23</sup>Anatol Rapoport, "What Is Semantics," Language, Meaning And Maturity, ed. S. I. Hayakawa (New York: Harper And Brothers, 1954).

<sup>24</sup>Harry L. Weinberg, Levels Of Knowing And Existence (New York: Harper And Row, Publishers, 1959).

<sup>25</sup>Gordon Wiseman and Larry Barker, Speech---Interpersonal Communication (San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company, 1967).

tain some basic general semantics formulations.

The above texts form the foundation for referents for the chapter on criteria. A synthesis of some of the general semantics formulations was sought. It is believed the authors cited---to say nothing of Korzybski himself---are to be considered authorities in their fields of communication including general semantics and therefore were used as the key referents for this study. An exhaustive survey of literature in the field of general semantics was not thought to be necessary and therefore not attempted. The key sources used in this paper, for the most part, carry extensive bibliographies to guide the interested reader and student to more works in the field of general semantics and related disciplines.

Some other general semantics sources: After having surveyed the specific works used for this study, consideration will now be given to other sources which it is felt would be of general interest to those persons investigating general semantics.

For what is being considered and talked about in the field contemporarily speaking, the reader is referred to the journal titled, ETC.: A Review of General Semantics.<sup>26</sup> This publication is the "Official

---

<sup>26</sup>ETC.: A Review of General Semantics (San Francisco: International Society for General Semantics).

organ of the International Society For General Semantics, for the encouragement of scientific research and theoretical inquiry into Monaristotelian Systems and General Semantics." At this writing, the editor of this quarterly is S.I. Hayakawa, Professor of English at San Francisco State College. Some of his texts were used for key sources in this paper. Hayakawa is currently Secretary-Treasurer of the International Society For General Semantics.

A letter of inquiry was sent to Dr. Hayakawa concerning certain formulations developed in the construction of this paper. "There's lots of work to be done,"<sup>27</sup> in the field of general semantics according to Professor Hayakawa. He advocates keeping "in touch" with ETC.

This investigator was interested in any relationships between the theories of Marshall McLuhan<sup>28</sup> and general semantics formulations. McLuhan's interview in the March, 1969 issue of Playboy<sup>29</sup> indicated a certain amount of "flux" or, according to this author's general semantics formulations, "dynamic modelization." Hayakawa

---

<sup>27</sup>Notes to the investigator and dated April 9, 1969.

<sup>28</sup>Typical McLuhanesque may be found in: Marshall McLuhan and Quentin Fiore, co-ordinated by Jerome Agel, The Medium is The Message (New York: Random, 1967).

<sup>29</sup>Eric Norden, "Marshall McLuhan: A candid conversation with the high priest of popcult and metaphysician of media," Playboy, March, 1969, p. 53.

gave this response to questioning:

I am much indebted to McLuhan for many important & provocative ideas. But I don't agree that his work is an 'extension' of g. s. general semantics. He is not interested in sanity.<sup>30</sup>

A response from the Centre For Culture And Technology at the University of Toronto to this investigator's query to McLuhan, was a cryptically printed drawing on a card with the words: "Sorry---choc-a-bloo for months to come...."<sup>31</sup>

One of McLuhan's books<sup>32</sup> is listed in the 1968-69 Book Catalogue of the International Society For General Semantics. The point to be made is that apparently others in the general semantics field besides this investigator, see some sort of connection with the theories of Marshall McLuhan. The reader may wish to pursue this avenue of inquiry.

A letter to the International Society For General Semantics asking for an explanation of their organization was answered. This organization has what seems to be an extensive public information and educational program. Included in this program are radio broadcasts and subscriptions

---

<sup>30</sup>Notes to the investigator and dated April 9, 1969.

<sup>31</sup>In the investigator's possession with envelope postmarked April 17, 1969.

<sup>32</sup>Marshall McLuhan, Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964).

to libraries around the world including those in some United States prisons.

Another organization which it would seem could be of benefit to those interested in general semantics is the Institute Of General Semantics located at Lakeville, Connecticut. One of the Institute's founders and first director was Alfred Korzybski. The Institute aids in sponsoring lectures, conferences, and classes in general semantics. Also, according to information sheets distributed by the Institute, certain of Korzybski's lectures, books, and recordings are available. This investigator sought to purchase one of the Korzybski recordings dealing with the Structural Differential but was informed it "is out of print indefinitely."<sup>33</sup> The Institute was also queried concerning any general semantics evaluation models known to be formulated to this date. Also, information as to why there are at least two general semantics organizations was asked for. There was no reply.

The Institute publishes the I G S News<sup>34</sup> for members. According to a recent announcement:

The Institute of General Semantics functions as the international center for non-aristotelian training and co-operation of workers in the theoretical and empirical development of the discipline and its applications to the problems of our times.<sup>35</sup>

---

<sup>33</sup>Note from M. Mallach and dated April 7, 1969.

<sup>34</sup>I G S News (Lakeville, Connecticut: Institute Of General Semantics).

<sup>35</sup>Announcement: Six Seminar-Workshops In General Semantics, 1969 (Lakeville, Connecticut: Institute Of General Semantics, 1969).

These are some other avenues of investigation available to the student interested in general semantics.

Some who have used general semantics as a tool:

In this area the main concern has been with any other theses or dissertations which have not only used general semantics formulations for evaluating but which may have set-up a model such has been constructed for this study.

Apparently there have been very few uses of general semantics in theses and dissertations, to this date.

The above statement is based upon an investigation of theses and dissertation titles and abstracts completed in United States colleges and universities since 1902 as listed by the Speech Association of America in Speech Monographs and previously cited.

According to titles, there seems to be approximately twenty theses and dissertations which have been completed involving general semantics either in toto or in part since 1934, a year after the publication of Korzybski's Science And Sanity. Further, it seems that out of this list, only four papers deal with the use of general semantics in evaluating speeches, in some manner or another. These people are: Gormley, Smith, Johnson, and Osborn, who were listed in Chapter One.

While Hayakawa maintains "many" studies have been done, if so, they are not ascertainable by title.



According to the survey mentioned above, it would seem then, that this study is appropos in the field of speech in establishing one person's formulations regarding "dynamic modelization" from general semantics criteria for speech evaluation.

Attention is called to Irving J. Lee's article, "Four Ways of Looking at a Speech."<sup>36</sup> One of the four approaches Lee advocates is that of general semantics.

The Speaker. Materials used in the area of general semantics have been discussed and mention will now be given to some Churchill references.

Two volumes by Lewis Broad are recommended for general background information on Churchill. They are The Years of Preparation<sup>37</sup> and The Years of Achievement.<sup>38</sup> To fill in some of the more ambiguous portions of his life, and to gain more color concerning the man himself, one of Churchill's autobiographies may

---

<sup>36</sup>Irving J. Lee, "Four Ways of Looking at a Speech," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXVIII (April, 1942), pp. 148-155.

<sup>37</sup>Lewis Broad, Winston Churchill, Vol. I: The Years Of Preparation (New York: Hawthorn Books, Inc., 1958).

<sup>38</sup>\_\_\_\_\_, Winston Churchill, Vol. II: The Years Of Achievement (New York; Hawthorn Books, Inc., 1963).

be found of interest: My Early Life: A Roving Commission.<sup>39</sup> A capsule sketch of Churchill's life is available in Henry Grunwald's essay, "Man Of The Century," printed in, Churchill The Life Triumphant: The Historical Record Of Ninety Years.<sup>40</sup>

A worthy bibliography of Churchill and his works is available from the Reference and Library Division of the British Information Services.<sup>41</sup> Except for one notation,<sup>42</sup> the bibliography was not particularly pertinent to this study.

The speech used as an illustration. Chosen as a speech in which to illustrate the constructed general semantics model for evaluation is Sir Winston Leonard Spencer Churchill's speech, "The Sinews Of Peace." This speech delivered on March 5, 1946 at Westminster College in Fulton, Missouri is also known as, "The Iron Curtain Speech."

The speech text for this study was taken from A. Craig Baird's book, Representative American Speeches

<sup>39</sup>Winston S. Churchill, My Early Life: A Roving Commission. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958).

<sup>40</sup>Grunwald, p. 8.

<sup>41</sup>British Information Services, 845 Third Avenue, New York, New York.

<sup>42</sup>Randolph S. Churchill (ed.), The Sinews Of Peace: Post-War Speeches (London: Cassell, 1948).

1945-1946.<sup>43</sup>

The investigator wishes to thank the staff at the Harry S. Truman Library located in Independence, Missouri for assistance in researching the Churchill speech. At the time of investigation, the Truman Library contained approximately half-a-linear foot of material on the Fulton trip. The materials include: tape recordings of Churchill's speech and former President Truman's introduction; the White House Scrap Book of January 1, 1946 to March 31, 1946; official letters both prior to and after the speech; interviews; letters and telegrams in reaction to the speech; and President Truman's Press Secretary's news conferences.

While the material concerning Churchill's Fulton, Missouri speech would be of considerable aid in an historical and political science approach, it was not found to be of benefit to this study.

For historical background Sharryl H. Hawke's Master's thesis, "A Rhetorical Analysis Of Winston S. Churchill's 'Iron Curtain Address'", contains much pertinent data. This thesis was noted in Chapter One.

Summary: In summation, this chapter has pointed out sources used for establishing a methodology, certain

---

<sup>43</sup>A. Craig Baird (ed.), Representative American Speeches: 1945-1946, Vol. 19, No. 4 (New York: H. W. Wilson Company, 1946), pp. 20-32.

other sources available, those who have used general semantics as a tool, and the role this paper has in making a contribution to the field of speech. An approach to the speaker and speech being used for illustrative purposes, was also discussed.

Anyone interested in general semantics may acquire a good working knowledge of the subject with the sources cited as key references for this study. As has been previously mentioned, most of the sources used contain more elaborate bibliographies.

While the investigator does not profess to know all studies conducted using general semantics and general semantics criteria for speech evaluation, from the method of investigation used and discussed earlier, it would seem there is abundant room open for such approaches being used in this paper.

It will be noted once again, that this study is to be taken from a "time-binding" point of view; i.e., it is to be considered for what it is worth in the future and emendation is to take place where and when it is felt necessary and applicable. This is the author's formulation referred to as, "dynamic modelization."

All sources available in the field of general semantics have not been used. But it is felt that the sources contained in this work include the discipline's basic premises.

All general semantics formulations were not used to construct the evaluative model to be found in this study. Some general semantics formulations were used which the investigator finds he uses often in his daily life<sup>1969</sup>.

Winston Leonard Spencer Churchill's life and speech used in this paper are not of prime concern. The man and his speech are used merely for illustration.

## CHAPTER THREE

### ESTABLISHING GENERAL SEMANTICS CRITERIA FOR SPEECH EVALUATION

Summary. Four main objectives have been listed for this study. They are: (1) to establish certain general semantics criteria for "initial" evaluations; (2) to construct a model for the "initial" evaluations; (3) to apply the model to a speech; and, (4) to make conclusions and recommendations in connection with the other three objectives.

Sources for establishing criteria and methodology have been discussed along with additional sources available.

The role this study may play in the field of speech has been considered.

Rationale for the use of Winston Leonard Spencer Churchill and one of his speeches has been reviewed.

The investigator's basic premises have been presented; (1) "dynamic modelization" and, (2) "initial" evaluations.

This chapter will deal with the first of the four main objectives; i. e., establishing criteria from the general semantics discipline. The second objective, which is establishing a model, will also be dealt with.

## INTRODUCTION

In 1922, The Manhood Of Humanity was published and eleven years and many lectures later, Korzybski's Science And Sanity was made available to the public. These two works set forth the principles of what Korzybski termed "general semantics."

This study's primary premise is that the principles of general semantics as set down by Alfred Korzybski and subsequently taken up by his students and disciples, is a worthwhile avenue of approach in handling inter-and-intra-personal communication. As used in this study, the term inter-personal communication has to do with the individual's contact with one or more persons outside himself. Intra-personal communication designates an individual's contact with himself. Public speaking is to be considered in these formulations.

It would seem that if an "initial" means of evaluating the veracity of a speaker were available, auditors would be invaluablely rewarded. It is suggested that the rewards would lay in the auditor's responses to the orator (inter-communication) and a better understanding on the part of the auditor as to why his reactions are what they are. Would this not be of particular importance if the auditor is being asked to feel a certain way or take specific action as a result of what is being said?

If the orator seems to have weak spots in his presentation, the auditor may wish to pursue a line of inquiry which will either aid in understanding better what has been said or which will lead to a conclusion that the speaker cannot be considered as a reliable source. Such an "initial" evaluation as is being suggested in this study will, it is hoped, aid the auditor in deciding at least whether or not the orator is speaking in a semantically "sane" manner.

The only limitation, it would seem, to such an "initial" evaluation would be any other form of government other than a democratic type. Or, at any rate, it is granted that the auditor would have to live in a society which would allow for questioning and decision making on the part of the individual.

As Korzybski puts it:

But we humans after these millions of years should have learned how to utilize the 'intelligence' which we supposedly have, with some predictability, etc., and use it constructively, not destructively, as, for example, the Nazis are doing under the guidance of specialists.

In general semantics we believe that some such thing as healthy human intelligence is possible, and so somehow we believe in the eventual possibility of 'democracy.'<sup>44</sup>

It should be made clear that we cannot know all there is to know about individual persons, objects,

---

<sup>44</sup>Korzybaki, Science And Sanity, p. 1.



events, etcetera, and that we can at best only abstract certain formulations from the sub-microscopic phenomenon confronting us. Nevertheless, it is submitted that such an "initial" model as is being advocated in this study will aid in "evaluating properly" and talking "sense." The investigator feels that a speech need not be filled one-hundred per cent with positive general semantics principles but should at least contain enough "sense" as to be labeled "sane" according to this study's established criteria.

The following, is an explanation of general semantics and how it is used in this study. Korzybski sets the stage when he writes:

...I made the obvious 'discovery' that our relations to the world outside and inside our skins often happen to be, on the gross level, two-valued. For instance, we deal with day or night, land or water, etc. On the living level we have life or death, our heart beats or not, we breathe or suffocate, are hot or cold, etc. Similar relations occur on higher levels. Thus, we have induction or deduction, materialism or idealism, capitalism or communism, democrat or republican, etc. And so on endlessly on all levels.

In living, many issues are not so sharp, and therefore a system which posits the general sharpness of 'either-or', and so objectifies 'kind'; is unduly limited; it must be revised and made more flexible in terms of 'degrees.'<sup>45</sup>

Such a system is general semantics.

S. I. Hayakawa has written:

---

<sup>45</sup>ibid., p. vii.

General semantics was conceived of by Korzybski as a discipline to improve human functioning and to reduce the propensity of human beings to talk themselves into trouble. It seeks these goals by striving to increase awareness of the extent to which the way in which we talk about the world shapes our perceptions of that world. "Mental therapy," wrote Korzybski...in the course of his discussion of Freud, 'always has the semantic aim and method; namely, to discover the unconscious material and make it conscious, and so make proper evaluation possible.' The 'unconscious material' of general semantics is the linguistic unconscious. And the goals of general semantics, like those of psychoanalysis, are therapeutic as well as scientific.<sup>46</sup>

Anatol Rapoport has written that the general semanticist:

...deals not only with words, assertions, and their referents in nature but also with their effects on human behavior. For a general semanticist, communication is not merely words in proper order properly inflected (as for the grammarian) or assertions in proper relation to each other (as for the logician) or assertions in proper relation to referents (as for the semanticist) but all these together, with the chain of 'fact to nervous system to language to nervous system to action.'<sup>47</sup>

It should be made clear that the general semanticist considers the individual from two points of view: communicating with himself and relating to others through symbolization.

In his discussion of linguistic structure, Harry

---

<sup>46</sup>S. I. Hayakawa (ed.), Our Language And Our World (New York: Harper And Brothers Publishers, 1958), p. viii.

<sup>47</sup>Rapoport, p. 13.

Weinberg gives the following abstractions concerning general semantics:

Structure of any kind involves an ordering of parts and relationships among these parts, between the parts and the whole environment. In living organisms these relationships can be described in terms of function. The four multiordinal interrelated terms--- order, function, relation, structure---are basic to general semantics. Any situation, object, event or occurrence can be better understood when it is analyzed in terms of structure and function, rather than in the static Aristotelian system of essential properties.<sup>48</sup>

Korzybski sums up his approach:

The prevalent and constantly increasing general deterioration of human values is an unavoidable consequence of the crippling use of neuro-linguistic and neuro-semantic mechanisms. In general semantics we are concerned with the sanity of the race, including particularly methods of prevention; eliminating from home, elementary, and higher education inadequate...types of evaluation, which too often lead to the un-sanity of the race, and building up for the first time a positive theory of sanity, as a workable...system.

The task ahead is gigantic if we are to avoid more personal, national, and even international tragedies based on unpredictability, insecurity, fears, anxieties, etc., which are steadily disorganizing the functioning of the human nervous system. Only when we face these facts fearlessly and intelligently may we save for future civilizations whatever there is left to save, and build from the ruins of a dying epoch a new and saner society.<sup>49</sup>

#### CRITERIA

A position taken in this study is that a "consciousness of abstraction" in connection with Korzybski's

---

<sup>48</sup>Weinberg, p. 48.

<sup>49</sup>Korzybski, Science And Sanity, p. liv.

Structural Differential, has merits upon which to construct an evaluative model for speech criticism.

Irving Lee refers to a Korzybski paper delivered in 1926 which gives Korzybski's premise concerning the Structural Differential and an evaluative process:

'The methods of training are obvious. First of all the student ought to understand the general principles. Then he should keep the Structural Differential Before his eyes; look at it; handle the labels and strings, and thus become thoroughly acquainted with it; tentatively explain it to friends and so slowly acquire the habit of it, thus keeping the labels in his pocket, so to say. In this way the consciousness that we abstract, which is the main issue, will become a permanent acquisition. Whenever he hears an argument of any kind, or reads one in the papers, some political speech for example, he should try to apply the diagram, which means to trace the confusion of orders of abstractions and the underlying assumptions.'<sup>50</sup>

According to Korzybski:

We see and are made to visualize that the...system is based on the denial of the 'is' of identity, which necessitates the differentiation of orders of abstractions.<sup>51</sup>

The Structural Differential is therefore a diagrammatical formulation (which may be literally real or within the general semanticist's mental formulations) of the various orders of abstraction of the Korzybskian system. Korzybski maintained, it seems, that an awareness of the orders of abstraction will lead to greater

<sup>50</sup>Lee, Language Habits In Human Affairs, pp. 269, 270.

<sup>51</sup>Korzybski, Science And Sanity, p. 399.

efficiency in inter-and-intra-personal communication, thereby enabling man to progress to a saner level of existence. Included in Korzybski's comments on the abstraction process are the following:

As abstracting in many orders seems to be a general process found in all forms of life, but particularly in humans, it is of importance to be clear on this subject and to select a language of proper structure. As we know already, we use one term, say 'apple,' for at least four entirely different entities; namely, (1) the event, or scientific object, or the sub-microscopic physico-chemical processes, (2) the ordinary object manufactured from the event by our lower nervous centres, (3) the psychological picture probably manufactured by the higher centres, and (4) the verbal definition of the term. If we use a language of adjectives and subject-predicate forms pertaining to 'sense' impressions, we are using a language which deals with entities inside our skin and characteristics entirely non-existent in the outside world. Thus the events outside our skin are neither cold nor warm, green nor red, sweet nor bitter, but these characteristics are manufactured by our nervous system inside our skins, as responses only to different energy manifestations, physico-chemical processes. When we use such terms, we are dealing with characteristics which are absent in the external world, and build up an anthropomorphic and delusional world non-similar in structure to the world around us. Not so if we use a language of order, relations, or structure, which can be applied to sub-microscopic events, to objective levels, to semantic levels, and which can also be expressed in words. In using such language, we deal with characteristics found or discovered on all levels which give us structural data uniquely important for knowledge. The ordering on semantic levels in the meantime abolishes identification. It is of extreme importance to realize that the relational, attitude is optional and can be applied everywhere and always, once the above-mentioned benefits are realized. Thus, any object can be considered as a set of relations of its parts., any 'sense' perception may be considered as a response to a stimulus., which again introduces relations,. As relations are found in the scientific sub-microscopic world, the objective world, and also in the psycho-logical and verbal worlds, it is

beneficial to use such a language because it is similar in structure to the external world and our nervous system; and it is applicable to all levels. The use of such a language leads to the discovery of invariant relations usually called 'laws of nature,' gives us structural data which make the only possible content of 'knowledge,' and eliminates also anthropomorphic, primitive, and delusional speculations, identifications, and harmful s.r.<sup>52</sup>

The "s. r." is Korzybeki's symbol for the two words, "semantic reaction(s)." The semantic reactions are those reactions expressed either overtly or covertly to words.

According to this investigator's formulations, the Structural Differential may be thought of in terms of two approaches, at least, to the world of man: (1) as the structure of what a "sane" approach to a language should be; and, (2) a representation of the relationships of our personal neuro-physiological compositions with our environments.

It should be made clear that the Structural Differential format includes the following: (1) the event, (2) our formulating an object to go with that event, (3) and, the verbal labels which may be ad infinitum having to do with that which is perceived. These are the "levels of abstraction."

The "event" and the "object" are in the realm of the "non-verbal" while the "labels" are "verbal."

---

<sup>52</sup>Ibid., pp. 384, 385.

The "event" in non-verbal and infinite---in that with present human capabilities, all cannot be known about the sub-microscopic. Perceiving an "object" is the "first order of abstraction." From the infinite pieces of information present in the "event," only some of the aspects may be "abstracted"(perceived and come away with) while untold amounts are left. From the "object" only a few pieces of information may be "abstracted", leaving some behind again. The information gleaned from the "object" is "verbalized"; i.e., "labels" are given to these and the "labels" become the "second order of abstraction." "Abstracting" can and often is, continue indefinitely. That is, a "label" may be "labeled," then the "label" of the "label" may be "labeled," etcetera. The more "abstracting" done from the original "object" or "first order abstraction" the "higher" the "abstraction" becomes.

It is maintained in this study that the mental construct of the Structural Differential aids in the elimination of the "is" of identity. "Label<sub>2</sub>" is not "label<sub>1</sub>", etcetera. It is further felt, that often, inter-and-intra-personal communication problems involve confusion on the levels of abstraction.

Any one who will work out the present analysis with the aid of the Differential will find clearly that the majority of human difficulties, the preventable or curable 'mental' or semantic disturbances included, are due to this fatal structural error, resulting in

false evaluation due to the identification or lack of differentiation.

.....

In a more complex language, one would say that the object is not the event, that the label is not the un-speakable object, and that a statement about a statement is not the 'same' statement, nor on one level. We see and are made to visualize that the ...system is based on the denial of the 'is' of identity, which necessitates the differentiation of orders of abstractions....<sup>53</sup>

Korzybski wrote of the importance of the formulation of the "consciousness of abstracting" and became more specific as to what the Structural Differential leads one to:

Once we have order, we differentiate and have orders of abstractions. Once we abstract, we eliminate 'allness,' the semantic foundation for identification. Once we abstract, we abstract in different orders, and so we order, abolishing fanciful infinities. Once we differentiate, differentiation becomes the denial of identity. Once we discriminate between the objective and verbal levels, we learn 'silence' on the un-speakable objective levels, and so introduce a most beneficial neurological 'delay'---engage the cortex to perform its natural function. Once we discriminate between the objective and verbal levels, structure becomes the only link between the two worlds. This results in search for similarity of structure and relations, which introduces the aggregate feeling, and the individual becomes a social being. Once we discriminate, we consider descriptions separately and so are led to observe the facts, and only from description of facts do we tentatively form inferences.. Finally, the consciousness of abstracting introduces the general and permanent differentiation between orders of abstractions, introduces the ordering, and so stratifications, and abolishes for good the primitive or infantile state to the adult period becomes a semantic, accomplished fact....<sup>54</sup>

---

<sup>53</sup>Ibid., pp. 403, 404.

<sup>54</sup>Ibid., p. 404.



Supporting some basic premises by which this study builds a "dynamic modelization" for evaluative purposes, are the following words by Korzybski who speaks of the pragmatism of the formulations which have thus far been considered:

A language, to be most useful, should be similar in its structure to the structure of the events which it is supposed to represent. The language of 'abstractions of different orders' appears to be satisfactory in point of structure. It is a non-elementalistic language, since it does not discriminate between 'senses' and 'mind,' etcetera. It is a functional language, since it describes, by implication, what is going on in the nervous system when it reacts to stimuli. It is a language which can be made flexible and as sharp as desired, thus making it possible to establish sharp verbal differences, of both horizontal and vertical type, between the terms 'man' and 'animal.'<sup>55</sup>

The abstractions from Science And Sanity to be found in this paper includes: (1) the formulation that the Structural Differential holds definite value in calling attention to the "consciousness of abstraction" which is necessary in order to break the bonds of ancient patterns which are alleged to have caused men to be more static than dynamic and hence progressive; and, (2) that the Differential establishes a pragmatic formulation for a "sane" and productive process of intra-and-inter-communication including personal relationships in one's own environment.

---

<sup>55</sup>ibid., p. 412.

Through this study it is maintained that an orator who is "conscious of abstracting" will be "extensionally oriented." That is, the orator will indicate through his symbolization that he realizes he cannot know all there is to know about what he experiences and perceives. He leaves the door of his mind open.

According to this paper's formulations, where "consciousness of abstracting" is not considered, the individual is said to be "intensionally oriented." Such a person indicates directly or indirectly that he has said all there is to say about a given subject, object, etcetera. His symbols represent a closed-door attitude and tends to violate to a high degree, the general semantics criteria.

Thus, the rationale has been presented for the use of the Structural Differential as the nucleus for the investigator's "dynamic modelization." It is suggested that the following criteria will indicate a speaker's "consciousness of abstraction" and thus his "intensional" or "extensional" orientation.

Allness Statements. In terms of general semantics, an attitude of "allness" is a most "unsane" approach to life for intra- and inter-personal communicating. A "consciousness of abstraction" should reduce appreciably attitudes of "allness"---if not exclude them altogether.

Harry Weinberg gives an example of "allness" in

the following:

We might...make the generalization that, based on their history, Germans are a martial people. If we have had no personal contact with any Germans, if the only opportunity we have had to learn about them is from some history books, and if we are in a situation where some statement about Germans and martial tendencies is required of us, then making the generalization is the best we can do. If this is just chatter, we can leave it at that. But if this generalization is a poor one and if making it can do harm (and such generalizations usually do), it is important that we have more cross-references and through a series of observations. It must be emphasized that the statement, 'Germans are martial,' tells practically nothing about the individual Hans Schmidt. A generalization is never 100 percent true for every member of a class except in certain highly technical, never social, situations. And we can never be sure that this Hans Schmidt is not one of the most pacific individuals extant. If you let the generalizations get in your eyes, you won't be able to see him.<sup>56</sup>

In excluding "allness" as much as possible, one then includes "differentiation" in thought processes as much as possible.

Hayakawa writes of this general semantics device:

The picture of reality created inside our heads by such unconsciousness of abstracting is not at all a 'map' of any existing 'territory.' It is a delusional world. In this never-never-land, all 'Jews' are out to cheat you; all 'capitalists' are overfed tyrants, smoking expensive cigars and gnashing their teeth at labor unions. In this world, too, all snakes are poisonous, automobiles can be disciplined by a well-directed sock in the eye, every stranger with a foreign accent is a spy. Some of these people who spend too much of their time in such delusional worlds eventually get locked up, but, needless to say, there are many of us still at large.<sup>57</sup>

---

<sup>56</sup>Weinberg, p. 71.

<sup>57</sup>Hayakawa, Language In Thought And Action, p. 193.

It is suggested then, that the speaker with at least a basic attitude of "non-allness" would be less dogmatic in statements. While the speaker may indeed be in the process of attempting to persuade, the persuasive technique would leave room for rational questioning and discussion and more information and views for his overall picture. In other words, the speaker knows he does not know all there is about his subject and does not attempt to imply that he does.

What we abstract, then, is never a mirror image of 'reality,' but an interpretation of the interaction between the atomic goings-on and our psychophysiological responses to them. During the process of abstraction, much 'information' is lost due to our lack of receptors for many kinds of information (ultraviolet light, cosmic rays, and so on), and also much 'misinformation' or 'noise' or 'distortion' is introduced into our interpretation by the very activity of the nervous system itself.<sup>58</sup>

Multi-Valued Orientation. It is here suggested that the "multi-valued" attitude can be applied by the evaluator to the speaker in at least two ways: (1) in implying or explicitly stating that there are an infinite number of sides to a situation, the speaker is being "multi-valued" and (2) the speaker may directly or indirectly let his audience know that there are any number of implications, aspects, contributing factors, etcetera, to his topic.

The "multi-valued" orientation excludes the old

---

<sup>58</sup>Weinberg, p. 52.

maxim that "there are two sides to every story." That is, more often than not, there are apparently innumerable sides to a story.

Irving Lee speaks of the "two-valued" orientation in relation to the "multi-valued" outlook:

Involved in this process is a neglect of the differing facts of experience and an assigning to them of few rather than many distinctions. This is a favorite device of the dogmatist, of an Adolf Hitler, in whose program everything must be 'positive or negative, love or hate, right or wrong, truth or lie, never half this or half that.' To restrict an analysis by reducing the number of evaluations is to introduce a spurious simplicity. The habit of seeing only two sides blurs in the utterance the often myriad variety and ever-changing diversity of what might be released from that too sharp, two-valued verbal orientation.<sup>59</sup>

Some possible results of a "limited-valued" orientation are considered by Hayakawa:

Another explanation, less pleasant to think about but in many instances highly probable, is that all the two-valued furore and spread-eagle oratory are a means of diverting public attention from more immediate issues. One can, by making an uproar about 'atheism in the state university,' 'communists on the government payroll,' 'theft of atomic information,' or 'who was to blame for Pearl Harbor,' keep people from noticing what is going on with respect to such immediate problems as housing legislation, misuse of highway funds, forest and soil conservation, and the appointment of stooges for public utility companies to public utility regulating commissions.<sup>60</sup>

A close kin to the "multi-valued" orientation will next be considered.

Multi-Ordinal Orientation. This, it would seem is

---

<sup>59</sup>Lee, p. 100.

<sup>60</sup>Hayakawa, Language In Thought And Action, pp. 231, 232.

a simple enough formulation, but one frequently violated. The "multi-ordinal" approach to words advocates that frequently any one word will have more than one meaning. Theoretically, words can sometimes have as many meanings as there are people using them. Therefore, especially when there is doubt, a check as to the meaning placed behind any given word as used by an individual, is of definite benefit in accomplishing and maintaining "sane" communicating.

If a word means one thing to the orator and the auditor attaches another meaning to the same word, then communication is going to be at least hampered, if not thrown into complete chaos.

...it is more true to say that a word does not have a real, single, unique meaning, but that it means what it does when it is used within the limits to be pointed out. Of course, in any period of cultural history there will be common uses. People will be able rather readily in discussion to discover the uses of a vast number of terms without questioning. Nevertheless, the inherent ambiguity of our language should give us pause and make us less ready to take the meanings for granted. It is better to ask than be misled without asking.<sup>61</sup>

It could be suggested that there is a dual responsibility between speaker and auditor to clarify meanings. However, in a speaking situation where contact with each individual auditor is not practical or possible, then it is maintained that it is the orator's

---

<sup>61</sup>Lee, Language Habits In Human Affairs, p. 37.

duty to work toward clarification. In evaluating a speech, the evaluator can therefore look for this attempt on the part of the orator.

Relatively few words are available to represent an infinity of objects, situations, happenings, feelings, etc. Any one word may have many uses. We waste time looking for but one-and-one-only-'meaning.' Misunderstanding and confusion arise when readers and listeners assume that their word uses are also the word uses of writers and speakers. Only study of the utterance and direct questioning can reveal the use.

The basic question: not, what do I represent by the terms, but what does he?<sup>62</sup>

Indexing and Dating. According to this investigator's formulations, an important premise of the general semanticist is that man is a constantly changing phenomenon in a constantly changing environment. No two people, objects, events, etcetera are one hundred per cent alike although similarities may be pointed out. No phenomenon, be it animate or inanimate, remains the same from second to second. It is further maintained that without special scientific instruments, man can tell, for the most part, little or no change in himself or other objects on a second-by-second basis but that change is occurring.

In this world 'complete sameness' between any two of anything has not yet been demonstrated, for in some respects objects and happenings differ from each other. And the closer to nature we are able to get, the more apparent does this structural fact become.

---

<sup>62</sup>Ibid., p. 47.

When the fact of difference has been understood, we should be ready for another---that each item of our acquaintance, each object and happening will appear unique, differing in some details from every other one:....

And with that fact assimilated there is one more---that the 'things ' of our experience do not exist the same now as they were, for no 'identity' or 'external sameness' in their make-up is to be found from one instant to another.<sup>63</sup>

Another premise of this study is that in the processes of inter-and-intra-personal communicating, this "dynamic", non-static formulation should be taken into account. The speaker would then, from a general semantics point of view, display this dynamic attitude by indexing for differentiation and dating to show that the object is not the same this year as it was last year, etcetera.

It is maintained that this is the more healthy way to approach associations with people, places, things, events, and, etcetera. Also, on a personal level, this attitude is just as applicable. As Weinberg views it:

These devices make the structure of the language fit the structure of reality. As far as proper evaluation is concerned, the three basic characteristics of the world around us are that events are infinitely complex, they are changing all the time, and no two are identical. If this is so, then dating statements implies a constantly changing in-process reality. Indexing referents implies non-identity of events....<sup>64</sup>

Through "indexing," differences are noted along

---

<sup>63</sup>Ibid, pp. 88, 89.

<sup>64</sup>Weinberg, p. 45.



with the similarities. In "dating" there is realization that changes take place constantly.

Facts versus Inferences. From the general semanticist's point of view, a considerable amount of harm can be done when "inferences" are used as "facts."

The confusion of inferential and factual knowledge is a causative factor in many accidents, needless quarrels, and misunderstandings ranging from the comic to the tragic. It is found in practically all forms of literature where plot is an important element in the story and, in a sense, is an indication that this pattern of misevaluation has always been with us. Finally, we find it present in the language and thought of the neurotic and psychotic.<sup>65</sup>

It should be made clear that there is nothing wrong with inferential (or judgment) statements being made, as long as they are labeled as such so that the auditor(s) will realize it is possible that facts are not being given. Inferential statements are probably necessary for the human being in that at certain points judgments must be made during the course of living. But the point to be made here is that especially in a speaking situation, if it is not obvious, the speaker should distinguish clearly and without question when what is said is a "fact" (as factual can be ascertained) or an "inference" on his part.

Hayakawa describes an "inferential" statement as meaning "all expressions of the writer's (speaker's) ap-

---

<sup>65</sup>Ibid., p. 33.

proval or disapproval of the occurrences, persons, or objects he is describing."<sup>66</sup> while on the other hand; "Scientific verifiability rests upon the external observation of facts, not upon the heaping up of judgments."<sup>67</sup>

Irving Lee writes of the "inferential" and "factual":

...inferences represent a different order of abstraction from descriptions; that inferences made before descriptions and without checking with life facts may lead to misvaluation; that when we observe the natural order of evaluation represented by the Structural Differential--- descriptions first and then inferences---we shall be in less danger of acting foolishly:....

We seek a consciousness of difference between the two, so thorough that abstractions of high order will not be identified with those of lower order. When a man infers, he is not describing, and a consciousness of that may prevent behavior set off by inferences on the assumption that they are descriptions of fact.<sup>68</sup>

What happens as a result of considering the differences between "fact" and "inference" is pointed out by Weinberg:

...gradually those parts of one's reactions and habits which are caused by the confusion of inferential and factual knowledge will come to be recognized....If one keeps harping on the importance of distinguishing between the two, after a while it may dawn on us that this applies

---

<sup>66</sup>Hayakawa, Language In Thought And Action, p. 42.

<sup>67</sup>Ibid., p. 43.

<sup>68</sup>Lee, Language Habits In Human Affairs, p. 192.

in important areas in our lives and can produce a difference in behavior that makes a difference.<sup>69</sup>

Symbol Reactions versus Signal Reactions. "The symbolic process is the means by which you, as a human being, are able to let symbols stand for ideas, events, places, and things."<sup>70</sup>

This study promotes the attitude that if there is to be a reaction to word-symbols, at least let there be some understanding as to what the symbol represents. Therefore, in the context of this paper, a "symbol reaction" involves some sort of delay before responding.

On the other hand, a "signal reaction" would be dependent upon treating the word-symbol as the actual event, person, object, etcetera. The "signal response" indicates an immediate, undelayed response. Lee describes this type as being:

...undelayed, over-quick, automatic, less observing, impulsive, seeing similarities only, undifferentiating ---in short, those which go on the assumption that what is seen is 'all' there is to be seen and known...<sup>71</sup>

Weinberg suggests that in "signal reaction" the feeling and symbol are "synchronous."<sup>72</sup> This investigator agrees with Johnson in that "to a stimulus which one evaluates as a signal, one is likely to react too soon,

---

<sup>69</sup>Weinberg, p. 23.

<sup>70</sup>Gordon Wiseman and Larry Barker, Speech---  
Interpersonal Communication (San Francisco: Chandler  
Publishing Company, 1967), p. 93.

<sup>71</sup>Lee, Language Habits In Human Affairs, p. 197.

<sup>72</sup>Weinberg, p. 43.

too much, and in too limited a pattern."<sup>73</sup>

While the formulations of "symbol and signal reactions" might seem to indicate more of a discipline on the part of the auditor, it is just as applicable to the orator. If the speaker does not treat the various "symbols" he is handling as the "events" themselves but simply as what they are, "symbols," then the "symbol reaction" may be applied to him and he is "sane" at least in this respect. If on the other hand, the orator directly or indirectly gives an immediate reaction to a symbol treating it as the actual "event," etcetera, then his validity would be suspect. Especially would this seem to be the case if the speaker is apparently eliciting a "signal" response from his auditors.

...any word or statement, as well as any object or event, any stimulus, is an abstract of something else. In that sense it is a symbol, representing something other than itself. One does not, therefore, react to it directly, as though it were a signal; rather, in reacting to a symbol, one reacts to the 'something other than itself.'<sup>74</sup>

The "Etcetera" Attitude. The general semanticist promotes the formulation that man cannot possibly know all there is to know about a given "event," "object," person, subject, etcetera. Therefore, if another person presents more or contributes another avenue of approach

---

<sup>73</sup>Johnson, p. 190.

<sup>74</sup>Ibid., p. 191.

to a given topic, this is to be accepted without being disturbed.

It would seem that the "etcetera" attitude is of utmost importance to human living. As pointed out by Korzybski:

A 'know it all' general tendency produces an environmental, psychological, linguistic, etc., manifold, filled with identifications which produce dogmas, prejudices, misunderstandings, fears, and what not, making an impersonal, impartial scientific approach next to impossible.<sup>75</sup>

It should be made clear that the "etcetera" formulation as presented in this study may be present in at least two ways in a speech: (1) with the literal word, "etcetera" appended to a sentence, or, (2) with the implication in some way within the speech context that the orator is not presenting all there is to be said but rather has his mind open for further data and considerations, and wants his auditors to do likewise.

#### CONCLUSION

Some basic formulations to be found in the discipline of general semantics have been presented. They are: (1) "Allness Statements," (2) the "Multi-Valued Orientation," (3) the "Multi-Ordinal Orientation," (4) "Indexing and Dating," (5) "Facts versus Inferences," (6) "Symbol Reactions versus Signal Reactions," and (7) use of the "Etcetera" attitude.

---

<sup>75</sup>Korzybski, Science And Sanity, p. lxvi.

It is to be made clear that it is not implied, nor is it to be inferred that these seven formulations are all of the general semantics formulations. It is also noted that other general semanticists may choose other formulations in establishing an evaluative model. However, at this writing, this investigator has established these seven criteria with which to construct a "dynamic modelization." It is the investigator's choice---as it is the reader's---to expand at any time.

From the "dynamic modelization" formulation of this investigator, the model for an "initial" evaluation may be symbolized on paper in the following manner.

#### A. General Semantics Model For Speech Evaluation

I. With a "consciousness of abstraction" leading to an "extensional orientation," the following formulations may be found.

- A. Non-allness statements
- B. A multi-valued orientation
- C. A multi-ordinal orientation
- D. Indexing and dating
- E. A designation between facts and inferences
- F. Use of the symbol reaction instead of the signal reaction
- G. An indication of the 'etcetera' attitude

- II. With no apparent "consciousness of abstraction" leading to an "intensional orientation" the following may be found by the evaluator.
- A. Little or no consideration of non-allness
  - B. Little or no consideration of the multi-valued orientation
  - C. Little or no consideration of the multi-ordinal orientation
  - D. Little or no consideration for indexing and dating
  - E. Little or no designation between facts and inferences
  - F. Use of the signal reaction in preference to the symbol reaction
  - G. Little or no use of the 'etcetera' attitude

It is a premise of this study, that the above model will aid the evaluator in achieving an "initial" analysis and evaluation of a speech.

Summary: The first two main objectives of this study have been accomplished: (1) to establish certain general semantics criteria for "initial" evaluations, and (2) to construct a model for the "initial" evaluations.

It is maintained that with a basic understanding of general semantics any individual may apply the above model to any speech and arrive at an "initial" analysis and evaluation which would have at least two results.

These results could be: (1) the evaluator will get an "initial" indication as to the "sanity" or "unsanity" of the speaker, according to the general semantics meanings of "sanity" and "unsanity"; (2) the evaluator may go no further in evaluating the speaker, or with the weak points suggested by the "initial" evaluation, the evaluator may wish to pursue those areas of inquiry himself or turn them over to other persons and/or departments.

As an illustration using the model established, the third main objective of this study will now be considered; i.e., to apply the model to a speech.



## CHAPTER FOUR

AN ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION OF 'THE SINews OF PEACE,'  
A SPEECH DELIVERED BY WINSTON LEONARD SPENCER CHURCHILL  
IN FULTON, MISSOURI, U.S.A., ON MARCH 5, 1946

Summary: In Chapter One, the four main objectives of this study were outlined. Limitations of the study and justifications for the use of general semantics criteria and Churchill and one of his speeches were presented.

Chapter Two reviewed materials used for this study. Other sources were indicated. Some studies using general semantics were mentioned.

Chapter Three included establishing seven criteria for the foundation of a "dynamic modelization" formulation for speech evaluation. Those seven criteria are: (1) "Allness Statements", (2) "Multi-valued Orientation," (3) "Multi-Ordinal Orientation," (4) "Indexing and Dating," (5) "Facts versus Inferences," (6) "Symbol Reactions versus Signal Reactions," and, (7) "the etcetera attitude." Also presented in Chapter Three was a written symbolization of this study's "dynamic modelization" formulation.

This chapter will illustrate how the established model may be used by applying it to one speech. The speech is Winston Leonard Spencer Churchill's Fulton, Missouri speech of 1946. This chapter will therefore deal with the

third of the four main objectives of this study; i.e., applying the model to a speech.

The Churchill speech text will be presented in its entirety and will include the investigator's numerical code in parenthesis were applicable. This code consists of the numbers one through seven which designate the general semantics criteria. The numerical notation is as follows: (1) "Allness Statements," (2) "Multi-Valued Orientation," (3) "Multi-Ordinal Orientation," (4) "Indexing and Rating," (5) "Facts versus Inferences," (6) "Symbol Reactions versus Signal Reactions," and, (7) the "Etcetera Attitude." In addition to the basic numbers, a plus and/or minus will accompany the number. This will designate whether the general semantics formulation was used in a positive manner by the speaker or, in case of a minus, this would indicate that in the opinion of the evaluator, one of the general semantics criteria has been violated.

An example of the investigator's notation system is the following, taken from the Churchill text. "In front of the iron curtain which lies across Europe are other causes for anxiety(plus 7; plus and minus 5)." According to the evaluator, this statement allows for "other causes for anxiety" other than just one and therefore displays the "Etcetera Attitude." However, the "iron curtain" which the speaker sees "across Europe" although a figure of speech indicating, in general, communism, may

or may not be factual. That is, an historical or political science approach would seem to be warranted here to attempt to determine whether-or-not at the time this speech was delivered, COMMUNISM was so all-pervading in Europe as Churchill indicated. Or was this just an "inference" on the part of the speaker who was attempting to have it accepted by his auditors as "fact?"

Two points should be made clear. First, although the above described notation will be placed in the speech text wherever this investigator feels they are applicable, each case will not be discussed in the evaluation. Second, it is possible that no two evaluators would agree entirely upon what is to be given which designate. Here is where a certain amount of subjectivity enters into the "initial" evaluation. But it is maintained, that there would be little or no disagreement on obvious violations of the criteria.

#### THE SPEECH ANALYSIS

'THE SINews OF PEACE,' A SPEECH DELIVERED  
BY WINSTON LEONARD SPENCER CHURCHILL IN  
FULTON, MISSOURI, U.S.A., MARCH 5, 1946

I am glad to come to Westminster College this afternoon and am complimented that you should give me a degree. The name 'Westminster' is somehow familiar to me. I seem to have heard of it before. (plus and minus 6)

Indeed it was at Westminster that I received a very large part of my education in politics, dialectic, rhetoric and one or two other things. (plus 4)

It is also an honor, perhaps almost unique, for a private visitor to be introduced to an academic audience by the President of the United States. (plus 4) Amid his heavy burdens, duties and responsibilities---unsought but not recoiled from (plus or minus 5)---the President has travelled a thousand miles to dignify and magnify our meeting here today (plus 4) and give me an opportunity of addressing this kindred nation, as well as my own countrymen across the ocean and perhaps some other countries too. (plus 7) The President has told you that it is his wish, as I am sure it is yours, (minus 5) that I should have full liberty to give my true and faithful counsel in these anxious and baffling times. (minus or plus 5) I shall certainly avail myself of this freedom and feel the more right to do so because any private ambitions I may have cherished in my younger days have been satisfied beyond my wildest dreams. (plus 4) Let me, however, make it clear that I have no official mission or status of any kind and that I speak only for myself. (plus or minus 5) I can therefore allow my mind, with the experience of a life-time, to play over the problems which beset us on the morrow of our absolute

victory in arms; (plus 4, plus 5) and try to make sure that what has been gained with so much sacrifice and suffering shall be preserved for the future glory and safety of mankind. (plus or minus 6)

The United States stands at this time at the pinnacle of world power. (plus 5, minus 3) It is a solemn moment for the American democracy. (minus 3, plus 4) With primacy in power (plus 5) is also joined an awe-inspiring accountability to the future. (minus 5) As you look around you, you must feel not only the sense of duty done but also feel anxiety lest you fall below the level of achievement. (minus 5) Opportunity (minus 3) is here now, (plus 4, minus 3, minus 2) clear and shining, for both our countries. (minus 2) To reject it or ignore it or fritter it away (minus 3) will bring upon us all the long reproaches of the after-time. (minus 3, plus 4) It is necessary (minus 1, minus 5) that constancy of mind, persistency of purpose and the grand simplicity of decision (minus 3) shall guide and rule the conduct of the English-speaking (minus 2) peoples in peace as they did in war. We must (minus 1) and I believe we shall (plus 5) prove ourselves equal to this severe requirement. (minus 3)

When American military men approach some serious situation they are wont to write at the head of their

directive, the words, 'Overall Strategic Concept.' (minus 3, plus 5) There is wisdom in this as it leads to clarity of thought. (minus 1, minus 3, minus 5) What, then, is the overall strategic concept which we should inscribe to-day? (minus 3, plus 4, minus 5) It is nothing less than the safety and welfare, (minus 3) the freedom and progress (minus 3) of all the homes and families of all the men and women in all the lands. And here, I speak particularly of the married cottage or apartment homes, (plus 3) where the wage-earner strives amid the accidents and difficulties of life, to guard his wife and children from privation and bring the family up in the fear of the Lord or upon ethical conceptions which often play their potent part. (minus 6)

To give security to these countless homes they must be shielded from the two gaunt marauders---war and tyranny. (minus 1, minus 2, minus 3, minus 5, minus 6) We all know the frightful disturbance in which the ordinary family is plunged when the curse of war swoops down upon the bread-winner (minus 6, plus 5) and those for whom he works and contrives. The awful ruin of Europe, with all its vanished glories, and of large parts of Asia, glares in our eyes. (minus 6) When the designs of wicked men or the aggressive urge of mighty states dissolve, over large areas, the frame of civilized society, (minus 3) humble folk (minus 3) are

confronted with difficulties with which they cannot (minus 1) cope. (minus 6) For them all is distorted, broken or even ground to pulp. (minus 1, minus 6)

When I stand here this quiet afternoon (plus 4) I shudder to visualize what is actually happening to millions now (plus or minus 5) and what is going to happen in this period when famine stalks the earth. (plus or minus 5, minus 6) None can compute what has been called 'the unestimated sum of human pain.' (minus 3) Our supreme task and duty (minus or plus 5) is to guard the homes of the common people from the horrors and miseries of another war. (minus 6) We are all agreed on that. (minus 1)

Our American military colleagues, after having proclaimed the 'Overall Strategic Concept' and computed all available resources, always proceed to the next step, namely the method. (minus 3) Here again there is widespread agreement. (plus or minus 5, minus 1) A world organization has already been erected for the prime purpose of preventing war. (plus 5) UNO, the successor of the League of Nations (plus 5), with the decisive addition of the United States and all that that means, (minus 3, minus 6, plus 7) is already at work. (plus 5) We must make sure that its work is fruitful, that it is a reality and not a sham, that it is a force for action and not merely a frothing of words, that it is a true

temple of peace, (minus 3) in which the shields of many nations can someday be hung and not merely a cockpit in a Tower of Babel. (minus 6) Before we cast away the solid assurances of national armaments for self-preservation, we must be certain that our temple is built not upon shifting sands or quagmires, but upon the rock.

(minus 3, minus 6) Anyone with his eyes open can see that our path will be difficult and also long, (minus 1, minus 3, minus 5, minus 6) but if we persevere together as we did in the two world wars, (plus 4, plus 5)--- though not alas in the interval between them (plus or minus 5)---I cannot doubt that we shall achieve our common purpose in the end.

I have however a definite and practical proposal to make for action. Courts and magistrates cannot function without sheriffs and constables. (plus 5) The United Nations Organization must immediately begin to be equipped with an international armed force. (minus 1, minus 5) In such a matter we can only go step by step; (plus or minus 5) but we must begin now. (plus or minus 5) I propose that each of the powers and states should be invited to dedicate a certain number of air squadrons to the service of the world organization. These squadrons would be trained and prepared in their own countries but would move around in rotation from one country to another. They would wear the uniform of their own countries with



different badges. They would not be required to act against their own nation but in other respects they would be directed by the world organization. This might be started on a modest scale and grow as confidence grew. I wished to see this done after the First World War and trust it may be done forthwith. (plus 4)

It would nevertheless be wrong and imprudent to entrust the secret knowledge or experience of the atomic bomb, which the United States, Great Britain and Canada now share, to the world organization, while it is still in its infancy. (plus or minus 1, plus 4) It would be criminal madness to cast it adrift in this still agitated and ununited world. (plus or minus 1, plus or minus 5, plus or minus 6, plus 4) No one in any country (minus 1) has slept less well in their beds because this knowledge and the method and the raw materials to apply it are at present largely retained in American hands. (Plus or minus 5, plus 4) I do not believe we should all have slept so soundly had the positions been reversed and some Communist or neo-Fascist state monopolized, for the time being, these dread agencies. (plus 5) The fear of them alone might easily have been used to enforce totalitarian systems upon the free democratic world, with consequences appalling to human imagination. (plus 5, minus 6) God (minus 2) has willed (plus or minus 5, minus 6) that this shall not be, and we have at least a breathing space

before this peril has to be encountered (minus 1, plus or minus 5, minus 6), and even then, if no effort is spared, we should still possess so formidable a superiority as to impose effective deterrents upon its employment by others. (plus or minus 5) Ultimately, when the essential brotherhood of man (minus 3, minus 6) is truly embodied and expressed in a world organization, (plus 4, plus or minus 5) these powers may be confided to it.

I now come to the second danger which threatens the cottage home and ordinary people, (minus 6) namely tyranny (minus 3, minus 6). We cannot be blind to the fact that the liberties enjoyed by individual citizens throughout the British Empire are not valid in a considerable number of countries, some of which are very powerful. (plus 4, plus 5) In these states, control is enforced (minus 3) upon the common people by various kinds of all-embracing police governments, (minus 3, plus or minus 5) to a degree which is overwhelming and contrary to every principle of democracy. (plus or minus 5) The power of the state is exercised without restraint, either by dictators or by compact oligarchies operating through a privileged party and a political police. (plus 5) It is not our duty at this time (plus 4, plus 5), when difficulties (minus 3) are so numerous, (plus or minus 5) to interfere forcibly in the internal affairs of countries whom we have not conquered in war. (minus 6) But we must

never cease to proclaim in fearless tones the great principles of freedom (minus 3) and the rights of man, (minus 3) which are the joint inheritance of the English-speaking world (minus 2) and which, through Magna Carta, the Bill of Rights, the Habeas Corpus, Trial by Jury and the English Common Law, (plus 4, minus 6) find their most famous expression in the Declaration of Independence. (minus 6)

All this means that the people of any country have the right and should have the power by constitutional action, by free, unfettered elections, with secret ballot, to choose or change the character or form of government under which they dwell, (minus 5, minus 6) that freedom of speech and thought should reign, (minus 3, minus 5) that courts of justice independent of the Executive, unbiased by any party, should administer laws which have received the broad assent of large majorities or are consecrated by time and custom. (minus 3, plus 4) Here are the titles of freedom, which should lie in every cottage home. (minus 1) Here is the message of the British and American peoples (minus 2) to mankind. (plus 7) Let us preach what we practice and practice what we preach.

I have now stated the two great dangers (minus 2) which menace the homes of the people. (minus 6) I have not yet spoken of poverty and privation which are in many cases the prevailing anxiety. But if the dangers

of war and tyranny are removed, there is no doubt that science and cooperation can bring in the next few years to the world, newly taught in the hard school of war, (minus 6) an expansion of material well-being beyond anything that has yet occurred in human experience. (plus 4, plus 7) Now, at this sad, breathless, moment, (plus or minus 5, plus or minus 3, plus 4, plus or minus 6) we are plunged in the hunger and distress which are the aftermath of our stupendous struggle (minus 1, plus or minus 5, minus 6); but this will pass and may pass quickly, and there is no reason except human folly or sub-human crime (minus 1, minus 2, minus 5) which should deny to all the nations (plus 2), the inauguration and enjoyment of an age of plenty. (plus 4, minus 3) I have often used words which I learned fifty years ago (plus 4) from a great Irish-American orator, Mr. Bourke Cockran, 'There is enough for all. The earth is a generous mother; she will provide in plentiful abundance food for all her children if they will but cultivate her soil in justice and in peace.' (minus 3) So far we (minus 3) are evidently in full agreement. (minus 5) Now, while still pursuing the method of realizing our overall strategic concept, (minus 3) I come to the crux of what I have travelled here to say. (plus 4)

Neither the sure prevention of war, nor the continuous rise of world organization (plus 2) will be

gained without what I have called the fraternal association of the English-speaking peoples. (minus 1, minus 2, minus 5, minus 6, minus 7) This means a special relationship between the British Commonwealth and Empire and the United States. (plus 3, minus 2) This is no time for generalities. (plus 3, plus 4, plus or minus 5) I will venture to be precise. (plus 3) Fraternal association requires not only the growing friendship and mutual understanding between our two vast but kindred systems of society but the continuance of the intimate relationships between our military advisers, leading to common study of potential dangers, similarity of weapons and manuals of instruction and interchange of officers and cadets at colleges. (minus 2, minus 7) It should carry with it the continuance of the present facilities for mutual security by the joint use of all naval and Air Force bases in the possession of either country all over the world. This would perhaps double the mobility of the American Navy and Air Force. It would greatly expand that of the British Empire Forces and it might well lead, (plus 5) if and as the world calms down, (minus 6) to important financial savings. Already we use together a large number of islands; more may well be entrusted to our joint care in the near future. The United States already

has a Permanent Defense Agreement with the Dominion of Canada, (plus 5) which is so devotedly attached to the British Commonwealth and Empire. (plus or minus 5) This agreement is more effective than many of those which have often been made under formal alliances. (plus or minus 5) This principle should be extended to all the British Commonwealths with full reciprocity. Thus, whatever happens and thus only we shall be secure ourselves and able to work together (minus 2) for the high and simple causes (minus 3) that are dear to us and bode no ill to any. Eventually there may come the principle of common citizenship, (minus 3, plus 2) There is however an important question we must ask ourselves. Would a special relationship between the United States and the British Commonwealth be inconsistent with our overriding loyalties to the world organization? I reply that, on the contrary, it is probably (plus 5) the only means by which that organization will achieve its full stature and strength. (minus 2, minus 7) There are already the special United States relations with Canada and between the United States and the South American Republics. (plus 5) We also have our Twenty-Years Treaty of Collaboration and Mutual Assistance with Soviet Russia. (plus 5) I agree with Mr. Bevin that it might well be a Fifty Years Treaty. (plus 5) We have an alliance with Portugal unbroken since 1384. (Plus 5) None of these clash with

with the general interest of a world agreement. (plus or minus 5) On the contrary they help it. (minus 5) 'In my father's house are many mansions.' (minus 3, minus 6) Special associations between members of the United Nations which have no aggressive point against any other country, (plus or minus 5) which harbor no design incompatible with the charter of the United Nations, (minus 3, plus or minus 5) far from being harmful, are beneficial (plus or minus 5, minus 1) and, as I believe, (plus 5) indispensable.

I spoke earlier of the temple of peace. (minus 3) Workmen from all countries must build that temple. (plus or minus 5, minus 3) If two of the workmen know each other particularly well and are old friends, if their families are intermingled and if they have faith in each other's purpose, hope in each other's future and charity towards each other's shortcomings, to quote some good words I read here the other day, (plus 4) why cannot they work together at the common task as friends and partners? (minus 6, minus 3, minus 5) Why cannot they share their tools and thus increase each others' working powers? Indeed they must do so or else the temple may not (plus 5) be built, (minus 6) or, being built, it may (plus 5) collapse, and we shall all be proved unteachable and have to go and try to learn again for a third time, in a school of war, incomparably more rigorous than that from which we have just been released. (plus 4) The dark ages (minus 3) may (plus 5) return, the stone age (minus 3) may (plus 5)

return on the gleaming wings of science, and what might now shower immeasurable material blessings upon mankind, may (plus 5) even bring about its total destruction.

(minus 6) If there is to be a fraternal association of the kind I have described, with all the extra strength and security which both our countries can derive from it (minus 2), let us make sure that that great fact is known to the world, and that it plays its part in steady-  
ing and stabilizing the foundations of peace. Prevention is better than cure. (minus 1, minus 3)

A shadow has fallen upon the scenes so lately lighted by the Allied victory. (minus 3, plus 4, plus or minus 5, minus 6) Nobody knows what Soviet Russia and its communist international organization intends to do in the immediate future, (minus 1, plus 4, plus or minus 5, minus 6) or what are the limits if any to their expansive and proselytizing tendencies. (minus 3, plus or minus 5) I have a strong admiration and regard for the valiant Russian people and for my wartime comrade, Marshal Stalin. There is sympathy and goodwill in Britain---and I doubt not here also---towards the peoples of all the Russias and a resolve to persevere through many differences and rebuffs (minus 3) in establishing lasting friendships. We understand the Russian needs to be secure on her western frontiers from all renewal of German aggression. (plus or minus 5) We welcome



her (plus or minus 5) to her rightful place (minus 3) among the leading nations of the world. (plus or minus 2) Above all we welcome constant, frequent and growing contacts between the Russian people and our own people on both sides of the Atlantic. It is my duty, (plus or minus 5) however, to place before you certain facts (plus or minus 5) about the present position in Europe. (plus 4)

From Stettin in the Baltic to Trieste in the Adriatic, an iron curtain (minus 3) has descended across the continent. (plus or minus 5, plus or minus 6) Behind that line lie all the capitals of the ancient states of Central and Eastern Europe. (plus or minus 5) Warsaw, Berlin, Prague, Vienna, Budapest, Belgrade, Bucharest and Sofia, all these famous cities and the populations around them lie in the Soviet sphere and all are subject in one form or another, not only to Soviet influence but to a very high and increasing measure of control from Moscow. (plus or minus 5) Athens alone, (plus or minus 5) with its immortal glories, is free to decide its future (plus or minus 5) at an election under British, American and French observation (minus 3). The Russian-dominated Polish Government (plus or minus 5) has been encouraged to make enormous and wrongful (minus 3) inroads (minus 3) upon Germany, (plus or minus 5) and mass expulsions of millions of Germans on a scale grievous and undreamed of are now taking place. (plus

or minus 5) The Communist parties, which were very small in all these Eastern states of Europe, have been raised to preeminence and power far beyond their numbers (plus or minus 5) and are seeking everywhere to obtain totalitarian control. (plus or minus 5) Police governments (minus 3) are prevailing in nearly every case, (plus or minus 5) and so far, except in Czechoslovakia, (plus or minus 5) there is no true democracy. (minus 3, plus or minus 5) Turkey and Persia are both profoundly alarmed and disturbed at the claims which are made upon them and at the pressure being exerted by the Moscow Government. (plus or minus 5) An attempt is being made by the Russians in Berlin to build up a quasi-Communist party in their zone of Occupied Germany by showing special favors to groups of left-wing German leaders. (plus or minus 5) At the end of the fighting last June, the American and British Armies withdrew westwards, in accordance with an earlier agreement, to a depth at some points of 150 miles on a front of nearly 400 miles to allow the Russians to occupy this vast expanse of territory which the Western Democracies had conquered. (plus or minus 5, plus 4) If now the Soviet Government tries, by separate action, to build up a pro-Communist Germany in their areas, (plus 5) this will cause new serious difficulties in the British and American zones, (plus or minus 5) and will give the defeated Germans the

power of putting themselves up to auction between the Soviets and the Western Democracies. (plus or minus 5) Whatever conclusions may be drawn from these facts (plus 7)---and facts they are (plus or minus 5)---this is certainly not the liberated Europe we fought to build up. (minus 1, minus 2, minus 3, plus 4, plus or minus 5, minus 6) Nor is it one which contains the essentials of permanent peace. (minus 3, plus or minus 5)

In front of the iron curtain (minus 3) which lies across Europe (plus or minus 5) are other causes for anxiety. (plus or minus 5, minus 6) In Italy the Communist party is seriously hampered by having to support the Communist-trained Marshal Tito's claims to former Italian territory at the head of the Adriatic. (plus or minus 5) Nevertheless the future of Italy hangs in the balance. (minus 1, plus or minus 5) Again one cannot imagine a regenerated Europe without a strong France. (plus 5) All my public life I have worked for a strong France and I never lost faith in her destiny, (plus or minus 5) even in the darkest hours. (minus 6) I will not lose faith now. (plus 4) However, in a great number of countries, far from the Russian frontiers and throughout the world, Communist fifth columns are established and work in complete unity and absolute obedience to the directions they receive from the Communist center. (plus 4, plus or minus 5) Except in the British Commonwealth and in

the United States, where Communism is in its infancy, (plus or minus 5) the Communist parties or fifth columns (minus 3) constitute a growing challenge and peril (minus 3) to Christian civilization. (plus or minus 5, minus 6, minus 2) These are sombre facts (plus or minus 5) for anyone to have to recite on the morrow of a victory (plus 4) gained by so much splendid comradeship in arms and in the cause of freedom and democracy, (minus 3) and we should be most unwise not to face them squarely while time remains. (plus 4, plus or minus 5, minus 6)

The outlook is also anxious in the Far East and especially in Manchuria. (plus or minus 5) The agreement which was made at Yalta, to which I was a party, was extremely favorable to Soviet Russia, (plus or minus 5) but it was made at a time when no one could say that the German war might not extend all through the summer and autumn of 1945 and when the Japanese war was expected to last for a further eighteen months from the end of the German war. (plus 4, plus 5) In this country you are all so well-informed about the Far East, (minus 1, plus or minus 5) and such devoted friends of China, (plus or minus 5) that I do not need to expatiate on the situation there. (plus or minus 5)

I have felt bound to portray the shadow which, alike in the West and in the East, falls upon the world. (plus or minus 5) I was a Minister at the time of the

Versailles Treaty and a close friend of Mr. Lloyd George. (plus 4) I did not myself agree with many things that were done, but I have a very strong impression in my mind of that situation, and I find it painful to contrast it with that which prevails now. (plus 4) In those days there were high hopes and unbounded confidence that the wars were over, and that the League of Nations would become all-powerful. (plus 4) I do not see or feel (plus 5) the same confidence or even the same hopes in the haggard world (minus 5) at this time. (plus 4)

On the other hand I repulse the idea that a new war is inevitable; (possible plus 6) still more that it is imminent. (plus 5) It is because I am sure, that our fortunes are in our own hands and that we hold the power to save the future, (minus 1, plus or minus 5) that I feel the duty to speak out now that I have the occasion to do so. I do not believe that Soviet Russia desires war. (plus 5) What they desire is the fruits of war and the indefinite expansion of their power and doctrines. (plus or minus 5) But what we have to consider here today while time remains, (plus 4) is the permanent prevention of war and the establishment of conditions of freedom and democracy (minus 3) as rapidly as possible in all countries. Our difficulties and dangers will not be removed by closing our eyes to them. (plus 5) They will

not be removed by mere waiting to see what happens; (minus 6, plus or minus 5) nor will they be relieved by a policy of appeasement. What is needed is a settlement, (minus 1, minus 3, plus or minus 5) and the longer this is delayed, the more difficult it will be and the greater our dangers will become. (plus or minus 5) From what I have seen (plus 5) of our Russian friends and Allies during the war, (plus 4) I am convinced (plus 5) that there is nothing they admire so much as strength, and there is nothing for which they have less respect than for military weakness. For that reason the old doctrine of a balance of power is unsound. (plus or minus 5) We cannot afford, if we can help it, to work on narrow margins, offering temptations to a trial of strength. If the Western Democracies (minus 2) stand together in strict adherence to the principles of the United Nations Charter, (minus 3) their influence (minus 3) for furthering those principles (minus 3) will be immense and no one is likely to molest them. (minus 3) If however they become divided or falter in their duty, (minus 3) and if these all-important years are allowed to slip away, (plus 4) then indeed catastrophe (minus 3, minus 6) may (plus 5) overwhelm us all.

Last time I saw it all coming and cried aloud to my own fellow-countrymen and to the world, but no one paid any attention. (minus 1, minus 3, plus 4, plus or

minus 5) Up till the year 1933 or even 1935, Germany might have been saved from the awful fate which has overtaken her and we might (plus 5) all have been spared the miseries Hitler let loose upon mankind. (plus 4, plus or minus 5) There never was a war in all history easier to prevent (minus 1) by timely action than the one which has just desolated such great areas of the globe. (plus 4, plus or minus 5) It could have been prevented without the firing of a single shot, (plus or minus 5) and Germany might (plus 5) be powerful, prosperous and honored today, but no one would listen (minus 1) and one by one we were all sucked into the awful whirlpool. (plus or minus 5) We surely must not let that happen again.

This can only be achieved (minus 1, plus or minus 5, minus 7) by reaching now, in 1946, (plus 4) a good understanding on all points (minus 3) with Russia under the general authority of the United Nations Organisation and by maintenance of that good understanding (minus 3) through many peaceful years, by the world instrument, supported by the whole strength of the English-speaking world (minus 2) and all its connections. (minus 3)

Let no man underrate the abiding power of the British Empire and Commonwealth. (plus or minus 6) Because you see the forty-six millions in our island harassed about their food supply, of which they only grow one half, even in wartime, or because we have

difficulty in restarting our industries and export trade after six years of passionate war effort, do not suppose that we shall not come through these dark years of privation as we have come through the glorious years of agony, or that half a century from now, you will not see 70 or 80 millions of Britons spread about the world and united in defense of our traditions, our way of life and of the world causes we and you espouse. (plus 4, plus or minus 5, plus or minus 6) If the population of the English-speaking Commonwealths be added to that of the United States, with all that such cooperation implies in the air, on the sea and in science and industry, there will be no quivering, precarious balance of power to offer its temptation to ambition or adventure. (minus 2, plus or minus 5) On the contrary, there will be an overwhelming assurance of security. (minus 1, plus or minus 5) If we adhere faithfully to the Charter of the United Nations and walk forward in sedate and sober strength, seeking no one's land or treasure, or seeking to lay no arbitrary control on the thoughts of men, if all British moral and material forces and convictions are joined with your own in fraternal association, the highroads (minus 3) of the future will be clear, not only for us but for all, not only for our time but for a century to come. (plus 4, plus or minus 5, minus 2, plus or minus 6)



Summary: This chapter has dealt with the third of the four main objectives of this study; i.e., applying the general semantics model established in Chapter Three to a speech.

It is to be understood that in the analysis contained in this chapter all words, phrases, sentences, etcetera which would apply to the criteria established, may not be noted. It is hoped that all important areas were found and evaluated according to the established criteria. As previously mentioned, since there is a certain degree of subjectivity involved in an "initial" analysis and evaluation of this kind, there may be some areas of labeling which might call for some discussion. Even so, it is maintained that the vital areas for analysis and evaluation may be readily discovered through the model established in this study.

The evaluator may find it convenient to establish some sort of quantitative analysis chart, such as the following, to aid in making the "initial" evaluation.

The plus column indicates in the evaluator's opinion, certain criteria were found to be present within the speech and were used in a positive manner as discussed in Chapter Three. The negative column shows when an apparent violation was found. The plus-or-minus entries show the evaluator's opinion that further investigation is needed before making judgment.



CHAPTER FIVE  
EVALUATION AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary: The preceding chapter contains the analysis of Winston Leonard Spencer Churchill's Fulton, Missouri speech of March 5, 1946. This final chapter will contain an evaluation from the analysis and also deal with the fourth and last main objective of this study; i. e., conclusions and recommendations.

THE SPEECH EVALUATION

Through the "initial" analysis made in Chapter Four according to the established general semantics criteria, it is the opinion of this investigator that Churchill's speech appears to be more "intensional" than "extensional." It is further suggested that the speaker is guilty of this apparent "intensionalism" due to a lack of the "consciousness of abstraction" as pointed out by applying the "dynamic modelization" established in this study, to his speech.

From the criteria established for the evaluative model produced in this paper, it is suggested that the violations leading to the speech being termed predominantly "intensional" have to do with the following: apparent "allness" attitude and subsequent statements; an apparent lack of a "multi-valued orientation"; apparently too many

"multi-ordinal" words being used; and, what in the opinion of the investigator were too many "signal reactions" being apparently solicited.

"Allness" in attitude displayed by statements were to be noted in various portions of the speech. Through these statements interspersed throughout the speech, it seemed that Churchill indicated he had the one and only answers to the alleged problems he posed. What he offered at times seemed too clear-cut and definite.

It is suggested that Churchill's "two-valuedness," as opposed to "multi-valuedness," took the form of considering only the United States and Great Britain as having the sole responsibility for the world's progress. There is "one-valuedness" it seems by his speaking of the "English-speaking peoples" as holding the destiny of man in their hands. It may be considered that Churchill qualified his "two-valuedness" by advocating such an organization as the United Nations. But it seems that any qualification of this sort is negated with attitudes displayed throughout the speech. At one point, Churchill even suggests that the success of the United Nations is dependent upon the United States and Great Britain, which appears to be again, a "two-valued" orientation. Concerning this apparent "one-and-two-valuedness," here is where the "initial" evaluator may wish to alert the his-

torian and political scientist. The "fact-territory" could be checked to ascertain: (1) how close to being correct was Churchill, when he maintained that the world at the time of the speech, was dependent wholly upon the United States and Great Britain; and, (2) was Churchill semantically "sane" in considering the "English-speaking peoples" as the saviors of the world.

In the opinion of this investigator, too many ambiguous words and phrases were used throughout the speech. That is, Churchill does not seem to have displayed a positive "multi-ordinal" orientation but rather used words of the following nature which can mean different things to different people: "pinnacle of world power;" "democracy"; "opportunity"; "long reproaches"; "constancy of mind"; "persistency of purpose"; "grand simplicity of decision"; and, etcetera. Did the "multi-ordinal" words and phrases used by Churchill contain the same meanings for his auditors as they did for him?

There appeared to be an over-all tone of appeal to fear in the speech. It is believed by the investigator that this was done through the use of words and phrases which could cause "signal reactions." A questionable (plus or minus) "signal reaction" is the first notation made in the speech. The "initial" evaluation questions whether or not these "signal reactions" were used purposely.

There seemed to be much positive use of "indexing

and dating" throughout the speech.

Churchill seemed to label in a subtle way many inferences. It is wondered if these subtle inferences were caught by the auditors. By the term "subtle" is meant the use of such words as "may," "might," "could," etcetera. In the opinion of this investigator, a "direct" qualification for inference would be something like "It is my opinion," "This is not a fact, but is my understanding," etcetera.

It will be noted that many times Churchill was given a "plus or minus 5" meaning that according to the evaluator, facts needed to be checked further. These facts could be checked by the "initial" evaluator or the areas in question turned over to an historian or political scientist for more study.

Churchill apparently left little room for further consideration in much of what he had to say. Thus, it is suggested that he was low in "etcetera" attitude. It seems that a major implication to be found in the speech, is that there is no other alternative than a bilateral pact between the United States and Great Britain against the Soviet Union.

The following is a summation of each general semantics criterion---as established in Chapter Three of this study---applied to Churchill's "The Sinews Of Peace"

speech.

Allness Statements. An analysis of Churchill's speech, taking into consideration only the "allness" criteria as outlined in Chapter Three, produces in the opinion of this investigator, at least twenty-nine counts of violations of this formulation. There seemed to be two questionable "allness" statements.

Examples of what seem to be "allness-type" statements may be found in the following:

Our supreme task and duty is to guard the homes of the common people from the horrors and miseries of another war. We are all agreed on that.

In labeling these as "allness" statements, it is offered for consideration that while it may generally be agreed that many people do not like war, some people probably do like war for various reasons. Churchill seems to assume a "one-valued" type orientation in saying: "We are all agreed on that." Qualifications in these statements would remove the "allness" which seems to prevail.

Another "allness" statement is found in the following:

In this country you are all so well-informed about the Far East, and such devoted friends of China, that I do not need to expatiate on the situation there.

It is suggested that Churchill is assuming far too much in including all persons in the United States having knowledge such as he describes.

In speaking of releasing the technical knowledge

of the Atomic Bomb to other nations, Churchill delivers a statement which may or may not be an "allness" statement as such, depending upon ones' point of view. Churchill tells his auditors: "It would be criminal madness to cast it adrift in this still agitated and ununited world." One may ask if whether to release the information is "criminal madness" or not. Is the world at the time of this speech "still agitated and ununited?" Perhaps the historian and/or political scientist could aid in these questionable areas and thus shed more light on establishing the "sane-ness" of these attitudes expressed by Churchill.

Churchill speaks of his proposed partnership between the United States and Great Britain in allegorical terms when he speaks of "friends" constructing a common "temple." Here, he seems to qualify himself and in the opinion of this investigator, saves himself from an un-categorical "allness" quality when he states:

Why cannot they share their tools and thus increase each others' working powers? Indeed they must do so or else the temple may not be built, or, being built, it may collapse, and we shall all be proved unteachable and have to go and try to learn again for a third time, in a school of war, incomparably more rigorous than that from which we have just been released.

Underlining has been added to the words which it is believed, tend to remove the "allness" attitude from Churchill's thoughts and words.

Multi-Valued Orientation. According to this criterion, it is suggested that the "multi-valued" formu-



lation was evident throughout the speech for a total of twenty-one times in a negative sense. The "multi-valued" formulation seemed positively apparent a total of three times and there was one instance marked as questionable.

An either-or attitude leading to "non-multi-valuedness" appeared evident in the following:

If the Western Democracies stand together in strict adherence to the principles of the United Nations Charter, their influence for furthering those principles will be immense and no one is likely to molest them. If however they become divided or falter in their duty, and if these all-important years are allowed to slip away, then indeed catastrophe may overwhelm us all.

A dichotomy seems thus to be established---that is, the West versus the East. This then, would be labeled as "two-valued" orientation according to the general semantics criterion established in this study.

It is maintained that the following is an example of "one-valuedness:"

Neither the sure prevention of war, nor the continuous rise of world organization will be gained without what I have called the fraternal association of the English-speaking peoples.

In essence, this investigator is left with the impression that this speaker takes the position that the "English-speaking peoples" are the only peoples in the world who count. Is this what Churchill meant? Here, it would seem, the "initial" evaluator might want to turn to Churchill's biographers, to historians and political scientists, etcetera, in order to check why this statement

was made, etcetera.

One of the three times noted when Churchill seems to enter the realm of "multi-valuedness" is when he speaks of the post-war period he sees the world in and the disaster which has resulted:

...but this will pass and may pass quickly, and there is no reason except human folly or sub-human crime which should deny to all the nations, the inauguration and enjoyment of an age of plenty.

Underlined, is the phrase suggestive of "multi-valuedness."

Multi-Ordinal Orientation. This area, as noted previously, seems to be one of the chief violations made by Churchill in his speech. There appears to be at least seventy-nine uses of words or phrases which could mean many different things to many different people.

In the opinion of the investigator, such words and phrases as the following should be defined by the rhetor in order to be semantically "sane"; "the un-estimated sum of human pain"; "and all that that means"; "the great principles of freedom"; "'In my father's house are many mansions'."; "police governments"; "true democracy"; "the cause of freedom and democracy"; and, "the establishment of freedom and democracy."

Four definitions of terms were found in the speech. Once, the speaker mentioned that he would be precise and not generalize. He defined what he meant by a "fraternal organization" as being a coalition between the United States and Great Britain.

The point to be made here is that with a speech of this type containing allegations and hypotheses of such apparent magnitude, it would seem advisable to be as specific as possible. It is offered for consideration that the speaker used for illustration in this study, did not clarify himself sufficiently in relation to the criterion established for the evaluative model. Further examination here may be warranted in the fields of history, political science, psychology, etcetera.

Indexing and Dating. This formulation was found at least fifty times within the speech. This investigator was led to believe that "indexing and dating" came easy to the speaker, or in other words, was a possible natural tendency of Churchill's.

An example of this criterion is to be found when Churchill states in the early part of his speech: "It is a solemn moment for the American democracy." The "indexing and dating" label was given this statement although it is felt the content might be questionable. That is, is it a fact or an inference that this moment is "solemn" for American democracy?"

Another statement given the "indexing and dating" label is the following:

When I stand here this quiet afternoon I shudder to visualize what is actually happening to millions now and what is going to happen in this period when famine stalks the earth.

Facts versus Inferences. At least eighty-nine instances in the speech were given the "plus or minus 5" designate. In at least forty other cases a positive sign was given while no fewer than seventeen areas of the speech received "minus 5" designates.

The eighty-nine instances where a "plus or minus" was given indicated that the evaluator felt more investigation was needed. Investigation into the area of "facts" could be produced by the historian or political scientist. It is felt that further investigation is particularly needed when the speaker discussed Soviet Russia and that country's alleged activities, desires, strategy, etcetera.

In most cases, the forty "plus 5" designates were given when it was felt Churchill qualified himself rather than indicating the evaluator considered those forty instances as expressly "factual." Qualifications such as the following fall into this category: "I agree with Mr. Bevin that it might well be a Fifty Years Treaty." The qualification has been underlined by the investigator.

The seventeen negative notations regarding "facts versus inferences," it is felt, were instances which the evaluator felt could be easily ascertained as "inferences" but were used as "facts" by the orator. Such a case is the following, when Churchill was talking of bilateral agreements not conflicting with a general

world organization such as the United Nations: "On the contrary they help it." This is an "inference" on his part, but he presents it as a "fact."

Symbol versus Signal Reactions. At least forty-one instances of what could produce "signal reactions" within the auditors were noted in the speech. An example is to be found in this statement:

But we must never cease to proclaim in fearless tones the great principles of freedom and the rights of man, which are the joint inheritance of the English-speaking world and which, through Magna Carta, the Bill of Rights, the Habeas Corpus, Trial by Jury and the English Common Law, find their most famous expression in the Declaration of Independence.

The evaluator suggests that the listing of the various English and especially, American documents, would tend to establish a "signal reaction" in the minds of many who would possibly not delay reactions to further ascertain what Churchill had to say relative to these historical documents. It is further suggested that "signal reactions" were highly possible if some sort of patriotic or nationalistic attitude were wanted through mentioning the documents. But here, perhaps the historian-political scientist could be of more aid.

It is also noted that a "signal reaction" could well be established in the minds of the religious through the following Biblical quotation: "'In my father's house are many mansions'."

One of the seven "plus or minus 6" designates given is the following: "From Stettin in the Baltic to Trieste in the Adriatic, an iron curtain has descended across the continent." It is felt the term "iron curtain" might possibly strike an immediate note of fear in many minds. Once again, the historian, political scientist, or psychologist, could possibly shed more light on whether or not Churchill deliberately used words to get instantaneous reactions---or in the terminology of this study, "signal reactions"---from his auditors.

Etcetera attitude. In this area, at least five instances were noted where Churchill seemed to take in other aspects other than what he specifically outlined. In at least four cases it was felt that he definitely lacked the "etcetera" attitude.

In speaking of what, in his opinion, Russian powers are doing, Churchill indicates the "etcetera" attitude in the following: "whatever conclusions may be drawn from these facts---and facts they are---this is certainly not the liberated Europe we fought to build up." It is felt the use of the words, "whatever conclusions" establishes an attitude of more to be said other than the conclusions already presented.

However, on the negative side of this criterion, Churchill leaves little room for more consideration when

he states:

Neither the sure prevention of war, nor the continuous rise of world organization will be gained without what I have called the fraternal association of the English-speaking peoples.

In general, this evaluator received an impression from the Churchill speech that he was saying all that there was to be said concerning his topics. Therefore, the "etcetera" attitude seemed to be missing both explicitly and implicitly.

#### CONCLUSIONS

One purpose of this study was to establish some general semantics criteria with which to analyze and evaluate speeches. This criteria was established through using some works of Alfred Korzybski, the "father of general semantics" and some of his disciples including S. I. Hayakawa, Wendell Johnson, Irving Lee, Anatol Rapoport, and Harry Weinberg plus Gordon Wiseman and Larry Barker. Only some of the basic formulations having to do with general semantics were established for criteria.

A second purpose of this work was to construct a general semantics model for evaluation from the established criteria. This "dynamic modelization" is not intended to be considered absolute in that it could not be re-organized, added to, or have deletions made. It is maintained, however, that the model contains certain of the basics of general semantics. Some of the basics of

general semantics which were used in the model for evaluation are: (1) "Allness Statements," (2) "Multi-Valued Orientation," (3) "Multi-Ordinal Orientation," (4) "Indexing and Dating," (5) "Facts versus Inferences," (6) "Symbol versus Signal Reactions," and, (7) the "Etcetera" attitude.

The third purpose of this study was to show the model's applicability to speech evaluation by conducting an analysis and evaluation with one speech. It is maintained that the use of the "dynamic modelization" set forth in this study will result in an "initial" evaluation. This "initial" evaluation, it is felt, may be an entity in itself or may point the way to further areas of investigation, if such investigation is so desired. Such an "initial" evaluation seems to be valid because: (1) when used from a semantics point of view it will give a basic indication as to the "saneness" or "unsaneness" of the rhetor as outlined in Chapter Three; and, (2) the evaluation will point to specific areas for further investigation by either the evaluator or specialists in other fields such as historians, political scientists, psychologists, etcetera.

The fourth purpose of this study---conclusions and recommendations---are being presented in this chapter.

This study has merely attempted to set up certain criteria for an "initial" evaluation. It is not to be inferred that the investigator advocates not using the



historical or political science approaches to communication evaluations. However, it was hoped that an additional method of evaluating might be added to any and all other methods being used in the speech field. It was hoped to establish a criteria of evaluation which in it's "initial" stages did not need to rely upon what it seems is all too frequently used, the historical and/or political science approaches.

This investigator feels that such "initial" criteria has been established and is evident in the "dynamic modelization."

It should be made clear that the criteria and model were established before referring to Winston Leonard Spencer Churchill's Fulton, Missouri speech used to illustrate the model. That is, the investigator maintains that the model should be applicable to any verbal or written form of communication and was therefore not formed around any one particular speech. This, it would seem, might make the criteria even more valid as a tool for evaluation.

The speech was analyzed innumerable times using the numerical notation system of "one" through "seven" designating each criterion. Examples were then offered where the criteria could be found in the speech.

Lastly, the "initial" evaluation has indicated

what areas of the speech used for illustration needed further investigation to test the rhetor's "saneness" or "unsaneness" speaking from a general semantics point of view.

A value judgment concerning Churchill and his speech was restricted only to what the "initial" evaluation indicated in relation to the general semantic criteria established.

In the opinion of this investigator after an analysis of the speech used for illustration, the "initial" evaluation indicates Winston Leonard Spencer Churchill was "intensionally oriented." This "intensional orientation" might lead to the speaker being labeled as "unsane" from a general semantics point of view and according to this study's dynamic modelization. It is felt that some of the alleged "facts" of his speech need to be checked before a final label of "saneness" or "unsaneness" is given to the speaker. The "initial" evaluation does, however, point toward "unsaneness."

Churchill's speech is listed "intensional" and tentatively as "unsane" for the following reasons:

- (1) The number of "allness" indications left no room for the "etcetera" attitude and therefore, left no other choices behind his allegations;
- (2) The speech seemed filled with a "one-and-two-valued" orientation which left little or no room

for other approaches or people to aid in solving the world problems posed by the speaker;

(3) The speech contained too many words and phrases of a "multi-ordinal" nature having, it is felt, different meanings to different people and the speaker did not clarify himself on what meanings he wanted attached to the terms;

(4) Finally, the "initial" evaluation indicates that the speaker used many words and phrases which could contribute toward establishing "signal reactions" within his auditors when semantically speaking it would have been more "sane" to strive for the "symbol reaction" as defined in Chapter Three.

In the "initial" evaluation, it was pointed out that certain areas of the speech would seem to need more investigation to further corroborate the "initial" findings. That is, areas of history, political science and psychology, to name just three, would probably add more weight to a final value judgment. For instance, some of the statistics given as "facts" concerning what, at the time of the speech, the Russians were or were not doing, could only, it seems, be answered through an historical and political science study. Also, more data needs to be made available as to whether or not Churchill was literally speaking only for himself or also other

individuals, governments, etcetera. As an example, it would seem that the political scientist could now have a better idea as to what the governments of Great Britain, the United States and Russia were seeking in 1946 at the time the speech was delivered. It might also be suggested that the psychologist might be called in with the historian and political scientist to delve further into Churchill's "one-and-two-valuedness" and his referral to the "English-speaking peoples" having control over the world's affairs in 1946. Also, the psychologist could possibly shed light on any personal motives which would influence what the orator had to say. And the psychologist could possibly give further information and suggestions as to why one of the world's alleged greatest leaders in the first half of the Twentieth Century, would risk semantic unsanity.

The above indicates some of the answers the "dynamic modelization" established in this study cannot answer with the "initial" evaluation. However, as stated in the beginning of this study, such questions were not intended to be answered in the "initial" evaluation.

The Model. The general semantics model in this study, frequently referred to as "dynamic modelization", was established in order to produce an "initial" indication as to the "saneness" or "unsaneness" of a speech. It is maintained that the model offered has done this.

For those using this "dynamic modelization" and who wish more than an "initial" analysis, it is suggested they have been helped by being given more specific areas for further investigation through other disciplines such as history, political science, and psychology, etcetera.

As the investigator has indicated frequently in this study, the model is to be considered flexible, hence it's designation as "dynamic modelization." It is felt that the model contains basic general semantics criteria which will indicate semantic "saneness" or "unsaneness" but the criteria may be re-organized, there may be additions or deletions, as long as the final set of criteria gives the desired result; i.e., an "initial" evaluation. It would seem that not every general semantics formulation from Alfred Korzybaki to the present day, need be included in such a model as presented in this study. Here then, it would seem, enters an area of valid subjectivity. That is, it appears conceivable, and indeed, is even advocated by this investigator, that a general semanticist may have his favorite handful of tools with which he likes to work, instead of every known formulation divided and sub-divided, that is available in the discipline.

Having applied this study's model to a speech, the following seems evident.

(1) The evaluator felt comfortable with seven criteria to work with. That is, it is felt that the use of more than seven criteria might prove cumbersome and in general, unnecessary for such an "initial" analysis and evaluation as is being advocated.

(2) Fewer than seven criteria might prove just as valid for an "initial" analysis and evaluation. It seems conceivable that an "initial" evaluation looking at only one area in the total general semantics field might be sought; e. g., "facts versus inferences."

(3) Of the established criteria for this study, it is felt that the label of "saneness" or "unsaneness" to be given to the speaker, is contingent upon a check of the "fact territory." The analysis of the speech indicated too many areas which were marked as "plus or minus 5"; i. e., questionable as to whether what was stated was "fact" or "inference."

(4) As a result of the above, (3), it is felt that the particular model established in this study cannot satisfy the investigator's inquiry into just what was "fact" and what was "inference." Through such a model as established in the paper, one can easily make note of when the speaker

qualifies what he is saying as an "inference," but, "fact" cannot be verified without further investigation outside the "initial" evaluative model. It seems the degree of importance to be attached here, is dependent upon what sort of final or ultimate result is wanted in the analysis and evaluation of any one speaker.

(5) After having applied the model to one speech, a question arises as to whether or not "allness" and the "etcetera" attitude should be divided and treated as separate criterion. That is, it seems that if the speaker uses "allness" statements or attitudes, he automatically then, excludes the "etcetera" attitude. Likewise, if the "etcetera" attitude is present, it would seem that "allness" would of necessity be negated. On the other hand, as happened on occasion with the speech used in this paper to test the model, in one area, the speaker used an "allness" statement while in another the "etcetera" attitude seemed evident. The investigator would offer for consideration that perhaps some sort of comparison should be looked for if both of these formulations are treated as separate criterion within a model. That is, perhaps a case for a speaker being either "eane" or "uneane" semantically, might depend on

how many times he indicated or used the "etcetera" attitude over and above any "allness" statements he may have used.

(6) Finally, it is suggested that such an "initial" evaluative model established in this study could be conveniently used in the classroom situation either for testing of students by the teacher, or by the student-body in analysis and evaluation of speeches. It would seem, that applying the model would make the evaluator more aware of general semantics formulations in connection with speeches and with other forms of communication, both on an inter- and intra-personal level.

Recommendations. The following suggestions are made for further research and investigation.

(1) It is felt that numerous applications of such an "initial" evaluative model as produced in this study is adviseable. This, it seems, would over a period of time indicate the usefulness of such a technique.

(2) Testing of the model with contemporary rhetors would seem of value especially if the rhetors could be interviewed regarding certain questionable areas of their product.

(3) After considerable use of the model, particularly



in the classroom, perhaps certain emanation would be deemed necessary for more effective analysis and evaluation.

(4) With this study's model or its emanated version as the initiator, a team-type effort might be conducted for the over-all evaluation of a speaker and his speech. A team effort such as this would have specialists from various disciplines zeroing in on the orator. That is, the general semanticist could give the "initial" evaluation and subsequent investigation could be conducted by such authorities as historians, political scientists, psychologists, and, etcetera.

(5) It is suggested this model or its emanated version may be of particular aid in the classroom situation to help students, especially, to become more familiar with the field of general semantics.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Books

- Baird, A. Craig, (ed.). Representative American Speeches: 1945-1946 (Vol. 19, No. 4). New York: H. W. Wilson Company, 1946.
- Broad, Lewis. Winston Churchill, Vol. II : The Years Of Achievement, New York: Hawthorn Books, Inc., 1963.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Winston Churchill, Vol. I : The Years Of Preparation. New York: Hawthorn Books, Inc., 1958.
- Churchill, Randolph S. (ed.). The Sinews Of Peace: Post-War Speeches. London: Cassell, 1948.
- Churchill, Winston S. My Early Life: A Roving Commission. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958.
- Eisenhower, Dwight D. "Sir Winston Churchill A Personal View," Churchill The Life Triumphant: The Historical Record Of Ninety Years. New York: The American Heritage Publishing Co., Inc., 1965.
- Grunwald, Henry Anatole. "Man Of The Century," Churchill The Life Triumphant: The Historical Record Of Ninety Years. New York: The American Heritage Publishing Co., Inc., 1965.
- Hayekawa, S. I. Language In Thought And Action. New York: Harcourt, Brace And Company, 1949.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (ed.). Our Language And Our World. New York: Harper And Brothers Publishers, 1958.
- Johnson, Wendell, People In Quandaries: The Semantics Of Personal Adjustment. New York: Harper And Brothers, 1946.
- Korzybski, Alfred. Manhood Of Humanity. Lakeville, Connecticut: International Non-Aristotelian Publishing Company, 1922.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Science And Sanity. 3rd ed. Lakeville, Connecticut: International Non-Aristotelian Library Publishing Company, 1950.

- Lee, Irving J. Language Habits In Human Affairs. New York: Harper And Brothers Publishers, 1941.
- McLuhan, Marshall and Fiore, Quentin, co-ordinated by Neil, Jerome. The Medium Is The Massage. New York: Random, 1967.
- McLuhan, Marshall. Understanding Media: The Extensions Of Man. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964.
- Rapoport, Anatol. "What Is Semantics," Language, Meaning And Maturity. Edited by S. I. Hayakawa. New York: Harper And Brothers, 1954.
- Weinberg, Harry L. Levels Of Knowing And Existence. New York: Harper And Row, Publishers, 1959.
- Wiseman, Gordon and Barker, Larry. Speech---Interpersonal Communication. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company, 1967.

#### Articles and Periodicals

- ETC.: A Review of General Semantics. San Francisco: International Society for General Semantics.
- I G S News. Lakeville, Connecticut: Institute Of General Semantics.
- Lee, Irving J. "Four Ways Of Looking At A Speech," Quarterly Journal Of Speech, XXVII (April, 1942), 148-155.
- Lomas, Charles W. "The British Orators, III---Winston Churchill: Orator-Historian," Quarterly Journal Of Speech (April, 1958), 153-160.
- Miller, Joseph W. "Winston Churchill, Spokesman For Democracy," Quarterly Journal Of Speech XXVII (April, 1942), 131-138.
- Norden, Eric. "Marshall McLuhan: A candid conversation with the high priest of popcult and metaphysician of media," Playboy, XVI. No. 3. (March, 1969).
- Speech Monographs I-XXXVI New York: Speech Association Of America, 1902-1968.
- Time, XXXVI (October 21, 1940), p. 36.

### Unpublished Material

- Gornley, Paul W. "A Critical Analysis and Evaluation of Ten Major Addresses Delivered Before Joint Sessions of Congress During the Period 1941-1951 by Means of General Semantics Criteria of Rhetorical Criticism." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Denver, 1952.
- Grosser, Lawrence W. "Winston Churchill's Fulton, Missouri Speech." Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Michigan, 1946.
- Hawke, Sharryl H. "A Rhetorical Analysis of Winston S. Churchill's 'Iron Curtain Address'." Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Kansas, 1967.
- Johnson, Robert G. "A General Semantics Analysis of Three of Arthur Miller's Plays: Death of a Salesman, The Crucible, and All My Sons." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Denver, 1963.
- Osborn, Clifford. "An Appraisal of Three Methods of Studying Semantic Reactions in Speech Situations." Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Denver, 1942.
- Smith, E. Debe. "A relating of the principles of general semantics to certain teachings of Jesus and to the nature of His instruction appearing in the Four Gospels." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Denver, 1952.

### Other Sources

- Announcement: Six Seminar-Workshops in General Semantics, 1969. Lakeville, Connecticut: Institute of General Semantics, 1969.
- British Information Services, 845 Third Avenue, New York, New York.
- Hayakawa, S. I. Note to the author of this paper. April 9, 1969.
- Mallach, M. Note to the author of this paper from Institute of General Semantics. April 7, 1969.

McLuhan, Marshall. Form card to the author of this  
paper from the Centre For Culture And  
Technology, University of Toronto. April, 1969.

Truman, Harry S. Library, Independence, Missouri.