

University of Montana

ScholarWorks at University of Montana

Graduate Student Theses, Dissertations, &
Professional Papers

Graduate School

1957

Rhetorical qualities in the campaign speeches of Adlai Ewing Stevenson

Donald John Cameron
The University of Montana

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.umt.edu/etd>

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Cameron, Donald John, "Rhetorical qualities in the campaign speeches of Adlai Ewing Stevenson" (1957).
Graduate Student Theses, Dissertations, & Professional Papers. 3438.
<https://scholarworks.umt.edu/etd/3438>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at ScholarWorks at University of Montana. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Student Theses, Dissertations, & Professional Papers by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at University of Montana. For more information, please contact scholarworks@mso.umt.edu.

RHETORICAL QUALITIES IN THE CAMPAIGN SPEECHES OF
ADLAI EWING STEVENSON

by

DONALD JOHN CAMERON

B. A. Montana State University, 1953

Presented in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
Master of Arts

MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY

1957

Approved by:


Chairman, Board of Examiners


Dean, Graduate School

AUG 13 1957

Date

UMI Number: EP36219

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI EP36219

Published by ProQuest LLC (2012). Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.

Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code



ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my appreciation to Dr. Ralph Y. McGinnis, Chairman of the Montana State University Speech Department, whose many hours of assistance were invaluable in the preparation of this thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED	1
Introduction	1
The Problem	2
Definition of Terms Used.	3
Organization of the Rest of the Study	5
II. SURVEY OF THE LITERATURE.	7
Biographical Background	7
Historical Background	9
Other Studies about Stevenson	9
III. METHOD OF PROCEDURE.	12
Selection of Speeches.	12
Speech of Acceptance	13
Farm Policy.	14
World Policy	15
The Atomic Future.	15
The Role of Labor.	15
On Liberty of Conscience	16
Speech of Acceptance	17
Freedom, Human Welfare and Peace	17
Equality of Rights and Opportunities	18
Our Foreign Policy	18
Control of Nuclear Weapons	19
Farm Policy.	19

CHAPTER	PAGE
Criteria for the Analysis and justification for selection	20
Invention	21
Arrangement	32
Style	34
 IV. FINDINGS IN THE RHETORICAL ANALYSIS OF TWELVE OF ADLAI STEVENSON'S CAMPAIGN SPEECHES DURING 1952 AND 1956.	51
Speech of Acceptance.	51
Farm Policy	64
World Policy.	81
The Atomic Future	103
The Role of Labor	123
On Liberty of Conscience.	147
Speech of Acceptance.	165
Freedom, Human Welfare and Peace.	188
Equality of Rights and Opportunities.	206
Our Foreign Policy.	220
Control of Nuclear Weapons.	242
Farm Policy	263
 V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	280
Summary of Invention.	280
Summary of Arrangement.	286
Summary of Style.	286
General Summary	290

CHAPTER	PAGE
Recommendations for Further Study	291
BIBLIOGRAPHY	293
APPENDIX	295
Speech of Acceptance	296
Farm Policy	300
World Policy	306
The Atomic Future	313
The Role of Labor	317
On Liberty of Conscience	324
Speech of Acceptance	329
Freedom, Human Welfare and Peace	335
Equality of Rights and Opportunities	341
Our Foreign Policy	346
Control of Nuclear Weapons	353
Farm Policy	359

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

I. INTRODUCTION

Adlai Ewing Stevenson was born on February 5, 1900. It may be said that he was born to come into the public spotlight, his ancestors on both sides of the family tree having been very prominent citizens of Illinois. His grandfather, Adlai Ewing Stevenson also, was vice-president of the United States from 1893-1897, and a very prominent member of the Illinois Democratic party. Young Stevenson grew up in Bloomington, Illinois, where his father was part-owner of the local newspaper. He attended several prep schools in the East, attended Princeton University, graduating in 1922, and subsequently earned his law degree at Harvard University and Northwestern University. After serving abroad as a newspaper correspondent, he became a federal official, principally with the agriculture, state and navy departments. Between appointments to Federal posts in Washington, Stevenson worked for a law firm in Chicago, but his primary interest always appeared to be with public works. In 1944 President Roosevelt appointed him to serve with the United States group charged with the duty of setting up the United Nations. After fulfilling this mission, he returned to Illinois and his law practice. He became a noted public speaker and was imposed upon by many friends to run as the Democratic candidate for Governor of Illinois in 1948. Against apparently overwhelming odds and in the face of a Republican landslide in the mid-west,

Stevenson was elected Governor by the largest plurality in the history of Illinois politics. After serving four years as Governor, during which many reforms were successfully undertaken, he was nominated as the Democratic candidate for President of the United States. Opposed by Dwight Eisenhower, Stevenson carried only nine states and was soundly defeated at the polls on November 4, 1952. He remained the titular head of his party and four years later was again nominated to run for the Presidency. In 1956 he carried only seven states, losing again to Eisenhower.¹

Stevenson is important to the American scene because he is more than a political candidate. His carefully prepared speeches have gained unusual attention, and he has been recognized as a fluent spokesman for a great section of the American populace. His broad experience in government and world affairs, plus an obvious desire to express important issues, marks him as an American respected and listened to by members of all political parties.

II. THE PROBLEM

Statement of the problem. It was the purpose of this study to discover the rhetorical qualities in the speeches of Adlai Stevenson as shown by an analysis of six representative speeches from his campaign of 1952 and six representative speeches from his campaign of 1956.

Importance of the study. The intrinsic worth of such a study lay, primarily, in the importance of the man being studied and the time in

¹Noel F. Busch, Adlai E. Stevenson of Illinois (New York: Farrar, Straus and Young, 1952), pp. 32-117.

which he lived. As the spokesman for the Democratic party during this very critical period, as well as a very influential liberal and independent group, Stevenson's influence was significant. Of further consequence, the study considered the value of these speeches as a part of the more extensive field of public address in America. Undoubtedly Stevenson has been ranked favorably among the articulate orators of the 1950's. This study might help make his place more evident.

Limitations of the study. The analysis of the speeches in this study has been restricted to the areas of Invention, Arrangement and Style. Examples of these three divisions and of the use to which they were put have been reported and recorded as parts of this study; however, the areas of Memory, Delivery, Psychology and the rest of the aspects of Stevenson's public addresses have not been included and were not mentioned in this analysis due to the complexity of any study thus prepared. The study was based upon these limitations, but it tried to consider as thoroughly as possible those general areas which were included.

III. DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

The terms requiring definition were explained in the examination of the criteria for evaluation. However, the general term "Rhetoric" needed to be delved into further in order to make the meaning more clear and to allow the analysis to be more understandable.

Rhetoric. Aristotle defined rhetoric as the science of persuasion. His classic quotation on the topic was a basis of rhetoric during the Greek period. "So let rhetoric be defined as the faculty (power) of

discovering in the particular case what are the available means of persuasion."² Cicero, writing 400 years later, expanded on this definition, using the term "oratory" as synonymous with "rhetoric."

Oratory is the result of a whole number of things, in any one of which to succeed is a great achievement. . . . To begin with, a knowledge of very many things must be grasped, without which oratory is but an empty and ridiculous swirl of verbiage; and the distinctive style has to be formed. . . . and all the mental emotions with which the human has been endowed are to be intimately understood.³

Cicero was more concerned with the style and delivery of the speech, reflecting the feeling of his fellow-citizens. Whately, writing in 19th century Britain, returned fundamentally to the ideas of Aristotle, disagreeing with the Roman concepts of rhetoric.

. . . the knowledge of the subjects on which the Orator is to speak, constitutes no part of the art of Rhetoric, though it is essential to its successful employment. . . . We propose in the present article to adopt a middle course between these two extreme points. . . . considering Rhetoric (in conformity with our original plan, and with the very just and philosophical view of Aristotle) as an off-shoot from Logic.⁴

A modern definition was given by Webster's Dictionary. "The art of expressive speech or of discourse, esp. of literary composition; esp., the art of writing well in prose."⁵ A brief and concise working definition was formed from these observations: Rhetoric is the art of effective communication in both the oral and written forms.

²Lane Cooper, The Rhetoric of Aristotle (New York: Appleton, Century, Crofts, Inc., 1932), p. 7.

³E. W. Sutton and H. Rackham, De Oratore of Cicero (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1942), Vol I, pp. 13-15.

⁴Richard Whately, Rhetoric (London: Charles Griffin and Company, 1872), p. 3.

⁵Webster's Collegiate Dictionary (Springfield, Massachusetts: G. and C. Merriam Company, 1948), p. 855.

IV. ORGANIZATION OF THE REST OF THE STUDY

Chapter II. The second chapter of the analysis included a survey of the literature available, on both Stevenson's speeches and his life. This survey also listed some of the background material pertinent to the period of history covered by this work. An analysis and consideration was made of the other studies done on the speeches of Stevenson and the relative merits and limitations of these studies.

Chapter III. Chapter three contained the method of procedure which was followed in analyzing the speeches which were selected for this study. The first section of this chapter was devoted to the justification of the speeches selected for analysis. In the second section of this chapter the criteria used in this study was substantiated.

Chapter IV. This chapter contained the results of the study as the speeches were analyzed according to the criteria which was previously decided upon.

Chapter V. This chapter presented a summary of the study on the fourteen speeches and the conclusions drawn therefrom. Also, it contained recommendations for further study upon Stevenson both as a speaker and as a personality.

Bibliography. The bibliography of material cited throughout the thesis was listed following the thesis. The more specific details on the references mentioned in the footnotes and in the context of the paper were listed therein.

Appendix. The manuscripts for all the fourteen speeches analyzed were placed in an appendix at the end of the study in order to expedite references to the content of the speeches.

Abstract. An abstract of the thesis contained a brief statement of the purpose, procedure, and the findings of this study.

CHAPTER II

SURVEY OF THE LITERATURE

1. BIOGRAPHICAL BACKGROUND

Previous to his nomination by the Democratic Party as a Presidential candidate in the summer of 1952, Stevenson was not generally recognized as a national figure. For this reason, prior to that time, no extensive biographies of him had been written. However, in the Autumn of 1952 two biographies of Stevenson appeared. Mr. Noel Busch authored a book entitled Adlai E. Stevenson of Illinois,⁶ and Mr. John Martin was the author of the book Adlai Stevenson.⁷ A search of the Montana State University library in February, 1957, revealed only these two biographies and nothing of more recent date. Also of value was the introduction written by Mr. Stevenson in the book Major Campaign Speeches of Adlai E. Stevenson.⁸ Stevenson gave a comprehensive autobiographical sketch of his life that helped establish his attitudes towards important issues.

Numerous magazine articles also appeared, especially during the latter half of 1952 and the same period in 1956. From the hundreds that were printed, three articles were of especial enlightenment, all written as complete portraits of Stevenson. The first of these was printed in

⁶Noel F. Busch, Adlai E. Stevenson of Illinois. (New York: Farmer, Straus, and Young, 1952).

⁷John B. Martin, Adlai Stevenson (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1952).

⁸Adlai E. Stevenson, Major Campaign Speeches of Adlai E. Stevenson (New York: Random House, 1952).

United States News and World Report, August 1, 1952 and was entitled "Stevenson: The Man and His Story."⁹ In the New York Times Magazine, September 13, 1953 appeared an article entitled "Adlai Stevenson of Libertyville, Illinois."¹⁰ The third article was printed in the Saturday Review, August 28, 1954, under the title "Portrait of Adlai E. Stevenson."¹¹

An excellent source of biographical data on Stevenson was found in the Speech Monographs for the years 1952 through the present (1957). Nothing at all was discovered prior to 1952 in examining the listings in Speech Monographs, but each year thereafter numerous references were made to works concerning Stevenson. Following is a list of biographical data taken from the Speech Monographs:

Speech Monographs; June, 1953.¹²

James, Bessie R. and Overstreet, Mary (eds.). Adlai's Almanac: The Wit and Wisdom of Stevenson of Illinois. New York: Schuman, pp. 80.

Speech Monographs; June, 1954.¹³

Hickey, Robert L. "A subjective criticism of Stevenson's speeches," The Speaker, (January, 1953), pp. 9-10.

Johnson, Gerald W. "Something old has been added: Adlai Stevenson of Illinois," American Scholar, (1952-53) pp. 9-16.

Thompson, Wayne N. "A Study of the Effectiveness of Address at St Louis by Adlai Stevenson," Central States Speech Journal, (1953) pp. 11-13.

⁹"Stevenson: The Man and His Story," United States News & World Report XXXIII (August 1, 1952), pp. 54-57.

¹⁰R. H. Revere, "Adlai Stevenson of Libertyville, Illinois," New York Times Magazine, (September 13, 1953), pp. 9-15.

¹¹"Portrait of Adlai E. Stevenson," Saturday Review of Literature, XXXVII (August 28, 1954), p. 18.

¹²Frederick W. Haberman, "A Bibliography of Rhetoric and Public Address for the Year 1952," Speech Monographs, XX (June, 1953), p. 101.

¹³Ibid., XXI (June, 1954), pp. 100-101.

Speech Monographs; June, 1955.¹⁴

Kaiser, Alvin R. "Style and Personal Appeal of Adlai E. Stevenson,"
Western Speech, (1954) pp. 181-185.

Stevenson, Adlai, Call to Greatness. New York: Harper and Brothers. p. 110.

Speech Monographs; August, 1956.¹⁵

Dean, Richard L. "Aspects of Persuasive Appeal in Stevenson's Campaign
Speeches," The Speaker, (May, 1955) pp. 19-22.

Richardson, Ralph. "Adlai E. Stevenson, Hollywood Bowl," Western Speech
(1955) pp. 137-174.

II. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

A survey of the campaign speeches of Stevenson in 1952 and 1956 would be impossible without a well-rounded knowledge of the contemporary events, both domestic and foreign, that happened at that time. The days have been long past when political campaigns were waged on purely local issues, and all the significant world-wide events affected the course of the political campaign. The best source material for the contemporary background of the period was found in the newspapers and magazines for that period. From the many fine publications printed throughout these years, Time Magazine, Newsweek Magazine and the New York Times Newspaper were utilized for any information required by the study.

III. OTHER STUDIES ABOUT STEVENSON

As in the case of biographical information, nothing was discovered prior to Stevenson's rise to prominence in 1952. This was quite logical,

¹⁴Ibid., XXII (June, 1955), p. 101.

¹⁵Ibid., XXIII (August, 1956), p. 179.

of course, because Stevenson first attracted national attention as an outstanding speaker during the political campaign of 1952. The Speech Monographs once each year list all the graduate dissertations and theses in the area of speech reported from colleges and universities across the nation. An examination of these lists revealed seven studies of a rhetorical nature written about Stevenson. Three of the studies were concerned with the 1952 Campaign Addresses of Stevenson, two were comparisons between Stevenson and Eisenhower in 1952, one was a study on all of Stevenson's speaking career, and one (presently uncompleted) dealt with the political debate between Stevenson and Eisenhower in 1956.

A study was conducted in 1953 by Robert B. Hawkins, at the University of Michigan, which was an analysis of the wit and humor employed by Stevenson in his 1952 campaign speeches.¹⁶ During 1954 Betty Faghin from the University of Washington wrote a paper critically analyzing only three of Stevenson's speeches in the 1952 campaign.¹⁷ Also in 1954, Mary Corpe, a graduate student at the University of Wisconsin, wrote a paper about the persuasive techniques employed by Stevenson during the same campaign.¹⁸ T. W. McCown, at the University of Oklahoma, in 1953 compiled a study showing a comparison between the logical proof used by Stevenson and his opponent in selected campaign addresses in 1952.¹⁹ Two years later, 1955, saw the publication of a study done by Malcolm Sillars at the University of Iowa, about the

¹⁶Ibid., Franklin H. Knowler, "Graduate Theses--An Index of Graduate Work in Speech," XXI (June, 1954), p. 119.

¹⁷Ibid., XXII (June, 1955), p. 129.

¹⁸Ibid., XXII (June, 1955), p. 130.

¹⁹Ibid., XXI (June, 1952), p. 123.

element of Invention in the two candidate's campaign addresses in 1952.²⁰ Max Norton, from College of Pacific, finished in 1955 a dissertation that offered a rhetorical criticism of selected Stevenson speeches delivered at various times throughout his career.²¹ Finally, Otto Bauer, graduate student at Northwestern, is presently compiling a study that will compare the political debate, from a rhetorical standpoint, between the two major party candidates for the presidency in 1956.²²

The seven studies mentioned above were the only ones discovered pertaining to rhetorical qualities in the speeches of Stevenson. Although all of them covered areas of similarity with this study, none were identical to the area covered by this study. None of the seven papers were available to the author of this study, nor was any information from any of the seven studies utilized in the preparation of this study.

Aside from these works, there appeared in the October, 1956 issue of the Quarterly Journal of Speech, an article written by Prof. Russell Windes, Jr. and Prof. James A. Robinson, both of Northwestern University, entitled "Public Address in the Career of Adlai E. Stevenson."²³ This article made general comments covering the speaking career of Stevenson.

This study, then, as far as could be determined, was not identical to any study done previously, and should offer new evidence to supplement the detailed work done on Stevenson.

²⁰Ibid., XXIII (August, 1956), p. 198

²¹Ibid., XXIII (August, 1956), p. 204

²²Ibid., J. Jeffery Auer, "Doctoral Dissertations in Speech: Work in Progress, 1956," XXIII (June, 1956), p. 80

²³Russell Windes, Jr., & James A. Robinson, "Public Address in the Career of Adlai E. Stevenson," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XLIII (Oct. 1956), pp. 225-233

CHAPTER III

METHOD OF PROCEDURE

I. SELECTION OF SPEECHES

The modern political tempo requires every Presidential candidate to deliver hundreds of speeches during each campaign. Stevenson sacrificed personal comfort and consideration to reach as many speaking engagements as possible, during both the 1952 and 1956 campaigns. Obviously it would have been impossible to consider all, or even a sizeable portion, of his talks. Therefore, in order to have as representative a group of speeches as possible, and yet keep the number within workable range, one speech dealing with each of the following areas was selected from each campaign: (1) Acceptance; (2) Farm policy; (3) Foreign policy; (4) Nuclear weapons; (5) Labor and Management problems; (6) Constitutional rights and guarantees. From the many and important issues facing the voters in both 1952 and 1956, these issues appeared most crucial and demanding of explanation. The acceptance speech, of course, covered all issues in a general way and set the tone of the impending campaign.

The next task was to select the particular speech best representing each topic. In most cases this was not difficult because one particular speech was promoted by Stevenson and the party leaders as setting forth the Democratic viewpoint on each subject. Several times more than one excellent talk pertained to the same topic, and all but one had to be eliminated from consideration. Many fine examples of Stevenson speeches had to be dropped from consideration, but those chosen were considered adequate and fair representations of the speeches given by Stevenson in the two campaigns.

In chronological order, starting with the 1952 campaign, the speeches selected were as follows: (1) "Speech of Acceptance"; (2) "Farm Policy"; (3) "World Policy"; (4) "The Atomic Future"; (5) "The Role of Labor"; (6) "On Liberty of Conscience." In 1956 the chronological listing was as follows: (1) "Speech of Acceptance"; (2) "Freedom, Human Welfare and Peace"; (3) "Equality of Rights and Opportunities"; (4) "Our Foreign Policy"; (5) Control of Nuclear Weapons"; (6) "Farm Policy."

A brief analysis of the circumstances surrounding each speech clarified its position in relation to the over-all campaign. The following examination was made of the background of each speech. The talks are considered in chronological order, starting with the acceptance speech in 1952.

Speech of Acceptance

The Democratic Party met in Chicago late in July, 1952 for their national convention and for the purpose of nominating a Presidential candidate. The convention grind was a rigorous one for all concerned, but the uncertainty concerning who would be their candidate kept the delegates interested. Stevenson had not been seeking the nomination, and had even shown reluctance to be considered. On Friday the balloting finally began, and on the third ballot, Stevenson garnered the necessary votes for nomination. This occurrence could not avoid being a very bitter blow to many friends of Kefauver, Russell and other candidates, who had fought hard and long on behalf of their men. So into this situation stepped Adlai Stevenson the evening of his nomination to deliver his acceptance speech. It was his first appearance as a politician before the Convention, and to many of those who voted for him, the first time they had seen him. Added to these circumstances was the fact that it was the fifth consecutive day of the Convention, and late at night

before Stevenson began to speak.²⁴ Time Magazine had this to say:

Harry Truman had just finished speaking when Adlai Stevenson walked down the steps on to the rostrum. Truman led him forward. It was the first glimpse most of the delegates--and most of the U.S.-- had of the man who, Democratic orators told them fervently, would be the next President of the United States. While Truman introduced him, Stevenson stood ramrod stiff behind the President. . . Then he began reading his speech. After a week of turgid oratory, Truman's included, Stevenson's words struck an entirely new, deeply appealing note. Most delegates had never heard anything like it.²⁵

Thus Stevenson made an impressive beginning, delivering a speech that has been called a literary masterpiece by many.

Farm Policy

A critical issue in this election was the farm issue. The farmers share of the national income had been gradually shrinking for several years, and nobody seemed to know exactly how to correct this trend. The Democratic stand supported high parity supports to sustain prices of basic agricultural commodities, while Republicans generally opposed this on the grounds that it would bring too much government interference in the affairs of the farmer. Early in the campaign, on September 6, 1952, both candidates spoke from the same platform to a rural audience attending the national plowing contest at Kasson, Minnesota. Eisenhower spoke first, Stevenson four hours later.

The farm vote went on the auction block last Saturday at Kasson, Minnesota, where 75,000 to 100,000 dirt farmers, their women, and their children, gathered on Henry Snow's sprawling 160-acre farm to watch the National Plowing Championships and to size up both the Presidential nominees.²⁶

²⁴Newsweek, XL, No. 5 (August 4, 1952), pp. 15-20.

²⁵Time, IX, No. 5 (August 4, 1952), pp. 14-15.

²⁶Newsweek, XL, No. 11 (September 15, 1952), p. 24.

World Policy

Stevenson felt very strongly about the foreign policy debate and tried hard to clarify his opinions, which he believed were misunderstood by many voters. Speaking in San Francisco, in the same building where, a few years earlier, he had helped originate the United Nations, he reviewed the entire foreign policy area and expounded his views.

At San Francisco, he set forth his views on future policy in Asia and stoutly endorsed the Administration's decision to fight in Korea and try to negotiate an armistice instead of expanding the war. Neither criticizing nor defending the Administration's past record in China, he called upon the GOP to support aid to India and other Asian countries to prevent them from going the way of China.²⁷

The Atomic Future

A new issue in political campaigns was the debate over atomic and hydrogen warfare and whether or not the use of such weapons should be abolished. No-one was suggesting giving up our advantage over the Communist world without obtaining iron-clad guarantees from them, guarantees that seemed too much to expect. But aside from the use of these potent discoveries for warfare was the appealing prospect of utilizing nuclear developments for peacetime uses. Stevenson recognized the importance of continued research and proposed new and expanded facilities for nuclear development. He spoke at Hartford, Connecticut, on September 18, at a dinner honoring the late Senator McMahon of Connecticut, who had been a leader in legislating for adequate nuclear facilities.²⁸

The Role of Labor

Traditionally the Democratic party has counted on the support of labor, and never more than in 1952 did the Democrats need the endorsement

²⁷Newsweek, XL, No. 12 (September 22, 1952), p. 27.

²⁸Time, LX, No. 13 (September 29, 1952), p. 14.

of an increasingly powerful labor group. Stevenson was not noted as being particularly partial to labor's viewpoint, and many labor leaders were withholding endorsements. So on September 22, speaking to the Convention of the American Federation of Labor in New York City, he put forth his views pertaining to labor-management relations.

. . . Amidst shouts of approval, Stevenson declared that he favored repeal of the Taft-Hartley Law--'not a recap job with reclaimed Republican rubber'. . . The delegates who had given Ike a tepid reception now whistled and shouted, 'Pour it on, Steve.' With the Stevenson speech over, the A.F.L. Executive Council recommended that federation members support Adlai Stevenson for the presidency.²⁹

On Liberty of Conscience

The raging domestic issue during 1952 concerned rights of individuals as guaranteed by the Constitution and the violation of these rights. It was a broad and undefined area, made confusing by "McCarthyism" and "Fifth-Amendment Communists." Stevenson felt strongly about the dangers involved if we allowed "guilt by association" credence in our thinking. In mid-October, speaking to an overflow crowd in the Mormon Tabernacle at Salt Lake City, Utah, Stevenson delivered an eloquent oration on the topic.

At Salt Lake City, he was greeted by crowds that were larger than those which had turned out for Ike the previous week. Said he . . . 'Regretful (God help us!) in the face of the stirring truth that Lincoln's vision has come true, that now we are indeed the 'last, best hope of earth! . . . What a day to live in! . . . Who in heaven's name would want America less strong, less responsible for the future?'³⁰

Many considered the speech too far above the heads of the average voter, and not so much a political talk as a commencement address. But all admitted it was a fine example of modern speech-making.

²⁹ Ibid., pp. 14-15.

³⁰ Time, LX, No. 17 (October 27, 1952), p. 30.

1956 CAMPAIGNSpeech of Acceptance

The 1956 Democratic National Convention was again held in Chicago, in mid-August, and the candidates, issues and results very much resembled the previous convention. One important difference concerning Stevenson was the fact that he was not reluctant about accepting the nomination this time. He had campaigned vigorously prior to the Convention seeking delegate support, and, despite an open break with ex-President Truman, won an overwhelming endorsement as party standard-bearer. For the second time in four years, Stevenson stood before his party in the huge Amphitheatre at the Chicago Stock-yards and accepted his party's nomination for the Presidency.

On the convention's last night Adlai Stevenson stood up before the Democratic delegates as their second-time standard bearer, accepted the nomination in a fighting speech studded with epigrams and clearly wrought phrases that brought applause from his audience 53 times.³¹

This was a different Stevenson from the man who spoke four years earlier. He seemed to portray a fighting figure, no longer awed by the position of responsibility thrust upon him, and no longer reluctant to call a spade a spade.

Stevenson's theme was the need of the Democratic Party to move beyond the New and Fair Deals and face up to the realities of a 'new America'--a theme he frequently clouded with catchwords from his party's past. ...With thunderbolts from Carlyle and Woodrow Wilson he blasted the Republicans from stem to stern.³²

Freedom, Human Welfare and Peace

Stevenson formally opened his campaign on September 13, 1956 in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania. He spoke in a general manner about the affairs

³¹Time, LXVIII, No. 9 (August 27, 1956), p. 16.

³²Ibid., pp. 16-18.

of the country, the problems at home, the distrust many workers now have, and the fear of this, that and the next thing that pervaded the country. He hit hard at the idea that President Eisenhower has lost his control over the affairs of government, because of health reasons, and the men who actually run the government are reactionary, conservative, 'big-business' men.³³

Mr. Stevenson thus formally opened a campaign that already had carried him 12,000 miles in a month. The speech sought to make the President's health and what the Democrats call his part-time performance of Presidential duties central issues of the campaign. . . . The Democratic candidate abandoned his 'moderate' line in dealing with the President personally. The crowd interrupted him with applause twenty-five times.³⁴

Equality of Rights and Opportunities.

Again the labor vote was crucial for the Democrats, and Stevenson knew he had to carry labor overwhelmingly to stand a chance in the election. On October 4, he arrived in New York, toured the boroughs all day and that night delivered a fighting speech in Harlem about the plight of labor.

Beneath gleaming floodlights in Harlem he struck hard, eloquently and effectively in favor of civil rights, 'The great, unfinished business of the U.S.'. . . praising public housing, and declaiming against filth and squalor. . . .³⁵

Labor, in 1956, was benefitting from the general prosperity of the nation and was in danger of breaking from the Democratic fold. To avoid this Stevenson stressed the historic development of labor's progress, and reminded laborers that the Democratic Party had continually fought for this progress.

Our Foreign Policy

The developments in the Near East had aroused much criticism of

³³New York Times, CV, No. 36,028 (September 14, 1956), p. 1.

³⁴Ibid.

³⁵Time, LXVIII, No. 16 (October 15, 1956), p. 29.

our diplomatic maneuvering in that area. Stevenson jumped at the opportunity to strike home against Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, and in Cincinnati, Ohio, on October 19, he levelled both barrels at those responsible for our diplomatic troubles.

Before an applauding (56 interruptions), highly partisan audience in Cincinnati's Music Hall, Stevenson delivered a major speech on foreign policy. 'The Republican candidate. . . has been misleading the nation about success at Suez.' The truth, he said, is that in these past few months. . . the Communist rulers of Soviet Russia have accomplished a Russian ambition that the czars could never accomplish: Russian power and influence have moved into the Middle East.³⁶

Control of Nuclear Weapons

Stevenson thought he had a clear-cut issue to win votes when he proposed ending all H-bomb and other nuclear weapon testing. He delivered a major speech on the subject in Madison Square Garden, New York City, on October 23. The crowd was enthusiastic, but the nation-wide response to the speech was generally unfavorable.

. . . he called again for an agreement with Russia to end H-bomb tests, added afterwards that 270 scientists support his position. He quoted Pope Pius XII on the fearful prospects of nuclear war. . . Said Adlai: 'Our arsenal of hydrogen bombs and other weapons is enough to deface the earth.'³⁷

Most people continued to feel that a major deterrent to Russian aggression was our hydrogen bomb supply and ability to readily retaliate, and this thrust by Stevenson met with little success.

Farm Policy

The possibilities of a major portion of the farm vote shifting to the

³⁶Time, LXVIII, No. 18 (October 29, 1956), p. 17.

³⁷Time, LXVIII, No. 19 (November 5, 1956), p. 24.

Democrats looked better than ever in 1956. Prices for most farm commodities were steadily going down while everything else in the nations economy was going up. The Republicans had been unable to halt this trend. Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson, a conservative Republican of the Taft wing of the Party, had made many enemies in the previous three years, and the disgust of many farmers was expected to show on election day. Vice-Presidential candidate Kefauver had been pleading for the farm vote, but on October 25, Stevenson met Kefauver in Springfield, Illinois, and delivered a major farm address.

Stevenson then took over to charge Ike and the G.O.P. with 'callous political perfidy', 'self-righteous hypocrisy', 'broken promises' and 'duplicity' in dealing with the farm problem. Ike, he said, has been guilty of 'transparent hypocrisy' or 'just doesn't know what is going on.'³⁸

II. CRITERIA FOR THE ANALYSIS AND JUSTIFICATION FOR SELECTION

Selection of the criteria used in this study was based upon a review of the writings of four of the more prominent rhetoricians of history. These outstanding men were Aristotle, Cicero, Whately and Brigance. This selection produced a representative rhetorician from each of the four great periods of rhetorical criticism. Aristotle lived in ancient Greece, Cicero in Early Roman times, Whately was a 19th century Britisher, and Brigance is a contemporary American. All were recognized as leaders in their field during their lives, and their stature as rhetoricians has stood the test of time.

From the voluminous writings of these gentlemen, their comments concerning the rhetorical divisions of invention, arrangement and style were particularly noted. This study is devoted to the application of these

³⁸Ibid.

three divisions, and their many partitions, to the speeches of Stevenson.

Concerning rhetoric itself, Aristotle stated: "So let Rhetoric be defined as the faculty (power) of discovering in the particular case what are the available means of persuasion."³⁹ Rhetoricians since have basically agreed with this observation. Cicero divided the art of rhetoric into invention, arrangement and style with these observations.

I learned that he must first hit upon what to say; then manage and marshall his discoveries, not merely in orderly fashion, but with a discriminating eye for the exact weight as it were of each argument; next go on to array them in the adornments of style.⁴⁰

In order to obtain a clearer distinction of these three divisions, it was necessary to take each separately and examine it in terms of the works of the five rhetoricians whose criteria were used.

Invention

The first area of analysis was Invention and it was examined under the three major areas of Logos, Ethos, and Pathos. Aristotle stated the original divisions of Invention as follows:

Of the means of persuasion supplied by the speech itself there are three kinds. The first kind reside in the character (ethos) of the speaker; the second consist in producing a certain (the right) attitude in the hearer; the third appertain to the argument proper, in so far as it actually or seemingly demonstrates.⁴¹

Cicero spent little time on invention, but appeared to accept the divisions made by Aristotle.

Aristotle, from whose doctrines you think my own differ but little. And between this Aristotle and these true professors of this art, there

³⁹Cooper, op. cit., p. 7

⁴⁰Sutton and Rackham, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 99.

⁴¹Cooper, op. cit., p. 8.

seemed to me to be this difference---that he surveyed these concerns of the art of rhetoric with that same keen insight, by which he had discerned the essential nature of all things; whereas those others. . . have dwelt upon the treatment of this subject, without his sagacity. ⁴²

Whately seemed to agree completely with Aristotle.

Among the ancients, Aristotle, who was the earliest, may safely be pronounced to be also the best, of the systematic writer on rhetoric. ⁴³

Brigance restated the ideas of Aristotle in modern language, emphasizing fundamentally similar concepts.

It is not sufficient just to 'know the subject,' or to 'give the facts,' or even to 'prove the case,' supremely important as are knowledge, facts, and proof. Human nature does not respond, or at least very seldom responds, to purely logical or 'rational' motives, for down within us all, below the surface, is a maze of subconscious motives that buffet our powers of reason to and fro like a wave-tossed ship. ⁴⁴

Logos, non-artistic proof. Aristotle divided logos, or argument, into "artistic" and "non-artistic" methods of proof.

Proofs are of two kinds, artistic and non-artistic. . . By 'non-artistic' proofs are meant all such as are not supplied by our own efforts, but existed beforehand, such as witnesses, admissions under torture, written contracts, and the like. By 'artistic' proofs . . . are meant those that may be furnished by the method of Rhetoric through our own efforts. The first sort have only to be used; the second have to be found. ⁴⁵

Whately dealt at length with the types of argument, agreeing fundamentally with Aristotle but rephrasing his terminology.

⁴²Sutton and Rackham, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 315.

⁴³Whately, op. cit., p. 4.

⁴⁴William Norwood Brigance, Speech Composition (New York: Appleton, Century, Crofts, Inc., 1953), p. 134.

⁴⁵Cooper, loc. cit.

In distributing, then, the several kinds of Arguments, according to this division, it will be found convenient to lay down first two great classes, under one or other of which all can be brought. viz. 1st, such Arguments as might have been employed to account for the fact or principles maintained, supposing its truth granted; 2nd, such as could not be so employed.⁴⁶

Through the years the divisions as set forth by Aristotle had to be revised to meet with changes in legal practice. Admissions under torture, for example, were soon considered invalid. However, his original meanings have been preserved.

Looking at the specific proofs which comprise the divisions of "artistic" and "non-artistic," Aristotle had this to say:

Of the subjects thus far mentioned, we must next take a cursory view of the means of persuasion called 'non-artistic', as these belong especially to the forensic branch of Rhetoric. They are of five sorts: laws, witnesses, contracts, tortures, the oath.⁴⁷

Today non-artistic proof is divided into the following four types of argument: evidence, authority, sign, and assumption. Aristotle's divisions of laws and contracts would come under evidence, witnesses would come under authority, and oath and torture under assumption.

Whately emphasized the same general areas, having this to say about proof by authority:

Matters of opinion (where we are not said properly to know, but to judge,) are established chiefly by Antecedent-probability; though the testimony of wise men is also admissible; past facts, chiefly by signs, of various kinds; (that term, . . . including testimony,). . .⁴⁸

Concerning argumentative proof by sign, he stated this:

⁴⁶Whately, op. cit., p. 16.

⁴⁷Cooper, op. cit., p. 80.

⁴⁸Whately, op. cit., p. 32.

By 'sign'. . . is meant a species of Argument of which the analysis is as follows: As far as any circumstance is, what may be called, a condition of the existence of that Effect: if it be a condition absolutely essential, the Argument is, of course, demonstrative.⁴⁹

To clarify his meaning, Whately offered the following examples:

. . . A man is suspected as the perpetrator of the supposed murder, from the circumstance of his clothes being bloody; the murder being considered as in a certain degree a probable condition of that appearance; i.e. it is presumed that his clothes would not otherwise have been bloody. Again, from the appearance of ice, we infer, decidedly, the existence of a temperature below freezing point, that temperature being an essential Condition of the crystallization of water.⁵⁰

Argument by sign, then, has been taken to mean a proof that is self-evident by observation of the circumstances, without recourse to extensive thought processes.

Brigance wrote as follows on argument by authority:

We live in a specialized world and we use the specialist to denote one who has attained a position of authority in any one of these fields. Where our knowledge is inadequate, we rely in a large degree on the judgment of accepted specialists. . . An audience very naturally places confidence in a speaker's opinions if it finds them shared by accepted authorities.⁵¹

Logos, artistic proof. The second division of logos as defined by Aristotle was "artistic" proof. He defined the term in this manner: "By 'artistic' proofs are meant those that may be furnished by the method of Rhetoric through our own efforts." In other words, as contrasted to "non-artistic" proofs, which are self-evident in themselves, "artistic" proofs require reasoning on the part of the individual before being valid. These "artistic" proofs are, in turn, divided into inductive and deductive reasoning. Induction has been separated into three areas, they being: generalization, causation, and analogy. Aristotle wrote the first recommendations about argument from generalization:

⁴⁹Ibid., p. 18.

⁵⁰Ibid..

⁵¹Brigance, op. cit., p. 164.

Another topos consists in arguing from the presence or absence of the cause to the existence or non-existence of the effect. If you prove the cause, you at once prove the effect; and conversely nothing can exist without its cause.⁵³

Whately stressed argument from causation. He asked: "Supposing the proposition in question to be admitted, would this Argument serve to account for the truth, or not?"⁵⁴ In other words, would it be a sufficient cause for the action? He further stated:

As far, then, as any Cause, popularly speaking, has a tendency to produce a certain Effect, so far its existence is an Argument for that of the Effect. If the cause be fully sufficient, and no impediments intervene, the Effect in question follows certainly; and the nearer we approach to this, the stronger the Argument.⁵⁵

In this type of inductive reasoning, the Effect may be inferred from the Cause, or, as Whately pointed out, from a mortal wound you may infer Death.⁵⁶

After argument from Generalization and Causation came argument from Analogy. Aristotle gave the following definition:

There are two kinds of argument by example. One consists in the use of a parallel from the facts of history; the other in the use of an invented parallel. This last may take the form of a comparison.⁵⁷

He gave the following example of argument from analogy:

Darius in his day did not cross (the Aegean) until he had seized Egypt; but once he had seized it, he crossed (the sea against us). And Xerxes, again, did not invade us until he had seized Egypt; but once he had seized it, he likewise crossed (against us) And so this man, if he seizes Egypt, will cross, too. . .⁵⁸

⁵³Ibid., p. 170.

⁵⁴Whately, op. cit., p. 16.

⁵⁵Ibid.

⁵⁶Ibid., p. 19.

⁵⁷Cooper, op. cit., p. 147.

⁵⁸Ibid.

He gave another example, which he called an inverted comparison.

It is like choosing athletes for a contest by lot, instead of picking those who can play the game; or it is as if the choice of a helmsman from a crew had to go by the toss of a coin, and not to the man who knows how to steer.⁵⁹

Whately had this to say about argument from analogy:

The word Analogy, again, is generally employed in the case of Arguments in which the instance adducted is somewhat more remote from that to which it is applied; e.g. a physician would be said to know by experience the noxious effect of a certain drug on the human constitution if he had frequently seen men poisoned by it; but if he thence conjectured that it would be noxious to some other species of animal, he would be said to reason from Analogy.⁶⁰

Analogy, then, has been accepted as the argument that attempts to prove a contention enumerating points of likeness between two or more phenomena.

Analogy, however, according to Whately, ought to be distinguished from direct resemblance, with which it is often confused.⁶¹

Analogy being a 'resemblance of ratios'. . . in which the two cases (viz. the one from which, and the one to which we argue) are not themselves alike, but stand in a similar relation to something else;. . . Thus an egg and a seed are not in themselves alike, but bear a like relation to the parent bird and to her future nestling, on the one hand, and to the old and young plant on the other, respectively; . . . And many arguments might be drawn from this Analogy.⁶²

⁵⁹Ibid., p. 148.

⁶⁰Whately, op. cit., p. 27.

⁶¹Ibid.;

⁶²Ibid., p. 28.

The other type of "artistic" proof employed by these rhetoricians was deductive reasoning, it being divided into argument from syllogism and argument from enthymeme. Aristotle was the father of syllogistic reasoning and used this method of reasoning extensively. Syllogism was defined as "A logical scheme or analysis of a formal argument, consisting of a major premise, a minor premise, and a conclusion. The conclusion necessarily followed from the premises."⁶³ Aristotle offered this definition of the term enthymeme:

'Enthymeme' is the name I give to a rhetorical syllogism. . . to derive a general law from a number of like instances is in Dialectic induction, in Rhetoric example; whereas to conclude from certain assumptions that something else follows from those assumptions (something distinct from them, yet dependent upon their existing) either universally or as a rule----this in Dialectic is called a syllogism, and in Rhetoric an enthymeme.⁶⁴

Whately contested the importance Aristotle placed on the difference between the syllogism and the enthymeme. He stated that the only differentiation was in the form of stating them and not in the argument as such.

⁶³ Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, op. cit., p. 1010.

⁶⁴ Cooper, op. cit., p. 10.

. . . for every one would allow that the same Argument may be either stated as an enthymeme, or brought in to the strict syllogistic form.⁶⁵

Ethos. The second principal division of Invention was that of ethical proof or ethos. This concerns the traits of the speaker that influence the audience. Aristotle emphasized the importance of ethos, remarking thus:

It is not true, as some writer on the art maintain, that the probity of the speaker contributes nothing to his persuasiveness; on the contrary, we might almost affirm that his character (ethos) is the most potent of all the means to persuasion.⁶⁶

He continually reiterated this idea.

Of the means of persuasion supplied by the speech itself there are three kinds. The first kind reside in the character (ethos) of the speaker. . .

The character (ethos) of the speaker is a cause of persuasion when the speech is so uttered as to make him worthy of belief; for as a rule we trust men of probity more, and more quickly, about things in general, while on points outside the realm of exact knowledge, where opinion is divided, we trust them absolutely.⁶⁷

Aristotle listed three general areas where ethos could be classified.

As for the speakers themselves, the sources of our trust in them are three, for apart from the arguments (in a speech) there are three things that gain belief, namely, intelligence, character and good will. . . It necessarily follows that the speaker who is thought to have all these qualities (intelligence, character, and good will) has the confidence of his hearers.⁶⁸

Cicero was more concerned with the speech itself and the delivery than with

⁶⁵Whately, op. cit., p. 14

⁶⁶Cooper, op. cit., p. 9.

⁶⁷Ibid., p. 8.

⁶⁸Ibid., pp. 91-92.

the character of the speaker. However, he did not disagree with Aristotle and apparently endorsed the quality of intelligence as a necessary attribute of the speaker.

And indeed in my opinion, no man can be an orator complete in all points of merit, who has not attained a knowledge of all important subjects and arts. . . unless there is such knowledge, well-grasped and comprehended by the speaker, there must be something empty and almost childish in the utterance.⁶⁹

Whately reverted to the definitions of Aristotle, agreeing that the character of the speaker is of great importance.

Under the head of Affections may be included the sentiments of Esteem, Regard, Admiration, etc., which it is so important that the audience should feel towards the Speaker. . . He (Aristotle) remarks, justly, that the Character to be established is that of, 1st, Good Principle, 2ndly, Good Sense, and 3rdly, Goodwill and friendly disposition towards the audience addressed, and that if the Orator can completely succeed in this, he will persuade more powerfully than by the strongest Arguments.⁷⁰

Brigance contended that attitude and personality of the speaker are influential in producing or preventing persuasion.

Some speakers seem to project their personality out into the far corners of the audience; some seem to draw their hearers right up to them and take them, as it were, by the hand. Others unfortunately repel the audience or draw an invisible screen between themselves and those who listen.⁷¹

Brigance further stressed the importance of what Aristotle called ethos, when he said:

It is almost needless to say that a successful speaker must have a strong moral character, for 'what you are speaks so loud I cannot hear what you say.' No speaker can expect others to believe his words if they cannot trust him.⁷²

The four rhetoricians generally agreed on the importance of ethos and upon the characteristics of ethos necessary in the effective speaker.

⁶⁹Sutton and Rackham, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 17.

⁷⁰Whately, *op. cit.*, pp. 48-49.

⁷¹Brigance, *op. cit.*, p. 140.

⁷²*Ibid.*, p. 141.

Pathos. The third major area of proof under Invention was that of pathos or emotion. Pathos concerned the speaker's effect upon the emotional responses of the audience. Aristotle defined pathos as follows:

Persuasion is effected through the audience, when they are brought by the speech into a state of emotion; for we give very different decisions under the sway of pain or joy, and liking or hatred.⁷³

By these, the emotions, are meant those states which are attended by pain and pleasure, and which, as they change, make a difference in our judgments (of the same thing;) for example, anger, pity, fear, and all the like, and also their opposites. With respect to this we must note (1) what the mental state of angry persons is, (2) with whom they are wont to be angry, and (3) what are the things that commonly make them so.⁷⁴

The complete break-down in Aristotle's Rhetoric listed these emotions as playing prominent parts in the study of speech: anger, mildness, love (friendship), fear and confidence, shame and shamelessness, benevolence and the lack of it, pity, indignation, envy, and emulation.⁷⁵

Cicero recognized the importance of the emotional appeal in speaking to others.

But closely associated with this is that dissimilar style of speaking which, in quite another way, excites and urges the feelings of the tribunal towards hatred or love, ill-will or well-wishing, fear or hope, desire or aversion, joy or sorrow, compassion or the wish to punish, or by it they are prompted to whatever emotions are nearly allied and similar to these passions of the soul, and to such as these.⁷⁶

Whately, who continually reverted to Aristotle, does so again in explaining his interpretation of what Aristotle was saying regarding the emotions.

Aristotle, and many others, have spoken of Appeals to the Passions as an unfair mode of influencing the hearers;. . . But Aristotle by no means overlooked the necessity for Persuasion, properly so termed,

⁷³Cooper, op. cit., p. 9.

⁷⁴Ibid., p. 92.

⁷⁵Ibid., pp. 93-129.

⁷⁶Sutton and Rackham, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 331.

calling into action some motive that may influence the Will; it is plain that whenever he speaks with reprobation of an appeal to the Passions, his meaning is, the excitement of such feelings as ought not to influence the decision at hand.⁷⁷

Both Whately and Aristotle felt that many emotions, such as revenge, etc., should not be used by any responsible speaker. That was not to say that educated persons should not be acquainted with them in order to recognize them when used by others. Whately declined to delve into the individual emotions to the extent that Aristotle did, but several general comments were note-worthy. He was particularly concerned with the manner in which emotional elements were introduced.

The first and most important point to be observed in every address to any Passion, Sentiment, Feeling, etc., is that it should not be introduced as such, and plainly avowed; otherwise the effect will be, in great measure, lost. . . our purpose and drift should be, if not absolutely concealed, yet not openly declared and made prominent.⁷⁸

In the modern civilized world, pathos apparently was more important than ever. Brigance was particularly impressed with the need for effective utilization of emotions.

Cold logic is not enough. We may talk all we please about people being moved by logic only---but it will all be just talk, for people are not moved by cold reasoning alone. I do not mean to say that people are not influenced by reason, but rather that they are not influenced by reason alone---that we are also influenced by our likes and dislikes, our loves and our fears, our pocket-books and our pride--and that our actions are a result of the interaction of our own emotions and our reasoning (if these can ever be separate) with our emotions predominating.⁷⁹

With this much emphasis upon the emotional appeal, it was very important that the speaker recognize how to take advantage of the situation.

⁷⁷Whately, op. cit., p. 47.

⁷⁸Ibid., p. 49.

⁷⁹Brigance, op. cit., p. 113.

Now the condition which confronts a speaker in closing his speech is this: His last words must leave the strongest possible emotional impression; they must lead the audience to feel the justice or righteousness of the speaker's cause; they must, if possible, make the audience want to believe or act. Therefore if the conclusion by summary reaches only the intellect, it is not sufficient. It needs also to reach human wants, hopes, ideals.⁸⁰

The principle emotions utilized in speech-making have not substantially changed since the time of Aristotle, although the terminology of the more recent rhetoricians is slightly different.

Arrangement.

The second major partition of speech analysis was that of Arrangement. Arrangement dealt with the order of presenting the materials in a speech. Little disagreement was discovered among the four writers, and all four wrote sparingly upon this area, apparently because of the obvious conformity of opinion on the matter.

Aristotle stated that the two indispensable constituents of any speech are the statement and the following argument, but expanded upon this as follows:

At most, the parts cannot exceed four--Proem, Statement, Argument, and Epilogue. 'Refutation' of the opponent falls under the head of the arguments; and since a 'Comparison' of both sides is an enlargement of your own case, it too appertains to this head.⁸¹

The beginning of the speech, according to Aristotle, was the proem or what we would today call the Introduction. "It answers to the prologue in poetry, or to the prelude in music for the flute."⁸² Cicero did not strictly divide the speech into sections, but spoke more generally about placement of various materials.

⁸⁰Ibid., pp. 113-114.

⁸¹Cooper, op. cit., p. 220.

⁸²Ibid., p. 221

And in regard to arrangement I also censure the people who place their weakest points first; . . . for the situation demands that the anticipation of the audience should be satisfied as quickly as possible, and if it is not satisfied at the start, a great deal more work has to be put in during the remainder of the proceedings.⁸³

Cicero stressed the importance of a good introduction, stating "for the opening passage contains the first impression and the introduction of the speech, and this ought to charm and attract the hearer straight away."⁸⁴ He continued to elaborate upon the contents of the various portions of the speech, but appeared to accept the four divisions of Aristotle as his basis for division.

Whately spent little time on Arrangement, except to verify his belief that the divisions of a speech laid down by Aristotle were still valid.⁸⁵ He did approve Cicero's approach to arrangement of the important parts of the speech, and stated in reference to Cicero:

The rule laid down by Cicero (De Oratore) not to compose the Introduction first, but to consider first the main argument, and let that suggest the Exordium, is just and valuable; for otherwise, as he observes, seldom any thing will suggest itself but vague generalities. . .⁸⁶

Brigance simplified the division of a speech into three steps, the Introduction, the Discussion, and the Conclusion.⁸⁷ He justified his action with these words:

The modern introduction includes within it all that these writers meant by 'exordium', 'statement', and 'proposition'. Likewise does the modern discussion include all that was meant by 'proof' and 'refutation', while the modern conclusion covers almost identically what the ancients called 'peroration'.⁸⁸

⁸³Sutton and Rackham, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 437

⁸⁴Ibid., Vol. I, p. 439.

⁸⁶Ibid.

⁸⁸Ibid., p. 67.

⁸⁵Whately, op. cit., p. 44.

⁸⁷Brigance, op. cit., p. 66.

Style

The third area of analysis was that of style, this area being concerned with the use of the language. Aristotle, while giving least consideration to this division, nevertheless recognized its importance.

It is not enough to know what to say--one must also know how to say it. The right way of doing this contributes much to the right impression of a speech. . . for success in delivery is of the utmost importance to the effect of a speech.⁸⁹

Cicero did not share Aristotle's reluctance to give prime importance to the area of style. He saw a very practical reason for speakers to master the style of speaking well; if one did not know too much about a certain subject, he might be able to cover his lack of knowledge with fluent and flowing language.

As for the other matters, even though he has not studied them, he will still be able, whenever the necessity arises, to beautify them by his eloquence, if only they are brought to his notice and described to him.⁹⁰

Cicero was not entirely pragmatic though, and he justified the importance of style by the beauty of language produced. He mentioned four requisites of style for oratory.

Now what better style of expression can there be--I will consider delivery later-- than that our language should be correct, lucid, ornate and suitably appropriate to the particular matter under consideration.⁹¹

Whately fails to share the enthusiasm of Cicero for the importance of style in a study of rhetoric. He reluctantly agrees that it is necessary to a general knowledge of the area.

⁸⁹Cooper, op. cit., pp. 182-183.

⁹⁰Sutton and Rackham, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 51.

⁹¹Ibid, Vol. II, p. 31.

Though the consideration of Style has been laid down as holding a place in a Treatise of Rhetoric, it would be neither necessary nor pertinent, to enter fully into a general discussion of the subject which would evidently embrace much that by no means peculiarly belongs to our present inquiry.⁹²

He did have one definite thought pertaining to the matter, though:

It is sufficiently evident (though the maxim is often practically disregarded) that the first requisite of Style not only in Rhetorical, but in all compositions, is Perspecuity; since, as Aristotle observes, language which is not intelligible. . . fails in the same proportion, of the purpose for which language is employed.⁹³

Brigance gave this modern interpretation of the area of style:

Authorities are generally agreed that there are three fundamental qualities upon which the elements of good style are based. These are (1) clearness, (2) force, and (3) ease, beauty, rhythm: clearness that the speaker's meaning may be understood; force that it may compel attention and so aid the memory; ease that it may not offend the ear and so distract from the thought.⁹⁴

The area of style was sub-divided into four parts with which the four rhetoricians seemed most concerned. They were Level, Diction and word choice, Sentence Structure, and Rhetorical Devices and Figurative Language.

Level. Cicero separated the levels of style into three areas, failing to give the divisions specific names. He obviously had contempt for all but the "ornate" style, as he called it.

But if you also want to hear about general character and tone of diction, there is the full and yet rounded style of oratory, the plain style that is not devoid of vigour and force, and the style which combines elements of either class and whose merit is to steer a middle course.⁹⁵

Considering these divisions in more modern terminology, we would list them as follows:

⁹²Whately, op. cit., p. 67.

⁹³Ibid.

⁹⁴Brigance, op. cit., p. 218.

⁹⁵Sutton and Rackham, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 159.

Plain style, composed of plain ideas and simple expressions.

Middle style, composed of serious and dignified thoughts.

Elevated style, composed of lofty and sublime thoughts.

Diction and word choice. Aristotle considered diction almost synonymous with style, and stressed the proper use of this tool.

To diction artistic principles may be applied; and hence, again, we find able writers who win prizes (that is, through artistic management of the diction),. . . for the written compositions owe more of their effect to their diction than to their thought.⁹⁶

Clarity, or, as the term was later applied, perspicuity, was foremost in the selection of words according to Aristotle.

. . . a good style is, first of all, clear. The proof is that language which does not convey a clear meaning fails to perform the very function of language. The style, again, should be neither mean nor above the dignity of the subject, but appropriate.⁹⁷

Clearness is secured through the use of name-words (nouns and adjectives) and, verbs, that are current terms. . . of these, the speaker should use rare words, compound words, and coined words, but sparingly and seldom.⁹⁸

It is essential to select words that would make the orator appear to be speaking naturally and not with artifice, because naturalness is persuasive and artifice is the direct opposite. People tend to grow suspicious of an artificial speaker, or one whose choice of words is not natural to him.⁹⁹ The best manner to acquire a personal knowledge and acquaintance with effective words, according to Cicero, was to study the famous speeches of the great men of history. By conscientiously doing this over a period of years, when called upon to speak, the words and phrases of the masters would come

⁹⁶Cooper, op. cit., p. 184.

⁹⁷Ibid., p. 185.

⁹⁸Ibid., pp. 185-186.

⁹⁹Ibid., p. 186.

naturally to the speaker.

But all correct choice of diction, although it is formed by knowledge of literature, is nevertheless increased by reading the orators and poets; for the old masters, . . . almost all had an eminently clear style, and those who have made themselves familiar with their language, will be unable to speak anything but good Latin, even if they want to. . . one who has diligently steeped himself in the old writings while employing words in current usage will be able to employ the choicest among them.¹⁰⁰

Whately stressed perspicuity of words used, and cautioned against using terms which are familiar to the author and perhaps not to others.

Universally, indeed, an unpractised writer is liable to be misled by his own knowledge of his own meaning, into supposing those expressions clearly intelligible, which are so to himself; but which may not be so to the reader, whose thoughts are not in the same train. . . it is a matter of some difficulty to keep in mind the necessity of carefully and copiously explaining principles which by long habit have come to assume in our minds the appearance of self-evident truths.¹⁰¹

The importance of clarity was ever present in Whately's comments, and in order to make meanings clear he urged the use of short, specific and commonly understood words.

Inexperienced preachers frequently err in this way, by dwelling on Virtue and Vice, Piety and Irreligion, in the abstract, without particularizing; forgetting that while they include much, they impress little or nothing.¹⁰²

Brigance quoted the famous passage from Joseph Conrad to emphasize the importance of the correct word choice, "He who wants to persuade should put his trust not in the right argument, but in the right word. . . Give me the right word and the right accent, and I will move the world."¹⁰³ Elaborating on this theme, Brigance stated:

¹⁰⁰ Sutton and Rackham, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 33.

¹⁰¹ Whately, op. cit., p. 71.

¹⁰² Ibid., p. 78.

¹⁰³ Brigance, op. cit., p. 199.

The raw materials with which a speaker must pattern his thoughts are words. Therefore, the choice of words goes very far toward determining the ultimate vividness of style. So important is this element that we shall consider it in some detail.¹⁰⁴

Sentence Structure. Neither Aristotle nor Cicero were concerned with sentence structure as such. Whately and Brigrance, being concerned with the English language, made pertinent comment's pertaining to this area. Whately, again stressing perspicuity, had this to say:

In respect to the Construction of sentences, it is an obvious caution to abstain from such as are too long; but it is a mistake to suppose that the obscurity of many long sentences depends on their length alone; a well constructed sentence of very considerable length may be more readily understood, than a shorter one which is more awkwardly framed.¹⁰⁵

Length, then, was not itself a detriment, but the difficulty of maintaining the thought throughout the sentence of length was not easily overcome. When sentences have to be read over, or thought over, to obtain the proper meaning then they were either too long or not clear in expression, or both.

According to Whately:

If a sentence be so constructed that the meaning of each part can be taken in as we proceed, (though it be evident that the sense is not brought to a close,) its length will be little or no impediment to perspicuity; but if the former part of the sentence conveys no distinct meaning till we arrive nearly at the end, however plain it may then appear, it will be on the whole deficient in perspicuity.¹⁰⁶

Another danger was that of assuming that the listener will be able to comprehend the meaning of a sentence because the meaning is plain to the speaker. As Whately stated:

The caution just given is the more necessary to be insisted on, because an author is apt to be misled by reading over a sentence to himself, and being satisfied on finding it perfectly intelligible, forgetting that he himself has the advantage, which a hearer has not,

¹⁰⁴Ibid., p. 220.

¹⁰⁵Whately, op. cit., p. 70.

¹⁰⁶Ibid.

of knowing at the beginning of the sentence what is coming in the close.¹⁰⁷

Brigance maintained that the study of sentence-structure had no place in the ideal study of rhetoric, but the common inability of citizens to write good literate English demanded correction.

All of this you will recognize is an aside, a stage whisper, inserted out of context. But it needs desperately to be said somewhere, for as Disraeli reminds us it is 'With words we govern men.' Let us now get down to earth and look at the weakest link in the mine-run management of words--sentence structure.¹⁰⁸

Brigance then related the importance of selecting the proper verbs and adjectives, and not wasting words, or even phrases, in relating the meaning. The English language especially is full of empty words, words that add nothing to the meaning of a sentence, but only add to its length. Quoting Henry Ward Beecher, this analogy was offered: "A good fireman will send the water through as short and straight a hose as he can."¹⁰⁹

He further stated that the changing civilization of recent years effected the type of sentence best employed.

The truth is that speakers must use shorter sentences to-day than they might use a century ago. The tempo of industrial life is faster. People are in more of a hurry. More voices compete for a hearing. . . . When any sentence gets over 20 words it starts to be "fairly difficult." when it gets over 25 words it becomes "difficult," and when it goes beyond 30 words it becomes "very difficult." This much has been discovered by research.¹¹⁰

The English language used today has been divided into four primary types of sentences according to structure, namely: simple, compound, complex, and compound-complex.

¹⁰⁷Ibid., p. 71.

¹⁰⁹Ibid., pp. 233-238.

¹⁰⁸Brigance, op. cit., p.233

¹¹⁰Ibid., pp. 238-239.

Rhetorical Devices and Figurative Language. During the time of Aristotle titles had not been selected for most of the various rhetorical devices, and he dwelt only briefly on the area. Cicero had almost all the figures of speech in mind, when he referred to problems of correct diction.

This is like a weapon either employed for use, to threaten and to attack, or simply brandished for show. For there is sometimes force and in other cases charm in iteration of words, in slightly changing and altering a word and in sometimes repeating the same word several times at the beginning of clauses and sometimes repeating the same word several times at their end. . . and climax, and assigning a different meaning to the same word used several times, and repetition of a word. . . There is also. . . inversion, and antithesis. . . and metonymy, and distinguishing terms, and order, and reference back and digression, and periphrasis. For these more or less are the figures--and possibly there may be even more also like them--that embellish oratory with thoughts and with arrangements of words.¹¹¹

Whately dealt specifically with the various figures of speech but had this to say about the entire group:

. . . all that are in any way removed from common use; whether uncommon terms, or ordinary terms, either transferred to a different meaning from that which strictly belongs to them, or employed in a different manner from that of common discourse. All the Tropes and Figures, enumerated by Grammatical and Rhetorical Writers, will of course fall under this head.¹¹²

Brigance gave the most satisfactory definition of the area, when he said:

Figures of speech may be defined as words used in a sense different from their literal meaning. Our language abounds in figures many of which have become so commonplace as to be accepted as literal. . . Figures promote clearness, for they can often be used when the literal meaning of words is inadequate to communicate an idea; they promote force, for they communicate by images rather than by abstraction and so 'give thought a shape'; and they promote beauty, for they add grace and charm to the style. . . they are a powerful aid to suggestion for, since their meaning is not literal, the speaker's conclusion can be suggested, rather than stated, in such a way as to disarm criticism or opposition.¹¹³

¹¹¹ Sutton and Rackham, op. cit., Vol. II, pp. 165-167.

¹¹² Whately, op. cit., p. 77.

¹¹³ Brigance, op. cit., p. 252.

The four writers did not offer the same names when referring to similar figures of speech and rhetorical devices but common usage in recent years has clarified the titles. Each rhetorician stressed perhaps a different figure, but little contradictory evidence was noted. From the combined listings of the four men, the following have stood out:

Analogy. Aristotle and Whately mention analogy briefly, and Cicero not at all. Brigance summed up the power of the analogy as following: "A new idea, by comparison and contrast, is given force through being compared with something already known."¹¹⁴ He further stated:

Analogy and antithesis, or as they are sometimes called, comparison and contrast, have no superior among the objective elements of vividness. They place black against white, good against bad, and the measure of difference is heightened by the comparison. . . The value of these rhetorical elements arises from the salient fact that we cannot measure hot against cold, good against bad, or great against small except by reducing them to such a common denominator as is afforded by comparison and contrast.¹¹⁵

We might define analogy as a comparison between two things not to show their absolute similarity, but to illustrate a resemblance of certain attributes or effects common to both.

Epigram. Brigance termed an epigram "a witty thought, tersely expressed. . . it may also be profound, serious truth, minted in novel form and, for the sake of catching attention, spiced with a dash of wit."¹¹⁶

He further elaborated as follows:

The epigram is a powerful attention-catcher. It mints an old idea into a new form. It is novel. It is interesting. And, since it must perforce be terse, it is easy to remember. By its use a speaker may pack an important idea into few words and stamp the whole idea firmly upon the minds of his auditors. . .¹¹⁷

¹¹⁴Ibid., pp. 248

¹¹⁶Ibid., p. 247.

¹¹⁵Ibid., pp. 247-248.

¹¹⁷Ibid., p. 246.

The following examples were given:

Wooden legs are not inherited, but wooden heads may be.¹¹⁸

A human cricket. . . who carried a gold-headed cane under his arm--
with more in its head than he had in his.¹¹⁹

Humor. Cicero was much impressed with the proper use of humor and wit.

Jesting too and shafts of wit are agreeable and often highly effective: But these, even if all else can be taught by art, are assuredly the endowment of nature and in no need of art. . . I hold that a man with any tincture of humour in him can discuss anything in the world more wittily than actual witticisms.¹²⁰

However, he was quick to state that foolish nonsense was far from good wit. It demanded quite the opposite of a fool to be effectively humorous.

But just as, with the former kind, both in narrative and in mimicry, all likeness to buffoons in pantomime is to be avoided, so in this latter case the orator must scrupulously shun all buffoonish raillery. . . The first point to make, I think, is that we should not feel bound to utter a witticism every time an occasion offers.¹²¹

Brigance admitted importance of humor in most speech situations, and ventured that all great speeches utilized wit or humor in some extent.

Humor can be found in the greatest of speeches--not much of it, but some of it, enough of it to overthrow any argument against its moderate use. . . the best humor arises from the clever turn of a phrase, a witty comparison, a comic narration, or the incongruous application of a quotation or well-known maxim.¹²²

Rhetorical Question. This developed as a figure of speech during the past several centuries and has been employed by most of the great speakers of recent years. Brigance regarded this practice as very effective.

¹¹⁸Ibid., p. 247.

¹¹⁹Ibid., 246.

¹²⁰Sutton and Rackham, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 357.

¹²¹Ibid., Vol. I, p. 379.

¹²²Brigance, op. cit., pp. 127-128.

Very often this restatement takes the form of the rhetorical question, a question the answer to which is not directly given but is unmistakably implied in the form of the question. There are few more telling methods of emphasis than the rhetorical question; it is vivid, terse, sharp; it arouses the attention because it compels the hearer to answer for himself.¹²³

Interrogation. Whately mentioned interrogation as follows:

Lastly, to the Speaker especially, the occasional employment of the Interrogative form, will often prove serviceable with a view to Energy. It calls the hearer's attention more forcibly to some important point by a personal appeal to each, either to assent to what is urged, or to frame a reasonable objection.¹²⁴

Brigance had this to say:

Interrogation is a commonly used form of direct discourse. . . . The psychological value of the question is that it boldly puts the proposition up to the hearer to answer for himself instead of laying out a ready-made answer. It is a personal matter, demanding individual attention from each member of the audience. It is an appeal, inviting a silent reply.¹²⁵

Irony and Satire. Aristotle saw the use of ironical comments to frustrate the individual concerned.

They, also, who are ironical with you when you are in earnest. . . . incense you all the more, . . . irony implies contempt. And they . . . who treat others well, and fail to treat him so. . . not to rate him as high as you rate all the world. . .¹²⁶

Cicero was pleased with the proper use of irony, saying it added spice to the speech, and held attention.

Irony too gives pleasure, when your words differ from your thoughts, not in the way of which I spoke earlier. . . . but when the whole tenor of your speech shows you to be solemnly jesting, what you think differing continually from what you say. . . . This is a choice variety of humour and blended with austerity, and suited to public speaking as well as to the conversation of gentlemen.¹²⁷

¹²³Ibid., p. 215.

¹²⁴Whately, op. cit., p. 107.

¹²⁵Brigance, op. cit., pp. 244-245.

¹²⁶Cooper, op. cit., p. 98.

¹²⁷Sutton and Rackham, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 403.

Contrast. Whately gave the best analysis of this rhetorical device. The term used then was antithesis, but the meaning was parallel to what is called contrast today.

One clause may be opposed to another, by means of some contrast between corresponding words in each, whether or not the clauses be so connected that the former could not, by itself, be a complete sentence. . . there can be no doubt that this figure is calculated to add greatly to Energy. Every thing is rendered more striking by contrast; and almost every kind of subject-matter affords materials for contrasted expressions. Truth is opposed to error; wise conduct to foolish.¹²⁸

Repetition. Aristotle noticed the use of repetition and how it could be employed for good effect.

Such devices. . . as repetition of the same word, which are rightly enough censured in the literary style, have their place in the controversial style when a speaker uses them for their dramatic effect. But if you repeat, you must also vary the repetition.¹²⁹

Whately saw the use of repetition in emphasizing a particular point that was necessary.

The best general rule for avoiding the disadvantage both of conciseness and of prolixity, is to employ Repetition: to repeat, that is, the same sentiment and Argument in many different forms of expression; each in itself brief, but all, together, affording such an expansion of the sense to be conveyed, and so detaining the mind upon it, as the case may require.¹³⁰

Brigance agreed almost exactly with the opinion of Whately, when he said:

In addition to iteration and restatement, emphasis through space is also obtained through the repetition of certain words and phrases. Repetition is the intellectual application of the principles used in driving a nail-- you hammer in the same spot until it is driven home.¹³¹

He warned, however, not to overdo the repetition of ideas, else they become tiresome and boring to the listener. To avoid this a rephrasing of the sentences might be necessary, often disguising the reiteration.¹³²

¹²⁸ Whately, op. cit., pp. 104-105.

¹²⁹ Cooper, op. cit., p. 217.

¹³⁰ Whately, op. cit., pp. 63-64.

¹³¹ Brigance, op. cit., p. 216.

¹³² Ibid., p. 217.

Climax. The concept of climax, in Greek and Roman times, was referred to as Gradation. Aristotle and Cicero mention this area only briefly, but Whately was concerned with the effective employment of this device to stress the most important point in an address.

When several successive steps of this kind are employed to raise the feelings gradually to the highest pitch (which is the principle employment of what Rhetoricians call the Climax,) a far stronger effect is produced than by the mere presentation of the most striking object at once. . . And the mind, no less than the eye, cannot so well take in and do justice to any vast object, at a single glance, as by several successive approaches and repeated comparisons.¹³³

He offered the story of the man who climbed the highest mountain in the Alps, being more impressed by each higher peak on his way to the top, until he was overwhelmed by the majestic view from the very highest of all.¹³⁴

Brigance expressed his opinion thusly:

Climax is that well-known principle of arranging thoughts in the order of ascending power. In this manner the thought, with each successive step, rises in interest and importance until 'the culmination concentrates in itself in some sense the significance of all that has gone before.'¹³⁵

Hyperbole. The hyperbole is very similar to the metaphor, but employing the quality of exaggeration. Aristotle gave several examples.

. . . about the man with the black eye: 'You would have taken him for a basket of mulberries.' The black eye has the purple color; the exaggeration lies in the quantity of fruit. If you employ a word of comparison. . . you have in effect, a hyperbole. . .¹³⁶

Nay, not if he offered me gifts as the sand and the dust for number
137
...

Onomatopoea. This figure of speech concerned the formation of words in imitation of natural sounds, or, according to Whately, the use of words

¹³³Whately, op. cit., pp. 52-52.

¹³⁵Brigance, op. cit., p. 263.

¹³⁷Ibid.

¹³⁴Ibid., p. 53.

¹³⁶Cooper, op. cit., p. 216.

whose sounds suggest a certain sense.

The principle here laid down will especially apply to the Choice of words, with a view to their Imitative, or otherwise, Appropriate sound. The attempt to make the sound an echo to the sense, is indeed more frequently to be met with in poets than in prose writers. . . . that words denoting sounds, or employed in describing them, may be Imitative, of those sounds, must be admitted by all. . . . such as 'hiss', 'rattle, clatter'. . . .¹³⁸

Anaphora and epistrophe. These are two devices not commonly studied today, but used by Stevenson extensively. Anaphora, according to the dictionary, was "repetition of a word or words at the beginning of successive clauses."¹³⁹ Epistrophe was identical except that the repetition came at the end of the several consecutive clauses or sentences.

Allusion and Reference. Whately stated that most great speakers have depended upon others before them to seek support for what they say.

Allusion is based upon the great principle of 'reference to experience' or to things with which the hearer, from previous reading, seeing, touching, tasting, smelling, or hearing, is already familiar. We may define allusion as an implicit reference to, or indirect suggestion of, 'some incident, expression, or custom in history or literature or life' that the hearer may be trusted to understand.¹⁴⁰

The power of the allusion, or reference to others, was based upon three sources, according to Brigrance. First, it was brief, since only the mention of the previous situation had to be made, and the listener would fill in the remainder from his knowledge. Secondly, it had the subtle power of suggestion, and lastly, it was vivid, because it brought to mind a familiar image and set in motion a series of associated thoughts.¹⁴¹

Understatement. Cicero was amused at the possibilities of this device, and maintained it was a most effective manner of getting the

¹³⁸Whately, op. cit., pp. 86-87.

¹³⁹Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, op. cit., p. 39.

¹⁴⁰Brigrance, op. cit., p. 250.

¹⁴¹Ibid.

audience on the speaker's side.

Then again there are those intentional understatements or over-statements which are exaggerated to a degree of the astonishing that passes belief, such as your assertion, Crassus, . . . that Memmius thought himself so exalted an individual that, on his way down into the Market-place, he lowered his head in order to pass under the Arch of Fabius.¹¹²

Metaphor. Webster's Dictionary gave this definition of a metaphor:

Use of a word or phrase literally denoting one kind of object or idea in place of another by way of suggesting a likeness or analogy between them such as 'the ship plows the sea' or 'a volley of oaths.'¹¹³

All of the rhetoricians dwelt at length on the metaphor. Aristotle considered it of greatest importance.

. . . metaphor is of the utmost value in both poetry and prose. . . It is the metaphor above all else that gives clearness, charm, and distinction to the style.¹¹⁴

Whately was concerned primarily with the various types of metaphors and the difference between them. Cicero enumerated dozens of examples that were considered good metaphors.

Simile. Webster's Dictionary offered this definition of a simile:

"A figure of speech by which one thing, action or relation is likened or explicitly compared, often with as or like, to something of different kind or quality."¹¹⁵ The simile was very closely related to the metaphor.

Aristotle had this to say:

The simile, as we said before, is a metaphor, differing from it only in that the simile adds the phrase of comparison, which makes it longer. . . nor does it, like the metaphor, say 'this is like that'; and hence the mind of the hearer does not have to seek the resemblance.¹¹⁶

¹¹²Sutton and Rackham, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 401.

¹¹³Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, op. cit., p. 628.

¹¹⁴Cooper, op. cit., p. 187.

¹¹⁵Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, op. cit., p. 927.

¹¹⁶Cooper, op. cit., p. 207.

Whately agreed with Aristotle.

The Simile or Comparison may be considered as differing in form only from the Metaphor; the Resemblance being in that case stated, which in the Metaphor is implied. Each may be founded either on Resemblance. . . or on analogy, which is the Resemblance of ratios.¹⁴⁷

Personification. Webster's Dictionary gave the following definition of personification: "representation of an inanimate object or abstract idea as endowed with personal attributes. A divinity or imaginary being thought of as representing a thing or abstraction."¹⁴⁸ Whately related his ideas on the subject as follows:

But the highest degree of Energy (and to which Aristotle chiefly restricts the term) is produced by such Metaphors as attribute life and action to things inanimate: . . . For the disadvantage is overbalanced by the vivid impression produced by the idea of personality or activity; as when we speak of the rage of the torrent, a furious storm, etc.¹⁴⁹

Whately went on to state that the English language, particularly, possesses one distinct advantage in this matter.

Our language possesses one remarkable advantage, with a view to this kind of Energy, in the constitution of its genders. . . when we speak of any such object in the masculine or feminine gender, that form of expression at once confers personality upon it. When 'virtue'. . . is spoken of as a female, or 'ocean' as a male, they are, by that very circumstance, personified.¹⁵⁰

Alliteration. This rhetorical device was the repetition of the same sound at the beginning of two or more consecutive words or of words near one another within the same sentence. An example would be "sweet, soft and smooth." Aristotle and Cicero failed to mention this area specifically, Whately went only as far as onomatopoeia, and Brigrance did not discuss this figure of speech.

¹⁴⁷Whately, op. cit., p. 79.

¹⁴⁸Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, op. cit., p. 741.

¹⁴⁹Whately, op. cit., p. 82.

¹⁵⁰Ibid.

Outline of Form Used.

The following form was derived for the purpose of reporting on the speeches of Stevenson:

I. Invention.

A. Logical Proof (logos).

1. "Non-Artistic" proof, including:
 - a. evidence.
 - b. authority.
 - c. sign.
 - d. assumption.
2. "Artistic" proof, including:
 - a. inductive reasoning, including:
 1. Argument from Generalization.
 2. Argument from Causation.
 3. Argument from Analogy.
 - b. deductive reasoning, including:
 1. Argument from syllogism and enthymeme.

B. Ethical Proof (ethos).

1. Sincerity.
2. Earnestness.
3. Devotion.
4. Patience.
5. Friendliness.
6. Sympathy.
7. Knowledge of subject.

C. Emotional proof (pathos).

1. Anger
2. Love and Friendship.
3. Enmity and Hatred.
4. Fear.
5. Confidence.
6. Shame.
7. Pity.
8. Indignation.
9. Envy.
10. Emulation.
11. Contempt.
12. Benevolence.

II. Arrangement.

- A. Introduction.
- B. Body.
- C. Conclusion.

III. Style.

A. Level of Style.

1. Low.
2. Middle.
3. High.

B. Diction and word choice.

1. Mono-syllabic or poly-syllabic.
2. Abstract or Concrete.

C. Sentence structure.

1. Simple.
2. Compound.
3. Complex.
4. Compound-complex.

D. Rhetorical Devices and Figurative Language.

1. Analogy.
2. Epigram.
3. Humor.
4. Rhetorical Question.
5. Interrogation.
6. Irony and Satire.
7. Contrast.
8. Repetition.
9. Climax.
10. Hyperbole.
11. Onomatopoeia.
12. Anaphora and epistrophe.
13. Allusion and reference.
14. Understatement.
15. Metaphor.
16. Simile.
17. Personification.
18. Alliteration.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS IN THE RHETORICAL ANALYSIS OF TWELVE OF ADLAI STEVENSON'S CAMPAIGN SPEECHES DURING 1952 and 1956.

In this chapter the criteria for analysis discussed in Chapter III were applied to the twelve speeches selected for the study. It would have been an impossible task to specifically list every example of each rhetorical quality in each speech. However, a representative portion of the examples discovered were used. The order of analysis was the same as listed in Chapter III and the speeches were examined in chronological order, the first six addresses from the 1952 campaign and the last six from the 1956 campaign.

1952

I. SPEECH OF ACCEPTANCE

INVENTION

Logos--non-artistic proof.

Evidence. In this speech Stevenson used very little evidence. He attempted to instill confidence in the audience, and gave a review of the coming campaign. For these reasons he spoke in general terms and rarely referred to specific instances in the past. He did, however, rely on evidence when expounding the virtues of the party platform he would campaign on.

And you have written a platform that neither equivocates, contradicts nor evades. You have restated our party's record, its principles and its purposes, in language that none can mistake, and with a firm confidence in justice, freedom and peace on earth that will raise the hearts and the hopes of mankind for that distant day when no one rattles a saber and no one drags a chain.¹⁵¹

No other examples of this type of proof were found in the address.

Authority. Stevenson was concerned that Americans should not think of him as a captive candidate, but rather as an individual who spoke for himself. His status as a national figure was not yet established and he was careful to refer only occasionally to others, lest his listeners think he was only a mouthpiece for other interests. However, the occasion did demand certain references to those who had been influential throughout the convention.

I know you join me in gratitude and respect for the great Democrats and the leaders of our generation whose names you have considered here in this Convention, whose vigor, whose character, whose devotion to the Republic we love so well have won the respect of countless Americans and have enriched our party.¹⁵²

President Truman, as leader of the Democratic Party, had a strong voice in selecting the party's presidential candidate, and his favoritism to Stevenson was perhaps the most important factor in sending the nomination his way. In his concluding paragraph, Stevenson recognized the President with these words:

I will give to you all I have, even as he who came here tonight and honored me, as he has honored you--the Democratic Party--by a life-time of service and bravery that will find him an imperishable page in the history of the Republic and of the Democratic Party--President Harry S. Truman.¹⁵³

¹⁵¹Adlai E. Stevenson, Major Campaign Speeches of Adlai E. Stevenson (New York: Randon House, 1952), p. 8.

¹⁵²Ibid

¹⁵³Ibid., p. 10.

Sign. Only one example of argument from sign was noticed. Although the address was generally very dignified and serious, humor crept in occasionally and in talking about his opposition Stevenson observed this sign of future trouble: "Nor am I afraid that the two-party system is in danger. Certainly the Republican Party looked brutally alive a couple of weeks ago, and I mean both Republican parties."¹⁵⁴

Assumption. The speech was full of assumptions by Stevenson. It was geared to inspire confidence and desire to win in the delegates, and so the speaker introduced numerous probabilities that could be attained only by hard work and sincere effort, assuming that this eventuality was certainly forthcoming. In the introduction Stevenson had this to say: "And now, my friends, that you have made your decision, I will fight to win that office with all my heart and soul. And, with your help, I have no doubt that we will win."¹⁵⁵ And later, "I am confident, too that your selection of a candidate for Vice-President will strengthen me and our party immeasurably in the hard, the implacable work that lies ahead for all of us."¹⁵⁶ The theme of the speech was a confidence in the future of America, but this confidence must consider the dangers that faced the nation. "The ordeal of the twentieth century--the bloodiest, most turbulent era of the Christian age--is far from over. Sacrifice, patience, understanding and implacable purpose may be our lot for years to come."¹⁵⁷ Referring to the opposition party, Stevenson predicted their strategy as follows:

¹⁵⁴Ibid., p. 9.

¹⁵⁶Ibid., p. 8.

¹⁵⁵Ibid., p. 7.

¹⁵⁷Ibid., p. 10.

Our troubles are all ahead of us. Some will call us appeasers; others will say we are the war party. Some will say we are reactionary. Others will say that we stand for socialism. There will be the inevitable cries of 'throw the rascals out'; 'it's time for a change'; and so on and so on.¹⁵⁸

He summed up the attacks his Party would face with these words: "We'll hear all those things and many more besides. But we will hear nothing that we have not heard before."¹⁵⁹

In the concluding portion of the address, Stevenson made the following assumption: "That, I think, is our ancient mission. Where we have deserted it we have failed. With your help there will be no desertion now."¹⁶⁰ And later in the same paragraph, "and we will justify our glorious past and the loyalty of silent millions who look to us for compassion, for understanding and for honest purpose."¹⁶¹ It might be stated that the theme of the entire speech was predicated on the assumption that the Democratic Party would elect their candidate for President.

Logos---artistic proof.

Inductive reasoning---argument from generalization. This type of reasoning was rarely used in the speech. In commenting upon the Democratic Party, the following statement was made:

And the Democratic Party is the people's party, not the labor party, not the farmer's party, not the employers' party--- it is the party of no one because it is the party of everyone.¹⁶²

Inductive reasoning---argument from causation. Stevenson advanced two reasons for not actively seeking the nomination for President, both illustrating argument from causation.

I have not sought the honor you have done me. I could not seek it because I aspired to another office, which was the full measure of my ambition. One does not treat the highest office within the gift of the

¹⁵⁸Ibid., p. 8.

¹⁶⁰Ibid., p. 10.

¹⁶²Ibid.

¹⁵⁹Ibid., p. 9.

¹⁶¹Ibid.

people of Illinois as an alternative or as a consolation prize.¹⁶³

I would not seek your nomination for the Presidency because the burdens of that office stagger the imagination. Its potential for good or evil now and in the years of our lives smothers exultation and converts vanity to prayer.¹⁶⁴

Earlier in the week the Convention had been torn by bitter strife over civil-rights issues, but this had been ironed out before balloting began for candidates. Stevenson acknowledged this dissention with the following words: "you have argued and disagreed, because as Democrats you care and you care deeply."¹⁶⁵

Inductive reasoning--argument from analogy. There was no example of analogy in this speech.

Deductive reasoning--argument from syllogism and enthymeme. No example of deductive reasoning was found in the "Speech of Acceptance."
Ethos.

Sincerity. Stevenson impressed his audience with his humility and obvious sincerity. The second sentence of the address was as follows: "I should have preferred to hear those words uttered by a stronger, a wiser, a better man than myself."¹⁶⁶ Later, in justifying his reluctance to seek the nomination, he said: "That my heart has been troubled, that I have not sought this nomination, that I could not seek it in honest self-appraisal, is not to say that I value it the less."¹⁶⁷ Other comments of a similar nature portrayed the speaker as a very sincere man, perhaps awed by the position in which he has been placed. "None of you, my friends, can wholly appreciate what is in my heart. I can only hope that you may understand my

¹⁶⁴Ibid.

¹⁶⁶Ibid., p. 7.

¹⁶⁵Ibid., p. 8.

¹⁶⁷Ibid.

my words."¹⁶⁸ He was sincere when he said, "You have summoned me to the highest mission within the gift of any people. I could not be more proud."¹⁶⁹ Stevenson wanted to express his sincere thanks to the delegates who had made the Convention a success. "Let me say, too, that I have been heartened by the conduct of this Convention."¹⁷⁰ His concluding statement was this: "And finally, my friends, in the staggering task you have assigned me, I shall always try to do justly and to love mercy and to walk humbly with my God."¹⁷¹

Earnestness. Stevenson presented himself as a man in earnest, struggling hard to accomplish the tremendous task ahead. Early in the address he spoke as follows: "I have asked the Merciful Father--the Father of us all---to let this cup pass from me. But from such dread responsibility one does not shrink in fear, in self-interest, or in false modesty."¹⁷² He urged his party followers to wage an elevated campaign, entreating them thus:

I hope and pray that we Democrats, win or lose, can campaign not as a crusade to exterminate the opposing party. . . but as a great opportunity to educate and elevate a people whose destiny is leadership.¹⁷³

Stevenson was determined to have the Democratic Party advance with the time, and not be content to rest on its laurels. Much remained to be done.

They are, my friends, walls that must be directly stormed by the hosts of courage, of morality and of vision, standing shoulder to shoulder, unafraid of ugly truth, contemptuous of lies, half truths, circuses and demagoguery.¹⁷⁴

¹⁶⁸Ibid.

¹⁷⁰Ibid., p. 8.

¹⁷²Ibid., p. 7.

¹⁷⁴Ibid., p. 10.

¹⁶⁹Ibid.

¹⁷¹Ibid., p. 10

¹⁷³Ibid., p. 9.

Devotion. Stevenson left little doubt in anyone's mind about his determination to wage a successful campaign. "And now, my friends, that you have made your decision, I will fight to win that office with all my heart and soul."¹⁷⁵ In conclusion he expressed himself simply: "I will give to you all I have. . ."¹⁷⁶

Patience. Stevenson maintained that patience is a necessary attribute of any successful politician, or businessman. He warned the Convention in this manner: "But I feel no exultation, no sense of triumph. Our troubles are all ahead of us."¹⁷⁷ He elaborated on this theme later.

The ordeal of the twentieth century--the bloodiest, most turbulent era of the Christian age--is far from over. Sacrifice, patience, understanding and implacable purpose may be our lot for years to come. Let's face it.¹⁷⁸

Friendliness. The tone of the speech was dignified, yet of a friendly nature. He spoke to the delegates as though they were all members of one big happy family. He expressed thanks to his many friends with these words: "I know you join me in gratitude and respect for the great Democrats and the leaders of our generation whose names you have considered here."¹⁷⁹

Sympathy. Stevenson showed more consideration for the opposition party than might have been expected. He was sympathetic towards several of their contentions.

You will hear many sincere and thoughtful people express concern about the continuation of one party in power for twenty years. I don't belittle this attitude. But change for the sake of change has no absolute merit in itself.¹⁸⁰

¹⁷⁵Ibid., p. 7.

¹⁷⁷Ibid., p. 8.

¹⁷⁹Ibid., p. 8.

¹⁷⁶Ibid., p. 10.

¹⁷⁸Ibid., p. 10.

¹⁸⁰Ibid., p. 9.

Knowledge of subject. Stevenson illustrated his ability to comprehend the situation by speaking effectively on all the important issues facing the Democrats. He showed a wide knowledge of the political scene, and made his listeners feel they were hearing a man of deep understanding and intelligence.

Pathos.

Love and Friendship. Stevenson expressed his gratitude to those who had helped him win the nomination.

So I am profoundly grateful and emboldened by their comradeship and their fealty, and I have been deeply moved by their expressions of good will and support. And I cannot, my friends, resist the urge to take the one opportunity that has been afforded me to pay my humble respects to a very great and good American, whom I am proud to call my kinsman, Alben Barkley of Kentucky.¹⁸¹

Confidence. Stevenson exuded confidence throughout the address, not questioning the outcome of the election, but being more concerned with how the victory was to be won. He stated near the beginning of his talk, "And now, my friends, that you have made your decision, I will fight to win that office with all my heart and soul. And, with your help, I have no doubt that we will win."¹⁸² And further, "Let me say, too, that I have been heartened by the conduct of this Convention."¹⁸³ Discussing the coming campaign, he said "With your help there will be no desertion now."¹⁸⁴ The entire talk was symbolic of the confidence apparent in the closing days of the Convention.

Emulation. While Stevenson was careful not to rely too heavily on any but his personal opinions and ideas, he did praise the Democratic Party leaders of the past few years, and inferred a desire to copy their traits.

¹⁸¹Ibid., p. 8.

¹⁸³Ibid., p. 9.

¹⁸²Ibid., p. 7.

¹⁸⁴Ibid., p. 10.

I know you join me in gratitude and respect for the great Democrats and the leaders of our generation whose names you have considered here in this Convention, whose vigor, whose character, whose devotion to the Republic we love so well have won the respect of countless Americans and have enriched our party. I shall need them. . .¹⁸⁵

Contempt. Only once did a note of contempt creep into the speech. Stevenson was discussing the accusations that would be hurled his way in the coming months. "We'll hear all those things and many more besides. But we will hear nothing that we have not heard before. I am not too much concerned with partisan demunciation. . ."¹⁸⁶

No particular examples of the other types of emotional proof were discovered.

ARRANGEMENT

The speech was a model of perfect arrangement. The introduction was composed of several short paragraphs in which Stevenson accepted the nomination and explained why he had not been eager to seek such an honor. The body of the speech dealt with the coming campaign and what the Party would have to do in order to win. The accomplishments of the Party were enumerated and the hopes for the future were carefully expounded. A simple, concrete and logical plan for the campaign was put forth, without leaving aside any of the more controversial issues. The conclusion was brief, but powerful, calling on the listeners to accept the challenge with the speaker, and expressing confidence in ultimate victory.

STYLE

Level.

The style level was between middle and high. The speech was heard

¹⁸⁵Ibid., p. 8

¹⁸⁶Ibid.

by Convention delegates and radio listeners across the nation, so it was not as sublime as perhaps Stevenson would have liked had he been speaking to a more select audience. However, the flowery speech and oratorical phrasing typical of Stevenson was present sufficiently to classify parts of the address as high level. The tone throughout was dignified and serious.

Diction and word choice.

Stevenson showed variety in word usage, ranging from the simplest at times to very erudite terminology at other times. Some of his most potent phrases were very simply worded, simplicity and sincerity combining for good effect. Other paragraphs involved detailed word usage and complex arrangement. No foreign words or words not commonly known were found.

Sentence Structure.

The sentences also showed great variety. Many simple sentences were found. The opening sentence read: "I accept your nomination and your program."¹⁸⁷ However, many sentences were lengthy and complex, or compound-complex. This is a typical example of such sentence structure:

When the tumult and the shouting die, when the bands are gone and the lights are dimmed, there is the stark reality of responsibility in an hour of history haunted with those gaunt, grim specters of strife, dissention and materialism at home, and ruthless, inscrutable and hostile power abroad.¹⁸⁸

It was impossible to state that any one type of sentence structure predominated in the speech.

Rhetorical Devices and Figurative Language.

Epigram. Stevenson uttered one phrase that in the following months became an epigram: "The Democratic Party is the party of no one because it is the party of everyone."¹⁸⁹

¹⁸⁷Ibid., p. 7.

¹⁸⁸Ibid., p. 9.

¹⁸⁹Ibid., p. 10.

Humor. This was primarily a very dignified and serious address, but humor was introduced at least twice. After explaining that he felt inadequately prepared to handle the immense burdens placed upon him, Stevenson added this: "But after listening to the President's speech, I feel better about myself."¹⁹⁰ Later in reference to the opposition party, this was said: "Certainly the Republican Party looked brutally alive a couple of weeks ago, and I mean both Republican Parties."¹⁹¹

Rhetorical Question. Only at one place in the speech did this device appear. Answering the charges that corruption in government and length in office were issues that would hurt his Party, Stevenson replied in this manner: "Is it the part of wisdom to change for the sake of change to a party with a split personality?"¹⁹² and "Do you believe with Charles Evan Hughes that guilt is personal and knows no party?"¹⁹³

Irony and satire. When speaking about the charges that the Democrats had intentionally been trying to minimize the ability of the free enterprise system to function in America, he said this: "They all know that the greatest danger to free enterprise in this country died with the great depression under the hammer blows of the Democratic Party."¹⁹⁴

Contrast. The following example of this device was noted: "I hope and pray that we Democrats, win or lose, can campaign not as a crusade to exterminate the opposing party, as our opponents seem to prefer. . ."¹⁹⁵

Climax. The following paragraph represented the climax of the speech. Stevenson had skillfully laid the groundwork for these words:

¹⁹⁰ Ibid., p. 7.

¹⁹² Ibid.

¹⁹⁴ Ibid., p. 8.

¹⁹¹ Ibid., p. 9

¹⁹³ Ibid.

¹⁹⁵ Ibid., p. 9.

With your help there will be no desertion now. Better we lose the election than mis-lead the people; and better we lose than misgovern the people. Help me to do the job in this autumn of conflict and of campaign; help me to do the job in these years of darkness, doubt and crisis which stretch beyond the horizon of tonight's happy vision, and we will justify our glorious past and the loyalty of silent millions who look to us for compassion, for understanding and for honest purpose.¹⁹⁶

Onomatopoeia. Much of what was said might approach this rhetorical device, although not in the strict sense of the definition. A typical example would be the phrase "when no one rattles a saber and no one drags a chain."¹⁹⁷

Anaphora and epistrophe. Several times the use of anaphora was noticed. Attacking the opposition, he said: "Some will call us appeasers; others will say we are the war party. Some will call us reactionary. Others will say that we stand for socialism."¹⁹⁸ And at another time, "That my heart has been troubled, that I have not sought this nomination, that I could not seek it in honest self-appraisal. . ."¹⁹⁹

Allusion and reference. Stevenson referred to his good friend and prominent Convention personality Alben Barkley with these words of praise:

And I cannot, my friends, resist the urge to take the one opportunity that has been afforded me to pay my humble respects to a very great and good American, whom I am proud to call my kinsman, Alben Barkley of Kentucky.²⁰⁰

He made reference near the conclusion of his address to the most important personality of all, President Truman.

. . .even as he who came here tonight and honored me, as he has honored you--the Democratic Party--by a lifetime of service and bravery that will find him an imperishable page in the history of the Republic and of the Democratic Party--President Harry S. Truman.²⁰¹

¹⁹⁶Ibid., p. 10.

¹⁹⁷Ibid., p. 8.

¹⁹⁸Ibid.

¹⁹⁹Ibid., p. 7.

²⁰⁰Ibid., p. 8.

²⁰¹Ibid., p. 10.

Another type of reference noted was that of referring to Biblical passages, as was done when Stevenson explained his unwillingness to seek the post of Presidential nominee: "If this cup may not pass from me, except I drink it, Thy will be done."²⁰² The last sentence of the address again referred to a Biblical passage: "To do justly and to love mercy and to walk humbly with my God."²⁰³

Understatement. Another explanation of his unwillingness to engage in attempts to lure votes was this understatement: "One does not treat the highest office within the gift of the people of Illinois as an alternative or as a consolation prize."²⁰⁴ Later this statement was noticed: "For it is a citadel guarded by thick walls of ignorance and of mistrust which do not fall before the trumpets' blast or the politicians' imprecations or even a general's baton."²⁰⁵

Metaphor. The only metaphor noted in the address involved a comparison between the concept of a wondrous democracy and a closely guarded building difficult to gain admittance into. ". . .the victory to be won in the twentieth century. . . is a citadel guarded by thick walls of ignorance and mistrust."²⁰⁶

Personification. Two examples were noticed illustrating this device of speech-making. Speaking of the historical achievements of his Party, Stevenson said this: "The greatest danger to free enterprise in this country died with the great depression under the hammer blows of the Democratic Party."²⁰⁷ Referring later to the opposition party, he animated his opponents in this manner: "Certainly the Republican Party looked brutally

²⁰²Ibid., p. 7.

²⁰⁴Ibid., p. 7.

²⁰⁶Ibid.

²⁰³Ibid., p. 9.

²⁰⁵Ibid., p. 10.

²⁰⁷Ibid., p. 8.

alive a couple of weeks ago, and I mean both Republican Parties."²⁰⁸

Alliteration. All of the uses of this device appeared of minor importance, and mostly accidental, except perhaps this excerpt:

. . .when the bands are gone and the lights are dimmed, there is the stark reality of responsibility in an hour of history haunted with those gaunt, grim sectors of strife, dissention and materialism at home, and ruthless, inscrutable and hostile power abroad.²⁰⁹

II. FARM POLICY

INVENTION

Logos--non-artistic proof.

Evidence. Stevenson employed a large amount of evidence in the farm policy speech. The speech opened with background information establishing Stevenson's position as a farmer. "I own farm land in Illinois, and I come from a family that has lived in the heart of the Corn Belt for over a hundred years."²¹⁰ He later gave this evidence of accomplishments during his term as Governor of Illinois:

I have relied on farmer's advice in other fields too--notably school and highway legislation. We now have under way in Illinois the largest highway program since advent of the hard road. For the first time a share of our gasoline tax is going to the townships for the rural roads.²¹¹

Defending the Democratic Party stand on acreage controls, Stevenson said this: "Incidentally, there could be no tobacco program at all right now without marketing quotas--as every tobacco farmer knows."²¹² Explaining the significant progress made in rural electrification, this evidence was cited: "You know about this in Minnesota, where the number of electrified farms has

²⁰⁸Ibid.

²¹⁰Ibid., p. 64.

²¹²Ibid., p. 68.

²⁰⁹Ibid.

²¹¹Ibid., p. 65.

risen from 7 per cent in 1935 to 90 per cent today."²¹³ Stevenson was concerned about the problem of absentee-owners of farms. He mentioned the following facts to justify his concern:

Farm ownership and the family farm are the foundation on which our whole agricultural system is built. From 1880 to 1932 we lost ground on farm ownership. In these years--years, incidentally, when Republicans were mostly in power and hadn't yet invented that slogan "it's time for a change"--the proportion of farm owners declined, until by 1932, 43 per cent of all farmers--two out of every five-- were either tenants or sharecroppers. That trend has now been reversed; three-fourths of our farmers now own their farms.²¹⁴

He recognized the great strides towards mechanization taken by American agriculture in recent years, summing up with these comments:

We are feeding thirty million more people than there were in our land in 1932; and we are giving the average American a far better diet. More than that, this better diet costs the average person no greater share of his income, after taxes, than it did in 1932--if he was lucky enough to have any income, after or before taxes, in that gloomy year.²¹⁵

Authority. Stevenson used only three appeals to authority in this speech. The first occurred when he discussed the philosophy of agriculture and referred to Thomas Jefferson. "We can all stand on the words of the first philosopher of American agriculture, Thomas Jefferson: 'Equal rights for all; special privileges for none!'"²¹⁶ Quoting another famous American, Stevenson stressed another reason for keeping our agricultural society healthy:

We believe, as Democrats have always believed, that our society rests on an agricultural base. . . . Our farms must grow more than crops and livestock. They must grow what Walt Whitman described as the best bar against tyranny--"a large, resolute breed of men."²¹⁷

He mentioned the vice-presidential candidate as a friend of the rural people and a man who knew their problems and sympathized with them.

²¹³Ibid., p. 69.

²¹⁴Ibid., p. 70.

²¹⁵Ibid., p. 67.

²¹⁶Ibid., p. 65.

²¹⁷Ibid.

That kind of American is a good risk. And no one knows it better than my running mate, Senator John Sparkman, who has led the battle for them, and who was himself one of eleven children of an impoverished tenant farmer.²¹⁸

Sign. Very little evidence was found concerning this type of reasoning. Only once did Stevenson resort to argument from sign.

What is more serious, many farmers cannot, with their existing land and equipment, make a decent living from the soil. In 1950, more than one million farmers had net incomes from all sources including outside employment of less than \$1,000.²¹⁹

Assumption. Stevenson used argument from assumption to point out that the use of acreage controls might not be needed within a few years.

Well, I do not like acreage allotments and marketing quotas myself. I hope--we all have good reason to hope--that a growing population and expanding markets will keep us from again needing controls for staple crops.²²⁰

A desire on the part of the speaker to have a hand in the future farm policies was apparent in the following assumption:

I hope to have a personal part in the continuation and extension of the policies which in the last twenty years have given farm life new strength and new dignity--and so restored it to its old place of honor in the Republic.²²¹

Stressing the importance of de-centralizing the administration of agriculture and conservation services, Stevenson looked into the future and made the following observations:

I like to think of soil conservation as democracy at work with technical assistance. I think we can go further toward making local administration compact and efficient, and getting dollar-for-dollar value for the money we spend.²²²

The predicted increase in population in the coming years was the basis for the following statement: "Today we seek even greater abundance as we look ahead to a thirty or forty million increase in our population in the next

²¹⁸Ibid., p. 70

²¹⁹Ibid.

²²⁰Ibid., p. 68

²²¹Ibid.

²²²Ibid., p. 69.

twenty-five years."²²³ The closing sentence of the address was based on an assumption.

If I didn't feel that the party which saw our needs and charted our course in the past is the best custodian of our future I would not be the Democratic candidate for President, and I would not be here on this great day in Kasson asking not for your thanks, but for your confidence.²²⁴

Numerous other instances were detected where the basis of statements might have been considered assumptions, but the reasoning used was not primarily argument from assumption.

Logos--artistic proof.

Inductive reasoning--argument from generalization. Again in this speech very little use of this type of argument was noticed. The following example was the only one found in the speech:

Rural electrification is one of our finest national achievements in this generation. It is more than a government program. It is a blessing.

It means electric lights for farm families who have had to live by coal-oil lamps. It means electric power for the farm wife in place of the back-breaking labor of the old-fashioned washtub and the hand pump. It means electric power to grind the farmer's feed, heat his brooder house, and help him with a hundred other chores.²²⁵

Inductive reasoning--argument from causation. Stevenson reasoned that an increase in farm income was essential before any solution to the farm problem could be realized.

This means that farm policy must focus first on the question of farm income. This is not because farmers are more concerned with money than any other group of society. It is because farmers, like all other citizens, are entitled to a fair return for their labor and a fair chance in the world for their children.²²⁶

An important argument against price supports was that they tend to keep the retail food prices too high. Using causal relations, Stevenson said this:

²²³Ibid., p. 68.

²²⁵Ibid., p. 69.

²²⁴Ibid., p. 71.

²²⁶Ibid., p. 65.

I know that opponents of the program claim that price supports raise food prices for housewives. Let us examine this charge a moment. Food prices are high enough today, heaven knows. But supports are not the reason. High employment and strong purchasing power--in short-- prosperity--are keeping most farm prices above support levels.²²⁷

Elaborating further on the same point, he stated:

What the support program does do is to encourage farmers to grow more food. You can now plant crops fairly secure in the knowledge that prices will still be good at market time. That is one reason why farm production has increased almost 50 per cent in the last twenty years. The support program thus helps to keep supply up with demand-- and that is the way to keep prices from going up.²²⁸

Inductive reasoning--argument from analogy. No example of this type of argument was discovered in the speech.

Deductive reasoning--argument from syllogism and enthymeme. In outlining the Democratic Party stand toward the farm issue, Stevenson included the following statement: "It has been the constant objective of our Democratic farm programs to maintain farm income--and thereby to assure the farmer that he can provide food, medical care and education for his family."²²⁹ The following statement is another illustration of reasoning by enthymeme: "A society can be no better than the men and women who compose it. The heart of any farm policy must therefore be the life of those who work the farms."²³⁰ Stevenson discussed farm co-operatives and wanted to express his admiration of their work. He did this by use of the following enthymeme:

The chief agency in this miraculous transformation in country living has been the farmer-owned co-operative. I've been a member of one for years and the co-operative seems to me a wonderful example of people solving their own local problems in their own way.²³¹

Only once in the speech did Stevenson approach syllogistic reasoning in the true rhetorical form. In his conclusion, the most decisive paragraph was

²²⁷Ibid., p. 67.

²²⁸Ibid.

²²⁹Ibid., p. 65.

²³⁰Ibid.

²³¹Ibid., p. 69.

this one:

The last twenty years have established a framework of justice and equity within which the farmer can do his indispensable part for the greater strength and safety of our nation. Only in an atmosphere of growth and confidence can the farmer make his necessary contribution to the worldwide fight for freedom.²³²

Ethos.

Sincerity. Stevenson was accepted by most of his audience as a very sincere man. The fact that he lived on a farm and spent most of his free time in rural areas gave credence to the sincerity with which he spoke on farm issues. Bringing the farm problem into proper perspective, he said this: "I know that the American farmers do not want, nor will they get through any effort of mine, anything more than what is justified by the larger good of the commonwealth."²³³ The body of the speech, taken as a whole, was a good example of sincere appeal. In the conclusion, Stevenson expressed himself with these words:

If I didn't feel that the party which saw our needs and charted our course in the past is the best custodian of our future I would not be the Democratic candidate for President, and I would not be here on this great day in Kasson asking not for your thanks, but for your confidence.²³⁴

Earnestness. That the speaker was a man in earnest could hardly be doubted. He explained his position in this way:

I come to you today as the Democratic candidate for the greatest responsibility on earth--the Presidency of the United States. I am running on the Democratic platform. I believe it is a good platform. . . I can stand on it without squirming.²³⁵

Stevenson tried hard to get the Democratic stand on farm issues across to the audience. Of many examples of earnestness on the part of the speaker,

²³²Ibid., p. 71.

²³³Ibid., p. 65.

²³⁴Ibid., p. 71.

²³⁵Ibid., p. 65.

perhaps this selection was typical: "There are no ifs, buts or maybes about this. And I think it is a policy that most farmers today understand and believe in. I only wish that everybody understood it so well."²³⁶

Devotion. Stevenson explained at length the Democratic platform planks concerned with agriculture, and then felt a need to associate himself with the platform stands. "I am for this platform, above all, because I believe that its pledges are not just in the interest of the farmer--they are in the public interest."²³⁷ A further explanation of his Party's stand and his agreement with that stand was stated thusly:

The heart of any farm policy must therefore be the life of those who work the farms. Our objective is to make that life full and satisfying. We believe, as Democrats have always believed, that our society rests on an agricultural base. It is our determination to keep that base solid and healthy.²³⁸

He indicated that at every opportunity afforded him, no deviation from his philosophy towards agriculture was entertained. "I've sold some farms and I've seen to it that they were sold to operators, not landlords, where possible."²³⁹

Patience. Many examples of this type of proof were noted. In promoting his remedies for the farm crisis, Stevenson was quick to note that none of them would work overnight. In conclusion of his explanation concerning 90 per cent parity, he cautioned his audience with these words: "I am not presuming for a moment to say that support at 90 per cent of parity is necessarily the permanent or only answer."²⁴⁰ Concerning the problem of maintaining adequate support prices for perishable commodities, Stevenson again urged patience:

²³⁶Ibid., p. 66.

²³⁸Ibid.

²⁴⁰Ibid., p. 67.

²³⁷Ibid., p. 65.

²³⁹Ibid., p. 70.

I do not underestimate the difficulty of finding a satisfactory method of doing this. And I can only hope that with continued careful study and close consultation with farmers and their leaders ways will be found to do something both practical and effective.²⁴¹

The dilemma over acreage restrictions warranted further urging to think in terms of what the future might bring.

Well, I do not like acreage allotments and marketing quotas myself. I hope--we all have good reason to hope--that a growing population and expanding markets will keep us from again needing controls for staple crops.²⁴²

In the area of flood control and water and soil conservation, Stevenson praised the work thus far accomplished, but warned that much remained to be done, and the work ahead would of necessity take many years to complete. "We still have far to go in upstream flood prevention and water and forest conservation. And I wish I could say that every farmer was using the best conservation methods to protect his farm."²⁴³ Much the same approach was noted regarding rural electrification.

The great task of bringing electricity to the farm is now far along to completion. It must be finished, and generation and transmission facilities must be adequate to meet the constantly growing demand for power on the farm, at prices the farmer can afford to pay.²⁴⁴

Stevenson touched also on the rural telephone program, supporting the movement as a necessary part of the modernization of American farms, and urging a hastened program to provide telephone service to more farm families. "We must also look forward to the time when every farm home may be in touch with its neighbors, the doctor and the world through rural telephone service."²⁴⁵

²⁴¹Ibid., p. 68.

²⁴³Ibid., p. 69.

²⁴⁵Ibid.

²⁴²Ibid.

²⁴⁴Ibid.

Sympathy. Stevenson expressed concern and sympathy with the farmers, justifying their complaints as fully warranted by the circumstances.

It is because farmers, like all other citizens, are entitled to a fair return for their labor and a fair chance in the world for their children. In the past, the labor of the farmer has remained the same; but his income has risen or sunk according to the unpredictable fluctuations of the market. It has been a constant objective of our Democratic farm programs to maintain farm income--and thereby to assure the farmer that he can provide food, medical care and education for his family.²⁴⁶

He further explained the Democratic platform as a program in sympathy with farmers needs.

What our program does is to place a floor under our agricultural economy in order to protect the farmer against sudden and violent price drops. What it does is to maintain farm income--and the farmer's purchasing power--in those uneasy moments when there is a temporary glut in the market, or when real depression threatens.²⁴⁷

The over-all problem that was called the farm problem included numerous smaller complaints and situations, many not related to the basic questions of price supports or acreage controls. Stevenson recognized this, and expressed his concern several times. "Our first line of defense for the producers of perishables is, of course, a strong economic policy that will insure, so far as it is humanly possible to do so, high employment and purchasing power."²⁴⁸ He mentioned his sympathy towards co-operative farm associations, and praised their work.

I've been a member of one for years and the co-operative seems to me a wonderful example of people solving their own local problems in their own way. Its effectiveness must not be crippled by hostile legislation.²⁴⁹

The problem of absentee farm ownership bothered the speaker, as evidenced by these words: "There is one final part of our farm program which especially

²⁴⁶Ibid., p. 65.

²⁴⁷Ibid., p. 66.

²⁴⁸Ibid., p. 67.

²⁴⁹Ibid., p. 69.

concerns me. . . Farm ownership and the family farm are the foundation on which our whole agricultural system is built."²⁵⁰ Speaking in more general terms, Stevenson showed concern over the future of the small farmer of all kinds, who faced economic strangulation at the hands of large operators." . . . but there must be ways to help the industrious small farmer who wants to help himself. That kind of American is a good risk."²⁵¹ At many times during the address did Stevenson express sympathy with the aims of the farm population, but perhaps this sentence best expressed his feelings:

I hope to have a personal part in the continuation and extension of the policies which in the last twenty years have given farm life new strength and new dignity--and so restored it to its old place of honor in the Republic.²⁵²

Knowledge of subject. To displace any ideas in the minds of the audience that he wasn't acquainted with the agricultural problems facing the nation, Stevenson briefly recounted his experiences pertaining to this area.

My first venture into public service was in Washington in the Agricultural Adjustment Administration. That was in the desolate days of 1933. . . I am thankful for my AAA experience, because it showed me in a way I will never forget how bad conditions can get on our farms--conditions that must never occur again.²⁵³

And more recently, while Governor of Illinois, he had reason to benefit from contact with agricultural problems.

For the last three and a half years I have been Governor of a great agricultural state. In this capacity I have worked closely with farmers and farm organizations. With their help and co-operation we have re-organized our Illinois Department of Agriculture.²⁵⁴

He spoke as an authority on acreage controls and their effectiveness, referring to his experience in the 1930's.

²⁵⁰Ibid., p. 70.

²⁵²Ibid., p. 68.

²⁵⁴Ibid.

²⁵¹Ibid.

²⁵³Ibid., p. 64.

I learned how useful they could be in the hard school of the triple-A. Incidentally, there could be no tobacco program at all right now without marketing quotas--as every farmer knows.²⁵⁵

Pathos.

Fear. The speech dealt with a subject that had been seeking solutions for some time and no one had come up with a satisfactory answer. The farm crisis was expected to continue, because not even the most exuberant politicians were endorsing programs other than short-run stop-gap measures, and in this atmosphere one who was concerned could hardly help feeling a certain fear for what the future might bring.

I do not underestimate the difficulty of finding a satisfactory method of doing this. And I can only hope that with continued careful study and close consultation with farmers and their leaders ways will be found to do something both practical and effective.²⁵⁶

The Democratic candidate seemed to hold an honest fear that the Republicans, if elected, would only provoke the situation from bad to worse.

If the Republican candidate says one thing, and the Republican platform says something else, and the Republican members of Congress say still another--how then can anyone tell what a Republican administration would actually do in Washington?²⁵⁷

Confidence. Stevenson, however, was far from despondent over the affairs of farmers. He had been a reluctant candidate, but was not reluctant any longer.

I am running on the Democratic platform. I believe it is a good platform. I believe its agricultural plank is clear, definite and sound. I can stand on it without squirming. I feel no need to modify this provision or that, to explain or to reinterpret, to dodge or to hedge.²⁵⁸

After reviewing the entire field of farm problems, he spoke with confidence of finally reaching an adequate and satisfying solution.

²⁵⁵ Ibid., p. 68.

²⁵⁷ Ibid., p. 66.

²⁵⁶ Ibid., p. 69.

²⁵⁸ Ibid., p. 65.

If I didn't feel that the party which saw our needs and charted our course in the past is the best custodian of our future I would not be the Democratic candidate for President, and I would not be here on this day in Kasson asking not for your thanks, but for your confidence.²⁵⁹

Shame. Stevenson was quick to admit that the present plight of many rural people did not warrant admiration. He gave the following facts to illustrate the shameful position of many farmers:

What is more serious, many farmers cannot, with their existing land and equipment, make a decent living from the soil. In 1950, more than one million farmers had net incomes from all sources including outside employment of less than \$1,000. How can a farmer rear, clothe, and educate a family on that?²⁶⁰

He brought home to the audience his personal experience with rural poverty and emphasized that it must never occur again.

I do not want to suggest to anyone that we Democrats are still running against Herbert Hoover, but I am thankful for my AAA experience, because it showed me in a way I will never forget how bad conditions can get on our farms---conditions that must never happen again.²⁶¹

Indignation. Stevenson showed some indignation towards the statements his opponent had been making. Speaking rather sarcastically of the Republican convention and the sentence in the Republican platform that "aims" at proper parity levels, he had this to say: "There is, and no one should know it better than my distinguished opponent, a vast difference between aiming at a target and hitting it."²⁶² Another comment upon the Republican platform concerned production controls, and illustrated indignation towards the authors of the platform.

The Republican leadership would now dispense entirely with production controls. "We do not believe in restrictions on the American farmer's ability to produce.", their platform states in one of its rare bursts of clarity. Well, I do not like acreage allotments and marketing quotas myself.²⁶³

²⁵⁹Ibid., p. 71.

²⁶¹Ibid., p. 64.

²⁶³Ibid., p. 68.

²⁶⁰Ibid., p. 70.

²⁶²Ibid., p. 66

Emulation. Stevenson several times praised the efforts of those who have done significant deeds relating to the farmers problems. Speaking about soil conservation, he praised the Minnesota farmers for their progressive work. "With the kind of local leadership you have in the Conservation Service and Districts we see here today, we will get the job done everywhere in time, and I would say very soon in Minnesota."²⁶⁴ He likewise had words of praise for farm co-operatives, and spoke of them as follows:

The chief agency in this miraculous transformation in country living has been the farmer-owned co-operative. I've been a member of one for years and the co-operative seems to me a wonderful example of people solving their own problems in their own way.²⁶⁵

ARRANGEMENT

The address was divided into the usual three parts, with a short introduction and conclusion encompassing the body of the speech. In the introduction Stevenson presented himself as an interested farmer and related his experience with farm problems. He outlined the problem briefly and stressed the importance of this issue. The body of the talk included a summation of the specific problems and how the Democratic platform dealt with each, and a projected view of the future for agriculture in America. He also covered the progress made in the past generation in various areas of farm improvement. The conclusion was an appeal to have confidence in the future and look to the past in order to gain that confidence, implying that the Democratic Party had been the chief promulgator of the rural people's problems.

²⁶⁴Ibid., p. 69.

²⁶⁵Ibid.

STYLELevel.

The style level was middle, with little variation. Some paragraphs reverted to a very common-place, conversational approach and could be called low style, but these were in the minority. Speaking to a rural audience, Stevenson undoubtedly attempted to minimize the use of flowery language and attack the problem from a simple, practical viewpoint. At no time was the thought difficult to follow, and the type of reporting used in much of the speech was quite clearly comprehended.

Diction and word choice.

The language was concrete, the adjectives and adverbs fewer than usual in a Stevenson speech, and the words quite understandable throughout. No use of foreign words was noted, although many poly-syllabic words were discovered.

Sentence structure.

The sentences ranged all the way from simple to compound-complex. It was difficult to determine which predominated, but probably the complex sentence was most effective. Many of the most potent meanings were stated in very simple, short sentences. The following sentences would be an example of this:

I am running on the Democratic platform. I believe it is a good platform. I believe its agricultural plank is clear, definite and sound. I can stand on it, without squirming. I feel no need to modify this provision or that, to explain or to reinterpret, to dodge or to hedge.²⁶⁶

²⁶⁶Ibid., p. 65.

However, more often observed were paragraphs like this, illustrating the use of all types of sentences, with the complex sentence most noticeable:

There should be no mysteries about price supports. What our program does is to place a floor under our agricultural economy in order to protect the farmer against sudden and violent price drops. What it does is to maintain farm income--and the farmer's purchasing power-- in those uneasy moments when there is a temporary glut in the market, or when real depression threatens. By stabilizing farm income, our program maintains markets for the businessman and the worker. The total effect, obviously, is to help stabilize the whole national economy at a high level of production and employment.²⁶⁷

Rhetorical devices and figurative language.

Humor. Stevenson did not use his usual amount of humor in the "Farm Policy" speech, but this device did appear once. He was speaking about the Republican Party convention when he said:

One place it was not understood was at the great fracas in the Chicago stockyards, two months ago, where one of the casualties was the farm plank in the Republican platform. . .as you all know, the Chicago slaughter finally ended in a cease-fire agreement.²⁶⁸

Other evidence of humor was subtle and tied in with other rhetorical devices.

Interrogation. Only twice in the address did the speaker resort to interrogation. The first occasion concerned the opposition party.

If the Republican candidate says one thing, and the Republican platform says something else, and the Republican members of Congress say still another--how then can anyone tell what a Republican administration would actually do in Washington?²⁶⁹

Later regarding the unjustly low farm income, he had this to say: "How can a farmer rear, clothe and educate a family on that?"²⁷⁰

Irony and satire. Stevenson exhibited his biting wit only occasionally in the address. Sarcastically using the principal campaign slogan of the

²⁶⁷Ibid., p. 66.

²⁶⁸Ibid.

²⁶⁹Ibid.

²⁷⁰Ibid., p. 70.

opposition, he had this to say: "From 1880 to 1932 we lost ground on farm ownership. In these years--years, incidentally, when Republicans were mostly in power and hadn't yet invented that slogan 'it's time for a change

. . ."271 Continuing to heap ridicule upon the Republicans, he ironically pointed to the contrasts in their platform:

The Republican leadership would now dispense entirely with production controls. "We do not believe in restriction on the American farmer's ability to produce," their platform states in one of its rare bursts of clarity.²⁷²

Criticizing the choice of words in the platform plank dealing with agriculture, Stevenson satirically commented as follows:

According to that agreement--better known as the Republican platform--Republican policy is "aimed"--that is their word-- is "aimed" at parity levels. That phrase may have looked good in a smoke-filled room in Chicago. It isn't very clear here in the daylight of Minnesota. There is, and no one should know it better than my distinguished opponent, a vast difference between aiming at a target and hitting it.²⁷³

Contrast. Comparing the two political parties, Stevenson contrasted farm conditions under each party.

In this spirit, Democratic administrations have developed the farm policies of the last twenty years. As a result, we of this generation, who saw farm conditions at their worst in 1932, have had a happy privilege of seeing them over the last decade at their best.²⁷⁴

The goal of the farmer has also changed rapidly in the last generation.

The farm problem has changed much since the thirties. Once abundance created surpluses because people could not buy what the farmer could produce. Today we seek even greater abundance as we look ahead to a thirty or forty million increase in our population in the next twenty-five years.²⁷⁵

The conclusion contained a picture of the future years as contrasted with the present.

²⁷¹Ibid.

²⁷³Ibid., p. 66.

²⁷⁵Ibid., p. 68.

²⁷²Ibid., p. 68.

²⁷⁴Ibid., p. 64.

This nation faces a stern present and a challenging future. The American farmer has a great role to play in these next critical years of precarious balance in the world. Our national commitment to an expanding economy rests upon the continued growth of our agriculture. Our struggle to strengthen the free world against communism demands the continued and growing productivity of the American farm. A hungry man is not a free man. In the long run peace will be won in the turn-rows, not on the battlefields.²⁷⁶

When he spoke of rural electrification an opportunity arose for contrasting the old methods of home utilities with the present electrical systems.

It means electric lights for farm families who have had to live by coal-oil lamps. It means electric power for the farm wife in place of the back-breaking labor of the old-fashioned washtub and the hand-pump.²⁷⁷

Anaphora and epistrophe. This device was not detected except in one paragraph in the introduction. Stevenson used short, simple sentences to emphasize his position, beginning each sentence in the same manner.

I am running on the Democratic platform. I believe it is a good platform. I believe its agricultural plank is clear, definite and sound. I can stand on it without squirming.²⁷⁸

Allusion and reference. This device was utilized several times, most effectively when referring to other noted individuals. "We can all stand on the words of the first philosopher of American agriculture, Thomas Jefferson: "Equal rights for all; special privileges for none."²⁷⁹ The same approach was used in reference to another great American: "Our farms must grow more than crops and livestock. They must grow what Walt Whitman described as the best bar against tyranny--'a large, resolute breed of men'."²⁸⁰ The only reference to a contemporary individual was made about his running mate in the campaign.

²⁷⁶Ibid., p. 70.

²⁷⁷Ibid., p. 69.

²⁷⁸Ibid., p. 65.

²⁷⁹Ibid.

²⁸⁰Ibid.

And no one knows it better than my running mate, Senator John Sparkman, who has led the battle for them, and who was himself one of eleven children of an impoverished tenant farmer.²⁸¹

Understatement. Stevenson made some statements that were classic examples of this device. He spoke at length about the different problems facing the farmer today, and summed up his comments with the sentence, "The farm problem has changed much since the thirties."²⁸² When speaking about the rising food costs and declining prices received by the producers, he condemned those responsible for rising food costs. "Food prices are high enough today, heaven knows."²⁸³

Simile. Again only one example of this device was discovered in the "Farm Policy" address. When he spoke of soil conservation the following simile was used: "I like to think of soil conservation as democracy at work with technical assistance."²⁸⁴

Alliteration. This was not a major rhetorical device used in the speech; however the following examples were found: ". . . farm policy must focus first on the question of farm income."²⁸⁵; "Farm ownership and the family farm are the foundation. . ."²⁸⁶

III. WORLD POLICY

INVENTION

Logos--non-artistic proof.

Evidence. Stevenson did not use as much evidence in this speech as he had in other talks. The theme of the address dealt with America's

²⁸¹Ibid., p. 70.

²⁸³Ibid., p. 66.

²⁸⁵Ibid., p. 65.

²⁸²Ibid., p. 68.

²⁸⁴Ibid., p. 69.

²⁸⁶Ibid., p. 69.

future role in world affairs, and so was primarily concerned with projections of what lay ahead rather than evidence of the past. However, several times he did refer to facts which verified his point. Reviewing the past success of foreign aid, he said:

The Marshall Plan has brought, as we all know, a striking improvement in political and economic conditions. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization is building a strong system of military defense. Europe is not yet wholly secure against subversion from within or attack from without, but this goal of security is, at least, in sight.²⁸⁷

He referred to the crisis in Asia with these words:

Across the continent of Asia more than a billion of the world's peoples are churning in one of history's greatest upheavals. All the struggles of man over the centuries--economic, political, spiritual--have come together in Asia and now seem to be reaching a climax.²⁸⁸

The threat of communism should not be thought of as only a military threat, Stevenson pointed out. Communists had tried hard, but with little success, to incite revolts in non-communist nations. "The communists have failed to incite the workers to revolution in Western Europe. They have failed to turn the Western Allies one against the other."²⁸⁹ He also spoke about the present armed conflicts in Asia. "There is active fighting, as we all know, in Malaya and in Indo-China. . . .These efforts have involved heavy loss of life and great material costs."²⁹⁰

Authority. The only reference to authorities was found in the conclusion. Stevenson wished to emphasize the importance of looking far ahead in diplomatic affairs, and referred to two great men of vision.

Some may say to you that this is visionary stuff. To this I reply that history has shown again and again that the self-styled realists are the real visionaries--for their eyes are fixed on a past that cannot

²⁸⁷Ibid., p. 94.

²⁸⁸Ibid.

²⁸⁹Ibid., p. 95.

²⁹⁰Ibid., p. 96.

be recaptured. It was Woodrow Wilson, with his dream of the League of Nations, who was the truly practical man--not the Old Guard who fought him to the death. And in the fateful summer of 1940 it was the vision of a Churchill that saw beyond Dunkerque to victory.²⁹¹

Sign. This type of proof was found only twice in the address. Early in the speech, Stevenson spoke about the importance of desire and ambition in the building of a nation.

Victory or defeat for a nation, as for a man, springs, first of all, from its attitudes toward the world. The men who built the West had victory in their hearts and songs on their lips. They were doers, not worriers. They really believed that the Lord helps those who help themselves.²⁹²

He wanted to assure our foreign friends that the apparent divergence in opinion in America, especially during an election campaign, did not indicate a collapse of our bi-partisan foreign policies.

And here let me say something to those abroad who may mistake our present wrangling for weakness. We have always had differences of opinion which have produced all sorts of noises and confusion--especially in campaign years! But it is the kind of noise that, to the inner ear, is the sweet music of free institutions. It is the kind of noise that has produced the harmony of firm purpose whenever our people have been put to the test. The costliest blunders have been made by dictators who did not quite understand the workings of real democracy and who mistook diversity for disunity.²⁹³

Assumption. The latter portion of the "World Policy" speech contained numerous assumptions. Stevenson employed this type of proof when he discussed the communist attitudes:

But the communists may well believe that in the aspirations and the grievances of the East, they now have the key to world power. They hope, and perhaps even expect, that the West cannot rise to the challenge in the East.²⁹⁴

He further commented along the same lines:

Furthermore, they may not feel the same need for quick and tidy solutions that is felt in certain quarters in our own country. They

²⁹¹Ibid., p. 99.

²⁹²Ibid., p. 91.

²⁹³Ibid., p. 93

²⁹⁴Ibid., p. 95.

may believe that they can afford to have a patience equal to the stakes involved.²⁹⁵

A vital issue between the Presidential candidates was the Korean stalemate and what should be done about it. Stevenson supported the actions of President Truman and felt very strongly about the matter. Many Americans considered the decision to send our armed forces into Korea a deadly mistake, and to those Stevenson directed these comments:

I believe we may in time look back at Korea as a major turning point in history--a turning point which led not to another terrible war, but to the first historic demonstration that an effective system of collective security is possible.²⁹⁶

It could be said that the entire speech was based on the assumption that the United States can no longer afford to stand alone but must invite and succor the support of other freedom-loving peoples. This feeling was summed up in the following sentence:

If we believe the communist threat to Asia is dangerous to us, then it is in our own self-interest to help them defend and develop, adjusting our policies to the constantly changing circumstances in a world of accelerating change.²⁹⁷

The last paragraph of the address was based upon assumption. "If these provide the common purpose of America and Asia, of our joint enterprise, of our progress together, we need have no fear for the future. Because it will belong to free men."²⁹⁸

Logos--artistic proof.

Inductive reasoning--argument from generalization. Stevenson illustrated argument from generalization when he reasoned against the Republicans and their actions over the past years regarding foreign policy measures.

²⁹⁵Ibid.

²⁹⁷Ibid., p. 98.

²⁹⁶Ibid., p. 96.

²⁹⁸Ibid., p. 99.

I could go on--talking of their attacks on our assistance program, even on the defense budgets, and similar knife work--for the Republican record in Congress is as long as it is wrong. How, then, can a disunited party unite the country for the hard tasks that lie ahead?²⁹⁹

He spoke of the advances made in Europe through our assistance, reasoning by generalization.

In Europe, our efforts to build patiently for peace are meeting with success. The Marshall Plan has brought, as we all know, a striking improvement in political and economic conditions. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization is building a strong system of military defense. Europe is not yet wholly secure against subversion from within or attack from without, but this goal of security is, at least, in sight.³⁰⁰

Stewenson acknowledged the spirit of nationalism that was sweeping the world, especially Asian and African nations. He explained his stand by stating what nationalism meant to him.

Nationalism to Asians means a chance to stand on their own feet, a chance to govern themselves, a chance to develop their resources for their own welfare, and a chance to prove that the color of their skins has nothing to do with their right to walk with self-respect among their fellow men in the world. Nationalism to them means the end of a legalized inferiority. It means pride, spirit, faith.³⁰¹

Using the specific example of India, the following reasoning was noted:

India is not caught up in civil strife. . . .India has to grow more food. It has to restore its land. It needs new resources of power. In short, it needs a democratic helping hand in the development programs it has already charted for itself.³⁰²

Stevenson was sarcastic in speaking about those in America who now cry the loudest for something to be done in Asia, but who were silent years ago when we should have been at work.

The time to stop a revolution is at the beginning, not the end. But I don't recall any pleas from these critics for help for Sun-Yat-Sen and Chinese democracy back in the twenties. Nor did I hear them demanding intervention by the United States in the mid-thirties when civil war with the communists broke out. Indeed it was not until quite

²⁹⁹Ibid., p. 93.

³⁰⁰Ibid., p. 94.

³⁰¹Ibid.

³⁰²Ibid., p. 97.

recently, when the Chinese wars were about over, that there was even an audible whisper that we help fight a hindsight war, that we should have given more help to China than we did.³⁰³

Inductive reasoning--argument from causation. Stevenson inferred causal relationships between the dilemmas America faces throughout the world today and the wrong direction of our foreign policy for the past two decades. The reasoning was not specifically written as argument from causation, but the implication was clear. In several specific instances, this type of reasoning was also noted, once when commenting about the Republican Congress.

I don't think that a Republican President could even get a bill to renew it out of committee--not, at any rate, without crippling amendments. Or are we to assume that the Republican leaders in Congress have been opposing it in the past not from conviction but just because it was a Democratic program?³⁰⁴

The reason for such a tremendous defense budget was given with this reasoning: "With 85 per cent of our budget allocated to defense, it is the Soviet Union which now fixes the level of our defense expenditures and thus our tax rates."³⁰⁵ The nationalistic spirit sprouting across the globe was explained in this manner: "The causes behind that upheaval are many and varied. But there is nothing complicated about what the people want. They want a decent living--and they want freedom."³⁰⁶ The vital significance of the turmoil in Asia was stressed by Stevenson when he said:

And the stakes are nothing less than an overwhelming preponderance of power--for with Asia under control, they could turn with new energy and vast new resources in an effort to win a bloodless victory in a weakened, frightened Europe.³⁰⁷

³⁰³Ibid.

³⁰⁴Ibid., p. 92.

³⁰⁵Ibid., p. 93.

³⁰⁶Ibid., p. 94.

³⁰⁷Ibid., p. 96.

Inductive reasoning--argument from analogy. No example of this type of argument was discovered.

Deductive reasoning--argument from syllogism and enthymeme. This type of reasoning was not used extensively in the "World Policy" address. At one time, when speaking about the opposition party members, Stevenson reasoned this way:

And the most powerful and numerous wing of the Republican Party-- the wing that would control all the important Congressional committees-- would not support the program which the Republican presidential candidate endorsed last Thursday. How do I know? Well, because the Old Guard has been fighting the same identical program for years.³⁰⁸

All the prospects for the future were not bleak, though, as evidenced by the following thoughts: "I don't think that war is an inevitable part of this contest. Even the most ambitious and ruthless men do not deliberately invite destruction of the basis of their power."³⁰⁹

Ethos.

Sincerity. Most of the audience was aware that Stevenson had worked on the committee that helped found the United Nations and they recognized his interest in world affairs. He was vitally concerned with securing the world for peaceful living, although admitting the difficulty of the task. "I don't think that war is an inevitable part of this contest. Even the most ambitious and ruthless men do not deliberately invite destruction of the basis of their power."³¹⁰ Stevenson was obviously sincere in his warning to those abroad:

And here let me say something to those abroad who may mistake our present wrangling for weakness. We have always had differences of opinion which have produced all sorts of noises and confusion-- especially in campaign years! . . .The costliest blunders have been

³⁰⁸Ibid., p. 92

³⁰⁹Ibid., p. 93.

³¹⁰Ibid.

made by dictators who did not quite understand the workings of real democracy and who mistook diversity for disunity.³¹¹

The inevitable struggle between East and West did not mean an armed conflict, of necessity, but might resolve itself into a lengthy state of co-existence.

Co-existence is not a form of passive acceptance of things as they are. It is waging the contest between freedom and tyranny by peaceful means. It will involve negotiation and adjustment--compromise and not appeasement--and I will never shrink from these if they would advance the world toward a secure peace.³¹²

Stevenson proudly defended President Truman's stand on Korea, and was sincere in his belief that the only logical action was taken.

In Korea we took a long step toward building a security system in Asia. As an American I am proud that we had the courage to resist that ruthless, cynical aggression; and I am equally proud that we have had the fortitude to refuse to risk extension of that war despite extreme communist provocations and reckless Republican criticisms.³¹³

Earnestness. Stevenson left no doubt in anyone's mind about how earnest he was, finishing his introduction with these words: "As your chairman said, because of my prior service here (at the United Nations Conference in 1945) and because San Fransisco is our window to the Far East, I want to talk soberly tonight about foreign policy."³¹⁴ He emphasized the crucial world situation, reiterating in various words the idea that "America is threatened as never before."³¹⁵ Stevenson preceded his comments about the Far East problems with these words: "Now, it's about America's relations with Asia that I should like to talk with you tonight, soberly and realistically."³¹⁶ He stressed the value of knowledge and

³¹¹Ibid.

³¹³Ibid., p. 96.

³¹⁵Ibid., p. 93.

³¹²Ibid., p. 94.

³¹⁴Ibid., p. 91.

³¹⁶Ibid., p. 94.

awareness on the part of freedom loving people toward the appeals of communism. "It's important that we know these things and think about them for we shall never be able to cope with communism unless we understand the emotional basis of its appeal."³¹⁷

Patience. Stevenson used this type of proof considerably in the address. The problems we faced in Asia and the rest of the world were not the sort to be ironed out overnight, and the solutions he offered were long-range plans intended to correct defects in our foreign policy that would require some time to be properly effective. Regarding the goals in foreign policy put forth by candidate Eisenhower, he had this to say: "The rub comes in doing anything to make progress toward these goals which we are glad the Republican candidates agree upon. A President can suggest but he cannot pass laws. That's the job of Congress."³¹⁸ Several times in the address Stevenson cautioned against expecting a quick cure to the world's ills. In a philosophical vein, he said "Though progress may be slow, it can be steady and sure. A wise man does not try to hurry history. Many wars have been avoided by patience and many have been precipitated by reckless haste."³¹⁹ Being more explicit, he stated:

No one can predict, and it would be foolish to try to predict, how and when the peaceful purpose of our power will succeed in creating a just and durable peace. But are our efforts conditional upon assurance of prompt success? To answer "yes" would be to accept the certainty of eventual defeat.³²⁰

He also cautioned Americans to consider the viewpoints of others, and realize that their aspirations are not always similar to ours.

³¹⁷Ibid., p. 95.

³¹⁹Ibid., p. 94.

³¹⁸Ibid., p. 92.

³²⁰Ibid.

Furthermore, they may not feel the same need for quick and tidy solutions that is felt in certain quarters in our own country. They may believe that they can afford to have a patience equal to the stakes involved.³²¹

Urging patience for another reason, he said:

But we must not, in our necessary concern for the urgent tasks of defense and development, permit the means to obscure the end. That end is the widening and the deepening of freedom and of respect for the dignity and the worth of man.³²²

Stevenson was again careful to urge patience as he summarized the major points in the address: "These are some of the questions, the hard, the ugly questions we must face before disaster, not afterward. This is no time, it seems to me, to kid ourselves with press agents' platitudes."³²³

Sympathy. The speaker was certainly in sympathy with the unfortunate peoples of the Orient who were caught in the middle of the power struggle. He recognized their reasons for turning towards nationalism as an answer to foreign meddling in their affairs.

This type of nationalism is not inconsistent with closer co-operation among nations nor with the need for an enforceable peace. The Asians actually regard freedom and national independence as the doorway to international order--just as we do.³²⁴

Showing sympathy towards the people of Asia who were victims of not knowing where to turn nor who to listen to next, he promised that America would not treat them as an imperialist's little brother. "These programs are in accordance, it seems to me, with our best traditions. And I want to assure our friends in Asia that America will never dominate their economic development."³²⁵ But the altruistic spirit of America was

³²¹Ibid., p. 95.

³²²Ibid., p. 98.

³²³Ibid., p. 96.

³²⁴Ibid., p. 95.

³²⁵Ibid., p. 98.

certainly not our only reason for helping our fellow-humans. We need them on our side, for very practical reasons. As Stevenson explained:

If we believe the communist threat to Asia is dangerous to us, then it is in our own self-interest to help them defend and develop, adjusting our policies to the constantly changing circumstances in a world of accelerating change.³²⁶

Stevenson also expressed sympathy for the administration's action regarding Korea, defending our policy as honorable and sensible. "This defensive effort in Korea and elsewhere in Asia is building a shield behind which we have the opportunity to assist in the other great task--the task of development."³²⁷

Knowledge of subject. Stevenson was a recognized authority on world affairs, having an outstanding record as governmental assistant to numerous commissions and organizations throughout the 1930's and the war years. He held an important post as advisor to help organize the United Nations. Only once during the speech did he actually refer to his vast experience, and that was regarding the recent Korean conflict. "On other occasions I have spoken and written much about the solid accomplishments which the Korean war has made possible."³²⁸ The listener did not hear from Stevenson about his knowledge of world affairs, but his manner of speaking left no doubt in the minds of the audience that here was a man who knew where-of he spoke.

Pathos.

Love and friendship. Stevenson expressed friendship for the enslaved peoples of the world, offering hope that the future holds better days.

³²⁶Ibid.

³²⁷Ibid., p. 97.

³²⁸Ibid., p. 96.

The answer to communism is, in the old-fashioned phrase, good works--good works inspired by love and dedicated to the whole man. The answer to the inhumanity of communism is humane respect for man. And the men and the women of Asia desire not only to rise from wretchedness of the body but from abasement of the spirit as well."³²⁹

Fear. Stevenson appeared not to disagree so much with candidate Eisenhower's attitudes, as with the expressions of the conservative wing of the Republican Party, whom he feared would control the next Administration if the Republicans won the election.

And the most powerful and numerous wing of the Republican Party--the wing that would control all of the important Congressional committees--would not support the program which the Republican presidential candidate endorsed last Thursday.³³⁰

He felt a definite fear of what the future holds for the Asiatic continent, and tempered his suggested solutions with the following statement:

I wish I could say the same for Asia, but there would be no greater disservice to the American people than to underestimate the gravity of the dangers that America faces in this area, perhaps for many years to come.³³¹

He reviewed the appeal of communism, and asked what the Free World could offer to counter-act these theories. "These are some of the questions, the hard, the ugly questions we must face before disaster, not afterward. This is no time, it seems to me, to kid ourselves with press agents' platitudes."³³²

Confidence. He expressed confidence that the wrangling of the political campaign would disappear into united expressions of the strength of democracy once the election was decided.

We have always had differences of opinion which have produced all sorts of noises and confusion--especially in campaign years! But it is the kind of noise that, to the inner ear, is the sweet music of

³²⁹Ibid., p. 98.

³³⁰Ibid., p. 92.

³³¹Ibid., p. 94.

³³²Ibid., p. 96.

free institutions. It is the kind of noise that has produced the harmony of firm purpose whenever our people have been put to the test. The costliest blunders have been made by dictators who did not quite understand the workings of real democracy and who mistook diversity for disunity.³³³

He made a point to approve of the American action in Korea, expressing confidence that the future would recognize our intervention as the correct thing to do.

I believe we may in time look back at Korea as a major turning point in history--a turning point which led not to another terrible war, but to the first historic demonstration that an effective system of collective security is possible.³³⁴

Stevenson's answer to the communistic method of direct control of a nation's economy was a program of aid and assistance given without strings attached. "But in these ways and by this kind of friendly advice and counsel we can help to guide this economic development in ways which will give powerful support to democratic political institutions."³³⁵ The final paragraph of the address illustrated confidence in the future and the ultimate victory of right over wrong.

I say that America has been called to greatness. The summons of the twentieth century is a summons to our vision, to our humanity, to our practicality. If these provide the common purpose of America and Asia, of our joint enterprise, of our progress together, we need have no fear for the future. Because it will belong to free men.³³⁶

Shame. Stevenson attempted to heap shame and ridicule upon the conservative branch of the Republican Party, attacking their record in Congress with these scathing words of condemnation: "I could go on-- talking of their attacks on our assistance program, even on the defense budgets, and similar knife work--for the Republican record in Congress is

³³³Ibid., p. 93.

³³⁴Ibid., p. 96.

³³⁵Ibid., p. 98.

³³⁶Ibid., p. 99.

as long as it is wrong."³³⁷

Pity. He refused to recognize the cries of many disillusioned citizens who called the present plight of the world hopeless and beyond redemption. He referred to these folks with these words: "There is something wrong, it seems to me, with the perspective of men who call the last ten years the 'dismal decade'."³³⁸ In reference to the desires of all nations for peace, he considered it a great pity that even as he was speaking, all was not peaceful in the world. "There is active fighting, as we all know, in Malaya and in Indo-China. . . .These efforts have involved heavy loss of life and great material costs."³³⁹

Indignation. Stevenson was indignant at times about the claims of his opposition. He chastised them with these words: "And there is something odd, too, in a point of view which at once endorses the nation's foreign policies and promises to save you at the same time from such enlightened bungling."³⁴⁰ He was equally indignant over the attitudes of those who couldn't understand our stand in the Korean affair. "But some men in this country seem to think that if definitive victory cannot be won, we should either take reckless military action or give the whole thing up. Such advice plays into the enemy's hands."³⁴¹ He continued this approach in condemning those who criticize our admitted failures in the Far East.

It would seem to me, my friends, that the Republican critics could better demonstrate the good faith of their concern for Asia by doing something about India and Pakistan today rather than talking about

³³⁷Ibid., p. 93.

³³⁸Ibid., p. 91.

³³⁹Ibid., p. 96.

³⁴⁰Ibid., p. 91.

³⁴¹Ibid., p. 97.

China yesterday. I don't think that tearful and interminable post-mortems about China will save any souls for democracy in the rest of Asia, the Near East and in Africa.³⁴²

Emulation. Stevenson showed respect and emulation for those Asians who fought so vigorously for freedom and were not satisfied to be led by others. "The Asians actually regard freedom and national independence as the doorway to international order--just as we do."³⁴³

Contempt. He showed contempt for those who attempted to make political advantage from the Korean conflict.

Whatever unscrupulous politicians may say to exploit grief, tragedy and discontent for votes, history will never record that Korea was a 'useless' war, unless today's heroism is watered with tomorrow's cowardice.³⁴⁴

Benevolence. Our interest in Asia was at least partly altruistic and stemmed from the heart-felt desire of many Americans to aid their suffering fellow-humans. Stevenson showed benevolence when he said:

And I want to assure our friends in Asia that America will never dominate their political and their economic development. We will not try to make their societies over in the image of our own. On the contrary, we respect the integrity of their institutions and the rich values of their cultures. We expect to learn as well as to teach.³⁴⁵

ARRANGEMENT

The introduction of the "World Policy" address consisted of two short paragraphs that related a little story and helped put the audience at ease. After this very brief introduction, Stevenson went directly into the body of the address. He outlined the history of the United Nations and the hopes and aspirations its followers rightfully hold. After some criticisms of the Republican Party stands on important foreign

³⁴²Ibid.

³⁴³Ibid., p. 95.

³⁴⁴Ibid., p. 96.

³⁴⁵Ibid., p. 98.

policy matters, the speaker dealt at length upon the problems of combatting communism throughout the world, and more especially in Asia. He defended the nationalistic spirit being evidenced across the globe and classified this movement as a potent and valuable force in world politics. Stevenson then spent some time justifying our government's policy in Korea and warned that we must be prepared to meet such flagrant violations of national sovereignty anywhere they occur. The conclusion was also brief, expressing hope for the future and offering a challenge to the free world in the ever-changing combat against totalitarian governments.

STYLE

Level.

The style level varied between middle and high, with the majority of the address delivered in middle style language. The entire speech was on a dignified and very serious level, but use of flowery and ornate language was kept to a minimum. Much of the speech dealt with possible courses of action in future years and in an attempt to be convincing, Stevenson maintained as simple and understandable approach as possible.

Diction and word choice.

The primary concern of the speaker seemed to be, as Whately would say, perspecuity, or clarity of language. Realizing that the topic was complex, Stevenson must have felt that a simplified, concrete approach would best serve the purpose he intended. No foreign words were noted, many of the verbs and adjectives were repeated, and the poly-syllabic words were used generally in recognizable situations.

Sentence structure.

A greater percentage of the sentences in this speech were simple than complex or compound. About equal percentages of the other types

were discovered. Even the lengthy sentences were not particularly complex or compound, but often simple according to grammatical structure.

Rhetorical devices and figurative language.

Analogy. Only once did this device appear, and that in the first paragraph of the speech. As an introduction, Stevenson told the following little story:

She writes that after Grover Cleveland was nominated for the Presidency in 1892 and my grandfather was nominated for Vice President, she named her two kittens Grover Cleveland and Adlai Stevenson. Grover, she writes me, couldn't stand the excitement of the campaign and died before the election. But Adlai lived to be a very old cat. And this, my friends, is obviously for me the most comforting incident of the campaign so far.³⁴⁶

Epigram. Several phrases used by Stevenson were picked up by the newspapers and magazines and reported considerably. "A wise man does not try to hurry history."³⁴⁷; "throw the rascals out"³⁴⁸; "Many wars have been avoided by patience and many have been precipitated by reckless haste."³⁴⁹; "The contest with tyranny is not a hundred-yard dash--it is a test of endurance."³⁵⁰; "We expect to learn as well as teach."³⁵¹; "I say that America has been called to greatness."³⁵²

Humor. This was a very dignified and serious speech and only once did the speaker bring in any humor. As usual, when he did it was in relation to the Republicans.

The General's ten-point foreign program, of which three points were 'throw the rascals out', and seven were a recital of the same foreign policy goals which the 'Democratic rascals' have been following for years, does not, it seems to me, contribute much to our foreign-policy discussion.³⁵³

³⁴⁶Ibid., p. 91.

³⁴⁸Ibid., p. 92.

³⁵⁰Ibid., p. 97.

³⁵²Ibid., p. 99.

³⁴⁷Ibid., p. 94.

³⁴⁹Ibid., p. 94.

³⁵¹Ibid., p. 98.

³⁵³Ibid., p. 92.

Rhetorical question. Three times did Stevenson employ this device to stress his point. First when he chastised the Republicans for scuttling much of the foreign policy program sponsored by the Democrats, he asked: "Or are we to assume that the Republican leaders in Congress have been opposing it in the past not from conviction but just because it was a Democratic program?"³⁵⁴ The next occasion was when cautioning that success was not to be expected over-night. "But are our efforts conditional upon assurance of prompt success?"³⁵⁵ Lastly he wondered if we were aware that even then in the Far East forces of other free nations were struggling against odds to preserve the voice of liberty in that area. "Have we given fitting recognition to the hard, bitter and prolonged efforts of the British, the French, the native Malayan and Indo-China forces?"³⁵⁶

Interrogation. Stevenson asked his audience this question, after pointing out the divergences in opinion among the Republicans regarding foreign affairs: "How, then, can a disunited party unite the country for the hard tasks that lie ahead?"³⁵⁷ Later he asked the audience the following question, apparently unanswerable at the time:

What will the defensive task require of us in these areas, and in the Philippines, Formosa, Japan, and Korea? What commitments, what contributions to security in this area should we make and can we make to the emerging system of Pacific defense?³⁵⁸

Irony and satire. This favorite device of Stevenson was used even in the serious vein employed throughout this address. After condemning the conservative wing of the opposition party, he summed up with this

³⁵⁴Ibid.

³⁵⁶Ibid., p. 95.

³⁵⁸Ibid., p. 96.

³⁵⁵Ibid., p. 94.

³⁵⁷Ibid., p. 93.

comment: "Even the extremist wing of the Republican Party will not really argue that peace and prosperity are bad or that the nation does not want allies."³⁵⁹ Referring again to the Republicans, he made this choice comment:

Now, among other things, it is not exactly a new idea to Democrats that a thriving foreign trade means better markets for American agriculture and industry and a better balance in world economy.³⁶⁰

In his next ironic comment, Stevenson does not exclude those of his own party who were guilty of vocal complaints after it was too late to rectify the situation.

Listening to the debate over China this past year, I had the distinct impression at times that the very Congressmen whose vocal cords were most active in the cause of isolation and against foreign entanglements were the same ones who were now talking as if they had wanted us to take part in a civil war in China.³⁶¹

Referring to the same individuals, he continued:

The time to stop a revolution is at the beginning, not the end. But I don't recall any pleas from these critics for help for Sun-Yat-Sen and Chinese democracy back in the twenties. Nor did I hear them demanding intervention by the United States in the mid-thirties when civil war with the communists broke out. Indeed, it was not until quite recently, when the Chinese wars were about over, that there was even an audible whisper that we help fight a hindsight war, that we should have given more help to China than we did.³⁶²

Contrast. Stevenson drew a contrast between the effective recovery of Europe after the World War and the continuing poverty and state of flux existant in Asia.

Europe is not yet wholly secure against subversion from within or attack from without, but this goal of security is, at least, in sight. I wish I could say the same for Asia, but there would be no greater disservice to the American people than to underestimate the gravity of

³⁵⁹Ibid., p. 92.

³⁶⁰Ibid.

³⁶¹Ibid., p. 97.

³⁶²Ibid.

the dangers that America faces in this area, perhaps for many years to come.³⁶³

He also contrasted our impressions of communism with those held by others.

There's an important difference, it seems to me, between communism as we view it and communism as some of the Asian peoples view it. When we think of communism we think of what we are going to lose. When many of the Asiatics think of communism they think of what they are going to gain--especially if they believe that they have nothing to lose.³⁶⁴

Climax. The climax of the address was the final paragraph. The previous three paragraphs had been leading to this challenge:

I say that America has been called to greatness. The summons of the twentieth century is a summons to our vision, to our humanity, to our practicality. If these provide the common purpose of America and Asia, of our joint enterprise, of our progress together, we need have no fear for the future. Because it will belong to free men.³⁶⁵

Onomatopoeia. Two examples of this device were noticed, both in reference to the Russian rulers and their ruthless suppression of liberty-loving peoples. "They can throw the iron dice, but they know they cannot foretell the fortunes of war."³⁶⁶; "But today the steel glove of a revolutionary ideology covers the heavy hand of imperialist expansion."³⁶⁷

Anaphora and epistrophe. Twice this device was employed by the speaker to emphasize his statements.

Nationalism to Asians means a chance to stand on their own feet, a chance to govern themselves, a chance to develop their resources for their own welfare, and a chance to prove that the color of their skins has nothing to do with their right to walk with self-respect among their fellow men in the world.³⁶⁸

Again Stevenson used this device in comparing political ideals.

³⁶³Ibid., p. 94.

³⁶⁴Ibid., p. 95

³⁶⁵Ibid., p. 99.

³⁶⁶Ibid., p. 93.

³⁶⁷Ibid., p. 95.

³⁶⁸Ibid.

The question history asks and which we must answer is whether the idea of individualism--the idea of personal freedom for you and me--is equal to the idea of collectivism--the idea of personal subordination to the state; whether the idea of maximum personal liberty is equal to the idea of maximum personal discipline.³⁶⁹

Allusion and reference. Stevenson began the speech with a reference to a letter written him by an admirer and containing a story which he proceeded to relate.

I want to share with you, if I may, a letter from a California lady who knew my parents when they lived here fifty years ago. She writes that after Grover Cleveland was nominated for the Presidency in 1892 and my grandfather was nominated for Vice President, she named her two kittens Grover Cleveland and Adlai Stevenson. Grover, she writes me, couldn't stand the excitement of the campaign and died before the election. But Adlai lived to be a very old cat.³⁷⁰

Once he alluded to the Bible when he said "They really believed that the Lord helps those who help themselves."³⁷¹ Twice the names of prominent historical figures were referred to for emphasis. The first reference was to Woodrow Wilson: "It was Woodrow Wilson, with his dream of the League of Nations, who was the truly practical man--not the Old Guard who fought him to death."³⁷² Stevenson followed this reference with one to Winston Churchill: "And in the fateful summer of 1940 it was a vision of a Churchill that saw beyond Dunkerque to victory."³⁷³

Understatement. Several statements bordered on the verge of being understatements. Two instances where the sentences, by themselves, might not imply an understatement, but read in context were definitely intended as such, would be: "The time to stop a revolution is at the beginning, not at the end."³⁷⁴; and, "But foreign policy consists of much more than

³⁶⁹Ibid., p. 93.

³⁷¹Ibid.

³⁷³Ibid.

³⁷⁰Ibid., p. 91.

³⁷²Ibid., p. 99.

³⁷⁴Ibid., p. 97.

the setting of goals."³⁷⁵

Metaphor. Perhaps the most-quoted portion of the speech was a metaphor, worded thusly: "The contest with tyranny is not a hundred-yard dash—it is a test of endurance."³⁷⁶ Following is an example of a metaphor: "Perhaps he hopes that the Republican Old Guard will swallow his bitter pill of approval of our policies if it is sugar-coated with condemnation of Democrats."³⁷⁷ Another illustration of this device is the following: "But it is the kind of noise that, to the inner ear, is the sweet music of free institutions."³⁷⁸

Personification. In reference to the communist menace, Stevenson used these apt words: "But today the steel glove of a revolutionary ideology covers the heavy hand of imperialist expansion."³⁷⁹ Still concerned with hands and gloves, this bit of personification was noted: "In short, it needs a democratic helping hand in the development programs it has already charted for itself."³⁸⁰

Alliteration. Examples of this rhetorical device were quite numerous, with no apparent favoritism for any particular consonant sound: "press agents' platitudes"³⁸¹; "extreme communist provocations and reckless Republican criticisms."³⁸²; ". . . will save any souls for democracy."³⁸³; "And the men and women of Asia desire not only to rise from wretchedness of the body but from abasement of the spirit as well."³⁸⁴; "dismal decade."³⁸⁵;

³⁷⁵Ibid., p. 92.

³⁷⁷Ibid., p. 92.

³⁷⁹Ibid., p. 95.

³⁸¹Ibid., p. 96.

³⁸³Ibid., p. 97.

³⁸⁵Ibid., p. 91.

³⁷⁶Ibid., p. 97.

³⁷⁸Ibid., p. 93.

³⁸⁰Ibid., p. 97.

³⁸²Ibid.

³⁸⁴Ibid., p. 98.

"This type of nationalism is not inconsistent with closer co-operation among nations. . . ."386; ". . .for we shall never be able to cope with communism."387; "And there is something odd, too, in a point of view which at once endorses the nation's foreign policies and promises to save you at the same time from such enlightened bungling."388; ". . .how and when the peaceful purpose of our power will succeed in creating a just and durable peace."389; "A wise man does not try to hurry history."390; "In Europe, our efforts to build patiently for peace are meeting with success."391

IV. THE ATOMIC FUTURE

INVENTION

Logos--non-artistic proof.

Evidence. The first portion of the speech contained several arguments from evidence. Stevenson was setting the stage for his suggestions concerning atomic development, and introduced this information on progress in the area: "We have already produced, with an atomic reactor, the steam to generate electric power. We are building now--and in a Connecticut shipyard--an atomic-powered submarine."392 Later he offered this fact: "The people of this country have invested more than six billion dollars in atomic development."393 The fact that the United States had been willing to internationalize its atomic knowledge and set

386 Ibid., p. 95.

388 Ibid., p. 91.

390 Ibid.

392 Ibid., p. 135.

387 Ibid.

389 Ibid., p. 94.

391 Ibid.

393 Ibid.

up a world-wide program for peaceful development of nuclear energy was an event that the rest of the world should remember.

We went to the United Nations and Bernard Baruch, a beloved and wise elder statesman, offered on behalf of the United States to share with other nations the good in atomic energy. In return, we asked that other nations join with us to curb its power for evil.³⁹⁴

Stevenson did not neglect the opportunity to chastise the Republican candidate for his announced support of all Republicans, a policy which he maintained was not in the best interest of the nation or the Republican Party. He recollected the following information:

It was not too long ago when Governor Dewey, as party leader, honorably refused to support a Republican Congressman who had distinguished himself by incessant and noisy opposition to vital national policies.³⁹⁵

Authority. Mr. Stevenson spoke to a Democratic rally in Hartford, Connecticut when he delivered this address, and the occasion was a memorial honoring the late Senator Brien McMahon, Democrat from Connecticut. So it was fitting that the speaker should refer to Senator McMahon, which he did several times during the speech. Immediately following the introduction came this paragraph:

I was moved to select this topic because atomic energy is a major component of our power and because our decision and actions in atomic energy matters, as they relate to preparedness for both war and peace, will long bear the imprint of our wise and lamented friend, Brien McMahon of Connecticut.³⁹⁶

Referring again to McMahon, he said:

Brien McMahon was among the first to see the great potentiality for good and evil which was opened up by this advance of the frontiers of knowledge. He sought to reconcile the needs for security with the needs for information.³⁹⁷

³⁹⁴Ibid., p. 136.

³⁹⁵Ibid., p. 134.

³⁹⁶Ibid., p. 135.

³⁹⁷Ibid.

Earlier the nation's legislators had been divided on the question of what to do about development of atomic power. Stevenson again referred to the late Senator in this matter.

In the decision to move ahead Brien McMahon again played a leading role. He demanded that we constantly step up our reserves of atomic weapons. He worked always to keep the sights of the atomic energy program high and its policies bold--and the United States has made a notable contribution to the security of the free world by its rapid development of atomic power.³⁹⁸

Contrasting the present-day Republicans with Theodore Roosevelt, Stevenson made the following statement: "Theodore Roosevelt used to say: 'speak softly and carry a big stick.' But these modern Republicans seem to prefer to throw away the stick and scream imprecations."³⁹⁹ He also stressed the horrors involved in an evil use of the atomic secret, recalling the devastation of Hiroshima. "The memory of Hiroshima is fresh within us--described in enduring prose by one of the most accomplished of contemporary writers--John Hersey."⁴⁰⁰ Finally, the last paragraph of the address was an argument from authority, the authority again being Senator McMahon.

To my fellow Democrats I would close by repeating what Brien McMahon said in his last public appearance. He said: 'The way to worry about November is to worry about what is right. If we do not stand for the right, ten thousand campaign speeches will never help us. If we do stand for the right, we will again be asked to lead our country.'⁴⁰¹

Sign. Only twice in the address was this type of argument noted. Stevenson indicated that the men in the Kremlin are not entirely irresponsible.

³⁹⁸Ibid., p. 136.

³⁹⁹Ibid., p. 137.

⁴⁰⁰Ibid., p. 136.

⁴⁰¹Ibid., p. 139.

We all know the character of the men in the Kremlin--their fanaticism, their ruthlessness, their limitless ambitions--but we know too that their realism has restrained them thus far from provoking a general war which they would surely lose.⁴⁰²

At another point he related that signs indicate amazing developments in the near future concerning nuclear power.

Men are at work today with atomic tools trying to find out how plants convert energy from the sun into food. It is not too fantastic to think that we may, in time, unlock new doors to boundless energy for our homes and industries.⁴⁰³

Assumption. Stevenson reasoned from assumption only occasionally, tending to base his suggestions on present known circumstances. However, speaking in general terms, he said:

But there can be no solution in an arms race. At the end of this road lies bankruptcy or world catastrophe. Already the earth is haunted by premonitions in this shadowed atomic age. Mankind must deserve some better destiny than this.⁴⁰⁴

On one subject he was not reluctant to discuss what would probably transpire in the future. He spoke of his Party with an air of certainty, but his comments still came under assumptions.

The Democratic Party will never desist in the search for peace. We must never close our minds or freeze our positions. We must strive constantly to break the deadlock in our atomic discussion. But we can never yield on the objective of securing a foolproof system of international inspection and control. And we will never confuse negotiation with appeasement.⁴⁰⁵

Stevenson admitted the impossibility of predicting the future. But he held out hope for a better life, a more peaceful world and greater freedom from poverty and disease.

We may hope that the steady strengthening of the free world will increase their sense of the futility of aggression; that the

⁴⁰²Ibid., p. 138.

⁴⁰³Ibid., p. 135.

⁴⁰⁴Ibid., p. 136.

⁴⁰⁵Ibid., p. 137.

intensification of peaceful pressures against the Soviet Empire will sharpen the internal contradictions within that Empire; that, in time, free peoples may lift their heads again in Eastern Europe, and new politics and leadership emerge within the Soviet Union itself.⁴⁰⁶

Logos--artistic proof.

Inductive reasoning--argument from generalization. Stevenson reasoned from generalization only once in the address. He illustrated that the United States is dependent on foreign allies in more ways than one can imagine, both for economic and strategic reasons.

And the irony is that it is our allies who make our atomic strength effective. We built the bomb with the help and co-operation of foreign scientists. Our atomic-production program today depends on foreign supplies of uranium. Our air power would be gravely crippled without foreign bases. Even in terms of the bomb itself, going-it-alone would simply be a shortcut to national disaster.⁴⁰⁷

Inductive reasoning--argument from causation. This was the favorite type of reasoning employed in "The Atomic Future." Stevenson expressed a great fear of nuclear weapons, for a very obvious reason. "We shrink from the use of such weapons--weapons which destroy the guilty and innocent alike, like a terrible sword from heaven. The memory of Hiroshima is still fresh within us."⁴⁰⁸ But despite its vast potential for devastation, we must not stop seeking the secrets of the atom, because "We can't renounce the power which science has given us when renunciation might expose our people to destruction."⁴⁰⁹ Another important reason for continuing our research into atomic power was the refusal of the Soviet Union to join in any agreeable plan for halting such research.

Unfortunately, as we all know, the Soviet Union has thus far refused to join in a workable system. The reason is obvious. To be effective,

⁴⁰⁶Ibid., p. 138.

⁴⁰⁷Ibid., p. 137.

⁴⁰⁸Ibid., pp. 135-136.

⁴⁰⁹Ibid., p. 136.

such a system would require effective United Nations inspection; and the Kremlin fears to open up the windows and floors of its giant prison.⁴¹⁰

The Soviet nation had every opportunity to join with the free world in a program of nuclear weapons inspection, but they refused. We had originated the idea of such an inspection program, because the obvious conclusion of an atomic weapons stockpile would be obliteration. "Because our Government knew the futility of the arms race, it made its great decision to seek an international system for the control of atomic power."⁴¹¹ Stevenson stressed the importance of the atomic bomb as an essential part of our defense program, but he gave the following reasons for not placing too much emphasis on one weapon:

Yet there always seemed to me a danger in making the atomic bomb the center of defense strategy. The bomb is but one part of a general system of defense. It cannot be a substitute for such a general system. It cannot be our only answer to aggression.⁴¹²

In the introduction of the speech, Stevenson expressed thanks to his friends and acquaintances who had come out to hear him speak. He then gave this possible reason for their attendance:

Some of them are here tonight and I am deeply touched by their continued interest in this Democratic heretic from the prairies of the West. Or should I attribute it to the fact that the last twenty years have won most of the more enlightened to the Democratic standard.⁴¹³

Moving into the body of the address, he stated his topic for the evening and the reason for selecting that topic.

I was moved to select this topic because atomic energy is a major component of our power and because our decisions and actions in atomic energy matters, as they relate to preparedness for both war

⁴¹⁰Ibid., pp. 136-137.

⁴¹¹Ibid., p. 136.

⁴¹²Ibid.

⁴¹³Ibid., p. 134.

and peace, will long bear the imprint of our wise and lamented friend, Brien McMahon of Connecticut.⁴¹⁴

Inductive reasoning--argument from analogy. Stevenson compared the plan of pooled information about the atomic bomb with the pooling of community funds to set up adequate police protection, etc.

By this offer, all nations were asked to diminish their own sovereignty in the interests of world security--just as each of us gives up some degree of personal independence when communities establish laws and set up police forces to see that they are carried out.⁴¹⁵

A second analogy was presented when he spoke of the attitudes of some Republican leaders, in reference to different items.

A year ago some Republican leaders contended that the best way to stop the war in Korea would be to extend it to the main-land of China. In the same vein, Republican leaders today seem to be arguing that the best way to deal with Soviet power in Europe is to instigate civil war in the satellite countries.⁴¹⁶

Deductive reasoning--argument from syllogism and enthymeme. The speaker chastised candidate Eisenhower for endorsing all Republican political candidates, and summed up with this reasoning: "If the voters of this nation ever stop looking at the record and the character of candidates, and look only at their party label, it will be a sorry day for healthy democracy."⁴¹⁷ In his summation, Stevenson reasoned for hope in the future with these ideas:

There is no evil in the atom; only in men's souls. We have dealt with evil men before, and so have our fathers before us, from the beginning of time. The way to deal with evil men has never varied; stand up for the right, and, if needs be, fight for the right.⁴¹⁸

His concluding sentences, which were quotations from Senator McMahon,

⁴¹⁴Ibid., p. 135.

⁴¹⁵Ibid., p. 136.

⁴¹⁶Ibid., p. 137.

⁴¹⁷Ibid., p. 134.

⁴¹⁸Ibid., p. 138.

represent deductive reasoning from enthymeme.

The way to worry about November is to worry about what is right. If we do not stand for the right, ten thousand campaign speeches will never help us. If we do stand for the right, we will again be asked to lead our country.⁴¹⁹

Ethos.

Sincerity. Stevenson opened his talk with a story of local interest to the people of Connecticut, and established himself as a sincere man in the process.

I am glad to be here in Connecticut. I first came here to school not far from Hartford about thirty-five years ago as a small boy. I have always gratefully recalled the warmth with which your citizens took me in, and also the patience with which my teachers tried to educate me. Some of them are here tonight and I am deeply touched by their continued interest in this Democrat heretic from the prairies of the West.⁴²⁰

Stevenson was very sincere when he cautioned against the substitution of physical power for moral power: "And we must never delude ourselves into thinking that physical power is a substitute for moral power which is the true sign of national greatness."⁴²¹ He also felt strongly about the danger of placing all our eggs in the basket of atomic weapons.

Yet there has always seemed to me a danger in making the atomic bomb the center of defense strategy. The bomb is but one part of a general system of defense. It cannot be a substitute for such a general system.⁴²²

Earnestness. The topic of the address was of the utmost national importance and Stevenson reflected this urgency throughout the speech. Humor was entirely lacking as he approached the topic of nuclear development in a most earnest manner. "I want to talk here tonight about something which transcends politics--atomic energy, which is the new dimension

⁴¹⁹Ibid., p. 139.

⁴²⁰Ibid., p. 134.

⁴²¹Ibid., p. 138.

⁴²²Ibid., p. 136.

in all our thinking--and also about the relation of power to peace."⁴²³ It was impossible to select all the examples of this type of proof, but usually at the conclusion of each major point Stevenson would make a statement like this: "Win or lose, I will not accept the proposition that party regularity is more important than political ethics. Victory can be bought too dearly."⁴²⁴ Stevenson vigorously defended the administration's agreement to pool nuclear knowledge with other nations. "I think this decision was right--profoundly right. Few things we have done since 1945 have so clearly demonstrated our national determination to achieve peace and to strengthen international order."⁴²⁵ A theme of earnestness ran through the entire address, and was found to some degree in almost every paragraph.

Devotion. Stevenson specifically mentioned the services of the late Senator from Connecticut, Brien McMahon, and stressed his devoted service to his country, especially in the field of atomic development.

In the decision to move ahead Brien McMahon again played a leading role. He demanded that we constantly step up our reserves of atomic weapons. He worked always to keep the sights of the atomic energy program high and its policies bold--and the United States has made a notable contribution to the security of the free world by its rapid development of atomic energy.⁴²⁶

He constantly brought out the idea that the Democratic Party was devoted to the constant search for peace and other desirable goals. "And we will never confuse negotiation with appeasement."⁴²⁷ At another time he stated: "The Democratic Party will never desist in the search for peace. We must never close our minds or freeze our position. We must strive constantly to break the deadlock in our atomic discussions."⁴²⁸

⁴²³Ibid., p. 134.

⁴²⁴Ibid.

⁴²⁵Ibid., p. 136.

⁴²⁶Ibid.

⁴²⁷Ibid., p. 137.

⁴²⁸Ibid.

Patience. The almost unbelievable potential of the atom and related elements will need time to be realized, but with patience and perserverance, amazing discoveries lie ahead for mankind. Supporting this theme, Stevenson stated:

Men are at work today with atomic tools trying to find out how plants convert energy from the sun into food. It is not too fantastic to think that we may, in time, unlock new doors to boundless energy for our homes and industries.⁴²⁹

The best, safest and quickest method of achieving this development was a matter of some debate, with government and business both eager to work on the program. "But more can be done to work out new relationships in this field between government and business—relationships which will safeguard the public interest and yet allow full room for private initiative."⁴³⁰ Urging caution and patience, Stevenson stated: "The age of atomic abundance is still far off. And we will never be able to release the power of the atom to build unless we are able to restrain its power to destroy."⁴³¹ This was a real dilemma, what to do with a new force that could obliterate the human race if mis-used, yet the necessity of building that force as a deterrent to the use of it by other nations. "But we can't renounce the power which science has given us when renunciation might expose our people to destruction."⁴³² Stevenson expressed the hope that over the years the civilized peoples of the globe would recognize the futility of warfare and adopt more sane relations with each-other. "We may hope that the steady strengthening of the free world will increase their sense of the futility of aggression."⁴³³ He

⁴²⁹Ibid., p. 135.

⁴³⁰Ibid.

⁴³¹Ibid.

⁴³²Ibid., p. 136.

⁴³³Ibid., p. 138.

maintained that this changed attitude would be necessary before mankind could live in a secure peace. The first step in this direction might well be to restrict each nation's military force.

In the long run, the strength of the free nations resides as much in this willingness to reduce their military power and subject it to international control as in the size of their military establishments.⁴³⁴

Friendliness. Stevenson stated near the end of the speech that he hoped both Parties could work together for the common solution to the problem of nuclear production. He erased any animosity towards his political opponents on this issue when he said:

To my Republican listeners I would say: the atomic adventure transcends partisan issues. Win or lose, we Democrats will work with you to follow this adventure to the end of peace and plenty for mankind.⁴³⁵

Sympathy. The speaker expressed profound sympathy towards the friends of Senator McMahon, and deemed it very unfortunate that the nation should lose the services of this respected legislator so early in his life. "We have already, for example, opened up fields of medical research. Brien McMahon died of cancer. With luck and the help of atomic research, our children may be safe from this grim disaster."⁴³⁶ He also expressed sympathy for those in the position of authority who must decide which way to turn in atomic development. "This is the merciless question of the present—the question of what we should do with atomic power in a divided world."⁴³⁷ The unfortunate residents of nations behind the iron curtain warranted a sympathetic comment from Stevenson. ". . .that, in time, free peoples may lift their heads again in Eastern Europe, and new policies

⁴³⁴Ibid.

⁴³⁵Ibid.

⁴³⁶Ibid., p. 135.

⁴³⁷Ibid.

and leadership emerge within the Soviet Union itself."⁴³⁸

Pathos.

Love and friendship. Stevenson expressed a warm affection for his friends in the Connecticut area, recalling the years he spent in the state as a youth.

I have always gratefully recalled the warmth with which your citizens took me in, and also the patience with which my teachers tried to educate me. Some of them are here tonight and I am deeply touched by their continued interest in this Democratic heretic from the prairies of the West.⁴³⁹

Fear. The basic appeal to emotion discovered in the address was that of fear. Stevenson first used this approach when criticizing candidate Eisenhower for supporting all members of the Republican Party.

But the General's theory is not only novel, it is dangerous. If the voters of this nation ever stop looking at the record and the character of candidates, and look only at their party label, it will be a sorry day for healthy democracy.⁴⁴⁰

Stevenson further declared that the mere mention of the term "atomic bomb" strikes fear into the hearts of the average person. The undeniable results of Nagasaki and Hiroshima are enough to sober any thinking individual. "We shrink from the use of such weapons--weapons which destroy the guilty and innocent alike, like a terrible sword from heaven."⁴⁴¹ But what to do about the presence in our world of such forces is a fearful question. "This is the merciless question of the present--the question of what we should do with atomic power in a divided world."⁴⁴² There must be a solution, because the consequences of uncertainty are disastrous.

⁴³⁸Ibid., p. 138.

⁴³⁹Ibid., p. 134.

⁴⁴⁰Ibid.

⁴⁴¹Ibid., p. 135.

⁴⁴²Ibid.

But there can be no solution in an arms race. At the end of this road lies bankruptcy or world catastrophe. Already the earth is haunted by premonitions in this shadowed atomic age. Mankind must deserve some better destiny than this.⁴⁴³

It appeared quite certain that the solution was not to dispose entirely of our atomic research program; at the same time it appeared foolhardy to rely too heavily on one weapon. "Yet there always seemed to me a danger in making the atomic bomb the center of defense strategy."⁴⁴⁴ Stevenson referred to the Soviet leaders in the Kremlin and recognized the threat they posed to future peace and security. "I hold out no foolish hopes. We all know the character of the men in the Kremlin--their fanaticism, their ruthlessness, their limitless ambitions."⁴⁴⁵ But the Communist leaders of Russia also know the meaning of fear, and live constantly in fear of having its citizens discover the truth about the outside world.

To be effective, such a system would require effective United Nations inspection; and the Kremlin fears to open up the windows and doors of its giant prison. It fears to have the rest of the world learn the truth about the Soviet Union. It fears even more to have the Russian people learn the truth about the rest of the world.⁴⁴⁶

Confidence. Amid the doubts and uncertainties pertaining to the future of nuclear power in our society, Stevenson held out confidence that peaceful solutions would be found for our problems and great strides forward made in peaceful uses for the atom. "It is not too fantastic to think that we may, in time, unlock new doors to boundless energy for our homes and industries."⁴⁴⁷ He supported our country's attempt to set up a world-wide program of atomic control.

⁴⁴³Ibid., p. 136.

⁴⁴⁴Ibid.

⁴⁴⁵Ibid., p. 138.

⁴⁴⁶Ibid., p. 137.

⁴⁴⁷Ibid., p. 135.

I think this decision was right--profoundly right. Few things we have done since 1945 have so clearly demonstrated our national determination to achieve peace and to strengthen international order.⁴⁴⁸

As the address drew to a close Stevenson wanted to leave the audience with a feeling of hope and faith in the future, rather than a feeling of frustration after hearing about the destruction potential of this new weapon.

We may hope that the steady strengthening of the free world will increase their sense of the futility of aggression; that the intensification of peaceful pressures against the Soviet Empire will sharpen the internal contradictions within that empire; that, in time, free peoples may lift their heads again in Eastern Europe, and new policies and leadership emerge within the Soviet Union itself.⁴⁴⁹

He also stressed confidence in the future use of atomic power for peaceful ends, and predicted a new and wonderful era for all mankind.

There is no evil in the atom; only in men's souls. We have dealt with evil men before, and so have our fathers before us, from the beginning of time. The way to deal with evil men has never varied; stand up for the right, and, if need must be, fight for the right.⁴⁵⁰

Pity. Stevenson considered it a great pity that Senator McMahon had died so early in life. "Brien McMahon died of cancer. With luck and the help of atomic research, our children may be safe from this grim disaster."⁴⁵¹

Indignation. Stevenson used this device when criticizing the opposition Party for their stand on this issue.

And likewise the Democratic Party opposes that weird Republican policy which proposes to reduce our contributions to free-world strength, on the one hand, while it steps up its verbal threats against the enemy, on the other hand. Theodore Roosevelt used to say: 'Speak softly and carry a big stick.' But these modern Republicans seem to prefer to throw away the stick and scream imprecations.⁴⁵²

⁴⁴⁸Ibid., p. 136.

⁴⁴⁹Ibid., p. 138.

⁴⁵⁰Ibid.

⁴⁵¹Ibid., p. 135.

⁴⁵²Ibid., p. 137.

Emulation. The occasion for the speech was a memorial honoring the late Senator McMahon, and Stevenson expressed his sincere and heart-felt admiration of the man and his works.

I was moved to select this topic because atomic energy is a major component of our power and because our decisions and actions in atomic energy matters, as they relate to preparedness for both war and peace, will long bear the imprint of our wise and lamented friend, Brien McMahon of Connecticut.⁴⁵³

He further offered words of admiration and praise later in the speech.

In the decision to move ahead Brien McMahon again played a leading role. He demanded that we constantly step up our reserves of atomic weapons. He worked always to keep the sights of the atomic energy program high and its policies bold--and the United States has made a notable contribution to the security of the free world by its rapid development of atomic power.⁴⁵⁴

Contempt. Stevenson illustrated contempt for those who were responsible for stalling negotiations on international atom control "And so the negotiations have long been deadlocked. And, in irritation and disgust, some of us have rebelled against the whole idea of negotiation itself."⁴⁵⁵ He also showed contempt for those Republicans who had been vocal in their criticism of recent American policies, yet had seemed to agree with those policies before they proved inadvisable.

A year ago some Republican leaders contended that the best way to stop the war in Korea would be to extend it to the main-land of China. In the same vein, Republican leaders today seem to be arguing that the best way to deal with Soviet power in Europe is to instigate civil war in the satellite countries. These are dangerous, reckless, foolish counsels and likely to lead to the sacrifice of the lives of the very people whom we hope to liberate.⁴⁵⁶

Benevolence. He emphasized the benevolent gesture of the United States when we offered to internationalize the atomic works program.

⁴⁵³Ibid., p. 135.

⁴⁵⁴Ibid., p. 136.

⁴⁵⁵Ibid., p. 137.

⁴⁵⁶Ibid.

Because our Government knew the futility of the arms race, it made its great decision to seek an international system for the control of atomic power. We went to the United Nations and Bernard Baruch, a beloved and wise elder statesman, offered on behalf of the United States to share with other nations the good in atomic energy. In return, we asked that other nations join with us to curb its power for evil.⁴⁵⁷

He also exemplified a benevolent feeling when he suggested that the issue of nuclear development was above party politics, and offered to join with the Republicans, win or lose, for the better solution to the problem.

"To my Republican listeners I would say: the atomic adventure transcends partisan issues. Win or lose, we Democrats will work with you to follow this adventure to the end of peace and plenty for mankind."⁴⁵⁸

ARRANGEMENT

"The Atomic Future" represented the usual divisions of a speech, with a short and friendly introduction, the bulk of the address being part of the body, and a longer than usual conclusion that summed up the problems facing humanity and offered hope in the future. Stevenson opened the address with some local-color, referring to his boyhood days in Connecticut. He moved then to a discussion of the contributions Senator McMahon had made in the area of atomic development, and discussed at length the problems facing the nation today in that area. He mentioned the great and wonderful possibilities science can offer for the future, but cautioned that this amazing power can be used for evil as well as good. The conclusion was lengthy in comparison to other speeches, but the speaker felt he needed to restore confidence in the people for the future and establish the importance of successful control of nuclear development.

⁴⁵⁷Ibid., p. 136.

⁴⁵⁸Ibid., p. 138.

He concluded the address with another reference to Senator McMahon, expressing hope and faith in humanity's future.

STYLE

Level.

The style level was primarily middle, with numerous excerpts warranting classification as high style. The conclusion could be called high style in its entirety, Stevenson employing very ornate and fluent language to emphasize his important points. Most of the remainder of the speech was dignified, but not overly erudite, and would be classified as middle style.

Diction and word choice.

Word choice was careful and not repetitious, which demanded the use of many words of similar meaning. The diction was clear and apparently carefully arranged. No foreign words were found, and not as many polysyllabic words as usual for a Stevenson speech.

Sentence structure.

Most of the sentences were either complex or compound. Not as many simple sentences were discovered in this speech as in the others. Although the sentences were longer, their meaning was not confusing and the author was careful to avoid any word arrangement that would allow mis-interpretation.

Rhetorical devices and figurative language.

Analogy. Stevenson used this device but once, in reference to the rights each nation would need to forsake if an effective international program of atomic control were to be adopted.

By this offer all nations were asked to diminish their own sovereignty in the interests of world security--just as each of us gives

up some degree of personal independence when communities establish laws and set up forces to see that they are carried out.⁴⁵⁹

Epigram. Several epigrams were quoted in the address, on all aspects of the topic discussed in the speech. "Victory can be bought too dearly."⁴⁶⁰; "There is no evil in the atom; only in men's souls."⁴⁶¹; "But there can be no solution in an arms race."⁴⁶²; "Speak softly and carry a big stick."⁴⁶³

Irony and satire. The seriousness of the topic prevented the speaker from utilizing his usual amount of ironic comments. Only once, in the beginning of the talk and in reference to his political opponents, did he speak in this way.

In recent weeks my distinguished opponent has adopted the singular theory that a candidate for President should support all state and local candidates on his party ticket--good, bad, indifferent--and regardless of their views and records.⁴⁶⁴

Contrast. Stevenson contrasted the Republicans of today with Theodore Roosevelt, to the disadvantage of modern Republicans. "Theodore Roosevelt used to say: 'Speak softly and carry a big stick.' But these modern Republicans seem to prefer to throw away the stick and scream imprecations."⁴⁶⁵ He also contrasted the death of Senator McMahon with hopes for prevention of such deaths. "Brien McMahon died of cancer. With luck and the help of atomic research, our children may be safe from this grim disaster."⁴⁶⁶ The power of the atom posed contrasting possibilities, either for unheard-of devastation and destruction, or wonderful peaceful uses. "And we will never be able to release the power of the atom to build

⁴⁵⁹Ibid., p. 136.

⁴⁶¹Ibid., p. 138.

⁴⁶³Ibid., p. 137.

⁴⁶⁵Ibid., p. 137.

⁴⁶⁰Ibid., p. 134.

⁴⁶²Ibid., p. 136.

⁴⁶⁴Ibid., p. 134.

⁴⁶⁶Ibid., p. 135.

unless we are able to restrain its power to destroy."⁴⁶⁷ Speaking along the same lines, he said: "The future is still open--open for disaster, if we seek peace cheaply or meanly, but open for real peace, if we seek it bravely and nobly."⁴⁶⁸

Climax. The climax came after a considerable build-up, and was the following paragraph:

In any case, let us not cower with fear before this new instrument of power. Nature is neutral. Man has wrested from nature the power to make the world a desert or to make the deserts bloom. There is no evil in the atom; only in men's souls. We have dealt with evil men before, and so have our fathers before us, from the beginning of time. The way to deal with evil men has never varied; stand up for the right, and, if needs must be, fight for the right.⁴⁶⁹

Anaphora and epistrophe. This rhetorical device was used when the speaker mentioned the fear present in the minds of the Soviet leaders. "It fears to have the rest of the world learn the truth about the Soviet Union. It fears even more to have the Russian peoples learn the truth about the rest of the world."⁴⁷⁰ Urging constant vigilance on the part of American citizens, he said this:

We must never close our minds or freeze our positions. We must strive constantly to break the deadlock in our atomic discussions. But we can never yield on the objective of securing a foolproof system of international inspection and control. And we will never confuse negotiation with appeasement.⁴⁷¹

Allusion and reference. There were quite a number of references to noted personalities found in the speech. At least a dozen times he referred to Senator McMahon, quoting him four times and relying on his ideas several times. Other sources were referred to also, one being Governor Dewey, the previous unsuccessful Republican candidate for President.

⁴⁶⁷Ibid.

⁴⁶⁸Ibid., p. 138.

⁴⁶⁹Ibid.

⁴⁷⁰Ibid., p. 137.

⁴⁷¹Ibid.

It was not too long ago when Governor Dewey, as party leader, honorably refused to support a Republican Congressman who had distinguished himself by incessant and noisy opposition to vital national policies.⁴⁷²

The disaster at Hiroshima was referred to, along with the author of a book which described the scene.

The memory of Hiroshima is fresh with us--described in enduring prose by one of the most accomplished contemporary writers--John Hersey--who, I am proud to say, is head of the Volunteers for Stevenson in Connecticut.⁴⁷³

The revered name of Bernard Baruch was introduced as testimony that we intended to place much faith in our plan for atomic controls.

We went to the United Nations and Bernard Baruch, a beloved and wise elder statesman, offered on behalf of the United States to share with other nations the good in atomic energy.⁴⁷⁴

Stevenson referred to Theodore Roosevelt as an authority on international diplomacy. "Theodore Roosevelt used to say: 'Speak softly and carry a big stick.'"⁴⁷⁵

Metaphor. This device was used but once, as follows: ". . .and the Kremlin fears to open up the windows and doors of its giant prison."⁴⁷⁶

Simile. One simile was also noted in the address. Stevenson was talking about the terror of atomic warfare when he said: We shrink from the use of such weapons--weapons which destroy the guilty and innocent alike, like a terrible sword from heaven."⁴⁷⁷

Personification. This example of personification was found: "Brien McMahon was among the first to see the great potentiality for good and evil which was opened up by this advance of the frontiers of knowledge."⁴⁷⁸

⁴⁷²Ibid., p. 134.

⁴⁷⁴Ibid.

⁴⁷⁶Ibid.

⁴⁷⁸Ibid.

⁴⁷³Ibid., p. 136.

⁴⁷⁵Ibid., p. 137.

⁴⁷⁷Ibid., p. 135.

It was the only example of this device discovered.

Alliteration. Stevenson, intentionally in most cases, used considerable alliteration in the speech. Here are several representative examples: "by incessant and noisy opposition to vital national policies!"⁴⁷⁹; "But this exhibition of Republican expediency,"⁴⁸⁰; "major component of our power."⁴⁸¹; "We have no choice but to insure our atomic superiority,"⁴⁸²; "The age of atomic abundance."⁴⁸³; "The Democratic Party will never desist in the search for peace."⁴⁸⁴; "preponderant power."⁴⁸⁵

V. THE ROLE OF LABOR

INVENTION

Logos--non-artistic proof.

Evidence. Stevenson used evidence to a greater extent than usual in this address. The reason was the need to trace the development of the labor movement, and the citing of numerous events and acts to verify his points. He cited the Norris-LaGuardia Act with these words:

He cites with approval the Norris-LaGuardia Act which was passed, so he said, under his party's administration in 1932. Now this will all seem a pretty broad claim to those who remember that the House of Representatives in the Seventy-second Congress was safely Democratic. . . He didn't mention the fact that that act virtually outlawed the labor injunction in the Federal Courts or that it had been seriously cut down by the Taft-Hartley Act.⁴⁸⁶

He justified his own interest and qualifications in labor matters with

⁴⁷⁹Ibid., p. 134.

⁴⁸¹Ibid., p. 135.

⁴⁸³Ibid., p. 135.

⁴⁸⁵Ibid., p. 138.

⁴⁸⁰Ibid.

⁴⁸²Ibid., p. 136.

⁴⁸⁴Ibid., p. 137.

⁴⁸⁶Ibid., p. 159.

a brief review of his experiences.

Strengthening the Labor Department is an old subject. . . .But I lay what I hope is not immodest claim to at least a journeyman's qualifications. My apprenticeship was served in getting and assisting to get, at least a partial labor program--over fifty bills--through a Republican legislature in Illinois.⁴⁸⁷

Referring to the attitude of the Republican Party towards organized labor, Stevenson recalled this bit of evidence: "One wonders why his party forgot them when, in 1947, they singled you out as peculiarly suspicious characters and required your taking a special oath of loyalty."⁴⁸⁸ He commented upon the accomplishments of labor by citing these examples of effective work:

. . .pressing the case in the United Nations against forced labor in the Soviet Union; supporting free trade unions in Europe and Asia and in South America; helping build up popular resistance wherever the spiked wall of Russia throws its shadow over free men and women.⁴⁸⁹

Authority. The name of Senator Taft was mentioned several times, this individual being a favorite of Democratic orators when addressing labor groups. The Taft-Hartley labor law was passed by a Republican Congress and was generally reported as unfavorable to the laboring group.

The real issue is what changes would be made in the law of the United States. But, if repeal were in itself the issue, I would remind Senator Taft that he himself has publicly recognized twenty-three mistakes in his favorite law, and it seems not unreasonable to recommend that a tire with twenty-three punctures and five blow-outs needs junking and not a recap job--and especially a recap job with reclaimed Republican rubber.⁴⁹⁰

The Republican Senator from Oregon, Wayne Morse, had recently announced that he could not support the campaign of General Eisenhower, and Stevenson did not allow this support to be forgotten.

⁴⁸⁷Ibid., p. 161.

⁴⁸⁸Ibid.

⁴⁸⁹Ibid., p. 162.

⁴⁹⁰Ibid., p. 158.

Now the final Republican maneuvers were executed (by General Eisenhower) on this platform last Wednesday. I am grateful that it was the Republican, Senator Morse, who revealed so masterfully how all of those explosions were only blank cartridges.⁴⁹¹

Stevenson felt that Eisenhower was mis-using the names of Norris and LaGuardia in reference to their labor legislation.

Now all this will seem a pretty broad claim to those who remember that the House of Representatives in the Seventy-second Congress was safely Democratic, and who can't see much resemblance between Republicans like George Norris and Fiorello LaGuardia, on the one hand, and Senator Taft and Representative Hartley on the other.⁴⁹²

He referred to President Truman and relied upon his analysis of the labor situation as an authentic survey of the area.

There are other tasks ahead, many of them here at home. President Truman listed the biggest among these jobs in his message to this convention, the priority jobs in making America still stronger and ever more healthy.⁴⁹³

The final paragraph of the address contained a reference to the great names in the labor movement.

I want, if I may, in closing to salute a tradition of leadership which embodies all I have been trying to say here tonight. The foundations of that tradition were laid by Samuel Gompers, and they have been built upon by William Green. You have held, sir, if I may say so, to the ideal of democratic leadership--the leadership which seeks the good of all, the leadership of him who wants only to serve.⁴⁹⁴

Sign. This was not a favorite type of argument used by Stevenson in this speech. He did indicate by sign the following situation:

It is proposed now apparently to change the Taft-Hartley Act in just two respects: by removing what the speaker called the union-busting clauses, and by making employers, like union leaders, swear that they are not communists. The tinkling sound of these little words was unfortunately smothered in the thundering silence of what was left unsaid.⁴⁹⁵

⁴⁹¹Ibid.

⁴⁹²Ibid., p. 159.

⁴⁹³Ibid., p. 162.

⁴⁹⁴Ibid., p. 164.

⁴⁹⁵Ibid., p. 158.

When he referred to the statements of his opponent in the campaign, he reasoned as follows:

Now what my opponent would do I cannot determine. . . .He seems to support the present law, which compels men to work under court injunction for eighty days on terms they have rejected. . . .And if I read what he says as fairly as I can, I gather that in fact he recognizes this too and agrees with me, and with you, that the labor injunction is not a fair or effective dispute-settling device.⁴⁹⁶

He spoke with admiration about the job labor unions have done in spreading good will throughout the world.

Where men's minds have been poisoned against democracy, many will learn that America is free, and they will learn it as they hear it from you when you say that you are free. To the workers of other nations, yours is today perhaps the clearest voice that America has.⁴⁹⁷

Assumption. Stevenson used this reasoning when discussing the possible improvements to be made in labor affairs.

Given sufficient funds, the Bureau of Labor Statistics could, it seems to me, better perform its essential service as keeper of the people's budget, and serve a much broader function than it now can.⁴⁹⁸

He continued in the same vein:

We should consider a labor counterpart of the Agricultural Extension Service to help train the men who make democracy work in the labor unions and around the bargaining tables.⁴⁹⁹

He made the following assumption regarding what would happen in the future:

"It will also be an important development in democracy when men and women will come in ever-increasing numbers from your ranks to positions of key responsibilities in government."⁵⁰⁰ Still projecting what might happen in the years to come, Stevenson made these statements:

⁴⁹⁶Ibid., p. 159.

⁴⁹⁷Ibid., p. 162.

⁴⁹⁸Ibid., p. 161.

⁴⁹⁹Ibid.

⁵⁰⁰Ibid.

Yet American labor, like the Democratic Party, faces new and uncharted tomorrows. You, as we, will be challenged anew to measure up to the demands of both freedom and power. The future of democracy, perhaps the future of our world, depends upon the exercise of power by America's private and public bodies alike with that self-restraint which separates power from tyranny and order from chaos.⁵⁰¹

Logos--artistic proof.

Inductive reasoning--argument from generalization. Stevenson illustrated the wonderful benefits that have accrued to the laboring masses within the past century and thus gave credence to his contention that under Democratic leadership, the working people have profited.

The understanding which flows between the party for which I speak and the enormous group you represent requires no detailing here. To remember the loneliness, the fear and the insecurity of men who once had to walk alone in huge factories beside huge machines, to realize that labor unions have meant new dignity and pride to millions of our countrymen, human companionship on the job, and music in the home, to be able to see what larger pay checks mean, not to a man as an employee, but as a husband, and as a father--to know these things is to understand what American labor means.⁵⁰²

He acknowledged the accomplishments of organized labor, and from these achievements drew a hope for even greater things ahead.

I hope you don't misunderstand me--I am neither courting nor embracing--when I acknowledge and applaud the job you have done, not only through the International Labor Organization, the Economic Co-operation Administration, the Department of State, but through your own offices in rejecting the communist World Federation of Trade Unions; pressing the case in the United Nations against forced labor in the Soviet Union; supporting free trade unions in Europe and Asia and in South America; helping build up popular resistance wherever the spiked wall of Russia throws its shadow over free men and women. Where men's minds have been poisoned against democracy, many will learn that America is free, and they will only learn it as they hear it from you when you say that you are free. To workers of other nations, yours is today perhaps the clearest voice that America has.⁵⁰³

⁵⁰¹Ibid., pp. 163-164.

⁵⁰²Ibid., p. 162.

⁵⁰³Ibid.

Inductive reasoning--argument from causation. The speaker outlined the reasons why he thought the Taft-Hartley Act should be repealed.

But, because the required changes are major changes, because the present law is spiteful, and because it has become a symbol of dissension and bitterness, I urge, therefore, as I did on Labor Day, that the Taft-Hartley Act be repealed.⁵⁰⁴

Stevenson admitted not knowing the cause of certain phenomenon that seem to appear every election year.

There has been, too, the usual barrage of intemperate name-calling. Why is it that when political ammunition runs low, inevitably the rusty artillery of abuse is always wheeled into action? To face the facts of labor relations is to be accused of 'captivity', and of 'turning left'.⁵⁰⁵

The newly acquired power of organized labor must be used wisely, else the cause of democracy will suffer.

It is no less essential to the future of democracy that American labor walk wisely with its power. Your awareness of this has been shown in many practical ways. There is, most recently, the forthright and heartening manner in which you have attacked the problem of jurisdictional strikes.⁵⁰⁶

Stevenson believed that the Democratic Party had both helped the working man and been helped by him, for these reasons:

Equally has the Democratic Party drawn its strength, I think, from the people. We have built our program on their hopes, stood by them in adversity and found the measure of our accomplishments in their welfare. We have written the laws of twenty years from pictures in our minds of men and women who are tired after a day's full work, who are defeated if a week's wages won't buy a week's food, who are out of a job, or who are sick or have finished a life's work. We believe in a government with a heart.⁵⁰⁷

Inductive reasoning--argument from analogy. Only one example of argument from analogy was found, that pertaining to the Taft-Hartley Act.

⁵⁰⁴Ibid., p. 158.

⁵⁰⁶Ibid., p. 163.

⁵⁰⁵Ibid.

⁵⁰⁷Ibid., p. 164.

But, if repeal were in itself the issue, I would remind Senator Taft that he himself has publicly recognized twenty-three mistakes in his favorite law, and it seems not unreasonable to recommend that a tire with twenty-three punctures and five blowouts needs junking, and not a recap job--and especially a recap job with reclaimed Republican rubber.⁵⁰⁸

Deductive reasoning--argument from syllogism and enthymeme. Quoting General Eisenhower, who had spoken to the same audience only two days earlier, Stevenson attempted to point out his faulty reasoning.

He says he is against compulsion. Yet he seems to support the present law, which compels men to work under court injunction for eighty days on terms they have rejected. I find it hard to see where there can be a greater compulsion than this. And if I read what he says as fairly as I can, I gather that in fact he recognizes this too and agrees with me, and with you, that the labor injunction is not a fair or effective dispute-settling device.⁵⁰⁹

He reasoned that the functions of the Democratic Party and organized labor, although often sympathetic with each-other, must be maintained on separate levels.

But our functions are different, and our responsibilities are different to different groups, even if these groups possibly overlap. The Democratic Party is the party of all the people. Were it otherwise, it would be false to democracy itself.⁵¹⁰

Ethos.

Sincerity. Stevenson opened the body of his address with the following plea: "So you will, I hope, understand that what little I have to say, or rather to add, to the many speeches you have dutifully listened to, is intended for your heads and not your hands."⁵¹¹ He spoke of the awesome responsibility that faced organized labor, since it now qualified as a major force in democracy. "'Uneasy lies the head that wears the crown.' It is cause for very real humility. It is the whole history of

⁵⁰⁸Ibid., p. 158.

⁵¹⁰Ibid., p. 160.

⁵⁰⁹Ibid., p. 159.

⁵¹¹Ibid., p. 157.

mankind that power lacking the inner strength of self-restraint will be eventually cast down."⁵¹² Stevenson was also sincere when he explained why he spoke so carefully of labor matters. "As spokesman for the Democratic Party, at least for the moment, I put this in plain language, not because you of the A. F. of L. misunderstand, but because others try to misrepresent."⁵¹³

Earnestness. From the beginning of the address, the speaker maintained an atmosphere of earnestness. His justification for the seriousness of the speech was the vast responsibility laid in the hands of both the audience and the speaker. "After all, you are the responsible leaders of organized labor, . . .and I, in turn, am a candidate for the most important individual responsibility in the world."⁵¹⁴ Stevenson was in earnest when he accused General Eisenhower of misquoting him in an earlier address. "But if he wrote what he said, he had not read what I said."⁵¹⁵ He was also speaking in earnest when he related his pride in his Party and its accomplishments, particularly regarding labor.

I am proud, as a Democrat, that a Democratic administration has recognized this and I hope that more and more union leaders will be called upon to serve their country abroad. I think we need diplomats who speak to people in the accents of the people. Ambassadors in overalls can be the best salesmen of democracy.⁵¹⁶

After mentioning the great benefits recently bestowed upon the working classes, Stevenson earnestly wanted to know what the opposition meant when it insisted upon a change. "The Republicans say they want a change. Well, then, let them speak out: Which of these things do they want changed."⁵¹⁷

⁵¹²Ibid., p. 163.

⁵¹⁴Ibid., p. 157.

⁵¹⁶Ibid., p. 162.

⁵¹³Ibid., p. 160.

⁵¹⁵Ibid., p. 159.

⁵¹⁷Ibid., p. 164.

Devotion. The Democratic candidate gave ample evidence throughout the address that he was a devoted man; devoted to his Party and its aims. "I should like, therefore, to discuss with you how we can best make this relationship work--this partnership, if you please, between government and an independent organization like the American Federation of Labor, both devoted to the same ends."⁵¹⁸ Speaking about the devotion of the Party itself: "The Democratic Party is the party of all the people. Were it otherwise, it would be false to democracy itself."⁵¹⁹ If Stevenson had anything to do with the future course of the Party, he appeared convinced that it would need to remain devoted to the ideals which had brought it such success and confidence in the past.

Equally has the Democratic Party drawn its strength, I think, from the people. We have built our program on their hopes, stood by them in adversity and found the measure of our accomplishments in their welfare. We have written the laws of twenty years from pictures in our minds of men and women who are tired after a day's full work. . . . We believe in a government with a heart.⁵²⁰

In conclusion, the speaker had this to say: "With mutual understanding, with a humbling sense of our power, with belief in our masters, the people, we shall see to it, my friends, that these things are not changed."⁵²¹

Patience. All the accomplishments of the past only predicate many more responsibilities in the future. "Yet American labor, like the Democratic Party, faces new and uncharted tomorrows. You, as we, will be challenged anew to measure up to the demands of both freedom and power."⁵²² The final climax was an appeal to continue the progress started in the

⁵¹⁸Ibid., p. 160.

⁵¹⁹Ibid.

⁵²⁰Ibid., p. 164.

⁵²¹Ibid.

⁵²²Ibid., p. 163.

area of labor relations. "With mutual understanding, with a humbling sense of our power, with belief in our masters, the people, we shall see to it, my friends, that these things are not changed."⁵²³

Friendliness. A primary theme of the entire speech was to convince the union members present that their true political friend was the Democratic Party. "I should like, therefore, to discuss with you how we can best make this relationship work--this partnership, if you please, between government and an independent organization like the American Federation of Labor, both devoted to the same ends."⁵²⁴ Another excerpt expressing a similar thought was this quote:

I am glad that the Democratic Party and the American Federation of Labor have both been guided for a long time by the same stars--stars that have led us toward the realization of human hopes and desires.⁵²⁵

Sympathy. Stevenson quickly expressed sympathy towards the widespread feeling that the Taft-Hartley labor Act should be repealed.

But, because the required changes are major changes, because the present law is spiteful, and because it has become a symbol of dissension and bitterness, I urge, therefore, as I did on Labor Day, that the Taft-Hartley Act be repealed.⁵²⁶

He showed sympathy towards various segments of the laboring force that have not enjoyed the benefits received by most union members.

Then there is the problem of the migrant farm laborers, over a million Americans who move north and south with the sun and the seasons, their lives often bleak cycles of exploitation and rejection. It certainly invites our compassionate attention.⁵²⁷

The Democratic Party had stood for years with the working man, and

⁵²³Ibid., p. 164.

⁵²⁴Ibid., p. 160.

⁵²⁵Ibid.

⁵²⁶Ibid., p. 158.

⁵²⁷Ibid., p. 161.

Stevenson emphasized this sympathetic feeling, maintaining that it must, and would, continue, to the benefit of both labor and the Democratic Party. Although he praised the labor movement numerous times, perhaps the best example of congenial sympathy were in these words:

One of the most significant developments in our national life is that the American labor movement is today much more than an instrument of collective bargaining. It has become a vital agency of a working democracy. Your purposes extend to making America strong in a free and a peaceful world, and to seeking all the democratic goals to which the Government of this country is dedicated.⁵²⁸

Stevenson recalled the past and sympathized with the unfortunate laborer before he became organized and bettered his status in life.

To remember the loneliness, the fear and the insecurity of men who once had to walk alone in huge factories beside huge machines, to realize that labor unions have meant new dignity and pride to millions of our countrymen, human companionship on the job. . . .to know these things is to understand what American labor means.⁵²⁹

Finally, in correlating the aims and hopes of labor and the Democratic Party, the speaker expressed these thoughts:

It has been the basic belief of the Democratic Party that only human freedoms are basic and that economic power must be exercised so as not to curtail them. We hold, too, that the power must be restricted to the point that government stands never as master and always as a servant.⁵³⁰

Knowledge of subject. Stevenson justified his ability to speak knowingly on labor problems by referring to his experience when Governor of Illinois.

Strengthening the Labor Department is an old subject. Advocacy is always easier than action. But I lay what I hope is not immodest claim to at least a journeyman's qualifications. My apprenticeship was served in getting and assisting to get, at least a partial labor program--over fifty bills--through a Republican legislature in Illinois.⁵³¹

⁵²⁸Ibid., p. 160.

⁵²⁹Ibid., p. 162.

⁵³⁰Ibid., p. 163.

⁵³¹Ibid., p. 161.

Pathos.

Love and friendship. One of the motivating aspects of the address was to cement the friendly relationship between labor and the Democrats, and Stevenson being a relatively new dignitary within the Party, sought to identify himself as a friend of labor by identifying himself as a good Democrat. "The understanding which flows between the party for which I speak and the enormous group you represent requires no detailing here."⁵³² He reworded the same thought in this manner: "I am glad that the Democratic Party and the American Federation of Labor have both been guided for a long time by the same stars --stars that have led us toward the realization of human hopes and desires."⁵³³ As a summation of his hopes for the future, Stevenson remarked: "With mutual understanding, with a humbling sense of our power, with belief in our masters, the people, we shall see to it, my friends, that these things are not changed."⁵³⁴

Fear. Only on one occasion did any proof of this type enter into the speech. After a confident appraisal of what labor could do in coming years, Stevenson warned: "Yet American labor, like the Democratic Party, faces new and uncharted tomorrows. You, as we, will be challenged anew to measure up to the demands of both freedom and power."⁵³⁵

Confidence. This speech was notably lacking in expressions of both fear and confidence. There was a noticeable underlying tone of confidence in the future, but rarely did this feeling appear in words. By remarking upon the strength of the Democratic Party and its past and present condition, a feeling of confidence was aroused.

⁵³²Ibid., p. 162.

⁵³³Ibid., p. 160.

⁵³⁴Ibid., p. 164.

⁵³⁵Ibid., p. 163.

The Democratic Party has been entrusted for twenty years with the awesome responsibility of leadership in governing the United States. During these years, the labor unions have become strong and vigorous. So American labor, too, has enormous power today and enormous responsibilities.⁵³⁶

Pity. The reference to the plight of migrant laborers certainly evoked pity on the part of the audience.

Then there is the problem of the migrant farm laborers, over a million Americans who move north and south with the sun and the seasons, their lives often bleak cycles of exploitation and rejection. It certainly invites our compassionate attention.⁵³⁷

The Democratic candidate also considered it a pity that his political opponents sometimes seemed to overlook certain factors relevant to basic human problems. "But they are the imponderable human elements that some among us, unhappily, have never understood."⁵³⁸

Indignation. Stevenson expressed indignation at the attitude of the Republican Party towards labor on certain issues, particularly the Taft-Hartley Act.

The Republican platform commends the Taft-Hartley Act because among other things it guarantees to the working man, and I quote, 'The right to quit his job at any time.' To this deceit they add the insistence that the real issue here is whether the present law should be 'amended' or 'repealed'. This is not the real issue.⁵³⁹

He was indignant towards those who intentionally attempted to misrepresent the basic issues and confuse the electorate.

There has been, too, the usual barrage of intemperate name-calling. Why is it that when political ammunition runs low, inevitably the rusty artillery of abuse is always wheeled into action? To face the facts of labor relations is to be accused of 'captivity' and of 'turning left.' Now these are words without roots, weeds which

⁵³⁶Ibid.

⁵³⁷Ibid., p. 161.

⁵³⁸Ibid., p. 163.

⁵³⁹Ibid., p. 158.

grow in darkness and wither in the sun. But the sun is sometimes slow to rise--especially during campaigns.⁵⁴⁰

He definitely felt that his views on revision of the Taft-Hartley Act had been misconstrued by the opposition camp, and was more than bothered by this action.

It was charged that I had 'embraced', and I quote the words, 'the principle of compulsion' by asking for the power as President to 'compel' arbitration of disputes which threaten the national safety. Now, after that great reunion with Senator Taft on the love-seat at Columbia University, I must say I respect the General's authority on the subject of embraces. But if he wrote what he said, he had not read what I said.⁵⁴¹

Emulation. Stevenson missed no opportunity to praise the leaders of organized labor for their successful efforts in many fields. He noted particularly their recent work in international affairs, heaping praise upon their efforts. "What you have to offer, in all of our essential governmental programs, has been perhaps best proven by the contribution that labor has already made on the international front."⁵⁴² The primary worth of this effort was combatting communistic elements in international labor groups. "Your effective fight against communism goes clear back to the time it was called bolshevism. You have licked it in your own houses, and you have gone after the roots from which it grows."⁵⁴³ He noted that General Eisenhower had also praised the labor unions in this regard, and made clear that he agreed. "I join with my distinguished opponent in saluting you for these accomplishments."⁵⁴⁴ In a similar vein he spoke thusly: "To the workers of other nations, yours is today

⁵⁴⁰Ibid.

⁵⁴²Ibid., p. 161.

⁵⁴⁴Ibid.

⁵⁴¹Ibid., p. 159.

⁵⁴³Ibid.

perhaps the clearest voice that America has."⁵⁴⁵ "I think that we need diplomats who speak to people in the accents of the people. Ambassadors in overalls can be the best salesmen of democracy."⁵⁴⁶ Stevenson cautioned against abusive use of the power of organized labor, but asserted that past experience indicated no trouble in the future.

It is no less essential to the future of democracy that American labor walk wisely with its power. Your awareness of this has been shown in many practical ways. There is, most recently perhaps, the forthright and heartening manner in which you have attacked the problem of jurisdictional strikes. Your joint-board procedure in the building trades and your prohibitions upon picketing in support of jurisdictional claims are examples of sound self-regulation directed against the abuse and, therefore, the corruption of power.⁵⁴⁷

In the concluding paragraph, the speaker praised in glowing terms the present leadership of organized labor. "You have held, sir, if I may say so, to the ideal of democratic leadership--the leadership which seeks the good of all, the leadership of him who wants only to serve."⁵⁴⁸

Contempt. This emotion was evoked only when speaking about the opposition Party and some of their actions. He was contemptuous of the Republicans when he explained: "As spokesman for the Democratic Party, at least for the moment, I put this in plain language, not because you of the A. F. of L. misunderstand, but because others try to misrepresent."⁵⁴⁹ He continued to speak contemptuously about the Republicans, implying that their historical record of antagonism to organized labor can not easily be smoothed over.

⁵⁴⁵Ibid., p. 162.

⁵⁴⁶Ibid.

⁵⁴⁷Ibid., p. 163.

⁵⁴⁸Ibid., p. 164.

⁵⁴⁹Ibid., p. 160.

It is the history of the Republican Party that it supported, and was supported by, those interests which believed that freedom meant the right to exercise economic power without restraint. And that party was cast down.⁵⁵⁰

By the use of interrogation the speaker heaped contempt upon those who would limit the advance of the labor movement.

What do they mean? Are they saying that our people are too well fed, too well clothed, too well housed? Do they say that our children are getting more and better schooling than they should? Have we gone too fast in our efforts to provide equal opportunities to working men and women of all races and colors? Are the 62,000,000 workers of America too healthy, too happy? Should fewer of them be working?⁵⁵¹

Benevolence. Stevenson expressed a feeling of kindness and a desire to be of service to the laboring people of America. He wanted to convey the idea that labor and government should mutually benefit by helping each-other.

I should like, therefore, to discuss with you how we can best make this relationship work—this partnership, if you please, between government and an independent organization like the American Federation of Labor, both devoted to the same ends.⁵⁵²

But, though both desire to further betterment of the nation, they each must work separately and not become dependent on each-other. "We seek then a pattern for full co-operation, but one which recognizes our mutual independence."⁵⁵³ Stevenson pointed out that the history of the Democratic Party showed continued benevolence towards the working man, and that the hope of the Party lies in continued pursuit of this objective.

Equally has the Democratic Party drawn its strength, I think, from the people. We have built our program on their hopes, stood by them in adversity and found the measure of our accomplishments in their welfare.⁵⁵⁴

⁵⁵⁰Ibid., p. 163.

⁵⁵¹Ibid., p. 164.

⁵⁵²Ibid., p. 160.

⁵⁵³Ibid.

⁵⁵⁴Ibid., p. 164.

ARRANGEMENT

"The Role of Labor" typified the Stevenson campaign speech as far as arrangement was concerned. A short, sincere introduction, the lengthy and meaty body of the address, and then the relatively short, but potent, conclusion. The introduction of this speech was primarily devoted to the task of introducing the Democratic Party to the audience as the true friend of labor. The speaker then proceeded to examine the stand of the two Parties on such issues as Taft-Hartley Act reform, the problem of collective bargaining, reforms in labor-management relations, the international fight against communist infiltration into the labor groups and other areas of importance. The conclusion was rather brief, covering the hopes and aspirations of laboring groups for the coming years. He saluted the leaders of organized labor and commended them for the splendid job they have done and are continuing to do on behalf of the American working man.

STYLELevel.

The level of this speech, as has been the case in all of the speeches analyzed thus far, was primarily middle. The conclusion, again, had excerpts that justified a classification of high style, but the body was almost entirely of a middle style variety. The mood was very dignified and serious throughout, with little reference to humor.

Diction and word choice.

The words used in this speech compared to his other speeches, were not quite as scholarly and tended to be more within the normal speaking range of the lesser-educated person. The reasoning was simple to follow

in most cases, with no involved thoughts encountered. Considerable repetition was found, mostly for emphasis of important points. No foreign words were found, and fewer poly-syllabic words than in the other speeches studied.

Sentence structure.

There were more simple sentences found than usual, although still more complex sentences were used. Stevenson liked to use dependent clauses in his speeches, and he used them considerably in this talk, often more than one per sentence.

Rhetorical devices and figurative language.

Analogy. One analogy was discovered, and that referred to the Republican Party's stand on the Taft-Hartley Act.

I would remind Senator Taft that he himself has publicly recognized twenty-three mistakes in his favorite law, and it seems not unreasonable to recommend that a tire with twenty-three punctures and five blow-outs needs junking and not a recap job--and especially a recap job with reclaimed Republican rubber.⁵⁵⁵

Epigram. Several epigrams were noted, the most often quoted being the following satirical reference to the opposition Party: "The tinkling sound of these little words was unfortunately smothered in the thundering silence of what was left unsaid."⁵⁵⁶ Others discovered were these: ". . .a lie can travel around the world while truth is pulling on its boots."⁵⁵⁷; "The Democratic Party is the party of all the people."⁵⁵⁸ ". . .justice delayed is justice denied."⁵⁵⁹; ". . .advocacy is always easier than action."⁵⁶⁰; "Ambassadors in overalls can be the best

⁵⁵⁵Ibid., p. 158.

⁵⁵⁷Ibid.

⁵⁵⁹Ibid., p. 161.

⁵⁵⁶Ibid.

⁵⁵⁸Ibid., p. 160.

⁵⁶⁰Ibid.

salesmen of democracy."⁵⁶¹; "Uneasy lies the head that wears the crown."⁵⁶²;
 ". . .government stands never as master and always as a servant."⁵⁶³;
 "We believe in government with a heart."⁵⁶⁴ None of these, except the
 first one quoted above, were original on the part of Stevenson.

Humor. This address was noticeably lacking in humor, most
 light touches coming in the form of satire or irony. A feeble
 attempt at humor was made in the introduction, when the speaker said:
 "And, if I don't start any cheers, I hope at least that I shall not stop
 any minds."⁵⁶⁵ When he referred to the renegade Republican Senator,
 Morse of Oregon, he made the following humorous comment: "I am grateful
 that it was the Republican, Senator Morse, who revealed so masterfully
 how all of those explosions we heard were only blank cartridges."⁵⁶⁶

Irony and satire. This was a favorite device of Stevenson's
 throughout this address. All the references which could be classified
 as ironic or satiric were references to the opposition Party or some
 of their members. He spoke of the recent re-union in mind and body
 between General Eisenhower and Senator Taft: "Now, after that great
 re-union with Senator Taft on the love-seat at Columbia University, I
 must say I respect the General's authority on the subject of embraces."⁵⁶⁷
 He spoke satirically of the address to the same labor union audience that
 his opponent delivered only two days previously:

⁵⁶¹Ibid., p. 162.

⁵⁶³Ibid., p. 163.

⁵⁶⁵Ibid., p. 157.

⁵⁶⁷Ibid., p. 159.

⁵⁶²Ibid., p. 164.

⁵⁶⁴Ibid., p. 164.

⁵⁶⁶Ibid., p. 158.

⁵⁶⁸Ibid.

Now this will all seem like a pretty broad claim to those who remember that the House of Representatives in the Seventy-second Congress was safely Democratic, and who can't see much resemblance between Republicans like George Norris and Fiorello LaGuardia, on the one hand, and Senator Taft and Representative Hartley on the other.⁵⁶⁸

Speaking about the historical differences between the two major Parties, Stevenson questioned the basic sincerity of the Republican appeal to labor groups. He maintained that the traditional stand of the opposition Party has been camouflaged by Republican candidates out to obtain votes. "One wonders why his party forgot them when, in 1947, they singled you out as peculiarly suspicious characters and required your taking a special oath of loyalty."⁵⁶⁹ He accused his opponent of courting labor's votes by making irresponsible statements, and commented satirically on this method. "I hope you don't misunderstand me--I am neither courting nor embracing--when I acknowledge and applaud the job you have done."⁵⁷⁰ He related the goals of organized labor, expressed his sympathy with those goals, and added these biting words: "But they are the imponderable human elements that some among us, unhappily, have never understood."⁵⁷¹ He was extremely ironic when he accused some Republicans, and some Democrats also, of opposing progress for the working man.

What do they mean? Are they saying that our people are too well fed, too well clothed, too well housed? Do they say that our children are getting more and better schooling than they should? Have we gone too fast in our efforts to provide equal opportunities to working men and women of all races and colors? Are the 62,000,000 workers of America too healthy, too happy? Should fewer of them be working?⁵⁷²

⁵⁶⁸Ibid.

⁵⁶⁹Ibid., p. 161.

⁵⁷⁰Ibid., p. 163.

⁵⁷¹Ibid.

⁵⁷²Ibid., p. 164.

Interrogation. This device was noted several times, always for effect after presenting a certain idea or complaint. After criticizing the Taft-Hartley Act, he wondered, "How to get a new one?"⁵⁷³ He philosophized with this question: "Why is it that when political ammunition runs low, inevitably the rusty artillery of abuse is always wheeled into action?"⁵⁷⁴ After relating the goals that humans over the world strive to attain, he wondered: "And what are the specific things we can do in moving toward human goals we hold in common?"⁵⁷⁵ The paragraph quoted above to illustrate irony and satire was also interrogation, although it was a secondary rhetorical device in that instance. In his conclusion Stevenson asked his opponents a rather pointed question: "The Republicans say they want a change. Well, let them, then, speak out: Which of these things do they want changed?"⁵⁷⁶

Contrast. Stevenson maintained that his opponents were evading the real issue as it concerned Taft-Hartley repeal. He contrasted the stands of the two Parties:

To this deceit they add the insistence that the real issue here is whether the present law should be 'amended' or 'repealed'. This is not the real issue. The real issue is what changes should be made in the law of the United States.⁵⁷⁷

Climax. The climax of the speech came after a lengthy discussion about the rightful expectations of organized labor. Stevenson appealed to his audience with these words:

⁵⁷³Ibid., p. 158.

⁵⁷⁵Ibid., p. 160.

⁵⁷⁷Ibid., p. 158.

⁵⁷⁴Ibid.

⁵⁷⁶Ibid., p. 164.

Yet American labor, like the Democratic Party, faces new and uncharted tomorrows. You, as we, will be challenged anew to measure up to the demands of both freedom and power. The future of democracy, perhaps the future of the world, depends upon the exercise of power by America's private and public bodies alike with that self-restraint which separates power from tyranny and order from chaos. . . . Equally has the Democratic Party drawn its strength, I think, from the people. We have built our program on their hopes, stood by them in adversity and found the measure of accomplishments in their welfare. . . . We believe in a government with a heart.⁵⁷⁸

Onomatopoeia. An example of this device was the following sentence:

"The tinkling sound of these little words was unfortunately smothered in the thundering silence of what was left unsaid."⁵⁷⁹

Anaphora and epistrophe. Twice in the speech did Stevenson repeat openings of phrases for the sake of emphasis. "But, because the required changes are major changes, because the present law is spiteful, and because it has become a symbol of dissention and bitterness. . . ."⁵⁸⁰ In the concluding portion of the speech, he pleaded for confidence in the future, and spoke as follows: "With mutual understanding, with a humbling sense of our power, with belief in our masters. . . ."⁵⁸¹

Allusion and reference. Stevenson referred in his introduction to what his opponent had told the same audience two days earlier. "I have been told that I should try here today to make you roar with enthusiasm."⁵⁸² He referred to Senator Morse, a recent critic of the Republican leaders, though himself a distinguished Republican Senator. "I am grateful that it was the Republican, Senator Morse, who revealed so masterfully how all of those explosions we heard were only blank cartridges."⁵⁸³ An allusion was made to the controversial labor

⁵⁷⁸Ibid., pp. 163-164.

⁵⁷⁹Ibid., p. 158.

⁵⁸⁰Ibid.

⁵⁸¹Ibid., p. 164.

⁵⁸²Ibid., p. 157.

⁵⁸³Ibid., p. 158.

legislation of the past, specifically the Norris-LaGuardia Act. "He cites with approval the Norris-LaGuardia Act which was passed, so he said, under his party's administration in 1932."⁵⁸⁴ Stevenson brought the name of labor's friend in the White House, President Truman, into the speech by mentioning his previous appearance before the convention. "President Truman listed the biggest among these jobs in his message to this convention, the priority jobs in making America still stronger and ever more healthy."⁵⁸⁵ He further brought back fond memories by mentioning labor's greatest benefactor, President Roosevelt. "Franklin Roosevelt knew these things. Harry Truman knows these things. . ."⁵⁸⁶ The final reference was made in the final paragraph of the address, and concerned the revered leaders of organized labor. "The foundations of that tradition were laid by Samuel Gompers, and they have been built upon by William Green."⁵⁸⁷

Understatement. Only once was this device noticed. Stevenson quoted his opponent in such a manner that he could infer an obvious understatement from the remarks.

But the General in his talk to you did recognize squarely that issuing injunctions, and I quote him, 'will not settle the underlying fundamental problems which cause a strike.' That is one statement we can all agree with.⁵⁸⁸

Metaphor. One illustration of the metaphor was found, as follows: "Now these are words without roots, weeds which grow in darkness and wither in the sun."⁵⁸⁹

⁵⁸⁴Ibid., p. 159.

⁵⁸⁶Ibid.

⁵⁸⁸Ibid., p. 159.

⁵⁸⁵Ibid., p. 162.

⁵⁸⁷Ibid., p. 164.

⁵⁸⁹Ibid.

Personification. Several examples of personification were discovered. Stevenson wondered, "Why is it that when political ammunition runs low, inevitably the rusty artillery of abuse is always wheeled into action?"⁵⁹⁰ He also quoted a well-known proverb that illustrated personification: ". . . a lie can travel around the world while the truth is pulling on its boots."⁵⁹¹ He compared his Party with the group he was addressing, using the following imaginative language:

I am glad that the Democratic Party and the American Federation of Labor have both been guided for a long time by the same stars--stars that have led us toward the realization of human hopes and desires.⁵⁹²

He spoke often of the American Federation of Labor, and once gave the organization imagery with these words: "It is no less essential to the future of democracy that American labor walk wisely with its power."⁵⁹³ Finally, the following sentence was discovered: "American labor's role, its whole purpose, has been to restore to people the status and dignity they lost when the sprawling factories reached out to engulf them."⁵⁹⁴

Alliteration. This speech was noticeably lacking in alliteration. Only the following examples were discovered: "reclaimed Republican rubber."⁵⁹⁵; "Labor unions, like all private persons and organizations, must maintain an independence from government."⁵⁹⁶; ". . . same stars--stars that have led us toward the realization of human hopes and desires."⁵⁹⁷; ". . . with the sun and the seasons."⁵⁹⁸

⁵⁹⁰Ibid.

⁵⁹²Ibid., p. 160.

⁵⁹⁴Ibid., p. 164.

⁵⁹⁶Ibid., p. 160.

⁵⁹⁸Ibid., p. 161.

⁵⁹¹Ibid.

⁵⁹³Ibid., p. 163.

⁵⁹⁵Ibid., p. 158.

⁵⁹⁷Ibid.

VI. ON LIBERTY OF CONSCIENCE

INVENTIONLogos--non-artistic proof.

Evidence. This speech was less factual and more in the realm of theory than the other speeches studied, and for this reason little use of evidence was noted. He introduced the talk with a reference to the pilgrimage of the Mormon followers from his home state of Illinois many years earlier. "It was 106 years ago now that there were those 'burnings', the persecution, the mob violence and the murders which finally drove the men and women of the Mormon faith on westward."⁵⁹⁹ Stevenson encouraged his listeners by stating the accomplishments of this country within the past decade.

To the dismay of the enemies of America, we proved after 1945 that we have learned in the last twenty years not only to produce mightily, but to distribute among all our people an increasingly fair share of that production. We have evolved a stronger and a better form of economy, which makes nonsense of the Russian textbooks. The friends of freedom have rejoiced. They have noted our rising and widespread wealth and well being. They have noted that we had no depression and no unemployment at the end of the war--in spite of headlong demobilization and disarmament.⁶⁰⁰

Authority. Stevenson used the authority of several well-known individuals to verify his reasoning. He quoted Washington, Lincoln and Wilson to illustrate the idea that the destiny of America has not changed, and we must not allow ourselves to relinquish our position of leadership today.

In 1787 George Washington said: 'The preservation of the sacred fire of liberty, and the destiny of the republican form of government,

⁵⁹⁹Ibid., p. 245.

⁶⁰⁰Ibid., p. 246.

are justly considered as deeply, perhaps as finally staked, on the experiment entrusted to the hands of the American people.'⁶⁰¹

He referred to the following quote from Abraham Lincoln:

In 1858 Abraham Lincoln said: 'Our reliance is in the love of liberty which God has planted in us. Our defense is in the spirit which prized liberty as the heritage of all men, in all lands everywhere.'⁶⁰²

As his third authority Stevenson used Woodrow Wilson, who spoke as follows during the dark days of World War I: "The interesting and inspiring thought about America is that she asks nothing for herself except what she has a right to ask for humanity itself."⁶⁰³ He referred to Julius Caesar, the man of the world, as opposed to the Deity, in explaining which duties are the province of each.

If you like, this is the distinction between the things that are God's and the things that are Caesar's. The mind is the expression of the soul, which belongs to God and must be let alone by government. But farm prices, minimum wages, old-age pensions, the regulation of monopoly, the physical safety of society--these things are Caesar's province, where in the Government should do all that is humanly possible.⁶⁰⁴

Sign. Stevenson used argument from sign when discussing the economic progress of America in recent years. "To the dismay of the enemies of America, we proved after 1945 that we have learned in the last twenty years not only to produce mightily, but to distribute among all our people an increasingly fair share of that production."⁶⁰⁵ No other example of this type of reasoning was noted.

Assumption. Stevenson spoke of the cold war and what it meant to the world's peoples in terms of normal living.

⁶⁰¹Ibid., p. 247.

⁶⁰²Ibid.

⁶⁰³Ibid.

⁶⁰⁴Ibid., p. 249.

⁶⁰⁵Ibid., p. 246.

But a cold war leads the timid and the discontented into frustration. And out of frustration comes pettiness--the niggling, pitiful picture of a confused, divided country which these office-seekers are now painting. And this, of course, was the very purpose for which the Russians invented the cold war and imposed it upon us.⁶⁰⁶

He expanded this line of argument with this comment: "They hoped we would feel frustrated, shackled by circumstances. They hoped we would fall to quarreling among ourselves and thus betray our mission."⁶⁰⁷ But, expressing confidence in the will of the free world, he made the following assumption: "We shall not be tempted by the cold war to be half-regretful, half-ashamed of our strength--or frightened of it, which is worse."⁶⁰⁸ Stevenson was worried about the trend of the opposition campaign, and he assumed that recent statements meant a return to more conservative policies on the part of the leaders of the Republican Party.

We never foresaw that the cult of thought-control and of the Big Lie would come to America. So if their conscience permits, they can say almost anything. And if my opponent's conscience permits, he can try to help all of them get re-elected. But will he have strengthened or weakened the American idea?⁶⁰⁹

He hit hard at those who investigate and suspicion a citizen on the slightest grounds. This type of guilt-by-association and character assassination was the lowest form of judicial action imaginable, in the opinion of Stevenson. He accused General Eisenhower of surrendering to that wing of the Republican Party which approved of such tactics, and feared the consequences.

But because of that surrender, because of those strange allies in his queer crusade, our role in world history, our faithfulness to the men who made the United States, is challenged in this election.⁶¹⁰

⁶⁰⁶Ibid.

⁶⁰⁷Ibid., p. 247.

⁶⁰⁸Ibid.

⁶⁰⁹Ibid., p. 249.

⁶¹⁰Ibid., p. 250.

Logos--artistic proof.

Inductive reasoning--argument from generalization. Stevenson attempted to define the greatness that is America, and argued from generalization in the process.

American power is not just coal and iron and oil; cotton and wheat and corn. It is not just our forests and our mountain-ranges, and the huge meandering rivers of our central plains, and the high dry cattle country, and this lucky land of yours between the mountains and the sea. It is not even all these things plus a hundred and sixty million people. It is these things, plus the people, plus the idea!⁶¹¹

Stevenson generalized in reaching the conclusion that many affairs of government today are beyond what some citizens would desire.

But farm prices, minimum wages, old-age pensions, the regulation of monopoly, the physical safety of society--these things are Caesar's province, wherein the Government should do all that is humanly possible.⁶¹²

Inductive reasoning--argument from causation. Stevenson employed this logic when explaining the reason the Soviet nation wished to continue the cold war.

But a cold war leads the timid and the discontented into frustration. And out of frustration comes pettiness--the niggling, pitiful picture of a confused, divided country which these office-seekers are now painting. And this, of course, was the very purpose for which the Russians invented cold war and imposed it upon us.⁶¹³

He also gave a cause and effect relationship between the freedom of speech allowed in America and the abuses of Congressional and other investigations.

Because we have always thought of government as friendly, not as brutal, character assassins and slanderers in the Congress of the United States have a free hand in the methods they use. We never foresaw that the cult of thought-control and of the Big Lie would come to America. So if their conscience permits, he can try to help all of them get re-elected. But will he have strengthened or weakened the American idea?⁶¹⁴

⁶¹¹Ibid., p. 248.

⁶¹²Ibid., p. 249.

⁶¹³Ibid., p. 246.

⁶¹⁴Ibid., p. 249.

Inductive reasoning--argument from analogy. In the "Liberty of Conscience" address no examples were found of argument from analogy.

Deductive reasoning--argument from syllogism and enthymeme.
Stevenson reasoned by deduction in the following instance:

We have been tapped by fate--for which we should forever give thanks, . . . And precisely because we are tapped by fate, we must be wise and patient as well as strong. This means that we must live, intensely live, the faith which has made us free and thereby invincible.⁶¹⁵

No other example of deductive reasoning was discovered in this speech.

Ethos.

Sincerity. In the introductory comments the speaker gave evidence of his sincere approach by mentioning the tragic history of the Mormon people.

Many of us who reside in Illinois have tasted the wholesome tonic of humility in contemplation of the mistakes to which history bears witness at Nauvoo--The Beautiful Place--in Illinois where your forefathers stopped on their long journey and built another temple.⁶¹⁶

He was likewise a very sincere man in attempting to answer the most penetrating question posed in the address.

What is this 'American idea' which we so justly venerate? I suggest that the heart of it is the simple but challenging statement that no government may interfere with our conscience, may tell us what to think. All our freedoms, all our dynamic unleashed energies, stem from this.⁶¹⁷

Earnestness. Stevenson spoke to a packed audience in the Mormon Tabernacle in Salt Lake City. The setting, as well as the audience, lent itself to an address of a higher philosophical level than normal for a political campaign. In fitting with this situation, Stevenson seemed particularly concerned about making his comments appear earnest

⁶¹⁵Ibid., p. 248.

⁶¹⁶Ibid., p. 245.

⁶¹⁷Ibid., p. 248.

and dignified. He referred directly to the setting in his introduction. "I wish that all of our political campaigning could be conducted in the spirit which this meeting place inspires. It is a spirit of faith, a faith that triumphs over any obstacles."⁶¹⁸ He did not avoid, however, numerous critical comments about the opposition candidates, and appeared in earnest when he made his most potent verbal thrust. "Must this inspiring record now be ridiculed for campaign purposes? Must our credit for using our capitalist system wisely and humanely be undermined in Europe--and by General Eisenhower, of all men?"⁶¹⁹ The concluding paragraphs were all delivered in a very earnest manner, with this excerpt perhaps most representative:

This is no small thing, this remorseless attack upon freedom of conscience, freedom of thought. A few peddlers of hate and fear would be of little consequence if they had not been welcomed as satellites by Senator Taft and included in the leadership of this strange crusade. And none of them would be significant if the General--who was implored to come home by Republican leaders so that they might be quit of Senator Taft--had not yielded to the demands of his beaten foe. But because of that surrender, because of those strange allies in his queer crusade, our role in world history, our faithfulness to the men who made the United States, is challenged in this election.⁶²⁰

Stevenson was also quick to caution against undue usurpation of power by government, stressing his stand with these words:

But never must government step across the line which separates the promotion of justice and prosperity from the interference with thought, with conscience, with the sacred private life of the mind.⁶²¹

Devotion. The Democratic candidate had often proven himself a man devoted to the cause he pursued. The entire speech was that of a devoted man, and excerpts were difficult to select that particularly pointed to

⁶¹⁸Ibid., p. 245.

⁶²⁰Ibid., p. 250.

⁶¹⁹Ibid., p. 246.

⁶²¹Ibid., p. 249.

this trait. At times the speaker seemed almost awed by the potential facing the human race, and the part that responsible Americans would play in developing our society. But he hoped we would accept this responsibility as a challenge and not shrink from the duty it imposed.

We have been tapped by fate--for which we should forever give thanks, not laments. What a day to live in! What a flowering of the work and the faith of our fathers. Who in heaven's name would want America less strong, less responsible for the future?⁶²²

In the conclusion he made a plea for unity by observing that we have a proud and noble tradition to uphold, and we must be devoted to that heritage.

Finally, then, let us recall that our basic faith in liberty of conscience has an ancient ancestry. We can trace it back through Christian Europe, and through pagan Rome, back to the Old Testament prophets. It is by no means exclusive with us. It is in fact our bond of unity with all free men. But we are its ordained guardians today.⁶²³

Patience. The wonders of the twentieth century are not to be unfolded at once or without long and hard work. Stevenson warned against this dangerous concept held by many, even in America where we have so much to be satisfied with at present. He also cautioned against being led into unfortunate circumstances by the moves of other nations in the cold war tactics. Truth always wins out, but not always immediately.

We shall not be tempted by the cold war to be half-regretful, half-ashamed of our strength--or frightened of it, which is worse. Regretful (God help us) in the face of the stirring truth that Lincoln's vision has come true, that now we are indeed the 'last, best hope of earth'--so recognized by all the free world, which implores us to be great, to lead with magnanimity and, above all, with patience. The very powerful, if they are good, must always be patient.⁶²⁴

⁶²²Ibid., p. 248.

⁶²³Ibid., p. 250.

⁶²⁴Ibid., p. 247.

There are times, the Democratic candidate recognized, when the faith of the people is sorely challenged, and in these times patience is the best medicine. "If we do not make it part of us--keep it forever before us, intense and demanding and clear--the faith might die and we should then die with it."⁶²⁵

Friendliness. The only expression of friendliness came when he mentioned the economic recovery of America after World War II, and referred to the gratitude of our friends across the ocean for this blessing. "Every liberty-loving European gave thanks that we had showed ourselves not only strong but stable."⁶²⁶

Sympathy. The first sentence of the speech brought Stevenson into sympathy with his audience, who for the most part were members of the Church of Latter-Day Saints. "I cannot speak tonight in this tabernacle without an awareness of the links between its history and that of the State from which I come."⁶²⁷ He elaborated on this theme, expressing sympathy for the suffering ancestors of the modern-day Mormons.

Pathos.

Anger. For the first time in any speech thus far studied, Stevenson actually appeared to be angered and evoked that feeling from the audience. He was discussing the character assassination investigations then being carried on by Senator McCarthy and others, and condemned the entire action in vituperative terms.

We never foresaw that the cult of thought-control and of the Big Lie would come to America. So if their conscience permits, they can say almost anything. And if my opponent's conscience permits, he can try to help all of them get re-elected.⁶²⁸

⁶²⁵Ibid., p. 248.

⁶²⁷Ibid., p. 245.

⁶²⁶Ibid., p. 246.

⁶²⁸Ibid., p. 249.

Fear. Stevenson held a fear that the average American would become so accustomed to his blessings that he would soon take them for granted and in the process come in danger of losing them.

So a second temptation of the cold frustrating war--which we also proudly reject--is to become so distracted by our troubles that we take this faith too much for granted, that we salute it (as some of us salute our religion), and then go our own way unchanged. If we do not make it part of us--keep it forever before us, intense and demanding and clear--the faith might die and we should then die with it.⁶²⁹

The greatest fear that bothered Stevenson, at least on the domestic scene, was the loss of Constitutional guarantees to those who practice the usurpation of individual liberties.

Let us remember also that the first of the Seven Deadly Sins is spiritual pride; the sin which assures me that I know and you don't, so that I give myself permission to use any dubious or dishonest means to discredit your opinion.⁶³⁰

The threat of this menace to our liberties in itself was not so much to be feared, because it has been with us for many years. But the apparent acquiescence of General Eisenhower to this philosophy posed another aspect to the problem.

This is no small thing, this remorseless attack upon freedom of conscience, freedom of thought. A few peddlers of hate and fear would be of little consequence if they had not been welcomed as satellites. . . . But because of that surrender, because of those strange allies in his queer crusade, our role in world history, our faithfulness to the men who made the United States, is challenged in this election.⁶³¹

Confidence. The speaker at numerous parts in the address stressed his confidence in Americans and how they will handle the future.

⁶²⁹Ibid., p. 248.

⁶³⁰Ibid., p. 249

⁶³¹Ibid., p. 250.

And tonight I want to talk in this Temple to the great confident majority of Americans--the generous and the unfrightened, those who are proud of our strength and sure of our goodness and who want to work with each other in trust, to advance the honor of our country.⁶³²

He quoted our past accomplishments in the economic field in order to give credence to our claim to confidence in the future.

The friends of freedom everywhere have rejoiced. They have noted our rising and widespread wealth and well being. They have noted that we had no depression and no unemployment at the end of the war--in spite of headlong demobilization and disarmament. And remember that all this happened before the Marshall Plan, before the revival of our armed might, before Korea. Every liberty-loving European gave thanks that we had showed ourselves not only strong but stable.⁶³³

He chastised the reactionary members of the population who have been opposing measures of progress, then added, "But the American giant will not be shackled!"⁶³⁴ His reference to Abraham Lincoln was intended to illustrate the confidence that great man held in the American ideal, even during the dark days before the Civil War.

At that time there were about thirty million Americans. And we were threatened with civil war. But there was no doubt, no fear, in Lincoln's mind. He saw the war and the dissolution of the Union as a threat to the new, revolutionary idea of the free man and to democratic aspirations everywhere.⁶³⁵

Woodrow Wilson also exuded confidence when he spoke shortly before the beginning of World War I. Referring to Wilson's speech, Stevenson said:

By that time we were a world power, about to enter into a world war. But there was no doubt, no fear, in Woodrow Wilson's mind. He knew, as in truth we have always known, that we were destined to be an example and to assume the burden of greatness.⁶³⁶

The final plea for strength of mind and purpose ended on a note of confidence.

⁶³²Ibid., p. 245.

⁶³³Ibid., p. 246.

⁶³⁴Ibid., p. 247.

⁶³⁵Ibid.

⁶³⁶Ibid., p. 248.

Let us lift up our hearts, therefore--glad of our strength, proud of the task it imposes. So far from being half-defeated, half-divided, half-bankrupt--while we are true to ourselves, we can never be defeated; while we accept the honorable burden of leadership, we can never be divided. And in the name of that burden we shall find the means and the determination to spend in money and in labor and in hard thought whatever is needed to save ourselves and our world.⁶³⁷

Shame. Stevenson looked upon the forced migration of the Mormon peoples from his home state of Illinois to the wilderness of the West a great disgrace upon our history pages. It represented a great mark of shame for us to ponder.

It was 106 years ago now that there were those 'burnings', the persecution, the mob violence and the murders which finally drove the men and women of the Mormon faith on westward.⁶³⁸

Indignation. The Democratic candidate was indignant towards the attitude expressed by certain Republicans during the campaign. "The dinosaur-wing of that Party"⁶³⁹ was his name for them, and he accused them in the following words: "But at all times they picture us unworthy--scared, stupid and heartless. They thus betray the conquering, hopeful, practical yet deeply moral America which you and I know."⁶⁴⁰

Emulation. He demonstrated admiration for the pioneer settlers of the Salt Lake Valley and urged continued application of their hardy traits. The Tabernacle they built, in which he now spoke, was a great inspiration to all. "I wish that all of our political campaigning could be conducted in the spirit which this meeting place inspires.. It is a spirit of faith, a faith that triumphs over any obstacle."⁶⁴¹ He contrasted the pioneer spirit of the founding fathers of our nation with the

⁶³⁷Ibid., p. 250.

⁶³⁸Ibid., p. 245.

⁶³⁹Ibid., p. 248.

⁶⁴⁰Ibid., p. 246.

⁶⁴¹Ibid., p. 245.

apathetic views of a minority of Americans today, praising our forebearers. "They knew that Providence had given us this empty, unexploited Continent for a purpose. And they knew that it must be a purpose which includes all men--for the same God made us all."⁶⁴²

Contempt. Stevenson displayed this emotion several times, always in reference to those citizens whom he felt were neglecting their duties or actively speaking against the welfare of the nation. He even spoke in such a manner about his opponent, for the first time in the campaign.

Must this inspiring record now be ridiculed for campaign purposes? Must our credit for using our capitalist system wisely and humanely be undermined in Europe--and by General Eisenhower of all men? Must our proud all-American achievement be pictured as a Democratic Party plot?⁶⁴³

He held nothing but scorn for those who would have America become an isolated island unto itself, rejecting the mantle of world leadership that destiny was offering.

And still some of us regret it! Some of us say: 'Why can't life leave us alone? We don't want to lead. We want to be undisturbed. . . .' What would our Fathers have said to such talk? From the dawn of our revolution they saw America as the saviour--not merely in terms of power, but in terms of goodness.⁶⁴⁴

He pointed to the contradictory comments of a minority of the opposition Party when they both condemned and claimed credit for our democratic process.

Yet the same Republicans (the dinosaur-wing of that party) who object to service from our government--who call everything 'creeping socialism', who talk darkly of 'dictatorship'--these same men begin to hint that we are 'subversive', or at best the tools of our country's enemies, when we boast of the great strides toward social justice and security we have already made, and of the still greater strides we plan. They laugh at us, superciliously, when we say we are the political party with a heart.⁶⁴⁵

⁶⁴²Ibid., p. 247.

⁶⁴⁴Ibid., p. 247.

⁶⁴³Ibid., p. 246.

⁶⁴⁵Ibid., pp. 248-249.

The most biting comments of all were saved for the supporters of "guilt by association" and "investigation without restraint." This menace to our Constitutional liberties deserved support from no thinking American, Stevenson maintained.

But those among us who would bar us from attempting our economic and social duty are quick with accusations, with defamatory hints and whispering campaigns, when they see a chance to scare or silence those with whom they disagree. Rudely, carelessly they invade the field of conscience, of thought--the field which belongs to God and not to Senators--and not to protect the Republic, but to discredit the individual.⁶⁴⁶

ARRANGEMENT

The introduction contained mainly references to the history of the Mormon people, and how their commendable traits should be duplicated in America today. The body of the speech covered, in general terms, the entire area of Constitutional liberties and the rights of the citizen. Stevenson criticized those who, because of fear or uncertainty, resort to un-American tactics in order to preserve the nation. He reviewed the achievements of our country since the end of World War II and gave reasons for confidence that this admirable record of achievement would continue. Next came a review of moments when our nation faced grave perils, but through the courage and leadership of great men, the nation always survived. The latter portion of the body was devoted to a discussion of investigating committees and their function in our society. The conclusion was short and a plea for patience, confidence and perspective in viewing America's role as a world leader, being careful not to adopt un-American tactics to control our society.

⁶⁴⁶Ibid., p. 249.

STYLELevel.

The level of "On Liberty of Conscience" was the highest of any speech thus far considered. It would probably be called high style, with parts reverting to middle style. The general level, though, justified being called high style.

Diction and word choice.

The terminology employed by the speaker was more scholarly than usual for a political talk, with considerable complexity of thought in many instances. The word choice was selected for a more educated listening audience than previous speeches.

Sentence structure.

Most of the sentences were either complex or compound, and generally quite lengthy. Even the simple sentences were composed of an average of over twenty words. Here is a sample paragraph from the speech:

So a second temptation of the cold frustrating war--which we also proudly reject--is to become so distracted by our troubles that we take this faith too much for granted, that we salute it (as some of us salute our religion), and then go our own way unchanged. If we do not make it part of us--keep it forever before us, intense and demanding and clear--the faith might die and we should then die with it.⁶⁴⁷

Rhetorical devices and figurative language.

Epigram. Stevenson quoted the epigram from Woodrow Wilson that was so famous after World War I. "The interesting and inspiring thought about America is that she asks nothing for herself except what she has a right to ask for humanity itself."⁶⁴⁸ He also borrowed this saying:

⁶⁴⁷Ibid., p. 248.

⁶⁴⁸Ibid., p. 247.

"Despotism may govern without faith, but liberty cannot."⁶⁴⁹ To these he added the following original thought: "But a cold war leads the timid and discontented into frustration."⁶⁵⁰

Rhetorical question. After severely chastising the opposition Party, Stevenson asked these questions:

Must this inspiring record now be ridiculed for campaign purposes? Must our credit for using our capitalist system wisely and humanely be undermined in Europe—and by General Eisenhower of all men? Must our proud all-American achievement be pictured as a Democratic Party plot?⁶⁵¹

He listed the power and greatness of America in the mid-twentieth century, then asked: "Who in heaven's name would want America less strong, less responsible for the future?"⁶⁵² After mentioning the support General Eisenhower was giving to all members of the Republican Party, regardless of their particular shade of Republicanism, Stevenson wondered, "But will he have strengthened or weakened the American idea?"⁶⁵³

Interrogation. There were several examples of questions that were not rhetorical questions, but merely interrogation. He questioned the views of the right-wing members of the Republican Party. "How do they picture our magnificent America?"⁶⁵⁴ He wondered about those Americans who wanted to relinquish our claim to world leadership. "Some of us say: 'Why can't life leave us alone? We don't want to lead. We want to be undisturbed.' What would our Fathers have said to such talk?"⁶⁵⁵ Later he spoke around the topic of "The American idea," then asked: "What is this "American idea" which we so justly venerate?"⁶⁵⁶

⁶⁴⁹Ibid., p. 248.

⁶⁵¹Ibid.

⁶⁵³Ibid., p. 249.

⁶⁵⁵Ibid., p. 247.

⁶⁵⁰Ibid., p. 246.

⁶⁵²Ibid., p. 248.

⁶⁵⁴Ibid., p. 245.

⁶⁵⁶Ibid., p. 248.

Irony and satire. Stevenson spoke with irony in his voice as he lambasted the "dinosaur-wing" of the opposition Party.

Yet the same Republicans (the dinosaur-wing of that party) who object to service from our government--who call everything 'creeping socialism,' who talk darkly of 'dictatorship'--these same men begin to hint that we are 'subversive,' or at best the tools of our country's enemies, when we boast of the great strides toward social justice and security we have already made, and of the still greater strides we plan. They laugh at us, superciliously, when we say we are the political party with a heart.⁶⁵⁷

He considered it very ironic that the man who had been brought back from Europe to lead the Republican campaign had been induced into the type of thinking employed by those whom his appearance was supposed to subjugate.

This is no small thing, this remorseless attack upon freedom of conscience, freedom of thought. A few peddlers of hate and fear would be of little consequence if they had not been welcomed as satellites by Senator Taft and included in the leadership of this strange crusade. And none of them would be significant if the General--who was implored to come home by Republican leaders so that they might be quit of Senator Taft--had not yielded to the demands of his beaten foe. But because of that surrender, because of those strange allies in his queer crusade, our role in world history, our faithfulness to the men who made the United States, is challenged in this election.⁶⁵⁸

Contrast. The Democratic candidate reiterated the boasts of some opposition candidates, then remarked, "We all know it is nonsense, and that in fact the reverse is true."⁶⁵⁹ He then contrasted the elements that fall under the jurisdiction of government and those that do not.

If you like, this is the distinction between the things that are God's and the things that are Caesar's. The mind is the expression of the soul, which belongs to God and must be let alone by government. But farm prices, minimum wages, old-age pensions, the regulation of monopoly, the physical safety of society--these things are Caesar's province, wherein the Government should do all that is humanly possible.⁶⁶⁰

⁶⁵⁷Ibid., pp. 248-249

⁶⁵⁸Ibid., p. 250.

⁶⁵⁹Ibid., p. 246.

⁶⁶⁰Ibid., p. 249.

Climax. Twice Stevenson brought his reasoning to a climax and effectively motivated his audience. After referring to the dangers of the cold war, he appealed for patience and confidence with these words:

We shall not be tempted by the cold war to be half-regretful, half-ashamed of our strength—or frightened of it, which is worse. Regretful (God help us) in the face of the stirring truth that Lincoln's vision has come true, that now we are indeed the 'last, best hope of earth'—so recognized by all the free world, which implores us to be great, to lead with magnanimity and, above all, with patience. The very powerful, if they are good, must always be patient.⁶⁶¹

Then in conclusion Stevenson summed up with challenging words, leaving the audience with something to think about.

Let us lift up our hearts, therefore—glad of our strength, proud of the task it imposes. So far from being half-defeated, half-divided, half-bankrupt—while we are true to ourselves, we can never be defeated; while we accept the honorable burden of leadership, we can never be divided. And in the name of that burden we shall find the means and the determination to spend in money and in labor and in hard thought whatever is needed to save ourselves and our world.⁶⁶²

Onomatopoeia. Two examples of this device were noted. "The niggling, pitiful picture of a confused, divided country which these office-seekers are now painting."⁶⁶³; ". . .and the huge meandering rivers of our central plains, and the high dry cattle country, and this lucky land of yours between the mountains and the sea."⁶⁶⁴

Anaphora and epistrophe. When Stevenson referred to the boasts of the opposition campaigners, he used this device.

Sometimes they whine about our troubles--describing us as half-bankrupt, half-defeated and wholly self-pitying.

Sometimes they boast about our self-sufficiency--describing us as choosing to live alone, friendless, on a remote island, indifferent to the fate of man, a huge hermit-crab without a soul.

Sometimes they call large sections of us dupes and fellow-travellers—a people without a purpose and without a mind.⁶⁶⁵

⁶⁶¹Ibid., p. 247.

⁶⁶³Ibid., p. 246.

⁶⁶⁵Ibid., p. 246.

⁶⁶²Ibid., p. 250.

⁶⁶⁴Ibid., p. 248.

One other time, when speaking about the economic recovery of the nation, he said: "And remember that all this happened before the Marshall Plan, before the revival of our armed might, before Korea."⁶⁶⁶

Allusion and reference. This rhetorical device was employed three times by Stevenson, all consecutively while stressing the ability of Americans to survive periods of danger. First was an allusion to Washington.

In 1787 George Washington said: 'The preservation of the sacred fire of liberty, and the destiny of the republican form of government, are justly considered as deeply, perhaps as firmly staked, on the experiment entrusted to the hands of the American people.'⁶⁶⁷

The next allusion was to Lincoln, in these words:

In 1858 Abraham Lincoln said: 'Our reliance is in the love of liberty which God has planted in us. Our defense is in the spirit which prized liberty as the heritage of all men, in all lands everywhere.'⁶⁶⁸

Finally he referred to Wilson who spoke before the dark days of World War I.

"In 1915 Woodrow Wilson said: 'The interesting and inspiring thought about America is that she asks nothing for herself except what she has a right to ask for humanity herself.'⁶⁶⁹

Metaphor. One metaphor was discovered. "Sometimes they boast about our self-sufficiency. . .indifferent to the fate of man, a huge hermit-crab without a soul."⁶⁷⁰

Personification. Several examples were uncovered. When Stevenson spoke about the cold war he gave that term life with these words: "But a cold war leads the timid and the discontented into frustration."⁶⁷¹

⁶⁶⁶Ibid.

⁶⁶⁷Ibid., p. 247.

⁶⁶⁸Ibid.

⁶⁶⁹Ibid.

⁶⁷⁰Ibid., p. 246.

⁶⁷¹Ibid.

He referred to the mighty American industrial machine in these terms:
 "But the American giant will not be shackled!"⁶⁷² The hand of fate had
 tapped our nation for world responsibility, so Stevenson said. "We have
 been tapped by fate--for which we should forever give thanks, not
 laments."⁶⁷³ He referred to the government in personal terms with this
 comment:

But newer must government step across the line which separates the
 promotion of justice and prosperity from the interference with
 thought, with conscience, with sacred private life of the mind.⁶⁷⁴

Alliteration. Evidence of this device was found in fewer instances
 in this speech than any observed thus far. Three examples only were
 discovered. "huge hermit-crab"⁶⁷⁵; "character assassins and slanderers
 in the Congress of the United States. . ."⁶⁷⁶; "self-sufficiency."⁶⁷⁷

THE 1956 CAMPAIGN

VII. SPEECH OF ACCEPTANCE

INVENTION

Logos--non-artistic proof.

Evidence. Stevenson referred to the economic plight of a certain
 segment of our population and intimated their average income was a shame-
 ful fact.

The truth is that the farmer, especially the family farmer who
 matters most, has not had his fair share of the national income and
 the Republicans have done nothing to help him. . . .The truth is that

⁶⁷²Ibid., p. 247.

⁶⁷⁴Ibid., p. 249.

⁶⁷⁶Ibid., p. 249.

⁶⁷³Ibid., p. 248.

⁶⁷⁵Ibid., p. 246.

⁶⁷⁷Ibid., p. 246.

30,000,000 Americans live today in families trying to make ends meet on less than \$2,000 a year.⁶⁷⁸

This was the only example of evidence noted in the address.

Authority. One of the most respected delegates to the Convention was the widow of the former Democratic President, Eleanor Roosevelt. She had delivered a very eloquent address to the Convention earlier in the week, and Stevenson early in his acceptance speech expressed his sympathy with the thoughts entertained in her remarks.

. . .and to none more than the noble lady who is also the treasurer of a legacy of greatness--Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, who has reminded us so movingly that this is 1956 and not 1932, nor even 1952; that our problems alter as well as their solutions; that change is the law of life, and that political parties, no less than individuals, ignore it at their peril.⁶⁷⁹

He also acknowledged the presence of former President Harry S. Truman, who earlier in the Convention had attempted to defeat the Stevenson bid for nomination.

I salute also the distinguished American who has been more than equal to the hard test of disagreement and has now reaffirmed our common cause so graciously--President Harry Truman. I am glad to have you on my side again, sir!⁶⁸⁰

The newly nominated standard bearer saluted his running mate, and the manner in which the Convention had selected him.

The office of the Vice-Presidency has been dignified by the manner of your selection as well as by the distinction of your choice. Senator Kefauver is a great Democrat and a great campaigner--as I have reason to know better than anybody!⁶⁸¹

He brought forth the memory of Woodrow Wilson, a great Democratic

⁶⁷⁸Adlai E. Stevenson, "Speech of Acceptance," Vital Speeches, XXII, No. 22, (Sept. 1, 1956), p. 680.

⁶⁷⁹Ibid., p. 679.

⁶⁸⁰Ibid.

⁶⁸¹Ibid.

President, and what he said about four decades previously.

What we need is a rebirth of leadership--leadership which will give us a glimpse of the nobility and vision without which peoples and nations perish. Woodrow Wilson said that 'when America loses its ardor for mankind it is time to elect a Democratic President.' There doesn't appear to be much ardor in America just now for anything.⁶⁸²

Sign. Stevenson argued from sign when he gave the following evidence to justify his belief concerning what the coming campaign would be like:

The men who run the Eisenhower Administration evidently believe that the minds of Americans can be manipulated by shows, slogans, and the arts of advertising. And that conviction will, I dare say, be backed up by the greatest torrent of money ever poured out to influence an American election.⁶⁸³

After criticizing the Republican Administration for not recognizing that the Republican Congressmen had been reluctant to support President Eisenhower on major issues, he gave this sign of why the Eisenhower Administration had taken any progressive steps at all. "The truth is that President Eisenhower, cynically coveted as a candidate but ignored as a leader, is largely indebted to Democrats in Congress for what accomplishments he can claim."⁶⁸⁴

Assumption. Many examples of this type of proof were noted. Early in the address Stevenson reassured the delegates as follows: "I am sure that the country is as grateful to this convention as I am for its action of this afternoon."⁶⁸⁵ Speaking about the wondrous potential facing the civilized world, he expressed himself in these words:

⁶⁸²Ibid., p. 680.

⁶⁸³Ibid., p. 679.

⁶⁸⁴Ibid., p. 680.

⁶⁸⁵Ibid., p. 679.

Tonight, after an interval of marking time and aimless drifting, we are on the threshold of another great, decisive era. History's headlong course has brought us, I devoutly believe, to the threshold of a new America--to the America of the great ideals and noble visions which are the stuff our future must be made of.⁶⁸⁶

He was indignant towards the campaign managers who lower the level of the political campaign. "This idea that you can merchandise candidates for high office like breakfast cereal--that you can gather votes like box tops-- is, I think, the ultimate indignity to the democratic process."⁶⁸⁷ The goal that Americans are seeking is probably not capable of being written in so many words, but the means used to reach our destiny should be honorable and defensible. "I say that what this country needs is not propaganda and a personality cult. What this country needs is leadership and truth."⁶⁸⁸ Stevenson was condemning national opinion when he criticized the President as a weak leader and a personality President, but he never hesitated to give his opinion of what was needed.

Here at home we can make good the lost opportunities; we can recover the wasted years; we can cross the threshold to the new America. What we need is a rebirth of leadership--leadership which will give us a glimpse of the nobility and vision without which peoples and nations perish.⁶⁸⁹

He dealt at considerable length with what improvements the nation could expect under Democratic administration. "With leadership, Democratic leadership, we can do justice to our children, we can repair the ravages of time and neglect in our schools. We can and we will."⁶⁹⁰ Other examples would illustrate the same type of proof. He concluded with the phrase: "All these things we can do and we will."⁶⁹¹

⁶⁸⁶Ibid.

⁶⁸⁷Ibid., p. 680.

⁶⁸⁸Ibid.

⁶⁸⁹Ibid.

⁶⁹⁰Ibid.

⁶⁹¹Ibid.

Logos--artistic proof.

Inductive reasoning--argument from generalization. Stevenson spoke for ten minutes about the outward appearances of the Republican administration and how in actuality they have been responsible for our lack of world leadership and economic stalemate on the domestic scene. He drew the entire area together with this graphic generalization:

Well, I say they have smothered us in smiles and complacency while our social and economic advancement has ground to a halt and while our leadership and security in the world have been imperiled.⁶⁹²

He spoke of the economic plight of many citizens, and concluded that too many are in need of help.

The truth is that everyone is not prosperous. . . .The truth is that the small farmer, the small business man, the teacher, the white collar worker, and the retired citizen trying to pay today's prices on yesterday's pension--all these are in serious trouble.⁶⁹³

Inductive reasoning--argument from causation. One of the major points of disagreement during the Convention concerned the civil-rights issue and the segregation problem. Stevenson stated his whole-hearted endorsement of the Party's platform plank on this issue, and explained why he didn't consider the bitter debate earlier in the week a dangerous omen.

Of course there is disagreement in the Democratic party on desegregation. It could not be otherwise in the only party that must speak responsibly in both the North and the South. If all of us are not wholly satisfied with what we have said on this explosive subject it is because we have spoken the only way a truly national party can--by understanding accomodation of conflicting views.⁶⁹⁴

Stevenson was concerned about the apathy and complacency of the American people, and listed as one of the primary causes of this attitude the

⁶⁹²Ibid.

⁶⁹³Ibid.

⁶⁹⁴Ibid., p. 679

willingness of the nation's press to sugar-coat the important events of the past four years. "And we Democrats must also face the fact that no administration has ever before enjoyed such an uncritical and enthusiastic support from so much of the press as this one."⁶⁹⁵ On the domestic scene the national administration had no excuse for not getting things done, but the international arena was another situation. There, the cause of much of our troubles came from the unpredictable Soviet block, who by their actions determined what ours would have to be.

But in the international field the timing is only partially our own. Here the 'unrepentant minute' once missed, may be missed forever. Other forces, growing yearly in potency, dispute with us the direction of our times.⁶⁹⁶

Inductive reasoning--argument from analogy. Only one analogy was found in the "Speech of Acceptance." Stevenson was speaking about the modern-day method of obtaining votes used by the less scrupulous. "This idea that you can merchandise candidates for high office like breakfast cereal--that you can gather votes like box tops--is, I think, the ultimate indignity to the democratic process."⁶⁹⁷

Deductive reasoning--argument from syllogism and enthymeme. The Democratic candidate reasoned by deduction when he gave this reason for electing the Democratic slate of candidates:

Woodrow Wilson said that 'when America loses its ardor for mankind it is time to elect a Democratic President.' There doesn't appear to be much ardor in America just now for anything, and it's time to elect a Democratic Administration and a Democratic Congress. . .⁶⁹⁸

No other example of deductive reasoning was discovered.

⁶⁹⁵Ibid., p. 680.

⁶⁹⁶Ibid., p. 681.

⁶⁹⁷Ibid., p. 680.

⁶⁹⁸Ibid.

Ethos.

Sincerity. Stevenson appeared before the Democratic Convention in a repeat performance of his acceptance speech of four years earlier. He continued to impress his political friends with his sincerity, and they felt that in 1956, contrary, perhaps, to 1952, he sincerely and desperately wanted to become President. "My heart is full tonight, as the scenes and faces and events of these busy years in between crowd my mind."⁶⁹⁹ He spoke sincerely to the delegates when he told them: "To you here tonight and across the country who have sustained me in this great undertaking, for months and even years, I am deeply, humbly grateful."⁷⁰⁰ The final form of the much debated Democratic platform met with the whole-hearted approval of Stevenson, and he wanted to express his sincere appreciation to the delegates for writing a platform that he could run on. "The program you have written is, I think, more than a consensus of the strongly held convictions of strong men; it is a signpost toward that new America."⁷⁰¹ After criticizing the President's actions on both the domestic and foreign scene, Stevenson clarified his position. "Don't misunderstand me, I, for one, am ready to acknowledge the sincerity of the Republican President's desire for peace and happiness for all."⁷⁰² But, he maintained, good intentions are not enough. The final sentence was a sincere expression of faith in the future. "Standing as we do here tonight at this great fork of history, may we never be silenced, may we never lose our faith in freedom and the better destiny of man."⁷⁰³

⁶⁹⁹Ibid., p. 679.

⁷⁰¹Ibid.

⁷⁰³Ibid., p. 681.

⁷⁰⁰Ibid.

⁷⁰²Ibid., p. 680.

Earnestness. The speech was delivered in great earnest by a man who obviously wanted to be President. He reviewed happenings of the past four years, then stated:

Tonight, after an interval of marking time and aimless drifting, we are on the threshold of another great, decisive era. History's headlong course has brought us, I devoutly believe, to the threshold of a new America--to the America of the great ideals and noble visions which are the stuff our future must be made of.⁷⁰⁴

Regarding the course of history for the past four years, Stevenson earnestly accused the Republican administration of blundering and erroneous judgment. "In spite of these unparalleled opportunities to lead at home and abroad, they have, I say, been wasting our opportunities and losing our world."⁷⁰⁵ He specifically accused the administration of an unwillingness to accept leadership of the free world. "But you cannot surround the future with arms, you cannot dominate the racing world by standing still. And I say it is time to get up and get moving again. It is time for America to be herself again."⁷⁰⁶ The unpredictability of the Soviet leadership imposed severe restrictions on American foreign policy. The critical importance of maintaining effective friendships abroad was not overlooked by the speaker, and he earnestly brought out this dilemma.

But in the international field the timing is only partially our own. Here the 'unrepentant minute' once missed, may be missed forever. Other forces, growing yearly in potency, dispute with us the direction of our times. Here more than anywhere guidance and illumination are needed in the terrifying century of the hydrogen bomb. Here more than anywhere we must move, and rapidly, to repair the ravages of the past four years to America's repute and influence abroad.⁷⁰⁷

In conclusion Stevenson urged a renewal of the admirable traits that had

⁷⁰⁴Ibid., p. 679.

⁷⁰⁵Ibid., p. 680.

⁷⁰⁶Ibid.

⁷⁰⁷Ibid., pp. 680-681.

been so evident in our earlier history.

Once we were not ashamed in this country to be idealists. Once we were proud to confess that an American is a man who wants peace and believes in a better future and loves his fellow man. We must reclaim these great Christian and humane ideas. We must dare to say again that the American cause is the cause of all mankind.⁷⁰⁸

Devotion. The first sentences of the address dispelled any doubt about the intention of the Democratic candidate regarding the coming campaign. "I accept your nomination and your program. And I pledge to you every resource of mind and strength that I possess to make your deed today a good one for our country and for our party."⁷⁰⁹ He proceeded to enumerate what he considered the major issues of the forthcoming campaign, and summed up with the following expression of his devotion to his cause:

These are the things I believe in and will work for with every resource I possess. These are the things I know you believe in and will work for with everything you have. These are the terms on which I accept your nomination.⁷¹⁰

If he were to be elected President, Stevenson assured his followers that he would support the issues stressed in the Democratic platform. "As President it would be my purpose to press on in accordance with our platform toward the fuller freedom for all our citizens which is at once our party's pledge and the old American promise."⁷¹¹

Patience. Most of the speech reflected impatience with the current policies and actions of our government. "But you cannot surround the future with arms, you cannot dominate the racing world by standing still. And I say it is time to get up and get moving again. It is time

⁷⁰⁸Ibid., p. 681.

⁷¹⁰Ibid.

⁷⁰⁹Ibid., p. 679.

⁷¹¹Ibid.

for America to be herself again."⁷¹² Stevenson was impatient, also, with the uncertain handling of foreign affairs. "Here more than anywhere we must move, and rapidly, to repair the ravages of the past four years to America's repute and influence abroad."⁷¹³ Not one example of appeal to patience was noted.

Friendliness. Stevenson especially wished to heal any wounds incurred during the week by certain elements of the Democratic Party. He expressed friendliness to all Democrats and warned that they must now unite or victory would not be forthcoming in the Fall. He also thanked the delegates for their choice of Vice-Presidential candidate Kefauver. "I am sure that the country is as grateful to this convention as I am for its action of this afternoon. It has renewed and reaffirmed our faith in free democratic processes."⁷¹⁴ He was concerned over the less powerful nations of the world community who were struggling to survive. "We must protect the new nations in the exercise of their full independence; and we must help other peoples out of Communist or colonial servitude along the hard road to freedom."⁷¹⁵

Sympathy. The controversial segregation issue was finally compromised between the extreme viewpoints, and Stevenson expressed his sympathy towards the final platform plank.

But in so doing, in substituting realism and persuasion for the extremes of force or nullification, our party has preserved its effectiveness, it has avoided a sectional crisis, and it has contributed to our national unity as only a national party could.⁷¹⁶

⁷¹²Ibid., p. 680.

⁷¹³Ibid., p. 681.

⁷¹⁴Ibid., p. 679.

⁷¹⁵Ibid., p. 681.

⁷¹⁶Ibid., p. 679.

President Eisenhower had suffered a heart attack the previous year, and many were concerned about his physical ability to conduct the office of President. Stevenson was naturally concerned about the President's health, and exhibited sympathy towards him.

I do not propose to make political capital out of the President's illness. His ability to personally fulfill the demands of his exacting office is a matter between him and the American people. So far as I am concerned that is where the matter rests. As we all do, I wish deeply for the President's health and well-being.⁷¹⁷

The economic plight of the farmer was a favorite topic of Democratic orators, and Stevenson did not lose the opportunity to sympathize with their situation.

The truth is that everyone is not prosperous. The truth is that the farmer, especially the family farmer who matters most, has not had his fair share of the national income and the Republicans have done nothing to help him—until an election year.⁷¹⁸

Actually he appealed to more than just the farmers in his plea for higher incomes for Americans.

The truth is that 30,000,000 Americans live today in families trying to make ends meet on less than \$2,000 a year. The truth is that the small farmer, the small business man, the teacher, the white collar worker, and the retired citizen trying to pay today's prices on yesterday's pension—all these are in serious trouble.⁷¹⁹

Finally, Stevenson recognized the spiritual revival noticed throughout the land, and reiterated his sympathy with such a movement.

There is a spiritual hunger in the world today and it cannot be satisfied by material things alone. Our forebears came here to worship God. We must not let our aspirations so diminish that our worship becomes rather of bigness—bigness of material achievement.⁷²⁰

⁷¹⁷Ibid.

⁷¹⁹Ibid.

⁷¹⁸Ibid., p. 680.

⁷²⁰Ibid., p. 681.

Pathos.

Fear. Stevenson maintained that the statements of the administration were not giving the people the truth, but were covering over the dangerous position America held in the battle for world favor.

The truth is that we are losing the military advantage, the economic initiative and the moral leadership. The truth is that we are not winning the cold war, the truth is that we are losing the cold war.⁷²¹

He was afraid of what the consequences would be if we did not soon change our policy. The America that we so proudly talk about was not formulated by apathetic men nor false promises.

America, which has lifted man to his highest economic state, which has saved freedom in war and peace, which saved collective security, no longer sparks and flames and gives off new ideas and initiatives. Our lights are dimmed. We chat complacently of this and that while, in Carlyle's phrase, 'death and eternity sit glaring.'⁷²²

The age of nuclear development brought with it a new element in the game of war and peace. Fear had been struck into the hearts of millions across the globe because they knew that the next war might well be the last engagement between humans the earth will ever see.

For in this nuclear age peace is no longer a visionary ideal. It has become an absolute, imperative, practical necessity. Humanity's long struggle against war has to be won and won now. Yes, and I say it can be won.⁷²³

Confidence. The last time Stevenson had been the Democratic Presidential nominee his ticket had been soundly trounced by the Republicans. The memory of that defeat would have to be erased before the Democrats could present a confident candidate. So Stevenson attempted to assure the

⁷²¹Ibid., p. 680.

⁷²²Ibid.

⁷²³Ibid., p. 681.

delegates that it would be a different story this time. "Four years ago I stood in this same place and uttered those same words to you. But four years ago we lost. This time we will win!"⁷²⁴ He had extreme confidence in America's future and was not reluctant to mention this.

In our hearts we know that the horizons of the new America are as endless, its promise as staggering in its richness as the unfolding miracle of human knowledge. America renews itself with every forward thrust of the human mind.⁷²⁵

After criticizing the Republican administration, he reviewed what could come about under Democratic leadership, expressing complete confidence that a change for the better would occur.

With leadership, Democratic leadership, we can restore the vitality of the American family farm. We can preserve the position of small business without injury to the large. We can strengthen labor unions and collective bargaining as vital institutions in a free economy. We can and our party history proves that we will!⁷²⁶

He continued later in the address with the same type of reasoning, expressing confidence in his Party's ability to improve the nation.

We can make this a land where opportunity is founded only on responsibility and freedom on faith, and where nothing can smother the lonely defiant spirit of the free intelligence! We can, and by our traditions as a party we will!⁷²⁷

The reason for such confidence in the Democratic Party must lie in its past record, and that record, according to the speaker, is one of great accomplishment.

For a century and a half the Democratic party has been the party of respect for people, of reverence for life, of hope for each child's future, of belief that 'the highest revelation is that God is in every man.'⁷²⁸

⁷²⁴Ibid., p. 679.

⁷²⁵Ibid., p. 680.

⁷²⁶Ibid.

⁷²⁷Ibid.

⁷²⁸Ibid., p. 681.

The entire address exuded with a confidence that this year the Democratic Party would be victorious at the polls.

Indignation. Stevenson showed indignation towards those who were operating the Republican administration.

The men who run the Eisenhower Administration evidently believe that the minds of Americans can be manipulated by shows, slogans, and the arts of advertising. And that conviction will, I dare say, be backed up by the greatest torrent of money ever poured out to influence an American election—poured out by men who fear nothing so much as change and who want everything to stay as it is—only more so.⁷²⁹

Most Democrats had claimed that the first Eisenhower Administration was merely a modern version of the Roosevelt New Deal, and they were quite indignant about the credit their political opponents were claiming for the successes of that program.

I will have to confess that the Republican Administration has performed a minor miracle—after twenty years of incessant damnation of the New Deal they not only haven't repealed it but they have swallowed it, or most of it, and it looks as though they could keep it down at least until after the election.⁷³⁰

The same Democrats were highly indignant at the claim of Congressional accomplishments for the Republican Administration, claims that they maintained would be impossible without considerable Democratic help.

The truth is that the Republican party is a house divided. The truth is that President Eisenhower, cynically coveted as a candidate but ignored as a leader, is largely indebted to Democrats in Congress for what accomplishments he can claim.⁷³¹

Stevenson also exhibited indignation at the remarks of the President that we are winning the cold war.

⁷²⁹Ibid., pp. 679-680.

⁷³⁰Ibid., p. 680.

⁷³¹Ibid.

The truth is not that this government's policy abroad has the Communists on the run. The truth, unhappily, is not—in the Republican President's words—that our 'prestige since the last world war has never been as high as it is this day.' The truth is that it has probably never been lower.⁷³²

ARRANGEMENT

The introduction was longer than usual, consuming over one-fifth of the address. Stevenson accepted the nomination, thanked the delegates for the platform they approved and the running mate the selected for him, and extolled the virtues of Senator Kefauver. The body of the speech was divided into two sections. The first dealt with the failings of the Republican administration over the past four years, with attacks against their methods of governing. Secondly, he enumerated the Democratic stand on numerous issues and expressed confidence that this stand represented the will of the majority of thinking Americans. The brief conclusion was a re-statement of faith in the basic precepts of his Party, with assurance that the ticket would be victorious in the coming election.

STYLE

Level.

The style level was mostly middle, with portions approaching high style. The "Speech of Acceptance" of 1956 was similar in style to the acceptance speech of 1952. The portion that might be called high style was the conclusion and certain paragraphs from the introduction.

Diction and word choice.

The word selection tended towards more commonly understood words, with fewer college-level terms used than in the speeches of four years

⁷³² Ibid.

previously. No foreign terms were found, nor any phrases that the layman would not comprehend. Generally speaking, the diction was aimed at common and easy understanding.

Sentence structure.

The average sentence was the complex type. More simple sentences were found than one might have expected, although most of the simple sentences, according to structure, were quite long. Compound and complex-compound sentences were definitely in the minority in this speech. This is a representative paragraph from the address:

Nor has it evaded the current problems in the relations between the races who comprise America, problems which have so often tormented our national life. Of course there is disagreement in the Democratic party on desegregation. It could not be otherwise in the only party that must speak responsibly in both the North and the South. If all of us are not wholly satisfied with what we have said on this explosive subject it is because we have spoken the only way a truly national party can—by understanding accomodation of conflicting views.⁷³³

Rhetorical devices and figurative language.

Analogy. One analogy was used in the speech, that in reference to the type of campaigning carried on by the opposition camp.

This idea that you can merchandise candidates for high office like breakfast cereal—that you can gather votes like box tops—is, I think, the ultimate indignity to the democratic process.⁷³⁴

Epigram. Perhaps the best remembered quote of the speech was the following, in reference to the Republican administration's public relations efforts: "I say they have smothered us in smiles and complacency. . ." ⁷³⁵
Another favorite sentence of Democratic orators in the campaign was the following: "The truth is that in this Government of big men—. . .no one

⁷³³Ibid., p. 679.

⁷³⁴Ibid., p. 680.

⁷³⁵Ibid.

speaks for the little man."⁷³⁶

Humor. The address was conspicuously lacking in humor, with a spirit of earnestness and seriousness running through the entire speech. Only once, in the introduction, did he move the audience to laughter. He was thanking the delegates for their selection of Senator Estes Kefauver as his running mate, praising his campaigning abilities and not mentioning the fact that Kefauver had almost eliminated Stevenson from contention as a Presidential candidate with a stunning primary victory in Minnesota earlier in the year. Then, after his words of commendation for Kefauver, he stated: "Senator Kefauver is a great Democrat and a great campaigner—as I have reason to know better than anybody!"⁷³⁷

Rhetorical question. Stevenson wondered what the administration had done to take advantage of the great popularity of its leader and the unrivaled opportunities for leadership the world situation presented.

Has the Eisenhower Administration used this opportunity to elevate us? To enlighten us? To inspire us? Did it, in a time of headlong, world-wide, revolutionary change, prepare us for stern decisions and great risks? Did it, in short, give men and women a glimpse of the nobility and vision without which peoples and nations perish?⁷³⁸

Interrogation. The speaker used the question once to introduce his next group of thoughts. "What is the truth?"⁷³⁹

Irony and satire. Stevenson spoke very ironically when he wondered at the apparent fact that the Republican administration had almost outdone the Democrats when it came to the philosophy behind the New Deal.

I will have to confess that the Republican Administration has performed a minor miracle—after twenty years of incessant damnation of the

⁷³⁶Ibid.

⁷³⁸Ibid., p. 680.

⁷³⁷Ibid., p. 679.

⁷³⁹Ibid.

New Deal they not only haven't repealed it but they have swallowed it, or most of it, and it looks as though they could keep it down until after the election.⁷⁴⁰

He also did not appreciate the Republican attitude towards the farming group, speaking satirically about their actions.

The truth is that the farmer, especially the family farmer who matters most, has not had his fair share of the national income and the Republicans have done nothing to help him—until an election year.⁷⁴¹

He accused the leaders of the opposition of being big men, as they liked to call themselves, but not in the same sense of the word as they would like to be called. "The truth is that in this Government of big men—big financially—no one speaks for the little man."⁷⁴²

Contrast. The speaker several times contrasted what the administration had said pertaining to a certain topic and what he thought the actual truth of the matter was more likely to be. "The truth, unhappily, is not—in the Republican President's words—that our 'prestige since the last world war has never been as high as it is this day.' The truth is that it has probably never been lower."⁷⁴³ Speaking about the over-all battle of the cold war, he had this to say: "The truth is not that we are winning the cold war. The truth is that we are losing the cold war."⁷⁴⁴ Stevenson contrasted the age of pre-nuclear power to the present, illustrating the tremendous difference that affects everything. "For in this nuclear age peace is no longer a visionary idea. It has become an absolute, imperative, practical necessity."⁷⁴⁵ He also contrasted what he thought this

⁷⁴⁰Ibid.

⁷⁴²Ibid.

⁷⁴⁴Ibid.

⁷⁴¹Ibid.

⁷⁴³Ibid.

⁷⁴⁵Ibid., p. 681.

country needed in the way of an administration and what it has had for the previous four years. "I say that what this country needs is not propaganda and a personality cult. What this country needs is leadership and truth."⁷⁴⁶

Climax. The climax came at the end of the speech, and had a lengthy build-up. It was a challenging plea to his followers, an expression of confidence in the future, assuming they worked hard and honestly at the task that lay ahead.

For a century and a half the Democratic party has been the party of respect for people, of reverence for life, of hope for each child's future, of belief that 'the highest revelation is that God is in every man.' . . .

If we are to make honest citizens of our hearts we must unite them again to the ideals in which they have always believed and give those ideals the courage of our tongues.

Standing here as we do tonight at this great fork of history, may we never be silenced, may we never lose our faith in freedom and the better destiny of man.⁷⁴⁷

Onomatopoeia. One example of this rhetorical device was noted.

"And that conviction will, I dare say, be backed up by the greatest torrent of money ever poured out to influence an American election."⁷⁴⁸

Anaphora and epistrophe. Use of this device was quite common in the "Speech of Acceptance" address. He stressed the positive nature of the Democratic platform by use of epistrophe.

It speaks of the issues of our time with a passion for justice, with reverence for our history and character, with a long view of the American future, and with a sober, fervent dedication to the goal of peace on earth.⁷⁴⁹

He admitted the similarity, yet insisted on a difference, between his position at the time of the address and that of exactly four years earlier.

⁷⁴⁶Ibid., p. 680.

⁷⁴⁷Ibid., p. 681.

⁷⁴⁸Ibid., p. 680.

⁷⁴⁹Ibid., p. 679.

"Four years ago I stood in this same place and uttered those same words to you. But four years ago we lost."⁷⁵⁰ He repeated similar beginnings for his concepts of what the "new America" represented.

I mean a new America where poverty is abolished and our abundance is used to enrich the lives of every family.

I mean a new America where freedom is made real for all without regard to race or belief or economic condition.

I mean a new America which everlastingly attacks the ancient idea that men can solve their differences by killing each other.⁷⁵¹

Stevenson enumerated the primary issues of the campaign, according to his way of thinking, and fitting with the mood of the delegates as expressed in the Democratic platform. He used anaphora effectively as he expressed himself in this manner:

These are the things I believe in and will work for with every resource I possess. These are the things I know you believe in and will work for with everything you have. These are the terms on which I accept your nomination.⁷⁵²

Stevenson dealt at length on the idea that most Americans are agreed upon the desirable goals which our nation should be pursuing, but we need a Democratic administration to vigorously pursue those goals. What might happen if the nation were to return to Democratic leadership was given expression in the following series of paragraphs:

With leadership, Democratic leadership, we can do justice to our children, we can repair the ravages of time and neglect in our schools. We can and we will.

With leadership, Democratic leadership, we can restore the vitality of the American family farm. We can preserve the position of small business without injury to the large. We can strengthen labor unions and collective bargaining as vital institutions in a free economy. We can and our party history shows that we will!

⁷⁵⁰Ibid.

⁷⁵¹Ibid.

⁷⁵²Ibid.

With leadership, Democratic leadership, we can conserve our resources of land and forest and water and develop them for the benefit of all. We can and the record shows that we will!

With leadership, Democratic leadership, we can rekindle the spirit of liberty emblazoned in the bill of rights; we can build this new America where the doors of opportunity are open equally to all, yes, the doors of our factories and the doors of our laboratories and the doors of our school rooms. We can make this a land where opportunity is founded only on responsibility and freedom on faith, and where nothing can smother the lonely defiant spirit of the free intelligence! We can, and by our traditions as a party we will!⁷⁵³

Stevenson stressed the urgency of altering our course in foreign affairs, because the demands of leading the free world will not wait to be met. Not patience, but persistence, were the traits our Government needed to adopt in foreign diplomacy.

We must move with speech and confidence to reverse the spread of communism. We must strengthen the political and economic fabric of our alliances. We must launch new programs to meet the challenge of the vast social revolution that is sweeping the world and turn the violent forces of change to the side of freedom.

We must protect the new nations in the exercise of their full independence; and we must help other peoples out of Communist or colonial servitude along the hard road to freedom.

And we must place our nation where it belongs in the eyes of the world--at the head of the struggle for peace.⁷⁵⁴

Allusion and reference. Stevenson made reference early in the speech to the lady who had encouraged the delegates earlier in the week with an inspiring address. Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt always warranted much respect from Democratic Conventions, and the delegates responded with heart-felt applause to the following reference by the speaker:

To you here tonight and across the country who have sustained me in this great undertaking, for months and even years, I am deeply, humbly grateful; and to none more than the noble lady who is also the

⁷⁵³Ibid., p. 680.

⁷⁵⁴Ibid., p. 681.

treasurer of a legacy of greatness—Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, who has reminded us so movingly that this is 1956 and not 1932, nor even 1952.⁷⁵⁵

Another conspicuous figure throughout the Convention had been the past Democratic President, Harry Truman. Truman had thrown his weight behind the faction attempting to block the Stevenson nomination, but when he saw failure ahead, had changed his course and supported Stevenson. Stevenson did not forget to acknowledge this switch-over.

I salute also the distinguished American who has been more than equal to the hard test of disagreement and has now reaffirmed our common cause so graciously—President Harry Truman. I am glad to have you on my side again, sir!⁷⁵⁶

Stevenson spent some time enumerating the virtues of Senator Kefauver, who was to be his running mate in the coming campaign. "The office of the Vice-Presidency has been dignified by the distinction of your choice. Senator Kefauver is a great Democrat and a great campaigner—as I have reason to know better than anybody!"⁷⁵⁷ A topic that was on every delegate's mind was the health of President Eisenhower. Stevenson alluded to this touchy topic with these words: "I do not propose to make political capital out of the President's illness."⁷⁵⁸ He referred to the famous quote from Carlyle, using it in application to the present apathy and non-concern of many Americans, which Stevenson considered a grave sign for America's future. "We chat complacently of this and that while, in Carlyle's phrase, 'death and eternity sit glaring.'"⁷⁵⁹

⁷⁵⁵Ibid., p. 679.

⁷⁵⁷Ibid.

⁷⁵⁹Ibid., p. 680.

⁷⁵⁶Ibid.

⁷⁵⁸Ibid.

Metaphor. One example of this rhetorical device was noted. The favorite topic of Stevenson, the Republican Party, received this description: "The truth is that the Republican Party is a house divided."⁷⁶⁰

Personification. Several times this device was discovered. The United States was given personal powers in this sentence: "They are not for those who look backward, who are satisfied with things as they are, who think that this great nation can ever sleep or ever stand still."⁷⁶¹ Also in this bit of flowery prose the nation is personified. "The country is stalled on dead center—stalled in the middle of the road—while the world goes whirling by."⁷⁶² Here is another example of personification: "And I could add that opportunity, neglected opportunity, sits glaring too!"⁷⁶³ His favorite topic became personified at one point in his attacks upon it.

I will have to confess that the Republican Administration has performed a minor miracle—after twenty years of incessant damnation of the New Deal they not only haven't repealed it but they have swallowed it, or most of it, and it looks as though they could keep it down at least until after the election.⁷⁶⁴

Alliteration. About the average number of examples of alliteration were uncovered in this speech. "age of abundance"⁷⁶⁵; "freedom on faith"⁷⁶⁶; "rapidly, to repair the ravages. . ."⁷⁶⁷; "It has renewed and reaffirmed our faith in free democratic processes."⁷⁶⁸; "History's headlong course"⁷⁶⁹

⁷⁶⁰Ibid.

⁷⁶²Ibid., p. 680.

⁷⁶⁴Ibid.

⁷⁶⁶Ibid.

⁷⁶⁸Ibid., p. 679.

⁷⁶¹Ibid., p. 679.

⁷⁶³Ibid.

⁷⁶⁵Ibid.

⁷⁶⁷Ibid., p. 681.

⁷⁶⁹Ibid.

"shows, slogans, and the arts of advertising."⁷⁷⁰; "face the fact"⁷⁷¹;
 "they have smothered us in smiles and complacency."⁷⁷²; "cynically coveted
 as a candidate."⁷⁷³

VIII. FREEDOM, HUMAN WELFARE AND PEACE

INVENTION

Logos--non-artistic proof.

Evidence. Stevenson reviewed the years since the turn of the century and introduced the following statistics into the record: "This is 1956, the fifty-sixth year of our century. America has spent twenty-eight years of these years--twenty-eight of these years--under Democratic government and twenty-eight under Republican government."⁷⁷⁴ He reviewed also the past four years under Republican administration and enumerated what had not been accomplished.

In four years--four years of wealth and abundance--our Government has let the shortage of schools and of school teachers get worse. It has done almost nothing to stop the slum cancer which today infects tens of millions of American dwellings. And juvenile delinquency which breeds in slums and in poor schools has increased at a frightening rate.⁷⁷⁵

He referred to the vast size of the Defense budget, and wondered if we were getting our money's worth from our tax dollars.

When we are spending \$40,000,000,000 a year for defense, when the peace the Republicans boast about looks more fragile by the moment, when the hydrogen bombs and the guided missiles are multiplying, when Communist influence is spreading among restless millions, when we can lose the cold war without ever firing a shot, then I say that

⁷⁷⁰Ibid.

⁷⁷¹Ibid., p. 680.

⁷⁷²Ibid.

⁷⁷³Ibid.

⁷⁷⁴Adlai E. Stevenson, "Freedom, Human Welfare and Peace," Vital Speeches, XXII, No. 24, (October 1, 1956), p. 775.

⁷⁷⁵Ibid., p. 756.

most of all America is anxious about America--about its peace and security.⁷⁷⁶

Authority. This speech opened officially the Democratic Presidential campaign, and Stevenson mentioned his running mate in glowing terms, although he was not present. ". . .our party is honored that leadership in our cause is shared by a man so widely loved and trusted as Senator Estes Kefauver."⁷⁷⁷ The Democratic candidate did not miss the opportunity to refresh the minds of his listeners concerning the recent surge of his Party to power in the state of Pennsylvania. He implied that the voters of Philadelphia and Pennsylvania were fore-runners of a national trend towards the Democratic Party.

And that's why, after generations of Republican rule, the people called on the Democrats to clean up Philadelphia; and that's why, after decades of Republican rule, the Governor of Pennsylvania today is a vigorous and gifted young Democrat, George Leader.⁷⁷⁸

No other references to authorities were found in the speech.

Sign. Stevenson saw signs of a mass movement of the voters toward the Democratic banner. He justified this prediction by the election results from the state of Maine, which had just the week before elected a Democratic Representative for the first time in over two decades. "And what is happening here in Pennsylvania is going on in state after state. Just this week the rising tide burst the ancient dikes in the state of Maine."⁷⁷⁹

Assumption. The speaker attempted to inspire confidence in his listeners by assuring them that their candidates would be victorious in

⁷⁷⁶Ibid.

⁷⁷⁷Ibid., p. 755.

⁷⁷⁸Ibid.

⁷⁷⁹Ibid.

November. "And that's why, too, the next United States Senator from Pennsylvania will be a Democrat—a dedicated man of noble principle and of demonstrated competence—Joseph Clark."⁷⁸⁰ He made a major issue out of the recent election results in Maine and gave a reason, which must be called merely an assumption, for why the voters acted as they did.

I think it's because the fog is rising, because the fog of half-truths and of amiable complacency has been penetrated and people perceive, at last, that all is not well in Washington and in the world.⁷⁸¹

Stevenson attempted to impress the voters with the idea that a second-term Eisenhower would be less effective because he would be unable to run again and therefore would not be able to help his fellow party-members who might desire his name on the ticket to aid them.

And the plain truth is that this situation would get worse, not better, because what influence the President has with the Republican leaders in Congress has depended on his running again.⁷⁸²

Another favorite assumption of Democratic orators revolved around Vice-President Nixon. If they could convince the people that a vote for Eisenhower was a vote for Nixon, they felt many potential Republican votes would be nullified.

But from here on the future of Republican leaders will not depend on Mr. Eisenhower, but the Republican heir apparent, Mr. Nixon. And the Vice President seems to sail down wind no matter which way the wind blows.⁷⁸³

Logos—artistic proof.

Inductive reasoning—argument from generalization. Stevenson generalized about the accomplishments of his Party during their twenty-

⁷⁸⁰Ibid.

⁷⁸²Ibid., p. 756.

⁷⁸¹Ibid.

⁷⁸³Ibid.

eight years in power during this century.

During these Democratic years what did we do? We abolished child labor, we commenced unemployment insurance, old age retirement, minimum wages, made collective bargaining work, guaranteed bank deposits, we financed home ownership, started public housing, put a floor under farm prices, set up T. V. A. (Tennessee Valley Authority) and R. E. A. (Rural Electrification Administration), protected investors through the Securities Exchange Commission, consumers through the Federal Trade Commission and we lifted the nation from the rubble of bankruptcy and despair to a great plateau of abundance.⁷⁸⁴

He pointed out several areas in which he felt the United States had neglected its mission as leader of the free world, then generalized with these words: "The Soviets have advanced, while we have fallen back, not only in the competition for strength of arms, but even in education. Millions of people have moved further toward the false promises of Communism than the true faith of freedom."⁷⁸⁵ Stevenson also condemned the "big business" attitude of the administration, generalizing as follows:

Where these interests are involved, cutting taxes for the well-to-do, turning our natural resources over to private companies, chipping away at T. V. A. and along with Mr. Dixon and Mr. Yates--these men have been highly effective indeed.⁷⁸⁶

Inductive reasoning--argument from causation. The first sentence of the speech was in praise of the comments of Governor Leader of Pennsylvania. Stevenson commented that he felt speechless coming after such an address, and then had to retract that meaning and explain why he did want to say something. "I came here tonight to summon you Democrats to the cause of freedom, the cause of human welfare and to the cause of peace."⁷⁸⁷ Stevenson cited the fact that each time he has appeared in Harrisburg a larger crowd greets him, and he proceeded to show why this occurred.

⁷⁸⁴Ibid., p. 755.

⁷⁸⁶Ibid.

⁷⁸⁵Ibid., p. 756.

⁷⁸⁷Ibid., p. 755.

Each time that I have come here the crowd gets larger, just as each month all across the country the tide of protest and of hope has risen. . . Now, why is this? I think it's because the fog is rising, because the fog of half-truths and of amiable complacency has been penetrated and people perceive, at last, that all is not well in Washington and in the world.⁷⁸⁸

He enumerated the failures in domestic affairs over the past four years, and had a ready answer for the cause of such misfortunes. "It has happened because for four years now we have had a Government which neither fully understands nor wholly sympathizes with our human needs or the revolution that is sweeping our world."⁷⁸⁹

Inductive reasoning--argument from analogy. The only analogy in the speech was a short comparison between the Party platforms and two checks, written by different people.

Well, when someone says that the two parties' programs are just about the same, I say that so are two checks, signed by different people. The question is which one can be cashed and which one will bounce.⁷⁹⁰

Deductive reasoning--argument from syllogism and enthymeme. Stevenson reasoned in this manner when he urged all qualified voters to register and vote when the time came:

Democracy's price is the participation in it of all who believe that it serves their best interest. I join with the President of the United States in urging every American, regardless of party, to register-- and to do it now, to do it before it is too late.⁷⁹¹

He used deduction as he reasoned that the people would desire the Democratic Party back in power this year.

⁷⁸⁸Ibid.

⁷⁸⁹Ibid., p. 756.

⁷⁹⁰Ibid., p. 755.

⁷⁹¹Ibid.

And, most of all, it was under Democratic leadership that this nation met and defeated the greatest threats to individual liberty and national freedom in modern history. . . . And that's why I say that to get these things done, America will once again turn to Democratic leadership.⁷⁹²

An example of the enthymeme was seen when Stevenson noted that President Eisenhower was not a full-time President, and that the needs of the nation would not be satisfied under his administration.

They are the reasons America's human needs go unmet. Nor will they be met as long as the President is not master in his own house. . . . But from here on the future of the Republican leaders will depend not on Mr. Eisenhower, but the Republican heir apparent, Mr. Nixon.⁷⁹³

Ethos.

Sincerity. Stevenson opened the address with a sincere appeal to all Americans who shared the views he was about to express to join ranks with his crusade.

And I summon all Americans who believe greatly in these things to join with us. We claim no monopoly on the ideal we assert. They are America's ideals. The victory we seek is not just for a party; it is for a people.⁷⁹⁴

He accused the opposition candidates of clouding the basic issues in slogans, but maintained that he would not resort to such tactics. "I pose these issues in terms of facts—the facts of America's unmet human needs, the facts of a revolutionary age of a revolutionary world in this hydrogen age."⁷⁹⁵ He reviewed the distressing circumstances facing America throughout the world, then summed up his feelings thusly:

Now these, these, my friends, are stern facts. To ignore them is perilous. They are the reasons America's human needs go unmet. Nor

⁷⁹²Ibid.

⁷⁹⁴Ibid., p. 755.

⁷⁹³Ibid., p. 756.

⁷⁹⁵Ibid.

will they be met as long as the President is not master in his own house.⁷⁹⁶

In the face of the challenge that confronted the nation, Stevenson urged action and action immediately else this God-given opportunity for leadership expire. He was a sincere man when he urged: "I firmly believe that America does not want to rest on dead center, that it wants--fervently-- to move forward again to meet these needs and to live up to the best that is in them."⁷⁹⁷ Numerous other illustrations could be quoted of Stevenson's sincerity in the speech.

Earnestness. The Democratic standard bearer apparently recognized that he was facing an up-hill fight against the most popular man in America. But this circumstance only seemed to make him more determined to give everything he had to the campaign. He spoke earnestly to the 10,000 people in the audience as he began his speech: "I came here tonight to summon you Democrats to the cause of peace."⁷⁹⁸ He entreated all potential voters to register before they forfeited their right to vote. "I join with the President of the United States in urging every American, regardless of his party, to register--and to do it now, to do it before it is too late."⁷⁹⁹ Stevenson defended the record of his Party and stoutly maintained that his Party has kept faith with the people.

And I say that for 150 years a check by the Democratic party written out to the American people has been worth its face value. We say what we mean. We mean what we say. And the record proves it.⁸⁰⁰

The advantageous portions of the administration program were aided through

⁷⁹⁶Ibid., p. 756.

⁷⁹⁷Ibid.

⁷⁹⁸Ibid., p. 755.

⁷⁹⁹Ibid.

⁸⁰⁰Ibid.

Congress, in most instances, by Democratic members. In other words, President Eisenhower could not depend upon his own Party to get his legislative program enacted. This bothered Stevenson, but when he projected what might occur during the next term, he became alarmed. "And the plain truth is that this situation would get worse, not better, because what influence the President has with the Republican leaders in Congress has depended on his running again."⁸⁰¹ He enumerated the dangers of radical governments and urged awareness of their actions. "We must guide the hopes of mankind away from the blind alleys of extreme nationalism or bogus Communist internationalism."⁸⁰²

Devotion. The thousands comprising the audience were mostly loyal Democrats who wanted to hear confident and assuring words from their candidate. Stevenson did not let them down, assuring them that he thought they would win in November if they worked hard, and he for one was going to do just that.

And I am going to fight for it with everything that I have, and our party is honored that leadership in our cause is shared by a man so widely loved and trusted as Senator Estes Kefauver.⁸⁰³

He outlined what he intended to accomplish in the months ahead, and what manner of campaign he would wage. In summation the candidate gave this expression of devotion to his cause:

As I have in the past, I will lay before you in as full detail as a political campaign permits, proposals for meeting our needs. And we will talk soberly about their cost and the ways and means of approaching them in a responsible manner.⁸⁰⁴

⁸⁰¹Ibid., p. 756.

⁸⁰³Ibid., p. 755.

⁸⁰²Ibid.

⁸⁰⁴Ibid., p. 756.

Friendliness. Stevenson acknowledged the opening of the Republican campaign at Gettysburg before a select group of Party notables, then contrasted the campaign send-off he was addressing: "And for my part I'm mighty glad to be here tonight to open the 1956 Democratic campaign before 10,000 Pennsylvanians with the whole nation as our invited guests."⁸⁰⁵ He also expressed friendship towards the good people of Harrisburg who greeted him so enthusiastically. "This is my third visit to Harrisburg in the past two years. Each time that I have come here the crowd gets larger. . ."⁸⁰⁶ The campaign manager for his 1956 attempt was a native Pennsylvanian, and Stevenson recognized him before his home-state audience. "And if I may claim a point of personal privilege, I want to salute tonight your good friend and my campaign manager—that wise and gentle Irishman, Jim Finnegan of Philadelphia."⁸⁰⁷ In his conclusion Stevenson exhibited trust and friendship towards the common people of America, who are the real back-bone of the nation.

If I were to attempt to put my political philosophy tonight into a single phrase, it would be this: trust the people. Trust their good sense, their decency, their fortitude, their faith. Trust them with the facts. Trust them with the truth.⁸⁰⁸

Sympathy. Stevenson thought that several groups within our population had not been reaping their fair share of benefits from the nation's booming economy. "We have done nothing to help the lot of the poor and of our older people, and their situation gets worse as the cost of living climbs to the highest point in our history."⁸⁰⁹ He sympathized with the

⁸⁰⁵ Ibid., p. 755.

⁸⁰⁷ Ibid.

⁸⁰⁹ Ibid.

⁸⁰⁶ Ibid.

⁸⁰⁸ Ibid., p. 756.

farmer who was getting a smaller share of the national income in 1956 than in any of the previous 15 years. "We have watched the vice of higher costs and lower prices close on the helpless farmer whose only defense is that he has done his job too well."⁸¹⁰ The recent illness of the President evoked sympathy from Stevenson, who made it clear that he was attacking not Eisenhower personally, but his administration of the office of President. "Everyone shares in the sympathy for the circumstances which have created a part-time Presidency."⁸¹¹

Pathos.

Love and friendship. Stevenson expressed his gratitude to the folks who turned out to attend the campaign kick-off speech.

And for my part I'm mighty glad to be here tonight to open the 1956 Democratic campaign before 10,000 Pennsylvanians with the whole nation as our invited guests. . . .This is my third visit to Harrisburg in the past two years. Each time that I have come here the crowd gets larger. . . .⁸¹²

He hit hard at the economic difficulties of those living on pensions, particularly older people, who were finding it increasingly difficult to live decently because of our inflationary spiral. "I think America wants to give to the lives of older people the dignity and meaning that they yearn for and that they deserve."⁸¹³ His concluding paragraph was an appeal to the friendship of the audience, urging them to join him in his campaign.

So I say to you, my friends, let us be up and doing, probing ceaselessly for solutions of today's problems and the new ones tomorrow will leave upon our doorstep. And if you share my view, if you share

⁸¹⁰Ibid.

⁸¹²Ibid., p. 755.

⁸¹¹Ibid.

⁸¹³Ibid., p. 756.

the Democratic view, that this election is a summons to a sleeping giant, then I hope you will join us to make that summons clear and strong on Election Day and to help us march toward the new America.⁸¹⁴

Fear. The shocking facts of the confused world situation struck fear into the minds of most of the nation's thinking people, according to Stevenson. How could we be anything but fearful upon examining the trend of recent world developments.

And the facts of our progress towards peace are even more sobering, it seems to me. The Soviets have advanced, while we have fallen back, not only in the competition for strength of arms, but even in education. Millions of people have moved further toward the false promises of Communism rather than the true faith of freedom.⁸¹⁵

Another factor that had fearful possibilities for most Democrats was the President's health, and the position of Richard Nixon as heir to the Presidency.

But from here on the future of Republican leaders will depend not on Mr. Eisenhower, but the Republican heir apparent, Mr. Nixon. And the Vice President seems to sail down wind no matter which way the wind blows.⁸¹⁶

In summation of our precarious position in this potentially explosive world, Stevenson was afraid that the signs were not very encouraging.

When we are spending \$40,000,000,000 a year for defense, when the peace the Republicans boast about looks more fragile by the moment, when the hydrogen bombs and the guided missiles are multiplying, when Communist influence is spreading among restless millions, when we can lose the cold war without ever firing a shot, then I say that most of all America is anxious about America—about its peace and security.⁸¹⁷

Confidence. The Democratic standard-bearer observed the signs of a return to the Democratic fold of millions of voters across the land and on this basis predicted with confidence Democratic victories in November.

⁸¹⁴Ibid.

⁸¹⁵Ibid.

⁸¹⁶Ibid.

⁸¹⁷Ibid.

"And that's why, too, the next United States Senator from Pennsylvania will be a Democrat—a dedicated man of noble principle and of demonstrated competence—Joseph Clark."⁸¹⁸ He reviewed the accomplishments of both Parties while they held power since the turn of the century, and from this comparison concluded that the Democratic Party would be called on to once again lead the people. "And that's why I say that to get these things done, America will once again turn to Democratic leadership."⁸¹⁹ The signs of trouble around the globe indicated a difficult task ahead, but Stevenson felt America was up to the job.

We Americans have never been and we never will be a nation content just to count today's blessings. We have confidence in ourselves—confidence that we can build what we have to build, that we can grow as we have to grow and that we can change as we must change, and play our full part in the making of a new America—a better tomorrow for ourselves and for all of mankind.⁸²⁰

Shame. The unlimited wealth and potential of our nation was a contrasting factor to the shameful situation existant in many areas.

In four years—four years of wealth and abundance—our Government has let the shortage of schools and of school teachers get worse. It has done almost nothing to stop the slum cancer which today infects tens of millions of American dwellings. And juvenile delinquency which breeds in slums and in poor schools has increased at a frightening rate.⁸²¹

Stevenson contended that America had been lacking in effective leadership on many fronts during the past four years. He could think of no excuse for such a situation.

But where human interests are concerned--the interests of the young and of the old, the worker, the farmer, where the need is to wipe out poverty or to build schools or hospitals, to clear slums, even

⁸¹⁸Ibid., p. 755.

⁸¹⁹Ibid.

⁸²⁰Ibid., p. 756.

⁸²¹Ibid.

to distribute the Salk vaccine--there, no one leads.⁸²²

Indignation. The opening of the Republican campaign had occurred just the day previously, but the circumstances were quite different from the Democratic campaign send-off.

Before what the newspaper called a crowd of more than 500 of the Grand Old Party elite. You know, I went to my dictionary and here is what it said: Elite--a group or body considered or treated as socially superior. Well, evidently Joe Smith didn't do any better in Gettysburg than he did in San Fransisco.⁸²³

Another sore point with many liberals was the conservation issue, and Stevenson indignantly criticized the administration for their handling of this problem. "Instead of turning our natural resources, our rivers and lands and forests to the public good, we have seen them raided for private profit."⁸²⁴ He spoke indignantly about the many men from Big Business who held responsible positions in the government. "Then--partly by choice, and partly by unhappy necessity--we regret that the President turned over to these men of limited interests and experience still more of the powers of Government."⁸²⁵

Emulation. The very popular young Governor of Pennsylvania had introduced Stevenson and done a superb job. In his first sentence Stevenson praised his predecessor in these words: "After listening to what Governor Leader said I've concluded that my words are so valuable this evening I'm almost speechless."⁸²⁶

Benevolence. Stevenson was asking not only for support from members of his Party, but from all Americans who felt as he did on the major issues.

⁸²²Ibid.

⁸²³Ibid., p. 755.

⁸²⁴Ibid., p. 756.

⁸²⁵Ibid.

⁸²⁶Ibid., p. 755.

And I summon all Americans who believe greatly in these things to join with us. We claim no monopoly on the ideals we assert. They are America's ideals. The victory we seek is not just for a party; it is for a people.⁸²⁷

ARRANGEMENT

The introduction was very brief, to the point, and delivered in earnest. It was primarily an appeal to Democrats and others sympathetic with their aims to join together and work for victory in November. The body of the "Freedom, Human Welfare and Peace" speech began with a review of what both Parties had accomplished, or not accomplished, during their terms of office since 1900. The comparison was then employed as the reason for returning to the Democratic administration, which would mean numerous changes in the direction of our domestic and foreign policy, these changes being enumerated by Stevenson. The conclusion challenged Americans to look confidently to the coming years and be alert to the ever-present dangers confronting us constantly.

STYLE

Level.

The style level was middle and high, with most of the speech falling into the middle category. From the standpoint of style, this address was probably the highest of the campaign, being concerned more with theoretical concepts and not so much basic, common-place issues. Several of the pleas delivered by Stevenson were definitely high style, with ornate and flowery language put to good effect.

Diction and word choice.

Along with the higher style was detected a choice of language more fitting for an educated audience than might be expected in a campaign

⁸²⁷Ibid.

speech. None of the words employed were completely foreign or unknown to most listeners, though, and the meaning of any sentence could easily be ascertained from the context of the sentence. Many times Stevenson employed more words than necessary to express his idea, but apparently in hopes of coloring his phrases and making them more palatable to the audience.

Sentence structure.

Few simple sentences were used in the speech. Most sentences were either complex or complex-compound. The few simple sentences found were usually in a series and designed for emphasis. This was a representative paragraph:

We must guide the hopes of mankind away from the blind alleys of extreme nationalism or bogus Communist internationalism. We must turn them instead to an ideal of partnership between the nations in which disputes are settled by conciliation, not violence, and in which the weapons of death are limited and controlled. We Americans have never been and we never will be a nation content just to count today's blessings.⁸²⁸

Rhetorical devices and figurative language.

Analogy. One analogy was used in the speech.

Well, when someone says that the two parties' programs are just about the same, I say that so are two checks, signed by different people. The question is which one can be cashed and which one will bounce.⁸²⁹

Epigram. Stevenson referred to the short slogan that the Republicans were employing: "peace, prosperity and progress."⁸³⁰ Another example of an epigram was, "We say what we mean. We mean what we say."⁸³¹

Humor. This was not used in the speech except once when the speaker

⁸²⁸Ibid., p. 756.

⁸²⁹Ibid., p. 755.

⁸³⁰Ibid.

⁸³¹Ibid.

referred to the favorite topic of the Democrats, Vice President Richard Nixon. The crowd roared their approval when Stevenson said:

But from here on the future of Republican leaders will depend not on Mr. Eisenhower, but the Republican heir apparent, Mr. Nixon. And the Vice President seems to sail down wind no matter which way the wind blows.⁸³²

Interrogation. Several short questions were used to introduce new evidence. "During these Democratic years what did we do?"⁸³³; "And what did the Republican leadership give us in the twenty-eight years of its leadership?"⁸³⁴; "And why has all this happened?"⁸³⁵

Irony and satire. Stevenson spoke about the ironic plight of the American farmer, who faced increasing expenses with decreasing prices. "We have watched the vice of higher costs and of lower prices close on the helpless farmer whose only defense is that he has done his job too well."⁸³⁶ He did not neglect to point out the irony involved in the record of the Republican Administration; a record that showed beneficial accomplishments aided through Congress primarily by Democratic support. "And certainly the Democrats in Congress have constantly rescued the Republican President from his own party."⁸³⁷

Contrast. The difference in campaigning techniques was mentioned by Stevenson, and he contrasted them in this manner:

The Republicans have posed the issues of this campaign in terms of slogans---of peace, prosperity and progress. I pose these issues in terms of facts---the facts of America's unmet human needs, the facts of a revolutionary age of a revolutionary world in this hydrogen age.⁸³⁸

He also contrasted the achievements of the Republican administrations with

⁸³²Ibid., p. 756.

⁸³³Ibid., p. 755.

⁸³⁴Ibid.

⁸³⁵Ibid., p. 756.

⁸³⁶Ibid.

⁸³⁷Ibid.

⁸³⁸Ibid., p. 755.

those of the Democrats, and came to the obvious conclusion, in his case; that the Democratic administrations had been better for the nation. In the introductory statement he contrasted what Governor Leader had just said and the worth of anything he could add. "After listening to what Governor Leader said I've concluded that my words are so valuable this evening I'm almost speechless."⁸³⁹ He contrasted the opening ceremonies of each Party, taking advantage of what appeared to be a closed session for the top brass of the Republican Party.

You know, I read here in Harrisburg this morning that another political campaign opened yesterday just forty miles from here. Before what the newspapers called a crowd of more than 500 of the Grand Old Party elite. . . .And for my part I'm mighty glad to be here tonight to open the 1956 Democratic campaign before 10,000 Pennsylvanians with the whole nation as our invited guests.⁸⁴⁰

Climax. The climax came during the final paragraph of the speech, after a lengthy build-up that was a logical background for the closing appeal.

So I say to you, my friends, let us be up and doing, probing ceaselessly for solutions of today's problems and the new ones tomorrow will leave upon our doorstep. And if you share my view, if you share the Democratic view, that this election is a summons to a sleeping giant, then I hope you will join us to make that summons clear and strong on Election Day and to help us march forward toward the new America.⁸⁴¹

Anaphora and epistrophe. Use of epistrophe was noted when Stevenson enumerated his basic reasons for making the appearance at Harrisburg. "I came here tonight to summon you Democrats to the cause of freedom, the cause of human welfare and to the cause of peace."⁸⁴² He used anaphora

⁸³⁹Ibid.

⁸⁴⁰Ibid.

⁸⁴¹Ibid., p. 756.

⁸⁴²Ibid., p. 755.

to emphasize his beliefs concerning America's future.

I think America wants to be called to build the school rooms and to train the teachers our children so desperately need.

I think America wants to be called to clear away the slums and bring basic dignity to millions more.

And I think America wants to attack relentlessly the vast realm of human pain, and lift from those hit by serious accident or illness at least the added burden of grinding debt.

I think America wants to give to the lives of older people the dignity and meaning that they yearn for and that they deserve.⁸⁴³

Allusion and reference. He alluded to the man who introduced him and was a popular Pennsylvania political leader, with these words:

". . .and that is why, after decades of Republican rule, the Governor of Pennsylvania today is a vigorous and gifted young Democrat, Governor Leader."⁸⁴⁴ He brought to the attention of his Pennsylvania audience the fact that his campaign manager was from the Quaker state. "And if I may claim a point of personal privilege, I want to salute tonight your good friend and my campaign manager--that wise and gentle Irishman, Jim Finnegan of Philadelphia."⁸⁴⁵

Metaphor. The only metaphor found in the address was the following:

I think it's because the fog is rising, because the fog of half-truths and of amiable complacency has been penetrated and people perceive, at last, that all is not well in Washington and in the world.⁸⁴⁶

Personification. He spoke of the election results from the usually rock-ribbed state of Maine, and made this comment: "Just this week the rising tide burst the ancient dikes in the state of Maine."⁸⁴⁷ Included in the praise of the Democratic Party was this bit of personification:

⁸⁴³Ibid., p. 756.

⁸⁴⁴Ibid., p. 755.

⁸⁴⁵Ibid.

⁸⁴⁶Ibid.

⁸⁴⁷Ibid.

"We lifted the nation from the rubble of bankruptcy and despair to a great plateau of abundance."⁸⁴⁸

Alliteration. Several examples of this rhetorical device were noted. "all is not well in Washington and the world."⁸⁴⁹; "peace, prosperity and progress."⁸⁵⁰; "stop the slum cancer. . ."⁸⁵¹; "A summons to a sleeping giant."⁸⁵²; "to the bold and the brave."⁸⁵³; "a point of personal privilege."⁸⁵⁴

IX. EQUALITY OF RIGHTS AND OPPORTUNITIES

INVENTION

Logos--non-artistic proof.

Evidence. This address was delivered in the heart of Harlem in New York City and was intended for the lower-income bracket voters. Among their major concerns was the housing problem, which presented a difficult situation in many populous cities across the nation. Stevenson acknowledged this unfortunate fact and promised action.

We are the richest nation in the world, the richest nation in history. . . . There are still miles and miles of slums in America. And every American family wants to escape from misery and squalor. We need new houses--millions of them.⁸⁵⁵

The majority of his Harlem audience was Negro so he struck hard at the Republican claims of progress in the area of de-segregation, maintaining that the steps forward were initiated under Democratic administration.

⁸⁴⁸Ibid.

⁸⁵⁰Ibid.

⁸⁵²Ibid.

⁸⁵⁴Ibid.

⁸⁴⁹Ibid.

⁸⁵¹Ibid., p. 756.

⁸⁵³Ibid., p. 755.

⁸⁵⁵Adlai E. Stevenson, "Equality of Rights and Opportunities," The New York Times, CVI, No. 36,049, October 5, 1956, p. 14.

In 1941 and 1942 I was assistant to the Secretary of the Navy. And it was then that we took the first and the hard steps toward removing the racial barriers in the United States Navy. My part in that was small and we only got the job started then, but we did get it started.

Then, on July 26, 1948, President Truman issued his Executive Order No. 9981. It was that order that sounded the death knell of segregation in the armed forces.⁸⁵⁶

Stevenson also covered the area of civil rights, boldly pointing out the stand of the Democratic Party as evidenced by the disputed plank finally written into the platform. He promised his allegiance to that platform, and reviewed his past experience with civil rights to illustrate his stand.

Surely the greatest problem we face here at home this year is the issue of civil rights. . . .I faced it when I was Governor of Illinois. During that interval we desegregated the National Guard; we used the National Guard to protect the safety of citizens in the Cicero riots; we came within an ace of passing a fair employment practises act--and were prevented from doing so only by a close vote in a Republican legislature. We eliminated all racial designations in the employment service of Illinois and on drivers licences¹, and so on.⁸⁵⁷

Authority. The minority groups which composed the vast population of Harlem, the Negroes, Puerto Ricans and Italians, had great respect for Democratic Presidents Roosevelt and Truman. Stevenson did not miss the opportunity to bring their names into the speech.

In the last generation the Democratic party has achieved social and economic and spiritual gains which have transformed American society, and it has done so under the leadership of two great-hearted Americans, Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman.⁸⁵⁸

He referred in glowing terms to other prominent Democrats of New York, mentioning Borough President Hulan Jack, Mayor Robert Wagner, Senator Herbert Lehman and Governor Averell Harriman, and he reserved the greatest

⁸⁵⁶Ibid.

⁸⁵⁷Ibid.

⁸⁵⁸Ibid.

praise for the lady who commanded unparalleled allegiance from the underprivileged of New York City.

And let me then express all our devotion and love to the great lady whose wisdom, grace of spirit and dedicated faith have illumined our life for a generation, the conscience of our party and the conscience of America—Eleanor Roosevelt.⁸⁵⁹

In his concluding sentence, Stevenson quoted the greatest authority of all as he referred to the Prophet Amos of the Old Testament. "For ours is a time like that of which the prophet Amos wrote, 'let justice roll down as waters, and righteousness as a mighty stream.'⁸⁶⁰

Sign. Closest to the hearts of the Harlem audience was the issue of civil rights, and Stevenson gave his unqualified endorsement to the Supreme Court decision outlawing segregation in public schools. He further reasoned that this fateful decision was a sign of the progress of man in his battle to offer all citizens an equal chance in life.

The Supreme Court decision on desegregation in the public schools was an expression of our steady movement toward genuine equality for all before the law, and it expressed in a new field the old principle that the American heritage of liberty and opportunity is not to be confined to men, women and children of a single race, a single religion or a single color.⁸⁶¹

Assumption. Stevenson criticized the Republican administration for failing to promote adequate housing development programs, and concluded his attack with the following argument from assumption: "I doubt if there will ever be much hope for an adequate public housing program under an administration which takes its policy from the real estate lobby."⁸⁶² He attempted to magnify the importance of the civil rights issue, which had been played down by the Republicans. "Surely the greatest problem

⁸⁵⁹Ibid.

⁸⁶⁰Ibid.

⁸⁶¹Ibid.

⁸⁶²Ibid.

we face here at home this year is the issue of civil rights."⁸⁶³ And later he spoke in the same vein. "Yet, despite the progress we have made, the achievement of equality of rights and opportunities for all American citizens is still the great unfinished business before the United States."⁸⁶⁴

Logos--artistic proof.

Inductive reasoning--argument from generalization. The Democratic candidate for President introduced the speech with enumerations of the benefits the average American has gained through the efforts of his Party. These accomplishments were the basis for this generalization: "I am proud because I come as the representative of the party which through history has been dedicated to the people of America--the Democratic Party."⁸⁶⁵ Stevenson spoke briefly about each of five leading Democratic Party stalwarts who were present that evening, then attempted to impress the audience with the idea that because Roosevelt, Lehman, Wagner, Jack and Harriman were good Democrats, the Party must be the Party of the people. "You know what our party stands for when you look at the men and women who honor us by their presence here tonight."⁸⁶⁶

Inductive reasoning--argument from causation. Stevenson praised Mayor Robert Wagner, who was running for the Senate on the Democratic ticket. He enumerated his desirable traits and concluded that they warranted his election as United States Senator. "There are many reasons why Bob Wagner will be your next Senator--his courage, his quiet integrity, his demonstrated ability, and his earnest devotion to the rights of

⁸⁶³Ibid.

⁸⁶⁴Ibid.

⁸⁶⁵Ibid.

⁸⁶⁶Ibid.

every American."⁸⁶⁷

Inductive reasoning--argument from analogy. No analogies were found in the speech.

Deductive reasoning--argument from syllogism and enthymeme. Stevenson defended the Supreme Court decision to abolish segregation in the nation's public schools, and by deductive reasoning re-iterated his faith in our highest tribunal.

The Supreme Court of the United States has determined unanimously that the Constitution does not permit segregation in the schools. As you know, for I have made my position clear on this from the start, I believe that decision to be right.⁸⁶⁸

Ethos.

Sincerity. The entire speech exemplified a sincere attempt to attract the sympathies of the minority groups. Stevenson listed the many areas where progress had been achieved in the past few decades and stressed the part his Party had played in making this progress possible. He was speaking sincerely when he stated: "America has made progress toward that fulfillment, too, and that progress has come in the main, I am proud to say, through the leadership of the Democratic party."⁸⁶⁹ He truly felt the urgency of the civil rights problem, and did not hesitate to speak about the controversial issue. "Surely the greatest problem we face here at home this year is the issue of civil rights."⁸⁷⁰ He repeated a statement made in Arkansas the week before, which showed his uncompromising stand in favor of the Supreme Court decision on segregation. It was before a Southern audience, and many feared repercussions, but such was

⁸⁶⁷Ibid.

⁸⁶⁹Ibid.

⁸⁶⁸Ibid.

⁸⁷⁰Ibid.

not the case. "And this statement, I am heartened to tell you tonight, brought applause from those who heard me in Arkansas."⁸⁷¹ And later, in reference to the same decision by the Supreme Court, he said: "As for myself, I have said from the beginning--and say now--that I support this decision."⁸⁷²

Earnestness. Stevenson spoke in earnest to his audience, promising that if elected he would continue the efforts of previous Democratic administrations on behalf of the minority groups in the nation.

Our party has fought valiantly for the plain people of America through its past, and I am here tonight to tell you that so long as I am its spokesman and leader, it will fight as hard as ever for the people in the years ahead. And because the people know that, it will win the election in November.⁸⁷³

One of the most pressing problems in New York City was that of adequate housing for the millions that inhabited the city. Stevenson accused the Republicans of intentionally neglecting this area of legislation, and promised that under a Democratic administration it would be a different story.

But I say to you that under the Democrats we will have public housing and urban renewal programs that will help provide every American family with an opportunity for a decent home in a decent neighborhood.⁸⁷⁴

The entire area of civil rights and human dignities was due to come under close scrutiny in future years, Stevenson felt, and much hope for America's future hinged upon fair and just solutions to these problems.

We have a code in this country--a design by which Americans live with one another. It is called the Bill of Rights. No other course is consistent with our Constitutional equality as Americans or with

⁸⁷¹Ibid.

⁸⁷²Ibid.

⁸⁷³Ibid.

⁸⁷⁴Ibid.

our human brotherhood as children of God.⁸⁷⁵

Devotion. The speaker showed extreme devotion to the Democratic Party, perhaps because the majority of the audience had great faith in the Party and in their lives it was more than merely a political faith. "I am proud because I come as the representative of the party which through history has been dedicated to the people of America—the Democratic party."⁸⁷⁶ He expounded on the glories of the Party, and maintained that it would always be devoted to the interests of the working, common citizen.

From the beginning of this Republic the Democratic party has worked, worked hard, yes, and worked successfully to improve the condition, confirm the rights and enlarge the opportunities of the Joe Smiths of our land.⁸⁷⁷

The most significant gains have been recorded in the struggle against poverty and discrimination, and in both areas the Democrats have been in the forefront campaigning for the working man.

We have come a long way in the battle for human dignity and opportunity in America. But we still have far to go. The Democratic Party has led the fight against poverty and discrimination, and it is our purpose to carry on that fight as long as those ugly specters still haunt American life.⁸⁷⁸

Patience. The struggle of the Negroes and other minority groups for equal rights will be a long, difficult task, and although some notable progress has been noticed, it will be many years before all the prejudice and animosity is eradicated. "Yet despite the progress we have made, the achievement of equality of rights and opportunities for all American citizens is still the great unfinished business before the United States."⁸⁷⁹

⁸⁷⁵Ibid.

⁸⁷⁷Ibid.

⁸⁷⁹Ibid.

⁸⁷⁶Ibid.

⁸⁷⁸Ibid.

Eventually the thinking people of our country will overcome the opposition to equality of rights regardless of race, color or religion, but such thinking will require time and effort.

I pray that all Americans, no matter what their feelings, will collaborate in working to sustain the Bill of Rights. No other course is consistent with our Constitutional equality as Americans or with our human brotherhood as children of God.⁸⁸⁰

Sympathy. Stevenson expressed sympathy towards those who still have difficulty obtaining adequate housing, good jobs and enough to eat.

We are the richest nation in the world, and the richest nation in history. And it is an indictment of our intelligence and humanity if we cannot provide every family in the country a decent opportunity to earn a living, a decent school, a decent roof over their heads and a decent prospect of security in old age.⁸⁸¹

The shocking fact that there still exist in America acres of slums and unsanitary living conditions should evoke the sympathy of any conscientious citizen. Stevenson deplored these conditions and promised to use the office of the President to alleviate the situation.

There are still miles and miles of slums in America. And every American family wants to escape from misery and squalor. We need houses--millions of them. We need a sound and imaginative public housing program. Every American who has taken the trouble to see how other people live in our country knows that these conditions exist and must be met.⁸⁸²

Another area of social welfare where much improvement could be brought about was that of elderly citizens who are no longer able to produce a days work. Stevenson praised the work of New York Governor Harriman in this area, and urged further study of the problem.

In particular it is our determination to carry out a program which will make the last years of life more serene and happy for our older citizens. Two weeks ago I issued a written statement in which I spelled out in detail what a Democratic Administration would propose to do. . .⁸⁸³

⁸⁸⁰Ibid.

⁸⁸¹Ibid.

⁸⁸²Ibid.

⁸⁸³Ibid.

Pathos.

Love and friendship. Stevenson expressed affection for those who had reached the declining years of life and were not properly taken care of.

In particular it is our determination to carry out a program which will make the last years of life more serene and happy for our older citizens. Two weeks ago I issued a written statement in which I spelled out in detail what a Democratic Administration would propose to do on behalf of our older citizens in the New America.⁸⁸⁴

Fear. The speaker feared that if the policies of the present administration were continued sufficient housing would never be constructed for millions of Americans. "I doubt if there will ever be much hope for an adequate housing program under an Administration which takes its policy from the real estate lobby."⁸⁸⁵

Confidence. At least once in every speech studied thus far, Stevenson has stressed his confidence in victory on election day. He expressed this feeling in the following manner in the "Equality of Rights and Opportunities" address: "Our party has fought valiantly for the plain people of America through its past. . . .And because the people know that, it will win the election in November."⁸⁸⁶ Contrary to the prospects for housing development under Republican administration, Stevenson asserted that if his Party were placed in power a definite change in policy would be brought about.

But I say to you that under the Democrats we will have public housing and urban renewal programs that will help provide every American family with an opportunity for a decent home in a decent neighborhood.⁸⁸⁷

He also expressed confidence that the Supreme Court ruling on segregation

⁸⁸⁴Ibid.

⁸⁸⁵Ibid.

⁸⁸⁶Ibid.

⁸⁸⁷Ibid.

would eventually be peacefully accepted by the people of the land.

The court's decree provides for the ways and means of putting into effect the principle it sets forth. I am confident that this decision will be carried out in the manner prescribed by the courts.⁸⁸⁸

Indignation. Stevenson was indignant towards the Republicans who had stifled all attempts to legislate public housing developments.

How have the Republicans met these needs? Well, the Republican leadership has fought and licked every good public housing bill proposed in these last four years--and the bills were always brought forward by the Democrats.⁸⁸⁹

He used the Republican attitude on public housing as typical of all Republican strategy on important issues for the working people.

The battle for housing is only one part of our Democratic battle for a new America, but in every field Democratic proposals to help the people are met by Republican indifference, obstruction and opposition.⁸⁹⁰

Stevenson spoke boldly on the segregation issue, and refuted the claims of Republican campaigners who claimed credit for progress in this field. "Well, you know, I happen to have been in on that story right from the start and these Johnny-come-lately Republican claims make me pretty disgusted."⁸⁹¹

ARRANGEMENT

The introduction was longer than usual, in which the speaker introduced the numerous dignitaries present and proclaimed their virtues. The body of the speech was an enumeration of the issues that were of greatest interest to the minority groups and the low-income groups. Public housing, segregation, civil rights, the minimum wage, pensions

⁸⁸⁸Ibid.

⁸⁸⁹Ibid.

⁸⁹⁰Ibid.

⁸⁹¹Ibid.

and unemployment benefits were all considered. Stevenson related the stand of the Eisenhower administration on each issue and then contrasted the Democratic stand against the Republicans. He hit hardest on the segregation issue, boldly proclaiming his stand in favor of the controversial Supreme Court decision. The conclusion was a promise of better days for America's lower classes, with a plea to vote the Democratic ticket in order to hasten this day of better living.

STYLE

Level.

The style varied between low and middle. This speech, of all those studied, fell most appropriately into the low style bracket. The speech was obviously aimed for those who did not possess high educational standards, and was very devoid of flowery language and was always to the point without unnecessary detail. The portion dealing with the Supreme Court ruling and its implications would be considered middle style, as well as the concluding paragraphs.

Diction and word choice.

The word choice was kept at a relatively simple level, with no difficult words detected. It was quite simple for the average laboring man to follow without difficulty the text of the speech at all times. Fewer adjectives and adverbs were found than in most other Stevenson talks. The diction had obviously been selected with the Harlem audience in mind.

Sentence structure.

Most of the sentences were simple or complex, with fewer lengthy sentences in this address than in others. More complex sentences were found than simple, but they usually had only one dependent clause. This

is a representative paragraph from the speech:

There are still miles and miles of slums in America. And every American family wants to escape from misery and squalor. We need new houses—millions of them. We need a sound and imaginative public housing program. Every American who has taken the trouble to see how other people live in our country knows that these conditions exist and must be met.⁸⁹²

Rhetorical devices and figurative language.

There was a noticeable lack of rhetorical devices in this speech.

The few that were found are as follows:

Humor. Once Stevenson made the audience laugh with a comment about the Republican usurpation of the Democratic platform.

I don't mind the President's trying to make off in broad daylight with the Democratic platform—he always returns it right after Election Day anyway—but he better stop trying to run on the Democratic record.⁸⁹³

Interrogation. The speaker asked, "How have the Republicans met these needs?"⁸⁹⁴ after listing the problems facing minority groups in the nation. He attempted to show that segregation in the armed services had been abolished prior to 1952, and then asked, "Why, then, why did President Eisenhower tell the American people last Monday, in listing the accomplishments of his Administration, that one thing the Republicans have done since 1952 is to end segregation in the armed forces?"⁸⁹⁵

Irony and satire. Stevenson used satire when he reasoned that New York City has shown progress in public housing because of Democratic administration.

You have already seen here in Harlem how public housing can begin to transform a community and make it a place where you can be proud to live—but then you have Democratic Mayors here in New York.⁸⁹⁶

⁸⁹²Ibid.

⁸⁹³Ibid.

⁸⁹⁴Ibid.

⁸⁹⁵Ibid.

⁸⁹⁶Ibid.

Contrast. Stevenson contrasted the apparent views of President Eisenhower on segregation in the armed forces when he was General in the Army in 1948 and when he was a political candidate in 1952.

That order was issued despite the testimony of Chief of Staff Dwight D. Eisenhower before a Congressional committee on April 2, 1948, that complete desegregation in the armed forces would, as he put it, get us 'into trouble.'

But four years later candidate Eisenhower admitted in a speech at Chicago on October 31, 1952, that--and these are his words--'Now, so far as I know, there is nothing in the way of segregation in the Army, Navy, Air Force or Marines left--at least as a matter of official record.'⁸⁹⁷

Repetition. Stevenson repeated words for the sake of emphasis several times. "From the beginning of this Republic the Democratic party has worked, worked hard, yes, and worked successfully. . ." ⁸⁹⁸ He urged the eligible voters to register so they could vote next November, using these words:

But we have got to register, and we have got to vote. I want to support with all my heart the appeals of your other speakers tonight that you register yourself, register your family, register your block and produce the highest registration New York City has ever seen.⁸⁹⁹

Climax. The concluding paragraphs of the address contained the climax.

The profound questions of our time remain questions of conscience and of will.

And the answers will come, at the last, 'Not by might, nor by power but by This spirit.'

For ours is a time like that of which the prophet Amos wrote, 'Let justice roll down as waters, and righteousness as a mighty stream.'⁹⁰⁰

Allusion and reference. This device was found many times throughout the address, with Stevenson referring to ten different individuals for various reasons. His first reference was to the hero of many minority group members, former President Roosevelt.

⁸⁹⁷Ibid.

⁸⁹⁸Ibid.

⁸⁹⁹Ibid.

⁹⁰⁰Ibid.

In the last generation the Democratic party has achieved social and economic and spiritual gains which have transformed American society, and it has done so under the leadership of two great-hearted Americans, Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman.⁹⁰¹

He alluded to the popular Governor of New York with these words of praise:

We have the man who embodies the gallantry and compassion of the liberal spirit, who has been the stalwart champion of those in distress and privation--the poverty-stricken, the aging, the common man everywhere--your great Governor, Averell Harriman.⁹⁰²

Similar references were made to Borough President Hulan Jack, Eleanor Roosevelt, Mayor Bob Wagner and Senator Herbert Lehman. Stevenson verified the contention that the Democrats had initiated desegregation in the armed forces by reference to the famous executive order that ordered such desegregation. "Then, on July 26, 1948, President Truman issued his Executive Order No. 9981. It was that order that sounded the death knell of segregation in the armed forces."⁹⁰³ He alluded to the much publicized quote of President Eisenhower's concerning the Supreme Court decision. "The President of the United States recently said of the Supreme Court decision, 'I think it makes no difference whether or not I endorse it.'"⁹⁰⁴ In conclusion two references were made to Biblical quotations that were known to most of his audience. "Not by might, nor by power but by This spirit."⁹⁰⁵; "Let justice roll down as waters, and righteousness as a mighty stream."⁹⁰⁶

Simile. The only simile found was contained in the Biblical quotation used by Stevenson in the last paragraph of the speech. "Let justice roll

⁹⁰¹Ibid.

⁹⁰³Ibid.

⁹⁰⁵Ibid.

⁹⁰²Ibid.

⁹⁰⁴Ibid.

⁹⁰⁶Ibid.

down as waters, and righteousness as a mighty stream."⁹⁰⁷

Personification. Several examples of personification were discovered. Stevenson personified the "specters" of poverty and discrimination in these words: "The Democratic party has led the fight against poverty and discrimination, and it is our purpose to carry on that fight as long as those ugly specters haunt American life."⁹⁰⁸ The non-segregation order of President Truman's had these powers: "It was that order that sounded the death knell of segregation in the armed forces."⁹⁰⁹ He once referred to the Bill of Rights as follows: "The Bill of Rights is the moral spine of our nation."⁹¹⁰

Alliteration. Only a few instances of this rhetorical device were noted. "No other course is consistent with our Constitutional equality as Americans or with our human brotherhood as children of God."⁹¹¹; "claimed credit"⁹¹²; "plain people"⁹¹³

X. OUR FOREIGN POLICY

INVENTION

Logos--non-artistic proof.

Evidence. Stevenson early in the speech challenged the statements made by Secretary of State John Foster Dulles concerning the victories of American foreign policy. He admitted some achievements, and was thankful for them, but proceeded to list several areas where recent events

⁹⁰⁷Ibid.

⁹⁰⁸Ibid.

⁹⁰⁹Ibid.

⁹¹⁰Ibid.

⁹¹¹Ibid.

⁹¹²Ibid.

⁹¹³Ibid.

indicated failure on the part of our diplomatic corps.

This other list shows that Korea is still divided by an uneasy armistice line and still costs us hundreds of millions of dollars in economic and military aid.

The richest half of Indochina has become a new Communist satellite, and after loud words and gestures America emerged from that debacle looking like a 'paper tiger.'

Communism and neutralism have made great gains in Ceylon and Burma and Indonesia in the past year or so.⁹¹⁴

Turning to the European continent, Stevenson enumerated situations that portended little good for the United States.

France has withdrawn most of her NATO forces to North Africa.

The Cyprus dispute has gravely disturbed the relations between three of our valued allies. Yet so far as I can discover, we have been of no help whatsoever in settling that dispute.

Iceland is insisting on the withdrawal of our forces from the key base we built there.

America's relations with its oldest and strongest allies, Britain and France, are more fragile than they have been in a generation or more.⁹¹⁵

Stevenson felt that the power, wealth and authority of the mighty United States must not be over-estimated, nor lead to complacency on our part. For all of our might, we are but a small percentage of the peoples that inhabit this earth.

We are rich, but there are only 168,000,000 of us and we have 2,500,000,000 neighbors. Our power is necessarily in conflict with the power of others who do not share or only partly share our aspirations.⁹¹⁶

The most critical area of conflict in the world at the time was the Middle East, especially inflamed over the Suez crisis. The nationalistic people of that area, with encouragement from the Soviet Union, had just declared their sovereignty over the Suez Canal, long held by the British and French.

⁹¹⁴Adlai E. Stevenson, "Our Foreign Policy," Vital Speeches, XXIII, No. 2, (November 1, 1956), p. 36.

⁹¹⁵Ibid.

⁹¹⁶Ibid., p. 37.

Stevenson offered these facts as evidence of an impending disaster to the Free World:

Why hasn't he told us frankly that what has happened in these past few months is that the Communist rulers of Soviet Russia have accomplished a Russian ambition that the Czars could never accomplish? Russian power and influence have moved into the Middle East—the oil tank of Europe and Asia and the great bridge between East and West.⁹¹⁷

Authority. Perhaps the favorite whipping-boy of the Democrats during the late stages of the 1956 campaign was Secretary of State Dulles. He had uttered several unfortunate predictions and was forced to acknowledge his error in several instances. Stevenson early in the speech commented upon Mr. Dulles and his verbal gymnastics.

I'm not going to spend much time on the Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles. . . . But I cannot refrain from commenting on Mr. Dulles' special contribution to our public life—you might almost call it Mr. Dulles' one new idea. I mean his habit of describing every defeat as a victory and every setback as a triumph. He is a master of reverse English.⁹¹⁸

A brief reference was made to General George Marshall. "General George Marshall used to warn his colleagues not 'to fight the problem' but to deal with it. That is good advice for us today."⁹¹⁹ No other prominent individuals were mentioned in the address.

Sign. Stevenson was alarmed at the declining influence of regional defense pacts such as NATO, and offered this explanation of why the member nations were not so enthusiastic now as previously. It was a sign to be heeded if we were to avoid similar pitfalls ahead.

NATO has served and will, in some form, continue to serve an essential need for collective security. But let us recognize clearly that cooperation in defense implies and demands cooperation in

⁹¹⁷Ibid.

⁹¹⁸Ibid., p. 36.

⁹¹⁹Ibid., p. 38.

political and economic affairs as well. And in the neglect of these matters lies the explanation of the declining vigor of the alliance.⁹²⁰

He also believed that United States leadership abroad had not strengthened the Free World alliance. There were many indications of dissatisfaction among our allies, none of disastrous proportions in themselves, but all signs of impending trouble.

The Cyprus dispute has gravely disturbed the relations between three of our valued allies. . . . Iceland is insisting on the withdrawal of our forces from the key base we built there. . . . Communism and neutralism have made great gains in Ceylon and Burma and Indonesia in the past year or so. . . . In India, which may be the key to a free Asia, we will have had four ambassadors in three and a half years.⁹²¹

Assumption. Perhaps the theme of the entire speech was an assumption—the assumption that the Republican administration had failed in the conduct of our foreign policy. "I want to talk with you about the most serious failure of the Republican Administration. I mean its failure in conducting our foreign policy."⁹²² The stand of the Republican administration was that those misfortunes and set-backs the free world had received were unavoidable or the workings of the unpredictable area of world diplomacy. The particular area where Stevenson felt our foreign office had bungled the admittedly touchy situation was in the Near East, with the Suez crisis culminating our failures. The attack by Britain and France upon the Egyptian troops that had moved into the Suez Canal area occurred only a few weeks before the November election, and Stevenson made the following assumption regarding the implications of this move.

The Suez crisis and all the thundering that has preceded it will probably not become an important campaign issue. It is too late and we have hardly begun to realize its implications. It will take some time for the implications to sink in.

⁹²⁰Ibid.

⁹²¹Ibid., p. 36.

⁹²²Ibid.

But I must say that it makes coping with the new problems of an awakening modern world under Soviet influence a lot harder when a set-back like this is painted as a triumph of diplomacy a la Dulles.⁹²³

One quick statement by the Democratic candidate was questioned later in the Republican press. There had been much discussion about the Korean armistice and exactly who should or should not get credit for stopping the shooting. Stevenson attempted to detract from the favorable political publicity President Eisenhower was getting with this statement: "Three and one-half years have passed since Stalin's death which made possible the armistice in Korea that President Eisenhower takes credit for."⁹²⁴

A favorite Stevenson idea was to encourage disarmament, and he urged every consideration be given possible disarmament plans. While admitting the difficulties of enforcement, he assumed without argument that if they would work, we should adopt disarmament plans immediately. "I would propose—in view of the unthinkable implications of modern warfare—that disarmament should be at the heart of American foreign policy."⁹²⁵ This line of reasoning ran counter to the thinking of many Americans.

Logos--artistic proof.

Inductive reasoning--argument from generalization. The basic generalization that American foreign policy had failed during the past three and a half years was the theme of the speech. "For although its failures have been serious here at home, in serving the cause of peace they are far more serious."⁹²⁶ He backed this contention up with nine instances of American diplomatic set-backs, ranging from Korea and Indochina to Cyprus and Iceland. Stevenson proceeded to make a few generalizations,

⁹²³Ibid., p. 37.

⁹²⁵Ibid.

⁹²⁴Ibid.

⁹²⁶Ibid., p. 36.

not all reinforced by adequate illustrations. "I believe, too, that we must breathe new life into the Atlantic community."⁹²⁷ He proposed to partly accomplish this by economic assistance, political co-operation and unified military command. "Next, I propose that we act, and act fast, to meet the challenge of the under-developed countries."⁹²⁸ He suggested doing this by changing our policy from one of being a reluctant philanthropist to that of becoming a welcome partner with the world's unfortunate millions.

Inductive reasoning--argument from causation. The Democrats had long been perturbed by the President's "non-political" press conferences, and Stevenson suggested that the reason for holding them so often was not for the purpose of disseminating information. "A week ago he came before a so-called press conference on television arranged by the advertising agents of the Republican campaign more for adulation than for information."⁹²⁹ Stevenson involved himself in the Republican Party activities with the following reasoning from causation that undoubtedly irritated most Republicans.

Instead of fresh ideas and creative thinking to advance the cause of peace, our approach to world affairs has remained sterile and timid. . . . I believe the President knows this. He must. I think it was this realization that led him, three years ago, to think seriously of forming a new political party. For the central fact is that the leader of the Republican party cannot possibly deal with the problems of today's world. If he did--if the President called now for the action which is needed in the conduct of our foreign affairs--it would split the Republican party right down the middle. . . . For the Republican party has been hopelessly divided over foreign policy ever since the League of Nations battle and the triumph of the isolationists thirty-five years ago.⁹³⁰

⁹²⁷Ibid., p. 38.

⁹²⁹Ibid., p. 37.

⁹²⁸Ibid.

⁹³⁰Ibid.

The Democrats hit hard at the apparent inadequacies of our military machine.

Stevenson had a reason for our weakness.

There is much evidence that we don't have the military establishment we need now. The problem is, I think, less one of money than adjusting our thinking and planning to the revolutionary changes in weapons and in world relationships.⁹³¹

Inductive reasoning--argument from analogy. Only one short analogy was used in the speech. Stevenson was attempting to impress the audience with the futility of trying to guide the destinies of the world without help--a great deal of help--from the other peoples inhabiting this globe. "Though we have great influence--as much as any other power, or more--we can no more, alone, control the forces at work than we can make the seas do our bidding."⁹³²

Deductive reasoning--argument from syllogism and enthymeme. The opening two sentences of the speech illustrate argument from enthymeme. "I want to talk with you about the most serious failure of the Republican Administration. I mean its failure in conducting our foreign policy."⁹³³ Not many examples of deductive reasoning were found in this speech, and none were true syllogistic reasonings. He reasoned deductively in the following group of sentences:

Instead of fresh ideas and creative thinking to advance the cause of peace, our approach to world affairs has remained sterile and timid. . . . I believe the President knows this. . . . I think it was this realization that led him, three years ago, to think seriously of forming a new political party.⁹³⁴

Another example of deductive reasoning was noted when Stevenson urged more information be given to the people, rather than kept hidden under the guise of security information.

⁹³¹Ibid.

⁹³³Ibid., p. 36.

⁹³²Ibid.

⁹³⁴Ibid., p. 37.

Finally, and perhaps most important, I propose that the American Government deal openly, frankly, honestly with the American people. . . . This seems to me the central point, for unless the American people are given the information required to understand the needs of this tempestuous, turbulent period when the swirling waters of three revolutions are converging, they will listen to demagogues who promise quick and easy solutions.⁹³⁵

Ethos.

Sincerity. Although Stevenson relentlessly attacked the administration for what he considered ill-advised actions over the past few years, he admitted the complexities of the problems and did not maintain that he knew all the answers.

Let me say at once that I have no slick formula. No patent medicine to cure our problems. The difficulties which face American policy makers in all parts of the world are deep-rooted and complex. And this will continue to be so regardless of who wins in November.⁹³⁶

One proposal that Stevenson offered earlier in the campaign had met with wide disapproval, but he did not lessen his enthusiasm for the idea. The proposal that aroused so much comment was for the abolishment of testing of large-scale nuclear bombs. Stevenson realized that many Americans felt that our government should continue to develop the weapons that had been a deterrent of war.

I am not dogmatic about this or any other proposal. Honest and open debate may suggest better ways. I think the heart of the issue is a weighing of different risks. The risk of permitting the arms race to continue unchecked seems to me most serious in view of the furies that have been unleashed. The world has had the last great war that civilization can afford. We must, if it is humanly possible, make a fresh start for peace and reason.⁹³⁷

The struggle for peace and security in this hectic world promised to be an unrelenting task that would have many pitfalls. Stevenson sincerely

⁹³⁵Ibid., p. 38.

⁹³⁶Ibid., p. 37.. .

⁹³⁷Ibid., p. 37-38.

believed that honest, intelligent leadership was the prime requisite of American foreign policy--leadership that was not static nor tied to outmoded concepts.

I ask your support not because I offer promises of peace and progress but because I do not. I promise only an unending effort to use our great power wisely in pursuing the goal of peace--in full knowledge that as soon as one problem is brought under control, another is likely to arise.⁹³⁸

In conclusion, the speaker humbly stated his position and what he was attempting to do.

I don't know whether that is the way to win at politics, but it is the only way I know to win. For, if you entrust me with the responsibility of power, I do not want to assume that power under any false pretenses nor do I want you to labor under any misapprehensions.⁹³⁹

Earnestness. The area of foreign relations was where Americans should be most concerned, according to Stevenson. It was also the area of least knowledge to the people, which was not entirely their fault. "We would all be better off with less fiction and more plain speaking about our foreign affairs."⁹⁴⁰ One particular area that Stevenson spoke earnestly about was the Middle East. "I have refrained until now from commenting on the Suez crisis. But I shall refrain no longer."⁹⁴¹ Later, in reference to the same point, he emphasized the urgency of the crisis in these words:

But there is no good news about Suez. Why didn't the President tell us the truth? Why hasn't he told us frankly that what has happened in these past few months is that the Communist rulers of Soviet Russia have accomplished a Russian ambition that the Czars could never accomplish? Russian power and influence have moved into the Middle

⁹³⁸Ibid., p. 38.

⁹³⁹Ibid.

⁹⁴⁰Ibid., p. 36.

⁹⁴¹Ibid., p. 37.

East--the oil tank of Europe and Asia and the great bridge between East and West.⁹⁴²

The Democratic candidate was in earnest when he proposed the adoption of a disarmament plan, despite the vigorous opposition to such a move. "Second, I would propose--in view of the unthinkable implications of modern warfare--that disarmament should be at the heart of American foreign policy."⁹⁴³

Devotion. Stevenson attached himself continually to the Democratic Party, and justified his vigorous criticism on the grounds that it was the duty of the opposition Party to be constructively critical of the administration in power.

The right to criticize--fairly, honestly, responsibly--is deeply rooted in the American political tradition. We cannot deal intelligently with problems unless we first recognize that they exist and ask ourselves what mistakes we made. Honest criticism is still the secret weapon of democracy.⁹⁴⁴

He felt strongly that the United States had been ordained by destiny to lead the free world, and it would be a grievous crime if we were to fail in this leadership.

If we can bring this about, all mankind will be the gainers. And I think that we, the United States, should once more assert the moral initiative, which many wait and pray for, to break out of the deadly deadlock which has blocked all progress toward arresting the arms race that imperils us all.⁹⁴⁵

Stevenson was concerned about the tendency to hide the true facts from the populace, under the subterfuge of security. He maintained that democratic government had an obligation to its citizens which included the dissemination of truth.

⁹⁴²Ibid.

⁹⁴⁴Ibid.

⁹⁴³Ibid.

⁹⁴⁵Ibid.

Some things must be kept private, but a democratic government must never forget that it is no wiser and no stronger than the people whose servant it is. The sources of information are the springs from which democracy drinks. These waters alone can nourish and sustain us in a free way of life.⁹⁴⁶

Finally, Stevenson explained why he was engaged in politics, and what purpose motivated him in the grueling business of campaigning.

Peace is our goal. I am in politics as a result of a personal decision to do what I could to help in building a peaceful world. That decision carried with it an obligation to talk sense, to tell the truth as I see it, to discuss the realities of our situation, never to minimize the tasks that lie ahead.⁹⁴⁷

Patience. Perhaps the most discouraging aspect of foreign relations concerned the time element. Rarely was it possible to see the benefits of our efforts until years later, and under these circumstances discouragement came easy. Patience was always needed by our diplomats and because of the uncertainty of developments, even patience did not always prove a soothing medicine. "We live at a watershed of history--and no man knows in what direction the elemental forces that are loose in the world will turn."⁹⁴⁸ The economic situation of the world's nations was in need of review, and many proposals had been advanced for quick improvements in trade, commerce, banking, etc. But Stevenson cautioned against acceptance of these quick-solution ideas.

Again, I propose a fresh approach to the problems of world economics. This new approach must take account of the almost universal desire for economic development and must rest solidly on the principle of mutual advantage. I am more interested in practical measures than in global plans for solving all the world's problems by some master stroke.⁹⁴⁹

⁹⁴⁶Ibid., p. 38.

⁹⁴⁸Ibid., p. 36.

⁹⁴⁷Ibid.

⁹⁴⁹Ibid., p. 38.

In his concluding statements, Stevenson appealed for patience in the work ahead, knowing that no quick and easy solutions were available.

I ask your support not because I offer promises of peace and progress but because I do not. . . . I ask your support not because I say that all is well, but because I say that we must work hard, with tireless dedication, to make the small gains out of which, we may hope, large gains will ultimately be fashioned.⁹⁵⁰

Friendliness. The speaker expressed friendship for citizens of the under-developed nations, promising assistance in their efforts for a better livelihood.

We must do better than we have been doing. And the way to begin is to understand the hopes and fears of these peoples and to work out with them new relationships based on cooperation and trust and mutual respect. I might add that, in my judgment, the spirit of these new relationships is more important than an expansion of economic aid.⁹⁵¹

Sympathy. A sympathetic feeling was expressed towards peoples who have been struggling to gain independence for themselves. "And there is a third area or grouping—of peoples who have recently won or who are struggling to win independence, to gain control of their own futures, to escape from poverty, to win a place for themselves in the sun."⁹⁵²

Pathos.

Anger. In his opening paragraph the speaker accused the administration of intentionally keeping many facts from the people for the sake of political expediency. He spoke in angry tones when he said:

For although its failures have been serious here at home, in serving the cause of peace they are far more serious. And they should not be kept out of sight—where the Administration would like to keep them. It will be a sad day for America when we no longer talk about the issue that means more to us than any other.⁹⁵³

⁹⁵⁰Ibid.

⁹⁵²Ibid., pp. 36-37.

⁹⁵¹Ibid.

⁹⁵³Ibid., p. 36.

Stevenson was also angry at President Eisenhower for the statements he made the week previously about the Suez situation. He believed that the President was speaking confidently when he knew that disaster was impending.

But there is no good news about Suez. Why didn't the President tell us the truth? Why hasn't he told us frankly that what has happened in these past few months is that the Communist rulers of Soviet Russia have accomplished a Russian ambition that the Czars could never accomplish?⁹⁵⁴

Fear. The growing power of the totalitarian states was a fearful fact for the free world to contemplate. "At the same time the Communist sphere has been growing, adding to its vast empire here and there, as it welded Communist ideology to modern technology to forge a powerful weapon for expansion."⁹⁵⁵ The unfortunate truth, according to Stevenson, was that the free world was not correspondingly increasing its strength. "The end of this conflict cannot be foreseen, nor the victor. History knows no sure things. But we do know that we have not been doing well these past few years."⁹⁵⁶ The advent of nuclear weapons as a force of destruction had altered the concepts of war. Another war might be the last conflict between humans, for very obvious reasons. "The world has had the last great war that civilization can afford. We must, if it is humanly possible, make a fresh start for peace and reason."⁹⁵⁷ Stevenson did not exude the confidence that marked his previous speeches, but rather the dominating mood was one of fear—fear for what might happen if we did not change our foreign policy.

⁹⁵⁴Ibid., p. 37.

⁹⁵⁶Ibid., p. 37.

⁹⁵⁵Ibid., p. 36.

⁹⁵⁷Ibid., p. 38.

We must take the world as we find it and try to work in the direction of peace. We did not want a contest with world communism, but the contest is upon us. We cannot escape it, and unless we wage it with greater wisdom, greater skill, greater tenacity of purpose than our opponent, we will fall, as other great powers have fallen in other great contests.⁹⁵⁸

Confidence. Although he condemned the direction of our policy towards regional pacts such as NATO, Stevenson nevertheless expressed confidence that these pacts would continue to serve a useful purpose. "NATO has served and will, in some form, continue to serve an essential need for collective security."⁹⁵⁹ He also felt that vast areas for improvement existed in the realm of economic policies. "I am impressed, for example, by the possibilities of a world food bank as a means of aiding economic development and of putting our agricultural surpluses to work."⁹⁶⁰ The speech taken in its entirety did not express the usual feeling of confidence in our nation's future, but had a tone of diffidence throughout.

Shame. One of the saddest occurrences of the past year had been the communist infiltration into Northern Indochina, accomplished despite loud and numerous threats from the United States. Stevenson looked upon this event as a shameful page in our foreign relations. "The richest half of Indochina has become a new Communist satellite, and after loud words and gestures America emerged from that debacle looking like a 'paper tiger.'"⁹⁶¹ Exceeding the Indochina fiasco in its implications was the Suez Canal crisis, steadily growing worse from the standpoint of the Western world. In reference to our diplomatic maneuvers in the Middle East, Stevenson had this to say: "I cannot remember any other series of diplomatic

⁹⁵⁸Ibid.

⁹⁶⁰Ibid.

⁹⁵⁹Ibid.

⁹⁶¹Ibid., p. 36.

strokes so erratic, naive and clumsy as the events of the past few years through which Russia gained welcome to the Near and Middle East."⁹⁶²

Indignation. Stevenson was indignant with President Eisenhower for making soothing statements to the voters about our position in the battle for survival. "And the Republican candidate says that 'all is well', that communism is 'on the run', that 'American prestige has never been higher', that peace is secure."⁹⁶³ The Democratic standard-bearer did not believe this was the case. He was equally indignant about the tendency of the administration to keep important facts from being publicized.

I do not mean to criticize the compromises that have been made. But I severely criticize this effort to mislead the people, to describe an armed truce as peace, to gloss over serious difficulties, to obscure the grim realities, to encourage the people not to know the truth.⁹⁶⁴

The so-called press conferences that the President held frequently came in for scornful treatment from Stevenson. "A week ago he came before that so-called press conference on television arranged by the advertising agents of the Republican campaign more for adulation than for information."⁹⁶⁵ The Democrats had jumped on the statement by President Eisenhower, made a week earlier, that he had "good news from Suez." This was shortly before the Egyptian government nationalized the canal and imposed heavy fees upon ships wishing passage through the waterway. Stevenson jibed at his Republican opponent for the contradictory statement.

But I must say that it makes coping with the new problems of an awakening modern world under Soviet influence a lot harder when a

⁹⁶²Ibid., p. 37.

⁹⁶⁴Ibid.

⁹⁶³Ibid., p. 36.

⁹⁶⁵Ibid., p. 37.

setback like this is painted as a triumph of diplomacy a la
Dulles.⁹⁶⁶

Contempt. The favorite whipping boy of the Democrats was Mr. Dulles, and Stevenson showed contempt for the Secretary of State.

I'm not going to spend much time on the Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles. Under our Constitution, the President conducts America's relations with the rest of the world, and he is responsible for them, and for his Secretary of State.⁹⁶⁷

ARRANGEMENT

The introduction was very short, consisting of only three paragraphs introducing the topic for discussion, foreign relations. The essence of the introduction was a condemnation of administration policy in foreign affairs. The body of the speech was a review of the areas where communism and nationalism have affected our foreign relations. Stevenson first gave the evidence of the setbacks we had suffered and then offered suggestions for how these disasters could have been avoided. He particularly reviewed the Middle East and the Suez developments and traced the lessening influence of the free world in that vital area. He reviewed several ideas he had put forth during the campaign, the abolishment of selective service and of nuclear-bomb testing, etc., and defended his reasoning in each case. The conclusion was also very short, being a quick review of the speech and a reiteration of the reasons for needing an immediate change in our foreign policy.

STYLE

Level.

The style was quite consistently middle, with some variation to both low and high style. The earnestness and emphasis of the appeal

⁹⁶⁶Ibid.

⁹⁶⁷Ibid., p. 36.

for a new direction in our diplomacy kept the style from being ornate or flowery, yet the dignity of the presentation demanded at least a middle style approach. The conclusion, in contrast to other speech conclusions, was mostly low style, or lower than the rest of the speech.

Diction and word choice.

The word choice was typical of Stevenson campaign talks—extensive use of adjectives and adverbs, words selected for their imagery in many instances, and words that were, for the most part, above the level of high-school graduates but not too erudite at any time. From the context of any paragraph it was possible for almost any listener to easily understand the reasoning at all times.

Sentence structure.

Most of the sentences in this speech were simple, in contrast, then, to the findings in previous speeches. Stevenson hammered away at the theme of negligence and stupidity in the handling of our foreign affairs, and he emphasized his points repeatedly with short, potent sentences. Many complex sentences were also noted, especially in presenting the evidence of world events.

Rhetorical devices and figurative language.

Analogy. The only analogy found in the speech was a short comparison employed to illustrate the uselessness of trying to control the forces of history without assistance from the other inhabitants of the world. "Though we have great influence—as much as any other power, or more—we can no more, alone, control the force at work than we can make the seas do our bidding."⁹⁶⁸

⁹⁶⁸Ibid., p. 37.

Epigram. Several short, quotable phrases were used by Stevenson that were bandied about in the newspapers later. In speaking about the uncertainties of diplomacy, he said, "History knows no sure things."⁹⁶⁹ A phrase that was in the papers every day during the Suez crisis was used in the speech. ". . .for the canal is a lifeline of the world."⁹⁷⁰ He justified his critical comments about the administration with this short sentence: "Honest criticism is still the secret weapon of democracy."⁹⁷¹ The famous epigram from Einstein was used. "The world has had the last great war that civilization can afford."⁹⁷²

Humor. The speech was consistently dignified and lacking in any form of humor, except for once early in the speech when Stevenson evoked some laughter with his comments about the Secretary of State.

But I cannot refrain from commenting on Mr. Dulles' special contribution to our public life--you might almost call it Mr. Dulles' one new idea. I mean his habit of describing every defeat as a victory and every setback as a triumph. He is a master of reverse English.⁹⁷³

Interrogation. After accusing the administration of hiding the true facts from the public, the Democratic candidate asked, "What are the realities?"⁹⁷⁴ He wondered about the strange series of events surrounding the Suez debacle, asking these questions:

Why didn't the President tell us the truth? Why hasn't he told us frankly that what has happened in these past few months is that the Communist rulers of Soviet Russia have accomplished a Russian ambition that the Czars could never accomplish?⁹⁷⁵

⁹⁶⁹Ibid.

⁹⁷¹Ibid.

⁹⁷³Ibid., p. 36.

⁹⁷⁵Ibid., p. 37.

⁹⁷⁰Ibid.

⁹⁷²Ibid., p. 38.

⁹⁷⁴Ibid.

After vigorously criticizing the conduct of our foreign affairs by the Republican administration, Stevenson asked himself how a Democratic administration could do differently. "What will a Democratic Administration do to meet the challenge of our times? How will a Democratic foreign policy differ from the Republican?"⁹⁷⁶

Irony and satire. Stevenson spoke with sarcasm about the "agonizing reappraisal" theory that Dulles had advanced when he justified America's alteration of course in foreign affairs several years earlier.

In Western Europe, when the idea of a European defense community collapsed, we heard no more about Mr. Dulles' threatened 'agonizing reappraisal', and meanwhile the declining influence of NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization) has stirred widespread concern.⁹⁷⁷

He thought it very ironic that political campaigners should proclaim our diplomacy abroad as successful at the very moment our influence was receiving a severe jolt in the important Middle East.

When the historians write of our era they may, I fear, find grim irony in the fact that when Russian power and influence were for the first time firmly established in the Near and Middle East, our Government was loudly, proudly proclaiming our victorious conduct of the 'cold war' and the President reported good news from Suez.⁹⁷⁸

He repeatedly emphasized the Middle Eastern area and the unfortunate turn of events that had precipitated the Suez Canal dispute, heaping sarcasm on the much-abused Dulles once more. "But I must say that it makes coping with the new problems of an awakening modern world under Soviet influence a lot harder when a setback like this is painted as a triumph a la Dulles."⁹⁷⁹ Stevenson felt that it was very ironic for President Eisenhower to be shackled in his desires to initiate reforms in diplomacy by members of

⁹⁷⁶Ibid.

⁹⁷⁸Ibid., p. 37.

⁹⁷⁷Ibid., p. 36.

⁹⁷⁹Ibid.

his own Party. "If he did--if the President called now for the action which is needed in the conduct of our foreign affairs--it would split the Republican party right down the middle--with the election only three weeks away."⁹⁸⁰

Contrast. Stevenson contrasted the leadership of the past three years with what he thought proper leadership should be. "We need to be called to labor, not lulled with rosy and misleading assurances that all is well."⁹⁸¹ He contrasted the old-fashioned methods of diplomacy with the modern challenges of the new world, accusing his opponents of stubborn attachment to outmoded ideas.

Instead of fresh ideas and creative thinking to advance the cause of peace, our approach to world affairs has remained sterile and timid. It has remained tied to old methods, old thinking, and old slogans. We are trying to meet new conditions and challenges with old methods and means. It won't work. It never does.⁹⁸²

He attempted to contrast his appeal to the voters with that of his opponent's.

I ask your support not because I say that all is well, but because I say that we must work hard, with tireless dedication, to make the small gains out of which, we may hope, large gains will ultimately be fashioned.⁹⁸³

Climax. The climax was found in the conclusion of the speech, comprising three of the four final paragraphs.

Peace is our goal. I am in politics as a result of a personal decision to do what I could to help in building a peaceful world. That decision carried with it an obligation--the obligation to talk sense, to tell the truth as I see it, to discuss the realities of our situation, never to minimize the tasks that lie ahead.

I don't know whether that is the way to win at politics, but it is the only way I know to win. For, if you entrust me with the responsibility of power, I do not want to assume that power under any false pretenses nor do I want you to labor under any misapprehensions.

⁹⁸⁰Ibid.

⁹⁸²Ibid.

⁹⁸¹Ibid.

⁹⁸³Ibid.

To achieve such understanding seems to me to be the true function of politics.⁹⁸⁴

Onomatopoeia. Several sentences, or portions of them, might be considered examples of this rhetorical device. ". . .press conference on television arranged by the advertising agents of the Republican campaign more for adulation than for information."⁹⁸⁵; ". . .in view of the unthinkable implications of modern warfare."⁹⁸⁶; ". . .to break out of the deadly deadlock which has blocked all progress toward arresting the arms race that imperils us all."⁹⁸⁷

Allusion and reference. The favorite human target of Stevenson's in this speech was Mr. Dulles, who was alluded to directly seven times, and indirectly many times more. Stevenson referred to the crucial debate at the conclusion of World War I that ruined the League of Nations membership for the United States. "For the Republican party has been hopelessly divided over foreign policy ever since the League of Nations battle and the triumph of the isolationists thirty-five years ago."⁹⁸⁸ A brief reference to General Marshall appeared in the conclusion. "General George Marshall used to warn his colleagues not 'to fight the problem' but to deal with it. That is good advice for us today."⁹⁸⁹ Three direct references were made to President Eisenhower, and countless indirect references. No other individuals were mentioned.

Metaphor. Two metaphors were found in the speech. The first concerned the Middle East. "Russian power and influence have moved into the

⁹⁸⁴Ibid.

⁹⁸⁶Ibid.

⁹⁸⁸Ibid.

⁹⁸⁵Ibid., p. 37.

⁹⁸⁷Ibid.

⁹⁸⁹Ibid.

Middle East—the oil tank of Europe and Asia and the great bridge between East and West."⁹⁹⁰ The second metaphor was the following bit of imagery: "The sources of information are the springs from which democracy drinks."⁹⁹¹

Simile. The term "paper tiger" when applied to the United States was an example of simile. "The richest half of Indochina has become a new Communist satellite, and after loud words and gestures America emerged from that debacle looking like a 'paper tiger'."⁹⁹²

Personification. An example of this device was found in the following sentence: "At the same time the Communist sphere has been growing, adding to its vast empire here and there, as it welded Communist ideology to modern technology to forge a powerful weapon for expansion."⁹⁹³ Stevenson was speaking about the government when he said, "I think that in the name of security we, the Republican Administration, have been sweeping far too many things under the rug."⁹⁹⁴ Personification was found in this instance also: "The sources of information are the springs from which democracy drinks. These waters alone can nourish and sustain us in a free way of life."⁹⁹⁵

Alliteration. The following examples of alliteration were found in the speech: ". . .a list of successes he likes to recite."⁹⁹⁶; "There goes with criticism of this sort a clear responsibility to state a constructive alternative."⁹⁹⁷; "Selective Service system."⁹⁹⁸; ". . .the future of freedom"⁹⁹⁹; "promises of peace"¹⁰⁰⁰; "unending effort"¹⁰⁰¹

⁹⁹⁰Ibid., p. 37.

⁹⁹²Ibid., p. 36.

⁹⁹⁴Ibid., p. 38.

⁹⁹⁶Ibid., p. 36.

⁹⁹⁸Ibid.

¹⁰⁰⁰Ibid.

⁹⁹¹Ibid., p. 38.

⁹⁹³Ibid.

⁹⁹⁵Ibid.

⁹⁹⁷Ibid., p. 37.

⁹⁹⁹Ibid., p. 38.

¹⁰⁰¹Ibid.

XI. CONTROL OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS

INVENTION

Logos--non-artistic proof.

Evidence. Stevenson introduced as evidence some of the areas where the turn of events had proven unfortunate to American interests.

When our erratic foreign policy has brought us repeatedly to the brink of war? When the Middle East is smoldering? When the earth is a trail of gunpowder from Korea to Suez to Cyprus? When all humanity lives in the grim shadow of the hydrogen bomb?¹⁰⁰²

He elaborated further on the same theme by referring to other setbacks that the free world had received recently.

It is not good news that Korea is still divided by an uneasy armistice; that the richest half of Indochina has become a new Communist satellite; that communism and neutralism have made important gains in Ceylon, in Burma, in Afghanistan and Indonesia; that the Soviets have even challenged us to economic and political competition everywhere on earth; that the coalition of free nations has never been in worse shape.¹⁰⁰³

Stevenson inspired confidence in his audience by reference to the Congressional election victories of the Democratic Party in 1954 and 1955.

"We won in 1954 from Maine to Oregon. We won again in 1955."¹⁰⁰⁴

Authority. The Presidential candidate referred to the leaders of the Party who attended the rally, and sought to attach his fortunes to their popularity. Eleanor Roosevelt, Bob Wagner, Herbert Lehman and Averell Harriman were respected names in New York politics, and all were in the audience. Reference was made to the utterances of Pope Pius, who

¹⁰⁰²Adlai E. Stevenson, "Control of Nuclear Weapons," New York Times, CVI, No. 36,068, October 24, 1956., p. 26.

¹⁰⁰³Ibid.

¹⁰⁰⁴Ibid.

had spoken strongly in support of pacifying the nuclear bombs.

In his Christmas message last year His Holiness Pope Pius vividly described the consequences of hydrogen war.

Let me quote some of his words: 'Entire cities, even the largest and richest in art and history wiped out; a pall of death over the pulverized ruins covering countless victims with limbs burned, twisted, scattered while others groan in death agony. There will be no song of victory, only the weeping of humanity which in desolation will gaze upon the catastrophe brought on by its own folly.'

These are the solemn words of the Pope.¹⁰⁰⁵

Sign. Stevenson pointed to signs that indicated our nation still had far to go in its effort to give all citizens a decent chance. He questioned the Republican claims that we had advanced rapidly in the past four years.

When the richest country in the world doesn't have schools and teachers enough for its children? When it doesn't have hospitals for its sick? When there is widespread need among our older citizens? When ugly slums deface our cities and offend human dignity? When millions of Americans are still denied opportunities because of race or color?¹⁰⁰⁶

Portentous signs were emanating from the Middle East, indications of trouble ahead for the Western world.

And it is not good news that never in history has Russia had such influence in the Middle East.

It is not good news that the Western oil interests, so vital to Western Europe, are threatened by the rising fires of Arab nationalism.¹⁰⁰⁷

Assumption. The assumption that all loyal Democrats possessed was that their ticket would win in November. Unless the Party faithful operated from that foundation, the campaign would be fruitless.

I remember so well your reception here four years ago. And now you have done it again. But this time there's a difference. This time we will win.

We won in 1954 from Maine to Oregon. We won again in 1955. And now we are going to win the world series in 1956.¹⁰⁰⁸

¹⁰⁰⁵Ibid.

¹⁰⁰⁶Ibid.

¹⁰⁰⁷Ibid.

¹⁰⁰⁸Ibid.

A significant duty of the Democrat candidate was to solidify a feeling of confidence in the coming election. A fundamental reason for confidence, Stevenson maintained, stemmed from the growing realization on the part of the voters that the Republicans were copying the Democratic platform of previous years. He projected this "plagiarism" into an assumption that only a good Democrat would whole-heartedly accept. "We must push ahead, serene in the knowledge that the Democratic program of 1956 will be the Republican declaration of principles of 1976."¹⁰⁰⁹ One of the touchiest issues of the campaign, one never mentioned directly, was the President's health. But behind much of the Democratic reasoning lay the conviction that Eisenhower would never live through another four years in the White House. Many private citizens were convinced of the same thing, so the Democrats attempted to take advantage of this situation by besmirching the reputation of Vice-Presidential candidate Richard Nixon in every way possible. Stevenson, although never mentioning the President's health, implied that he would not be able to execute the office of President for another full term by several statements such as this: "And I don't think that this nation wants the great decisions about the H-bomb entrusted to Richard M. Nixon."¹⁰¹⁰ The sincere belief that Mr. Eisenhower could not physically endure another term in the exacting office of President of the United States was one of the wide-spread silent assumptions of the campaign. Stevenson attacked Secretary of State Dulles with a vengeance, assuming that if the Republican slate were elected, he would continue in his job for another four years. "Do we want four more years of

¹⁰⁰⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰¹⁰ Ibid.

John Foster Dulles?"¹⁰¹¹

Logos--artistic proof.

Inductive reasoning--argument from generalization. Stevenson stated simply, "There is no good news about the Middle East."¹⁰¹² He verified this generalization with seven paragraphs composed of setbacks the West had suffered during the past two years. No other arguments from generalization were found in the speech.

Inductive reasoning--argument from causation. The Democratic standard-bearer tried to convince his audience that victory would be their's in November. He gave these reasons for thinking the voters would reject the Republican Administration.

And now we are going to win the world series in 1956.

Now I'll tell you why. The Republican team has made too many mistakes. First, they kept Secretary Dulles in the box one brink too long, and they also, I think, turned their farm system over to Ezra Taft Benson.¹⁰¹³

One of the most controversial issues of the campaign had centered around the Stevenson proposal to halt testing of nuclear weapons. He realized that many voters disagreed violently with his stand, so in the light of this fact he attempted to justify his reasoning.

These are the solemn words of the Pope. His views are shared by many. They are backed by the cold proof of scientists. It is for these reasons that I proposed long before this campaign that we take the lead in curbing this ghastly killer.¹⁰¹⁴

Stevenson praised the four prominent Party members who were present and lending their support to his campaign. He classified them collectively as idealists, and gave this reason for their success: "They have been

¹⁰¹¹Ibid.

¹⁰¹²Ibid.

¹⁰¹³Ibid.

¹⁰¹⁴Ibid.

denounced, each one of them, as idealists and as dreamers, but by their fidelity to these ideals, they have lived to see their dreams come true."¹⁰¹⁵

Inductive reasoning--argument from analogy. No example of argument from analogy was discovered in the speech.

Deductive reasoning--argument from syllogism and enthymeme. This type of reasoning was employed by Stevenson in reference to Vice-President Nixon and the possibility that he might become President.

. . .if the Republicans were to win this fall, who would be running the store for the next four years?

The key man of the Republican future is President Eisenhower's hand-picked heir, Vice-President Nixon.¹⁰¹⁶

We draw from these statements the conclusion that Richard Nixon will be "running the store" before the term is over.

Ethos.

Sincerity. Stevenson was sincerely impressed with the reception Democratic leaders had arranged for him that evening in Madison Square Garden.

Governor Harriman, my friends, no man would be unmoved by this great reception you have given me here tonight in the Garden. I remember so well your reception here four years ago. And now you have done it again.¹⁰¹⁷

The Democratic candidate continued to lampoon the administration for their mismanagment of the Middle East crisis. But the dire consequences of our failings in that area were not humerous, and he expressed sincere concern over the matter.

I wish, I wish, my friends, and I wish it very much, that there were more good news to report, that there were better news elsewhere. I have kept my peace in spite of our blundering vacillation in the Middle East. . .¹⁰¹⁸

¹⁰¹⁵Ibid.

¹⁰¹⁷Ibid.

¹⁰¹⁶Ibid.

¹⁰¹⁸Ibid.

Many politicians accused Stevenson of introducing the H-bomb issue for political expediency, a charge that angered him greatly. He sincerely felt that the United States should take the lead in outlawing the use of nuclear weapons for warfare.

Now let me say to you that this hydrogen bomb discussion is not a political controversy. This is a matter of national security and of moral responsibility to our citizens and to our fellow inhabitants of the whole globe.¹⁰¹⁹

Speaking about the same topic, he concluded his plea with these words:

"I think that we must make this effort—I think that we must make it in the name of humanity."¹⁰²⁰

Earnestness. The Democratic campaign machine believed that the opposition had been successful in keeping the basic issues from being widely discussed. But the election was two weeks away and in that time they hoped to make the voters aware of certain points. Stevenson stressed this desire several times in the speech, once in these words: "The decisive days of this great campaign lie just ahead."¹⁰²¹ A touchy topic with Stevenson and his fellow Democratic campaigners was the health of the President. They did not criticize President Eisenhower directly, but did find fault with the prevalent idea that a man of his health and position should not be severely condemned.

I say to you that in a free democracy there is no place for the notion that the President can do no wrong. And we reject too the notion that this President is somehow not responsible for the deeds of his Government.¹⁰²²

Stevenson was very emphatic in his denunciation of the type of campaign the Republicans were waging. He repeatedly accused them of conducting a

¹⁰¹⁹Ibid.

¹⁰²¹Ibid.

¹⁰²⁰Ibid.

¹⁰²²Ibid.

"press-agent's" type of campaign, and earnestly entreated the voters not to be misled by this type of approach. "We Americans want--we Americans are determined to have--not the press agent's peace the Administration seems content to offer us, but a genuine peace, founded on freedom and on justice."¹⁰²³ After his review of the H-bomb issue and his plea for banishment of further testing of this destructive weapon, he offered this earnest comment upon the topic. "My friends, this is not a partisan issue. It goes far beyond the fate of Democrats or Republicans in this campaign. It goes to the very survival of mankind."¹⁰²⁴

Devotion. Stevenson called on all the Democratic Party faithful to remember the proud record of their Party and take courage in that record for the job that remained ahead.

It has been the historic faith of the Democratic party that the people can be trusted with the great decisions. It has been the historical role of the Democratic party to meet the new challenges of each generation. It is the passion of the Democratic party to make the Twentieth century safe for the people--the people in America and people throughout the world.¹⁰²⁵

Patience. The speaker evidenced impatience with the administration, and asked his audience, "And I would ask you how much longer can we afford the bungling which precipitated the Suez crisis?"¹⁰²⁶ He was most impatient with the Secretary of State. "Do we want four more years of John Foster Dulles?"¹⁰²⁷ The frustrating implications of disarmament discussions led many people to the brink of giving up any hope for the goal of world disarmament. But Stevenson cautioned that great achievements

¹⁰²³Ibid.

¹⁰²⁵Ibid.

¹⁰²⁷Ibid.

¹⁰²⁴Ibid.

¹⁰²⁶Ibid.

are not accomplished over-night. "I reject the idea of throwing up our hands and refusing to try. This is one time that we can't take no for an answer."¹⁰²⁸

Friendliness. Stevenson expressed fealty towards the distinguished Party members who had honored him by their presence at Madison Square Garden that night.

But I am honored by the presence here tonight of men and women whose lives personify the noblest traditions of the Democratic party; Eleanor Roosevelt, Herbert Lehman, Averell Harriman, Bob Wagner and so many others that my limited time will not permit me to enumerate.¹⁰²⁹

Sympathy. The speaker was sympathetic towards the Negro population in their fight to gain equal rights.

Men and women of both races have worked hard, have risked much, have dared much, so that America might offer the world a model of democracy in action. But they have looked to the White House in vain for moral leadership and encouragement in support of this great re-adjustment.¹⁰³⁰

The subjugated peoples of Poland had recently revolted against the brutalities of their Soviet masters. This demonstration of freedom-loving men and women aroused the sympathy of thinking folks around the globe. "We have all been stirred these days by the struggle in Poland against Soviet domination. I say to you that independence from foreign Communist control is at least a step toward independence from domestic Communist control, so that we must help. . ."¹⁰³¹ Another nation that was attracting much attention was Israel, surrounded by Arab nations where Islam nationalism was forging them into dangerous neighbors. Much of the voting

¹⁰²⁸Ibid.

¹⁰²⁹Ibid.

¹⁰³⁰Ibid.

¹⁰³¹Ibid.

population of New York City was Jewish, so Stevenson took this opportunity to express sympathy for the aims of the Israel nation.

Israel is not a cause to be cynically remembered by the Administration in late October of an election year. It is the symbol, rather, of man's triumph over one of the darkest sorrows in human history—the attempt of Adolf Hitler to destroy a whole people.¹⁰³²

In conclusion, Stevenson expressed his sympathy for the unfortunate millions that are hungry for food, for self-respect and for equality. "Most of the world is poor and hungry. Everywhere demagogues prey upon the longings of the dispossessed and the fears of the disinherited."¹⁰³³

Pathos.

Anger. Stevenson allowed his emotions free rein when he discussed the immunity from criticism that President Eisenhower seemed to enjoy. He was obviously angry that his opponent should be above critical analysis, a notion that he blamed the nation's press and radio for instilling in the public's mind.

I say to you that in a free democracy there is no place for the notion that the President can do no wrong. And we reject too the notion that this President is somehow not responsible for the deeds of his Government.¹⁰³⁴

The other instance of anger was noted when Stevenson wondered why the Republican orators continued to tell the people that all was well in the world when they could not verify these pleasing platitudes with much proof.

Yet the Republican candidate says that all is well, that the American prestige has never been higher, that aggression has been stopped and peace restored around the world.

Why don't they at least tell us the truth about the world in which we live?¹⁰³⁵

¹⁰³²Ibid.

¹⁰³⁴Ibid.

¹⁰³³Ibid.

¹⁰³⁵Ibid.

Fear. The speaker attempted continually to paint a dismal picture of the world we live in, eliciting fear for the future at many points in the address. He maintained that a nation uninformed needed to be afraid of what it did not know.

But we know we cannot win that peace when our Government will not face the facts itself or tell us the facts, tell the people the truth, when it deludes itself and us by a fatuous optimism, when it presents defeats as victories and finds in each new Soviet advance fresh evidence of Soviet weakness, when it systematically declines challenges and refuses opportunities.¹⁰³⁶

The frightful prospect of Soviet domination in the Middle East was enough to strike fear into the heart of any thinking Westerner. "It is not good news, in fact it is very, very bad news that the Soviets have in a few months penetrated the Middle East as the Czars couldn't do in 300 years of persistent effort."¹⁰³⁷ The nationalistic fires of Arab patriots were being fueled from Moscow, while America and her allies watched. Not only in the Middle East were diplomatic setbacks to be noted. Fearful reports were coming from around the globe.

I could go on. It is not good news that Korea is still divided by an uneasy armistice; that the richest half of Indochina has become a new Communist satellite; that communism and neutralism have made important gains in Ceylon, in Burma, in Afghanistan and Indonesia; that the Soviets have even challenged us to economic and political competition everywhere on earth; that the coalition of free nations has never been in worse shape.¹⁰³⁸

He chided the administration with this fearful prediction: "We know we cannot win the great struggle of our century under a leadership whose only hope, so far as I can see, is that communism may at last be exhausted by success."¹⁰³⁹ He offered another chilling thought when he wondered if

¹⁰³⁶Ibid.

¹⁰³⁸Ibid.

¹⁰³⁷Ibid.

¹⁰³⁹Ibid.

the next generation would be around to enjoy this generations's efforts.

In many ways this election will determine the kind of tomorrow that we and our children may enjoy. But the transcending question before humanity is whether there will be a tomorrow at all.¹⁰⁴⁰

The words of Pope Pius presented an awesome sight to those who could imagine the scene he illustrated.

Entire cities, even the largest and richest in art and history wiped out; a pall of death over the pulverized ruins covering countless victims with limbs burned, twisted, scattered while others groan in death agony. There will be no song of victory, only the weeping of humanity which in desolation will gaze upon the catastrophe brought on by its own folly.¹⁰⁴¹

Confidence. The Democratic Party will sweep to victory in November! This was the theme of every Stevenson address during the last month of the campaign. "I remember so well your reception here four years ago. And now you have done it again. But this time there's a difference. This time we will win. . . . And now we are going to win the world series in 1956."¹⁰⁴² Speaking to a large segment of the Jewish vote in the metropolitan New York City area, Stevenson expressed his confidence in the future of Israel.

And I say that the first premise of any Middle Eastern policy is that Israel is here to stay; that she must have the arms; the economic support and the diplomatic guarantees necessary to assure her independence and integrity.¹⁰⁴³

Despite the troubles our nation had been experiencing throughout the world, Stevenson left no doubt about his confidence in our ability, with proper leadership, to be the principle bastion of peace and freedom.

¹⁰⁴⁰ Ibid.

¹⁰⁴² Ibid.

¹⁰⁴¹ Ibid.

¹⁰⁴³ Ibid.

I think that we must make this effort—I think that we must make it in the name of humanity. America's military strength is the single greatest deterrent to war and the first bastion of freedom. It must not be weak. But America's moral, intellectual, productive strength can be more than a deterrent. It can lead the way to peace.¹⁰⁴⁴

The reason for our faith in the future could be seen in our record from the past. People in other lands expect the nation of the Declaration of Independence to lead the freedom-loving peoples of the world in their battle for self-respect. We can do nothing but live up to this expectation, said Stevenson.

The America which excites the world's admiration is not timid, fearful and confused. It is the America of the Declaration of Independence; it is the America of the Emancipation Proclamation; it is the America of the Marshall Plan and Point 4—it is America, the champion of freedom, it is America the bold and magnanimous.¹⁰⁴⁵

Shame. Stevenson felt it was a great shame that our national income and standard of living were so high and ever-increasing, yet millions of our citizens were not adequately cared for.

Progress? When the richest country in the world doesn't have schools and teachers enough for its children? When it doesn't have hospitals for its sick? When there is widespread need among our older citizens? When ugly slums deface our cities and offend human dignity? When millions of Americans are still denied opportunities because of race or color?¹⁰⁴⁶

Indignation. He was indignant when he heard that Eisenhower was claiming credit for benefits that Stevenson believed were fundamental doctrines of Democratic platforms for many years.

But how things have changed! Now President Eisenhower even implies that all of these things were invented by the Republicans.

So we must disregard these alarms. We must push ahead, serene in the knowledge that the Democratic program of 1956 will be the Republican declaration of principles of 1976.¹⁰⁴⁷

¹⁰⁴⁴ Ibid.

¹⁰⁴⁶ Ibid.

¹⁰⁴⁵ Ibid.

¹⁰⁴⁷ Ibid.

He was similarly indignant at the type of campaign waged by his opponents. He felt the American voters were not hearing the true issues, but were getting a masterful camouflage job from the Republicans, under the guise of slogans like peace, progress, and prosperity.

And we have done so in the face of an unprecedented effort to suppress and bury the urgent issues of our day under an avalanche of slogans and of propaganda.

We are told that everything is fine--that we are enjoying unprecedented peace and prosperity and progress.¹⁰⁴⁸

Emulation. Stevenson promised to emulate the public careers of the Democratic leaders of New York State. He implied that their service to public life was a model to be copied by future politicians.

But I am honored by the presence here tonight of men and women whose lives personify the noblest traditions of the Democratic party; Eleanor Roosevelt, Herbert Lehman, Averell Harriman, Bob Wagner and so many others that my limited time will not permit me to enumerate.

These are people to whom politics has meant the fight to win a better break in life for the poor and for the helpless, for the harassed immigrant and the child of misfortune, for the victims of greed and intolerance.¹⁰⁴⁹

He also praised the efforts of those citizens who honestly tried to further civil rights for members of all races and minority groups, in the face of prejudice and bitter criticism. "Men and women of both races have worked hard, have risked much, have dared much, so that America might offer the world a model of democracy in action."¹⁰⁵⁰

Contempt. Stevenson was contemptuous towards the Secretary of State for his continual excuses regarding setbacks to the Free World, especially in the Middle East.

I wish, I wish, my friends, and I wish it very much, that there were more good news to report, that there were better news elsewhere.

¹⁰⁴⁸Ibid.

¹⁰⁴⁹Ibid.

¹⁰⁵⁰Ibid.

I have kept my peace in spite of our blundering vacillation in the Middle East and Mr. Dulles' succession of appeasements and of provocations which preceded the Egyptian dictator's seizure of the Suez Canal.¹⁰⁵¹

He regarded with contempt the administration attitude towards Israel, accusing them of becoming concerned when election day approached.

Israel is not a cause to be cynically remembered by the Administration in late October of an election year. It is the symbol, rather, of man's triumph over one of the darkest sorrows in human history--the attempt of Adolf Hitler to destroy a whole people.¹⁰⁵²

He returned to his favorite target, Mr. Dulles, and heaped his contemptuous attacks upon the much-persecuted Secretary of State. "And I would ask you how much longer can we afford the bungling which precipitated the Suez crisis? Do we want four more years of John Foster Dulles?"¹⁰⁵³ Second only to Mr. Dulles as the whipping-boy for the Democrats was Vice-President Nixon, and he came in for similar verbal treatment, this time on the issue of H-bomb decisions.

I reject the idea of throwing up our hands and refusing to try. This is one time that we can't take no for an answer. And I don't think that this nation wants the great decisions about the H-bomb entrusted to Richard M. Nixon.¹⁰⁵⁴

Benevolence. The heroic struggle that the people of Poland were waging against the oppressive domination of Soviet rulers had aroused the heart-felt sympathy of peoples everywhere. Stevenson expressed the American feeling of benevolence towards these brave people who were sacrificing so much to achieve what we take for granted.

We have all been stirred these days by the struggle in Poland against Soviet domination. I say to you that independence from foreign Communist control is at least a step toward independence from

¹⁰⁵¹ Ibid.

¹⁰⁵³ Ibid.

¹⁰⁵² Ibid.

¹⁰⁵⁴ Ibid.

domestic Communist control, so that we must help, if we can, and I believe that we should be prepared to join other nations in offering economic assistance to a free government in Poland.¹⁰⁵⁵

ARRANGEMENT

A very short introduction opened the speech, with only quick expressions of confidence and appreciation of the reception that New York Democrats had given him. The body of the address commenced with attacks upon administration foreign policy and where it had resulted in setbacks to the Western world. Stevenson quoted several favorite lines of reasoning used by Republicans in the campaign and attempted to point out the fallacies in such reasoning. He then countered with Democratic proposals and showed how they would better serve the needs of world peace and solidarity. The latter half of the speech dealt with nuclear weapons and how to control destructive use of H-bombs and similar devices in future wars. The conclusion was an earnest plea to accept disarmament and control of H-bombs, and an expression of confidence that the future did not hold a third World War of atomic and hydrogen weapons and a fourth World War fought with clubs.

STYLE

Level.

The style level was between low and middle. Stevenson was much chattier and tried hard to get down to the level of the average voter in this speech. Any use of ornate language was very limited and inconsistent with the remainder of the talk.

¹⁰⁵⁵Ibid.

Diction and word choice.

The diction was also aimed at a lower level, and word choice reflected this trend. Fewer words were employed that might demand a trip to the dictionary, and fewer thoughts that required much thinking to comprehend. He continued to use many adjectives, more sarcasm and much wit, but all on a slightly lower level of abstraction than in previous talks.

Sentence structure.

A greater percentage of simple sentences were employed in this speech than in any previously studied. Almost no complex-compound sentences were found, and fewer compound sentences. The desire on the part of the speaker to drive his point home, with as little deviation as possible from the basic issues, apparently accounted for the shorter, simpler sentences. A typical paragraph was the following:

We would be deprived of none of our ability to retaliate. We could continue to improve the means of delivery. We would continue our research and development and our preparations for tests. Our arsenal of hydrogen bombs and other weapons is enough to deface the earth. Our stock-pile continues to grow. By entering such an agreement we lose none of our war power and we gain peace power.¹⁰⁵⁶

Rhetorical devices and figurative language.

Humor. Most of the laughter caused by the speech was the result of sarcasm or contrast, but once Stevenson resorted to straight humor. He was discussing the Vice-President and made the following comment: "Now we all know that in recent months the Vice President has been subjected to a remarkable process of face-lifting and hand-laundering."¹⁰⁵⁷

Rhetorical Question. For three consecutive paragraphs Stevenson employed this rhetorical device to emphasize his point. The first paragraph was the following:

¹⁰⁵⁶Ibid.

¹⁰⁵⁷Ibid.

Progress? When the richest country in the world doesn't have schools and teachers enough for its children? When it doesn't have hospitals for its sick? When there is widespread need among our older citizens? When ugly slums deface our cities and offend human dignity? When millions of Americans are still denied opportunities because of race or color?¹⁰⁵⁸

After thoroughly chastising the Secretary of State, he asked the following question: "Do we want four more years of John Foster Dulles?"¹⁰⁵⁹

Interrogation. Stevenson wondered who exactly was the power in the administration, if President Eisenhower did not warrant criticism for what his administration was doing. "But who's in charge, anyway? We know that this is a business man's administration, but what we want to know is: who's running the store?"¹⁰⁶⁰ And beyond the question of who has been in charge would come the question of who will be in charge if the Republican ticket is elected in November. "And the even more important question is: if the Republicans were to win this fall, who would be running the store for the next four years?"¹⁰⁶¹ After a recitation of the blunders our foreign service has been guilty of in recent years, Stevenson wondered why the Republican campaigners continually attempt to hide the facts from the voters. "Why don't they at least tell us the truth about the world in which we live?"¹⁰⁶²

Irony and satire. Stevenson seemed to use sarcasm and irony more as the campaign wore on. He spoke sarcastically on numerous occasions in this address, particularly about Dulles and Nixon. He thought it was quite ironic that the Republican orators now claim credit for principles

¹⁰⁵⁸ Ibid.

¹⁰⁶⁰ Ibid.

¹⁰⁶² Ibid.

¹⁰⁵⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰⁶¹ Ibid.

that were in Democratic platforms continually for the past twenty years. "So we must disregard these alarms. We must push ahead, serene in the knowledge that the Democratic program of 1956 will be the Republican declaration of principles of 1976."¹⁰⁶³ He spoke ironically about the claims that America is winning the cold war when the evidence hardly verified this contention. "We know we cannot win the great struggle of our century under a leadership whose only hope, so far as I can see, is that communism may at last be exhausted by success."¹⁰⁶⁴ Stevenson enumerated the areas where our diplomatic achievements have not been too brilliant, and arrived at the general conclusion that all is not well in the world from our viewpoint. He then satirically added this sentence: "Yet the Republican candidate says that all is well, that the American prestige has never been higher, that aggression has been stopped and peace restored around the world."¹⁰⁶⁵ Stevenson maintained that this election might well determine the future that our posterity can enjoy, or not enjoy, but the ironic possibility was that we may not have any posterity at all.

In many ways this election will determine the kind of tomorrow that we and our children may enjoy. But the transcending question before humanity is whether there will be a tomorrow at all.¹⁰⁶⁶

Contrast. Political platforms do change over the years, at least some political platforms, thought Stevenson. The about-face in Republican platforms was a wonder to behold. "But how things have changed! Now President Eisenhower even implies that all of these things were invented

1063 Ibid.

1065 Ibid.

1064 Ibid.

1066 Ibid.

by the Republicans."¹⁰⁶⁷ He also contrasted the type of campaign each Party was attempting to wage. "The Administration had hoped to make this election just a public exercise of a personality cult. But we have turned it into a debate on principles and on policies."¹⁰⁶⁸ And he sharply contradicted the view of President Eisenhower that all was well in the Middle East. "He announced a few days ago on a political television show paid for by the Republican party that he had 'good news' about Suez. There is no good news about the Middle East."¹⁰⁶⁹

Climax. The climax in the speech came near the end, and included the following paragraphs:

Most of the world is poor and hungry. Everywhere demagogues prey upon the longings of the dispossessed and the fears of the disinherited. The age summons us to a new war against poverty, injustice and inequality--in our own land and everywhere in the world. Most of all, we are summoned to war against war itself.

Humanity cries out for new courage, new ideas, new effort. It cries out for a new faith in the people and a new determination to move ahead in the changing century.

It has been the historic faith of the Democratic party that the people can be trusted with the great decisions. It has been the historic role of the Democratic party to meet the new challenges of each generation. It is the passion of the Democratic party to make the Twentieth century safe for the people--the people in America and people throughout the world. In this spirit, we can advance with high hearts to the day of decision in this election--two weeks from tonight.¹⁰⁷⁰

Onomatopoeia. The following examples of onomatopoeia were noted in the address: "These are people to whom politics has meant the fight to win a better break in life for the poor and for the helpless, for the harrassed immigrant and the child of misfortune, for the victims of greed and intolerance."¹⁰⁷¹; "And we have done so in the face of an unprecedented

¹⁰⁶⁷ Ibid.

¹⁰⁶⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰⁷¹ Ibid.

¹⁰⁶⁸ Ibid.

¹⁰⁷⁰ Ibid.

effort to suppress and bury the urgent issues of our day under an avalanche of slogans and of propaganda."¹⁰⁷²

Anaphora and epistrophe. Stevenson accused the Republicans of unfair tactics when they claimed credit for measures they had ten years before condemned.

Well, we all know--we all should know--that everything is pie in the sky from the Republican point of view--until the Democrats bring it down to earth. They called Social Security pie in the sky. A fair break for farmers was pie in the sky. Minimum wages was called pie in the sky. The whole New Deal was pie in the sky.¹⁰⁷³

Another example of this device was in the parallel construction employed when Stevenson enumerated the areas where the news was not good for Western diplomats.

It is not good news that Korea is still divided by an uneasy armistice; that the richest half of Indochina has become a new Communist satellite; that communism and neutralism have made important gains in Ceylon, in Burma, in Afghanistan and Indonesia; that the Soviets have even challenged us to economic and political competition everywhere on earth; that the coalition of free nations has never been in worse shape.¹⁰⁷⁴

Allusion and reference. Mr. Dulles had written an article that appeared in Life magazine in which he stated that America had been at the brink of war three times since 1953. This article caused much embarrassment to himself and the Administration, and was alluded to by Stevenson when he uttered the following comment about Dulles: "The Republican team has made too many mistakes. They first, they kept Secretary Dulles in the box one brink too long. . ."¹⁰⁷⁵ In the conclusion the historic documents of our nation were referred to as the foundations for the great faith other peoples hold towards our type of government.

¹⁰⁷²Ibid.

¹⁰⁷⁴Ibid.

¹⁰⁷³Ibid.

¹⁰⁷⁵Ibid.

The America which excites the world's admiration is not timid, fearful and confused. It is the America of the Declaration of Independence; it is the America of the Emancipation Proclamation; it is the America of the Marshall Plan and Point 4--it is America, the champion of freedom, it is America the bold and magnanimous.¹⁰⁷⁶

Metaphor. The only metaphor found in the speech was the following: "The United States has a compelling interest in peace in the Middle East--the oil tank of Europe and of Asia and the great bridge between East and West."¹⁰⁷⁷

Alliteration. Numerous examples of this rhetorical device were noticed, among them the following: "public exercise of a personality cult."¹⁰⁷⁸; "unprecedented peace and prosperity and progress."¹⁰⁷⁹; "Suez to Cyprus."¹⁰⁸⁰; "press agent's peace,"¹⁰⁸¹; "face the facts,"¹⁰⁸²; "a pall of death over the pulverized ruins covering countless victims. . ."¹⁰⁸³ "safe and sane,"¹⁰⁸⁴; "we can safely stop hydrogen explosions without inspection. . ."¹⁰⁸⁵; "high hearts,"¹⁰⁸⁶; "day of decision."¹⁰⁸⁷. Perhaps the classic example of alliteration found thus far was the following sentence:

I have kept my peace in spite of our blundering vacillation in the Middle East and Mr. Dulles' succession of appeasements and of provocations which preceded the Egyptian dictator's seizure of the Suez Canal.¹⁰⁸⁸

¹⁰⁷⁶
Ibid.

¹⁰⁷⁸
Ibid.

¹⁰⁸⁰
Ibid.

¹⁰⁸²
Ibid.

¹⁰⁸⁴
Ibid.

¹⁰⁸⁶
Ibid.

¹⁰⁸⁸
Ibid.

¹⁰⁷⁷
Ibid.

¹⁰⁷⁹
Ibid.

¹⁰⁸¹
Ibid.

¹⁰⁸³
Ibid.

¹⁰⁸⁵
Ibid.

¹⁰⁸⁷
Ibid.

XII. FARM POLICY

INVENTIONLogos--non-artistic proof.

Evidence. Stevenson assailed the Republican claims that they have reduced government red-tape in Washington, introducing this fact as supporting evidence: "It now takes 6,400 more men to run the ineffective Republican Department of Agriculture than it used to take to run the effective Democratic programs."¹⁰⁸⁹ He took the administration to task on the subject of farm surpluses, insisting that they have not, as they claimed, reduced farm surpluses since coming into office.

At the end of the last crop year the Government investment in surpluses was almost six times as great as at the end of 1952, when the Republicans took over.

On the 31st of this August the government had on hand or under loan two and a half times as much corn, fifteen times as much cotton, 132 times as much rice, two and one-fourth times as much oats and nearly eight times as much barley as when the Eisenhower Administration took over in January, 1953.¹⁰⁹⁰

The statistical comparison of farm income in 1952 and 1956 was given as follows: "Net farm income was then \$15,100,000,000; this year it will be \$11,500,000,000."¹⁰⁹¹ He quoted the stockyard prices for hogs in 1956 as follows: "Early this year, when hog prices were at \$10.90 or 52 per cent of parity. . ."¹⁰⁹² The terrific cost of high price supports for all agricultural products was a major objection of many thoughtful people, yet Stevenson introduced the figures on the cost of the present program for agriculture.

¹⁰⁸⁹Adlai E. Stevenson, "Farm Policy," The New York Times, CVI, No. 36,070, October 26, 1956, p. 20.

¹⁰⁹⁰Ibid.

¹⁰⁹¹Ibid.

¹⁰⁹²Ibid.

He does not say that during this fiscal year we will be paying \$5,700,000 for an ineffective program. This is three and a half times as much as the average cost of a program that worked during the last three Democratic fiscal years.¹⁰⁹³

Authority. The only individuals mentioned in the entire speech were President Eisenhower and members of his official family, and they at no time were referred to for proof of any arguments. No appeal to authority was noted in the speech.

Sign. Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson symbolized everything the Democrats opposed regarding agricultural policy. He was considered reactionary, ultra-conservative, anti-rural and all sorts of uncomplimentary things. Many Republicans felt he was a hindrance to the Party in the farming areas, and Stevenson detected signs that even the President felt similarly.

I think it's interesting, too, that, so far as I can discover, neither the President nor the Vice President--either in Peoria or any place else in this campaign--has ever once mentioned the name of the Secretary of Agriculture.¹⁰⁹⁴

Stevenson frankly accused the administration of playing politics with the American farmers, going to their assistance until election day with incentives to vote Republican. He offered the following signs of this activity:

Today's loose administration of the soil bank program and the frantic effort to get the checks to the farmers on any terms before the election is more of the farm politics he so righteously denounces, and everyone of us knows it. . . . There are more politics in the emergency purchase of turkeys, eggs and hamburger and lard to keep prices stable until the election.¹⁰⁹⁵

¹⁰⁹³Ibid...

¹⁰⁹⁵Ibid.

¹⁰⁹⁴Ibid.

Assumption. Stevenson accused the administration of failure to carry out their campaign promises to farmers made in 1952. This conclusion was based on an assumption that Eisenhower in 1952 meant certain things, which he maintained later he did not. The debate evolved around the interpretation given certain words used in the campaign. Stevenson's conclusion was summed up like this: "The first lesson is that there is no connection between what a Republican candidate says in an election campaign about the farm issue and what he does about it if he gets elected."¹⁰⁹⁶ The difference in interpretation of what the words "parity" and "price supports" meant has caused much misunderstanding. From the Democratic viewpoint, the Republican administration had been guilty of gross neglect of the farmer and renegeing on their promises. "The pieces of broken Republican promises are there for every farmer and every citizen to see. The Eisenhower record of broken promises to the farmer is a record of callous political perfidy and the farmer knows it."¹⁰⁹⁷

Logs--artistic proof.

Inductive reasoning--argument from generalization. Stevenson cited various agricultural commodities and how the 1956 surpluses far surpassed the 1952 figures, and from these examples he generalized that any predicted decrease in surpluses has failed to materialize.

On the 31st of this August the Government had on hand or under loan two and a half times as much corn, fifteen times as much cotton, 132 times as much rice, two and one-fourth times as much oats and nearly eight times as much barley as when the Eisenhower Administration took over in January, 1953.

Who does the President think he is fooling when he says that they have started to reduce the inherited surpluses?¹⁰⁹⁸

¹⁰⁹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁰⁹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁰⁹⁷ Ibid.

He felt that farmers were being discriminated against because they were not guaranteed price supports like other industries. Stevenson generalized that price supports are necessary and beneficial for almost every segment of the American economy.

Secretary of Defense Wilson, when he was with General Motors, didn't sell his automobiles on the open market for whatever he could get. The price was set before the car was even produced.

Wilson had a support price.

Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey, when he headed the M. A. Hanna Company didn't sell his iron ore by the boatload for whatever he could get. The price of ore is negotiated far in advance.

Humphrey had a support price.

The advertising men who manage the President's campaign get paid on a fixed return that hasn't been changed for fifty years.

They too, have a support price.¹⁰⁹⁹

Inductive reasoning--argument from causation. Secretary of Agriculture Benson was a stormy figure in the rural areas, and Stevenson launched verbal blasts at the Secretary on numerous occasions. He had this to say about the speaking tour Mr. Benson was then conducting:

I see it reported in the paper that this tour has been a great triumph, that Mr. Benson hasn't been booed much at all. From the reports of his visit here Tuesday I understand why. When a man who has presided over a 20 per cent drop in farm income has the gall to come out and boast--after the latest drop--that farm prices are going to go up now, you don't boo him; you just wonder what's wrong with him.¹¹⁰⁰

Stevenson openly accused the Republicans of playing politics with the farm vote. He thought they said certain things four years ago with no intention of carrying out their promises, but merely to get elected.

At Peoria, four years later, the President told his Republican audience that what he meant at Kasson was that farmers should get their parity in the market place. If that means anything it means they should get parity without price supports. And if that is what Mr. Eisenhower meant, why didn't he say so four years ago?

He didn't say so because he knew that any such statement would have cost him votes.¹¹⁰¹

¹⁰⁹⁹Ibid.

¹¹⁰⁰Ibid.

¹¹⁰¹Ibid.

Stevenson attacked Benson for the book he had written and the manner in which it was being distributed. He accused businessmen of using tax-money to finance the advertising and distribution of the book. Why did they do this?

And these big business men aren't subsidizing Mr. Benson's book because they love farmers, or because they want farm prices to go up. They are doing it for reasons of their own, and I'm sure you can guess what they are.¹¹⁰²

Inductive reasoning—argument from analogy. Stevenson compared the money being used to finance the distribution of Benson's book with the money honest citizens contribute to the Red Cross—both are tax deductible.

And what is worst of all is that the money they give that foundation in order to push Ezra Benson's book is tax deductible. In other words, they can subtract every contribution to this foundation from their taxes—just as you can subtract contributions you make to the Red Cross or to your church.¹¹⁰³

Deductive reasoning—argument from syllogism and enthymeme. Stevenson reasoned by deduction when he said the following, again regarding Benson's book:

In short, money that ought to go to the United States Treasury is being used by a collection of big business men to promote this partisan political tract of Mr. Benson's. It's your money, and my money, which is being used to spread around Mr. Benson's book.¹¹⁰⁴

Ethos.

The "Farm Policy" address was concerned almost entirely with criticism of the Republican approach to the farm problem, and presented little opportunity for ethical proof. The few examples found totalled the least use of ethos in any of the twelve speeches analyzed.

¹¹⁰²Ibid.

¹¹⁰³Ibid.

¹¹⁰⁴Ibid.

Sincerity. After quoting the President on the issue of inflation, Stevenson stated: "No one could be more concerned than I am about the way prices are going up."¹¹⁰⁵

Earnestness. The body of the speech began with these words: "Tonight I want to summarize what this record shows, and I'm not going to mince any words about it."¹¹⁰⁶ He attacked the Republican record in earnest, no holds barred. He commented on the attack from the opposition that high parity payments would be an old-fashioned method of alleviating the farmer's distress.

Let me clear up this point once and for all. The Republicans did not cut the minimum wage for the working man, as many of them would dearly love to do if they only dared. But the Republicans did cut the minimum wage of the farmer. Our first job is to put it back. This we do when we put the price of basic commodities back to 90 per cent of parity.¹¹⁰⁷

Devotion. Stevenson felt strongly that the Democratic record of support for the farmer was being misused and forgotten, and he thought this needed to be corrected.

The most liberal farm credit program we ever had was the one which bailed the farmers out of the mess that was left after twelve Republican years of Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover—the last time the Republicans were in Washington.¹¹⁰⁸

The Democratic platform stated quite clearly the Party stand towards agriculture, and Stevenson expressed his complete support of that platform.

The Democratic platform sets out the best farm program any party has ever offered. And it will be our program after we are elected, just as it is now.

¹¹⁰⁵
Ibid.

¹¹⁰⁷
Ibid.

¹¹⁰⁶
Ibid.

¹¹⁰⁸
Ibid.

We have made it clear that we stand for parity of income--a fair share of national income for the farmers. And we will support the prices of basic crops at 90 per cent of parity.¹¹⁰⁹

On conclusion the Democratic candidate expressed his devotion to his Party and their stand on the farm question. "We know that we can have a sensible and effective farm program which gives the farmer--and the American economy--the support they need to move toward greater abundance for all."¹¹¹⁰ He assured the voters that if he were elected his post-election stand would not be different from what he now told them. "If you elect a Democratic administration on the sixth of next month, these will be our goals. And we will lose no time in preparing the program."¹¹¹¹

Patience. Farm experts realized that the complicated farm problem could not be solved overnight, nor by the advocacy of high parity supports. Stevenson also realized this, and did not promise any quick or easy solution, but urged patience as a necessary ingredient of any farm program.

But we don't regard fixed supports as the last and only word. They are the beginning of the path to a good farm policy--not the end. There must be a constant search for ways of developing a national farm program to meet the varying circumstances of various crops in order to insure the farmer his fair share of national income and to make it possible for the consumer to share the benefits of our farm abundance.¹¹¹²

Friendliness. Despite vigorous verbal punches at President Eisenhower and what he had been saying, Stevenson definitely did not accuse the President of intentionally "plowing under" the farmer.

Mr. Eisenhower is, I am sure, a well meaning man. But indifference and ignorance can be as damaging as ill will. If the President

¹¹⁰⁹Ibid.

¹¹¹¹Ibid.

¹¹¹⁰Ibid.

¹¹¹²Ibid.

doesn't realize the hardship his policies are causing--if he thinks farmers are doing well--. . .then he just doesn't know what's going on.¹¹¹³

Sympathy. President Eisenhower had attacked what he called "the synthetic farmers behind Washington desks"¹¹¹⁴, calling them uninformed bureaucrats. Stevenson came to their defense. "Well, like it or not, it takes good, devoted public servants with pencils to help make a farm program work. When the President attacks these men he attacks the whole idea of a farm program."¹¹¹⁵ The administration had allowed some of its lesser officials to say that small farmers were a hindrance to the farm program, and would have to find other employment. This angered many citizens of both parties, and Stevenson took advantage of the situation to express sympathy for these neglected people. "We must protect the family farm and help the low income farmers, those people the President says he loves and his appointees say should be plowed under."¹¹¹⁶

Pathos.

Anger. Stevenson aroused the anger of the audience many times before he had finished his verbal thrusts at the vulnerable Republican position regarding farmers. His choice of words left no doubt that he was highly perturbed at the elusive campaign tactics of the opposition, from President Eisenhower on down. "The pieces of broken Republican promises are there for every farmer and every citizen to see. The Eisenhower record of broken promises to the farmer is a record of callous political perfidy and the farmer knows it."¹¹¹⁷ He continued in the same vein.

¹¹¹³Ibid.

¹¹¹⁵Ibid.

¹¹¹⁷Ibid.

¹¹¹⁴Ibid.

¹¹¹⁶Ibid.

To get votes that way is bad enough; to then say, as President Eisenhower did at Seattle, 'that the farmer is no longer to be insulted as a commodity for which our parties make competitive bids in the political market-place' is compound deceit with self-righteous hypocrisy.¹¹¹⁸

Stevenson was angry with the audacity that the administration showed in its favoritism towards big business, while neglectful of the smaller operators. "And it says a lot that in this Administration what's good for General Motors is good, but what's good for American farmers is socialism."¹¹¹⁹ The tactics of intentionally misleading the voters was the lowest type of campaigning, felt Stevenson, and he emphatically accused his opponents of doing just this.

And I ask him what he was doing last spring when after vetoing the Democratic farm bill, he then raised support prices? What was he doing when he said firm price supports at 90 percent of parity were uneconomic and immoral and would enslave the farmer and then promptly raised supports on basic crops this year to 86 per cent of parity in order to win votes? Does the President think that the difference between immorality and morality, slavery and freedom, is only 4 per cent?¹¹¹²⁰

Fear. The speaker expressed fear that the tight-money policies of the administration were going to bring irreparable harm to the nation's economy.

No one could be more concerned than I am about the way prices are going up. The nonsense the President has been talking about how he stabilized the dollar is dangerous camouflage of the fact that this Administration's tight money policy is today hurting us in this country and hurting us seriously.¹¹²¹

Confidence. Stevenson indicated his confidence that the voters would not return the administration to office. "But there isn't going to be four more years of flexible promises, flexible prices and inflexible

¹¹¹⁸Ibid.

¹¹²⁰Ibid.

¹¹¹⁹Ibid.

¹¹²¹Ibid.

policy."¹¹²² The concluding sentence of the address was a confident statement. "With a Democratic administration, the farmer will again be a full partner in our progress toward a New America."¹¹²³

Pity. For the first time in any campaign speech Stevenson attempted to evoke this emotion, and in reference to President Eisenhower. After scathing condemnations of Eisenhower's policies towards farmers, he reasoned as follows:

Mr. Eisenhower is, I am sure, a well meaning man. But indifference and ignorance can be as damaging as ill will. If the President doesn't realize the hardship his policies are causing--if he thinks farmers are doing well--if he thinks that farmers have a 'liberal' supply of credit--then he just doesn't know what's going on.¹¹²⁴

Later he employed the same approach in reference to his opponent. "And if what he says is not transparent hypocrisy, then I guess that's the hard truth of the matter--the President just doesn't know what's going on."¹¹²⁵

Indignation. A good part of the speech ranged between indignation and contempt for the Republican Party and how they were handling the farm problem. Only a few of the many examples found will be shown to illustrate the use of these two emotions. He indignantly asked Mr. Eisenhower to explain his conduct of 1952 regarding price supports.

At Peoria, four years later, the President told his Republican audience that what he meant at Kasson was that farmers should get their parity in the market place. If that means anything it means they should get parity without price supports. And if that is what Mr. Eisenhower meant, why didn't he say so four years ago?¹¹²⁶

¹¹²²Ibid.

¹¹²⁴Ibid.

¹¹²⁶Ibid.

¹¹²³Ibid.

¹¹²⁵Ibid.

He indignantly refuted Eisenhower's contention that Democratic farm programs were price-depressing.

The President has spoken scornfully and often of what he called in Peoria 'the old price-depressing Democratic farm program.' These are the programs which rescued the farmer from the worst depression he has ever known and which helped him to enjoy the most prosperous years he has ever had. Farmers know what these programs did for them. And if Mr. Eisenhower did not know he should have found out by now.¹¹²⁷

Stevenson wondered how the Republicans could explain the fact that consumer prices for food had increased while the amounts received by the producers had decreased steadily since 1953.

Why don't they tell the whole truth?

Why don't they tell the housewife that while her food prices have been going up under this Administration farm prices have been falling. Why don't they admit, in all honesty, that in July of this year, when consumer prices went to their all-time peak, farm prices took another sharp drop?¹¹²⁸

He was very indignant at the manner in which tax-exempt funds were being used to further the sale of a political book by Mr. Benson. "In short, money that ought to go to the United States Treasury is being used by a collection of big business men to promote this partisan political tract of Mr. Benson's."¹¹²⁹ The charge that high price supports was an old-fashioned and temporary solution to the problem infuriated Stevenson.

Let me clear up this point once and for all. The Republicans did not cut the minimum wage for the working man, as many of them would dearly love to do if they only dared. But the Republicans did cut the minimum wage of the farmer.¹¹³⁰

Contempt. Secretary of Agriculture Benson was treated with contempt and scorn by most Democratic orators of the 1956 campaign. In this speech Stevenson turned the full fury of his wrath upon the much-persecuted Utahan.

¹¹²⁷ Ibid.

¹¹²⁹ Ibid.

¹¹²⁸ Ibid.

¹¹³⁰ Ibid.

I see it reported in the paper that this tour has been a great triumph, that Mr. Benson hasn't been booed much at all. From the reports of his visit here Tuesday I understand why. When a man who has presided over a 20 per cent drop in farm income has the gall to come out and boast--after the latest drop--that farm prices are going to go up now, you don't boo him; you just wonder what's wrong with him.¹¹³¹

He was contemptuous also of President Eisenhower's stand on several issues, verbalizing as follows on the surplus problem.

Surely, 'politics' is a charitable description of what is really involved when the President tells the country, as he did at Peoria, that his Administration has started to reduce the farm surpluses it 'inherited.'¹¹³²

Speaking about the general farm situation and how the Republicans were mis-representing the truth, Stevenson gave forth with the following critical views:

But duplicity and hypocrisy to the extent it has been carried by the Eisenhower Administration is not partisanship, it is contempt. And, if anything, it is worse in foreign affairs than in agriculture.¹¹³³

ARRANGEMENT

The introduction was entirely a review of comments made recently by Republican orators and satirical remarks about them. After five such paragraphs, Stevenson launched into the body of this speech. He sharply criticized the Republicans for failing to carry through on their 1952 promises to the farmers. He then accused them of playing politics to obtain votes, and of being insincere in many of their appeals. He contradicted Republican reasoning on the soil bank, the farm surpluses, parity payments and farm prosperity. Lastly, he accused the opposition of double talk, saying different things to urban and rural voters. He then

¹¹³¹Ibid.

¹¹³²Ibid.

¹¹³³Ibid.

attacked the tax exempt businesses who were using their money for illicit purposes. In conclusion, Stevenson listed the points of difference with the Democratic platform and promised aid and continued assistance to the farmer if elected.

STYLE

Level.

The style level was low, with certain portions middle style. Stevenson was not attempting to be dignified, nor ornate, but hard-hitting and speaking the common man's language. He was conversational, with extensive use of short questions, and always speaking on the level of the farmer who wonders what has been happening to him. Classified according to level, it was the lowest of the twelve studied.

Diction and word choice.

The diction reflected the lower level of style, and was obviously aimed for common comprehension. No unusual words were found, no foreign words, and more short, witty phrases that were easily understood.

Sentence structure.

Again there was a greater use of the simple sentence, although many complex sentences were also noted. The general length of sentences was reduced, and the complexity of thought involved also was minimized. For emphasis many times Stevenson would use short, sarcastic sentences, repeating many key words. The clarity of sentence structure was illustrated in the following paragraph:

Sometimes I wonder, in all honesty, how much political oratory really clarifies things. And yet this year's debate on farm policy has cleared up a lot of things. Whether they intended it or not, the Republican orators, including the President, have made the

Republican position on agriculture crystal clear. Farmers now know exactly where the candidates of both parties stand.¹¹³⁴

Rhetorical devices and figurative language.

Analogy. One analogy was used in the speech, in reference to the method of financing Benson's book.

And what is worst of all is that the money they give that foundation in order to push Ezra Benson's book is tax deductible. In other words, they can subtract every contribution to this foundation from their taxes--just as you can subtract contributions you make to the Red Cross or to your church.¹¹³⁵

Humor. Stevenson was sarcastically funny quite often throughout the speech. The second sentence brought a response of laughter from the crowd. "The President, you will remember, went to the plowing match last month at Newton and said a few words in favor of the plow."¹¹³⁶ He saw a chance to get a laugh from the title of the much-discussed book by Ezra Taft Benson, and he did not neglect the opportunity.

Mr. Benson's book is called Farmers at the Crossroads. As we review the way he is permitting a tax-exempt foundation to distribute his political propaganda, it is obvious that his book should be called farmers at the double-crossroads.¹¹³⁷

Rhetorical question. Continually Stevenson quoted portions of 1952 speeches by Eisenhower and other Republicans and then he asked, "Did President Eisenhower keep these promises?"¹¹³⁸

Interrogation. Stevenson peppered the opposition with embarrassing questions, such as the following series on price supports:

And I ask him what he was doing last spring when after vetoing the Democratic farm bill, he then raised support prices? What was he doing when he said firm price supports at 90 per cent of parity were

1134 Ibid.

1136 Ibid.

1138 Ibid.

1135 Ibid.

1137 Ibid.

uneconomic and immoral and would enslave the farmer and then promptly raised supports on basic crops this year to 86 per cent of parity in order to win votes? Does the President think that the difference between immorality and morality, slavery and freedom, is only 4 per cent?¹¹³⁹

He ridiculed the opposition Party for their attempts to camouflage the truth regarding prices of farm produce.

Why don't they tell the whole truth?

Why don't they tell the housewife that while her food prices have been going up under this Administration farm prices have been falling? Why don't they admit, in all honesty, that in July of this year, when consumer prices went to their all-time peak, farm prices took another sharp drop?¹¹⁴⁰

Stevenson revealed the method by which Benson's book was being distributed, then wondered, "I wonder if President Eisenhower approves the use of taxpayer's money to circulate his campaign literature--or is this another thing he hasn't been told?"¹¹⁴¹

Irony and satire. Stevenson considered it very ironic that the very policies Eisenhower refused to condone for farmers he applied as national policy to other enterprises. "And it says a lot that in this administration what's good for General Motors is good, but what's good for American farmers is socialism."¹¹⁴² He wondered at the open-facedness with which the Republican campaign headquarters maintained the Benson book was "non-political."

There is nothing very new about the book. It is the same old Benson line--about how our farm policy is 'headed in the right direction' and how President Eisenhower 'won a great victory for the American farmer' by vetoing the farm bill earlier this year.

As you can see, it is a strictly nonpolitical document.¹¹⁴³

¹¹³⁹ Ibid.

¹¹⁴¹ Ibid.

¹¹⁴³ Ibid.

¹¹⁴⁰ Ibid.

¹¹⁴² Ibid.

He offered the following example of satirical speaking in reference to the contradictory statements coming from the opposition Party:

As a matter of fact only a few days after his Peoria speech in which he accused us of favoring liberal credit for the farmer, the President himself had a change of heart—or maybe it was a lapse of memory—or could it have been some more of those farm politics he condemns?¹¹⁴⁴

Contrast. Stevenson contradicted quite a number of contentions advanced by the Republicans. He directly contrasted the impression Eisenhower would leave with the audience and the truth about surpluses.

Surely, 'politics' is a charitable description of what is really involved when the President tells the country, as he did at Peoria, that his Administration has started to reduce the farm surpluses it 'inherited.'

At the end of the last crop year the Government investment in surpluses was almost six times as great as at the end of 1952, when the Republicans took over.¹¹⁴⁵

He contradicted the Eisenhower interpretation of farm credit also.

At all events he went up to Minneapolis and boasted that his Administration had put into effect 'the most liberal farm credit program in history.'

That, too, is wrong. The most liberal farm credit program we ever had was the one which bailed the farmers out of the mess that was left after twelve Republican years of Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover. . .¹¹⁴⁶

He even illustrated instances where members of the Administration were contradicting themselves, showing the contrasting opinions that were present in the Republican Party.

Up in Minneapolis on October 16, Mr. Eisenhower said of the farm situation: 'Clearly, we are over the hump.' But just three days later in Des Moines, his Assistant Secretary of Agriculture said: 'I do not mean to imply that we are completely over the hump.'¹¹⁴⁷

Onomatopoeia. The following sentence illustrated effective use of this rhetorical device: "But indifference and ignorance can be as damaging

¹¹⁴⁴Ibid.

¹¹⁴⁶Ibid.

¹¹⁴⁵Ibid.

¹¹⁴⁷Ibid.

as ill will."¹¹⁴⁸

Anaphora and epistrophe. Once this device was employed for emphasis, when referring to the President and his apparent confusion over the plight of the farming population.

If the President doesn't realize the hardship his policies are causing--if he thinks farmers are doing well--if he thinks that farmers have a 'liberal' supply of credit--then he just doesn't know what's going on.¹¹⁴⁹

Metaphor. One metaphor was noted. Eisenhower was speaking about the 'synthetic farmers behind Washington desks'¹¹⁵⁰ when he uttered this graphic phrase: "farming looks mighty easy when your plow is a pencil and you're a thousand miles from the cornfield."¹¹⁵¹

Alliteration. The following examples of alliteration were found in the "Farm Policy" address: "crystal clear"¹¹⁵²; "90 per cent parity price support"¹¹⁵³; "to protect the prices of producers of perishable products."¹¹⁵⁴; "seeks to set city against country"¹¹⁵⁵; "Benson's book"¹¹⁵⁶; "to promote this partisan political tract"¹¹⁵⁷; "flexible promises, flexible prices and inflexible policy."¹¹⁵⁸; "varying circumstances of various crops"¹¹⁵⁹; "prices of perishable products"¹¹⁶⁰.

¹¹⁴⁸Ibid.

¹¹⁵⁰Ibid.

¹¹⁵²Ibid.

¹¹⁵⁴Ibid.

¹¹⁵⁶Ibid.

¹¹⁵⁸Ibid.

¹¹⁶⁰Ibid.

¹¹⁴⁹Ibid.

¹¹⁵¹Ibid.

¹¹⁵³Ibid.

¹¹⁵⁵Ibid.

¹¹⁵⁷Ibid.

¹¹⁵⁹Ibid.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

I. SUMMARY OF INVENTION

Logos--non-artistic proof.

Evidence. Stevenson employed considerable use of evidence in all twelve speeches. The six 1952 speeches were found to contain numerous references to historical fact, much evidence of the benefits accruing from Democratic Administrations since 1932, and some statistical evidence that implemented the theme of "World Policy" and "The Atomic Future." Most of the evidence found in the 1956 speeches pertained to events that occurred since the Republican Administration took office in 1952. Particularly in "Our Foreign Policy" and "Farm Policy" evidence condemning the Administration was pointed out. In "Control of Nuclear Weapons" Stevenson presented considerable evidence to support his theory that testing of these destructive weapons should cease. Some use of evidence was noted in all the twelve speeches studied.

Authority. Every one of the twelve speeches studied appealed to at least two authorities and usually three or four. The great names of the Democratic Party were alluded to several times, including Eleanor Roosevelt, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry Truman, Woodrow Wilson and Brien McMahon. Historical figures referred to included Lincoln, Washington, Caesar, Churchill, Whitman and others. Eisenhower, Benson, Nixon, Dulles and other prominent Republicans were, of course, referred to critically, but their position of authority was not denied. In both Acceptance speeches and in the "Equality of Rights and Opportunities" address Stevenson alluded to the Biblical statesmen as authorities for his particular theme.

Sign. Argument from sign was noted at least once in every speech, but it was not of major importance, especially in the 1952 speeches. The 1956 speeches appeared to rely more on this proof, apparently because the speaker attempted to indicate signs of failures in the Republican Administration. Most examples of this proof were not clearly evident, but subtly phrased by Stevenson. It was not a proof of major significance in the speeches.

Assumption. The basic assumption running through the entire group of speeches was that victory would come to the Democratic party in the coming elections. In each of the speeches Stevenson reasoned from assumption, gearing his thinking to the particular topic being discussed. Many times the assumption from which Stevenson reasoned was not, in itself, spoken, but was nevertheless the basis for ensuing remarks. An assumption in the "Farm Policy" speech of 1956 was that candidate Eisenhower had reneged on his campaign promises to farmers in 1952, a position vigorously denied by Republicans who interpreted the 1952 campaign promises differently.

Logos--artistic proof.

Inductive reasoning--argument from generalization. Stevenson generalized about world conditions in "World Policy" and "Our Foreign Policy," enumerating many examples to verify his conclusions. He also employed argument from generalization to a lesser degree in most of the other speeches.

Inductive reasoning--argument from causation. This type of argument was used frequently in all the speeches and was a favorite method of reasoning employed by Stevenson. He would mention some event or situation which the Republican Administration had not been able to

avoid, then reason from the cause of the situation that our national action should have been otherwise. In the 1952 speeches, his purpose was to defend the Democratic action of previous years by showing that the cause of beneficial occurrences was intelligent, foresighted action by his Party, while unfortunate events were not avoidable. For a political campaigner, Stevenson illustrated an unusual willingness to discuss the cause and effect relationship of the important issues.

Inductive reasoning--argument from analogy. Not many analogies were noted in the speeches, four speeches completely lacking in this type of proof. In four of the others, only one analogy was found, and not more than three in any speech. This type of reasoning was not of primary significance in the campaign speeches of Stevenson.

Deductive reasoning--argument from syllogism and enthymeme. A limited number of deductive arguments were found, indicating that Stevenson did not depend very heavily on deductive reasoning. His preference was, obviously, inductive reasoning. The deductions found were primarily enthymemes, and not too clearly stated as such.

Ethos.

Sincerity. Stevenson always presented himself as a man of sincerity. He spoke with deep feeling about the issues that meant most to him, and his Party, and obviously was convinced of his stand on all issues. He appeared more humble, more awed by his position in 1952, and the speeches reflected this sincere, humble attitude. The 1956 speeches veered away from this approach considerably, with greater stress on pathos than ethos.

Earnestness. The Democratic candidate wanted to be President, especially in 1956, and as the speeches were considered chronologically,

he appeared more in earnest with every speech. The final address, "Farm Policy," exhibited a man almost desperate, striving hard to grasp an issue that might salvage something from imminent defeat. Stevenson was earnestly presenting his case at all times, and this his opponents would hardly deny.

Devotion. Stevenson had been a reluctant candidate in 1952, but once he accepted the nomination his reluctance vanished, replaced by a conviction that he had to do his utmost for the cause he had been selected to lead. He always spoke reverently, almost, of the traditions of the Party and heaped much praise on the Democratic leaders of the past. The office of President was a man-killing job, and Stevenson was obviously prepared to sacrifice personal comfort to carry out the duties involved.

Patience. The two campaigns required different use of this proof on the part of Stevenson. He pled for patience on the part of citizens in order to give the Democratic Administration an opportunity to solve some of the major problems facing America in 1952. He cautioned against a hasty conclusion to the Korean conflict, urged patience in dealing with the Russians and thought we should wait before committing ourselves to disarmament proposals or nuclear-weapon testing. In 1956, the shoe was on the other foot, and Stevenson minced no words in demanding immediate action to alleviate the distressed farmers, to do something about our diplomatic blundering in the Middle East, and to bring about a change of policy in many other areas. So the appeal to patience, or impatience, as the case may have been, was widely employed.

Friendliness. Indications of this proof were not particularly noticeable, with Stevenson maintaining a campaign above the level of

the hand-shaking, back-slapping variety, especially in 1952. He simply did not rely on this method to advance ethical proof.

Sympathy. This proof was detected quite often throughout the 1956 speeches, with Stevenson appealing for sympathy on behalf of the farmers, the victims of civil rights mistreatment, the laboring groups who complained about Taft-Hartley regulations, and all the citizens who suffer from devaluation of their savings because of inflation. The 1952 speeches did not exhibit as much use of sympathetic proof.

Knowledge of subject. This type of proof was almost entirely implied and rarely explicitly stated by Stevenson. His presentation was such, and the topics he spoke about such, that few questioned his ability to speak intelligently and responsibly on the important issues of the campaign.

Pathos.

Anger. Stevenson rarely used this proof. Only once was anger found in the 1952 speeches and it was not used extensively in the 1956 talks.

Love and friendship. This proof was also rarely relied upon by Stevenson. He seemed to be reluctant to express extreme friendship, but implied the feeling instead.

Enmity and hatred. Not once did Stevenson employ this proof in any of the speeches studied.

Fear. With great consistency Stevenson utilized this proof in both campaigns. He wanted his listeners to be sufficiently aware of the grave problems facing the world in order that they might begin to comprehend the complexity and seriousness of the situation. Especially in "The Atomic Future" and "Control of Nuclear Weapons" did he

stress the awesome potential of these destructive forces and employ fear as a proof to further his point. In both speeches pertaining to farm policy he elicited fear from the audience concerning the future of the rural interest of the nation.

Confidence. Stevenson certainly appeared confident of victory throughout both campaigns, although signs would indicate that towards the end of the 1956 campaign he could see the hand-writing on the wall. He was constantly expressing his confidence in America's bright future, if we availed ourselves of the potential for good work that faced us. The climax of most of the speeches were expressions of confidence in what lay ahead.

Shame. Only three examples of this proof were noted, none of great significance to the theme of the speech involved.

Pity. Only once in the twelve speeches was this proof noted, so we can conclude that Stevenson did not use this proof extensively in his speeches.

Indignation. Stevenson seemed to become increasingly more indignant as the campaigns wore on. The concluding speech in each campaign, "On Liberty of Conscience" in 1952 and "Farm Policy" in 1956 were replete with dozens of indignant accusations directed towards his political opponents. He spared few adjectives as he heaped verbal attacks upon the Republicans from Mr. Eisenhower on down, constantly evoking indignation for the blunders they had been guilty of and their attempts to cover over lightly these errors. The other speeches also illustrated effective use of this proof.

Envy. Not once was this proof discovered.

Emulation. Stevenson reserved this proof for only special individuals, employing this proof as he praised the lives of Eleanor Roosevelt, Harry Truman, George Marshall, Woodrow Wilson, Winston Churchill, and only a few others.

Contempt. This proof was not as frequent as indignation, but when Stevenson did employ it the verbal stings were quite sharp. He spoke with contempt of the Republican attempts to hide the issues of the campaign behind slogans, and hit hard on this point during the final three speeches of the 1956 campaign. When he did use contempt, mixed with his biting irony and satire, the result was pointed and cutting.

Benevolence. This proof was found at times but not with any degree of frequency and was not one of his major emotional proofs.

II. SUMMARY OF ARRANGEMENT.

Each of the twelve speeches studied followed the same organizational pattern. An introduction, a body, and the conclusion were found in that order in each speech.

III. SUMMARY OF STYLE

Level.

The level varied from one speech to the next. In each campaign one speech stood out as primarily an example of high style. "On Liberty of Conscience" in 1952 and "Freedom, Human Welfare and Peace" in 1956 were found to be written mostly in high style. All the other speeches were constructed mostly on middle style level, except "Equality of Rights and Opportunities" and "Farm Policy" which were mostly low style level.

Diction or word choice.

The diction and word choice for each campaign was fairly consistent, but a great divergence was noted between the two campaigns. Stevenson spoke on a more elevated, more sublime plane than was expected for a political campaign in 1952. He altered this approach four years later, bringing his word choice down more to the level of the average listener, and employing fewer lofty phrases and words. The result was disappointing from a rhetorical standpoint, Stevenson seeming to lose much of his stature by lowering his diction level. The results at the polls would indicate that neither approach could have averted defeat in either campaign.

Sentence structure.

Stevenson seemed to be more at home with a complex or complex-compound sentence. He used these types more frequently than the other sentence types, although for emphasis many times he would divide his points into short, simple sentences, often very repetitious. Compound sentences were also found in abundance in certain speeches.

Rhetorical devices and figurative language.

Analogy. Stevenson averaged one analogy per speech, never using more than three and using at least one analogy in all but four of the speeches.

Epigram. Many of the witticisms of Stevenson's were picked up by the newspapers and radio and became epigrams before the campaign had ended. He used more epigrams than most speakers, and used them effectively, often repeating the phrase for emphasis.

Humor. Most of the humor noted in the speeches was tinted with irony or satire. The audiences laughed often, but from indignation, or

satire, or amusement at the semantics employed by the speaker more often than because of straight humor. However, Stevenson did bring in some very humorous comments at times.

Rhetorical question. This was a favorite device of the Democratic candidate throughout most of the speeches. He would ask the audience a number of rhetorical questions after thoroughly discussing a point. He used this device with great effectiveness.

Interrogation. He also used interrogation considerably, more so it seemed in the 1956 speeches.

Irony and satire. Stevenson proved himself a master of ironic comments and satirical statements. He kept his audience amused, interested and attentive with his constant use of this device. He seemed to become more sarcastic as the campaign progressed, until the "Farm Policy" address in 1956 was a classic example of the uninhibited use of irony and satire. Even Mr. Eisenhower was not immune to the verbal thrusts put forth by Stevenson in the last three 1956 speeches.

Contrast. He used this device quite often, primarily in reference to the actions of the two parties on a certain issue, always contrasting the Democratic Party favorably, of course.

Repetition. Stevenson did repeat some of his basic points, often using slightly different language but not altering the meaning of his words. He emphasized his themes by repetition of questions many times.

Climax. Every speech had a climax, usually coming near the end of the address. It was usually a plea for confidence and patience on the part of the populace.

Hyperbole. This was not a device that Stevenson used to any significant degree in the speeches studied.

Onomatopoeia. Several times Stevenson used this device, but not with any great frequency, and usually when it did appear it seemed to be included more for amusement and novelty than any other reason.

Anaphora and epistrophe. The practice of repeating the same words at the beginnings and ends of succeeding sentences was repeatedly used throughout the speeches. Stevenson emphasized his major themes by implementation of this device.

Allusion and reference. Stevenson alluded to at least three or four prominent names in history during each speech in order to lend authority to his views. He also referred frequently to events of significance in the past pages of history.

Understatement. Only a few examples of this device were noted and they were not of primary importance in the evaluation of the speech.

Metaphor. About one metaphor per speech was discovered in the study of the twelve addresses.

Simile. The use of simile was negligible in the speeches studied. Not more than eight were detected in the entire group.

Personification. This was a favorite device of the speaker, used at least a half-dozen times on the average in each speech. Stevenson personified all sorts of entities, often arriving at some very imaginative conclusions.

Alliteration. Stevenson used much alliteration in all speeches, and several times appeared to intentionally seek out words with similar sounds to express his thoughts. Alliteration was quite noticeable in most of the speeches.

IV. GENERAL SUMMARY

The twelve speeches were studied as a unit, but it soon became apparent that the six speeches from the 1952 campaign differed considerably from those of the 1956 campaign. This difference was most emphatic in style level, in diction and word choice, in variation of emphasis upon ethos and pathos, and in uses of different rhetorical devices.

The six speeches of 1952, in the area of Invention, tended to stress causation, evidence and authority as modes of proof. In the field of ethos, the Democratic candidate emphasized mostly sincerity, devotion and patience. Pathos was primarily conveyed through the mediums of confidence, benevolence and emulation.

The arrangement in all six speeches followed the usual pattern of division into three parts, the Introduction, Body, and Conclusion.

Style varied greatly, from high style in one speech to low style in another, depending upon the occasion and the audience. The diction was more elevated than usual for political campaigning, and the word choice on a higher level than would have been expected. The sentences were of all sorts, lengthy and complex sentences predominating. Considering the field of rhetorical devices, it became apparent that Stevenson employed considerable amounts of figurative expression, with rhetorical question, alliteration, personification, and contrast most prominent.

Considering the speeches of the 1956 campaign, in the area of Invention, argument from evidence, causation and sign were most prominent and frequently found. Only a small amount of reasoning by deduction was noted. In the field of ethos, Stevenson used earnestness,

sympathy and sincerity as his primary modes of proof. He did not stress the area of ethos as much in 1956 as he had four years earlier. Instead, more emphasis was placed upon pathos, with particular stress on anger, fear, indignation and contempt.

The arrangement of the speeches in 1956 was similar to the earlier talks, divided into the three commonly accepted divisions of Introduction, Body and Conclusion.

Style again varied, from high style in one speech to low style in two others, with much middle style found in all six talks. The diction and word choice had been altered considerably from the 1952 talks. He now spoke on a lower level, with simpler words, more repetition of thoughts, and easier-to-comprehend issues discussed. The sentences were neither so long nor so complex as earlier, and the excessive use of adjectives and adverbs of an ornate nature was minimized. The rhetorical devices of greatest significance were irony and satire, rhetorical question, repetition, onomatopoeia, personification and alliteration.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

The purpose of this study was to examine the rhetorical qualities in a representative group of Stevenson's campaign speeches of 1952 and 1956. The analysis covered only six addresses from each campaign, selected by their content and topic from the hundreds delivered by the candidate for President. Each campaign was represented by one speech from each of six areas considered most important during the course of both campaigns. It was deemed foolish and too burdensome to have attempted the analyzation of more speeches. The speeches studied covered only the campaigns, and did not include the other speaking and writing

that Stevenson had done. One of the motivating reasons for his nomination in 1952 was the fine record he had attained as a public speaker during the decade previously. Stevenson had spoken upon innumerable topics and before audiences of great diversity. Further study could attempt to analyze that portion of his speaking career not involved with the Presidential campaigns.

Of course this study has of necessity been limited in scope and has not covered with any degree of thoroughness the entire rhetorical implications of the campaign speeches. For example, any one of the areas of Invention, Arrangement or Style could have been the basis for a more thorough investigation of the speeches studied. Many possibilities remain for exploration into the speeches of Stevenson.

As this thesis was nearing completion, the future of Adlai E. Stevenson remained a mystery. The strange web of circumstance and fate hold the destiny of this man who tried hard to become President and who utilized to the utmost the oratorical abilities and rhetorical qualities he possessed. Apparently, as of this date, his has not been the case of the man who could affect the ultimate result of history by the power of speech. However, after the passing of time, and after his career has ended, further studies of Adlai Stevenson will determine his final place as a public speaker in the history of his country.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

- Brigance, William Norwood. Speech Composition. New York: Appleton, Century, Crofts, Inc., 1953.
- Busch, Noel F. Adlai E. Stevenson of Illinois. New York: Farmer, Straus and Young, 1952.
- Cooper, Lane. (trans.). The Rhetoric of Aristotle. New York: Appleton, Century, Crofts, Inc., 1932.
- Martin, John B. Adlai Stevenson. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1952.
- Stevenson, Adlai E. The Major Campaign Speeches of Adlai E. Stevenson. New York: Random House, 1952.
- Sutton, E. W. and Rackham, H. (trans.). De Oratore of Cicero. 2 vols. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1942.
- Webster's Collegiate Dictionary. Springfield, Massachusetts: G. & C. Merriam Company, 1948.
- Whately, Richard. Rhetoric. London: Charles Griffin and Company, 1872.

B. PERIODICALS

- Auer, J. Jeffrey. Doctoral Dissertations in Speech: Work in Progress, 1956," Speech Monographs, XXIII (June, 1956).
- Haberman, Frederick W. "A Bibliography of Rhetoric and Public Address for the Year 1952," Speech Monographs, XX (June, 1953).
- _____. "A Bibliography of Rhetoric and Public Address for the Year 1953," Speech Monographs, XXI (June, 1954).
- _____. "A Bibliography of Rhetoric and Public Address for the Year 1954," Speech Monographs, XXII (June, 1955).
- _____. "A Bibliography of Rhetoric and Public Address for the Year 1955," Speech Monographs, XXIII (August, 1956).
- Knower, Franklin H. "Graduate Theses--An Index of Graduate Work in Speech," Speech Monographs, XXI (June, 1954).

- _____. "Graduate Theses—An Index of Graduate Work in Speech," Speech Monographs, XXII (June, 1955).
- _____. "Graduate Theses—An Index of Graduate Work in Speech," Speech Monographs, XXIII (August, 1956).
- New York Times, August, 1952–November, 1952; August, 1956–November, 1956.
- Newsweek, July, 1952–November, 1952; August, 1956–November, 1956.
- Revere, R. H. "Adlai Stevenson of Libertyville, Illinois," New York Times Magazine, (September 13, 1953).
- Saturday Review of Literature, "Portrait of Adlai E. Stevenson," XXXVII (August 28, 1954).
- Stevenson, Adlai E. "Speech of Acceptance," Vital Speeches, XXII, No. 22 (September 1, 1956).
- _____. "Freedom, Human Welfare and Peace," Vital Speeches, XXII, No. 24 (October 1, 1956).
- _____. "Equality of Rights and Opportunities," New York Times, CVI, No. 36, 049 (October 5, 1956).
- _____. "Our Foreign Policy," Vital Speeches, XXIII, No. 2 (November 1, 1956).
- _____. "Control of Nuclear Weapons," New York Times, CVI, No. 36,068 (October 24, 1956).
- _____. "Farm Policy," New York Times, CVI, No. 36,070 (October 26, 1956).
- Time, July, 1952–November, 1952; July, 1956–November, 1956.
- United States News and World Report, "Stevenson: The Man and His Story," XXXIII (August, 1952).
- Windes, Russell Jr. and Robinson, James A. "Public Address in the Career of Adlai E. Stevenson," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XLIII (October, 1956).

APPENDIX

SPEECH OF ACCEPTANCE

Democratic National Convention
Chicago, Illinois
July 26, 1952

I accept your nomination--and your program.

I should have preferred to hear those words uttered by a stronger, a wiser, a better man than myself. But, after listening to the President's speech, I feel better about myself!

None of you, my friends, can wholly appreciate what is in my heart. I can only hope that you may understand my words. They will be few.

I have not sought the honor you have done me. I could not seek it because I aspired to another office, which was the full measure of my ambition. One does not treat the highest office within the gift of the people of Illinois as an alternative or as a consolation prize.

I would not seek your nomination for the Presidency because the burdens of that office stagger the imagination. Its potential for good or evil now and in the years of our lives smothers exultation and converts vanity to prayer.

I have asked the Merciful Father--the Father of us all--to let this cup pass from me. But from such dread responsibility one does not shrink in fear, in self-interest, or in false humility.

So, "If this cup may not pass from me, except I drink it, Thy will be done."

That my heart has been troubled, that I have not sought this nomination, that I could not seek it in honest self-appraisal, is not to say that I value it the less. Rather, it is that I revere the office of the Presidency of the United States.

And now, my friends, that you have made your decision, I will fight to win that office with all my heart and soul. And, with your help, I have no doubt that we will win.

You have summoned me to the highest mission within the gift of any people. I could not be more proud. Better men than I were at hand for this mighty task, and I owe to you and to them every resource of mind and of strength that I possess to make your deed today a good one for our country and for our party. I am confident too, that your selection of a candidate for Vice-President will strengthen me and our party immeasurably in the hard, the implacable work that lies ahead for all of us.

I know you join me in gratitude and respect for the great Democrats and the leaders of our generation whose names you have considered here in this Convention, whose vigor, whose character, whose devotion to the

Republic we love so well have won the respect of countless Americans and have enriched our party. I shall need them, we shall need them, because I have not changed in any respect since yesterday. Your nomination, awesome as I find it, has not enlarged my capacities. So I am profoundly grateful and emboldened by their comradeship and their fealty, and I have been deeply moved by their expressions of good will and support. And I cannot, my friends, resist the urge to take the one opportunity that has been afforded me to pay my humble respects to a very great and good American, whom I am proud to call my kinsman, Alben Barkley of Kentucky.

Let me say, too, that I have been heartened by the conduct of this Convention. You have argued and disagreed, because as Democrats you care and you care deeply. But you have disagreed and argued without calling each other liars and thieves, without despoiling our best traditions in any naked struggles for power.

And you have written a platform that neither equivocates, contradicts nor evades. You have restated our party's record, its principles and its purposes, in language that none can mistake, and with a firm confidence in justice, freedom and peace on earth that will raise the hearts and the hopes of mankind for that distant day when no one rattles a saber and no one drags a chain.

For all these things I am grateful to you. But I feel no exultation, no sense of triumph. Our troubles are all ahead of us. Some will call us appeasers; others will say we are the war party. Some will say we are reactionary. Others will say that we stand for socialism. There will be the inevitable cries of "throw the rascals out"; "it's time for a change"; and so on and so on.

We'll hear all those things and many more besides. But we will hear nothing that we have not heard before. I am not too much concerned with partisan denunciation, with epithets and abuse, because the workingman, the farmer, the thoughtful businessman, all know that they are better off than ever before and they all know that the greatest danger to free enterprise in this country died with the great depression under the hammer blows of the Democratic Party.

Nor am I afraid that the two-party system is in danger. Certainly the Republican Party looked brutally alive a couple of weeks ago, and I mean both Republican parties! Nor am I afraid that the Democratic Party is old and fat and indolent. After 150 years it has been old for a long time; and it will never be indolent as long as it looks forward and not back, as long as it commands the allegiance of the young and the hopeful who dream the dreams and see the visions of a better America and a better world.

You will hear many sincere and thoughtful people express concern about the continuation of one party in power for twenty years. I don't belittle this attitude. But change for the sake of change has no absolute merit in itself. If our greatest hazard is preservation of the values of Western civilization, in our self-interest alone, if you please, is it the part of wisdom to change for the sake of change to a party with a split personality;

to a leader, whom we all respect, but who has been called upon to minister to a hopeless case of political schizophrenia?

If the fear is corruption in official position, do you believe with Charles Evan Hughes that guilt is personal and knows no party? Do you doubt the power of any political leader, if he has the will to do so, to set his own house in order without his neighbors having to burn it down?

What does concern me, in common with thinking partisans of both parties, is not just winning the election, but how it is won, how well we can take advantage of this great quadrennial opportunity to debate issues sensibly and soberly. I hope and pray that we Democrats, win or lose, can campaign not as a crusade to exterminate the opposing party, as our opponents seem to prefer, but as a great opportunity to educate and elevate a people whose destiny is leadership, not alone of a rich and prosperous, contented country as in the past, but of a world in ferment.

And, my friends, more important than winning the election is governing the nation. That is the test of a political party--the acid, final test. When the tumult and the shouting die, when the bands are gone and the lights are dimmed, there is the stark reality of responsibility in an hour of history haunted with those gaunt, grim specters of strife, dissension and materialism at home, and ruthless, inscrutable and hostile power abroad.

The ordeal of the twentieth century--the bloodiest, most turbulent era of the Christian age--is far from over. Sacrifice, patience, understanding and implacable purpose may be our lot for years to come. Let's face it. Let's talk sense to the American people. Let's tell them the truth, that there are no gains without pains, that we are now on the eve of great decisions, not easy decisions, like resistance when you're attacked, but a long, patient, costly struggle which alone can assure triumph over the great enemies of man--war, poverty and tyranny--and the assaults upon human dignity which are the most grievous consequences of each.

Let's tell them that the victory to be won in the twentieth century, this portal to the Golden Age, mocks the pretensions of individual acumen and ingenuity. For it is a citadel guarded by thick walls of ignorance and of mistrust which do not fall before the trumpet's blast or the politicians' imprecations or even a general's baton. They are, my friends, walls that must be directly stormed by the hosts of courage, of morality and of vision, standing shoulder to shoulder, unafraid of ugly truth, contemptuous of lies, half truths, circuses and demagoguery.

The people are wise--wiser than the Republicans think. And the Democratic Party is the people's party, not the labor party, not the farmer's party, not the employer's party--it is the party of no one because it is the party of everyone.

That I think, is our ancient mission. Where we have deserted it we have failed. With your help there will be no desertion now. Better we lose the election than mislead the people; and better we lose than misgovern the people. Help me to do the job in this autumn of conflict

and of campaign; help me to do the job in these years of darkness, doubt and of crisis which stretch beyond the horizon of tonight's happy vision, and we will justify our glorious past and the loyalty of silent millions who look to us for compassion, for understanding and for honest purpose. Thus we will serve our great tradition greatly.

I ask of you all you have; I will give to you all I have, even as he who came here tonight and honored me, as he has honored you--the Democratic Party--by a lifetime of service and bravery that will find him an imperishable page in the history of the Republic and of the Democratic Party--President Harry S. Truman.

And finally, my friends, in the staggering task you have assigned me, I shall always try "to do justly and to love mercy and to walk humbly with my God."

FARM POLICY

National Plowing Contest
Kasson, Minnesota
September 6, 1952

I am grateful for the opportunity to talk with you about the national farm policies. I won't waste your time this afternoon telling you, in the political tradition, all about how I am myself a farmer. I own farm land in Illinois, and I come from a family that has lived in the heart of the Corn Belt for over a hundred years. But I am here today as a candidate for public office--not masquerading as a dirt farmer, but as a politician.

My first venture into public service was in Washington in the old Agricultural Adjustment Administration. That was in the desolate days of 1933, when the American farmer, like everybody else, was flat on his back. I do not want to suggest to anyone that we Democrats are still running against Herbert Hoover, but I am thankful for my AAA experience, because it showed me in a way I will never forget how bad conditions can get on our farms--conditions that must never occur again.

In this spirit, Democratic administrations have developed the farm policies of the last twenty years. As a result, we of this generation, who saw farm conditions at their worst in 1932, have had a happy privilege of seeing them over the last decade at their best. I am proud of the work my party has done in these twenty years to restore the American farmer to a position of equality and dignity in our national life.

For the last three and a half years I have been Governor of a great agricultural state. In this capacity I have worked closely with farmers and farm organizations. With their help and co-operation, we have reorganized our Illinois Department of Agriculture; and, if you will forgive a commercial here at Kasson for a rival show, we have improved our great Illinois State Fair and cut the cost to the taxpayer by two-thirds. I have relied on farmers' advice in other fields too--notably school and highway legislation. We now have under way in Illinois the largest highway program since advent of the hard road. For the first time a share of our gasoline tax is going to the townships for the rural roads.

I come to you today as the Democratic candidate for the greatest responsibility on earth--the Presidency of the United States. I am running on the Democratic platform. I believe it is a good platform. I believe its agricultural plank is clear, definite and sound. I can stand on it without squirming. I feel no need to modify this provision or that, to explain or to reinterpret, to dodge or to hedge.

And I am for this platform, above all, because I believe that its pledges are not just in the interest of the farmer--they are in the public interest. I know that the American farmers do not want, nor will they get through any effort of mine, anything more than what is justified by the larger good of the commonwealth. We can stand on the words of the first

philosopher of American agriculture, Thomas Jefferson: "Equal rights for all; special privileges for none."

A society can be no better than the men and women who compose it. The heart of any farm policy must therefore be the life of those who work the farms. Our objective is to make that life full and satisfying. We believe, as Democrats have always believed, that our society rests on an agricultural base. It is our determination to keep that base solid and healthy. Our farms must grow more than crops and livestock. They must grow what Walt Whitman described as the best bar against tyranny--"a large, resolute breed of men."

This means that farm policy must focus first on the question of farm income. This is not because farmers are more concerned with money than any other group of society. It is because farmers, like all other citizens, are entitled to a fair return for their labor and a fair chance in the world for their children. In the past, the labor of the farmer has remained the same; but his income has risen or sunk according to the unpredictable fluctuations of the market. It has been a constant objective of our Democratic farm programs to maintain farm income--and thereby to assure the farmer that he can provide food, medical care and education for his family.

The way we have chosen to maintain farm income is to support farm prices. Our platform lays this out in clear language. Here is what it says: "We will continue to protect the producers of basic agricultural commodities under the terms of a mandatory price-support program at not less than 90 per cent of parity."

There are no ifs, buts or maybes about this. And I think it is a policy that most farmers today understand and believe in. I only wish that everybody understood it so well. One place where it was clearly not understood was at the great fracas in the Chicago stockyards, two months ago, where one of the casualties was the farm plank in the Republican platform. There are, of course, two Republican Parties for agriculture as well as two Republican Parties for foreign policy and almost everything else. The General evidently decided this morning to plow under the Republican platform altogether.

As you all know, the Chicago slaughter finally ended in a cease-fire agreement. According to that agreement--better known as the Republican platform--Republican policy is aimed--that is their word--"aimed" at parity levels. That phrase may have looked good in a smoke-filled room in Chicago. It isn't very clear here in the daylight of Minnesota. There is, and no one should know it better than my distinguished opponent, a vast difference between aiming at a target and hitting it.

How good is their aim anyway? Their sights were a mile off in June of this year when more than half the Republican members of the House of Representatives voted against the law that extended price support at 90 per cent of parity through 1954.

If the Republican candidate says one thing, the Republican platform says something else, and the Republican members of Congress say still

another--how then can anyone tell what a Republican administration would actually do in Washington?

There should be no mysteries about price supports. What our program does is to place a floor under our agricultural economy in order to protect the farmer against sudden and violent price drops. What it does is to maintain farm income--and the farmer's purchasing power--in those uneasy moments when there is a temporary glut in the market, or when real depression threatens. By stabilizing farm income, our program maintains markets for the businessman and the worker. The total effect, obviously, is to help stabilize the whole national economy at a high level of production and employment.

I know that opponents of the program claim that price supports raise food prices for housewives. Let us examine this charge a moment. Food prices are high enough today, heaven knows. But supports are not the reason. High employment and strong purchasing power--in short, prosperity--are keeping most farm prices above support levels.

What the support program does do is to encourage farmers to grow more food. You can now plant crops fairly secure in the knowledge that prices will still be good at market time. That is one reason why farm production has increased almost 50 percent in the last twenty years. The support program thus helps to keep supply up with demand--and that is the way to keep prices from going up.

The price-support program thus does more than assure a decent life and a fair opportunity for most of our farm families. It also improves the life of the boys and girls in our cities. From your farms today food pours in a steady stream to every corner of the country. Think what this means in the terms of human lives! We are feeding thirty million more people than there were in our land in 1932; and we are giving the average American a far better diet. More than that, this better diet costs the average person no greater share of his income, after taxes, than it did in 1932--if he was lucky enough to have any income, after or even before taxes, in that gloomy year.

I am not presuming for a moment to say that support at 90 per cent of parity is necessarily the permanent or only answer. Economic conditions are constantly changing and I think this program, like all our economic policies, should be constantly reappraised to determine if it is fair to the taxpayer and responsive to our needs. We are all dependent on one another and the only certainty of a stable, prosperous agriculture is a stable, prosperous nation.

The price-support program is doing a good job for the basic crops--corn, cotton, wheat, rice, and the others--for which loan and storage operations are now in effect. The same protection could be accorded to other storable commodities.

For perishable products, however, such as hogs, dairy products, fruits and vegetables, these loan and storage operations do not work well. Yet these products provide about three-fourths of all the income received

by farmers.

Our first line of defense for the producers of perishables is, of course, a strong economic policy that will insure, so far as it is humanly possible to do so, high employment and purchasing power. But behind this there should be protection against unreasonably low prices for those producers of perishables who need it. They should know they can expand production and that the public that benefits will bear part of the risk.

I do not underestimate the difficulty of finding a satisfactory method of doing this. And I can only hope that with continued careful study and close consultation with farmers and their leaders ways will be found to do something both practical and effective.

The farm problem has changed much since the thirties. Once abundance created surpluses because people could not buy what the farmer could produce. Today we seek even greater production as we look ahead to a thirty or forty million increase in our population in the next twenty-five years.

Nevertheless, there is the constant necessity to adjust output to need in the short run. We have worked out excellent voluntary methods for doing this.

The Republican leadership would now dispense entirely with production controls. "We do not believe in restrictions on the American farmer's ability to produce," their platform states in one of its rare bursts of clarity. Well, I do not like acreage allotments and marketing quotas myself. I hope--we all have good reason to hope--that a growing population and expanding markets will keep us from again needing controls for staple crops.

But farmers have learned from bitter experience that we need these controls in reserve. I learned how useful they could be in the hard school of the triple-A. Incidentally, there could be no tobacco program at all right now without marketing quotas--as every tobacco farmer knows. I would never favor controls for the sake of control. But I think we have to face a practical problem when we see one.

Price policy is the heart of the farm program but it is not the whole of it. Farming is a way of using our great inheritance of water and land; and it is a way of life. Our effort must be to improve the quality and content of life for our farm families. I hope to have a personal part in the continuation and extension of the policies which in the last twenty years have given farm life new strength and new dignity--and so restored it to its old place of honor in the Republic.

We of this generation are the trustees of our soil and water resources for our children and their children. We have an elaborate soil-conservation program. It too should have constant scrutiny to determine if we are getting the maximum value in land improvement out of our conservation tax dollar. We still have far to go in upstream flood prevention and water and forest conservation. And I wish I could say that every farmer was using the best conservation methods to protect his farm--methods such as those demonstrated here at Kasson at this magnificent and

celebrated exhibition. With the kind of local leadership you have in the Conservation Service and Districts we see here today, we will get the job done everywhere in time, and I would say very soon in Minnesota.

You may have heard that, where administration is concerned, I am no admirer of mere size. Let us strive for big men, not big government. We must continue to decentralize the management of our agricultural and conservation programs and, if anything, increase farmer participation. I like to think of soil conservation as democracy at work with technical assistance. I think we can go further toward making local administration compact and efficient, and getting dollar-for-dollar value for the money we spend.

Rural electrification is one of our finest national achievements in this generation. It is more than a government program. It is a blessing.

It means electric lights for farm families who have had to live by coal-oil lamps. It means electric power for the farm wife in place of the back-breaking labor of the old-fashioned washtub and the hand pump. It means electric power to grind the farmer's feed, heat his brooder house, and help him with a hundred other chores. You know about this in Minnesota, where the number of electrified farms has risen from 7 per cent in 1935 to 90 per cent today.

The great task of bringing electricity to the farm is now far along to completion. It must be finished, and generation and transmission facilities must be adequate to meet the constantly growing demand for power on the farm, at prices the farmer can afford to pay.

We must also look toward the time when every farm home may be in touch with its neighbors, the doctor and the world through rural telephone service.

The chief agency in this miraculous transformation in country living has been the farmer-owned co-operative. I've been a member of one for years and the co-operative seems to me a wonderful example of people solving their own local problems in their own way. Its effectiveness must not be crippled by hostile legislation.

There is one final part of our farm program which especially concerns me.

Farm ownership and the family farm are the foundation on which our whole agricultural system is built. From 1880 to 1932 we lost ground on farm ownership. In these years—years, incidentally, when Republicans were mostly in power and hadn't yet invented that slogan "it's time for a change"—the proportion of farm owners declined, until by 1932, 43 per cent of all farmers—two out of every five—were either tenants or sharecroppers. That trend has now been reversed; three-fourths of our farmers now own their farms.

We have recovered, in twenty years, the ground lost in the previous fifty. I've sold some farms and I've seen to it that they were sold to operators, not landlords, where possible.

Things are not yet as they should be. Many young, vigorous and ambitious men would like to become owners of farms. What is more serious, many farmers cannot, with their existing land and equipment, make a decent living from the soil. In 1950, more than one million farmers had net incomes from all sources including outside employment of less than \$1,000. How can a farmer rear, clothe and educate a family on that? We can take pride in our remarkable progress, but we cannot be complacent.

Research, housing, and credit programs particularly must be focused on this problem of rural poverty. No one should promise miracles here; but there must be ways to help the industrious small farmer who wants to help himself. That kind of American is a good risk. And no one knows it better than my running mate, Senator John Sparkman, who has led the battle for them, and who was himself one of eleven children of an impoverished tenant farmer.

This nation faces a stern present and a challenging future. The American farmer has a great role to play in these next critical years of precarious balance in the world. Our national commitment to an expanding economy rests upon the continued growth of our agriculture. Our struggle to strengthen the free world against communism demands the continued and growing productivity of the American farm. A hungry man is not a free man. In the long run, peace will be won in the turnrows, not on the battlefields.

The last twenty years have established a framework of justice and equity within which the farmer can do his indispensable part for the greater strength and safety of our nation. Only in an atmosphere of growth and confidence can the farmer make his necessary contribution to our nation, and our nation its necessary contribution to the worldwide fight for freedom.

If I didn't feel that the party which saw our needs and charted our course in the past is the best custodian of our future I would not be the Democratic candidate for President, and I would not be here on this great day in Kassel asking not for your thanks, but for your confidence.

And now let us get back to the plowing.

WORLD POLICY

Veterans Memorial Auditorium
San Fransisco, California
September 9, 1952

I want to share with you, if I may, a letter from a California lady who knew my parents when they lived here fifty years ago. She writes that after Grover Cleveland was nominated for the Presidency in 1892 and my grandfather was nominated for Vice President, she named her two kittens Grover Cleveland and Adlai Stevenson. Grover, she writes me, couldn't stand the excitement of the campaign and died before the election. But Adlai lived to be a very old cat.

And this, my friends, is obviously for me the most comforting incident of the campaign so far.

As your chairman said, because of my prior service here (at the United Nations Conference in 1945) and because San Fransisco is our window to the Far East, I want to talk soberly tonight about foreign policy.

We think and we talk a lot these days about our dangers. We should think and talk more about our opportunities as well.

Victory or defeat for a nation, as for a man, springs, first of all, from its attitudes toward the world. The men who built the West had victory in their hearts and songs on their lips. They were doers, not worriers. They really believed that the Lord helps those who help themselves.

There is something badly wrong, it seems to me, with the perspective of men who call the last ten years the "dismal decade."

And there is something odd, too, in a point of view which at once endorses the nation's foreign policies and promises to save you at the same time from such enlightened bungling.

It was some such curious mixture which was served up in Philadelphia on last Thursday. Now I am reluctant to believe that my honored opponent has been persuaded that bad history is good politics--perhaps he hopes that the Republican Old Guard will swallow his bitter pill of approval of our policies if it is sugar-coated with condemnation of Democrats.

At any rate, however we interpret it, his speech in Philadelphia does not dispose of foreign policy as an issue in this campaign. The General's ten-point program, of which three points were "throw the rascals out", and seven were a recital of the same foreign-policy goals which the "Democratic rascals" have been following for years, does not, it seems to me, contribute much to our foreign-policy discussion.

But foreign policy consists of much more than the setting of goals. Even the extremist wing of the Republican Party will not really argue

that peace and prosperity are bad or that the nation does not want allies.

The rub comes in doing anything to make progress toward these goals which we are glad the Republican candidates agree upon. A president can suggest but he cannot pass laws. That's the job of Congress.

And the most powerful and numerous wing of the Republican Party--the wing that would control all of the important Congressional committees--would not support the program which the Republican presidential candidate endorsed last Thursday.

How do I know? Well, because the Old Guard has been fighting the same identical program for years.

Let me illustrate.

My opponent spoke approvingly of foreign trade. Now, among other things, it is not exactly a new idea to Democrats that a thriving foreign trade means better markets for American agriculture and industry and a better balance in world economy.

I don't think even the Republicans will try to take credit for the Reciprocal Trade Agreements program. Certainly the Old Guard won't. It has been trying to wreck that program every time it comes up for renewal--as it does again next year.

I don't think that a Republican President could even get a bill to renew it out of a committee--not, at any rate, without crippling amendments. Or are we to assume that the Republican leaders in Congress have been opposing it in the past not from conviction but just because it was a Democratic program?

I could go on--talking of their attacks on our assistance program, even on the defense budgets, and similar knife work--for the Republican record in Congress is as long as it is wrong.

How, then, can a disunited party unite the country for the hard tasks that lie ahead? I don't think it can. No matter how great their commander, divided and embittered men do not win battles.

America is threatened as never before. The question history asks and which we must answer is whether the idea of individualism--the idea of personal freedom for you and me--is equal to the idea of collectivism--the idea of personal subordination to the state; whether the idea of maximum personal liberty is equal to the idea of maximum personal discipline.

This ancient contest between freedom and despotism, which is renewed in every generation, is acute in ours. And the most important single event, it seems to me, in our history is that it is our turn to be freedom's shield and sanctuary.

I don't think that war is an inevitable part of this contest. Even the most ambitious and ruthless men do not deliberately invite destruction

of the basis of their power. They can throw the iron dice, but they know they cannot foretell the fortunes of war.

We who are free must have great strength in order that weakness will not tempt the ambitious. And the measure of the strength we must have is not what we would like to afford but what the adversary compels us to afford.

With 85 per cent of our budget allocated to defense, it is the Soviet Union which now fixes the level of our defense expenditures and thus of our tax rates. The only way to emancipate ourselves from this foreign control, and to cut taxes substantially, is first to develop our strength and then to find the means of ending the armaments race.

And here let me say something to those abroad who may mistake our present wrangling for weakness. We have always had differences of opinion which have produced all sorts of noises and confusion--especially in campaign years! But it is the kind of noise that, to the inner ear, is the sweet music of free institutions. It is the kind of noise that has produced the harmony of firm purpose whenever our people have been put to the test. The costliest blunders have been made by dictators who did not quite understand the workings of real democracy and who mistook diversity for disunity.

No one can predict, and it would be foolish to try to predict, how and when the peaceful purpose of our power will succeed in creating a just and durable peace.

But are our efforts conditional upon assurance of prompt success? To answer "yes" would be to accept the certainty of eventual defeat.

Co-existence is not a form of passive acceptance of things as they are. It is waging the contest between freedom and tyranny by peaceful means. It will involve negotiation and adjustment--compromise and not appeasement--and I will never shrink from these if they would advance the world toward a more secure peace.

Though progress may be slow, it can be steady and sure. A wise man does not try to hurry history. Many wars have been avoided by patience and many have been precipitated by reckless haste.

In Europe, our efforts to build patiently for peace are meeting with success. The Marshall Plan has brought, as we all know, a striking improvement in political and economic conditions. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization is building a strong system of military defense. Europe is not yet wholly secure against subversion from within or attack from without, but this goal of security is, at least, in sight.

I wish I could say the same for Asia, but there would be no greater disservice to the American people than to underestimate the gravity of the dangers that America faces in this area, perhaps for many years to come.

Now, it's about America's relations with Asia that I should like to talk with you tonight, soberly and realistically.

Across the continent of Asia more than a billion of the world's peoples are churning in one of history's greatest upheavals. All the struggles of man over the centuries—economic, political, spiritual—have come together in Asia and now seem to be reaching a climax.

The causes behind that upheaval are many and varied. But there is nothing complicated about what the people want. They want a decent living—and they want freedom.

The word most frequently used by Asians to describe their aspirations is nationalism.

Nationalism to Asians means a chance to stand on their own feet, a chance to govern themselves, a chance to develop their resources for their own welfare, and a chance to prove that the color of their skins has nothing to do with their right to walk with self-respect among their fellow men in the world. Nationalism to them means the end of a legalized inferiority. It means pride, spirit, faith.

This type of nationalism is not inconsistent with closer co-operation among nations nor with the need for an enforceable peace. The Asians actually regard freedom and national independence as the doorway to international order—just as we do.

Russia's interest in Asia is nothing new.

The expansionist aims of Russia did not change with the passing of the Czars. But today the steel glove of a revolutionary ideology covers the heavy hand of imperialist expansion.

The strategy of communism in Asia is to pose as the champion—the only champion—of the Asian peoples. Communism has not created the cause or the forces behind Asia's vast upheaval. It is attempting to give direction to those forces. It seeks to impose its own label on the multiple revolutions going on in Asia today by identifying itself with the deeply felt needs and hopes of the Asian peoples.

There's an important difference, it seems to me, between communism as we view it and communism as some of the Asian peoples view it. When we think of communism we think of what we are going to lose. When many of the Asiatics think of communism they think of what they are going to gain—especially if they believe that they have nothing to lose.

It's important that we know these things and think about them, for we shall never be able to cope with communism unless we understand the emotional basis of its appeal.

The communists have failed to incite the workers to revolution in Western Europe. They have failed to turn the Western Allies one against the other.

But the communists may well believe that in the aspirations and the grievances of the East they now have the key to world power. They hope,

and perhaps even expect, that the West cannot rise to the challenge in the East.

Furthermore, they may not feel the same need for quick and tidy solutions that is felt in certain quarters in our own country. They may believe that they can afford to have a patience equal to the stakes involved.

And the stakes are nothing less than an overwhelming preponderance of power--for with Asia under control, they could turn with new energy and vast new resources in an effort to win a bloodless victory in a weakened, frightened Europe.

These communist expectations define the dimensions of the threat we face in Asia and of the tasks which lie ahead for us--tasks which can be met only by disciplined, resourceful, imaginative, and reasoned effort. It is an effort which has two parts: defense and development.

There is active fighting, as we all know, in Malaya and in Indo-China. Have we given fitting recognition to the hard, bitter and prolonged efforts of the British, the French, the native Malayan and Indo-Chinese forces? These efforts have involved heavy loss of life and great material costs.

What will the defensive task require of us in these areas, and in the Philippines, Formosa, Japan, and Korea? What contributions, what commitments to security in this area should we make and can we make to the emerging system of Pacific defense?

These are some of the questions, the hard, the ugly questions we must face before disaster, not afterward. This is no time, it seems to me, to kid ourselves with press agents' platitudes.

In Korea we took a long step toward building a security system in Asia. As an American I am proud that we had the courage to resist that ruthless, cynical aggression; and I am equally proud that we have had the fortitude to refuse to risk extension of that war despite extreme communist provocations and reckless Republican criticism.

Whatever unscrupulous politicians may say to exploit grief, tragedy and discontent for votes, history will never record that Korea was a "useless" war, unless today's heroism is watered with tomorrow's cowardice.

On other occasions I have spoken and written much about the solid accomplishments which the Korean war has made possible. Tonight let me say only this:

I believe we may in time look back at Korea as a major turning point in history--a turning point which led not to another terrible war, but to the first historic demonstration that an effective system of collective security is possible.

Having failed to defeat us on the field of battle, the enemy there now seeks to defeat us by prolonging the negotiations and by exhausting our

patience.

But some men in this country seem to think that if definitive victory cannot be won, we should either take reckless military action or give the whole thing up. Such advice plays into the enemy's hands. The contest with tyranny is not a hundred-yard dash--it is a test of endurance.

This defensive effort in Korea and elsewhere in Asia is building a shield behind which we have the opportunity to assist in the other great task--the task of development.

Listening to the debate over China this past year, I had the distinct impression at times that the very Congressmen whose vocal cords were most active in the cause of isolation and against foreign entanglements were the same ones who were now talking as if they had wanted us to take part in a civil war in China.

The time to stop a revolution is at the beginning, not the end. But I don't recall any pleas from these critics for help for Sun-Yat-Sen and Chinese democracy back in the twenties. Nor did I hear them demanding intervention by the United States in the mid-thirties when civil war with the communists broke out. Indeed it was not until quite recently, when the Chinese wars were about over, that there was even an audible whisper that we help fight a hindsight war, that we should have given more help to China than we did.

It would seem to me, my friends, that the Republican critics could better demonstrate the good faith of their concern for Asia by doing something about India and Pakistan today rather than talking about China yesterday. I don't think that tearful and interminable post-mortems about China will save any souls for democracy in the rest of Asia, the Near East and in Africa.

India is not caught up in civil strife. It can be helped in a way that is natural to us and best for it; help in the ways of peace and of social progress. India has to grow more food. It has to restore its land. It needs new resources of power. In short, it needs a democratic helping hand in the development programs it has already charted for itself.

The same is true of many other countries.

It is help of this kind that we can provide by sending agricultural experts, engineers and other trained people to these countries, and through programs of assistance to economic development.

By working with each country to expand the production of goods which are needed by other countries in the region, a self-generating and self-financing cycle of trade and development can be initiated, which will reduce and can eventually eliminate the need for American aid. At the same time, we can enlarge our export markets and develop new sources of the products we need to import.

Land reform is, of course, fundamental to the problem of Asia. But in these ways and by this kind of friendly advice and counsel we can help to guide this economic development in ways which will give powerful support to democratic political institutions.

These programs are in accordance, it seems to me, with our best traditions. And I want to assure our friends in Asia that America will never dominate their political and their economic development. We will not try to make their societies over in the image of our own. On the contrary, we respect the integrity of their institutions and the rich value of their cultures. We expect to learn as well as to teach.

These programs are primarily concerned with the material needs and wants of individual men and women. Yet we do not make the mistake of believing that the answer to communist materialism is a different brand of materialism.

The answer to communism is, in the old-fashioned phrase, good works—good works inspired by love and dedicated to the whole man. The answer to the inhumanity of communism is humane respect for the individual. And the men and the women of Asia desire not only to rise from wretchedness of the body but from abasement of the spirit as well.

In other words, we must strive for a harmony of means and of ends in our relations with Asia—and indeed with the rest of the world. The means of our co-operation are primarily material.

If we believe the communist threat to Asia is dangerous to us, then it is in our own self-interest to help them defend and develop, adjusting our policies to the constantly changing circumstances in a world of accelerating change. But we must not, in our necessary concern for the urgent tasks of defense and development, permit the means to obscure the end. That end is the widening and the deepening of freedom and of respect for the dignity and the worth of man.

Some may say to you that this is visionary stuff. To this I reply that history has shown again and again that the self-styled realists are the real visionaries—for their eyes are fixed on a past that cannot be recaptured. It was Woodrow Wilson, with his dream of the League of Nations, who was the truly practical man—not the Old Guard who fought him to the death. And in the fateful summer of 1940 it was the vision of a Churchill that saw beyond Dunkerque to victory.

I say that America has been called greatness. The summons of the twentieth century is a summons to our vision, to our humanity, to our practicality. If these provide the common purpose of America and Asia, of our joint enterprise, of our progress together, we need have no fear for the future. Because it will belong to free men.

THE ATOMIC FUTURE

Bushnell Memorial Auditorium
Hartford, Connecticut
September 18, 1952

I am glad to be here in Connecticut. I first came here to school not far from Hartford about thirty-five years ago as a small boy. I have always gratefully recalled the warmth with which your citizens took me in, and also the patience with which my teachers tried to educate me. Some of them are here tonight and I am deeply touched by their continued interest in this Democratic heretic from the prairies of the West. Or should I attribute it to the fact that the last twenty years have won most of the more enlightened to the Democratic standard!

In recent weeks my distinguished opponent has adopted the singular theory that a candidate for President should support all state and local candidates on his party ticket--good, bad, indifferent--and regardless of their views and records.

I believe this is a new theory, even in the Republican Party. It was not too long ago when Governor Dewey, as party leader, honorably refused to support a Republican Congressman who had distinguished himself by incessant and noisy opposition to vital national policies. But the General's theory is not only novel, it is dangerous. If the voters of this nation ever stop looking at the record and the character of candidates, and look only at their party label, it will be a sorry day for healthy democracy.

Win or lose, I will not accept the proposition that party regularity is more important than political ethics. Victory can be bought too dearly.

But this exhibition of Republican expediency is not what I wanted to talk to you about. I wanted to talk here tonight about something which transcends politics--atomic energy, which is the new dimension in all our thinking--and also about the relation of power to peace.

I was moved to select this topic because atomic energy is a major component of our power and because our decisions and actions in atomic energy matters, as they relate to preparedness for both war and peace, will long bear the imprint of our wise and lamented friend, Brien McMahon of Connecticut.

Brien McMahon was among the first to see the great potentiality for good and evil which was opened up by this advance of the frontiers of knowledge. He sought to reconcile the needs for security with the needs for information--both to encourage further scientific advances and an intelligent public opinion. He saw the need for civilian control. He fought to keep the sights of the development program high.

We have already, for example, opened up fields of medical research. Brien McMahon died of cancer. With luck and the help of atomic research,

our children may be safe from this grim disaster.

We have already produced, with an atomic reactor, the steam to generate electric power. We are building now--and in a Connecticut shipyard--an atomic-powered submarine. We can begin to dream of electric stations, ships, airplanes and machinery to be powered by the atom. Men are at work today with atomic tools trying to find out how plants convert energy from the sun into food. It is not too fantastic to think that we may, in time, unlock new doors to boundless energy for our homes and industries.

This is a field in which government and industry can work in ever more fruitful partnership. The people of this country have invested more than six billion dollars in atomic development.

This work must be for everyone's good, and not just for the profits of some. But more can be done to work out new relationships in this field between government and business--relationships which will safeguard the public interest and yet allow full room for private initiative.

This is the excitement of the future which awaits us. The age of atomic abundance is still far off. And we will never be able to release the power of the atom to build unless we are able to restrain its power to destroy. This is the merciless question of the present--the question of what we should do with atomic power in a divided world.

Here again we face a bitter decision. We shrink from the use of such weapons--weapons which destroy the guilty and innocent alike, like a terrible sword from heaven. The memory of Hiroshima is fresh within us--described in enduring prose by one of the most accomplished of contemporary writers--John Hersey--who, I am proud to say, is head of the Volunteers for Stevenson in Connecticut. But we can't renounce the power which science has given us when renunciation might expose our people to destruction.

In the decision to move ahead Brien McMahon again played a leading role. He demanded that we constantly step up our reserves of atomic weapons. He worked always to keep the sights of the atomic energy program high and its policies bold--and the United States has made a notable contribution to the security of the Free World by its rapid development of atomic power.

Yet there has always seemed to me a danger in making the atomic bomb the center of defense strategy. The bomb is but one part of a general system of defense. It cannot be a substitute for such a general system. It cannot be our only answer to aggression. But the bomb remains an essential part of our defense system. Until it is subjected to safe international control, we have no choice but to insure out atomic superiority.

But there can be no solution in an arms race. At the end of this road lies bankruptcy or world catastrophe. Already the earth is haunted by premonitions in this shadowed atomic age. Mankind must deserve some better destiny than this.

Because our Government knew the futility of the arms race, it made its great decision to seek an international system for the control of atomic power. We went to the United Nations and Bernard Baruch, a beloved and wise elder statesman, offered on behalf of the United States to share with other nations the good in atomic energy. In return, we asked that other nations join with us to curb its power for evil.

I think this decision was right--profoundly right. Few things we have done since 1945 have so clearly demonstrated our national determination to achieve peace and to strengthen international order. By this offer, all nations were asked to diminish their own sovereignty in the interests of world security--just as each of us gives up some degree of personal independence when communities establish laws and set up police forces to see that they are carried out.

Unfortunately, as we all know, the Soviet Union has thus far refused to join in a workable system. The reason is obvious. To be effective, such a system would require effective United Nations inspection; and the Kremlin fears to open up the windows and doors of its giant prison. It fears to have the rest of the world learn the truth about the Soviet Union. It fears even more to have the Russian peoples learn the truth about the rest of the world.

And so the negotiations have long been deadlocked. And, in irritation and disgust, some of us have rebelled against the whole idea of negotiation itself. Some of us have even felt that our possession of the bomb makes negotiation unnecessary and, if our allies are alarmed by our uncompromising attitude, so much the worse for them. When we have the bomb as our ally, some of us may say, we need no other.

Such ideas are folly. If we started throwing our atomic weight around the world, no stockpile of bombs could remotely make up for all the friends we would lose. And the irony is that it is our allies who make our atomic strength effective. We built the bomb with the help and co-operation of foreign scientists. Our atomic-production program today depends on foreign supplies of uranium. Our air power would be gravely crippled without foreign bases. Even in terms of the bomb itself, going-it-alone would simply be a shortcut to national disaster.

A year ago some Republican leaders contended that the best way to stop the war in Korea would be to extend it to the main-land of China. In the same vein, Republican leaders today seem to be arguing that the best way to deal with Soviet power in Europe is to instigate civil war in the satellite countries. These are dangerous, reckless, foolish counsels and likely to lead to the sacrifice of the lives of the very people whom we hope to liberate.

And likewise the Democratic Party opposes that weird Republican policy which proposes to reduce our contributions to free-world strength, on the one hand, while it steps up its verbal threats against the enemy, on the other hand. Theodore Roosevelt used to say: "Speak softly and carry a big stick." But these modern Republicans seem to prefer to throw away the stick and scream imprecations.

The Democratic Party will never desist in the search for peace. We must never close our minds or freeze our positions. We must strive constantly to break the deadlock in our atomic discussions. But we can never yield on the objective of securing a foolproof system of international inspection and control. And we will never confuse negotiation with appeasement.

In the long run, the strength of the free nations resides as much in this willingness to reduce their military power and subject it to international control as in the size of their military establishments. This desire and willingness of the free nations to give up their preponderant power and to abandon force as an instrument of national policy in the interests of peace is not only unprecedented—it provides the moral justification for the amassing of great power. And we must never delude ourselves into thinking that physical power is a substitute for moral power which is the true sign of national greatness.

I hold out no foolish hopes. We all know the character of the men in the Kremlin—their fanaticism, their ruthlessness, their limitless ambitions—but we know too that their realism has restrained them thus far from provoking a general war which they would surely lose, and they know that they can have peace and freedom from fear whenever they want it and are prepared to honor their wartime pledges and the obligations assumed when they signed the United Nations Charter. We may hope that the steady strengthening of the free world will increase their sense of the futility of aggression; that the intensification of peaceful pressures against the Soviet Empire will sharpen the internal contradictions within that empire; that, in time, free peoples may lift their heads again in Eastern Europe, and new policies and leadership emerge within the Soviet Union itself.

No one can be certain about the meaning of peace. But we all can be certain about the meaning of war. The future is still open—open for disaster, if we seek peace cheaply or meanly, but open for real peace, if we seek it bravely and nobly.

In any case, let us not cower with fear before this new instrument of power. Nature is neutral. Man has wrested from nature the power to make the world a desert or to make the deserts bloom. There is no evil in the atom; only in men's souls. We have dealt with evil men before, and so have our fathers before us, from the beginning of time. The way to deal with evil men has never varied; stand up for the right, and, if needs must be, fight for the right.

To my Republican listeners I would say: the atomic adventure transcends partisan issues. Win or lose, we Democrats will work with you to follow this adventure to the end of peace and plenty for mankind.

To my fellow Democrats I would close by repeating what Brien McMahon said in his last public appearance. He said: "The way to worry about November is to worry about what is right. If we do not stand for the right, ten thousand campaign speeches will never help us. If we do stand for the right, we will again be asked to lead our country."

THE ROLE OF LABOR

American Federation of Labor
Convention
New York City, New York
September 22, 1952

This convention has followed the American tradition of giving a hearing to both parties to an argument, and I am glad to take my turn.

You have been transacting your business here for eight days. And I would think it was high time for a little humor. But I fear that there may be some people listening who don't like the light touch, although, well, they don't seem to mind the heavy touch, as long as it is a Republican and not a Democrat. But, gentlemen, there is business before your house and I propose to get right to it, obeying, as far as I can, what seems to be known as the Republican law of gravity.

I have been told that I should try here today to make you roar with enthusiasm. Why, I would not do that even if I could. After all, you are the responsible leaders of organized labor, which, if it does not act responsibly, could do the nation and the working people infinite harm. And I, in turn, am a candidate for the most important individual responsibility in the world. If I were more comforted by your cheers than your thoughts I would hardly merit the confidence of responsible men.

So you will, I hope, understand that what little I have to say, or rather to add, to the many speeches you have dutifully listened to, is intended for your heads and not your hands. And, if I don't start any cheers, I hope at least that I shall not stop any minds.

First I should like if I may to dispose of this matter of the Taft-Hartley law.

The Democratic platform says that the Taft-Hartley Act is "inadequate, unworkable and unfair," and should be replaced by a new law. I developed, on Labor Day, the five basic respects in which the present law seems to me defective and I outlined some five principles to guide the writing of a new one.

How to get a new one? The method, whether by amendment of the existing law or replacement with a new one, has, frankly, seemed to me less important than the objective. But, because the required changes are major changes, because the present law is spiteful, and because it has become a symbol of dissention and bitterness, I urge, therefore, as I did on Labor Day, that the Taft-Hartley Act be repealed.

The Republican platform commends the Taft-Hartley Act because among other things it guarantees to the working man, and I quote, "the right to quit his job at any time."

To this deceit they add the insistence that the real issue here is whether the present law should be "amended" or "repealed." This is not

the real issue. The real issue is what changes should be made in the law of the United States. But, if repeal were in itself the issue, I would remind Senator Taft that he himself has publicly recognized twenty-three mistakes in his favorite law, and it seems not unreasonable to recommend that a tire with twenty-three punctures and five blowouts needs junking and not a recap job--and especially a recap job with reclaimed Republican rubber.

There has been, too, the usual barrage of intemperate name-calling. Why is it that when political ammunition runs low, inevitably the rusty artillery of abuse is always wheeled into action? To face the facts of labor relations is to be accused of "captivity," and of "turning left." Now these are words without roots, weeds which grow in darkness and wither in the sun. Not the sun is sometimes slow to rise--especially during campaigns. And I am reminded of the saying that a lie can travel around the world while the truth is pulling on its boots.

Now the final Republican maneuvers were executed (by General Eisenhower) on this platform last Wednesday. I am grateful that it was the Republican, Senator Morse, who revealed so masterfully how all of those explosions we heard were only blank cartridges.

It is proposed now apparently to change the Taft-Hartley Act in just two respects: by removing what the speaker called the union-busting clauses, and by making employers, like union leaders, swear that they are not communists. The tinkling sound of these little words was unfortunately smothered in the thundering silence of what was left unsaid.

And on only one point was there anything even approaching a joining of the issues.

It was charged that I had "embraced", and I quote the words, "the principle of compulsion" by asking for the power as President to "compel" arbitration of disputes which threaten the national safety. Now, after that great reunion with Senator Taft on the love-seat at Columbia University, I must say I respect the General's authority on the subject of embraces. But if he wrote what he said, he had not read what I said.

My proposal was, and is, that if Congress sees fit to direct the President to intervene in a labor dispute it should give the President authority to try, among other things, to have that dispute referred to arbitration. I did not say that he should be given the power to "compel" arbitration. I recommended a flexibility of procedures, all built around the mediation process, to replace the present requirement that in all of these cases the collective-bargaining process be stopped--stopped dead--in its tracks, by a court order.

Now what my distinguished opponent would do I cannot determine. If that was his purpose, by the way, he succeeded. He says he is against compulsion. Yet he seems to support the present law, which compels men to work under court injunction for eighty days on terms they have rejected. I find it hard to see where there can be a greater compulsion than this. And if I read what he says as fairly as I can, I gather that in fact

he recognizes this too and agrees with me, and with you, that the labor injunction is not a fair or effective dispute-settling device.

He cites with approval the Norris-LaGuardia Act which was passed, so he said, under his party's administration in 1932. Now this will all seem a pretty broad claim to those who remember that the House of Representatives in the Seventy-second Congress was safely Democratic, and who can't see much resemblance between Republicans like George Norris and Fiorello LaGuardia, on the one hand, and Senator Taft and Representative Hartley on the other. He didn't mention the fact that that act virtually outlawed the labor injunction in the Federal courts or that it had been seriously cut down by the Taft-Hartley Act. I wonder if by any chance Senator Taft deleted such frankness from the General's text.

But the General in his talk to you did recognize squarely that issuing injunctions, and I quote him, "will not settle the underlying fundamental problems which cause a strike." That is one statement we can all agree with. The trouble is that the Taft-Hartley Act was written by those who don't recognize that squarely.

But enough of the labor relations law. There are other problems of equal concern to American labor.

When many of you first came into this business, the only job of American labor--and it was a tough one--was to organize workers and to bargain with employers. This is still perhaps your main job. But you also have greatly expanded your interests and broadened your horizons.

One of the most significant developments in our national life is that the American labor movement is today much more than an instrument of collective bargaining. It has become a vital agency of a working democracy. Your purposes extend to making America strong in a free and a peaceful world, and to seeking all the democratic goals to which the Government of this country is dedicated.

I should like, therefore, to discuss with you how we can best make this relationship work--this partnership, if you please, between government and an independent organization like the American Federation of Labor, both devoted to the same ends.

We recognize, to begin with, that in this partnership no partner can be allowed to dominate the other. Labor unions, like all private persons and organizations, must maintain an independence from government. Government, including political parties, must be independent of any private bodies.

As spokesman for the Democratic Party, at least for the moment, I put this in plain language, not because you or the A. F. of L. misunderstand, but because others try to misrepresent. I am glad that the Democratic Party and the American Federation of Labor have both been guided for a long by the same stars--stars that have led us toward the realization of human hopes and desires.

But our functions are different, and our responsibilities are different to different groups, even if these groups possibly overlap. The Democratic Party is the party of all the people. Were it otherwise, it would be false to democracy itself.

We seek then a pattern for full co-operation, but one which recognizes our mutual independence.

And what are the specific things we can do in moving toward the human goals we hold in common?

We can start, because the opportunity is so obvious, by making the Department of Labor a more effective service agency. To mention a few specific responsibilities here is to suggest many others:

1. Given sufficient funds, the Bureau of Labor Statistics could, it seems to me, better perform its essential service as keeper of the people's budget, and serve a much broader function than it now can.

2. We should consider a labor counterpart of the Agricultural Extension Service to help train the men who make democracy work in the labor unions and around the bargaining tables. And

3. By retraining men who are replaced by machines and directing them to new jobs, where now we simply pay them unemployment compensation, we could save both manpower and tax money.

4. Again the National Labor Relations Board, operating outside the Labor Department but in this same field, must be staffed to process cases in half the time it now takes, for in this field particularly "justice delayed is justice denied."

5. Then there is the problem of the migrant farm laborers, over a million Americans who move north and south with the sun and the seasons, their lives often bleak cycles of exploitation and rejection. It certainly invites our compassionate attention.

Strengthening the Labor Department is an old subject. Advocacy is always easier than action. But I lay what I hope is not immodest claim to at least a journeyman's qualifications. My apprenticeship was served in getting and assisting to get, at least a partial labor program--over fifty bills--through a Republican legislature in Illinois.

It will also be an important development when men and women will come in ever-increasing numbers from your ranks to positions of key responsibility in government.

What you have to offer, in all of our essential governmental programs, has been perhaps best proven by the contribution that labor has already made on the international front.

Your effective fight against communism goes clear back to the time it was called bolshevism. You have licked it in your own houses, and you have

gone after the roots from which it grows.

I join with my distinguished opponent in saluting you for these accomplishments. One wonders why his party forgot them when, in 1947, they singled you out as peculiarly suspicious characters and required your taking a special oath of loyalty. I hope you don't misunderstand me--I am neither courting nor embracing--when I acknowledge and applaud the job you have done, not only through the International Labor Organization, the Department of States, the Economic Co-operation Administration, but through your own offices in rejecting the communist World Federation of Trade Unions; pressing the case in the United Nations against forced labor in the Soviet Union; supporting free trade unions in Europe and Asia and in South America; helping build up popular resistance wherever the spiked wall of Russia throws its shadow over free men and women. Where men's minds have been poisoned against democracy, many will learn that America is free, and they will only learn it as they hear it from you when you say that you are free. To the workers of other nations, yours is today perhaps the clearest voice that America has.

I am proud, as a Democrat, that a Democratic administration has recognized this and I hope that more and more union leaders will be called upon to serve their country abroad. I think we need diplomats who speak to people in the accents of the people. Ambassadors in overalls can be the best salesmen of democracy.

There are other tasks ahead, many of them here at home. President Truman listed the biggest among these jobs in his message to this convention, the priority jobs in making America still stronger and ever more healthy.

How well we meet these problems together will depend upon, it seems to me, these three things:

First, that we understand each other, and

Second, that we exercise our powers always with firm self-restraint, and

Third, that we hold fast to the conviction that only people are important.

The understanding which flows between the party for which I speak and the enormous group you represent requires no detailing here. To remember the loneliness, the fear and the insecurity of men who once had to walk alone in huge factories beside huge machines, to realize that labor unions have meant new dignity and pride to millions of our countrymen, human companionship on the job, and music in the home, to be able to see what larger pay checks mean, not to a man as an employe, but as husband, and as a father--to know these things is to understand what American labor means.

Franklin Roosevelt knew these things. Harry Truman knows these things. But they are the imponderable human elements that some among us, unhappily, have never understood.

Now—as to the exercise of our powers.

The Democratic Party has been entrusted for twenty years with the awesome responsibility of leadership in governing the United States. During these years, the labor unions have become strong and vigorous. So American labor, too, has enormous power today and enormous responsibilities. "Uneasy lies the head that wears the crown." It is cause for very real humility. It is the whole history of mankind that power lacking inner strength of self-restraint will be eventually cast down.

It is the history of the Republican Party that it supported, and was supported by, those interests which believed that freedom meant the right to exercise economic power without restraint. And that party was cast down.

It has been the basic belief of the Democratic Party that only human freedoms are basic and that economic power must be exercised so as not to curtail them. We hold, too, that the power of government must be restricted to the point that government stands never as master and always as a servant.

It is no less essential to the future of democracy that American labor walk wisely with its power. Your awareness of this has been shown in many practical ways. There is, most recently perhaps, the forthright and heartening manner in which you have attacked the problem of jurisdictional strikes. Your joint-board procedure in the building trades and your prohibitions upon picketing in support of jurisdictional claims are examples of sound self-regulation directed against the abuse and, therefore, the corruption of power.

You have expressed your willingness to accept procedures which recognize the priority of the public interest in national-emergency disputes. You today accept the fact that, in the private free-enterprise system which we all recognize as basic to our liberty and our prosperity, employees can prosper only as their employers do, and that irresponsible demands are only self-defeating.

Yet American labor, like the Democratic Party, faces new and uncharted tomorrows. You, as we, will be challenged anew to measure up to the demands of both freedom and power. The future of democracy, perhaps of our world, depends upon the exercise of power by America's private and public bodies alike with that self-restraint which separates power from tyranny and order from chaos.

American labor's role, its whole purpose has been to restore to people the status and dignity they lost when the sprawling factories reached out to engulf them. Hence, for example, your insistence that there be a community law of job rights—seniority rules—to stand beside the law of property rights.

Equally has the Democratic Party drawn its strength, I think, from the people. We have built our program on their hopes, stood by them in adversity and found the measure of our accomplishment in their welfare.

We have written the laws of twenty years from pictures in our minds of men and women who are tired after a day's full work, who are defeated if a week's wages don't buy a week's food, who are out of a job, or who are sick or have finished a life's work. We believe in a government with a heart.

Yet we are told that we have gone too far.

What do they mean? Are they saying that our people are too well fed, too well clothed, too well housed? Do they say that our children are getting more and better schooling than they should? Have we gone too fast in our efforts to provide equal opportunities to working men and women of all races and colors? Are the 62,000,000 workers of America too healthy, too happy? Should fewer of them be working?

The Republicans say they want a change. Well, let them, then, speak out: Which of these things do they want changed?

With mutual understanding, with a humbling sense of our power, with belief in our masters, the people, we shall see to it, my friends, that these things are not changed.

I want, if I may, in closing to salute a tradition of leadership which embodies all I have been trying to say here today. The foundations of that tradition were laid by Samuel Gompers, and they have been built upon by William Green. You have held, sir, if I may say so, to the ideal of democratic leadership--the leadership which seeks the good of all, the leadership of him who wants only to serve.

ON LIBERTY OF CONSCIENCE

Mormon Tabernacle
Salt Lake City, Utah
October 14, 1952

I cannot speak tonight in this tabernacle without an awareness of the links between its history and that of the State from which I come.

Many of us who reside in Illinois have tasted the wholesome tonic of humility in contemplation of the mistakes to which our history bears witness at Nauvoo--the Beautiful Place--in Illinois where your forefathers stopped on their long journey and built another temple.

It was 106 years ago now that there were those "burnings", the persecution, the mob violence and the murders which finally drove the men and women of the Mormon faith on westward.

When the caravans of those who today seek public office in this nation stop here with you, to meet with you in this, your tabernacle, they stop their clamor and haranguing. They seek the response of your hearts and your minds rather than of your hands or your voices.

I wish that all of our political campaigning could be conducted in the spirit which this meeting place inspires. It is a spirit of faith, a faith that triumphs over any obstacle.

And tonight I want to talk in this Temple to the great confident majority of Americans--the generous and the unfrightened, those who are proud of our strength and sure of our goodness and who want to work with each other in trust, to advance the honor of our country.

Needless to say this includes many millions of Republicans. If all virtue were in one party the nation would be in a sad way. But this confident majority, I am sorry to say, does not include the Republican speech-makers of this campaign. How do they picture our magnificent America?

Sometimes they whine about our troubles--describing us as half-bankrupt, half-defeated and wholly self-pitying.

Sometimes they boast about our self-sufficiency--describing us as choosing to live alone, friendless, on a remote island, indifferent to the fate of man, a huge hermit-crab without a soul.

Sometimes they call large sections of us dupes and fellow-travellers--a people without a purpose and without a mind.

But at all times they picture us unworthy--scared, stupid, and heartless. They thus betray the conquering, hopeful, practical yet deeply moral America which you and I know.

We all know it is nonsense, and that in fact the reverse is true. To

the dismay of the enemies of America, we proved after 1945 that we have learned in the last twenty years not only to produce mightily, but to distribute among all our people an increasingly fair share of that production. We have evolved a stronger and a better form of economy, which makes nonsense of the Russian textbooks.

The friends of freedom everywhere have rejoiced. They have noted our rising and widespread wealth and well being. They have noted that we had no depression and no unemployment at the end of the war--in spite of headlong demobilization and disarmament. And remember that all this happened before the Marshall Plan, before the revival of our armed might, before Korea. Every liberty-loving European gave thanks that we had showed ourselves not only strong but stable.

Must this inspiring record now be ridiculed for campaign purposes? Must our credit for using our capitalist system wisely and humanely be undermined in Europe--and by General Eisenhower of all men? Must our proud all-American achievement be pictured as a Democratic Party plot?

During the war, you remember, when we all knew America was in danger, we only wanted the best, the most unselfish. We had no time for building political mantraps or for inventing derogatory tales. It was a heart-lifting moment.

But a cold war leads the timid and the discontented into frustration. And out of frustration comes pettiness--the niggling, pitiful picture of a confused, divided country which these office-seekers are now painting. And this, of course, was the very purpose for which the Russians invented cold war and imposed it upon us.

They hoped we would feel frustrated, shackled by circumstances. They hoped we would fall to quarreling among ourselves and thus betray our mission.

But the American giant will not be shackled!

We shall not be tempted by the cold war to be half-regretful, half-ashamed of our strength--or frightened of it, which is worse. Regretful (God help us) in the face of the stirring truth that Lincoln's vision has come true, that now we are indeed the "last, best hope of earth"--so recognized by all the free world, which implores us to be great, to lead with magnanimity and, above all, with patience. The very powerful, if they are good, must always be patient.

And still some of us regret it! Some of us say: "Why can't life leave us alone? We don't want to lead. We want to be undisturbed."

What would our Fathers have said to such talk? From the dawn of our Revolution they saw America as the saviour--not merely in terms of power, but in terms of goodness.

They knew that Providence had given us this empty, unexploited Continent for a purpose. And they knew that it must be a purpose which

includes all men—for the same God made us all.

In 1787 George Washington said: "The preservation of the sacred fire of liberty, and the destiny of the republican form of government, are justly considered as deeply, perhaps as finally staked, on the experiment entrusted to the hands of the American people."

At that time we had less than four million inhabitants. But there was no doubt, no fear, in Washington's mind regarding our destiny.

In 1858 Abraham Lincoln said: "Our reliance is in the love of liberty which God has planted in us. Our defense is in the spirit which prized liberty as the heritage of all men, in all lands everywhere."

At that time there were about thirty million Americans. And we were threatened with civil war. But there was no doubt, no fear, in Lincoln's mind. He saw the war and the dissolution of the Union as a threat to the new, revolutionary idea of the free man and to democratic aspirations everywhere.

In 1915 Woodrow Wilson said: "The interesting and inspiring thought about America is that she asks nothing for herself except what she has a right to ask for humanity itself."

By that time we were a world power, about to enter into a world war. But there was no doubt, no fear, in Woodrow Wilson's mind. He knew, as in truth we have always known, that we were destined to be an example and to assume the burden of greatness.

So we are marked men, we Americans at the mid-century point. We have been tapped by fate—for which we should forever give thanks, not laments. What a day to live in! What a flowering of the work and the faith of our fathers! Who in heaven's name would want America less strong, less responsible for the future?

And precisely because we are tapped by fate, we must be wise and patient as well as strong. This means that we must live, intensely live, the faith which has made us free and thereby invincible. "Despotism may govern without faith, but liberty cannot."

American power is not just coal and iron and oil; cotton and wheat and corn. It is not just our forests and our mountain-ranges, and the huge meandering rivers of our central plains, and the high dry cattle country, and this lucky land of yours between the mountains and the sea. It is not even all these things plus a hundred and sixty million people. It is these things, plus the people, plus the idea!

So a second temptation of the cold frustrating war—which we also proudly reject—is to become so distracted by our troubles that we take this faith too much for granted, that we salute it (as some of us salute our religion), and then go our own way unchanged. If we do not make it part of us—keep it forever before us, intense and demanding and clear—the faith might die and we should then die with it.

What is this "American idea" which we so justly venerate? I suggest that the heart of it is the simple but challenging statement that no government may interfere with our conscience, may tell us what to think. All our freedom, all our dynamic unleashed energies, stem from this.

We Americans just naturally talk like this: "No government can tell me what to think. No government can tell me what to do, unless it can prove that the common good is served by such interference." This is the American way of living.

Yet the same Republicans (the dinosaur-wing of that party) who object to service from our government--who call everything "creeping socialism", who talk darkly of "dictatorship"--these same men begin to hint that we are "subversive", or at best the tools of our country's enemies, when we boast of the great strides toward social justice and security we have already made, and of the still greater strides we plan. They laugh at us, superciliously, when we say we are the political party with a heart.

To honor and uphold our faith, therefore, we must never let them confuse us about the difference between what government should do if possible and what it must never do if America is to survive.

It should strengthen us in our freedom by fostering widespread ownership and as much economic independence as possible. In the towns and counties, in the state capitals and in Washington, that great work goes forward today.

But never must government step across the line which separates the promotion of justice and prosperity from the interference with thought, with conscience, with the sacred private life of the mind.

If you like, this is the distinction between the things that are God's and the things that are Caesar's. The mind is the expression of the soul, which belongs to God and must be let alone by government. But farm prices, minimum wages, old-age pensions, the regulation of monopoly, the physical safety of society--these things are Caesar's province, wherein the Government should do all that is humanly possible.

But those among us who would bar us from attempting our economic and social duty are quick with accusations, with defamatory hints and whispering campaigns, when they see a chance to scare or silence those with whom they disagree. Rudely, carelessly they invade the field of conscience, of thought--the field which belongs to God and not to Senators--and not to protect the Republic, but to discredit the individual.

Let us remember also that the first of the Seven Deadly Sins is spiritual pride; the sin which assures me that I know and you don't, so that I give myself permission to use any dubious or dishonest means to discredit your opinion.

Because we have always thought of government as friendly, not as brutal, character assassins and slanderers in the Congress of the United States have a free hand in the methods they use. We never foresaw that the cult of thought-control and of the Big Lie would come to America. So if their

conscience permits, they can say almost anything. And if my opponent's conscience permits, he can try to help all of them get re-elected. But will he have strengthened or weakened the American idea?

This is no small thing, this remorseless attack upon freedom of conscience, freedom of thought. A few peddlers of hate and fear would be of little consequence if they had not been welcomed as satellites by Senator Taft and included in the leadership of this strange crusade. And none of them would be significant if the General--who was implored to come home by Republican leaders so that they might be quit of Senator Taft--had not yielded to the demands of his beaten foe. But because of that surrender, because of those strange allies in his queer crusade, our role in world history, our faithfulness to the men who made the United States, is challenged in this election.

Finally, then, let us recall that our basic faith in liberty of conscience has an ancient ancestry. We can trace it back through Christian Europe, and through pagan Rome, back to the Old Testament prophets. It is by no means exclusive with us. It is in fact our bond of unity with all free men. But we are its ordained guardians today.

Let us lift up our hearts, therefore--glad of our strength, proud of the task it implores. So far from being half-defeated, half-divided, half-bankrupt--while we are true to ourselves, we can never be defeated; while we accept the honorable burden of leadership, we can never be divided. And in the name of that burden we shall find the means and the determination to spend in money and in labor and in hard thought whatever is needed to save ourselves and our world.

SPEECH OF ACCEPTANCE

Democratic National Convention
Chicago, Illinois
August 17, 1956

I accept your nomination and your program. And I pledge to you every resource of mind and strength that I possess to make your deed today a good one for our country and for our party.

Four years ago I stood in this same place and uttered those same words to you. But four years ago we lost. This time we will win!

My heart is full tonight, as the scenes and faces and events of these busy years in between crowd my mind.

To you here tonight and across the country who have sustained me in this great undertaking, for months and even years, I am deeply, humbly grateful; and to none more than the noble lady who is also the treasurer of a legacy of greatness—Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, who has reminded us so movingly that this is 1956 and not 1932, nor even 1952; that our problems alter as well as their solutions; that change is the law of life, and that political parties, no less than individuals, ignore it at their peril.

I salute also the distinguished American who has been more than equal to the hard test of disagreement and has now reaffirmed our common cause so graciously—President Harry Truman. I am glad to have you on my side again, sir!

I am sure that the country is as grateful to this convention as I am for its action of this afternoon. It has renewed and reaffirmed our faith in free democratic processes.

The office of the Vice-Presidency has been dignified by the manner of your selection as well as by the distinction of your choice. Senator Kefauver is a great Democrat and a great campaigner—as I have reason to know better than anybody!

If we are elected and it is God's will that I do not serve my full four years, the people will have a new President whom they can trust. He has dignity; he has convictions; and he will command the respect of the American people and the world.

Perhaps these are simple virtues, but there are times when simple virtues deserve comment. This is such a time. I am grateful to you for my running mate—an honorable and able American—Senator Estes Kefauver, and may I add that I got as excited as any of you about that photo-finish between Senator Kefauver and that great young American Senator John Kennedy.

When I stood here before you that hot night four years ago we were at the end of an era—a great era of restless forward movement, an era of unparalleled social reform and of glorious triumph over depression and tyranny. It was a Democratic era.

Tonight, after an interval of marking time and aimless drifting, we are on the threshold of another great, decisive era. History's headlong course has brought us, I devoutly believe, to the threshold of a new America--to the America of the great ideals and noble visions which are the stuff our future must be made of.

I mean a new America where poverty is abolished and our abundance is used to enrich the lives of every family.

I mean a new America where freedom is made real for all without regard to race or belief or economic condition.

I mean a new America which everlastingly attacks the ancient idea that men can solve their differences by killing each other.

These are the things I believe in and will work for with every resource I possess. These are the things I know you believe in and will work for with everything you have. These are the terms on which I accept your nomination.

Our objectives are not for the timid. They are not for those who look backward, who are satisfied with things as they are, who think that this great nation can ever sleep or ever stand still.

The program you have written is, I think, more than a consensus of the strongly held convictions of strong men; it is a signpost toward that new America. It speaks of the issues of our time with a passion for justice, with reverence for our history and character, with a long view of the American future, and with a sober, fervent dedication to the goal of peace on earth.

Nor has it evaded the current problems in the relations between the races who comprise America, problems which have so often tormented our national life. Of course there is disagreement in the Democratic party on desegregation. It could not be otherwise in the only party that must speak responsibly in both the North and the South. If all of us are not wholly satisfied with what we have said on this explosive subject it is because we have spoken the only way a truly national party can--by understanding accomodation of conflicting views.

But in so doing, in substituting realism and persuasion for the extremes of force or nullification, our party has preserved its effectiveness, it has avoided a sectional crisis, and it has contributed to our national unity as only a national party could.

As President it would be my purpose to press on in accordance with our platform toward the fuller freedom for all our citizens which is at once our party's pledge and the old American promise.

I do not propose to make political capital out of the President's illness. His ability to personally fulfill the demands of his exacting office is a matter between him and the American people. So far as I am

concerned that is where the matter rests. As we all do, I wish deeply for the President's health and well-being.

But if the condition of President Eisenhower is not an issue as far as I am concerned, the condition and the conduct of the President's office and of the Administration is very much an issue.

The men who run the Eisenhower Administration evidently believe that the minds of Americans can be manipulated by shows, slogans, and the arts of advertising. And that conviction will, I dare say, be backed up by the greatest torrent of money ever poured out to influence an American election--poured out by men who fear nothing so much as change and who want everything to stay as it is--only more so.

This idea that you can merchandise candidates for high office like breakfast cereal--that you can gather votes like box tops--is, I think, the ultimate indignity to the democratic process. And we Democrats must also face the fact that no administration has ever before enjoyed such an uncritical and enthusiastic support from so much of the press as this one.

But let us ask the people of our country to what great purpose for the republic has the President's popularity and this unrivaled opportunity for leadership been put? Has the Eisenhower Administration used this opportunity to elevate us? To enlighten us? To inspire us? Did it, in a time of headlong, world-wide, revolutionary change, prepare us for the stern decisions and great risks? Did it, in short, give men and women a glimpse of the nobility and vision without which peoples and nations perish?

Or did it just reassure us that all is well, everything is all right, that everyone is prosperous and safe, that no great decisions are required of us, and that even the Presidency of the United States has somehow become an easy job?

I will have to confess that the Republican Administration has performed a minor miracle--after twenty years of incessant damnation of the New Deal they not only haven't repealed it but they have swallowed it, or most of it, and it looks as though they could keep it down at least until after the election.

I suppose we should be thankful that they have caught up with the New Deal at last, but what have they done to take advantage of the great opportunities of these times--a generation after the New Deal?

Well, I say they have smothered us in smiles and complacency while our social and economic advancement has ground to a halt and while our leadership and security in the world have been imperiled.

In spite of these unparelled opportunities to lead at home and abroad, they have, I say, been wasting our opportunities and losing our world.

I say that what this country needs is not propaganda and a personality cult. What this country needs is leadership and truth. And that's what we mean to give it.

What is the truth?

The truth is that the Republican party is a house divided. The truth is that President Eisenhower, cynically coveted as a candidate but ignored as a leader, is largely indebted to Democrats in Congress for what accomplishments he can claim.

The truth is that 30,000,000 Americans live today in families trying to make ends meet on less than \$2,000 a year. The truth is that the small farmer, the small business man, the teacher, the white collar worker, and the retired citizen trying to pay today's prices on yesterday's pension--all these are in serious trouble.

The truth is that in this Government of big men--big financially--no one speaks for the little man.

The truth is not that this government's policy abroad has the Communists on the run. The truth, unhappily, is not--in the Republican President's words--that our "prestige since the last world war has never been as high as it is this day." The truth is that it has probably never been lower.

The truth is that we are losing the military advantage, the economic initiative and the moral leadership.

The truth is not that we are winning the cold war. The truth is that we are losing the cold war.

Don't misunderstand me, I, for one, am ready to acknowledge the sincerity of the Republican President's desire for peace and happiness for all. But good intentions are not good enough and the country is stalled on dead center--stalled in the middle of the road--while the world goes whirling by. America, which has lifted man to his highest economic state, which has saved freedom in war and peace, which saved collective security, no longer sparks and flames and gives off new ideas and initiatives. Our lights are dimmed. We chat complacently of this and that while, in Carlyle's phrase, "death and eternity sit glaring."

And I could add that opportunity, neglected opportunity, sits glaring too!

But you cannot surround the future with arms, you cannot dominate the racing world by standing still. And I say it is time to get up and get moving again. It is time for America to be herself again.

And that's what this election is all about!

Here at home we can make good the lost opportunities; we can recover the wasted years; we can cross the threshold to the new America.

What we need is a rebirth of leadership—leadership which will give us a glimpse of the nobility and vision without which peoples and nations perish. Woodrow Wilson said that "When America loses its ardor for mankind it is time to elect a Democratic President." There doesn't appear to be much ardor in America just now for anything, and it's time to elect a Democratic Administration and a Democratic Congress, yes, and Democratic Government in every state and local office across the land.

In our hearts we know that the horizons of the new America are as endless, its promise as staggering in its richness as the unfolding miracle of human knowledge. America renews itself with every forward thrust of the human mind.

We live at a time when automation is ushering in a second industrial revolution, and the powers of the atom are about to be harnessed for ever greater production. We live at a time when even the ancient spectre of hunger is vanishing. This is the age of abundance. Never in history has there been such an opportunity to show what we can do to improve the equality of living now that the terrible, grinding anxieties of daily bread, of clothing and shelter, are disappearing.

With leadership, Democratic leadership, we can do justice to our children, we can repair the ravages of time and neglect in our schools. We can and we will.

With leadership, Democratic leadership, we can restore the vitality of the American family farm. We can preserve the position of small business without injury to the large. We can strengthen labor unions and collective bargaining as vital institutions in a free economy. We can and our party history proves that we will!

With leadership, Democratic leadership, we can conserve our resources of land and forest and water and develop them for the benefit of all. We can and the record shows that we will!

With leadership, Democratic leadership, we can rekindle the spirit of liberty emblazoned in the bill of rights; we can build this new America where the doors of opportunity are open equally to all, yes, the doors of our factories and the doors of our school rooms. We can make this a land where opportunity is founded only on responsibility and freedom on faith, and where nothing can smother the lonely defiant spirit of the free intelligence!. We can, and by our traditions as a party we will!

All these things we can do and we will. But in the international field the timing is only partially our own. Here the "unrepentant minute" once missed, may be missed forever. Other forces, growing yearly in potency, dispute with us the direction of our times. Here more than

anywhere guidance and illumination are needed in the terrifying century of the hydrogen bomb. Here more than anywhere we must move, and rapidly, to repair the ravages of the past four years to America's repute and influence abroad.

We must move with speed and confidence to reverse the spread of communism. We must strengthen the political and economic fabric of our alliances. We must launch new programs to meet the challenge of the vast social revolution that is sweeping the world and turn the violent forces of change to the side of freedom.

We must protect the new nations in the exercise of their full independence; and we must help other peoples out of Communist or colonial servitude along the hard road to freedom.

And we must place our nation where it belongs in the eyes of the world--at the head of the struggle for peace. For in this nuclear age peace is no longer a visionary ideal. It has become an absolute, imperative, practical necessity. Humanity's long struggle against war has to be won and won now. Yes, and I say it can be won.

It is time to listen again to our hearts, to speak again our ideals, to be again our own great selves.

There is a spiritual hunger in the world today and it cannot be satisfied by material things alone. Our forebears came here to worship God. We must not let our aspirations so diminish that our worship becomes rather of bigness--bigness of material achievement.

For a century and a half the Democratic party has been the party of respect for people, of reverence for life, of hope for each child's future, of belief that "the highest revelation is that God is in every man."

Once we were not ashamed in this country to be idealists. Once we were proud to confess that an American is a man who wants peace and believes in a better future and loves his fellow man. We must reclaim these great Christian and humane ideas. We must dare to say again that the American cause is the cause of all mankind.

If we are to make honest citizens of our hearts we must unite them again to the ideals in which they have always believed and give those ideals the courage of our tongues.

Standing as we do here tonight at this great fork of history, may we never be silenced, may we never lose our faith in freedom and the better destiny of man.

FREEDOM, HUMAN WELFARE AND PEACE

Democratic Rally
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania
September 13, 1956

Governor Leader, Senator Kefauver, distinguished guests and ladies and gentlemen:

After listening to what Governor Leader said I've concluded that my words are so valuable this evening I'm almost speechless.

I came here tonight to summon you Democrats to the cause of freedom, the cause of human welfare and to the cause of peace.

And I summon all Americans who believe greatly in these things to join with us. We claim no monopoly on the ideals we assert. They are America's ideals, The victory we seek is not just for a party; it is for a people.

But we do claim that this victory will come only to the bold and to the brave, to those who are willing to work to make democracy's ideals come true in the lives of every man, woman and child in America--yes, and in the world. This is our Democratic goal. This is the victory we seek in November.

And I am going to fight for it with everything that I have, and our party is honored that leadership in our cause is shared by a man so widely loved and trusted as Senator Estes Kefauver.

But it is not by the candidates that this cause will be either won or lost. Democracy's price is the participation in it of all who believe that it serves their best interest. I join with the President of the United States in urging every American, regardless of his party, to register--and to do it now, to do it before it is too late.

You know, I read here in Harrisburg this morning that another political campaign was opened yesterday just forty miles from here. Before what the newspaper called a crowd of more than 500 of the Grand Old Party elite. You know, I went to my dictionary and here is what it said:

Elite--a group or body considered or treated as socially superior. Well, evidently Joe Smith didn't do any better in Gettysburg than he did in San Fransisco.

And for my part I'm mighty glad to be here tonight to open the 1956 Democratic campaign before 10,000 Pennsylvanians with the whole nation as our invited guests.

This is my third visit to Harrisburg in the past two years. Each time that I have come here the crowd gets larger, just as each month

all across the country the tide of protest and of hope has risen. And that's why, after generations of Republican rule, the people called on the Democrats to clean up Philadelphia; and that's why, after decades of Republican rule, the Governor of Pennsylvania today is a vigorous and gifted young Democrat, George Leader.

And that's why, too, the next United States Senator from Pennsylvania will be a Democrat—a dedicated man of noble principle and of demonstrated competence—Joseph Clark.

And if I may claim a point of personal privilege, I want to salute tonight your good friend and my campaign manager--that wise and gentle Irishman, Jim Finnegan of Philadelphia.

And what is happening here in Pennsylvania is going on in state after state. Just this week the rising tide burst the ancient dikes in the state of Maine.

Now, why is this? I think it's because the fog is rising, because the fog of half-truths and of amiable complacency has been penetrated and people perceive, at last, that all is not well in Washington and in the world.

Our Republican friends have been suggesting in one way or another that there are no real issues between the parties.

Well, when someone says that the two parties' programs are just about the same, I say that so are two checks, signed by different people. The question is which one can be cashed and which one will bounce.

And I say that for 150 years a check by the Democratic party written out to the American people has been worth its face value. We say what we mean. We mean what we say. And the record proves it.

This is 1956, the fifty-sixth year of our century. America has spent twenty-eight years of these years--twenty-eight of these years--under Democratic government and twenty-eight years under Republican government.

During these Democratic years what did we do? We abolished child labor, we commenced unemployment insurance, old age retirement, minimum wages, made collective bargaining work, guaranteed bank deposits, we financed home ownership, started public housing, put a floor under farm prices, set up T. V. A. (Tennessee Valley Authority) and R. E. A. (Rural Electrification Administration), protected investors through the Securities Exchange Commission, consumers through the Federal Trade Commission and we lifted the nation from the rubble of bankruptcy and despair to a great plateau of abundance.

And, and most of all, it was under Democratic leadership that this nation met and defeated the greatest threats to individual liberty and national freedom in modern history--and what did the Republican

leadership give us in the twenty-eight years of its leadership?

Well, there were, there were some accomplishments, but the comparison is not very flattering. And that's why I say that to get these things done, America will once again turn to Democratic leadership.

The Republicans have posed the issues of this campaign in terms of slogans--of peace, prosperity and progress.

I pose these issues in terms of facts--the facts of America's unmet human needs, the facts of a revolutionary age of a revolutionary world in this hydrogen age.

Here are some of the facts:

In four years--four years of wealth and abundance--our Government has let the shortage of schools and of school teachers get worse. It has done almost nothing to stop the slum cancer which today infects tens of millions of American dwellings. And juvenile delinquency which breeds in slums and in poor schools has increased at a frightening rate.

We have done nothing to help the lot of the poor and of our older people, and their situation gets worse as the cost of living climbs to the highest point in our history.

And we've done mighty little to aid the fight against disease, or to make up the shortage of doctors and nurses.

We have watched the vice of higher costs and of lower prices close on the helpless farmer whose only defense is that he has done his job too well.

And the small business man is now back to the wall.

Instead of turning our natural resources, our rivers and lands and forests to the public good, we have seen them raided for private profit.

And the facts of our progress towards peace are even more sobering, it seems to me. The Soviets have advanced, while we have fallen back, not only in the competition for strength of arms, but even in education. Millions of people have moved further toward the false promises of Communism rather than the true faith of freedom.

And why has all of this happened?

It has happened because for four years now we have had a Government which neither fully understands nor wholly sympathizes with our human needs or the revolution that is sweeping our world.

The Republican Administration took office on the pledge to make it a business man's Government. Well, that's one pledge they kept. President Eisenhower filled most of the top ranking offices in his Administration

with those whose lives had been spent in business, and mostly in big business.

Then--partly by choice, and partly by unhappy necessity--we regret that the President turned over to these men of limited interests and experience still more of the powers of Government.

Where these interests are involved, cutting taxes for the well-to-do, turning our natural resources over to private companies, chipping away at T. V. A. and along with Mr. Dixon and Mr. Yates--these men have been highly effective indeed.

But where human interests are concerned--the interests of the young and of the old, the worker, the farmer, where the need is to wipe out poverty or to build schools or hospitals to clear slums, even to distribute the Salk vaccine--there, no one leads.

Now I respect Mr. Eisenhower's good intentions. I have been accused of undue moderation toward his Administration. And certainly the Democrats in Congress have constantly rescued the Republican President from his own party.

Everyone shares in the sympathy for the circumstances which have created a part-time President. But we cannot understand--and we will not accept--turning the Government over to men who work full-time for the wrong people, or for a limited group of people.

And the plain truth is that this situation would get worse, not better, because what influence the President has with the Republican leaders in Congress has depended on his running again.

But from here on the future of Republican leaders will depend not on Mr. Eisenhower, but the Republican heir apparent, Mr. Nixon. And the Vice President seems to sail down wind no matter which way the wind blows.

Now these, these, my friends, are stern facts. To ignore them is perilous. They are the reasons America's human needs to today unmet. Nor will they be met as long as the President is not master in his own house.

I firmly believe that America does not want to rest on dead center, that it wants--ferverently--to move forward again to meet these needs and to live up to the best that is in them.

I think America wants to be called to build the school rooms and to train the teachers our children so desperately need.

I think America wants to be called to clear away the slums and bring basic dignity to millions more.

And I think America wants to attack relentlessly the vast realm of human pain, and lift from those hit by serious accident or illness at

least the added burden of grinding debt.

I think America wants to give to the lives of older people the dignity and meaning that they yearn for and that they deserve.

As I have in the past, I will lay before you in as full detail as a political campaign permits, proposals for meeting our needs. And we will talk soberly about their cost and the ways and means of approaching them in a responsible manner.

Whatever we can do here at home will be meaningless unless the world is such that what we do can endure.

When we are spending \$40,000,000,000 a year for defense, when the peace the Republicans boast about looks more fragile by the moment, when the hydrogen bombs and the guided missiles are multiplying, when Communist influence is spreading among restless millions, when we can lose the cold war without ever firing a shot, then I say that most of all America is anxious about America—about its peace and security.

It is not enough to pile pact on pact, weapons on weapons, or to totter dangerously from crisis to crisis. There must be a call to war against the poverty, the hunger, the nothingness in people's lives that draws them to communism's false beacon.

We must guide the hopes of mankind away from the blind alleys of extreme nationalism or bogus Communist internationalism. We must turn them instead to an ideal of partnership between the nations in which disputes are settled by conciliation, not violence, and in which the weapons of death are limited and controlled. We Americans have never been and we never will be a nation content just to count today's blessings.

We have confidence in ourselves—confidence that we can build what we have to build, that we can grow as we have to grow and that we can change as we must change, and play our full part in the making of a new America—a better tomorrow for ourselves and for all of mankind.

Our plan for Twentieth Century man is not just for his survival, but for his triumph.

If I were to attempt to put my political philosophy tonight into a single phrase, it would be this: trust the people. Trust their good sense, their decency, their fortitude, their faith. Trust them with the facts. Trust them with the truth. Trust them with the great decisions. And fix, as our guiding star, the passion to create a society where people can fulfill their best selves—where no American is held down by race or color, by worldly condition or social status, from gaining what his character earns him as an American citizen, as a human being and as a child of God.

So I say to you, my friends, let us be up and doing, probing ceaselessly for solutions of today's problems and the new ones tomorrow will leave upon our dorrstep. And if you share my view, if you share

the Democratic view, that this election is a summons to a sleeping giant, then I hope you will join us to make that summons clear and strong on Election Day and to help us march forward toward the new America.

EQUALITY OF RIGHTS AND OPPORTUNITIES

Democratic Party Rally
New York City, New York
October 4, 1956

I am proud to come to Harlem tonight as candidate for President of the United States.

I am proud because I come as the representative of the party which through history has been dedicated to the people of America--the Democratic party.

From the beginning of this Republic the Democratic party has worked, worked hard, yes, and worked successfully to improve the condition, confirm the rights and enlarge the opportunities of the Joe Smiths of our land.

In the last generation the Democratic party has achieved social and economic and spiritual gains which have transformed American society, and it has done so under the leadership of two great-hearted Americans, Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman.

Our party has fought valiantly for the plain people of America through its past, and I am here tonight to tell you that so long as I am spokesman and leader, it will fight as hard as ever for the people in the years ahead. And because the people know that, it will win the election in November.

But we have got to register, and we have got to vote. I want to support with all my heart the appeals of your other speakers tonight that you register yourself, register your family, register your block and produce the highest registration New York City has ever seen.

You know what our party stands for when you look at the men and women who honor us by their presence here tonight.

Let me first express my gratitude for his hospitality to a fine public servant, a man of responsibility, intelligence and courage, your Borough President, Hulan Jack.

And let me then express all our devotion and love to the great lady whose wisdom, grace of spirit and dedicated faith have illumined our life for a generation, the conscience of our party and the conscience of America--Eleanor Roosevelt.

We also have with us tonight the man who has battled for human rights on the floor of the Senate with serenity, fortitude and never-failing courage, who elevates us all by his own unwavering faith in the dignity of man--your great Senator, Herbert Lehman.

We have the man who embodies the gallantry and compassion of the liberal spirit, who has been the stalwart champion of those in distress and

privation—the poverty-stricken, the aging, the common man everywhere—your great Governor, Averell Harriman.

We have the man who is consecrated by family tradition as well as by liberal principle to the service of the people, your great Mayor and your next Senator, Robert F. Wagner.

There are many reasons why Bob Wagner will be your next Senator—his courage, his quiet integrity, his demonstrated ability, and his earnest devotion to the rights of every American.

We have come a long way in the battle for human dignity and opportunity in America. But we still have far to go. The Democratic party has led the fight against poverty and discrimination, and it is our purpose to carry on that fight as long as those ugly specters still haunt American life.

We are the richest nation in the world, the richest nation in history. And it is an indictment of our intelligence and humanity if we cannot provide every family in the country a decent opportunity to earn a living, a decent school, a decent roof over their heads and a decent prospect of security in old age.

We have had four years of Republican rule—four years of shuffling and postponement—four years of "time out" in the battle for expanding human dignity. The time has come to resume our onward march.

There are still miles and miles of slums in America. And every American family wants to escape from misery and squalor. We need new houses—millions of them. We need a sound and imaginative public housing program. Every American who has taken the trouble to see how other people live in our country knows that these conditions exist and must be met.

How have the Republicans met these needs? Well, the Republican leadership has fought and licked every good public housing bill proposed in these last four years—and the bills were always brought forward by the Democrats.

I doubt if there will ever be much hope for an adequate public housing program under an Administration which takes its policy from the real estate lobby.

But I say to you that under the Democrats we will have public housing and urban renewal programs that will help provide every American family with an opportunity for a decent home in a decent neighborhood.

You have already seen here in Harlem how public housing can begin to transform a community and make it a place where you can be proud to live—but then you have Democratic Mayors here in New York.

The battle for housing is only one part of our Democratic battle for a New America, but in every field Democratic proposals to help

the people are met by Republican indifference, obstruction and opposition.

Take the minimum wage. Over the strenuous objections of the Eisenhower Administration, the Democrats in the last session of Congress raised the minimum wage to \$1. But this is not enough; and it is the Democratic platform pledge to raise the minimum wage--if you will make sure that there are enough Democrats in Washington next year to help us do it.

In particular it is our determination to carry out a program which will make the last years of life more serene and happy for our older citizens. Two weeks ago I issued a written statement in which I spelled out in detail what a Democratic Administration would propose to do on behalf of our older citizens in the New America.

I want to take this occasion to pay tribute to your Governor, whose concern for the aging in New York has so greatly influenced our nation's thinking on how we can meet our obligations to our parents and grandparents.

But food and dress and shelter are not all that matter to a good life. Man's highest fulfillment comes in the realm of the spirit--in the fulfillment of his inward sense of dignity, his responsibility and his freedom.

America has made progress toward that fulfillment, too, and that progress has come in the main, I am proud to say, through the leadership of the Democratic party.

Yet we have seen nothing more brazen in the entire record of Republican misrepresentation in this campaign than the Republican effort to seize partisan credit for progress in civil rights.

They have claimed credit for ending segregation in the armed forces.

Well, you know, I happen to have been in on that story right from the start and these Johnny-come-lately Republican claims make me pretty disgusted.

In 1941 and 1942 I was assistant to the Secretary of the Navy. And it was then that we took the first and the hard steps toward removing the racial barriers in the United States Navy. My part in that was small and we only got the job started then, but we did get it started.

Then, on July 26, 1948, President Truman issued his Executive Order No. 9981. It was that order that sounded the death knell of segregation in the armed forces.

That order was issued despite the testimony of Chief of Staff Dwight D. Eisenhower before a Congressional committee on April 2, 1948, that complete desegregation in the armed forces would, as he put it, get us "into trouble."

But four years later Candidate Eisenhower admitted in a speech at Chicago on October 31, 1952, that--and these are his words--"Now, so far as I know, there is nothing in the way of segregation in the Army, Navy, Air Force or Marines left--at least as a matter of official record."

Why, then, why did President Eisenhower tell the American people last Monday, in listing the accomplishments of his Administration, that one thing the Republicans have done since 1952 is to end segregation in the armed forces?

I don't mind the President's trying to make off in broad daylight with the Democratic platform--he always returns it right after Election Day anyway--but he better stop trying to run on the Democratic record.

The Republicans have claimed credit for stopping discrimination in employment by Government contractors, though all they did was to continue the work begun by the Fair Employment Practices Commission under President Roosevelt and by the Committee on Government Contract Compliance under President Truman. For that we are grateful.

They have even claimed credit for ending segregation in the District of Columbia, though the case which meant the end of segregation in many public places in the district was initiated at the time President Truman was in office and while Mr. Eisenhower was still a private citizen.

And finally, when the President was presented with an opportunity for great national leadership in this field, he was virtually silent. I am referring to the Supreme Court decision on desegregation in the public schools.

Surely the greatest problem we face here at home this year is the issue of civil rights. We have faced it continuously for many years in varying forms and changing urgency. I faced it when I was Governor of Illinois. During that interval we desegregated the National Guard; we used the National Guard to protect the safety of citizens in the Cicero riots; and we came within an ace of passing a fair employment practices act--and were prevented from doing so only by a close vote in a Republican Legislature. We eliminated all racial designations in the employment service of Illinois and on drivers licences, and so on.

Yet, despite the progress we have made, the achievement of equality of rights and opportunities for all American citizens is still the great unfinished business before the United States. The Supreme Court decision on desegregation in the public schools was an expression of our steady movement toward genuine equality for all before the law, and it expressed in a new field the old principle that the American heritage of liberty and opportunity is not to be confined to men, women and children of a single race, a single religion or a single color.

I have spoken about this decision many times. Last week I spoke about it in Arkansas, and I am glad to have the opportunity to say here what I said there: "The Supreme Court of the United States has determined

unanimously that the Constitution does not permit segregation in the schools. As you know, for I have made my position clear on this from the start, I believe that decision to be right."

"Some of you feel strongly to the contrary. But what is most important is that we agree that once the Supreme Court has decided this Constitutional question, we accept that decision as law-abiding citizens."

And this statement, I am heartened to tell you tonight, brought applause from those who heard me in Arkansas.

I continued: "Our common goal is the orderly accomplishment of the result decreed by the court. I said long ago, and I stand now squarely on the plain statement, adopted in the Democratic platform, that we reject all proposals for the use of force to interfere with the orderly determination of these matters by the courts."

"The court's decree provides for the ways and means of putting into effect the principle it sets forth. I am confident that this decision will be carried out in the manner prescribed by the courts. I have repeatedly expressed the belief, however, that the office of the Presidency should be used to bring together those of opposing views in this matter--to the end of creating a climate for peaceful acceptance of this decision."

The President of the United States recently said of the Supreme Court decision, "I think it makes no difference whether or not I endorse it."

As for myself, I have said from the beginning--and say now--that I support this decision.

We have a code in this country--a design by which Americans live with one another. It is called the Bill of Rights. It should not only be obeyed, it should be respected. The Bill of Rights is the moral spine of our nation.

I pray that all Americans, no matter what their feelings, will collaborate in working to sustain the Bill of Rights. No other course is consistent with our Constitutional equality as Americans or with our human brotherhood as children of God.

The profound questions of our time remain questions of conscience and of will.

And the answers will come, at the last, "Not by might, nor by power but by This spirit."

For ours is a time like that of which the prophet Amos wrote, "Let justice roll down as waters, and righteousness as a mighty stream."

OUR FOREIGN POLICY

Democratic Rally
Cincinnati, Ohio
October 19, 1956

I want to talk with you about the most serious failure of the Republican Administration. I mean its failure in conducting our foreign policy. For although its failures have been serious here at home, in serving the cause of peace they are far more serious. And they should not be kept out of sight—where the Administration would like to keep them. It will be a sad day for America when we no longer talk about the issue that means more to us than any other.

I'm not going to spend much time on the Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles. Under our Constitution, the President conducts America's relations with the rest of the world, and he is responsible for them, and for his Secretary of State.

But I cannot refrain from commenting on Mr. Dulles' special contribution to our public life—you might almost call it Mr. Dulles' one new idea. I mean his habit of describing every defeat as a victory and every setback as a triumph. He is a master of reverse English.

We would all be better off with less fiction and more plain speaking about our foreign affairs.

The Republican candidate has a list of successes he likes to recite. And let us acknowledge such successes as we have had and be thankful.

There is, unfortunately, another list.

This other list shows that Korea is still divided by an uneasy armistice line and still costs us hundreds of millions of dollars in economic and military aid.

The richest half of Indochina has become a new Communist satellite, and after loud words and gestures America emerged from that debacle looking like a "paper tiger."

Communism and neutralism have made great gains in Ceylon and Burma and Indonesia in the past year or so.

In India, which may be the key to a free Asia, we will have had four ambassadors in three and a half years—provided the Administration gets around to filling the vacancy which has existed since last July. And that is a very poor way of showing our concern for the second largest and one of the most influential countries in the world.

In Western Europe, when the idea of a European defense community collapsed, we heard no more about Mr. Dulles' threatened "agonizing

reappraisal," and meanwhile the declining influence of NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization) has stirred widespread concern.

France has withdrawn most of her NATO forces to North Africa.

The Cyprus dispute has gravely disturbed the relations between three of our valued allies. Yet so far as I can discover, we have been of no help whatsoever in settling that dispute.

Iceland is insisting on the withdrawal of our forces from the key base we built there.

America's relations with its oldest and strongest allies, Britain and France, are more fragile than they have been in a generation or more.

And the Republican candidate says that "all is well", that communism is "on the run", that "American prestige has never been higher", that peace is secure.

I do not mean to criticize the compromises that have been made. But I severely criticize this effort to mislead the people, to describe an armed truce as peace, to gloss over serious difficulties, to obscure the grim realities, to encourage the people not to know the truth.

What are the realities?

We live at a watershed of history—and no man knows in what direction the elemental forces that are loose in the world will turn.

This much is plain: the West, so long the dominant force in world affairs, has now gone on the defensive, drawing back little by little from positions long established in the rest of the world, particularly in Asia and Africa.

At the same time the Communist sphere has been growing, adding to its vast empire here and there, as it welded Communist ideology to modern technology to forge a powerful weapon for expansion.

And there is a third area or grouping—of peoples who have recently won or who are struggling to win independence, to gain control of their own futures, to escape from poverty, to win a place for themselves in the sun.

The truth is that the lines of division are fluid and might shift in any direction. Though we have great influence—as much as any other power, or more—we can no more, alone, control the force at work than we can make the seas do our bidding. For our power, like all power, is limited. We are rich, but there are only 168,000,000 of us and we have 2,500,000,000 neighbors. Our power is necessarily in conflict with the power of others who do not share or only partly share our aspirations.

The end of this conflict cannot be foreseen, nor the victor. History knows no sure things. But we do know that we have not been doing well

these past few years.

We need to be called to labor, not lulled with rosy and misleading assurances that all is well. Leadership which fails in this is leadership to disaster.

Yet a few nights ago the Republican candidate sought to make political capital out of a crisis that could engulf the world. Wars have begun over matters of far less moment than the Suez dispute--for the canal is a lifeline of the world.

I have refrained until now from commenting on the Suez crisis. But I shall refrain no longer. The Republican candidate has introduced it, in a highly misleading way, into the campaign.

A week ago he came before that so-called press conference on television arranged by the advertising agents of the Republican campaign more for adulation than for information. He announced that he had "good news" about Suez.

But there is no good news about Suez. Why didn't the President tell us the truth? Why hasn't he told us frankly that what has happened in these past few months is that the Communist rulers of Soviet Russia have accomplished a Russian ambition that the Czars could never accomplish? Russian power and influence have moved into the Middle East--the oil tank of Europe and Asia and the great bridge between East and West.

When the historians write of our era they may, I fear, find grim irony in the fact that when Russian power and influence were for the first time firmly established in the Near and Middle East, our government was loudly, proudly proclaiming our victorious conduct of the "cold war" and the President reported good news from Suez.

The Suez crisis and all the thundering that has preceded it will probably not become an important campaign issue. It is too late and we have hardly begun to realize its implications. It will take some time for the implications to sink in.

But I must say that it makes coping with the new problems of an awakening modern world under Soviet influence a lot harder when a setback like this is painted as a triumph of diplomacy a la Dulles.

This reverse was not inevitable. I cannot remember any other series of diplomatic strokes so erratic, naive and clumsy as the events of the past few years through which Russia gained welcome to the Near and Middle East.

The trouble is that neither there nor anywhere else has the Administration shown any real capacity to adjust its policies to new conditions. Three and one-half years have passed since Stalin's death which made possible the armistice in Korea that President Eisenhower takes credit for. It is now fourteen months since the Geneva conference at the summit.

And I ask the Republican candidate to tell us of a single new idea that has emerged from Washington for meeting the new Soviet challenge.

Instead of fresh ideas and creative thinking to advance the cause of peace, our approach to world affairs has remained sterile and timid. It has remained tied to old methods, old thinking, and old slogans. We are trying to meet new conditions and challenges with old methods and means. It won't work. It never does.

I believe the President knows this. He must. I think it was this realization that led him, three years ago, to think seriously of forming a new political party. For the central fact is that the leader of the Republican party cannot possibly deal with the problems of today's world. If he did--if the President called now for the action which is needed in the conduct of our foreign affairs--it would split the Republican party right down the middle--with the election only three weeks away. For the Republican party has been hopelessly divided over foreign policy ever since the League of Nations battle and the triumph of the isolationists thirty-five years ago.

The right to criticize--fairly, honestly, responsibly--is deeply rooted in the American political tradition. We cannot deal intelligently with problems unless we first recognize that they exist and ask ourselves what mistakes we made. Honest criticism is still the secret weapon of democracy.

There goes with criticism of this sort a clear responsibility to state a constructive alternative. What will a Democratic Administration do to meet the challenge of our times? How will a Democratic foreign policy differ from the Republican?

Let me say at once that I have no slick formula. No patent medicine to cure our problems. The difficulties which face American policy makers in all parts of the world are deep-rooted and complex. And this will continue to be so regardless of who wins in November.

But it is equally true that there is much that can and must be done.

First, our entire military establishment must be re-examined to determine how we can best build and keep the forces we need for our national security.

There is much evidence that we don't have the military establishment we need now. The problem is, I think, less one of money than adjusting our thinking and planning to the revolutionary changes in weapons and in world relationships.

Among other things, I have suggested a restudy of the Selective Service system to find, if possible, some better way of meeting our manpower requirements than the draft, with its rapid turnover.

I have been surprised that the Republican candidate has reacted so violently to my suggestion that this ought to be considered. I thought

that it was hardly open to debate that we need to find a better way of obtaining the mobile, expert, ready forces we need in the handling of the new weapons and the new tactics of the military age. My suggestion, I should like to add, was aimed at stronger, not weaker, forces.

Second, I would propose—in view of the unthinkable implications of modern warfare—that disarmament should be at the heart of American foreign policy.

I have suggested that we could initiate a world policy of stopping the exploding of large-size nuclear bombs—the H-bombs. This appears to be a safe, workable, reliable proposal.

I call your attention to the fact that the other powers concerned have stated that they are prepared to act.

If we can bring this about, all mankind will be the gainers. And I think that we, the United States, should once more assert the moral initiative, which many wait and pray for, to break out of the deadly deadlock which has blocked all progress toward arresting the arms race that imperils us all.

I am not dogmatic about this or any other proposal. Honest and open debate may suggest better ways. I think the heart of the issue is a weighing of different risks. The risk of permitting the arms race to continue unchecked seems to me most serious in view of the furies that have been unleashed. The world has had the last great war that civilization can afford. We must, if it is humanly possible, make a fresh start for peace and reason.

Next, I propose that we act, and act fast, to meet the challenge of the under-developed countries. The choices these nations make may well determine the future of freedom in the world.

We must do better than we have been doing. And the way to begin is to understand the hopes and fears of these peoples and to work out with them new relationships based on cooperation and trust and mutual respect. I might add that, in my judgment, the spirit of these new relationships is more than an expansion of economic aid.

I believe, too, that we must breathe new life into the Atlantic community. NATO has served and will, in some form, continue to serve an essential need for collective security. But let us recognize clearly that cooperation in defense implies and demands cooperation in political and economic affairs as well. And in the neglect of these matters lies the explanation of the declining vigor of the alliance.

Again, I propose a fresh approach to the problems of world economics. This new approach must take account of the almost universal desire for economic development and must rest solidly on the principle of mutual advantage. I am more interested in practical measures than in global plans for solving all the world's problems by some master stroke.

I am impressed, for example, by the possibilities of a world bank as a means of aiding economic development and of putting our agricultural surpluses to work.

Finally, and perhaps most important, I propose that the American Government deal openly, frankly, honestly with the American people. I think that in the name of security we have been sweeping far too many things under the rug. We have drawn a paper curtain between the American people and the world in which they live.

It is easy--and when mistakes have been made or reverses suffered, it is all too inviting--to use the excuse of security for not telling the people the facts.

Some things must be kept private, but a democratic government must never forget that it is no wiser and no stronger than the people whose servant it is. The sources of information are the springs from which democracy drinks. These waters alone can nourish and sustain us in a free way of life.

This seems to me the central point, for unless the American people are given the information required to understand the needs of this tempestuous, turbulent period when the swirling waters of three revolutions are converging, they will listen to the demagogues who promise quick and easy solutions. But the ideological revolution of communism cannot be met by quick and easy solutions. Neither can the political revolution of the oppressed and the newly independent peoples, or the historic revolution of technology throughout the world.

I ask your support not because I offer promises of peace and progress but because I do not. I promise only an unending effort to use our great power wisely in pursuing the goal of peace--in full knowledge that as soon as one problem is brought under control, another is more than likely to arise. If peace could be won by wishing for it, by fine rhetoric, it would have been ours long ago.

I ask your support not because I say that all is well, but because I say that we must work hard, with tireless dedication, to make the small gains out of which, we may hope, large gains will ultimately be fashioned.

I ask your support not in the name of complacency but in the name of anxiety.

We must take the world as we find it and try to work in the direction of peace. We did not want a contest with world communism, but the contest is upon us. We cannot escape it, and unless we wage it with greater wisdom, greater skill, greater tenacity of purpose than our opponent, we will fall, as other great powers have fallen in other great contests.

The first and in some ways the most difficult task is to recognize this fact of contest. General George Marshall used to warn his colleagues not "to fight the problem" but to deal with it. That is good advice for us today. If we try to hide the problem from our minds, to pretend that

it does not exist, to wage our political contests here at home in terms of misleading promises, we will be fighting the problem and we will fail.

Peace is our goal. I am in politics as a result of a personal decision to do what I could to help in building a peaceful world. That decision carried with it an obligation--the obligation to talk sense, to tell the truth as I see it, to discuss the realities of our situation, never to minimize the tasks that lie ahead.

I don't know whether that is the way to win at politics, but it is the only way I know to win. For, if you entrust me with the responsibility of power, I do not want to assume that power under any false pretenses nor do I want you to labor under any misapprehensions.

To do otherwise would be not only to mislead you, but to make my own task almost impossibly difficult, for I would not have won your support on the basis of an understanding between us about the needs we face and the demands they place upon us.

To achieve such understanding seems to me to be the true function of politics.

CONTROL OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS

Madison Square Garden
New York City, New York
October 23, 1956

Governor Harriman, my friends, no man would be unmoved by this great reception you have given me here tonight in the Garden. I remember so well your reception here four years ago. And now you have done it again. But this time there's a difference. This time we will win.

We won in 1954 from Maine to Oregon. We won again in 1955. And now we are going to win the world series in 1956.

Now I'll tell you why. The Republican team has made too many mistakes. They first, they kept Secretary Dulles in the box one brink too long, and they also, I think, turned their farm system over to Ezra Taft Benson. Now my only regret is that my running mate, Estes Kefauver, is not here to share this memorable evening with me. But I am honored by the presence here tonight of men and women whose lives personify the noblest traditions of the Democratic party; Eleanor Roosevelt, Herbert Lehman, Averell Harriman, Bob Wagner and so many others that my limited time will not permit me to enumerate.

These are people to whom politics has meant the fight to win a better break in life for the poor and for the helpless, for the harassed immigrant and the child of misfortune, for the victims of greed and intolerance.

They have been denounced, each one of them, as idealists and as dreamers, but by their fidelity to these ideals, they have lived to see their dreams come true.

Now, as we Democrats point the road toward the great new frontiers of progress in an age that could be the most abundant that has ever blessed mankind, we are assaulted by an old Republican wail once more. This time it is not "creeping socialism." This time it's "pie in the sky."

Well, we all know--we all should know--that everything is pie in the sky from the Republican point of view--until the Democrats bring it down to earth. They called Social Security pie in the sky. The whole New Deal was pie in the sky.

But how things have changed! Now President Eisenhower even implies that all of these things were invented by the Republicans.

So we must disregard these alarms. We must push ahead, serene in the knowledge that the Democratic program of 1956 will be the Republican declaration of principles of 1976.

The decisive days of this great campaign lie just ahead.

The Administration had hoped to make this election just a public exercise of a personality cult.

But we have turned it into a debate on principles and on policies.

We have--we have--we have forced great questions into the daylight of free discussion.

And we have done so in the face of an unprecedented effort to suppress and bury the urgent issues of our day under an avalanche of slogans and of propaganda.

We are told that everything is fine--that we are enjoying unprecedented peace and prosperity and progress.

Progress? When the richest country in the world doesn't have schools and teachers enough for its children? When it doesn't have hospitals for its sick? When there is widespread need among our older citizens? When ugly slums deface our cities and offend human dignity? When millions of Americans are still denied opportunities because of race or color?

Prosperity? Yes, but can we be content? What about the farmer? What about the small business man? The distressed areas? The great pockets of unemployment? And the thirty million Americans who live in families with incomes of less than \$2,000 a year?

And finally, peace? When our erratic foreign policy has brought us repeatedly to the brink of war? When the Middle East is smoldering? When the earth is a trail of gunpowder from Korea to Suez to Cyprus? When all humanity lives in the grim shadow of the hydrogen bomb?

I say to you that in a free democracy there is no place for the notion that the President can do no wrong. And we reject too the notion that this President is somehow not responsible for the deeds of his Government.

In all too many instances, he has abdicated the responsibilities of office without abdicating the office itself.

And nowhere has this abdication been more total than in the difficult process of transition toward desegregation of our schools.

In many areas the progress achieved has been great. Men and women of both races have worked hard, have risked much, have dared much, so that America might offer the world a model of democracy in action. But they have looked to the White House in vain for moral leadership and encouragement in support of this great readjustment. The President has even declined to express his views on the decision of the Supreme Court.

Now indeed, one seems to detect a hint of resentment at the whole idea of the President's accountability. But who's in charge, anyway? We know that this is a business man's administration, but what we want to know is: who's running the store?

And the even more important question is: if the Republicans were to win this fall, who would be running the store for the next four years?

The key man of the Republican future is President Eisenhower's hand-picked heir, Vice-President Nixon.

Now we all know that in recent months the Vice President has been subjected to a remarkable process of face-lifting and hand-laundering.

If the stakes were less urgent, if the issues of our time were less cruel, less ominous, this public rehabilitation of the Vice President of the United States might be amusing.

But what is at stake is not only progress at home; what is at stake is peace in the world.

We Americans want--we Americans are determined to have--not the press agent's peace the Administration seems content to offer us, but a genuine peace, founded on freedom and on justice.

But we know we cannot win that peace when our Government will not face the facts itself or tell us the facts, tell the people the truth, when it deludes itself and us by a fatuous optimism, when it presents defeats as victories and finds in each new Soviet advance fresh evidence of Soviet weakness, when it systematically declines challenges and refuses opportunities.

We know we cannot win the great struggle of our century under a leadership whose only hope, so far as I can see, is that communism may at last be exhausted by success.

We have all been stirred these days by the struggle in Poland against Soviet domination. I say to you that independence from foreign Communist control is at least a step toward independence from domestic Communist control, so that we must help, if we can, and I believe that we should be prepared to join other nations in offering economic assistance to a free government in Poland.

I wish, I wish, my friends, and I wish it very much, that there were more good news to report, that there were better news elsewhere. I have kept my peace in spite of our blundering vacillation in the Middle East and Mr. Dulles' succession of appeasements and of provocations which preceded the Egyptian dictator's seizure of the Suez Canal.

But the Republican candidate himself has introduced this matter into the campaign. He announced a few days ago on a political television show paid for by the Republican party that he had "good news" about Suez.

There is no good news about the Middle East.

It is not good news, in fact it is very, very bad news that the Soviets have in a few months penetrated the Middle East as the Czars couldn't do

in 300 years of persistent effort.

And it is not good news that never in history has Russia had such influence in the Middle East.

And it is not good news--indeed it is very bad and very sad news--that our relations with our oldest and our strongest allies--Britain and France--are more fragile than they have been in a generation.

The United States has a compelling interest in peace in the Middle East--the oil tank of Europe and of Asia and the great bridge between the East and West. And we have a natural interest in the nation of Israel--a nation in whose creation in 1947 I had a proud part.

Israel is not a cause to be cynically remembered by the Administration in late October of an election year. It is the symbol, rather, of man's triumph over one of the darkest sorrows in human history--the attempt of Adolf Hitler to destroy a whole people.

And I say that the first premise of any Middle Eastern policy is that Israel is here to stay; that she must have the arms; the economic support and the diplomatic guarantees necessary to assure her independence and integrity.

I could go on. It is not good news that Korea is still divided by an uneasy armistice; that the richest half of Indochina has become a new Communist satellite; that communism and neutralism have made important gains in Ceylon, in Burma, in Afghanistan and Indonesia; that the Soviets have even challenged us to economic and political competition everywhere on earth; that the coalition of free nations has never been in worse shape.

Yet the Republican candidate says that all is well, that the American prestige has never been higher, that aggression has been stopped and peace restored around the world.

Why don't they at least tell us the truth about the world in which we live?

And I would ask you how much longer can we afford the bungling which precipitated the Suez crisis?

Do we want four more years of John Foster Dulles?

And I say it is time and past time for truth and not advertisements from Washington.

In many ways this election will determine the kind of tomorrow that we and our children may enjoy. But the transcending question before humanity is whether there will be a tomorrow at all.

Now let me say to you that this hydrogen bomb discussion is not a political controversy. This is a matter of national security and of

moral responsibility to our citizens and to our fellow inhabitants of the whole globe.

In his Christmas message last year His Holiness Pope Pius vividly described the consequences of hydrogen war.

Let me quote some of his words: "Entire cities, even the largest and richest in art and history wiped out; a pall of death over the pulverized ruins covering countless victims with limbs burned, twisted, scattered while others groan in death agony. There will be no song of victory, only the weeping of humanity which in desolation will gaze upon the catastrophe brought on by its own folly."

These are the solemn words of the Pope. His views are shared by many. They are backed by the cold proof of scientists. It is for these reasons that I proposed long before this campaign that we take the lead in curbing this ghastly killer.

The only question, it seems to me, is whether we can do so without endangering our national defense--because we must have a national defense establishment second to none--until that day when our enemies come to their senses and agree on a safe and sane disarmament.

Yet the hard scientific fact seems to be that we can safely stop hydrogen explosions without inspection because if Russia or anyone else should violate an agreement and explode a big bomb we would immediately detect it.

So here my friends--here is one place where we can break out of the deadly vise of this catastrophic arms race--and we can break out at the most important place of all.

I think that we must make this effort--I think that we must make it in the name of humanity. America's military strength is the single greatest deterrent to war and the first bastion of freedom. It must not be weak. But America's moral, intellectual, productive strength can be more than a deterrent. It can lead the way to peace.

We must ask ourselves two questions:

1. Will the peace and the health of the world be advanced if all nations stop exploding these weapons. The answer is yes.
2. We must ask ourselves would an agreement weaken the relative military position of the United States and the answer is no.

We would be deprived of none of our ability to retaliate. We could continue to improve the means of delivery. We would continue our research and development and our preparations for tests. Our arsenal of hydrogen bombs and other weapons is enough to deface the earth. Our stock-pile continues to grow. By entering such an agreement we lose none of our power and we gain peace power.

And--and a point to remember is that there can be no security for any-

one so long as this elemental fire is loose in the world--so long as the furies that we have unleashed are unchained.

I reject the idea of throwing up our hands and refusing to try. This is one time that we can't take no for an answer. And I don't think that this nation wants the great decisions about the H-bomb entrusted to Richard M. Nixon.

Seldom before has such power, such responsibility, rested in the hands of so few. And a sober question in this election is whether such fateful decisions can be safely entrusted to the Republican party leadership, with its record of isolationism, rigidity and mistrust of the people.

My friends, this is not a partisan issue. It goes far beyond the fate of Democrats or Republicans in this campaign. It goes to the very survival of mankind.

But it is only part of the larger issue--that is, the struggle for peace and freedom everywhere in the world.

I say to you that this struggle can be won only by a government which represents the real America--which cares about people, and seeks day and night to meet their needs, advance their welfare and enlarge their opportunities.

Most of the world is poor and hungry. Everywhere demagogues prey upon the longings of the dispossessed and the fears of the disinherited. The age summons us to a new war against poverty, injustice and inequality--in our own land and everywhere in the world. Most of all, we are summoned to war against war itself.

But, to recover leadership in the fight for peace and freedom, America itself must have a new vision and a new hope. A rigid, complacent and self-righteous nation cannot hope to inspire the men and women fighting for human dignity and social advance in other parts of the world.

The America which excites the world's admiration is not timid, fearful and confused. It is the America of the Declaration of Independence; it is the America of the Emancipation Proclamation; it is the America of the Marshall Plan and Point 4--it is America, the champion of freedom, it is America the bold and magnanimous.

Humanity cries out for new courage, new ideas, new effort. It cries out for a new faith in the people and a new determination to move ahead in the changing century.

It has been the historic faith of the Democratic party that the people can be trusted with the great decisions. It has been the historic role of the Democratic party to meet the new challenges of each generation. It is the passion of the Democratic party to make the Twentieth century safe for the people--the people in America and people throughout the world. In this spirit, we can advance with high hearts to the day of decision in this election--two weeks from tonight.

FARM POLICY

Democratic Farm Rally
Springfield, Illinois
October 25, 1956

My opponent in this campaign has chosen not to talk about the farm issues to farmers.

The President, you will remember, went to the plowing match last month at Newton and said a few words in favor of the plow. I suppose the reasons for this evasion are fairly clear. For it was at the plowing match at Kasson four years ago that candidate Eisenhower made the golden promises that he so quickly forgot when he went to the White House. This year he must have felt that anything he said at a plowing match just wouldn't be believed anyway.

The President went instead to Peoria and bravely told the folks there how happy the farmers are—or at least how happy they ought to be. I think it's interesting, too, that, so far as I can discover, neither the President nor the Vice President—either in Peoria or any place else in this campaign—has ever mentioned the name of the Secretary of Agriculture. Well, I don't think it's any secret. It's Ezra Taft Benson. But a lot of think it's time for a change.

And now the Secretary has also been on a tour. I see it reported in the paper that this tour has been a great triumph, that Mr. Benson hasn't been booed much at all. From the reports of his visit here Tuesday I understand why. When a man who has presided over a 20 per cent drop in farm income has the gall to come out and boast—after the latest drop—that farm prices are going to go up now, you don't boo him; you just wonder what's wrong with him.

Sometimes I wonder, in all honesty, how much political oratory really clarifies things. And yet this year's debate on farm policy has cleared up a lot of things. Whether they intended it or not, the Republican orators, including the President, have made the Republican position on agriculture crystal clear. Farmers now know exactly where the candidates of both parties stand.

Tonight I want to summarize what this record shows, and I'm not going to mince any words about it.

The first lesson is that there is no connection between what a Republican candidate says in an election year campaign about farm issues and what he does about it if he gets elected.

Every farmer remembers the promises candidate Eisenhower made in 1952 at Kasson, Minnesota, and at Brookings, South Dakota, and at a dozen other places: That "the Republican party is pledged to the sustaining of 90 per cent parity price support and it is pledged even more than that to helping

the farmer obtain his full parity, 100 per cent, with the guarantees in the price support at 90 per cent." Did President Eisenhower keep those promises? He did not.

At Peoria, four years later, the President told his Republican audience that what he meant at Kasson was that farmers should get their parity in the market place. If that means anything it means they should get parity without price supports. And if that is what Mr. Eisenhower meant, why didn't he say so four years ago?

He didn't say so because he knew that any such statement would have cost him votes.

Let me cite another case. Four years ago, as now, farmers were worried about hog prices. And four years ago candidate Eisenhower made another of his clear promises. "We will find a way," he said, "to protect the prices of producers of perishable products." Early this year, when hog prices were at \$10.90 or 52 per cent of parity, the President was asked about supporting the price of hogs. Did he "find a way?" No. Supporting the price of hogs would, he said, be dangerous--and that was the end of it.

The pieces of broken Republican promises are there for every farmer and every citizen to see. The Eisenhower record of broken promises to the farmer is a record of callous political perfidy and the farmer knows it.

To get votes that way is bad enough; to then say, as President Eisenhower did at Seattle, "that the farmer is no longer to be insulted as a commodity for which our parties make competitive bids in the political market-place" is to compound deceit with self-fighteous hypocrisy.

Now the second lesson: In 1952 the Republican candidate pretended for campaign purposes to adopt the Democratic farm policies. This time they have dropped this cynical pretense. They're in favor of doing just as little about the farm problem as they possibly can.

The President has spoken scornfully and often of what he called in Peoria "the old price-depressing Democratic farm programs." These are the programs which rescued the farmer from the worst depression he has ever known and which helped him to enjoy the most prosperous years he has ever had. Farmers know what these programs did for them. And if Mr. Eisenhower did not know he should have found out by now.

But I am willing to concede that American agriculture is one of a number of things he knew very little about when he resigned an appointment from President Truman and flew back from France to run for President in 1952.

In Peoria the President also attacked what he called "the synthetic farmers behind Washington desks" and he went on to say that "farming looks mighty easy when your plow is a pencil and you're a thousand miles from the cornfield."

Well, like it or not, it takes good, devoted public servants with pencils to help make a farm program work. When the President attacks these men he attacks the whole idea of a farm program. And while I am at it let me point out that these farmers were replaced by paid Republican appointees. It now takes 6,400 more men to run the ineffective Republican Department of Agriculture than it used to take to run the effective Democratic programs. And that means a lot more pencils, too.

We have also heard from the other Republican leaders. Mr. Nixon has repeatedly called the Democratic program a "cruel hoax." And Mr. Benson has told us repeatedly that the Democratic mission is to save the American farmer from socialism. Well, the Democratic mission is to save the American farmer from going broke. And it says a lot that in this Administration what's good for General Motors is good, but what's good for American farmers is socialism.

Third; We have learned during this campaign that in spite of the President's virtuous declaimers, the Republicans are still playing election-year politics with the farmer for all its worth.

Again and again the President has said, with a great show of self-righteousness, that the farm problem is something dreamed up by the "politicians"--he gets very indignant when he uses that word--to win votes.

If the President is against playing politics, ask him what he was doing four years ago at Kasson, Minnesota.

And I ask him what he was doing last spring when after vetoing the Democratic farm bill, he then raised price supports? What was he doing when he said firm price supports at 90 per cent of parity were uneconomic and immoral and would enslave the farmer and then promptly raised supports on basic crops this year to 86 per cent of parity in order to win votes? Does the President think that the difference between immorality and morality, slavery and freedom, is only 4 per cent? And I would like to know if he intends to reduce those supports, as he can, right after the election.

Today's loose administration of the soil bank program and the frantic effort to get the checks to the farmers on any terms before the election is more of the farm politics he so righteously denounces, and everyone of us knows it. What is being done is not designed to conserve soil and it's not conserving soil. It's destined to conserve Republicans in office--and it's not going to do that either.

There are more politics in the emergency purchase of turkeys, eggs and hamburger and lard to keep prices stable until the election.

Surely, "politics" is a charitable description of what is really involved when the President tells the country, as he did at Peoria, that his Administration has started to reduce the farm surpluses it "inherited."

At the end of the last crop year the Government investment in surpluses was almost six times as great as at the end of 1952, when the Republicans took over.

On the 31st of this August the Government had on hand or under loan two and a half times as much corn, fifteen times as much cotton, 132 times as much rice, two and one-fourth times as much oats and nearly eight times as much barley as when the Eisenhower Administration took over in January, 1953.

Who does the President think he is fooling when he says that they have started to reduce the inherited surpluses?

The President has said the Democratic proposals will be too costly. He does not say that during this fiscal year we will be paying \$5,700,000 for an ineffective program. This is three and a half times as much as the average cost of a program that worked during the last three Democratic fiscal years.

President Eisenhower has asked farmers to remember how things were four years ago when the Eisenhower-Benson program began. With this suggestion I agree. Net farm income was then \$15,100,000,000; this year it will be \$11,500,000,000. None of us objects the partisanship of politics. But duplicity and hypocrisy to the extent it has been carried by the Eisenhower Administration is not partisanship, it is contempt. And, if anything, it is worse in foreign affairs than in agriculture.

I come to number four in my list. We have learned in this campaign that the Republicans are still at their old game of setting city against country. They have told city people how well the farmers are doing and that an adequate farm program would mean higher living costs.

Why don't they tell the whole truth?

Why don't they tell the housewife that while her food prices have been going up under this Administration farm prices have been falling? Why don't they admit, in all honesty, that in July of this year, when consumer prices went to their all-time peak, farm prices took another sharp drop?

I want to give you one more example of how the President seeks to set city against country. The other night in Seattle the President attacked the Democratic party for what he called "the big saddle." Here is what he said: "They (meaning the Democrats) bravely denounce inflation in the cities--and they go to the country-side with their extravagant promises of the loose credit that makes for inflation." Those were the President's words.

No one could be more concerned than I am about the way prices are going up. The nonsense the President has been talking about how he stabilized the dollar is dangerous camouflage of the fact that this Administration's tight money policy is today hurting us in this country and hurting us seriously.

The credit squeeze of the Eisenhower Administration does not hurt General Motors and the other big companies. And it never will. Their credit is good; they can always borrow if they have to. But the farmer

and the small business man are at the end of the line when it comes to getting credit.

As a matter of fact only a few days after his Peoria speech in which he accused us of favoring liberal credit for the farmer, the President himself had a change of heart--or maybe it was a lapse of memory--or could it have been some more of those farm politics he condemns? At all events he went up to Minneapolis and boasted that his Administration had put into effect "the most liberal farm credit program in history."

That, too, is wrong. The most liberal farm credit program we ever had was the one which bailed the farmers out of the mess that was left after twelve Republican years of Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover--the last time the Republicans were in Washington.

Mr. Eisenhower is, I am sure, a well meaning man. But indifference and ignorance can be as damaging as ill will. If the President doesn't realize the hardship his policies are causing--if he thinks farmers are doing well--if he thinks that farmers have a "liberal" supply of credit--then he just doesn't know what's going on.

And here's another example of the way the Republicans don't play politics in an election year. It is the strange case of Ezra Taft Benson's book.

There is nothing very new about the book. It is the same old Benson line--about how our farm policy is "headed in the right direction" and how President Eisenhower "won a great victory for the American farmer" by vetoing the farm bill earlier this year.

As you can see, it is a strictly nonpolitical document.

What is new is the way it is being distributed. This book of Ezra Benson's is being sent around the country by a foundation in New York. The organization is called the Constitution and Free Enterprise Foundation and it is backed by some of the most conservative big industrialists in the country. And what is worst of all is that the money they give that foundation in order to push Ezra Benson's book is tax deductible. In other words, they can subtract every contribution to this foundation from their taxes--just as you can subtract contributions you make to the Red Cross or to your Church.

In short, money that ought to go to the United States Treasury is being used by a collection of big business men to promote this partisan political tract of Mr. Benson's. It's your money, and my money, which is being used to spread around Mr. Benson's book. And these big business men aren't subsidizing Mr. Benson's book because they love farmers, or because they want farm prices to go up. They are doing it for reasons of their own, and I'm sure you can guess what they are.

Mr. Benson doesn't want to use tax money to support the farmers--but he's perfectly willing to use tax money to support his own book--and the Republicans.

Mr. Benson doesn't like firm price supports for the farmer—but he seems to like them for his own products.

Mr. Benson's book is called *Farmers at the Crossroads*. As we review the way he is permitting a tax-exempt foundation to distribute his political propaganda, it is obvious that his book should be called *farmers at the double-crossroads*.

I wonder if President Eisenhower approves the use of taxpayer's money to circulate his campaign literature—or is this another thing he hasn't been told?

And if what he says is not transparent hypocrisy, then I guess that's the hard truth of the matter—the President just doesn't know what's going on.

In Minneapolis the other day he said with seeming indignation that "some political orators actually have been saying that I am against the little farmer, that I consider the farmer expendable—that I think the family farm is obsolete."

Doesn't he know that last year his Assistant Secretary of Agriculture said in plain words that the little farmer, the family farmer, is expendable, obsolete? Here are his exact words: "Agriculture is now big business, too many people are trying to stay in agriculture." And Mr. Eisenhower's Under Secretary of Agriculture also publicly advised the farmer who is having a hard time to give up and go to the city. Yet this is the man Mr. Eisenhower put in charge of the program for helping these farmers.

Up in Minneapolis on October 16, Mr. Eisenhower said of the farm situation: "Clearly, we are over the hump." But just three days later in Des Moines, his Assistant Secretary of Agriculture said: "I do not mean to imply that we are completely over the hump."

They could have easily agreed on where the farmer really is—he's over the barrel.

But this is a serious matter. We've had enough of a President's saying all the right things while his Cabinet does all the wrong ones. In this campaign, the President has specifically endorsed and defended his Secretary's farm policies—from top to bottom. We now know that four more years of Eisenhower means four more years of Benson—and four more years of Dulles and Wilson and Nixon's eager hand, on the tiller of the ship of state.

But there isn't going to be four more years of flexible promises, flexible prices and inflexible policy.

The Democratic platform sets out the best farm program any party has ever offered. And it will be our program after we are elected, just as it is now.

We have made it clear that we stand for parity of income--a fair share of national income for the farmers. And we will support the prices of basic crops at 90 per cent of parity.

Secretary of Defense Wilson, when he was with General Motors, didn't sell his automobiles on the open market for whatever he could get. The price was set before the car was even produced.

Wilson had a support price.

Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey, when he headed the M. A. Hanna Company didn't sell his iron ore by the boatload for whatever price it would bring. The price of iron ore is negotiated far in advance.

Humphrey had a support price.

The advertising men who manage the President's campaign get paid on a fixed return that hasn't been changed for fifty years.

They would be outraged at the thought of a flexible fee.

They, too, have a support price.

The captains of industry have agreed that the free market is the only thing for the farmer and Mr. Eisenhower acquiesces--as usual.

We Democrats don't agree. We know that we can have a sensible and effective farm program which gives the farmer--and the American economy--the support they need to move toward greater abundance for all.

In this campaign the Republicans have said repeatedly that a return to 90 per cent supports would be a backward step. They have told farm people and city people alike that we Democrats are committed to an out-of-date formula.

Let me clear up this point once and for all. The Republicans did not cut the minimum wage for the working man, as many of them would dearly love to do if they only dared. But the Republicans did cut the minimum wage of the farmer. Our first job is to put it back. This we do when we put the price of basic commodities back to 90 per cent of parity.

But we don't regard fixed supports as the last and only word. They are the beginning of the path to a good farm policy--not the end. There must be a constant search for ways of developing a national farm program to meet the varying circumstances of various crops in order to insure the farmer his fair share of national income and to make it possible for the consumer to share the benefits of our farm abundance.

We must try to keep the prices of perishable products--including livestock prices--at fair levels. And we must do this by methods that benefit the farmer, not just the packer and processor.

We must strengthen the Soil Conservation Service under sound district leadership.

We must not let rural electrification wither for want of a reliable supply of electricity at low cost.

We must protect the family farm and help the low income farmers, those people the President says he loves and his appointees say should be plowed under.

We believe that the farmer should have a fair break on credit.

And we must see that the drought-stricken farmer has adequate and sympathetic help and has it promptly.

If you elect a Democratic administration on the sixth of next month, these will be our goals. And we will lose no time in preparing the program. Let me tell you specifically what I have in mind. I propose to explore at once the appointment of a task force to put the Democratic farm program in shape for swift action at the opening of Congress. And I have in mind asking the next Vice President, Estes Kefauver to head that committee. The farmers of America know about his concern and sympathy. They have every reason for confidence in Estes Kefauver's good sense and good judgment, too.

With a Democratic administration, the farmer will again be a full partner in our progress toward a New America.