





The Art of Effective Speaking

BY
HALDOR B. GISLASON
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA



D. C. HEATH AND COMPANY

BOSTON

NEW YORK

CHICAGO

ATLANTA

SAN FRANCISCO

DALLAS

LONDON

Copy 2

PN 4121
G5
copy 2

COPYRIGHT, 1934,
By HALDOR B. GISLASON ✓

No part of the material covered by this
copyright may be reproduced in any form
without written permission of the publisher.

3 A 4

©CIA 70479 ✓
R

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

MAR - 2 1934

What boots it thy pleasure?
What profit thy parts?
If one thing thou lackest,
The art of all arts?

The only credentials,
Passport to success,
Opens castle and parlor, —
Address, man, address.

— RALPH WALDO EMERSON

Eloquence is a republican art, — as conversation is an aristocratic one. — GEORGE SANTAYANA

PREFACE

“ELOQUENCE, like every other art,” says Emerson, “rests on laws the most exact and determinate.” Certainly much progress has been made during the last twenty-five years in discovering what these laws are. Nevertheless, though much has been accomplished, much remains to be done.

Whoever would acquire skill in speaking may attack the problem in three different ways: he may study theory; he may study models; he may practice. To ask which of these is the most important is a great deal like asking which is the most important leg of a three-legged stool.

One of my aims in writing this text has been to give parallel treatment to all three. Many years of teaching experience have convinced me that the mere statement of a principle is of little value until it has been (1) thoroughly explained, (2) carefully illustrated, and (3) repeatedly exemplified in practice. Every principle here enunciated is concretely linked up with the manner of its application by one or more of our great speakers. It is hoped that this abundance of illustrative material may prove welcome in the classroom, especially where library facilities are limited.

Another aim has been to stress the importance of linking up speaking with the vital interests of the audience. Modern psychology has made it plain that we are essentially creatures of desire, motivated by a never-ending quest for the satisfaction of human wants, material, intellectual, spiritual, æsthetic. The aim of all persuasive speaking, presumably, is to promote a fairer distribution of life's satisfactions, to mould human environment closer to our heart's desire.

It may fairly be affirmed that fuller treatment than usual

has been given in this book to a number of phases of effective speech. The different forms of support, or the different kinds of speech materials, and their adaptation to the different types of speeches, have been given full and specific treatment. The significant part which illustrations play in speaking has been stressed, for it is largely through illustrations, embodying vivid and familiar experiences, that the new is compared to the old, and new behavior patterns are identified with the old ones. The speaking style has been given a somewhat elaborate treatment, which I believe its importance easily warrants. The same may be said of suggestion.

An effort has been made to give the argumentative speech a balanced treatment, by which I mean that logical argument has been given only the place it merits. It is often an important form of support in this type of speech, but it is only one form of support out of many. To give it virtual monopoly of the field is to disregard the patent psychological fact that the real "controls" of human lives are lower than our heads. If, in 1863, when he pleaded the Northern cause in his five speeches in England, Henry Ward Beecher had followed, as a model, the traditional college argumentative forensic, one may imagine how disastrous would have been the consequences. Beecher's addresses in England, and Lincoln's political addresses in America, afford us as fine examples as we have of popular argumentative speeches. They are good models for study.

A word in regard to the illustrative material used in the text. It has been selected in part from successful present-day speakers, and in part from speakers of the last generation, who exemplified the conversational type of speaking, and who were acknowledged masters in the art of communicating ideas to the ordinary run of audiences — the kind of audiences most persons have to deal with. If objection be made that some of these specimens show too much art for the ordinary person to follow, the answer is, it seems to me, that there is plenty of opportunity for everybody to read and hear the mediocre. We bathe in

an ocean of mediocrity every day. These models, in which American oratorical literature is rich beyond others, should serve to inspire students to their best efforts by keeping constantly before them the highest ideals. When we study other forms of art — painting and sculpture — we use the best models available. Why not in speaking? The student who saturates himself with good models along with his practice is well on the way to becoming a good speaker.

No one can work in this subject without feeling a large measure of indebtedness to veterans in the field like James Winans, Arthur Edward Phillips, William Trufant Foster, Charles H. Woolbert, James Milton O'Neill, and others. I may with propriety make special mention of Frank M. Rarig, head of the Department of Speech, University of Minnesota, with whom for many years I threshed out most of the problems here dealt with, and whom I here absolve from all responsibility for whatever heresies may be found within these covers; to Franklin H. Knower of the same department, for carefully reading the manuscript and offering constructive suggestions; also, to Joseph M. Thomas, Assistant Dean, Senior College, University of Minnesota, for good counsel in preparing the manuscript.

H. B. G.

COPYRIGHT ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

To Jane Addams, for permission to reprint her address, "Washington's Birthday."

To D. Appleton-Century Company, for permission to quote from *Contemporary Speeches*, by James Milton O'Neill and Floyd K. Riley; *Public Speaking*, by James Winans; and *Psychology of Suggestion*, by Boris Sidis.

To E. P. Dutton and Company, for permission to quote from *Selected Papers on Philosophy* (Everyman's Library), by William James.

To Ina Firkins, for permission to reprint the speech, "The Usurpations of Society," by Oscar W. Firkins.

To Funk and Wagnalls Company, for permission to quote from William Jennings Bryan's "Cross of Gold Speech," as contained in *Speeches of William Jennings Bryan*.

To Harper and Brothers, for permission to quote from *Human Values*, by DeWitt H. Parker; *Eloquence*, by Garrett P. Serviss; and *Fundamentals of Speech*, by Charles H. Woolbert; and for permission to reprint the speeches, "Social versus Biological Inheritance," by Clifford Kirkpatrick, from *Man and His World*, and "Acres of Diamonds," by Russell H. Conwell.

To Henry Holt and Company, for permission to quote from *Talks to Teachers*, by William James, and *Psychology*, by Robert S. Woodworth.

To Lothrop, Lee and Shepard Company, for permission to reprint "The Calf Path" from *Whiffs from Wild Meadows* and "The House by the Side of the Road" from *Dreams in Homespun*, by Sam Walter Foss; and "Little Boy Blue," by Eugene Field.

To the Macmillan Company, for permission to quote from *Purposive Speaking*, by Robert W. West.

To Edwin Markham, for permission to reprint his poems, "Lincoln, the Man of the People," and "The Man with the Hoe," copyright by the author.

To A. L. Miller, for permission to reprint the poem "Columbus," by Joaquin Miller.

To W. W. Norton and Company, for permission to quote from *Influencing Human Behavior*, by Harry Allen Overstreet.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. THE VALUE OF SPEECH TRAINING	I
II. THE SPEECH SITUATION	8
III. CHOOSING A SUBJECT	20
IV. FINDING AND RECORDING SPEECH MATERIALS .	31
V. SPEECH ORGANIZATION: THE OUTLINE	39
VI. PREPARATION FOR DELIVERY.	56
VII. FORMS OF SUPPORT	79
VIII. FORMS OF SUPPORT: ILLUSTRATIONS	96
IX. MOTIVATION: WANT APPEAL.	118
X. MOTIVATION: SUGGESTION	137
XI. THE SPEAKING STYLE	162
XII. KINDS OF SPEECHES	191
XIII. THE INFORMATIVE SPEECH.	218
XIV. THE IMPRESSIVE SPEECH	231
XV. THE ARGUMENTATIVE SPEECH	259
XVI. THE ENTERTAINMENT SPEECH	292
XVII. THE OCCASIONAL ADDRESS.	297
XVIII. WHAT HOLDS ATTENTION	307
XIX. ACTION: GESTURE, POSTURE, MOVEMENT . . .	327
XX. VOICE: PRONUNCIATION, ENUNCIATION	344
APPENDIXES	
I. Suggestions for Criticism of Speeches . .	369
II. Specimen Speeches	371
III. Selections for Practice	445
IV. Compilations of Speeches	488
INDEX	489

CHAPTER I

THE VALUE OF SPEECH TRAINING

Nothing so truly distinguishes one person from another in point of culture as his manner of speaking. There is much truth in the statement that a man is known by the character of his speech. This is perfectly natural when we reflect that speech is our most important means of communication and the chief instrumentality by which we become known to each other. "Guard well thy tongue," said Thomas Carlyle, "for out of it are the issues of life." It is primarily through speech that we give expression to our personality — interpreting speech in the broad sense, not only of words, but also of the accompanying action, posture, gesture, and facial expression. John Ruskin has put this effectively in the following paragraph:

A well educated gentleman may not know many languages, may not be able to speak any but his own, may have read very few books. But whatever language he knows, he knows precisely; whatever words he pronounces, he pronounces rightly. An ordinary clever and sensible seaman will be able to make his way ashore at most ports; yet he has only to speak a sentence of any language to be known for an illiterate person. So also the accent or turn of expression of a single sentence will at once mark a man a scholar. And this is so strongly felt, so conclusively admitted by educated persons, that a false accent or a mistaken syllable is enough, in the parliament of any civilized nation, to assign to a man a certain degree of inferior standing forever.

The more fully we appreciate the extent to which speaking is a revelation of personality, the more readily will we give of our time and effort to attain in the largest possible measure the charm and power of cultivated speech.

Advantages of Speech Training. 1. *Speech training affords the very best kind of discipline in the art of thinking.* There is no use in disguising the fact that there is no good speaking without careful thinking. The two processes go together and cannot be separated, or at any rate should not be. A student making a speech in class is compelled to see that his thinking cap is on straight. He knows that his performance will be under fire from his associates and from his teacher. If his facts are colored, reasoning processes wobbly, authorities warped, illustrations inapt, the searchlight of criticism will reveal these deficiencies. If he departs from his purpose and moves in a semicircle instead of in a straight line, as many of us have seen youthful Ciceros do, some one will probably point out how far the needle of his aim has deflected from the true meridian.

The process of analysis that underlies every well-prepared speech, the search for materials in books, pamphlets, periodicals, interviews, and experience, the sifting of essentials from unessentials, the discovering of the main ideas on which the discussion hinges, the selection of speech materials in support of these propositions, and finally the preparation of this material for oral presentation to an audience — all these afford opportunity for sustained and discriminating thinking bounded only by the capacity of the individual. “The ability to think oneself *into* and *through* a subject, to be the master of a subject and not its slave,” is worthy of a man’s best efforts.

2. *Speech training helps us to form correct habits of speech, and to overcome incorrect and slovenly habits.* To speak distinctly, so that every vowel and every consonant sound is properly enunciated; to speak audibly, so that every word and every syllable can be heard with the least possible effort; to speak correctly, so that every word is properly pronounced — this is no mean accomplishment. Unfortunately, it is not so easy of attainment as one would think. There is a tendency for most people to be careless and slovenly in their speech. Teachers of public speaking have the experience every day of

being within thirty feet of a student speaking from the platform and still being unable to hear or understand one-half of what is being said. Voices fail to carry, and words sound as if they were being swallowed by the speaker. Vowel and consonant sounds are either slurred or incorrectly given. For *society*, we hear *sassiety*; for *government*, *gouvurment*; for *beauty*, *beaudy*; for *duty*, *doody*; for *spirit*, *spearit*; for *trusts*, *truss*.

Faults like these and many others need to be overcome only once in our lives, and then they will stay corrected. It matters not whether it be in conversation, in business, or on the platform, a clear, distinct, confident, and cultivated speech is one of the greatest accomplishments any man can acquire.

3. *The skill in speaking which is acquired through speech training extends one's sphere of influence.* A man may have native ability of a high order, but as long as he uses it only in his calling, very few have occasion to observe it. "Extemporaneous speaking," said Lincoln, "should be practiced and cultivated. It is the lawyer's avenue to the public. However able and faithful he may be in other respects, people are slow to bring him business if he cannot make a speech."

As long as a man hides his talents under a bushel, nobody will notice him much. But let him show his mettle in public, utter words of wise counsel, or blaze a trail of thought, and all the four winds of heaven will become willing messengers to spread the news of his advent into the community life. He will be singled out as "a man who can make a speech."

Such a man is always in demand. He is wanted at clubs, luncheons, banquets, conventions, festivals, Fourth of July celebrations, political rallies, Old Settlers picnics, and all the rest of the community's festal and commemorative occasions. It is doubtful whether there is any accomplishment so much in constant demand in the church, in the schools, in the public assemblies, on the platform, and for occasions of all kinds as is the gift of effective speech. Those who cultivate this talent, therefore, have a very good chance in the long run of being singled

out for preference and distinction. It was precisely Lincoln's power of speech which lifted him into fame and launched him on a career of noble and conspicuous statesmanship, in the course of which he was destined to sway the fortunes of the Republic. "It is undeniable that it was Webster's power of speech that made his greatness," affirms Gamaliel Bradford in a biographical sketch. Those who have heard Carrie Chapman Catt will understand how large a factor in her leadership, conspicuous in forward-looking movements for forty years, has been her distinctive charm of speech. We have only to look about us to be impressed with the fact that even moderate skill in speaking is the open-sesame to public preferment.

4. *Speech training develops ability to speak in public, which has become almost a business necessity.* Business these days is no longer the simple undertaking it used to be — or much of it, at least, is not. Business today is done on a large scale, with vast organizations involving personnels of thousands of people, and a hierarchy of officials from the president down to the shop foreman, each one responsible for the efficiency of those under his management. Ability to manage and address large groups has become one of the requisites of business leadership. Moreover, our economic system is so ordered that the problem is no longer so much how to produce as how to get people to consume all the things we produce. This requires advertising and salesmanship of a high order, both grounded in the *science and art of persuasion*, which is the province of public speaking. For salesmen, at least, experience and skill in public address is of great value. It is not enough that they know principles; they must know how to apply them when face to face with prospective buyers whether singly or in groups. A salesman bulging with theories about salesmanship and without training in speaking is like a carpenter who knows all about tools but cannot drive a nail straight.

Not only do we have large business units these days, but businesses large and small organize themselves into state and

national associations. The local hardware man may become president of the state association; the local elevator man, state president of his group. At their annual conventions the members of these groups exchange ideas and talk about things of mutual interest: prices, economies, new methods, needed legislation to protect their interests, and other matters. Here are large opportunities for leadership. Men who have ideas and can make them known are the trail-blazers in business progress.

5. *Speech training is an aid to social adjustment.* Speaking is a social performance and tends to develop those social qualities and personality traits that make us more desirable and efficient social beings. Among these may be mentioned tact, poise, ease, grace, self-confidence, and tolerance of other persons' views. We are beginning to realize that it may be quite as important for us to learn to "get along with other people" as it is to master the details of our work. Social adjustments in a society as complex as ours are not easy to make. Nowhere do maladjustments of personality come to the surface as they do in a class in speaking. Here they may be dealt with intelligently and with sympathy. To cultivate satisfactory social relationships, to adjust oneself easily and fully to one's social environment, is a vital thing. Speech or speech habits determine largely how we succeed in doing this.

6. *Speech training makes for intelligent citizenship.* The theory of our government is that all political power is lodged in the people, and that up from the people must spring "the life-giving waters of good government." Movements for social amelioration cannot move faster than public sentiment. It may be said truthfully that the basis of all progress in a democratic government is an enlightened public opinion. Daniel Webster once said, "We are living in an age when the accumulated common sense of the people outweighs the greatest statesman or the most influential individual." If this was true one hundred years ago, how much more is it true now. Woodrow Wilson has put the same thought more picturesquely:

And so with the making of public opinion; back in the country, on the farms, in the shops, in the hamlets, in the homes of cities, in the schoolhouses, where men get together and are true with one another, *there* come trickling down the streams which are to make the mighty force of the river, the river which is to drive all enterprises of human life as it sweeps on into the common sea of humanity.¹

How important it is, then, that public opinion shall be truly enlightened! Too often our opinions are mere bundles of inherited or acquired prejudices. Many a man is a protectionist for no other reason than that his father was a Republican, and many a man is a free-trader for no better reason than that his grandfather was a Democrat. How few there are who come to conclusions on great public questions as a result of investigation and thought! We let our editors, preachers, and politicians do our thinking for us. One great value of public discussion is that it leads to independent thinking. He who, through speaking, comes in contact with live questions, learns something of their vital relation to our well-being, and forms opinions on them as a result of study and reflection, lays the foundation of a broad and intelligent citizenship. John Stuart Mill in his Autobiography says: "I have always dated from these conversations [discussions in a debating society] my own inauguration as an original and independent thinker."

In Conclusion. We may be assured that it is well worth while for any one to improve his speech habits and to acquire some degree of skill in speaking. In point of clear thinking, cultivated speech, business leadership, personality development, intelligent citizenship, it is discipline of the first order. In no better way, moreover, can one make one's influence felt than through public address. He who can stand before his fellows, give adequate expression to his thoughts and feelings, and so help to mould even in a small measure the opinions of his fellow men, is likely to be in the long run a power in his community, and perhaps in his state and nation.

¹ *The New Freedom* (1913), p. 103.

EXERCISES

1. Have you ever listened to a man speaking to a large audience, who was incapable of being heard or understood by more than a small group? If so, what was the difficulty? Could he have overcome it by early training?
2. Name some prominent men in your community in politics, business, and professional life. To what extent, do you think, has proficiency in speaking been a factor in their success?
3. Introduce yourself to the class by telling them about your interests, ambitions, likes and dislikes, why you are taking speech, your principal difficulties in speaking, and what you expect to do when you get out of college. Aim to show the same degree of frankness that you would like to see in others. This may be very valuable information for your teacher. (About three minutes.)
4. Commit to memory the stanzas by Emerson on page iii. Aim to give expression to them with conviction and fulness of meaning.
5. Report orally or in writing on one of the speeches suggested for reading. Give your impressions of it as a speech.

READINGS

Speeches

“Oratory,” by Henry Ward Beecher (*Beecher*: I).¹

“The Value of an Ideal,” by William Jennings Bryan (*Bryan*, Vol. II).

¹ Many of the speeches assigned for reading are to be found in *Modern Eloquence* (Third Edition, revised in 1929), our best compilation of lectures and addresses. For all such speeches, no reference is given except the volume number. Often these speeches may be found in earlier editions also. In case of all other speeches, reference is made to the volume in which each appears by inserting in italic type, after the name of the author of the speech, the name of the author of the volume, as shown here. The complete reference may be found in Appendix IV (page 488).

In listing speeches for reading, reference is sometimes made to the same speech more than once. A good speech illustrates several if not all important principles of speech-making; e.g., good style and good selection of speech materials. The same speech may be read with profit several times,

CHAPTER II

THE SPEECH SITUATION

Always bear in mind that your own resolution to succeed is more important than any other one thing. Work, work, work is the secret of success. — ABRAHAM LINCOLN

When you appear on the platform for the first time to address your fellows, you face a situation which to you seems new, novel. When you come to think about it, however, there are not many elements of newness to be found in the situation. You are accustomed to speaking to a group of your friends, on occasion at some length. You have stood up in school and given recitations many times. You may even have spoken before your class; so you are used to facing at least one audience. If you have been accustomed to doing these things, then there is really nothing new in the situation when you make your first speech in a class in speaking, unless it be that the occasion is a trifle more formal, and that a little more careful preparation is expected of you. If you can meet the situation by feeling that there is really nothing new about it except a little added responsibility, then that is the best way to approach it. Behave on the platform just as you would anywhere else when you are on your dignity; and speak to your audience much as you would speak in ordinary conversation to a group of your friends.

This sounds very simple, but of course it is not quite so simple as it sounds. If we are to be perfectly frank, we have to admit that most of us face the situation with some degree of uneasiness, with more or less uncertainty as to how we shall comport ourselves, and with a feeling of far heavier responsibility than we are accustomed to feel in ordinary conversation

or classroom recitations. The problem is to make the necessary adjustments, to resolve the situation to our advantage and to master it.

The Communicative Attitude. The first thing to note is that a speech situation always involves two parties: the person speaking, and the persons spoken to. This is obvious, of course, and would not need to be mentioned were it not for the fact that there is an ever-present tendency for the first party to forget all about the second party. We need always to remember that the chief and only purpose of speaking is to get certain responses from the audience, *to influence their behavior*. Henry Ward Beecher defines oratory or persuasive speaking as “the art of influencing conduct with the truth sent home by all the resources of the living man.” The aim of a speaker is not merely to unload what is on his mind; it is to present it in such a way that it will stir up thoughts and feelings in the hearers. To do this he must have an alert consciousness of an observing and listening audience. Note that an audience not only listens to a speaker, but also observes or watches him. A speech appeals both to the ear and to the eye. Both voice and action carry meaning.

Just what is meant by the communicative attitude may perhaps best be made clear by an illustration. I had occasion recently to be present at an international gathering of scientists — chemists, to be exact. An informal discussion was going on, in the presence of an audience of about eight hundred people. The first speaker talked very slowly, and while he was speaking, he would refer to some notes he had, and most of the time look down at his chair or at his feet, once in a while at the ceiling. He gave one the impression of a man *meditating aloud*. If it ever occurred to him that eight hundred people were trying to hear him and understand him, he gave not the slightest evidence of it. Judging by the manner of his speaking, he seemed to be wholly oblivious of the fact that there were more than half a dozen or so persons right around him. Seated

as I was near the door, I could not hear more than one word in three. It is safe to say that not half the audience heard him with any degree of comfort, and many not at all. In several places in the room, men were talking among themselves, showing that the speaker had completely lost their attention. His difficulty consisted in overlooking the fact that there were two parties in the speech situation, the speaker and the audience. He forgot about the audience, or at least failed almost completely to take it into consideration. Speaking that does not reach the hearers is wasted breath, no matter how distinguished the speaker. How often it happens that prominent men speak to large audiences and cannot be heard or understood beyond the seventh row!

After two or three others had spoken more or less indifferently, there arose a man who no sooner had opened his mouth than the whole assemblage pricked up their ears, eagerly alert to catch every word that fell from his lips. This man had a good voice and knew how to use it, so that it carried easily to the whole assembly. He was, moreover, perfectly conscious of the fact that he had a large number of people listening to him, and was intent upon having them get what he was trying to convey. He surrendered himself completely to the task of delivering his message. He did not look at the ceiling, nor at his feet, nor out of the windows, nor close his eyes, as the first man did. He looked his listeners in the face and talked *to* them, not *at* them; and he could be heard. In brief, he had the communicative attitude.

This matter of speaking *to* an audience presents one of the greatest problems in speech training. I recently listened to a state declamation contest, as oftentimes before, in which were several young contestants, of more than ordinary ability, although not necessarily with much training. So far as the oratorical contestants were concerned, there were, among many merits, two besetting weaknesses. They had a *lack of directness* which resulted in a *lack of modulation in the voice*. Almost

without exception, these youthful aspirants spoke in the direction of the audience, *at* them; but an individual in the audience could hardly feel that the message was meant for him. In fact, he wondered for whom it was really meant, and could not but conclude that it was really meant for nobody. A speaker would start out well and impressively; but before the ten minutes were up, the deadly monotony of voice and of emotional mood, together with the aimlessness in speaking and failure to sense a perceiving audience, detracted greatly from the effectiveness of the speech.

The Conversational Mode. Perhaps the best way to develop the communicative attitude is to cultivate what we call the conversational mode of speaking; that is, the type of speaking exemplified in conversation. We mean, of course, conversation at its best, polite, orderly, dignified. Everybody knows in a general way what that means, but still it has some implications that need comment.

Young students sometimes get the notion that speaking from the platform is a sort of "showing off" process, and that they must therefore appear in "grand style," using sonorous tones and assuming a pompous attitude. No concept of platform speaking could be more disastrous than that. The frail bark of many a young man's ambition has foundered on that rock. If ever humility serves a man well, it is when he faces an audience the first time, or the first few times. He is likely to feel humble anyway, before he gets very far; so he might as well start right.

When we say that a man should speak in public much as he speaks in conversation, we should understand what that means and what it does not mean. We do not mean, of course, that he should carry to the platform the faults of ordinary conversation. Quite the contrary. We expect thought more carefully organized, diction more dignified though equally simple, enunciation that is more distinct, and a somewhat more formal manner.

What we refer to particularly, in speaking of the conversa-

tional style, is the *use of the voice*, its modulations generally, with respect to vocal quality, variety in pitch, force, and rate of utterance. We mean that these should be much the same on the platform as in ordinary conversation. We mean that the voice, instead of being pitched in a high monotone with unvarying emphasis, as is so often true of speakers, should have the easy, informal swing of conversation, a variety of inflection and emphasis, which is absolutely necessary to express meaning and hold attention.

We should understand clearly, of course, that there is much variety in the so-called conversational style of speaking. We do not in conversation speak exactly in the same way to one or two persons that we do to a group of ten or twelve; nor do we speak to ten or twelve as we speak to one hundred, even if they are all personal friends and the occasion the most informal one imaginable. If we should raise the group to five hundred, there would be a corresponding change in the character of the speaking, which any one may realize in imagination. Considerably more voice would be used, and the rate of speaking would probably be slowed down, if the speaker wished to be easily heard and understood. Still, the conversational mode could be retained. It is not a question of how much voice we use, but rather of how we *modulate* the voice, or change it in point of quality, pitch, rate, emphasis. We may shout at the top of our voice, express the most violent emotions, as we occasionally do, and still be conversational.

It is very much the same with platform speaking. We do not speak to five or ten as we do to one hundred; nor do we speak to one hundred as we do to five hundred or a thousand. It is possible, however, to speak to a thousand people, or even to several thousand, and be conversational.

Bryan could speak to ten thousand people and use the conversational mode. In fact, he never used any other. Clarence Darrow never speaks except in a conversational tone. One should adapt his voice to the audience and the hall, being care-

ful to be comfortably heard by all present. Do not confuse *volume* of voice with *loudness*. Volume refers to the amount of breath passing through the larynx; loudness measures the intensity of vocalization. One may use so much volume of voice in a whisper that five thousand people can hear. One may talk so loud that he cannot be understood thirty feet away. This may sound paradoxical, but it is true. The problem is to use the right amount of voice in the right way, remembering always that the requirements of cultivated conversation should be the guide. Wendell Phillips has been described as a "gentleman conversing." No better concept than that can be formed of platform speaking, and no finer type of platform speaking than that of Phillips is on record.

A good way to discover how far a speaker has departed from the conversational mode is to stop him in his speech and ask him a question. He will very likely answer the question in a conversational tone. Of course, the answer will be given to an individual, and we do not speak to a single person exactly as we speak to a crowd. No man does, no matter how conversational he may be in his public address. But, roughly speaking, the contrast between the mode of answering the question and the mode of speaking will reveal the speaker's departure from the conversational style.

Naturalness. You will hear much about being "natural" in a course in speech training. All of us use the term more or less, and still it is one of rather vague and indefinite meaning. "Be natural," in the sense of "Be unaffected," is good advice, but do not mistake being natural for being effective.

I recently observed two young women in a play. One spoke rapidly and indistinctly, blurting out her words, "clipping" some and mispronouncing others, having very little sense of emphasis, and even being slovenly in dress and personal appearance. The other was much the opposite; her utterance was very distinct, every word crisp as a newly minted coin, pronunciation studiously correct, voice firm and finely modulated,

and personal appearance attractive. Both were natural; only it was natural for one to be effective, and for the other to be ineffective. *The purpose of training is to make it natural for one to be effective.*

Every advance you make in perfecting your speech should register progress in personality development. The correct pronunciation of a word instead of an incorrect one; distinct enunciation instead of a slovenly one; the right tone color, adapted to the thought and feeling content of a sentence, instead of an improper one; a soft, well-modulated voice instead of a harsh, monotonous one; a graceful gesture or movement instead of an awkward one — all these mark unmistakably the growth of a more commanding personality, as well as progress in purposeful speaking.

Nervousness. It has been said that no man ever makes a speech unless he has to. Strange as it may seem, the feeling of uneasiness that persons experience when they face an audience is universal. Wendell Phillips, who made lecturing the principal business of his life for fifty years, used to say that he never walked out on a platform to face an audience without wishing that the platform would sink out of sight and he with it. Bryan, who more than any man of his generation lifted public speaking to the level of an art, affirmed that he usually had a "hollow" feeling in his stomach before addressing an audience.

The problem of stage fright is one that almost every speaker has to face in some degree. There is no panacea for it. To control it is a part of the mastery of the speech situation. A few helpful suggestions may be given.

1. *Accept the situation and make the best of it.* If you do not feel a certain amount of nervous tenseness when you begin to speak, the chances are that you will not do well. Persons with cold or phlegmatic temperaments do not make good speakers. Speaking in public requires much mental concentration and the expenditure of considerable nervous energy. When the new-

ness of the speech situation wears away, the tenseness will gradually wear off, except in so far as it is needed to stimulate effective effort. Here is testimony from an experienced teacher: "In a period extending over several years, the writer has known but one absolute failure among five or six hundred girls from embarrassment in speaking before a class."¹

2. *Practice relaxation.* The chief difficulty in stage fright is overtenseness of the muscles. We have so steeled ourselves to meet the situation that ease and naturalness have left us. Charles H. Woolbert, a searching student of the psychology of public address, offers this advice:

Relax whatever muscles are not needed to accomplish the thing you are trying to do. Use enough energy in the legs to stand on, and no more; those muscles which by their opposition cause the trembling at the knees must be relaxed; the legs must be content to stand and not run. Reduce the extra muscular tension in the back and hips; so also the tension of the arms, hands, and especially of the neck and face. Study what is involved in *Strength* and *Ease*.

The cure for those speakers whose fright is genuine and extreme and seemingly hopeless is in beginning to speak while limp all over, except for the vocal apparatus. Start freed of any possible excess of muscular tension. Then gradually add a stiff back, legs strong enough to hold the body, arms falling just in place, but nothing more. Do the same with the rest of the muscle systems — hands, neck, and face. Practice this sort of thing until you have achieved control over each of these systems and can throw each into or out of gear as you please. Such control is the essence of intellectuality, mental strength, self-possession. It is the opposite extreme from the baby's general explosion; for he lives in a constant state of stage fright, unless when totally at ease — especially asleep. This is the case when he howls, for one of the surest manifestations of fright in some green speakers is a disposition to roar. The cure is far from easy, either for the baby or for the student; but except for psychopaths it is entirely possible always.²

¹ Cornelia C. Ward: *Oral Composition* (1914), Preface.

² *Fundamentals of Speech* (Revised Edition, 1927), p. 86.

3. *Get a grip on yourself.* The cultivation of the will is supposed to be a vital part of education. To cultivate will power is to cultivate habits that are favorable to personal development and wholesome living. We do not know much about the possibilities in this field. A number of modern cults are founded in part, if not wholly, on this theory. Couéism is an example. The following quotation on this subject is from a recent magazine article by a scientist:

Full scientific attention has not been given to the power of *will* in controlling all bodily functions. Very few have realized how great becomes the power of will intensified by practice and concentration. There can be no doubt of the *predisposition* which can be conferred on the nerve by internal power of will in facilitating or inhibiting the nervous impulse.¹

Robert West, in his *Purposive Speaking*, has expressed this in plain English as follows:

If you want A's qualities some day, you must pretend to have them today. Yes, *pretend*. What does that word mean? It means *tend in advance*. What you *pretend* to have today, you will *tend* to have tomorrow, and you will actually *possess* it the day after. Proper tensions, then, are caused by proper pretensions.

Pretend to be confident; react as though you are, and you will be.

There is good opportunity for practicing will power in preparation for platform work. The following cheerful advice from Frank Channing Haddock may be taken for what it is worth:

Resolutely appropriate the occasion as your own and willfully use it as such. If the right word fails you, throw in another as nearly right as may be, or as meaningless as printers' pie. If any one looks weary, ignore that person as an imbecile. Cling to the friendly face, though it be that of a fool. Remember, everybody desires that you should do well, for an audience suffers under a public collapse. Believe that fact. Keep faith in yourself. Storm the situation. Resolve to win on the spot.

¹ Sir J. C. Bose: *Century Magazine*, February, 1929, p. 385.

4. *Prepare your speech carefully.* Careful preparation is one of the greatest safeguards against overtense nerves on the floor. To be well prepared is to be sure of oneself, and to be sure of oneself makes one feel at ease. If you have carefully arranged your materials and gone over them often enough to be thoroughly familiar with the ground to be covered, the chances are that you will not have much trouble. The more completely you can surrender yourself to the subject in hand, the less likely you are to think about yourself, and the better you will get along.

It may be a comfort to the neophyte to know that even men with reputation and experience are not immune from the virus of stage fright. A recent "release" from one of the two largest broadcasting chains in the country announces that a colorful reception room has been transformed into an English beamed-ceiling library studio "for the exclusive use of speakers who might be affected by micro fright. Heretofore, some of the timid radio speakers have paused before the majestic microphone. Often they suffered attacks of 'nerves.' Realizing that surroundings had much to do with this, we have arranged the library studio as a means to end this idiosyncrasy."

Difficult Emotional Adjustments. There is no doubt that many students come into classes in speech to overcome nervousness and to adjust themselves properly to the speech situations. Most students can meet the adjustment without serious difficulty, and with practice become habituated to facing audiences without any more emotional disturbance than is proper for effective work. Occasionally cases arise that are stubborn and present real problems. It is for such that speech clinics have been established in many departments of speech, with a specialist in charge, who is usually well grounded in psychology, especially in abnormal mental traits. If, after giving speaking a fair trial, you experience abnormal fear and find it difficult to develop confidence and self-assurance in facing an audience, you should confer with your instructor about it, frankly and

fully, and try to discover where the trouble is. It may date back to early childhood. The important thing is to get at the root of the difficulty and understand the cause of the trouble. Where the cause is understood, much may be done to correct the maladjustment.

Much depends on the attitude with which you approach and do your work. Aim to make it cheerful and optimistic. Look for and dwell on the pleasant situations rather than the unpleasant ones. A class in speech should have an atmosphere of informality where everybody should feel free to say what he wants to say, and to talk about his own and other students' difficulties fully and freely. A class so conducted will carry with it some of the pleasantest memories of your school career, and you will look back upon it as the source of some of the best discipline you ever had.

EXERCISES

1. Discuss frankly with your teacher and other members of the class the merits and demerits of certain speakers fairly well known to the group. The aim should be to understand the good points and weak points of each, so that you may emulate their virtues and avoid their faults. Consider, among others, the following points:
 - a. Do they use the conversational mode?
 - b. Do they speak so that they can be heard?
 - c. Do they rant? That is, do they use more voice and energy than is necessary or in good taste?
 - d. Do they speak distinctly? Do they sound distinctly final *sts*, in such words as *ghosts*, *mists*, *lists*?
 - e. Do they give you the impression that they are conversing *with* you or talking *at* you?
2. Report orally or in writing on one of the speeches suggested for reading, as to whether it exemplifies directness and informality of conversation. Characterize the style of the one you read as to diction, simplicity, and other qualities of good style. You should read several speeches if you can.

3. Relate some personal experience that has in it something of the thrilling or unusual. Aim to make it as direct and simply conversational as possible. (About three minutes.)

READINGS

Speeches

- “Masters of the Situation,” by James T. Fields (*Mod. El.*: I, Vol. V).
“The New South,” by Henry W. Grady (Vol. II).
“Public Opinion,” by Wendell Phillips (*Phillips*, Vol. I).
“The Reign of the Common People,” by Henry Ward Beecher (Vol. XIII).
“Liberty of Man, Woman, and Child,” by Robert Ingersoll (*Ingersoll*, Vol. I).
“Which Knew Not Joseph,” by Bruce Barton (*Lindgren*).

References

- Charles Henry Woolbert: *Fundamentals of Speech* (Revised Edition, 1927), pp. 86-88.
James Milton O'Neill and Andrew Thomas Weaver: *The Elements of Speech* (1926), Chap. II.
Arleigh Boyd Williamson: *Speaking in Public* (1929), Chap. II.

CHAPTER III

CHOOSING A SUBJECT

The cause of truth is advanced, in the long run, by allowing all to air their prejudices and advocate all their errors. — WENDELL PHILLIPS

What shall I talk about? That is a question that must be answered by any one who undertakes to make a speech. Sometimes, especially in early practice, it is almost as puzzling to choose a subject as it is to make the speech when the subject is once chosen. To find subjects suitable for different audiences and different occasions is certainly not easy, either in school or out of it.

One way to answer the question is to say that choosing a subject is a part of the speech problem. You cannot make a speech without having something to talk about, and there is really no good reason why any one should help you choose your subject any more than there is a reason why any one should help you make your speech. It is all one project, and an individual one at that. Your instructor may give you some suggestions at first while you are getting started; but after all, the final choice must rest with you, for you alone know, or at least you know best, where your interests lie and in what field you are likely to do the most effective speaking. If you have to scratch your head to find a suitable subject, that is a part of the game.

This problem of finding interesting and suitable subjects to talk about will remain with you in mature life, and in some measure as long as you continue to make speeches. Even a man of so wide experience as Senator Borah frankly confessed to an audience of university students that he was always puzzled to know what to talk about to an audience of college men and

women. When, in future years, you will be asked to speak at the reunion of your class, or give a commencement address at your old school, or a Decoration Day address, no one will hand you a subject on a silver platter. When you ask, "What shall I speak about?" the reply will almost invariably be, "Oh, we are willing to leave that to you." And they think they are doing you a favor by leaving the subject to you. Well, perhaps they are. Even if some one should suggest a subject to you, the chances are that you would not speak on it anyway unless it were one almost demanded by the occasion. As a rule, you would want to choose your own subject, for you alone know what subject would be best suited to you and to the time and place. The choice might give you some thought, but you would be the only one to make the choice.

Finding Suitable Subjects. A student in class who evidently was having trouble in finding something to talk about suggested that the instructor should select subjects for all speeches. A moment's reflection will reveal the futility of such an arrangement. How can any instructor know about the interests and prejudices of every member of the class and select the particular subjects for each member best suited to his knowledge and tastes? One student may be interested in sports, another in economic reforms, a third in agriculture, and a fourth in travel. Each should find topics for speeches in the field in which he is especially interested. If the instructor were to make an assignment of subjects, he would be bound to get most of them wrong, although he might once in a while hit upon the right one. Occasionally an instructor can guide a student into green pastures for speech subjects, but beyond that, he cannot reasonably be expected to go.

Requisites of a Good Subject. For the benefit of the inexperienced, a few suggestions for choosing subjects for speeches are ventured.

1. *Find subjects in your own experiences.* It was Sir Philip Sidney who advised, "Look within thy heart and write." The

same sage counsel holds good for a speaker, "Look within thy heart and speak." For within you, in the storehouse of your memory, are countless experiences and reactions to your environment, accumulated throughout the years. We live in a complex society, presenting numberless opportunities for new experiences and activities of all kinds. To this many-sided environment, you are at all hours of the day constantly reacting in one way or another. Some of your reactions are favorable, some unfavorable. Some things about your environment you like; others you do not like. You may live in the city and feel the lure of the simple life in the country. You may be a conservative and fear that the radicals are planning to overthrow our social order; or you may be a radical and think that the conservatives are planning another world war. Here is your opportunity to give your views on all the burning questions of the day. You may not be right, but you have a right to your opinions, even the right to be wrong. The utmost freedom of expression should prevail in a class in speaking. A good slogan for such a class is the sentiment uttered by Wendell Phillips and given at the head of this chapter.

For your first speeches, at any rate, it will be well to take subjects that are at hand and of which you have some first-hand knowledge. Your college environment is full of problems, with some of which you have doubtless come in contact. You may not think that campus politics move on as high a plane as they should. Give your views and help to set such matters right. There are many questions touching college life on which you should have intelligent opinions. Do you approve of the honor system in examinations? Do you think a student who observes cheating in examinations should report it? Is football occupying too much attention of undergraduates to the detriment of scholarship? Should the faculty censor student publications? Should your Alma Mater foster debating or discussion clubs on the order of the Oxford Union, England? Do too many classes and recitations hinder the earnest student's

pursuit of knowledge? Is a liberal arts education worth while for a man bent on a business career? These and countless other questions are meat for speeches. Observe what subjects you get into disputes about with your friends and associates. Some of them may be serious enough to warrant a speech. Good speeches are often made on simple subjects.

What are you interested in? That is a good question to ask yourself. The different studies that you pursue in college should furnish some interesting subjects for speeches. You have probably selected, or else are considering the selection of, your major and minor groups of study. That is one clue to where your interests lie. We are apt to overlook the opportunities that are right before us, and seek for them in the far distance.

Take for instance the subject of psychology. That is one of the most popular of all the sciences, and one that has a bearing on almost every aspect of life. In its approach to the study of human behavior, it has almost completely changed its point of view in the last fifteen or twenty years. It is becoming increasingly objective — a science of experimentation, tests, measurements, and of technical terminology. What, in plain English, is the meaning of such terms as *mental conflict*, *complex*, *compensation*, *rationalization*? What have physical characteristics to do with intelligence? What has become of the theory of the localization of brain functions? What have intelligence tests added to our concept of mental abilities? What is the ability of adults to learn? How does it compare with that of college students? Is there compensation in psychological traits? These are merely suggestions of the many interesting topics which a study of psychology presents to the speaker. To explain these in simple and concrete language to an audience not familiar with them is good practice in speaking.

Take anthropology as another example. It is revealing many interesting facts about the early life of the human race. Excavations are being made in all quarters of the globe, yielding interesting relics and information about how other peoples and

racers lived and moved and had their being thousands of years ago. To most persons, Neanderthal Man and Pithecanthropus Erectus are only names. The lives and customs of primitive man are of absorbing interest and throw much light on the arts, institutions, and general behavior of the more advanced races today. I recently read a volume in this field which to me contained some startling statements. One was to the effect that our study of races does not enable us to say that the so-called savage races have a lower mentality than the civilized ones. The differences in culture are to be accounted for largely by the means they have to work with. An African "savage" recently made a lecture tour of America and turned out to be a capital speaker! Here are opportunities for a series of interesting speeches.

So with many of the other natural and social sciences. Sociology, history, economics (always a fertile field for speakers), political science, business administration, agriculture, engineering, astronomy — all furnish a variety of interesting subjects for speeches, provided one has done special work in one of these fields. It is assumed that a speaker who undertakes to talk about these subjects knows something about them, and has enough interest in them to give to his speech materials the imprint of his personality. No one can make an interesting speech until he has assimilated and made his own the ideas which he wishes to present.

2. *Choose subjects that you know something about.* This is very much in line with what has preceded, and means that you, as a speaker, should have a degree of knowledge larger than that possessed by your audience. It is a great advantage in speaking — in fact an essential — to have a knowledge of your subject far beyond that of your hearers. It gives a certain amount of prestige and authority to your statements. We are all willing to give a hearing to the man who can impart new information on an old subject, or push forward the boundaries of knowledge on any subject of interest.

The world surrenders to the man who knows. "In any knot of men," says Emerson, "conversing on any subject, the person who knows most about it will have the ear of the company if he wishes it, and lead the conversation — no matter what genius or distinction other men there present may have; and in public assembly, him who has the facts and can and will state them, people will listen to, though he is otherwise ignorant, though he is hoarse and ungraceful, though he stutters and screams."¹

It is not intended, of course, and cannot be expected, that a person will make himself a specialist in every subject that he undertakes to talk about. But a student of speech-making might as well understand early in his career that making speeches is serious business, and that if he wishes to excel, it will mean much hard work and application. One of the mistakes students often make is to wait until the last minute to choose their subjects, and then wonder why they do not get on better. A subject for even a ten-minute speech should be chosen at least two weeks before the speech is to be made. A speech grows. It does not just happen. Ideas must have time to germinate. If you have eight hours to put on a speech, it is much better to spend, say, two hours at a time, twice a week, for two weeks, than cram for it the last day or so. That gives you an opportunity to think about the subject when you are walking to your classes, or riding on a street car. It gives you also an opportunity to talk about it with your friends. In this way, you will revolve it in your mind again and again, look at it from every angle, change your mind perhaps several times, and finally evolve something worth presenting.

3. *Do not make the aim of your speech too broad.* Many speeches are spoiled by covering too much ground. A five-minute speech on disarmament or the League of Nations is foredoomed to failure. It is impossible in a few minutes to give adequate support to any vital propositions on questions of such

¹ *Lecture on Eloquence.*

magnitude. If you must take a big subject, be sure to limit it in some way, and deal with one or two aspects of it. Suppose you want to speak on the American protective tariff policy for five or ten minutes. You will not get very far in an argument for or against it. Consider the following propositions: Is it needed to protect American industry? To what extent does our tariff policy protect American labor? What is the probable cost of it to the consumer? To what extent are such tariffs the cause of international conflicts? Any one of these propositions is well adapted to an hour's speech. What is the effect of our protective tariff policy on the agriculture of the Northwest? That is somewhat limited, but still a very broad proposition. What protection does the American tariff afford the American wheat grower? That is narrowing the subject down to the limits of a possible good ten- or fifteen-minute speech.

So with every broad subject. Aim to limit it, and find a purpose sentence that can be adequately supported in the time you have at your disposal. To spread your efforts over too much ground is fatal. The River Platte in Nebraska has been described as being a mile wide, a foot deep, and five hundred miles long. If that is an accurate description of it, we may know that it serves no good purpose, and is mostly a nuisance. Confine it within a channel a hundred or two hundred feet wide, and it becomes a mighty stream capable of developing great power. It is much the same way with a speech. Spread it over broad ground, and it accomplishes nothing. It has neither depth nor momentum. Confine it within narrow limits, get cumulative support for your propositions, and you may have a dynamic message that will move an audience to resolute action.

4. *A good subject "grips."* A subject for a speech is well chosen if it grips both speaker and audience. To do well, a speaker must be dominated by his purpose. Emerson defines an orator as a man "drunk with an idea." The speaker should feel that he would really like to say something on the subject, and when he gets through, the audience should feel that some-

thing has been said that needed to be said. Avoid making a speech that is merely an "elaboration of the obvious." If you try to explain something, let it be something that needs to be explained. If you want to convince your audience of something, be sure that they are not convinced before you begin. If you want to make them feel deeply on a subject, let it be some subject to which they are indifferent and with which they are not properly impressed. Experience, training, practice will gradually lead you to subjects that grip, and away from those that do not.

A subject grips an audience if it deals concretely with fundamental wants and desires. (See Chapter IX.) It grips a speaker when it impels him to put forth his best efforts in the preparation and the presentation of his speech.

The Value of Your Own Experiences. Learn to value properly your own experiences, for you will find in the long run that your experiences will suggest the best subjects to you, and will also prove to be among the very best speech materials you can get. It takes practice to realize this fully, and to select those experiences that have the greatest interest values. Lincoln helped a pig out of a tight place in a fence, and the world has been talking about it ever since. You may have done something just as startling, only the world does not know about it. The problem is to learn to value and interpret experiences properly. Charles H. Woolbert, in his *Fundamentals of Speech*, speaks to the point in the following:

Never confess that you cannot think of anything to talk about; it is a confession either of fear or of poverty of life. That boys and girls can arrive at upper-school and college age and not have countless good things to discuss is inconceivable. You have all done enough and been through enough to have more than enough to say that will be interesting to others — providing you have learned the art of saying it well. Likely enough the thing you talk about most interestingly is the very thing that looks so commonplace to you that you cannot imagine anybody's being interested in it. Yet if it

is genuinely yourself and out of your own experience, and if it is told well, you will never have to send out a town crier to get a hearing. Half the time the stuff people like best is the very stuff the speaker thinks is too simple to be mentioned. No more interesting matter for writing or speech exists than commonplace experiences well told.¹

Learn to have opinions of your own, but do not have many convictions unless you are sure of your ground. Convictions without proper understanding and evidential support are dangerous. Large portions of the earth have been drenched in blood in support of convictions that have proved unsound. Several good speeches could be made on the theme, *The Tragedy of Uninformed Opinion*.

In Conclusion. Choose, then, a subject that comes well within your own personal experiences; that you know something about, or are willing to gather authoritative information for; that is not too broad, but will enable you to give it adequate support in the time at your disposal; that will grip your audience and yourself as well, and so impel you to put forth your very best efforts. Remember Emerson's definition of a good speaker — one who is drunk with an idea. Do not forget that it is not enough to have a good subject and good speech materials. You yourself must react to those materials, make them your own, assimilate them, and not merely serve as a conduit for passing them on. Something like a chemical reaction is needed between your speech materials and your own personality. Your own individuality must at all times dominate the situation and make its impress on all your utterances.

When class work in speaking gets under way, you will find that the speeches given by members of your class will suggest to you all kinds of subjects. Some of the things said will arouse opposition. You will not agree with them and will want to make reply. You will find, also, that in working up your own speeches, you will come upon trains of thought that you may want to follow up and develop. In this way, a new world of

¹ Revised Edition, 1927, p. 305.

opportunities for speaking will open up before you, and this will be worth more to you than all the subjects that can be given to you. In the meantime, refer to Chapter XII, "Kinds of Speeches," for suggested subjects.

EXERCISES

1. Prepare a three- to five-minute speech for class, choosing a subject on which you have some settled convictions. Aim to express these convictions candidly. In preparing your speech, try to show that it is to the advantage of your audience to think as you do on the subject.
2. Hand in five subjects suitable for class speeches. Justify your choice of subjects on the basis of criteria given in this chapter.
3. Criticize the following speeches from the point of view of choice of message:
 - "The Gettysburg Address," by Abraham Lincoln.
 - "Progress of the American Negro," by Booker T. Washington.
 - "Liberty under the Law," by George W. Curtis.
 - "George Washington," by Jane Addams.
4. Make a list of three subjects that you have recently heard discussed, either in church or elsewhere, and that have appealed to you as being good. Why did they appeal to you?
5. What speeches have you read that exemplify a wise choice of message?

READINGS

Speeches

- "The Battle of Life," by Mary Livermore (*Mod. El.*: I, Vol. V).
- "The Reign of the Common People," by Henry Ward Beecher (Vol. XIII).
- "Liberty under the Law," by George W. Curtis (Vol. I).
- "Progress of the American Negro," by Booker T. Washington (Vol. VIII).
- "The Gettysburg Address," by Abraham Lincoln (Vol. XI).

For a variety of short speeches on many themes, see James Milton O'Neill: *Modern Short Speeches*.

References

- James Winans: *Public Speaking* (Revised Edition, 1917), Chap. XIV.
William Phillips Sandford and Willard Hayes Yeager: *Principles of Effective Speaking* (Revised Edition, 1930), Chap. XVI.
Arleigh Boyd Williamson: *Speaking in Public* (1929), Chap. IX.
Thomas Wentworth Higginson: "Hints on Speech Making," *Modern Eloquence* (Third Edition, revised in 1929), Vol. II, pp. xv-xxii.

CHAPTER IV

FINDING AND RECORDING SPEECH MATERIALS

When you have chosen a topic and formulated a proposition to express your purpose, broad enough to include all you want to say on the subject, the next step is to find something to say. If you are talking about a subject that will enable you to draw heavily on your personal experiences — as, for instance, a travel talk or an account of some unusual and thrilling adventure — all you may have to do will be to draw on your memory, and simply tell about things you have actually seen and heard. If the subject is more involved, and requires careful analysis and the use of facts, figures, and authorities, you may have to look for all available sources of material, including interviews, current periodicals, books, and reports of different kinds.

Sources of Speech Materials. Let us look at a few of the available sources in their order.

1. *Your Own Knowledge of the Subject.* The first and most important source of information on many subjects will be your own mind and memory. If, as has been suggested, you choose subjects at first that come largely within your own observation and experience, you may not have to go beyond this primary source. If you are going to talk about a fishing trip, a day in the woods, or travel abroad, you will not need to consult any books or magazines. All you will need to do will be to set down in orderly fashion all the important points you can think of, and then proceed with whatever other preparation you wish to make for your speech.

Sometimes you will talk on subjects that do not actually come within the range of your own observation, but may give

you an opportunity to observe things directly. If, for example, you should decide to explain a telephone exchange in a big city, through which one may get any one of half a million families in a few minutes, you could easily observe an exchange in action and so get your information direct. There is nothing like first-hand information whenever you can get it. If you want to explain how highways are built these days, the best way to get information is to watch a road crew at work.

Much of the time, in making speeches, you will find that you can only in part draw on your own knowledge and observation, and must in large part depend on information from other sources. You may, then, properly begin by taking an inventory of your own mind on the subject. Set down in plain words what you know, arranging your ideas in orderly fashion, and using cards as suggested later in this chapter. You will find this a capital exercise in thinking. It will help you to draw a line between what you know and what you do not know, and at the same time suggest to you the kind of information and evidential support that you will need to get from other sources.

2. *Conversation and Interviews.* Talk over your subject with your friends and acquaintances. Seek out especially those who know something about it. If you are speaking on mail-order houses, the farmers who buy from such houses and the merchants who are their competitors are the persons who should have interesting information to give you. If the subject is a proper diet for building up healthy teeth, your dentist should have something to say on that question. If your subject is vitamins, then a dietitian or a doctor might supply useful information.

When you get interesting information on any subject, it is good practice to impart it to members of your family or friends. You can do so without pretending to make a speech, and their reaction will give you some idea of the interest value of your materials. You might consider to advantage — and a very great one — forming the habit of imparting to your family or

associates *every day* some interesting bit of experience that you have had, either in school or out of school. Let the telling of it be in the course of conversation and without any particular effort on your part. If you do this consistently, you may wake up some day to find yourself an interesting conversationalist. That is worth while in itself, and of course is a very great aid to speaking.

3. *Current Magazines.* All students of speaking should be informed on current events. Some of this information you may get from newspapers, but most of it you will get from current magazines. Your library will no doubt have many of them, and perhaps all the leading ones. You will find much valuable information on current topics in magazines like the following:

MONTHLY MAGAZINES

<i>Forum</i>	<i>New Outlook</i>
<i>Harper's</i>	<i>World's Work</i>
<i>Atlantic Monthly</i>	<i>North American Review</i>
<i>Scribner's</i>	<i>Current History</i>
<i>American Mercury</i>	<i>Review of Reviews</i>
<i>New Statesman (English)</i>	

WEEKLY PERIODICALS

<i>Literary Digest</i>	<i>Dearborn Independent</i>
------------------------	-----------------------------

JOURNALS OF LIBERAL OPINION

<i>New Republic</i>	<i>World Tomorrow</i>
<i>Nation</i>	<i>Christian Century</i>

These and others will be fruitful sources of information on a large number of current questions.

4. *Readers' Guide and Poole's Index.* The Readers' Guide is an index of the leading articles in the leading magazines from 1900 to the present, arranged alphabetically by subjects and authors. Poole's Index dates still farther back. If you have access to good libraries, you will find these your greatest source of information.

5. *Other Printed Materials.* There are many other sources, like the Congressional Record (on current economic and political subjects), the United States Daily, trade journals, and reports of commissions, which your librarian can tell you about. You will gradually learn to avail yourself of all sources within your reach.

On many subjects you will of course have to do a large amount of reading. Aim to distribute your reading so as to get as broad a view as possible of the subject under discussion. On public questions, get all points of view — conservative, liberal, radical. Assume that all persons have reasons for the opinions they hold, and try to understand them. Cultivate tolerance of opinion. Broad reading is the best way.

6. *Observation.* Be a good observer. Learn to see things clearly and in detail. One difference between Darwin and the ordinary man was that Darwin could look at an object and see in it things that other people could not see. Henry Ward Beecher, the famed preacher of Plymouth Church, was a great observer. Often he would spend hours in Tiffany's jewelry store in New York City, observing beautiful objects worked in silver and gold and other metals. Sometimes he would take extended walks along the piers of New York City, watching the freighters and ocean liners take on and empty their cargoes. He was a great lover of nature, and to him nature was full of beauty and object lessons. So when Sundays came around, we find his sermons full of illustrations based on these observations and experiences which everybody was familiar with and all could understand.

Wendell Phillips took up a quarter one day and noticed that the figure on it looks backward. He used this fact in an impressive simile in one of the most powerful speeches he ever made, "The Scholar in a Republic." "Sit not like the figure on our silver coin looking ever backward," he said to his audience of Harvard graduates. Phillips used to spend the summers in the country. One day he noticed that the geese bent their necks

going through a barn door, even though they never came within several feet of the top of the door. He got an effective illustration from this for a speech.

Almost any subject may be illuminated and enlivened with personal experiences and illustrations based on them. You will probably be surprised to observe how extensively this form of support is used by our very best speakers. The speeches of men like Wendell Phillips, Henry Ward Beecher, Robert Ingersoll, Thomas Starr King, Russell H. Conwell, John B. Gough, Henry W. Grady, and William Jennings Bryan abound in such references. You will find that speeches having to do with home, school, church, community, sports, vacations, outings, readily lend themselves to such forms of support.

Recording Materials. It is important to have a very definite system of taking notes as you proceed with the preparation of your speech. Especially is that true of the longer speeches and debates where notes are often voluminous, bearing perhaps on scores of points. These notes should be arranged in such a way as to make it easy to get at them and find what is wanted.

1. *The use of notebooks is not a good system*, for several reasons. First, when the notes become numerous, it is very difficult to find the particular piece of material one may want, and that difficulty grows as the notes pile up. In the second place, it will be found that even with the greatest of care as to what is taken down, many of the notes will prove useless for the speech or debate in its final form and should be discarded as soon as that fact is discovered. It is not easy to do this if notes are taken in a notebook. Lastly, in giving the speech or debate from the platform, notebooks are clumsy for reference purposes. To use notebooks first and then copy from them the main points needed for the occasion is a waste of time.

2. *Use cards.* There is a much better way of note-taking, and that is the use of cards from the beginning. Experience has proved this to be the best and the only good method. Indicate at the top of the card what point the material bears on

and, in a general way, the source of it. Then keep together the cards that bear on the same point. Thus you are able at any time with the least possible effort to get a survey of all the material you have on any one phase of your speech. If the materials on some cards prove useless, throw those cards out. Then, when you need to refer to facts, authorities, or other forms of support, they are ready for you in the best possible form. Ruled cards, three by five inches, are most serviceable.

A few suggestions for taking notes on these cards may be helpful.

1. On any particular card, put materials bearing only on one point. There is no harm in using both sides of the card, provided materials all bear on the same point.
2. If you mean to quote a writer or speaker exactly, put the words in quotation marks to indicate that they are those of another. Indicate omissions as follows: . . .
3. At the top of the card on the left, indicate the main heading or subheading on which the material bears; on the right, the author quoted.
4. At the bottom of the card, make a definite reference to the source: name of book, magazine, report, etc., with number of volume, year of publication, and page; e.g., Immigration Commission Report, Vol. II, 1906, p. 422.

If you follow these directions consistently, you can, by looking at a card, see at a glance what point it bears on. You can sort the cards so as to bring together those that cover the same point in your speech. Then, in the final speech or debate, you can use these cards so far as you need to use them, and so far as it is wise to do so. Be careful to make references definite, so that you can look them up when necessary.

Using Cards on the Platform. It is very easy to abuse the practice of using cards while giving a speech or a debate. On such occasions cards are crutches, and should be used sparingly. When you go to hear a man speak, you do not like to see him keep his nose in his notes. No more does an audience like to

see you do it. Cards have their places, however, especially as aids to the inexperienced speaker. It is perfectly proper to read exact quotations from them when you want to quote an authority. It is also proper to refer to them occasionally for sequence of points or arguments; but do not forget that *the less you depend on cards to aid the memory the better*. The ideal to be reached is to be able to stand before an audience and deliver your message without any notes except for reading of quotations.

In Conclusion. Cultivate the habit of drawing on your own personal experiences whenever possible for speech-making purposes. If well-selected and suitable for the accomplishment of your aim, personal experiences seldom fail to hold the attention of an audience. They are frequently more illuminating and more convincing than other speech materials.

Do not overlook, as a source of information, conversation and interviews with persons who really have something to contribute on the subject. On many questions, current magazines will yield valuable information. More than ever, our magazines have become outlets for representative opinions in almost all fields of thought — economics, politics, social problems, science, philosophy.

On involved questions, where much investigation is to be made, consult your librarian for additional and unusual sources of information. Take your notes on cards, not in notebooks, and use the cards sparingly on the floor. Exact quotations may properly be read from cards in any kind of speech. Beyond that, cards are crutches, and not to be used except in emergencies.

EXERCISES

1. Choose a subject for a ten-minute speech to be given later in class, and make as complete a bibliography of the subject as you can, for magazines, books, newspapers, etc. Make your references definite and use cards.

2. Read and criticize in writing Edward Bok's lecture, "Keys to Success." (*Mod. El.*: I, Vol. IV).
 - a. Note the informal and personal style.
 - b. Observe the striking effect Mr. Bok gets from relating a personal experience with President Hayes.
 - c. Do you think he gains by withholding until the last who the reporter was? Why?
 - d. What is the dominant feeling aroused by the speech?
3. "Be a good observer."
 - a. Tell about some interesting incident or phenomenon that you have observed lately, either on the street car, in the classroom, or elsewhere. Give as many details as possible. Suggest how this might be used in a speech.
 - b. "The law of the pendulum is a law of life." Give an example of this from your own observations.
4. Read Lincoln's "Cooper Union Speech" and observe how he goes to original sources for his evidence for the first half of the speech.
5. Study critically the lecture, "Masters of the Situation," by James T. Fields, and note how much the author draws on personal experiences. Make a list of them.

READINGS

Speeches

- "Cooper Union Speech," by Abraham Lincoln (Vol. XI).
 "The Farmer and the Cities," by Henry W. Grady (*Grady*).
 "Masters of the Situation," by James T. Fields (*Mod. El.*: I, Vol. V).
 "Get Facts: Look Far: Think Through," by William C. Redfield.¹

References

- William Phillips Sandford and Willard Hayes Yeager: *Principles of Effective Speaking* (Revised Edition, 1930), Chap. XVI.
 James Winans: *Public Speaking* (Revised Edition, 1917), Chap. XV.
 James Milton O'Neill and Andrew Thomas Weaver: *The Elements of Speech* (1926), Chap. XIII.

¹ This speech appears on page 413 of this volume.

CHAPTER V

SPEECH ORGANIZATION: THE OUTLINE

We develop a speech in much the same way that we do any other composition, except that in a speech we have to be careful about the way in which our ideas hang together. The reason is that the relationship of ideas must be made very plain, so that the audience can grasp it as the speech is uttered. In reading an essay, we can stop to reflect about the bearing which one idea has on the rest. In listening to a speech, we must understand what is said when it is said.

Importance of Good Structure. In point of structure, a speech is the most exacting of all forms of composition. Careful speech organization is one of the primary requisites of a good speech, and the speaker who disregards it does so at his peril. The ordinary mind is not overanalytical; furthermore, there is so much aimless talking in conversation that we have a tendency to carry this lack of order into our speech-making. Many speeches remind one of the title of a once popular song, "I don't know where I'm going, but I'm on my way."

No matter what kind of speech one is going to make — unless, perhaps, it be one for pure entertainment — a precise purpose or aim must always be sought. In informative speeches this is usually a simple matter; in persuasive speeches it may be a very difficult matter. If one wants to explain the operation of a telephone exchange in a big city, the speech problem is clear and unmistakable: it is to make the audience understand the process involved. If one wishes to explain how a radio tube manages, in effect, to hear and talk, the problem is already defined. It may be a very difficult one, but the aim of the speech is fairly well fixed. If one chooses to talk about the

Eighteenth Amendment, however, or the League of Nations, or disarmament, there are a score or more aspects to each of these questions, any one of which he may wish to discuss. It is therefore important that one should determine as definitely as possible the precise phase he wants to discuss.

I recall a student of more than ordinary ability once making a speech on the Eighteenth Amendment, lasting perhaps ten or fifteen minutes. It was a rather carefully prepared speech, and it was plain that the student spoke from conviction as well as from considerable knowledge of the question. When he got through speaking, some members of the class were asked to give the purpose or aim of the speech. No one could. It took five or ten minutes to ferret out precisely what he was driving at, and when we had finally discovered it and formulated a proposition, it was this: "The Eighteenth Amendment has discouraged, or wrought havoc with, temperance." The idea was that, since the passing of the amendment, temperance as an ideal among young people—a movement which had gained great momentum in the pre-amendment period—was no more. The result was that young people no longer felt the inhibitions of former days. It was an excellent idea to develop, with much evidence to support it, but no one caught the real aim with any degree of definiteness. The trouble was that the message was not sufficiently clear in the mind of the speaker, when he prepared the speech, to serve properly as a guide in the choice and organization of his materials. Or if it was, then the speaker did not know how to manage the movement of his speech.

Another student once spoke on the subject of forest fires. Without any apparent aim, he simply began to talk on forest fires, and continued to talk on forest fires until he had what passed for a speech on forest fires. The speech was a jumbled mess from beginning to end and revealed only vaguely, even to an inquiring mind, what the speaker was driving at. The speaker had a few interesting facts about the accidental cause of forest fires, such as that cigarettes when thrown into dry

grass set fire in seventeen cases out of nineteen. When asked what type of speech he was making and what his purpose was, he could not tell. Neither could anybody else.

From the speech several ideas emerged somewhat vaguely. One was that forest fires were difficult to fight for lack of adequate equipment. Another was that there is much carelessness on the part of tourists and campers in regard to forest fires, and that while lightning may occasionally set a fire, most of them are the result of some form of carelessness. A statement or two was made about the annual devastation of forest fires, but no facts were given, and the idea was not developed.

Typical Speech Plan. If we should put these propositions together in proper order, and give them appropriate statement, we should have a speech plan somewhat as follows:

TYPE OF SPEECH: Impressive.

PURPOSE: We should work to prevent forest fires.

SUB-IDEA I: Forest fires work great devastation every year.

SUB-IDEA II: Forest fires are caused largely by carelessness.

SUB-IDEA III: Once started, they are extremely difficult to control.

Here is the framework of a typical impressive speech. The selection of speech materials will be governed wholly by their value in supporting these propositions and bringing them home impressively to the audience.

Importance of Definite Purpose. The first thing to do, then, in planning a speech is to determine as definitely and precisely as possible just what you wish to accomplish — or just what your purpose is. What definite response do you wish from the audience? This can always be expressed in a sentence, which we may call *statement of aim* or *purpose sentence*. This must be broad enough to include all the speaker wishes to say on the subject; and it must be so limited in scope that the speaker can give it adequate support in the time at his disposal.

When once formulated, such a statement — always a complete sentence — will furnish you an exact guide for choosing

your materials and rejecting those that do not serve your aim. Good speaking is frequently best served by drastic rejection of speech materials. There is always a temptation to use materials that one has gathered; but unless they further the end of the speech, they should be rigidly excluded.

Main Divisions of a Speech.¹ Having determined a precise purpose, and presumably gathered effective speech materials in support of that purpose, the next step is the organization of your materials, or grouping related ideas under a few appropriate headings or propositions. These are the main divisions of the speech, and are variously known as *sub-ideas*, or main ideas, or supporting ideas. Arthur Edward Phillips in his *Effective Speaking* calls them sub-ideas, and perhaps that is as good a name as any for them, for they are subordinate to the purpose or aim. In argumentative speeches or in debates when put in the form of questions, they are known as the main issues. These propositions cannot be arbitrarily selected any more than we can arbitrarily select our direction for traveling if we want to get to a certain place. They inhere in the question, and to find them usually requires thorough analysis of the subject. The sub-ideas or the main divisions of a speech should have the following earmarks:

1. They are always relatively broad propositions, capable of support, amplification, and development.
2. They should always read as supports of the statement of aim or purpose sentence; or of the *central idea*² if one is used.
3. They should be comprehensive enough so that if they are properly substantiated, they will in turn establish, or make sufficiently vivid and impressive, the aim of the speaker.
4. They should, in all persuasive speeches, be linked up with vital interests of the audience; that is, they should permit of want appeal³ and so grip hearers.
5. There should not be too many. From three to five is a good number.

¹ To be distinguished from introduction, body, and conclusion.

² Cf. page 50.

³ Cf. Chapter IX, page 118.

Suppose we refer to the speech on forest fires and see if the plan complies with these requirements. We shall find that the sub-ideas, I, II, and III, are all broad propositions, capable of development and support, and still not so broad but that they can be fairly well supported in a short speech. They all read as supports of the statement of aim or purpose sentence. They are probably comprehensive or inclusive enough so that if the speaker carefully selects his materials and brings them home vividly to his listeners, he will reasonably well accomplish his purpose.

They are formulated in such a way as to make them vital or gripping to the ordinary audience. The second and third borrow interest from the first. You will note that there are only three sub-ideas.

In working out support for each of the sub-ideas, we go through much the same process of analysis. Referring again to the speech on forest fires, we can take any one of the sub-ideas and find supporting ideas for it, just as we did for the proposition expressing the aim of the speech. Let us consider the third one.

- III. Forest fires, when once started, are extremely hard to control,
for
 - A. They often cover large areas.
 - B. They are often far from centers of population.
 - C. It is difficult to get adequate equipment to the scene of fire.
 - D. The available water-supply is often insufficient.

The process of analysis and development suggested here is much the same as in any other well-organized composition. The development of any theme or subject consists essentially in the discovery of related propositions and the giving of such propositions adequate support. All forms of support, all speech materials, no matter what they are — whether facts, examples, testimony, illustrations, analogies, hypothetical cases — are always used in support of some proposition expressed or implied.

Propositions in a Speech. It is of some importance to note here that *all ideas take the form of propositions*. We cannot express an idea or a thought except in the form of a proposition, or complete statement. "Going to college" is a phrase, not an idea, and does not really say anything. "You should go to college" is an idea, a proposition, and says something very definite. Such a proposition may serve to express either the purpose of a speech or any one of the supporting ideas of the speech.

From this there follows a very important principle of speech-making: namely, that *a speech is a series of propositions and their supports*. This is something we should always remember. It may be said with some degree of emphasis that, if a speaker does not know at any time in the course of a speech just what proposition he is supporting, it is but the simple truth that he does not know what he is talking about. The same, of course, may be said of the audience. If they do not know what proposition a speaker is supporting, neither do they know what he is talking about.

The Outline. The best guide to consistent thinking that we have discovered is the outline. This serves as a standard by which to check our thought processes and determine to what extent our analysis of the question is correct. Form the habit of making an outline for every speech. It has many advantages, among them these:

1. It guides us to consistent, although not necessarily to correct, thinking.
2. It gives the speech definite movement.
3. It helps to make the speech clear to the audience.
4. It is an aid to the memory.
5. If rightly used, it will help to hold attention.
6. It encourages the extempore style of speaking and discourages word-for-word memorizing.

Kinds of Outlines. There are two methods of outlining a speech, or two kinds of outlines. One is the *topical* outline, in

which single words and phrases may be used. The other is the *logical* or sentence outline, in which only complete declarative sentences are used.

Both kinds have their place. For informative or expository speeches, the topical outline is frequently used, and it is sufficient. If one wants to give a travelogue, for instance, and tell about interesting scenes, places, persons, and experiences, the topical outline will usually do. It serves to give direction and orderliness to the speech. Observe that while you use terms and phrases in the outline, you are always supporting propositions when you come to make the speech.

1. *The Topical Outline.* As an example of a topical outline, let us consider the following outline for an account of a trip to the Icelandic Millennial Celebration.

PURPOSE: To entertain with an account of the trip

- I. Ocean journey
 - A. The interesting people we met on the boat
 - B. The activities we enjoyed
- II. Reykjavik, the capital
 - A. The people
 - B. The dwellings
 - C. The schools
 - D. The hotels
- III. The Centennial Celebration
 - A. The Althing: place where parliament was founded in 930 A.D.
 - B. World representatives
 - C. Important meetings and speeches
- IV. Impressions of the people
 - A. Their hospitality
 - B. Their industry
 - C. Their literary attainments

Every speech should have a definite plan, and the topical outline indicates the order of ideas to be treated, and the main headings under each.

Grouping of ideas may be just as desirable in an informative speech as in the other types. After all, a large part of explanation or exposition consists in showing the relationship of parts or of ideas. If, for example, you are going to talk about radio tubes, you will not get the best results by just starting somewhere and then going on more or less blindly and aimlessly until you have made a speech. When you come to study and organize your ideas on the subject, you will find that they will lend themselves to some natural form of grouping. There may be several ways of grouping the ideas, and one may be about as good as another, but some form of grouping there must be, and the best one of course is the one that will make the subject clearest to the audience with the least mental effort. You might want to begin with a brief history of the technology of the radio tube. You may discover, however, that it is easy to tire an audience with a long historical narrative unless it is carefully done, and facts and incidents are selected that have real *interest value*. History for the sake of history may be easily overdone. Ask yourself the question, "What do my hearers want to know about this?" Do they want primarily to know who made contributions to the technological development of the tube, or do they want to know just how it works — what part it plays in reproducing the human voice? Seize upon some point of interest for your audience, and when you have satisfied their curiosity in that, you may go into details which before might not have had any interest at all. The important thing is to have a definite plan, a definite order or arrangement of ideas. That order must be determined upon with a view to interesting your audience and bringing home to them with as much clarity as possible whatever ideas or processes you wish to explain.

2. *The Logical Outline, for Persuasive Speeches.* It is only when we come to make persuasive speeches, especially of the argumentative type, that the sentence or logical outline becomes important. Here the work of analysis is much more difficult, and straight thinking correspondingly harder.

The rules for the sentence or logical outline are few and easily understood. The difficulty always is to discover the right relationship between ideas; but when that relationship has once been found, it is not difficult to throw the ideas or propositions into outline form.

Let us suppose that some of your best high school friends have made up their minds not to go to college and that you are attending college and want your friends to go also. You are impressed with the value of a college education as a preparation for living a purposeful life. You have here a problem in persuasion. Your purpose would be expressed in the proposition addressed to your high school associates: "You should go to college."

Now your problem is to present ideas that will stir up in them a desire to go to college. What those ideas should be may require careful thought. You might aim at your friends through their pocketbooks, first, and say to them, "It will increase your earning power." That is a very broad proposition and needs to be supported. To get at the facts may be difficult. Some research has been done to show the earnings of persons at different levels of education. These show that the lifetime earnings of a person with an eighth-grade schooling are on an average \$60,000; of a high school graduate, \$88,000; and of a university graduate, \$160,000. You could probably find many other things to say on this subject; for instance, you might refer to college graduates that you know, who are drawing good salaries.

What else could you say to create a desire in your friends to go to college? Well, you could say: "College education will give you personality development." This is a broad proposition too, and requires support. Many things certainly can be said in support of it. "You will be a better-informed man. Your social nature will be developed by rubbing elbows with all kinds of people. Your power of speech will be improved. A college education will develop your artistic tastes."

For a third main idea you might say to them: "It is fun to go to college." You could support that according to your friends' notions of what would be fun. Safely, you could say: "It is fun to know things. It is fun to engage in or attend big athletic events. Social life at college would be enjoyable."

These are only a few suggestions as to what may be said on this subject. There are many other ideas just as good or better. If we throw this into outline form, we have the following:

TYPE OF SPEECH: Argumentative

PURPOSE: To persuade your friends that they should go to college

Introduction

- I. The choice of a career is important.
- II. Our education determines largely what our career shall be.

Body

- I. College education will increase your earning power, for
 - A. Statistics on average lifetime earnings show this:
 1. Average lifetime earnings of persons with grade schooling only are \$60,000.
 2. Average lifetime earnings of persons with high school training are \$88,000.
 3. Average lifetime earnings of college graduates are \$160,000.
 - B. These figures were found by an extensive survey.¹
- II. College education will give you personality development, for
 - A. It will give you much interesting information.
 - B. It will develop your social nature.
 - C. It will develop your artistic tastes.
 - D. It will help you develop cultivated speech.
- III. Going to college is fun, for
 - A. It is fun to know things.
 - B. It is fun to engage in or attend athletic events.
 - C. Social life at college will be enjoyable.

¹ The criticism can be made that these figures are not convincing, since colleges and high schools are selective and tend to attract persons of more than average ability. We are concerned here with form rather than logic, however, and the argument may be taken for what it is worth.

Conclusion

- I. College education will increase earning power.
- II. It will give personality development.
- III. It will be enjoyable.

We may formulate certain general rules.

RULES FOR OUTLINING A SPEECH

1. Every outline is divided into three parts: *introduction*, *body*, and *conclusion*.
2. Symbols are used to show the relationship of ideas. The following order of symbols has been widely adopted:

- I. _____
 - A. _____
 1. _____
 - a. _____
 - b. _____
 2. _____
 - B. _____
- II. _____
 - A. _____
 etc.

3. All statements in a logical outline or brief are complete sentences.
4. Every speech has a certain number of main divisions or sub-ideas, I, II, and III, so-called because they are subordinate to and support your purpose. The number three is not arbitrary, although most often used.
5. Propositions I, II, III, or sub-ideas, always read as supports of the proposition expressing the purpose sentence; or of the central idea if one is used.
6. *General Rule.* Every proposition in a logical outline should read as support of the proposition to which it is subordinate.
7. The proper connecting word between a proposition in an outline and its subordinate is *for* or *because*. If you have occasion to use *hence* or *therefore*, it simply means inverted order.
8. The conclusion in an outline merely states the main divisions or sub-ideas of the speech.

Examples of How Great Speakers Have Planned Their Speeches. Let us take as our first example Wendell Phillips' argumentative speech on capital punishment delivered before a committee of the Massachusetts legislature. If you will take the trouble to examine this speech, you will find that it has a very definite purpose, and three very definite main divisions or sub-ideas. The broad outline may be stated as follows:

PURPOSE: Capital punishment should be abolished in Massachusetts for all offenses.

SUB-IDEA I: The state has not the right to take life.

SUB-IDEA II: The Bible does not impose an obligation on the state to take life.

SUB-IDEA III: It is not necessary for our protection to take life.

Observe, first, that all the propositions embodying the main divisions of the speech or sub-ideas read as supports of the purpose. Also, that if these propositions are adequately supported and established, it is not easy to escape the conclusion expressed in the purpose. The speaker would then get the mental response wanted; namely, a favorable attitude for abolishing capital punishment, and action in accordance with that attitude when occasion presented.

The Central Idea. Sometimes it is an advantage to have a *central idea*, which gives a definite direction and a unified effect to the whole speech. The central idea always supports the purpose of the speech, and is in turn supported by the sub-ideas. The central idea is chosen with reference to the audience, and must be of such a nature that, if accepted by the audience, the purpose will be attained. It is useful in limiting a broad subject.

William Jennings Bryan, after taking a trip around the world and observing conditions in all the leading countries, delivered in Chicago and other centers a speech on world progress, intended as a sort of tonic for reformers. He threw his subject

into the following simple outline, and drew upon a wealth of illustrative material to drive home his points.

PURPOSE: Reformers should take heart.

CENTRAL IDEA: The world is making progress.

SUB-IDEA I: The world is progressing intellectually.

SUB-IDEA II: The world is progressing morally.

SUB-IDEA III: The world is progressing politically.

Observe here that all the main divisions support the central idea, and that if these propositions are established, it is very likely that the central idea will be, and the purpose attained.

Suppose you were to make a speech on automobile accidents. You might select your purpose, and make the scope of your speech somewhat as follows:

PURPOSE: We should work to prevent automobile accidents.

CENTRAL IDEA: Automobile accidents can be greatly reduced.

SUB-IDEA I: Speeding can be largely reduced by more strict law enforcement.

SUB-IDEA II: Incompetent and careless drivers can be in large part eliminated by licensing.

SUB-IDEA III: Dangerous grade crossings can be abolished.

SUB-IDEA IV: Country-wide "safety" propaganda would be effective.

If you could support these propositions adequately, your central idea would be accepted. Your purpose would be reasonably well attained.

Number of Sub-ideas. Observe that both Phillips and Bryan used three main divisions or sub-ideas in their speeches while we used four. There is no law, except a psychological one, as to the number of supporting ideas to use in a speech. The ancient writers on this subject had it settled two thousand years ago that from three to five is a good number of main ideas to develop in a speech. We have not discovered any good reason for changing that rule. It may sound more or less arbitrary, but to develop too many separate ideas in the course

of a single speech leads to confusion and an overtaxing of the memory. It is possible to group ideas on almost all subjects in such a way as to observe this time-honored rule of the ancients. It is just as good today as it was in the time of Pericles, and it was pretty good then.

Relation between Outline and Speech. Finished outlines may well be used until the process of making an outline is thoroughly mastered and the structure of a speech thoroughly understood. When that goal is once attained, it is not necessary to make a finished outline to make a good speech, although it may be well enough to make an outline of every speech as long as class work continues. An outline is a guide to clear and orderly presentation of ideas. It is the framework of the speech structure, but it is a great mistake to think that the structure should bear much resemblance to the framework, when once completed.

It is a mistake, for example, to think that the order of ideas in an outline is necessarily the order of ideas as they should be presented in the speech. The leading ideas in an outline — the main divisions of the speech, or sub-ideas — are in the form of conclusions; and conclusions, as a rule, should not be stated in a speech until the evidence has been presented in support of them. That is especially true of beliefs or propositions that are unwelcome to the audience. To state such propositions boldly at the outset is to arouse contrariant ideas in the minds of the listeners. It is a rule of persuasion never to draw an unwelcome conclusion until the evidence in support of it has been presented — until, in fact, it is no longer unwelcome. A much better way is simply to point the direction in which you are planning to move by means of direct or indirect questions.

You will observe that Lincoln in his "Springfield Speech" does not say, "I am going to prove to you that the leaders of the Democratic Party are in a conspiracy to nationalize slavery." He gives it as his opinion that the slavery question will not be

settled until the country is either all free or all slave. Then he asks, "Have we not a tendency to the latter condition?" Thereupon he presents his evidence and finally draws his conclusion. In the brief, the proposition would be stated at the outset as a conclusion; in the speech, the proposition is not stated until all the supports for it have been given.

An outline is not an end in itself. It is only a means to an end. When you have once grasped the underlying structure of a speech, and learned to organize your materials in a logical and orderly way, it makes very little difference whether you make an outline or not. It is probable that few speakers in actual practice make much use of the logical outline. We have notes on many of Lincoln's speeches, but no outlines. Burke is said to have written the "Conciliation Speech" eleven times before it suited him, but if he made a complete outline of it, there is no record of it. Many public speeches, however, would be improved if more careful outlines were made of them.

Recently I have listened to three distinguished speakers in convocation hour: one a president of a great endowed university; another a man of letters, author of one of the popular novels of the day; the third a Congresswoman of more than ordinary speaking ability and charm. If there was in any of these speeches a clearly conceived and logically carried out plan, it was not revealed. Any listener if asked to state the message of any of them would probably have had to scratch his head and admit that it was not very clear to him. The lack of any definite plan or outline seemed to me to mar the effectiveness of these speeches. Aside from that, the speeches all had power and charm. There is much aimless speaking, these days, and the best way to give any speech a definite objective is to throw it into outline form and so check up on one's thought processes.

In Conclusion. Learn to make good outlines, and learn to understand their value and their limitations. Let them serve you and not master you or make you their slave. Try to under-

stand clearly the relation of outline to speech. This is a subject that should command your very earnest attention. There is no doubt that it is entirely possible to spoil a good speech by making a too minute outline or by following the outline too closely. On the other hand, it is difficult to make a good speech without having gone through the analytical process which underlies all good outlining. Careful analysis spells clear progress — a very great merit in a speech. To present a clear analysis of a subject, giving speech an orderly movement, and still not be the slave of the outline that expresses the analysis, is something of an art. Here, as elsewhere, it is true that the greatest art is the art that conceals itself.

The best way to get the proper understanding of the relation of an outline to a speech is to outline a good speech, and observe how far the outline falls short of suggesting what there is in the speech.¹ Then you might try to make a speech from the outline and compare it with the original. This would be very good discipline, and probably impress upon you more forcefully than any other experience could both the usefulness and the shortcomings of an outline. An outline helps us to move clearly and in a straight line. It does not help us to move forcefully, or interestingly, or concretely, or with originality and charm. Learn to use it, and learn to realize its limitations. Do not follow it slavishly.

EXERCISES

1. Using the sentence outline in this chapter as a guide, outline material for a speech on one of the following subjects, choosing either side:
 - a. There should be faculty censorship of student publications.
 - b. College athletics interfere unduly with scholarship.
 - c. Installment buying should be discouraged.
 - d. The jury system should be abolished.
 - e. Any other subject that appeals to you.

¹ For a complete outline and speech, see Lincoln's "Springfield Speech," which appears on page 426 of this volume.

2. Use this outline for your talk in class, making it a point to add those elements not indicated by the outline — rhetorical questions, examples, illustrations, effective repetition, etc.

Have your outline on the board before the class, if convenient, so that the class, too, can recognize these elements.

3. Let the entire class outline simply the talks given by its members and then report on the material that must necessarily escape the outline.
4. Outline Lincoln's "Cooper Union Speech." Observe how far your outline falls short of suggesting what there is in the speech.
5. Make a thorough study of Lincoln's "Springfield Speech" and the outline of it.

READINGS

Speeches

- "Capital Punishment," by Wendell Phillips (*Phillips*, Vol. II).
"Cooper Union Speech," by Abraham Lincoln (Vol. XI).
"The Wastes and Burdens of Society," by Henry Ward Beecher (*Beecher*: I).
"Boyhood, the Greatest Asset of Any Nation," by John R. Mott (*Lindgren*).
"Why Men Strike," by Edward A. Filene (Vol. IV).

References

- Arthur Edward Phillips: *Effective Speaking* (1908), Chaps. XVII, XVIII, XIX.
James Milton O'Neill and Andrew Thomas Weaver: *The Elements of Speech* (1926), Chap. XV.
William Phillips Sandford and Willard Hayes Yeager: *The Principles of Effective Speaking* (Revised Edition, 1930), Chap. XVI.
Charles Henry Woolbert: *Fundamentals of Speech* (Revised Edition, 1927), Chap. XVI.

CHAPTER VI

PREPARATION FOR DELIVERY

Suppose you have chosen your subject; carefully formulated a proposition broad enough to include all you want to say, which will roughly express your purpose; gathered your speech materials through interviews and readings, after taking an inventory of your own thoughts on the question; and finally organized and arranged your materials in orderly and logical form on cards as suggested and in outline form — then what? Are you prepared to go before your class or any other audience and make your speech?

If you think so, you make a very great mistake — a mistake which many students and speakers make to their sorrow. You should realize that the most important part of the preparation of a speech is still to be made: namely, preparation for presentation, or preparing the speech for delivery. How shall this be done?

Methods of Preparing a Speech for Delivery. There are several methods of preparing a speech for presentation. One may write out and memorize all of it. One may use a carefully prepared outline as a basis for rehearsal and go over the speech again and again before an imaginary audience, and in this way prepare it for delivery. One may combine these two methods and write out the most important parts and extemporize the rest. One may write out the speech and read it from manuscript. Finally, one may dispense with any preparation whatsoever, and give the speech impromptu. This method, as a rule, is not expected to be used in class, but the unexpected sometimes happens!

As to which method is the best, or whether any one method

is the best, it behooves one not to be too dogmatic. The more experience one has in preparing speeches and in observing others at work, the more one comes to realize that perhaps no one method is best for everybody, but that each must work out a method best suited to his type of mind and the results he wishes to accomplish. There are so many and such pronounced individual differences among persons in this respect that no rigid rules can be laid down. Henry Ward Beecher in his lectures to Yale students set it down emphatically that a preacher must use either one method or the other. He must either extemporize all of his sermon or he must write out all of it. He cannot extemporize parts of it and read the rest from manuscript. If he does, he will go down between the two processes. For many years I took him at his word and passed the advice on to my students.

Of late years, however, I have listened somewhat regularly to the discourses of a minister who does exactly what Beecher said could not be done; he writes out his manuscript, has it on his desk before him every Sunday morning, reads from it when it suits him and extemporizes when that suits him better. He does this so smoothly that a stranger coming into the church would probably not know that he had a manuscript at all. Still it is there, and perhaps half the sermon is read from it. These discourses occupy a whole hour every Sunday morning, and about a thousand people come to hear them. They are packed with solid matter — are in fact lectures rather than sermons. The minister, with this method, is an exceptionally engaging speaker. The style of speaking is distinctly conversational, simple, direct, impressive.

It used to be said of former president Grover Cleveland that he could write out a speech and give it from memory without much preparation. Many of his speeches suggest the written manuscript and exemplify a style that is ponderous and unwieldy. Beecher, on the other hand, has told us that he did not begin to throw his Plymouth Church sermons into definite

form until after breakfast Sunday morning. While that statement may be true, broadly speaking, we also know it to be true that Beecher's fertile and imaginative mind was not slumbering during the week, but active and alert all the time. Beecher was a great observer and gathered information and illustrations for his sermons in his daily haunts, visiting Tiffany's, walking along the piers and watching the longshoremen at work, traveling through the country on his lecture tours; so that when Sunday came around, he had but to draw upon his vast resources for the substance of his sermon. There is no doubt that he used the extempore method consistently in his pulpit, and by it produced discourses both finished and powerful. Many volumes of them have been published and are available to the student.

These are the methods of mature men, and while they are interesting, they are not necessarily suited to the beginner or the immature speaker. We shall now consider in some detail the several methods that may be used in preparing a speech for presentation, noting the advantages and disadvantages of each. First and foremost, we shall deal with the extempore method, because we wish to hold it forth as fundamental to the most efficient speech training, and as furnishing the best preparation for the kind of speaking most people in practical life are called upon to do.

The Extempore Method. The word is derived from the Latin *ex*, meaning "from" or "out of," and *tempus*, meaning "time." The literal meaning, therefore, is *at the time*, or perhaps better, *out of the moment*. That is to say, the speaking or the giving of language to the thought is the product of the moment. In other words, the extempore style of speaking contemplates, in strict construction, that the language of the speaker shall be the product of the moment. We do not, however, construe the meaning of the term so strictly as that. To make language wholly the product of the moment may do well enough for seasoned speakers, but certainly not for amateurs.

It is a goal to work for, an ideal to be held in mind, but it is one seldom attained. We use the term more loosely, to indicate almost any method of preparing a speech, other than the impromptu — which contemplates no preparation at all — and the memoriter — that is, writing out a speech and memorizing it verbatim.

Let us now try to understand what we really mean by the extempore method of preparing a speech, using the term somewhat broadly as suggested.

The best way to do this is to imagine yourself before the audience that you are expecting to address and to proceed to make the speech, just as you would if you were before them. Express your ideas, not vaguely but in definite words and sentences. Begin with the introduction and go through whatever explanatory remarks you think are necessary and appropriate. If some words in the statement of your subject need defining, here is the place to define them. If a brief history of the subject is needed, give it. Try to arouse an interest in the subject you are talking about.

That done, proceed with your first point, and try to say all you can on it. You will have to pause once in a while and do some thinking; refer to your outline or cards to refresh your memory. Try to express your ideas as simply and clearly as you can, remembering that the vocabulary of good speaking is at least ninety per cent words of one and two syllables. Be informal and confidential in your attitude toward your audience. Talk to them much as you would to a group of your friends. Do not be afraid to use the personal pronouns "I" and "you." It will help you to get into close *rapport* with your listeners. Pay attention to the best arrangement of ideas. Let the order be natural, and if possible climactic. When you get through with each main point or division in the speech, be sure to let your audience know that you are through with it, and that you are going on with your next one. Of course, if you have only a three-minute speech, it will not have many divisions or tran-

sitions. But if you have an eight- or ten-minute speech, it may have several divisions. Transitions from one point to another should be clear and definite. A speech should have clear and orderly movement from one point to another. Just as in walking we move by steps, so in speaking we should move by steps quite as definite. The more clearly you have in mind just what you are trying to accomplish, the more clear will be the progress of your speech, and the more definite its movement.

In this way, proceed with the speech until you reach the end of it. It may cost you considerable effort to do so, but the effort will be handsomely worth while. You should rehearse your speech not only once but several times — as many times as may be necessary to ensure fluency when you come to make the speech. The amount of practice of this kind that is necessary will depend on how your mind works, and how easy or difficult it is for you to speak. To some persons words come more easily than to others. Some have better memories than others. Some, therefore, will require less and others more of this kind of practice. All will be benefited greatly by a considerable amount of it, for it is the best method of developing fluency in speaking.

This kind of speaking will develop what is generally called the extempore or extemporaneous style of speaking. It is for ordinary purposes the most serviceable and practicable method of making speeches. It requires thorough preparation in advance, a careful selection and arrangement of ideas, and much practice in giving effective expression to those ideas. It goes without saying that if one goes over the ground carefully several times, using definite language, some things will become more or less fixed in memory. The sequence of the more important ideas will become fixed; and to some extent words and sentences, or phraseology, will have taken definite form. But note that whatever memorizing is done by this method is in terms of ideas rather than in terms of words. If, in the course of practice, well-selected words and effective phrases have become

more or less set in the speech pattern, there is no harm in that. The important thing is that when you come to deliver your speech, you shall do so with confidence and spontaneity, and give the impression of grappling with your audience as you go along, instead of reciting something that you have memorized verbatim. • As you gain in confidence and develop fluency, you may safely leave more and more to the occasion. But in your early practice, leaving too much to the inspiration of the moment may prove your ruin.

It is one thing to write out a speech and learn it word for word; it is quite another thing to go over your speech again and again in rehearsal until even some phrases and sentences may have taken on definite form. The first method may develop woodenness in speaking unless carefully managed; the second will develop fluency and flexibility.

Walking and Speech Preparation. If you want to do good work in preparing for a speech, go out for a walk. Preparing a speech is, among other things, a thinking process of a high order. It requires sustained thinking and mental concentration. It is important, therefore, that conditions shall be as favorable as possible for mental activity. It is a familiar fact that the brain works best under the stimulation of a rather lively blood circulation. Almost every one has had the experience of being in his study and not being able to inveigle a single idea into consciousness, and then going out for a walk and finding a troop of them crowding the brain. The reason is simply that the blood circulation stimulates the brain and vitalizes our thought processes. You can try this out for yourself. When you have once set the thinking process going, you can go back to your room and work. When Wendell Phillips had an important speech to make, he would go out for a walk and then shut himself up in his study for hours at a time. Gladstone prepared some of his great parliamentary speeches while cutting down trees. Some would have it that Lincoln prepared some of his best speeches while splitting rails. This would probably have

been correct but for the fact that Lincoln had quit splitting rails long before he made any speeches of consequence. It is not unlikely, however, that he prepared many of his legal arguments while walking the judicial circuit over the Illinois prairies in early days. At any rate, any activity that speeds up the circulation will do the work, even walking briskly to and fro in one's room.

M. Sarcey, distinguished French lecturer, gives this advice:

A lecture is never prepared except in walking. The movement of the body lashes the blood and aids the movement of the mind. You have possessed your memory of the themes from the development of which the lecture must be formed; pick one out of the pile, the first at hand, or the one you have most at heart, which for the moment attracts you most, and act as if you were before the public; improvise upon it. Yes, force yourself to improvise. Do not trouble yourself about badly constructed phrases, nor inappropriate words — go your way. Push on to the end of the development, and the end once reached, recommence the same exercise; recommence it three times, four times, ten times, without tiring. You will have some trouble at first. The development will be short and meager; but, little by little, around the principal theme there will group themselves accessory ideas, or pat anecdotes, that will extend and enrich it. Do not stop in this work until you notice that in taking up the same theme you fall into the same development, and that this development, with its turns of language and order of phrases, fixes itself in your memory.

Language was primarily invented for speaking, not for writing; and since it embodies thought, there is no reason why it should not keep step with thought. The inability to express oneself freely is largely due to the habit of thinking without simultaneously shaping the thought in words. A thought remains nebulous even in the mind of the thinker as long as he does not concentrate it in words and form it into sentences. Accustom yourself, therefore, to verbal thinking. . . . The habit of thinking in words, of always trying to put your thought in a communicable form, will unconsciously cultivate the power of extemporization, which is the distinguishing mark of a good speaker.¹

¹ Quoted in Garrett P. Serviss: *Eloquence*, p. 110.

Writing Out Speeches. It is good practice to write out your speeches, especially in the early stages of preparation. We never know exactly what we can say on any subject until we have put it down in writing. As John Stuart Mill observes: "If you want to know whether you are thinking rightly, put your thought into words. It forces us to think clearly even when it cannot make us think correctly." If you write out what you are going to say, however, be sure that you *write as you would speak*. Have your audience in mind all the time, and simply set down what you would say to them. Then, when you are through, you will have your speech in writing, and not an ordinary written manuscript. It is important to make the distinction, for young speakers have a tendency to speak as they write, rather than to write as they speak. Always observe the simple, informal, personal style in all your writing for speech preparation.

Do not memorize the speech when you have written it out. This warning should hardly be necessary after the suggestions that have been made. You might possibly make a better speech that way the first few times. That, however, is not primarily the kind of practice you want to cultivate, and it is more important to develop correct methods than to make good speeches to begin with. Use the writing process simply as a part of the practice in preparing your speech for presentation. If you have said something well in writing, you might use that in your speech, but memorizing any part will be incidental to the process of going over your speech materials in repeated practice as already suggested.

John Bright, English parliamentarian and statesman, is quoted as having given the following advice to a friend. Remember that John Bright was an experienced speaker.

You can't prepare your *subject* too thoroughly, but it is easy to *overprepare* your *words*. Divide your subject into two or three — not more — main sections. For each section prepare "an island" — by this I mean a carefully prepared sentence to clinch your argument.

Make this the conclusion of the section, and trust yourself to swim to the next island. Keep the best island for the peroration of the speech, and then sit down. . . . To write speeches and then commit them to memory is, as you say, a double slavery which I could not bear. To speak without preparation, especially on great and solemn topics, is rashness, and cannot be recommended. When I intend to speak on anything that seems to me important I consider what it is that I wish to impress upon my audience. I do not write my facts or my arguments, but make notes on two or three or four slips of note-paper, giving the line of argument and the facts as they occur to my mind; and I leave the words to come at call while I am speaking. There are occasionally short passages which, for accuracy, I may write down; as sometimes, also — almost invariably — the concluding words or sentences may be written.¹

Memorizing and Extempore Speaking. There is a great deal of memorizing to be done in preparing a speech, and it is not at all inconsistent with forming correct habits of speaking. The order of ideas must be well fixed in memory if the speech is to have clear and logical movement. Some of the language as indicated will also have taken more or less definite form if the speech has been carefully prepared. It is of some importance, therefore, to a speaker to know how he may best enlist the memory and get from it the greatest possible service.

For speech purposes, there are three ways in which things may become fixed in memory; namely, through the muscles, through the eyes, and through the ears. Or, to put it differently, we can enlist the *muscular*, *visual*, and *auditory* memory.

Try, for example, to call to mind some selection you learned when a child to give in school, one you can still give from memory. How does it happen that you can repeat it? There are only three possible ways. Your organs of speech may have gone through the process of saying it so often that the order of muscular movements has become fixed, so that when you start it going, it will continue without much effort. It is possible,

¹ Quoted in Serviss: *Eloquence*, p. 108.

although not likely, that you may have some visual images of the printed page where the selection appeared or perhaps visual images from the selection. You may also have heard your voice so often in saying it that one sound recalls another. If you have no visual or auditory images of the selection, then your memory of it is in the organs of speech. If you touch off the first set of muscle movements, the rest will follow with ease, provided you remember well the selection. It is a good deal like setting off a bunch of firecrackers: the first one sets fire to another, and that one to a third, and so on until the whole bunch is exploded.

In preparing speeches, we should take advantage of what we know about the memory so as to get maximum results. We may, for instance, practice our speeches silently in our room or study, or on a street car, and get certain results. That kind of practice would harness only the muscular memory of our speech organs. Or we might have a good friend who would be willing to listen to us rehearse the speech, in which case we should get the benefit of the auditory memory as well. Then we might have an outline of our speech before us either on a sheet of paper or on cards, so as to form visual images of the order of ideas in the speech. The kind of practice that would be the most valuable would be the one that would harness all the forms of memory. *The more closely the practice resembles the actual performance in giving the speech, including voice, gestures, and other bodily movements, the more valuable it is.* For our muscle memory resides not only in the speech organs — tongue, throat, lips — but also in our arms, legs, head, and torso — in our whole body, in fact.

The Value of Pictures for Extemporizing. The more one talks in terms of the concrete, the less one has to depend on word-for-word memorizing, and the easier it is to extemporize. In telling a story, relating a personal experience, describing a situation, or giving an example or a hypothetical case, one does not care to have the language absolutely set. In fact, there is every

advantage in not having the language set, unless one has gone over the ground so often that the words come without effort.

The following comment from Alfred Flude, a lecturer who has traveled all over the world and won more than ordinary success as a speaker before schools and colleges, is interesting. Note its emphasis on pictures.

I never committed but two talks to memory and I shall never do it again. It is a great mistake — for me at least. I remember, years ago, when I gave “The Baby Days,” listening to myself to see where I was. The work becomes too automatic. It is only as one creates while one works that one may secure the best results. At least, that is true of myself.

Dr. Sadler and other scientists tell us that we have a “subconscious mind” that will do much for us without any effort on our part. I call my subconscious mind, “George.” I let “George” do it. It is all very simple. Fill your mind full of a subject — not with words, but with mental pictures. The words will take care of themselves. If you want a piece of pie, you don’t rehearse and commit to memory your request. You say: “Gi’me some pie,” and the pie comes. In the same way, if I am to speak on Chinese poetry, I do not worry. I open the door into my Chinese poetry shop and “George” does the rest.

Use of the Extempore Method by Great Speakers. The method here presented is one that has been used by many great speakers. We have already seen how Beecher extemporized all his sermons in his famous Brooklyn church and probably produced the finest and most finished products ever wrought by that method. His five speeches in England, delivered in 1863 to win English support for the Lincoln administration, give every evidence of having been in the main extemporized, and resulted in what is regarded as one of the greatest oratorical triumphs in history.

Webster used to rehearse his speeches while fishing. The well-known passage from his Bunker Hill oration he would address to the more doughty fish as he pulled them in. “You

have come down to us from a former generation. Heaven has bounteously lengthened out your lives that you might behold this glorious day," etc. Wendell Phillips would arrange the chairs in his father's library in a semicircle and then proceed to address them. One day his mother said to him, "Wendell, don't you get tired of talking to those chairs?" "No, I don't get tired," came the reply, "but I guess it must be hard on the chairs." Lincoln rehearsed his speeches with great care, some of them almost to the point of memorizing, and although he never studied psychology, he soon discovered that it was a great advantage to practice aloud. Many more examples could be given, but these will do for our purpose.

Not only have virtually all great speakers used this method, but they have all excelled in the extempore style of speaking. Lincoln was a great extemporizer. In his seven debates with Douglas, each one lasting three solid hours, there is hardly any repetition. When the same ground is covered in the different debates, as it is more or less, the language used is different on each occasion. There may be found a few instances in which the order of ideas is much the same and the sentences somewhat alike; but not many. This is the more remarkable when we remember that both Lincoln and Douglas delivered upwards of sixty speeches each in the memorable campaign. Douglas was even a more fluent extemporizer than Lincoln, and was a consummate master in debate. Webster was doubtless one of the greatest extemporizers of all time. His "Reply to Hayne" was given under circumstances which made it impossible for him to prepare it in advance. He was, of course, familiar with his ground, and in one sense, as he remarked, had been preparing that speech for twenty years. The language must have been almost wholly the product of the moment. Wendell Phillips, Henry Ward Beecher, Robert Ingersoll, all excelled in this type of speaking. They practiced it all their lives, although at times both Phillips and Ingersoll used the memoriter method.

It should be said that the speeches handed down to us by these men are not necessarily the speeches as they were delivered. Speakers revise their utterances for publication, and sometimes it is hard to recognize the original in the copy. Some day you may take occasion to look over the original copy of Webster's "Reply to Hayne¹" as it was taken down when he gave it and as you will find it in the Boston Public Library. You may be astonished to find how different is the original from the speech as it was printed. Especially is this true of the peroration.¹ As actually given, it is far from being the finished product found in the printed speech, and as we are accustomed to hear it declaimed. This is not to say that the effect produced may not have been just as great. The whole speech was carefully revised and written out for publication.

Practice Makes Perfect. Nowhere is it more true than in extemporaneous speaking that practice makes perfect. If you have an ambition to become an accomplished speaker, make up your mind that it will require much diligent study and practice. Think how the young musician spends from one to three hours a day at the piano for ten or fifteen years before he becomes an accomplished pianist. Consider what one-tenth of such practice would do for you in speaking. Any one with talent who would so apply himself to improve his speech would become an accomplished speaker, and hardly a day would pass when he could not use this skill to great advantage.

The following bit of advice should be heeded by the ambitious:

Think. Think much. Think very much.

Practice. Practice much. Practice very much.

Speak. Speak much. Speak very much.

The Memoriter Method. Let us now consider briefly the memoriter method of preparing speeches for presentation; namely, that of writing out the speech and memorizing the manuscript. This method is probably more widely used in

¹ Cf. page 75 of this volume.

classes in speaking than we suspect, and it is to be admitted that it has certain advantages. It permits of more finished form than the extemporized type, and enables us to say with much greater precision what we want to say. But it is a heavy tax on the memory — in fact so great a tax that no memory can meet the demands made on it by this type of speech without, on occasion, breaking down under it. That is one of its dangers. We have all seen students on the floor proceeding smoothly and fluently with a speech, when all of a sudden their minds were blank, and they could not think of a single word to say. They were “off the track” and helpless until they could get back on it somewhere. The ensuing pauses under such circumstances are embarrassing to speaker and listeners alike. In class speeches, of course, they should not be so regarded, as the aim is practice and the perfection of methods. In public, these lapses are embarrassing and weigh heavily against this method as a general one.

Another obvious disadvantage of the memoriter method is that it fosters an attitude of aloofness from the audience, and militates against spontaneity and close contact, which the extempore method invites. It is possible, of course, to learn a speech so well and express it so effectively as to make the language seem spontaneous and out of the moment, but that rarely happens, and when it does happen, it means the expenditure of greater time and effort than the extemporized method requires. The speaker who extemporizes is not bound by any set language. He can vary it and adapt it more or less to the needs of the occasion. It is very difficult, on the other hand, to break away from the memorized manuscript, and doubly difficult to get back to the right place.

This said, the fact remains that this method has its place, and some practice in it is proper in class work. When short speeches are to be made on rather formal occasions, the best method may be to write them out and memorize them. Speeches of introduction, presentation, welcome, farewell, are examples,

as are the traditional school valedictory and salutatory addresses. This method is almost universally used in speaking contests, where careful preparation and finished form are emphasized; and usually it is necessary to employ it, even in long speeches, where precision and accuracy of statement are essential. Wendell Phillips, during the antislavery crusade, on several occasions wrote out his speeches and committed them to memory. In the preface to the First Series of his speeches he says, "Four or five of them were delivered in such circumstances as made it proper I should set down beforehand substantially what I had to say." He knew that every sentence he uttered would be closely scrutinized by a hostile public sentiment and a hostile press, and twisted and turned against him if he left any opening. Public lecturers, especially those who possess the gift of originality and whose lectures show literary form, write out their discourses and memorize them. This was true of many of Ingersoll's public lectures, which are works of art. No one need suppose that the marvelous word painting which we find in his lectures, the lavish imagery and picturesque style, were the product of the moment. They show the careful work of the artist. Some of Bryan's speeches show workmanship of a high order, revealing power and beauty wrought with painstaking care and genuine art. Many public lectures, of course, were delivered before hundreds of audiences and doubtless went through a sort of evolutionary process. They have been handed down to us, presumably, in their most finished form rather than as originally given.

This method, then, has its place, and has its advantages, especially for certain occasions. Some practice in it may therefore properly be given. It will have a tendency to correct some of the more obvious faults of the extempore method, such as lack of finish and precision. But for every speech prepared by this method, there should be several prepared by the extempore method. The latter affords the best mental training; it fosters the kind of speaking which people are called upon to do most

often; it develops proficiency in thinking on one's feet and a command of language and ideas to serve specific ends. Not the least of its merits is that it promotes an informal, personal, spontaneous, flexible, conversational style of speaking which for ordinary purposes is the most effective, and which represents an ideal all speakers may well labor to attain.

Reading from Manuscript. Many speeches are written out and read from manuscript. This method likewise is appropriate for certain occasions. Men who hold responsible public positions, and who are supposed to speak with authority when they do speak, frequently use this method. The President of the United States and governors of states, among others, usually read what they wish to say, when they have important matters to communicate. They do this in part for their own protection to avoid misconstruction of statement, and also to save time. At the inauguration of a university president, most of the addresses are likely to be in manuscript form. Some who are accustomed to extemporizing will use that method. Scientific men frequently "read papers" at conventions. Here thought is primary, and accuracy of statement imperative. In less formal talks, the extempore method is also used. Some preachers, who emphasize matter rather than manner, use the manuscript method, and, be it said, with good effect. Where content of thought and accuracy of statement are of paramount importance, the manuscript method is proper.

Many persons have an inveterate prejudice against speeches read from manuscript. Personally, I do not share that prejudice, and I would much rather hear a good speech well read from manuscript than a poor one extemporized. Much depends on how the speeches are read. Of pulpit speakers that I have been particularly interested in, I recall four who have used the manuscript method, either wholly or in large part. All of them spoke longer than is customary in churches. Three of them were exceedingly stimulating, and I was not conscious of any distraction of attention because they read from manu-

script. We must admit that, while the extempore method should be the one method most extensively cultivated by young speakers, because it is the method most often used, it has some very decided limitations. One is that it is impossible to say as much with that method in an hour as with the manuscript method. Consummate geniuses like Henry Ward Beecher and Wendell Phillips can extemporize for an hour and say good things all the time, but very few men can. The extemporized speech is often a very thin product, like Douglas' doctrine of popular rights, which Lincoln likened to soup made from boiling the shadow of a starved chicken.

Everything depends on the speech situation. If the audience is educated and capable of assimilating solid discourses, there is much to be said for the manuscript method. If they prefer their mental and spiritual diet in more diluted form, the extempore method will serve. I recently heard a preacher who is said to draw large crowds every Sunday morning to his church. He is a pleasing and entertaining speaker, and at times there is the roar of a lion in his voice. All he said in an hour could be comfortably put into ten minutes without doing violence to a single second. It is plain that the people who go to hear him want a large measure of entertainment and are willing to accept a small measure of instruction.

So far as I know, this method is not used in classes in public speaking. Occasionally, manuscripts of speeches are required, but they are seldom read in class. The method has some things to recommend it from the point of view of training. If it is used, it is imperative that a student learn to write as he speaks, and so get away from the written style, which as a rule is much heavier and more unwieldy than the speaking style. In working for definite effects this method lends itself to specific and detailed criticism. Reading from manuscript occasionally would be excellent practice for students. It may be that teachers of speaking do not cultivate this method as much as it deserves.

The Impromptu Speech. There remains the impromptu speech. We understand by this a speech without any special preparation. It goes without saying that not much time can be taken up in class work with unprepared speeches. It is excellent drill for a student to get up on his feet and speak to a definite point for five minutes or so, but he must expect to get that practice largely outside of class. It may be that occasionally, once a semester or so, a class may with profit be organized into an assembly for the discussion of some pressing question of the day, and may engage in a running debate according to parliamentary rules. Drill in conducting a meeting and in parliamentary practice is valuable, as would be also the practice had in speaking. It is a question of how much time to give to it.

If you are ambitious to become an influential speaker, you can do no better than to take advantage of every occasion that presents itself for speaking. Those occasions are constantly arising in class meetings, public assemblies, church affairs, political rallies, and other gatherings. The person who takes advantage of these opportunities, and is even willing to make a fool of himself on occasion, is the one that in the long run will be heard from. If you are unexpectedly called upon to make a speech or give your opinion on a current question, it is a mistake to spend time trying to make excuses. The audience understands the situation and does not expect too much. It is good practice in a situation like that to try to guide your thoughts into familiar channels, although what is said must obviously have some bearing on the subject in hand. Remarks made by other speakers frequently form a good starting point, and may suggest a train of thought to develop. If you can use a personal experience in point, or give a concrete example or two, the chances are that you will meet the situation and make good. When you speak, aim to say something. Mere glibness of tongue is not enough. It is in fact frequently a nuisance.

Some of the best speeches on record, strange to say, have

been made impromptu. Wendell Phillips' famous "Lovejoy Speech" in Faneuil Hall, 1837, is an example. It is strange but true that this speech, made when Phillips was only twenty-six years of age, reveals a maturity of style and method that he never excelled in his fifty years on the platform. It is said that Ingersoll's "Oration at a Child's Grave" was impromptu, although it bears all the earmarks of careful preparation.

In Conclusion. Do not neglect this most important step of preparing your speeches for delivery, and do not go about it aimlessly. Correct method will greatly promote your success as a speaker. That method is not necessarily the best that will enable you to make the best speeches with the least possible effort, to begin with. No one method is best for all occasions, and no one method is best, perhaps, for all speakers. Give the extempore method careful thought and a fair trial. It will probably serve you best on the largest number of occasions. Practice with this method means careful selection and organization of speech materials in advance, and going over these materials repeatedly, using definite language, and imagining yourself before the audience that you are to address. Remember that the kind of practice which most resembles the actual speech situation will be the most effective. Aim to enlist all the forms of memory — the muscular, auditory, visual. This means practicing aloud with appropriate action. As you progress in your speaking, more and more may be left to the occasion, but it will be a safe rule to follow that few speeches are made without careful preparation both of materials and of presentation.

EXERCISES

1. Prepare a five- or ten-minute speech, aiming to use mostly personal experiences and other concrete materials. Make a simple outline, to arrange speech materials in the best order. Go over the ground a few times, but avoid memorizing any part of it word for word. Be as conversational as possible in presenting the speech.
2. Choose from three to five subjects and prepare in advance such

thoughts on each of them as you can. Then speak for three minutes in class on the subject selected by your instructor. Use the extempore method.

3. Pair yourself with a classmate; choose a disputed proposition and prepare in advance to argue one side of it for four minutes in constructive argument and two minutes in rebuttal. Use the extempore method.
4. Without preparation in advance, tell in two or three minutes what you are planning to do when you get out of college, and your reasons for choosing such a course.

READINGS

Speeches

- “Lovejoy Speech,” by Wendell Phillips (*Phillips*, Vol. I).
 “Eulogy on Wendell Phillips,” by Henry Ward Beecher (*Beecher*: I).
 “Tribute to William Lloyd Garrison,” by Wendell Phillips (*Phillips*, Vol. II).
 “Oration at a Child’s Grave,” by Robert Ingersoll (*Ingersoll*, Vol. XII).
 “Our Commission,” by David Lloyd George (*Lindgren*).
 “More Business in Government,” by Albert C. Ritchie (*Lindgren*).

References

- Charles Henry Woolbert: *Fundamentals of Speech* (Revised Edition, 1927), Chap. XVII.
 William Phillips Sandford and Willard Hayes Yeager: *Principles of Effective Speaking* (Revised Edition, 1930), Chap. XVII.

CONCLUSION OF WEBSTER’S “REPLY TO HAYNE”

This is the conclusion of Webster’s “Reply to Hayne” as it was copied from the stenographer’s notes and before it was revised by Webster for publication. The manuscript is in the Boston Public Library. Compare it with the published version.

Sir, I am sorry to detain the senate so long. I have been drawn into this debate without the least premeditation. But I do not wish to leave it, even now, without stating that the question upon which I have been this morning addressing the senate is one of deep and vital

importance to the people of the United States. I profess, through the whole of my little professional career, to have had mainly in view the prosperity and glory of the country, and the union of the states. I have felt that I have no wish to look beyond the union to see what might lie hidden in the dark recess behind. I have not made the inquiry whether Liberty herself would survive the rupture of its bonds. I believe that all that we have in prosperity and safety at home, and in consideration and dignity abroad, has its source in that copious fountain of national, social, and personal felicity, the union of the states. I profess myself a devotee to this object of my admiration and profound veneration.

While the union lasts, we have a great prospect of prosperity before us; and when this union breaks up, there is nothing in prospect for me to look at but what I regard with horror and despair. God forbid, yes sir, God forbid, that I should live to see this cord broken, to behold that state of things which carries us back to disunion, calamity, and civil war! When my eyes shall be turned for the last time on the meridian sun, I hope I may see him shining bright upon my united, free, and happy country. I hope I shall not live to see his beams falling upon the dispersed fragments of the structure of this once glorious union. I hope that I may not see the flag of my country, with its stars separated or obliterated, torn by commotion, smoking with the blood of civil war. I hope I may not see the standard raised of separate state rights, star against star, and stripe against stripe; but that the flag of the union may keep its stars and its stripes corded and bound together in indissoluble ties. I hope I shall not see written as its motto, First liberty, and then union. I hope I shall see no such delusive and deluded motto on the flag of that country. I hope to see spread all over it, blazing in letters of light, and proudly floating over land and sea, that other sentiment, dear to my heart, Union *and* liberty, now and forever, one and inseparable.

CONCLUSION OF "REPLY TO HAYNE" AS REVISED FOR PUBLICATION

Mr. President, I have thus stated the reasons of my dissent to the doctrines which have been advanced and maintained. I am conscious of having detained you and the Senate much too long. I was

drawn into the debate with no previous deliberation such as is suited to the discussion of so grave and important a subject. But it is a subject of which my heart is full, and I have not been willing to suppress the utterance of its spontaneous sentiments. I cannot, even now, persuade myself to relinquish it without expressing once more my deep conviction that since it respects nothing less than the Union of the States, it is of most vital and essential importance to the public happiness. I profess, sir, in my career, hitherto, to have kept steadily in view the prosperity and honor of the whole country, and the preservation of our Federal Union.

It is to that Union we owe our safety at home and our consideration and dignity abroad. It is to that Union that we are chiefly indebted for whatever makes us most proud of our country. That Union we reached only by the discipline of our virtues in the severe school of adversity. It had its origin in the necessities of disordered finance, prostrate commerce and ruined credit. Under its benign influence, these great interests immediately awoke us as from the dead and sprang forth with newness of life. Every year of its duration has teemed with fresh proofs of its utility and its blessings; and, although our territory has stretched out wider and wider, and our population spread further and further, they have not outrun its protection or its benefits. It has been to us all a copious fountain of national, social and personal happiness. I have not allowed myself, sir, to look beyond the Union to see what might lie hidden in the dark recess behind. I have not coolly weighed the chances of preserving liberty when the bonds that unite us together shall be broken asunder. I have not accustomed myself to hang over the precipice of disunion to see whether, with my short sight, I can fathom the depth of the abyss below; nor could I regard him as a safe counselor in the affairs of this Government, whose thoughts should be mainly bent on considering not how the Union should be best preserved, but how tolerable might be the condition of the people when it shall be broken up and destroyed. . . . While the Union lasts we have high, exciting, gratifying prospects spread out before us, for us and our children. Beyond that I seek not to penetrate the veil. God grant that in my day, at least, that curtain may not rise. God grant that, on my vision, never may be opened what lies behind. When my eyes shall be turned to behold, for the last time, the sun in heaven, may I not

see him shining on the broken and dishonored fragments of a once glorious Union; on States dissevered, discordant, belligerent; on a land rent with civil feuds, or drenched, it may be, in fraternal blood! Let their last feeble and lingering glance rather behold the gorgeous ensign of the Republic, now known and honored throughout the earth, still full high advanced, its arms and trophies streaming in their original luster, not a stripe erased or polluted, nor a single star obscured, bearing for its motto no such miserable interrogatory as, "What is all this worth?" nor those other words of delusion and folly, "Liberty first and union afterwards"; but everywhere, spread all over in characters of living light, blazing on all its ample folds, as they float over the sea and over the land and in every wind under the whole heavens, that other sentiment, dear to every American heart — Liberty and Union, now and forever one and inseparable!

CHAPTER VII

FORMS OF SUPPORT

Set it down as the first principle of speech composition that any effort to make a speech out of nothing as raw material will result in failure. No one can make a good speech out of wind. It has been tried hundreds of times, and always with the same disastrous results.

Nature of Good Speech Materials. In order to make good speeches, you must have specific and concrete speech materials. You cannot deal in generalities, abstractions, or long reasoning processes. If you do, nobody will listen to you for any length of time. The reason is that mental processes of that order are usually hard to follow, and soon tire the minds of listeners, causing them to lose attention. If you want to hold the attention of your audience and to accomplish something with them, you must deal with *facts, figures, statistics, examples, experiences, persons, incidents, quotations, illustrations, figures of speech, anecdotes, fables, parables* — in short, you must speak in terms of things that can be seen and heard, and otherwise sensed.

It is not easy to give a classification of speech materials, or forms of support, without having some overlapping, but even an imperfect one is helpful, and will serve, at least, to center your attention on some definite things.

First of all, you must, of course, have ideas; *vital ideas* that grip the audience and generate moral earnestness in yourself. You must have a *definite purpose* and definite propositions in support of that purpose. Some examples of that have already been given. Then, when you come to support, or “drive home,” the main ideas of your speech, you will need *definite forms of*

support. That is what we mean, broadly speaking, by speech materials.

Propositions and Their Support. In your effort to master the art of speaking, you will soon discover that *your chief problem is in giving propositions, or assertions, adequate support.* Not all statements in a speech need to be supported; many of them will be taken for granted and accepted by your audience on your own say-so. Statements that involve matters of common knowledge do not have to be supported. Some statements you may want to make on your own authority and let them go for what they are worth. They will be rated at what your opinion on that question is worth. It may be worth something, or it may not be worth anything, depending on your knowledge and fairness of attitude on the subject. No one can tell you what statements will or will not be accepted by any particular audience. It is for you to use your judgment.

To determine what statements will pass without support, what statements will not, what kind of support to give each, and how much, is certainly one of the major problems in speaking. The careful speaker will be constantly on the alert about this, and will ask himself questions accordingly. You may state an actual fact — as, for example, that the prison population of your state is larger today than it ever was before if that is a fact; but your audience may not accept it without satisfactory authority. Nothing is *fact* to an audience but what it chooses to accept; everything else is *opinion*, and as such must be established in a manner satisfactory to them. The question always is: What will satisfy my audience on this? What is needed to make them understand, believe, feel, act, as the case may be?

Classification of Forms of Support. Phillips, in his *Effective Speaking*, gives four forms of support: Restatement, General Illustration, Specific Instance, Testimony. These are good so far as they go, and worth remembering. We shall use a somewhat different classification.

1. *Facts, Figures, Statistics.* Not all figures are statistics, nor do we necessarily use either when we give facts, although we frequently do. When we say that the price of wheat is now the lowest in twenty years, assuming that it is, we state a *fact*. If we follow that up and say that the price of wheat is now fifty-two cents a bushel, or whatever it may be, we state a fact and give some *figures*. If we offer a table on the price of wheat on the Chicago Board of Trade for the last twenty years, we are giving *statistics*.

By statistics we usually mean a compilation of figures in some field of knowledge relating to human welfare, such as health, politics, economics, education. These are often valuable materials in a speech, and important forms of support. In using them, be on your guard against making them too involved for your audience to understand. Present them in as simple form as possible. Aim to have them up-to-date and accurate, and quote original sources whenever possible.

When you are dealing with facts and figures, be as specific as you think is necessary to get the best effect. To say that we spend millions of dollars in chewing gum annually is not nearly so effective as to say that we spend one hundred million dollars — or whatever the figure is — in round numbers. To say that thousands of people are killed by automobiles every year is not so effective as to say that over 35,000 people are annually killed in that way. To say that there is corruption in a certain city government does not mean much until you show what the corruption consists of, how extensive it is, so far as that can be determined, and then give concrete examples of proved corruption.

In reading large numbers, give only the larger units. If the farm income in the United States for a certain year was \$9,942,-678,234, it is a mistake to read more than three or four of the figures. If we are dealing in billions, we are not interested in the thousands; and if we are dealing in millions, we are not interested in the hundreds, and only mildly in the thousands.

Give enough figures to make the reading reasonably accurate, and that is sufficient. If you read the small ones, we forget about the big ones in the meantime.

2. *Restatement, Repetition.* By *restatement* we mean expressing the same thought in somewhat different language. By *repetition*, we mean expressing the same thought in identical language. Restatement may be used for clearness, or for impressiveness, or for any other end of speech. A dictionary restates the meaning of a word in simple language to make it clearer. We often do the same for an idea and for the same reason. We may also make an idea impressive by restatement.

There is much restatement in the following paragraph from Elihu Root's speech at the Union League Club, New York City, February 13, 1925.

I think that I would like to say a few words to you all about the view that I take of the progress of our country during this long period. Special incidents are not of so much consequence. . . . They all pass and as we look back at them, they all seek a level; but the important thing, the all important thing, is the tendency. In what direction have we been going? Not whether the country was right or wrong on this question or that question, not so much whether our legislative bodies are doing their work as they ought to now, not so much whether our laws are being executed as well as they ought to be, but which way is the country going? What is the aggregate and permanent effect upon the maintenance and the development and the progress of free self-government, for the maintenance of liberty and justice? Are we going up or down? Is the experiment gaining ground or is it losing it? Have all the services and the sacrifices and all the good and brave things done been built into a structure that will last, or have they been wasted?¹

In making transitions from one point to another, we often refer to what has been said, and clinch it either by repeating the original proposition as given, or by restating the substance

¹ Homer Dorr Lindgren: *Modern Speeches* (Revised Edition, 1930), p. 262.

of our idea in different language. Summaries at the end of speeches, or important divisions of them, are usually given by repeating the topic sentences or propositions we started out to support. This is not necessarily the best method of summarizing. In fact, it is a very much abused one, especially in debates. You will do well to be on your guard against too many repetitions of statements in identical language. It is usually better to search for freshness of phrase and a greater forcefulness of language than was originally used. Work for variety of statement and climax in emphasis.

3. *The General Example.* As a form of support, the general example occupies a sort of middle ground between the statement, or assertion, and the concrete example. It includes members of a class.

STATEMENT: Our world today has many fine artists.

GENERAL EXAMPLES: We have many fine singers, violinists, orchestra leaders.

CONCRETE EXAMPLES: We have such artists as John McCormack, Lawrence Tibbett, Fritz Kreisler, Jascha Heifetz, Eugene Ormandy, and Leopold Stokowski.

Carrie Chapman Catt gets a good effect by the use of the general example in the following paragraph, which is also a good example of *cumulation*.¹

As men have ever been their own worst enemies, so women have been a potent power to retard the advancement of their own sex. It was women as well as men who were scandalized at the idea of taxing the public to maintain public schools for the education of "She's." It was women who regarded the high school, the college and the university education as indelicate for women. It was women who refused to speak to Dr. Elizabeth Blackwell, the first woman physician. It was women who cried shame at Susan B. Anthony when she arose to address a teacher's convention in the state of New York. It was women who cried "served them right" when several of the leading newspapers of the country editorially stig-

¹ Cf. page 90.

matized the first women who attempted to speak in public as "she hyenas." It was wives, when the first petition to the legislature for property rights for women was circulated, who refused to sign it upon the ground that the control of property was the just privilege of husbands.¹

4. *The Specific Example.* This is what its name implies and does not need much explanation. It is an actual instance of the general idea that is being supported. It is a matter of names, dates, places, actual happenings. It may be the mere mention of a name, or it may require a lengthy narration or description. We may say that the United States has had many great senators, and name as examples of what we mean Charles Sumner and Daniel Webster. We say that many automobile accidents can be prevented, and then proceed to describe — give examples of — some that we have observed. That may require several minutes. J. B. Gordon, in his lecture, "The Last Days of the Confederacy," takes several pages to describe, or relate, an incident that happened to him in the Civil War. Sometimes we may describe a situation at some length and then proceed to draw inferences from this one situation.

Russell H. Conwell, in his "Acres of Diamonds," is trying to impress on his hearers the idea that one way to be successful in business is to take a genuine interest in your patrons and to study their wants with a view to satisfying those wants. Note what effect he gets with an example.

When I was young, my father kept a country store, and once in a while he left me in charge of that store. Fortunately for him it was not often. (*Laughter.*) When I had it in my charge a man came in the store door and said: —

"Do you keep jack-knives?"

"No, we don't keep jack-knives." I went off and whistled a tune, and what did I care for that man? Then another man would come in and say: —

"Do you keep jack-knives?" "No, we don't keep jack-knives."

¹ *Independent*, Oct. 11, 1915, Vol. 84, p. 58.

Then I went off and whistled another tune, and what did I care for that man?

Then another man would come in the same door and say: "Do you keep jack-knives?"

"No, we don't keep jack-knives. Do you suppose we are keeping this store just for the purpose of supplying the whole neighborhood with jack-knives?"

Do you carry on your business like that? Do you ask what was the difficulty with it? The difficulty was that I had not then learned that the foundation principles of business success and the foundation principles of Christianity, itself, are both the same. It is the whole of every man's life to be doing for his fellow men. And he who can do the most to help his fellow men, is entitled to the greatest reward himself. Not only so saith God's holy book, but also saith every man's business common sense. If I had been carrying on my father's store on a Christian plan, or on a plan that leads to success, I would have had a jack-knife for the third man when he called for it.

For speaking purposes, at least, the specific example is the most important of all forms of support. It is a good rule never to make a general statement without giving an example of what you mean. For informative purposes, to offer a specific example in support of an obscure statement is frequently to flood it with light. A good specific example is much like a skyrocket that explodes in the air and illuminates the whole heavens. For appealing to the feelings, a single well-chosen example, as we shall see later, will do more than a long string of generalities and abstractions. For winning belief, it is a very valuable form of support, although it has limitations that should be recognized. If, for example, you are trying to show that liquor legislation cannot be enforced, a few examples of violation mean very little as evidential support. It should be said, however, that a few examples usually produce a psychological effect on your audience that is out of proportion to their real evidential value.

5. *Testimony.* Next to being able to say something well ourselves is the ability to quote some one who has said it well.

There is hardly a field of human thought these days that has not been explored; hardly an idea that some one else has not already expressed probably better than we can express it. Hence the value of testimony, provided we can find appropriate testimony to give.

We may distinguish roughly three kinds of testimony, which is always in the form of quotations:

- (1) Testimony as to facts.
- (2) Testimony of authorities, or expert testimony.
- (3) The literary quotation.

(1) Testimony as to facts. The opportunity for any one to gather first-hand information on different questions through observation and experience is necessarily very limited. As Walter Lippmann has so well put it: "Man is no Aristotelian God contemplating all existence at a glance." So we have to depend very largely on information that we get from others. Most of our information we get from reading; some occasionally from letters or interviews. When a man tells us about an accident he has seen, or when we consult the census reports in regard to the population of a certain city, or a newspaper about market prices, we are getting testimony as to facts. The first is oral; the other two are written.

(2) Authority, or expert opinion. When we quote Professor Manley Hudson on the World Court, or a soil expert on what crops to plant, we are quoting the opinion of an authority.

In quoting authorities, keep in mind two things at least. First, be sure that the person quoted has a right to speak on the question — is in fact an authority on it. Satisfy yourself that he has had unusual opportunity to study the question and is a man of recognized standing. Not all writers are authorities on the questions they write about. Much less are all speakers authorities on the questions they talk about. The fact that a man is in the public eye does not make him an authority on all subjects. Only special study and recognized ability make a man

an authority. Be sure your authorities meet these requirements.

The second point to note about an authority is that he shall be unprejudiced. Almost everybody has some slant or bias on most questions, and it is likely to creep out in his utterances and writings. Sometimes this bias is very pronounced and may render an opinion almost worthless. It is very often difficult to distinguish the propagandist from the seeker after truth. The testimony of a salesman as to the merits of his goods has usually to be discounted. The testimony of the representatives of a manufacturing corporation as to the need of a higher tariff must be scrutinized carefully. These have their own interests to serve. On the other hand, the testimony of a crop expert on the adaptation of soil to certain crops is likely to be fair and unprejudiced. He has no interest in the matter except to tell the truth. If a man has a personal interest in maintaining certain views and holding certain opinions, his testimony on such questions is likely to be of little value.

Always keep in mind that your authority is no better than you succeed in making your audience believe he is. It is not enough that a man shall be an authority. You must make your audience *see* that he is one. Simply quoting an unknown writer to an audience, without impressing them with his knowledge of his subject and his right to speak on it, has next to no effect. If your writer is well known and likely to be accepted, good. If not, be sure to make him known and acceptable before you quote him. So far as getting results in speaking is concerned, no authority is any better than your audience thinks he is.

(3) The literary quotation. By this we mean a quotation from literature rather than from writers on public questions. It may be a line only, or it may be a stanza or two of poetry. James T. Fields, in his lecture, "Masters of the Situation," suggests that one of the best lessons a true American can practice is that expressed so feelingly by Wordsworth:

Never to blend our pleasure or our pride,
With sorrow of the meanest thing that feels.

The literary quotation is at once a form of support and an embellishment to your speech. The chief problem is to find the appropriate quotation. You will find it a most commendable practice to accustom yourself to making use of your knowledge of literature and to ground your speaking in the best thought of the ages. An occasional quotation in a speech adds spice and variety. It is possible to overdo this, of course, and by overdoing, make speaking pedantic. You will probably be in no danger of that for the present. George W. Curtis, Wendell Phillips, Charles Sumner, Abraham Lincoln, and others of our best speakers used quotations of this kind in their speeches. Lincoln did not use quotations lavishly by any means, but on occasion he quoted the Bible and Shakespeare with excellent effect. It is only a slight extravagance of language to say that a Biblical quotation — “A house divided against itself cannot stand” — used in his “Springfield Speech” sent Lincoln to the White House.

6. *Reasoning from Facts and Authorities.* Another form of support much used in argumentative speeches, and more or less in all types, is *reasoning* — inferences from facts and opinions. To say that the study of Latin will give one a command of English not otherwise to be had is to reason from cause to effect. If we cite examples of several Latin students who later showed a ready knowledge of English and infer from these examples that all students of Latin have a better command of English than those who do not know Latin, we reason by means of a *generalization*. If we find minnows in the milk and infer that the milk has been mixed with water, we reason from effect to cause. If we compare two things and find them resembling each other in certain essential particulars, and infer from this that they will resemble each other in certain other unknown particulars, we reason by *analogy*. If, for example, we infer that

a labor party in the United States will be successful because the English Labor Party has been successful, our inference is from analogy.

The different forms of argument based on reasoning are dealt with more fully in Chapter XV, "The Argumentative Speech."

7. *The Hypothetical Case.* This is an imagined example or situation suggested to explain facts and draw conclusions vividly. We use it in conversation almost every day of our lives, and speakers find it equally advantageous to use it in public address. We say, for example, "Suppose a man forms the habit of driving his car recklessly; the chances are good that some day he will break his neck." This is the simplest form. Like other examples, the hypothetical case may have a string of attendant circumstances to suit the purpose of the speaker. Note the following from Wendell Phillips' "Tribute to Lincoln":

He caught the first notes of the coming jubilee, and heard his own name in every one. Who among living men may not envy him? Suppose that when a boy, as he floated on the slow current of the Mississippi, idly gazing at the slave upon its banks, some angel had lifted the curtain and shown him that in the prime of his manhood he should see this proud empire rocked to its foundations in the effort to break those chains; should himself marshal the hosts of the Almighty in the grandest and holiest war that Christendom ever knew, and deal with half-reluctant hand that thunderbolt of justice which would smite the foul system to the dust, then die, leaving a name immortal in the sturdy pride of our race, and the undying gratitude of another, — would any credulity, however sanguine, any enthusiasm, however fervid, have enabled him to believe it? Fortunate man! He has lived to do it!

Sometimes the supposed case is made to stand for a class. If it is, its effect may depend in large measure on its being made truly representative of the class. The case must be fairly stated.

The following from Thomas Carlyle will be regarded as

effective or not, depending on whether we think it is typical of how wars originate and proceed.

What, speaking in quite unofficial language, is the net purport and upshot of war? To my own knowledge, for example, there dwell and toil, in the British village of Dumdrudge, usually some five hundred souls. From these, by certain "natural enemies" of the French, there are successively selected, during the French war, say thirty able-bodied men. Dumdrudge, at her own expense, has suckled and nursed them; she has, not without difficulty and sorrow, fed them up to manhood, and even trained them to crafts, so that one can weave, another build, another hammer, and the weakest can stand under thirty stone avoirdupois. Nevertheless, amid much weeping and swearing, they are selected; all dressed in red; and shipped away, at the public charges, some two thousand miles, or say only to the south of Spain; and fed there till wanted.

And now to the same spot in the south of Spain are thirty similar French artisans, from a French Dumdrudge, in like manner wending; till at length, after infinite effort, the two parties come into actual juxtaposition; and Thirty stands fronting Thirty, each with a gun in his hand.

Straightway the word "Fire!" is given, and they blow the souls out of one another, and in place of sixty brisk useful craftsmen, the world has sixty dead carcasses, which it must bury, and anon shed tears for. Had these men any quarrel? Busy as the devil is, not the smallest! They lived far enough apart; were the entirest strangers; nay, in so wide a universe, there was even, unconsciously, by commerce, some mutual helpfulness between them. How then? Simpleton! their governors had fallen out; and instead of shooting one another had the cunning to make these poor blockheads shoot.¹

8. *Cumulation.* Phillips, in his *Effective Speaking*, stresses the effectiveness of cumulative support for assertions or propositions in a speech. There is no doubt that this is good psychology, if used with discretion. Robert Ingersoll is the one conspicuous master in the use of this speaking device. He uses it freely, more or less in every lecture. Other speakers use it occasionally.

¹ *Sartor Resartus.*

Cumulation is not merely a series of statements in support of a proposition; it is a series of statements usually of the same class. The forms of support most often used for cumulative effect are the general and specific example. Testimony may also be used, but is not used nearly so often. The best effect seems to be had by using the same form of support throughout — as, for instance, the general example or the specific example. It is possible to use effectively first one and then the other in support of the same proposition, but more often it will be found that sticking to the same one will give the best effect. To get cumulative effect, it is necessary that the statements be not too long, or the cumulative effect will be lost. Cumulative support should move rapidly. Note the effect of the following from Ingersoll's lecture, "Farming in Illinois."

The old way of farming was a great mistake. It was all labor and weariness and vexation of spirit. The crops were destroyed by wandering herds, or they were put in too late, or too early, or they were blown down, or caught by the frost, or devoured by bugs, or stung by flies, or eaten by worms, or carried away by birds, or dug up by gophers, or washed away by floods, or dried up by the sun, or rotted in the stack, or heated in the crib, or they all run to vines, or tops, or straw, or smut, or cobs. And when in spite of all these accidents that lie in wait between the plow and the reaper, they did succeed in raising a good crop and a high price was offered, then the roads would be impassable. And when the roads got good, then the prices went down. Everything worked together for evil.

Henry W. Grady gets a cumulative effect with specific instances in the following extract from his lecture, "The Farmer and the Cities."

Character, like corn, is dug from the soil. A contented rural population is not only the measure of our strength, and an assurance of its peace when there should be peace, and a resource of courage when peace would be cowardice — but it is the nursery of the great leaders who have made this country what it is. Washington was born and

lived in the country. Jefferson was a farmer. Henry Clay rode his horse to the mill in the slashes. Webster dreamed amid the solitude of Marshfield. Lincoln was a rail splitter. Our own Hill walked between the handles of the plow. Brown peddled barefoot the product of his patch. Stephens found immortality under the trees of his country home. Toombs and Cobb and Calhoun were country gentlemen, and afar from the cities' maddening strife established that greatness that is the heritage of their people. The cities produce very few leaders. Almost every man in our history formed his character in the leisure and deliberation of village or country life, and drew his strength from the dugs of the earth even as a child draws his from his mother's breast.

For impressive or emotional effect, the general example is probably the most effective form of cumulative support. Ingersoll uses this method extensively, and gets with it some of his most eloquent effects. His "Vision of War" is a cumulation made up of general examples. The conclusion to his lecture on Shakespeare is also an impressive cumulation made up largely of general examples. The word painting, rhythm, and alliteration add greatly to the effect.

He lived the life of all. He was a citizen of Athens in the days of Pericles. He listened to the eager eloquence of the great orators, and sat upon the cliffs, and with the tragic poet heard the multitudinous laughter of the sea. He saw Socrates thrust the spear of question through the shield and heart of falsehood. He was present when the great man drank hemlock, and met the night of death, tranquil as a star meets morning. He listened to the peripatetic philosophers, and was unpuzzled by the sophists. He watched Phidias as he chiseled shapeless stone to forms of love and awe.

He lived by the mysterious Nile, amid the vast and monstrous. He knew the very thought that wrought the form and features of the Sphinx. He heard great Memnon's morning song when marble lips were smitten by the sun. He laid him down with the embalmed and waiting dead, and felt within their dust the expectation of another life, mingled with cold and suffocating doubts — the children born of long delay.

He walked the ways of mighty Rome, and saw great Caesar with his legions in the field. He stood with vast and motley throngs and watched the triumphs given to victorious men, followed by uncrowned kings, the captured hosts, and all the spoils of ruthless war. He heard the shout that shook the Coliseum's roofless walls, when from the reeling gladiator's hand the short sword fell, while from his bosom gushed the stream of wasted life.

In Conclusion. Good speeches need good speech materials, just as well-constructed buildings need good building materials. You cannot build a home out of blue sky; you cannot make a speech out of wind. A speech is a series of propositions and their support. A good speech is made up of vital ideas and adequate support for those ideas. As to what are vital ideas in any subject, that must be left to the speaker's invention and judgment. We are dealing here primarily with the problem of giving ideas proper support. *Unsupported assertion is the vice of most speeches.* Ideas in a speech must not only be clearly conceived and formulated; they must be adequately supported. The forms of support must be specific and concrete. The principal forms are given in this chapter and the next. A good speech will have facts, figures, general and specific examples, testimony, considerable repetition or restatement, very likely some hypothetical cases, logical argument or reasoning, an occasional cumulation, and a wealth of illustrations. The importance of illustrations will be considered in the next chapter. If you will check the content of your speech by these criteria, you will probably find that you will have something to say, and what you say will hold attention. Those are the big things in a speech: to have something to say, and to say it in such a way that people will listen to you. Vital and concrete speech materials are indispensable to the attainment of those ends.

EXERCISES

1. Prepare a ten-minute speech, aiming to use specific and concrete speech materials. Avoid too many broad statements and generalities. Stay on the ground and not in the clouds. Deal with human experiences.
2. Study critically the speech of James T. Field, "Masters of the Situation," or some other speech that interests you.
 - a. List all the forms of support you find on the basis of the classification given in this chapter.
 - b. Which forms predominate?
 - c. Which in your opinion are the most effective?
 - d. How would you characterize the style of the lecture? Is it abstract or concrete? Simple or involved? Etc.
 - e. Does the lecture grip? Why or why not?
3. Support the following ideas by the use of facts, statistics, and authorities:
 - a. Crime is increasing.
 - b. The purchasing power of the farmer is too low.
 - c. Prohibition decreased drunkenness.
 - d. The national income should be more fairly distributed.
 - e. The birth rate is decreasing.
4. Support the following propositions by examples and illustrations:
 - a. Courtesy pays.
 - b. Selfishness is an ugly trait.
 - c. Many men have achieved great things in old age.
 - d. We learn through experience.

READINGS

Speeches

- "Masters of the Situation," by James T. Fields (*Mod. El.*: I, Vol. V).
- "The Reign of the Common People," by Henry Ward Beecher (Vol. XIII).
- "Substance and Show," by Thomas Starr King (*Mod. El.*: I, Vol. V).
- "Social Responsibilities," by John B. Gough (Vol. XIII).
- "Commencement Address," by William Lyon Phelps (*Lindgren*).
- "Get Facts: Look Far: Think Through," by William C. Redfield.¹

¹ This speech appears on page 413 of this volume.

References

- Arthur Edward Phillips: *Effective Speaking* (1908), Chaps. VIII-XVI.
- William Phillips Sandford and Willard Hayes Yeager: *Principles of Effective Speaking* (Revised Edition, 1930), Chap. X.
- James Milton O'Neill and Andrew Thomas Weaver: *The Elements of Speech* (1926), Chap. XIII.
- Arleigh Boyd Williamson: *Speaking in Public* (1929), Chaps. XII-XIII.

CHAPTER VIII

FORMS OF SUPPORT: ILLUSTRATIONS

One picture is worth ten thousand words. — CHINESE PROVERB

All of us use the word "illustration" freely, and still if some one were to ask us to define it, or to tell what it includes, it might bother us to do so. The word is derived from the Latin verb *illustrare* and means "to light up," "to brighten." So Beecher defines an illustration as "a window that lets in light." That is a very good definition, so far as it goes; only an illustration frequently lets in heat as well as light — that is, it may appeal to the feelings as well as to the intellect. A speech without illustrations is like a house without windows — mentally stifling and smothering.

Illustrations and Reference to Experience. When you come to study the literature of public address, especially popular oratory as distinguished from parliamentary or congressional oratory, you will be surprised to find how extensively illustrations are used. Many speeches have just about enough framework of logic to hold the illustrations and examples together. An illustration usually embodies a vivid experience that is familiar to all, and is therefore the very best means of driving truth home. All great speakers have been masters in the use of illustrations.

In his lectures to Yale students, Henry Ward Beecher offered the following explanation of the value of illustrations:

The mode in which we learn a new thing is by its being likened to something which we already know. This is the principle underlying all true illustrations. They are a kind of covert analogy, or likening of one thing to another, so that obscure things become plain, being

represented pictorially or otherwise by things that are not obscure and that we are familiar with. So, then, the groundwork of all illustration is the familiarity of your audience with the thing on which the illustration stands. Now and then it will be proper to lay down and explain with particularity the fact out of which an illustration is to grow, and then to make the fact illustrate the truth to be made clear. The speaker will, for instance, undertake to explain the isochronism of a watch, and having done this so that the audience will understand it, he may employ the watch in that regard as an illustration. But, generally, the subject-matter of an illustration should be that which is familiar to the minds of those to whom you are speaking.

An illustration is never to be a mere ornament, although its being ornamental is no objection to it. If a man's sermon is like a boiled ham, and the illustrations are like cloves stuck in it afterward to make it look a little better, or like a bit of celery or other garnish laid around on the edge for the mere delectation of the eye, it is contemptible. But if you have a real and good use for an illustration, that has a real and direct relation to the end you are seeking, then it may be ornamental, and no fault should be found with it for that.

Kinds of Illustrations. As to what form an illustration may take, we may not all be agreed. We may suggest the following forms, all of which may be used to advantage in making speeches: the simile; the metaphor; the analogy; the anecdote or story; the fable; the parable. All illustrations involve comparisons.

1. *The Simile.* This figure of speech, as you know from your study of rhetoric, is an *expressed* comparison in one or more respects between objects or ideas that are essentially unlike. It is one of the most familiar figures in literature, although in speaking, it is not used nearly so much as the metaphor. The reason is that it does not possess the compressed and driving force of the metaphor, and is therefore not so well adapted to trenchant and vigorous expression such as speaking requires. It is a very useful form of illustration, however, and more or less freely used by many good speakers. Edmund Burke was

known for his picturesque similes. Beecher was a master in driving home truth by means of this figure of speech. Ingersoll makes free use of the simile, often with striking beauty of effect. You will find a dozen or a score in many of Phillips' speeches. Some of Lincoln's homely illustrations are in the form of similes.

The simile is effective for illustrative purposes when it embodies well-known and familiar objects of thought. The degree of effectiveness will depend on the immediate perception of likeness between the ideas or things compared. The simile is usually a figure of adornment and gives charm to style. We use the simile in conversation occasionally, and should cultivate its use in public address, which is merely a somewhat more formal and dignified type of speech.

When Edward Everett wanted to bring vividly before a certain Indian chief the influence of Washington, he said of the great Virginian: "He is gone to the world of spirits, but his words have made a very deep print in our hearts, like the steps of a great buffalo on the soft clay of the prairie."

Students of speech may well ponder the following simile from Aristotle: "It is improper to warp the judgment of a juror by exciting him to anger or jealousy, or compassion, as this is like making the rule which one is going to use, crooked."

Lincoln, in a letter to General Hooker, advised against having his army cross a river at a certain time "lest it might be caught in the position of an ox half jumped over a fence, liable to be attacked both front and rear and with no fair chance to gore in one direction or kick in the other."

Beecher said in the opening of his "Glasgow Speech," "I came to this land which, though small, is as full of memories as the heaven is of stars."

2. *The Metaphor.* The metaphor is "the staple figure of oratory," more extensively used than any other. Always it is an *implied* comparison between two objects or ideas, and always the likeness observed is between things that are essentially

unlike. You will find as many as one hundred metaphorical expressions in some of the speeches of Ingersoll, Starr King, Phillips, and Beecher.

There is nothing mysterious about a metaphor. We use it in conversation every hour of the day. When you refer to a girl friend as a "peach," a bright pupil as a "shark," a course of study as a "snap," a bad defeat of your football team as their "Waterloo," you are talking in metaphorical language. A metaphor is a kind of short cut in giving information and expressing feeling. "It is with words as with sunbeams: the more they are condensed, the brighter they burn." You use the word "peach" to describe certain likable qualities in your girl friend that could not be described so simply and effectively in any other way. A "shark" has great capacity for devouring things, and so we apply that term to a pupil who has capacity for devouring knowledge. When you speak of a football team as having met their "Waterloo," you convey the idea of a crushing defeat, such as Napoleon met on the famous battle field. In no other way can it be done so simply and effectively.

Fisher Ames, one of our statesmen of the Revolutionary period, used the following metaphor to contrast in certain aspects monarchy and democracy as forms of government.

A monarchy is a man of war, stanch, iron-ribbed, and resistless when under full sail; yet a single hidden rock sends her to the bottom. Our republic is a raft hard to steer, and your feet always wet, but nothing can sink her.

Here are some others:

Greece flashes today the torch which guilds yet the mountain peaks of the old world. — WENDELL PHILLIPS

For other men we walk backward and throw over their memory the mantle of charity and excuse, saying, "Remember the temptation and the age." But Vane's ermine has no stain.

— WENDELL PHILLIPS

He (Shakespeare) knew the thrills and ecstasies of love, the savage joys of hatred and revenge. He heard the hiss of envy's snakes and watched the eagles of ambition soar. There was no hope that did not put its star above his head, no fear he had not felt, no joy that had not shed its sunshine on his face. — ROBERT INGERSOLL

An unsold surplus is the blood clot in the heart of business.

— ALBERT J. BEVERIDGE

Sometimes the metaphor may be sustained like the following:

To them [men of former ages] life was an Alpine country; it had its great mountains towering skyward, its dark and bottomless abysses, its caverns haunted by unknown horrors, its mighty glaciers, and its awful precipices; it was a chaos of sublimity and horror, of grandeur and desolation. Now what have we done? We have leveled, smoothed, graded this wild and barbarous country, we have torn down every mountain, we have filled up every chasm, we have reduced it to a perfectly even lawn, an admirably trimmed and exquisitely decorated park, infinitely more comfortable and infinitely less grand. Life has lost its heights, and its depths; its summits and its abysses; all its grandeurs, and all its horrors; all its sublimity and all its barbarity. — OSCAR W. FIRKINS

Shakespeare was an intellectual ocean, whose waves touched all the shores of thought; within which were all the tides and waves of destiny and will; over which swept all the storms of fate, ambition and revenge; upon which fell the gloom of darkness and despair and death and all the sunlight of content and love, and within which was the inverted sky, lit with the eternal stars — an intellectual ocean — toward which all rivers ran, and from which now the isles and continents of thought received their dew and rain.

— ROBERT INGERSOLL

3. *The Analogy.* This is an example that involves comparison. It is used most frequently in argumentative speeches, although it may be used to advantage in any speech. An analogy proceeds on the theory that because two things are alike in several *known* particulars essential to the comparison,

they are probably alike in certain other *unknown* particulars. We reason that, because the several states in our Union can get along together most of the time without fighting each other, a union of European states might be able to work out some sort of satisfactory plan of coöperation. The points of resemblance are that the states which originally made up the American union were independent and sovereign states, and gave up a part of their sovereignty for safety when they organized the United States of America. From these points of known resemblance we infer that the two cases *might* be alike in the one particular unknown: namely, the success of the venture. The problem of race feelings and race hatreds would enter in to make the situation somewhat different, but the analogy is suggestive.

Mary Livermore, in her lecture, "The Battle of Life," in which she pleads for making the struggle less severe, uses the following analogy with telling effect:

When you travel in Switzerland, in the neighborhood of the high mountains, you will sometimes come across a group of people in the valley, who are intently observing some object through a powerful glass. On inquiry, you will learn that a company of tourists, with guides, are making the ascent of Mount Blanc. You take your place amidst the sight-seers. And while you watch the group slowly making their perilous way along the dizzy heights, two or three lose their footing, drop suddenly out of sight, and are gone. Your heart stops its beating; — you are sure they have fallen to a horrible death, down the steep, jagged rocks, into the inaccessible depths below. You look again. No, they are not lost; one is restored to his place in the long line of climbers, and slowly the others struggle up into view, and cautiously they resume their upward march. What is the explanation?

Before they came to the dangerous places they tied themselves together with strong ropes, both the tourists and the guides, and braced themselves at every step with their steel-pointed alpen-stocks, which they planted firmly in the frozen snow and ice. Those who dropped down behind the treacherous ridges were held by the strength

of their companions on either side, who, firmly braced, arrested their descent into the horrors below, and drew them back into line, in safety. So it is in life. Many a one is saved from ruin by the wise and strong love of the friends who retain their hold upon him, and halt him in his downward plunge.

You should always be on your guard against superficial resemblances. You may know the story of De Lesseps who built the Suez Canal, and thought that because he could build the Suez Canal at a profit, he could also build a Panama Canal at a profit. He tried it and failed, after sinking a fortune in the venture.

4. *The Anecdote.* The anecdote, or story, is an extremely valuable form of support in a speech, and you will do well to cultivate its use. The anecdote is a personal incident, sometimes a bit of biography, usually an amusing one, although not necessarily so.

The anecdote is especially appropriate in the lighter forms of address, like the after-dinner speech, but it may be used in all kinds of speeches. You will find from one to half a dozen anecdotes in many of Wendell Phillips' speeches. Bryan used the anecdote with telling effect. It is probably the easiest way to get humor in a speech, although not the most distinctive way. As a means of holding attention, the anecdote, if rightly used, is an important speech device.

In choosing your anecdotes, be sure they are appropriate for speeches. You are not obliged to use the barber-shop and pool-hall variety. There are plenty of good anecdotes to be found in literature, especially the literature of oratory. *Modern Eloquence* is a storehouse of good anecdotes. Biographies will yield many interesting anecdotes, and so will your own personal experiences. Lincoln was a great storyteller although he did not use many stories in his speeches, largely because his speeches dealt mostly with serious subjects.

All good things may be abused, and many are, including the anecdote. That is nothing against the anecdote. The story is

not an end in itself. When it is so used, it is usually bad. When used as a means to an end, to drive home truth, it is a very effective instrument.

David Lloyd George used an anecdote to bring vividly home the idea that while we are always willing to take credit to ourselves when things go well, we are not so ready to assume responsibility when things go wrong. He applied this to the nations in regard to the victory won in the war, and the troublous times that followed.

Who smashed Germany? Who destroyed Austria? Who created this impotence which makes it difficult to execute treaties? Well, if you had asked it on Armistice Day, we all would have gently hinted that it was really done by us.

There was an old preacher in our country who, going on the Saturday night to his preaching engagement, saw on the roadside a haystack, very neat, very well put together; it looked very firm. And he saw a farmer standing alongside it, and he said, "Who made that excellent haystack?" "Oh," he said, "I did it; I did it."

The following day there was a great storm, and on Monday morning, when the old preacher was returning that way, the haystack had been scattered all over the field in hopeless confusion. And he saw the same farmer standing there, and he said to him, "That was very badly put together; that was not very well done. Who did it?"

"Well," he said, "we did it somehow between us."

That is really true of the condition of things in Europe; we were all responsible for the victory; we each contributed his part; we each did something toward shattering the fabric and we have got our responsibility for what follows.

Roe Fulkerson tells an amusing story to illustrate the feverish haste in American life.

We all rush through the world like a bicycle cop and a joy rider, racing for a ten-dollar purse.

The mother-in-law of a busy business man died. His wife, of course, had to go to the home town for the funeral. The man agreed to see that his several kids were put to bed the night she was gone. On her return she asked if he had had any trouble. "Only the little

red-headed one," he answered. "I had to lick her before she would go to bed." "Why John," replied his wife. "That is not our child. She lives across the street."

5. *The Fable.* The fable is very much like the anecdote in form, except that the incident is taken from the animal world instead of from human society. In the fable, animals and inanimate objects are personified and made to talk like persons. The fable is not extensively used by speakers, not nearly so much as its merits warrant. We meet it occasionally, however, and always with good effect. You will make no mistake in familiarizing yourself with a good collection of fables for purposes of speaking.

Beecher used a fable in his effort to make ridiculous the claim of fear on the part of the people of Harper's Ferry when John Brown made his invasion and raid.

And the attempt to hide the fear of these surrounded men by awaking a larger fear will never do. It is too literal a fulfillment, not exactly of prophecy but of fable; not of Isaiah but of Æsop.

A fox having been caught in a trap, escaped with the loss of his tail. He immediately went to his brother foxes to persuade them that they would all look better if they too would cut off their tails. They declined. And our two thousand friends, who lost their courage in the presence of seventeen men, are now making an appeal to this nation to lose its courage too, that the cowardice of the few may be hidden in the cowardice of the whole community. It is impossible. We choose to wear our courage for some time longer.

Wendell Phillips uses a fable to show that the attitude of Webster on slavery, while it was no doubt an expedient one, was not altogether comfortable.

Did you ever hear the fable of the wolf and the house dog? The one was fat, the other gaunt and famine-struck. The wolf said to the dog, "You are very fat." "Yes," replied the dog, "I get along very well at home." "Well," said the wolf, "could you take me home?" "O, certainly." So they trotted along together; but as they neared the

house, the wolf caught sight of several ugly scars on the neck of the dog, and, stopping, cried, "Where did you get those scars on your neck? they look very sore and bloody." "O," said the dog, "they tie me up at night, and I have rather an inconvenient iron collar on my neck. But that's a small matter; they feed me well." "On the whole," said the wolf, "taking the food and the collar together, I prefer to remain in the woods." Now, if I am allowed to choose, I do not like the collar of Daniel Webster and Parson Dewey, and there are certain ugly scars I see about their necks. I should not like, Dr. Dewey, to promise to return my mother to slavery; and, Mr. Webster, I prefer to be lean and keep my "prejudices," to getting fat by smothering them.

6. *The Parable.* The parable is an extremely effective form of illustration. It finds exemplification principally in the New Testament. The truths expressed in the Gospels derive their vitality in large part from the striking manner in which they are expressed. The parable is a pictorial presentation of truth, and as such has the advantage of the "eye appeal." It is not found extensively in oratorical literature, probably because so few men have the art to apply it. As a form of illustration it is worthy of consideration, and always effective when skillfully used. It presents truth clearly, is easy to understand, and so requires a minimum of mental effort.

The parables of the New Testament are presumably so well known that examples are not necessary. In his lecture, "Individuality," Robert Ingersoll uses the following parable to suggest the folly of trying to compel conformity to certain beliefs or ways of living.

A monarch said to a hermit, "Come with me and I will give you power."

"I have all the power that I know how to use," replied the hermit.

"Come," said the king, "I will give you wealth."

"I have no wants that money can supply," said the hermit.

"I will give you honor," said the monarch.

"Ah, honor cannot be given, it must be earned," was the hermit's answer.

"Come," said the king, making a last appeal, "and I will give you happiness."

"No," said the man of solitude, "there is no happiness without liberty, and he who follows cannot be free."

"You shall have liberty too," said the king.

"Then I will stay where I am," said the old man.

And all the king's courtiers thought the hermit a fool.

All these forms of illustration are in effect comparisons and embody familiar experiences that are vivid and hold attention. Whenever we can ground what we want to say in the universal experiences of the race, we may be reasonably sure that we are on solid ground, and that our listeners will feel the same way.

Illustrations Furnish Pictorial Elements in Speaking. Illustrations always embody mental images or imagery that may appeal to any of the senses. For our purpose, the most important ones are those that appeal to the senses of sight and hearing. At the heart of every metaphor is a picture, and as a rule, that holds true for the simile and all the other forms of illustration. "Talk in terms of pictures" is advice we often hear these days, and it is sound if we understand what it means. When we speak of being concrete, talking in terms of pictures, using examples and illustrations, we mean pretty much the same thing. We take in more experiences through the sense of sight than through any other. We speak of going to "see the city," "see the factories," "see the schools." Even in the days of the old drama, we spoke of "seeing" the play. This will explain why the silent "movie" had such a hold on the popular imagination, and why the play and the novel which present pictures are such popular forms of amusement and instruction.

Newell Dwight Hillis, in his introduction to Beecher's *A Treasury of Illustration*, affirms:

The highest genius is pictorial; the works that abide are pictures. Homer's Iliad is a gallery of pictures; Dante's threefold epic of the

unseen world is another. And so it is with Shakespeare, and all the rest of the sons of fame, to whom not only certain classes of specialists but all men of all time pay glad reverence. Others there have been, indeed — a glorious company — whose contributions of invention, statesmanship, learning, or criticism have mightily influenced their own and later times, without surviving in individual form to be reckoned among the world's eternal masterpieces. No doubt we owe more in the aggregate to this host of thinkers and actors than to the few crowned ones. But the question of merit and reward does not concern me here. I would only point out the recognised, universal, and imperishable supremacy of the genius which sees and says pictorially.

To the galaxy of the great in pictorial presentation belong the great orators quite as much as the poets. Especially is this true of our great popular orators: Beecher, Phillips, Ingersoll, Starr King, Bryan, George W. Curtis, and others. Similitudes dropped from their lips like rain from the clouds. Some of their more carefully prepared speeches have about enough structure and logic to hold the illustrations in place. They literally teem with metaphor, simile, analogy, and anecdote. The following table will serve to give one a vivid notion of the affluence of illustration to be found in some of Wendell Phillips' better-known speeches.

	<i>Metaphors</i>	<i>Similes</i>	<i>Analogies</i>	<i>Anecdotes</i>
Harper's Ferry Address	89	8	33	3
The Scholar in a Republic . . .	78	5	24	1
Progress	76	7	27	0
Lincoln's Election	61	8	29	5
Daniel O'Connell	55	5	22	6
Under the Flag	47	3	9	..
Idols	39	4	17	..
The Pulpit	39	3	7	..
Disunion	64	3	22	..
Christianity a Battle	33	4	4	..
The Puritan Principle & J. B.	31	3	17	..
Education of the People	27	1	10	2

When we remember that most of these speeches are only from six to eight thousand words long, we may well be impressed with the wealth of illustrative materials that is to be found in them. In this concrete, imaginative, objective presentation of truth, the great orators largely get their effects.

All illustrations, to be apt, [says Beecher] should touch your audience where their level is. I do not know that this art can be learned; but I may suggest that it is a good thing in looking over an audience, to cultivate the habit of seeing illustrations *in them*. If I see a seaman sitting among my audience, I do not say: "I will use him as a figure" and apply it personally; but out of him jumps an illustration from the sea, and it comes to seek me out. If there be a watchmaker present that I happen to recognize, my next illustration will very likely be from horology; though he will be utterly unconscious of the use I have made of him. Then I see a school mistress, and my next illustration will be out of school teaching. Thus where your audience is known to you, the illustration ought not simply to meet your wants as a speaker, but it should meet the wants of your congregation; it should be a help to them.¹

Cultivate, therefore, the art of so presenting your ideas that your listeners can see them with their mind's eye. It is well enough to use illustrations that call up other forms of imagery as well, such as the auditory and olfactory; but you will find that the visual image will serve you much more often than any of the others.

An interesting specimen of concreteness and the use of illustrations is furnished by "The Scholar in a Republic," by Wendell Phillips. In this lecture there are ninety-two references to historical personages, seventy-eight metaphors, five similes, twenty-four analogies, and sixty-four quotations from literature, history, and the contemporary press.

Sources of Illustrations. We may draw on many sources for our illustrations; such as nature, history, literature, science,

¹ *Yale Lectures on Preaching*. The Pilgrim Press: First Series, p. 169.

the fine arts, and objects from everyday life. Beecher got many of his illustrations from nature and the fine arts. Wendell Phillips drew his more from history and literature, using many classic references, although he made use of all sources. Lincoln drew his largely from everyday life, occasionally from the Bible and Shakespeare. Woodrow Wilson borrowed one of the best illustrations he ever used from so homely an object as the ordinary well pump. "Where corporations," said he in effect, "make large contributions to political campaigns, they expect returns multiplied many times. It is very much like priming a pump. When you prime a pump, you expect to get out of it much more than you put in."

Consider this from *The Autocrat of the Breakfast Table*.

There is no power I envy so much — said the divinity-student — as that of seeing analogies and making comparisons. I don't understand how it is that some minds are continually coupling thoughts or objects that seem not in the least related to each other, until all at once they are put in a certain light, and you wonder that you did not always see that they were as like as a pair of twins. It appears to me a sort of miraculous gift.

You call it *miraculous*, — I replied, — tossing the expression with my facial eminence, a little smartly, I fear. — Two men are walking by the polyphloesboean ocean, one of them having a small tin cup with which he can scoop up a gill of sea-water when he will, and the other nothing but his hands, which will hardly hold water at all, — and you call the tin cup a miraculous possession! It is the ocean that is the miracle, my infant apostle!

If all that poetry has dreamed, all that insanity has raved, all that maddening narcotics have driven through the brains of men, or smothered passion nursed in the fancies of women, — if the dreams of colleges and convents and boarding-schools, — if every human feeling that sighs, or smiles, or curses, or shrieks, or groans, should bring all their innumerable images, such as come with every hurried heart-beat, — the epic that held them all, though its letters filled the zodiac, would be but a cupful from the infinite ocean of similitudes and analogies that rolls through the universe.

The Advantages of Illustrations. The question may well be asked: Why are illustrations used so extensively by the best speakers? There must be reasons for it. There are, as a matter of fact — several of them. Let us examine two important ones.

1. *Illustrations aid the memory.* It is a well-known fact that, long after we have forgotten principles and precepts, we remember the anecdotes, parables, figures of speech, and fables used to illustrate them. Not only do we do most of our thinking in images, but we assuredly also do most of our remembering by means of images. An image is a memory peg on which we can hang general statements. Without such pegs to hang them on, broad statements in the abstract, no matter how true and vital, are forgotten almost as soon as heard. It is by means of a well-selected picture, image, or illustration that a “glittering generality” may become a “blazing ubiquity.” We not only understand a thing better when we can see it in the mind’s eye, but we remember it infinitely longer. When we once see a beautiful landscape or a beautiful building, the image remains in memory almost indefinitely. When we merely hear it described in a general way, the picture soon fades.

It was Woodrow Wilson who observed, in his many years of teaching, that long after his students had forgotten all the history he had taught them, they remembered the stories he had told them. It is probable that a good deal of history may have stuck to the stories. When we once understand the position which Lincoln sought to make clear with his “house divided against itself” illustration, we not only remember the comparison but also Lincoln’s attitude on the slavery question as expounded in his “Springfield Speech.”

So it is true, as Beecher has well put it, that “Your illustrations will be the salt that will preserve your teachings, and men will remember them.”¹

2. *Illustrations economize mental effort.* One of the things

¹ *Yale Lectures on Preaching.* The Pilgrim Press: First Series, p. 159.

a speaker has to learn is to understand the limitations of an audience in following a speech. It requires a great deal of mental effort to listen to a speech for any length of time, unless there happens to be a master on the platform. It is a great art to know how to speak for an hour or hour and a half without tiring the mind and losing attention. Broad generalities and abstract statements are a constant tax on the understanding. As mental diet they are heavy as lead, and there is a limit to what the mind can carry.

The reason that it is more difficult to apprehend general and abstract statements than specific and concrete ones is that the former are much more indefinite in meaning than the latter. If we say, "John drinks a glass of water every morning before breakfast," we know in a moment exactly what that means. But if we say, "John has just enough imagination to spoil his judgment," we cannot grasp the full meaning of that immediately, unless we happen to be familiar with the aphorism and have given it some thought beforehand. Otherwise it will require some reflection and speculation to get at the full meaning. If half a dozen statements like this follow each other in rapid succession, it is easy to see that not only will any ordinary mind tire of trying to follow, but most minds will give it up.

Santayana opens a paragraph as follows: "We must remember that ever since the days of Socrates, and especially after the establishment of Christianity, the dice of thought have been loaded. Certain pledges have preceded inquiry and have divided the possible conclusions beforehand with the acceptable and unacceptable, the edifying and the shocking, the noble and the base." Now, even an erudite reader may want to ponder a moment over this to drink in the full meaning, and what it ultimately means to him will depend to some extent on what is in his head before he reads it. Imagine an audience trying to interpret the meaning of sentences like these as the speaker addresses them. Even if a group of the elect could do it, it would tire them out in a short time. As Oliver Wendell Holmes

said, nothing should go into a speech or lecture that five hundred persons cannot grasp the moment it is uttered. Illustrations are among the most efficient means of making understanding easy. They always deal with the concrete, and the concrete requires very little mental effort to comprehend. We can look at pictures a long time without much mental fatigue. About all that is required is to keep awake.

Illustrations conserve attention also by lending variety to speech materials and forms of appeal. The importance of *variety* in holding attention is discussed more fully in Chapter XVIII, "What Holds Attention." We may use facts and figures and address the understanding. We may reason and draw inferences, and address the reflective mind or judgment. We may use illustrations — draw pictures — and appeal to the imagination. We may appeal to the emotions and provoke laughter, or perhaps tears. If one can, in addition, make the thought sparkle with originality and wit, it will be all the more effective. The secret of holding the attention, especially in a long speech, is to *vary the appeal*, by using illustrations as well as other forms of support. This is precisely the method used by successful speakers.

Illustrations and Mixed Audiences. In preparing speeches for mixed audiences, composed of grown-ups and children, and persons on different levels of information and intelligence — most audiences are of that type — one must offer such a variety of mental diet that all may receive some nourishment, or get at least a taste. For the better informed, one may offer something substantial — facts, ideas, inferences; but it would be folly to feed a mixed audience exclusively on that kind of diet. The children and the less well informed will need stories, incidents, personal experiences that are suited to their type of understanding and enjoyment. The language used must be simple, the sentences short and crisp. Fortunately the interests of the different groups in any assembly are not mutually exclusive. It is true that the more substantial, or at any rate the more

abstract and general, parts of the speech will not serve the youngsters or the less well informed; but the lighter portions, the incidents, anecdotes, and the other forms of illustrations, will serve all just about equally well, old as well as young, the erudite and cultured as well as the ignorant and unlettered.

In speaking of this problem as related to the minister, Beecher has this to say:

You are bound to see that *everybody gets something every time*. There ought not to be a five-year-old child that shall go home without something that pleases and instructs him.

How are you going to do that? I know of no other way than by illustration.

I have around my pulpit, and sometimes crowding upon the platform, a good many of the boys and girls of the congregation. I notice that, during the general statements of the sermon and the exegetical parts of it, introducing the main discourse, the children are playing with each other. One will push a hymn-book or a hat toward the other, and they will set each other laughing. That which ought not to be done is, with children, very funny and amusing. By and by I have occasion to use an illustration, and I happen to turn round and look at the children, and not one of them is playing, but they are all looking up with interest depicted on their faces. I did not think of them in making it, perhaps, but I saw, when the food fell out in that way, that even the children were fed too. You will observe that the children in the congregation will usually know perfectly well whether there is anything in the sermon for them or not. There always ought to be, and there is no way in which you can prepare a sermon for the delectation of the plain people, and the uncultured, and little children, better than by making it attractive and instructive with illustrations. It is always the best method to adopt with a mixed audience.¹

While it is a fact that the ordinary audience is somewhat heterogeneous, it is also a fact that no one need be discouraged on that account so far as adaptation of speech materials goes. It is an attribute of illustrations that almost invariably they

¹ *Yale Lectures on Preaching*. The Pilgrim Press: First Series. p. 163.

embody experiences that have in them the element of universality. That is, in fact, the essence of a good illustration. For every experience peculiar to a group, there are scores of experiences that are common to all people. Whether a man be a merchant, a farmer, a lawyer, a laborer, a preacher, a teacher, a salesman or a chimney sweep, he is first of all a man and shares with all others the common life of home, friends, community, state, and nation. He walks the same earth and gets his sustenance from it; is warmed and lighted by the same sun; has his life fashioned by much the same institutions — schools, press, platform, and church; and in considerable measure is moulded by the same artistic and cultural influences.

The adaptation of speeches to audiences of different groups requires tact and judgment. It is well enough to speak in the language of your listeners and seek illustrations that come peculiarly within their lives. But it can be easily overdone. The moment an audience senses that you are making a conscious effort to come down to their level, the chances are good that they will become suspicious of your sincerity. A university professor gave a commencement address at a high school in a rather progressive town of about one thousand people. He tried so hard to see things from their point of view and speak in terms of their own everyday experiences that, according to the statement of the superintendent of schools, he made himself ridiculous and the audience disgusted.

Facility in the Use of Illustrations May Be Cultivated. The best way to learn to use illustrations is to use them. Practice here as elsewhere tends to make perfect. In order to make proper use of them, one must be impressed with the significant part they play in good speaking. To be so impressed, one must read extensively the speeches of men who have been masters in the art of communicating ideas. One must study their methods of using illustrations. Doubtless individuals differ here greatly. Some have a native aptitude for seeing and presenting things in the concrete; others naturally incline to the abstract. Those

with imaginative temperaments will find the habit of using illustrations easy to form; the unimaginative will find it difficult.

Once more we quote Beecher, himself one of the greatest of all masters in the use of illustrations:

I can say, for your encouragement, that while illustrations are as natural to me as breathing, I use fifty now to one in the early years of my ministry. For the first six or eight years, perhaps, they were comparatively few and far apart. But I developed a tendency that was latent in me, and educated myself in that respect; and that, too, by study and practice, by hard thought, and by a great many trials, both with the pen, and extemporaneously by myself, when I was walking here and there. Whatever I have gained in that direction is largely the result of education. You need not, therefore, be discouraged if it does not come to you immediately. You cannot be men at once in these things. This world is God's anvil, and whatever is fit for the battle has been beaten out on that anvil, and it has felt the fire before it has felt the blow. So that whatever you would get in this world that is worth having, you must work for.

In Conclusion. Illustrations constitute in large part the imaginative or pictorial element in speaking. Modern psychology stresses the importance of this in our education. The great mass of information which we get both from school subjects and elsewhere comes to us through the sense of sight. "Seeing is believing," to say nothing about understanding. Motion pictures are becoming a part of the equipment of every progressive school. We think largely in pictures, and remember almost exclusively in terms of pictures. This element, therefore, in any method of communication, is extremely important; in speaking, more so than anywhere else. Facility in the use of illustrations is the most distinctive earmark of great speaking. It is this imaginative, pictorial element in *The Autocrat of the Breakfast Table* — informal talks — that gives it distinction and makes it one of the world's great books. It is this same pictorial element that gives distinction to our great speeches. Whoever

would excel in speaking should form the habit of freely using illustrations.

EXERCISES

1. Study critically one of the speeches listed below for the use of illustrations and other forms of support. Classify illustrations and show how often each form is used.
2. Choose a proposition and support it briefly for a definite purpose, using one of the following anecdotes, or any that you consider equally good.
 - a. A friend called on Michelangelo, who was finishing a statue. Some time afterward he called again; the sculptor was still at work. His friend, looking at the figure, exclaimed, "You have been idle since I saw you last."

"By no means," replied the sculptor. "I retouched this feature, and brought out this muscle; I have given more expression to this lip, and more energy to this limb."

"Well, well," said the friend, "but all these are trifles."

"It may be so," replied the sculptor, "but recollect that trifles make perfection, and perfection is no trifle."
 - b. A man walking on an icy sidewalk slipped and fell. Just then the parson happened by, and seeing the accident remarked, "Sinners stand on slippery ground."

To which the other replied, "I don't see how they do it."
 - c. "Why don't you let your little brother have your sled with you," said Willie's mother.

"I do. I have the sled going downhill, and he has it going uphill."
3. Look up some fables. Write a paragraph in connection with one of your speeches, and use a fable as an illustration.
4. Bring to class some parables from the New Testament. Show how they are used and discuss their effectiveness.

Speeches

READINGS

- "Commencement Address," by William Lyon Phelps (*Lindgren*).
 "Abraham Lincoln," by Robert Ingersoll (Vol. III).
 "The Choice of Books," by Frederic Harrison (Vol. VII).

References

Henry Ward Beecher: *Yale Lectures on Preaching*. The Pilgrim Press: First Series, Chap. VII.

Harry Allen Overstreet: *Influencing Human Behavior* (1925), Chaps. III and VIII.

William Phillips Sandford and Willard Hayes Yeager: *Principles of Effective Speaking* (Revised Edition, 1930), Chap. X.

James Winans: *Public Speaking* (Revised Edition, 1917), Chap. X.

Arleigh Boyd Williamson: *Speaking in Public* (1929), Chap. XII.

CHAPTER IX

MOTIVATION: WANT APPEAL

The person who advocates a standard as valid for other people must create its validity for them by creating the corresponding desires and values.
— DEWITT H. PARKER

The aim of all persuasive speaking is to influence human behavior. It is to mould the minds and hearts of men so that they will act in accordance with the views set up and supported by the speaker. We have therefore to inquire into those springs of human behavior which lead men to do certain things and avoid others.

The Meaning of Want Appeal. We recognize certain values in life, which are grounded in our experience. We feel that some experiences are worth more than others, or mean more to us. We shall find that our experiences are valuable in proportion to their capacity to satisfy human wants or gratify human desires. Life is a never-ending quest for the satisfaction of human impulses or cravings that are constantly urging us on. We are all governed or motivated by our wants, wishes, desires, prejudices — fundamental urges that move us and move the world. These we call our fundamental life interests. Reason may serve to evaluate desire, or at least see to it that all our impulses get a hearing; but in our impulses or desires we must seek largely the motor power for our actions. The essential problem of the speaker is to harness these impulses to the views he sets forth or the course of conduct which he advocates. It is not enough merely to suggest a course of action to an audience, or to give reasons for its adoption. The crux of the speech problem in persuasion is to set up a system of adequate rewards in the minds of the listeners, to show them that what the

speaker wants them to believe or do is in line with their best interests. The chief aim in advertising is to create a desire for the product or service advertised. So, in speaking; the important objective is to build up a desire on the part of the audience for whatever course of action is advocated.

In order to have an idea prevail, it is necessary to harness it to men's desires. "Suggestions to action which cannot in some way lay hold of these 'system desires' are never accepted by us as standards for our behavior."¹ Show an audience that they can gratify certain fundamental desires by supporting the policy you advocate, and they will be with you heart and soul. We are willing to believe almost anything if it can be shown that it is to our advantage, or if we are predisposed, to believe it. We have a strong tendency to believe what we want to believe.

To link up our speech aim, or the course of action advocated, with the satisfaction of fundamental human wants; to show that behavior in accordance with our aim means the fulfillment of desire, is to *motivate an audience through want appeal*.

Classification of Motives.² The wants or motives that impel men to action are reasonably well understood, although there is not entire agreement as to how they are derived. They lie largely within the range of our feelings and emotions, and vary in character from the meanest to the highest. Most of us understand tolerably well how our actions are influenced by such considerations as fear, anger, love, hate, pride, vanity, property, power, jealousy, shame, curiosity, emulation or rivalry, gratitude, charitableness, pity, desire for comfort, pleasure; love of children, family, friends, community, country; love of liberty, love of justice, love of art, literature, love of approbation, dread of public censure, fear of ridicule.

Persuasive speeches depend so largely for their effectiveness

¹ DeWitt Henry Parker: *Human Values* (1931), p. 38.

² This follows closely, and elaborates somewhat, the classification given in Arthur Edward Phillips: *Effective Speaking* (1908), Chap. V. See also DeWitt Henry Parker: *Human Values* (1931), Chap. III.

on skillful appeal to these motives that it is worth while to get a broad survey of the subject. Always the problem is to show that what you advocate will gratify human wants and desires, particularly those of your audience.

In treating of motives and the manner of appealing to them, it is of advantage to consider them in groups. No accurate classification is possible, for the reason that in civilized societies motives are so complex. We may speak, for instance, of the acquisitive instinct — man's desire to possess things, as for example wealth. But that is really a complex motive compounded of several simple ones. Besides mere acquisition, it involves love of family, of social position, of power, and perhaps love of fame. It may be helpful to know that most of the impelling motives of action are derived from a few primary dispositions deep rooted in our nature. For practical purposes they may be grouped as follows:

1. *Self-preservation: Security; Playing Safe.* "Self-preservation is the first law of life." All people wish to keep well and strong, to avoid sickness and disease and "the thousand natural shocks that flesh is heir to." They wish to keep their persons safe from harm, and to minimize the hazards that endanger lives. Out of these motives arises an endless variety of actions public and private. In the interest of personal health and safety, we enact pure food laws, provide for milk inspection and building inspection, establish medical colleges, organize boards of health, provide fire and police protection, safety appliances on railroads, safety equipment in factories, lighthouses on the high seas, lifeguards on lakes and ocean beaches.

In business, the patent medicine vender who can make his patrons believe that his product best prevents disease and conserves health multiplies his sales; the grocer who handles the freshest and purest of foods gets the customers; the railroad that can show the best-constructed coaches and the longest line of double tracks, other things equal, gets the business. The politician who can credit his party with the most relentless

war on diseases, the most rigid enforcement of pure food laws, and general protection of the public health, will get the votes — and he should.

Growing out of this group of motives are large and varied expenditures for social or public security. Individual preservation depends in part on national safety. For this end, supposedly, we organize our standing armies, fortify our coasts, build our battleships, maintain our navies, and, if necessary, fight our wars with foreign nations.

Numerous appeals to this motive are to be found in political speeches and addresses. For many years after the Civil War, the strongest appeal the Republican Party could make was that it “saved the Union.” Lincoln, in his debates with Douglas, sought to show that the Union could not endure permanently half slave and half free; that slavery was the one thing that had ever threatened its existence and with it that of free institutions — those safeguards thrown about the freedom of the individual. The purpose of the Philippic of Demosthenes was to arouse the Athenians to a realization of the threatened danger from the north and to make an appeal for defense of Athens and her liberties. Webster, in the well-known peroration of his “Reply to Hayne,” made his appeal largely to the motive of national safety, “the preservation of the Union.”

It is to that Union we owe safety at home and our consideration and dignity abroad. It is to that union that we are chiefly indebted for whatever makes us most proud of our country. . . . Every year of its duration has teemed with fresh proofs of its utility and its blessings; and although our territory has stretched out wider and wider, and our population spread further and further, they have not outrun its protection or its benefits. It has been to us all a copious fountain of national, social and personal happiness.

Franklin D. Roosevelt in his speech of acceptance of the Democratic nomination for President at the Democratic National Convention held in Chicago, July 2, 1932, sought to

motivate the American people by an appeal to this same motive — economic security — which is one of the most fundamental of human wants:

In my mind are two things; work, work with all the moral and spiritual values that go with work. And with work, a reasonable measure of security, security for themselves and for their wives and children.

These are more than words. They are more than facts. They are the spiritual values, the true goal to which efforts at reconstruction should lead. These are the values that this program is intended to gain.

2. *Love of Family, Home, and Friends.* Solicitude for our own safety and well-being is naturally extended to those who are the objects of our affections. Our love for those near and dear to us is rooted in that impulse of protection and tenderness that we call the parental instinct. It is this feeling that is the foundation of the family, and is declared by some writers to be the source of all altruistic impulses. It impels the mother to self-sacrifice and unremitting toil in behalf of her offspring. It causes the ambitions of parents to be merged in the welfare of their children. The associations of "home" are among the strongest of human ties; the attachment to friends, among the strongest of our possessions. These interests usurp a large place in human activities.

How may we appeal to these motives? By showing that the course of action advocated will favorably affect the lives of those who hold the hearer's affections. The salesman, instead of emphasizing solely the merits of the piano, will show the mother how much a piano will mean to her daughter. The defender of liquor legislation will draw vivid pictures of young careers blighted by intemperance. The successful politician understands the strength of the family affections and gets into the good graces of the voters of his district by showering favors on their wives and children. As Beecher put it:

He can shake hands with more mothers, kiss more pretty girls and more babies, and tell more funny stories in an hour than any other man in a month, and so they send him up to make laws.¹

3. *Ambition: Desire for Power and Glory.* Motives kindred to this are emulation and pride. These motives have as their end the attainment of influence among our fellows. Among our most cherished satisfactions is a feeling of personal worth and social recognition. The desire to be superior motivates almost all normal beings. The boy takes great pride in being the best swimmer, the best rider, or the best ball player. In adult years, this motive takes the form of the desire for leadership. Social ambition, political ambition, professional ambition, all have their origin here. Superior mental endowments, accumulated wealth, mechanical and inventive skill, scientific researches, even brute physical prowess, are all sources of influence. The prize orator and prize debater find keen satisfaction in their persuasive skill.

Lecturers on the power of personality, much in vogue these days, make their appeal mostly to this group of motives. So do speeches that hold up to view the value of education, self-improvement, industry, excelling in scholarship.

Craving for power varies greatly in different individuals, although desire for superior excellence in some line is strong in most people. Within bounds, it is a worthy motive, and adds much to the zest of life. Lincoln was known to be intensely ambitious. With Napoleon, love of power was a consuming flame. Much of what passes for philanthropy, these days, must be ascribed to a desire for personal worth and social recognition.

Charles Phillips, the brilliant Irish orator, in an eloquent panegyric to American democracy, takes occasion to remind his fellow statesmen that national power and glory are often short-lived because governments do not build on right foundations.

¹ "The Reign of the Common People."

I appeal to History! Tell me, thou reverend chronicler of the grave, can all the illusions of ambition realized, can all the wealth of an universal commerce, can all the achievements of successful heroism, or all the establishments of this world's wisdom, secure to empire the permanency of its possessions? Alas, Troy thought so once; yet the land of Priam lives only in song! Thebes thought so once, yet her hundred gates have crumbled, and her very tombs are but as the dust they were vainly intended to commemorate! So thought Palmyra — where is she? So thought the countries of Demosthenes and the Spartan, yet Leonidas is trampled by the timid slave, and Athens insulted by the servile, mindless and enervate Ottoman! In his hurried march, Time has but looked at their imagined immortality, and all its vanities, from the palace to the tomb, have, with their ruins, erased the very impression of his footsteps! The days of their glory are as if they had never been; and the island that was then a speck, rude and neglected in the barren ocean, now rivals the ubiquity of their philosophy, the eloquence of their senate, and the inspiration of their bards! Who shall say, then, contemplating the past, that England, proud and potent as she appears, may not one day be what Athens is, and the young America yet soar to be what Athens was! Who shall say, when the European column shall have mouldered, and the night of barbarism obscured its very ruins, that that mighty continent may not emerge from the horizon, to rule for its time sovereign of the ascendant! ¹

4. *The Acquisitive Motive.* The desire to possess things is one of the strongest and most fundamental urges of our being. The child early distinguishes between "mine" and "thine," loves to own its toys and trinkets. Few grow to maturity without having made a collection of objects of some kind or other.

As we know this motive in adults, operating in civilized society, it is no more the simple disposition to acquire things, but a composite motive made up of several others, such as love of family, ambition, social prestige, reputation. In fact it is one of the strongest and most comprehensive urges in human

¹ Charles Phillips: *Speeches*, London, 1817.

society, since the possession of wealth may satisfy so many wants and gratify so many desires. Whatever may be said for making money for the love of the "game," the fact remains that most people desire money not for its own sake but for what it can buy. "You take away my life," said Shylock, "when you do take away that which maintains it." The love of money may be the root of all evil; it is also the spur to some of our greatest efforts.

From the point of view of the public speaker, this motive must be reckoned with in almost every subject. Questions of taxation, trust regulation, safeguarding the public against fraudulent stocks and bonds, keeping down the ever mounting expenses of governments, chain stores, installment buying — all are in the last analysis matters of dollars and cents to us. The battle cry of the Republican Party for decades past has been "Prosperity." "Vote the Republican ticket and the country will be prosperous, and so will you." Victory has perched upon the party's banner.

Walter Lippmann, in an address before the National Conference of Social Work, Philadelphia, 1932, gives credit to the free play of the acquisitive instinct in American society for the unprecedented material achievements of the nineteenth century.

Man has invented the power to produce wealth on a scale which allows us to say that the most ancient of human problems — the problem of scarcity — has been solved.

We who stand at the culmination of this epoch can see today that in order to reap the results of this achievement, in order to translate the power we possess into a secure and ordered civilization, we have to do something which is extremely difficult. We have to tamper with the motives which made the achievement possible. For if we are realistic we must acknowledge that the moving force behind the stupendous material work of the nineteenth century was the acquisitive instinct stimulated to tremendous energy by the prospect of enormous personal profits and personal power.

The supreme social problem of the twentieth century, and perhaps for a longer time than that, is to find energies as powerful and as

persistent as the acquisitive and the competitive which are disinterested and co-operative in their effect.

Beecher, in his "Liverpool Speech," sought to show that what England needed most was not cotton but customers — customers that had some wealth and real buying power.

It is a necessity of every manufacturing and commercial people that their customers should be very wealthy and intelligent. Let us put the subject before you in the familiar light of your own local experience. To whom do the tradesmen of Liverpool sell the most goods at the highest profit? To the ignorant and poor, or to the educated and prosperous? (A voice: "To the Southerners." Laughter.) The poor man buys simply for his body; he buys food, he buys clothing, he buys fuel, he buys lodging. His rule is to buy the least and the cheapest that he can. He goes to the store as seldom as he can, — he brings away as little as he can, — and he buys for the least he can. (Much laughter.) Poverty is not a misfortune to the poor only who suffer it, but it is more or less a misfortune to all with whom they deal. On the other hand, a man well off, — how is it with him? He buys in far greater quantity. He can afford to do it; he has the money to pay for it. He buys in far greater variety, because he seeks to gratify not merely physical wants, but also mental wants. He buys for the satisfaction of sentiment and taste, as well as of sense. He buys silk, wool, flax, cotton; he buys all metals — iron, silver, gold, platinum; in short he buys for all necessities and of all substances. But that is not all. He buys a better quality of goods. He buys richer silks, finer cottons, higher grained wools. Now, a rich silk means so much skill and care of somebody's that has been expended upon it to make it finer and richer; and so of cotton, and so of wool. That is, the price of the finer goods runs back to the very beginning, and remunerates the workman as well as the merchant. Indeed, the whole laboring community is as much interested and profited as the mere merchant, in this buying and selling of the higher grades in the greater varieties and quantities.

Then Mr. Beecher proceeded to show them that the slave had virtually no buying power, and that the best way to make the South a good customer was to free the slaves. That meant,

of course, a favorable attitude to the North, which was precisely the purpose Beecher wanted to attain.

5. *Regard for Reputation.* This feeling has reference to the regard we have for the opinions of others, of those now living as well as of generations yet unborn. It has to do with all those interests that are wrapped up in winning and preserving "our good name." We wish to do those things and possess those qualities which in others arouse our admiration and regard, and for the reason that what we admire in others, we believe others will admire in us. To win the approval of our fellow men is assuredly one of the fundamental urges of our being.

This feeling not only impels us to do things, but it also keeps us from doing things. It has at once a positive and negative influence on human conduct. On its positive side, it takes the form of love of public approbation, love of fame. On its negative side, it takes the form of dread of public censure, fear of ridicule.

"A good name is more to be desired than great riches" is a time-honored maxim. Cassio, in *Othello*, bewails the loss of his good name in the familiar quotation: "Reputation, reputation, reputation. O, I have lost my reputation. I have lost the immortal part, Sir, of myself, and what remains is bestial. My reputation, Iago, my reputation!"

The young singer, actor, or orator, takes great interest in his press notices. "The applause of listening senates to command" has always been regarded as worthy of a good man's best efforts. Regard for the opinions of posterity has been a moulding influence in the life of many a great man. Cicero's love of fame is well known. "To extend one's name over the world and to distant ages fires the human breast as the sublimest destiny to which mortal can achieve."

Dread of Public Censure: Fear of Ridicule. It is on the negative side that this motive is almost all-powerful in shaping conduct. It is the great inhibitor of action. Nobody likes to be laughed at; nobody likes to be criticized by his fellows. What

a host of noble impulses are hourly stifled by such paralyzing interrogations as: "What will people think if I do this?" "Is it proper?" "Will my friends approve of it?" Wendell Phillips sought to strike terror into the hearts of those who upheld slavery by suggesting to them what posterity will think of them.

You load our names with infamy, and shout us down. But our words bide their time. We warn the living that we have terrible memories, and that their sins are never to be forgotten. We will gibbet the name of every apostate so black and high that his children's children shall blush to bear it. Yet we bear no malice, — cherish no resentment. We thank God that the love of fame, "that last infirmity of noble minds," is shared by the ignoble. In our necessity, we seize this weapon in the slave's behalf, and teach caution to the living by meting out relentless justice to the dead. How strange the change death produces in the way a man is talked about here! While living men live, they avoid as much as possible all mention of slavery, from fear of being thought Abolitionists. The moment they are dead, their friends rake up every word they ever contrived to whisper in a corner for liberty, and parade it before the world; growing angry, all the while, with us, because we insist on explaining these chance expressions by the tenor of a long and base life. While drunk with the temptations of the present hour, men are willing to bow to any Moloch. When their friends bury them, they feel what bitter mockery, fifty years hence, any epitaph will be, if it cannot record of one living in this era some service rendered to the slave!

How few in public life are strong enough to weather the storms of a hostile public opinion! To do that takes a Savonarola, a Martin Luther, a William Lloyd Garrison, a Wendell Phillips.

It is true that these motives also do impel to action. Fear of ridicule is a whip to keep the individual in line with other people. It is fear of ridicule that prods the youngster to do with the gang what his conscience balks at. "Following the fashions" probably is a variation of this motive.

6. *The Moral Sentiments: Love of Right and Justice.* Most

of the motives already considered are egoistic. In them the highest regulator of conduct is either self-interest or the approval or disapproval of our fellows. We have now to consider the altruistic motives, those concerned with the welfare of others. Among these are included such motives as love of right, justice, truth, courage, honor, uprightness, honesty, nobility of character; and on the negative side hatred of cruelty, injustice, dishonesty, selfishness, deceit, slothfulness, oppression, tyranny. The kinds of actions to which this group of motives leads are those which have our moral approval or disapproval. Among the emotions prominent in shaping the sentiments is moral indignation.

Few motives are more frequently appealed to than this. Almost every public question has its ethical aspects. The crux of the child labor question is the cruelty and injustice of it. The struggle between capital and labor that centers around organized unions and the "closed shop" involves more than matters of mere expediency; it involves matters of right and wrong. To what extent do the toilers receive a fair share of the products of industry, and to what extent may they work together to enforce their demands for better hours, higher wages, and improved sanitary conditions? These are important aspects of that question. Likewise the distribution of wealth, the disfranchisement of the negro in the South, questions of taxation, of rate regulation, of the honor system among prisoners — all have their ethical side and, therefore, afford opportunities for appealing to the higher motives.

There is pathos in this vivid portrayal of the passing of the Indian by Joseph Story. The appeal is to our sympathy (moral sentiments).

There is, in the fate of these unfortunate beings, much to awaken our sympathy, and much to disturb the sobriety of our judgment; much which may be urged to excuse their own atrocities; much in their characters, which betrays us into an involuntary admiration. What can be more melancholy than their history? By a law of their

nature, they seem destined to a slow, but sure extinction. Everywhere, at the approach of the white man, they fade away. We hear the rustling of their footsteps, like that of the withered leaves of autumn, and they are gone for ever. They pass mournfully by us, and they return no more. Two centuries ago, the smoke of their wigwams and the fires of their councils rose in every valley, from Hudson's Bay to the farthest Florida, from the ocean to the Mississippi and the lakes. The shouts of victory and the war-dance rang through the mountains and the glades. . . .

But where are they? Where are the villagers, and warriors, and youth; the sachems and the tribes; the hunters and their families? They have perished. They are consumed. The wasting pestilence has not alone done the mighty work. No, — nor famine, nor war. There has been a mightier power, a moral canker, which has eaten into their heart-cores — a plague, which the touch of the white man communicated — a poison, which betrayed them into a lingering ruin. The winds of the Atlantic fan not a single region, which they may now call their own. Already the last feeble remnants of the race are preparing for their journey beyond the Mississippi. I see them leave their miserable homes, the aged, the helpless, the women, and the warriors, "few and faint, yet fearless still." The ashes are cold on their native hearths. The smoke no longer curls round their lowly cabins. They move on with a slow, unsteady step. The white man is upon their heels, for terror or despatch; but they heed him not. They turn to take a last look of their deserted villages. They cast a last glance upon the graves of their fathers. They shed no tears; they utter no cries; they heave no groans. . . . They know and feel that there is for them still one remove further, not distant, nor unseen. It is to the general burial-ground of their race.

Reason as we may, it is impossible not to read in such a fate much that we know not how to interpret; much of provocation to cruel deeds and deep resentments; much of apology for wrong and perfidy; much of pity mingling with indignation; much of doubt and misgiving as to the past; much of painful recollections; much of dark forebodings.

7. *The Æsthetic Sentiments: Æsthetic Pleasures.* As a motive of action, this has reference to the pursuit of pleasure through

the senses and to the gratification of our æsthetic tastes. It includes our liking for art in all its forms, poetry, drama, fiction, oratory, music, painting, sculpture, architecture, and the decorative arts; also our love for the beautiful in nature, such as mountain views and other forms of natural scenery.

Interests like these mould the lives of different people in varying degrees. The higher forms of art make their appeal, in general, more to the educated than to the ignorant. The love of the beautiful seems, in many, dormant if not dead. Some forms of art have much wider appeal than others. Millions will go to the theater, while only hundreds go to the art museum. When you advocate in a speech the construction of a new auditorium for your school or community, it is largely because of the pleasure it will give you in hearing good plays, good lectures, and other cultural programs. Your appeal is to the æsthetic sentiments or tastes. This would be true also of an appeal for a new library or books for an old one.

Great speakers frequently have the æsthetic tastes highly developed. Beecher was a great lover of art and nature, had a large collection of stones of his own gathering, and would often spend one day a week watching the workers in fine art in New York establishments. Robert Ingersoll was a great lover of the beautiful and, like his brother, "was with color, form and music touched to tears." With keen appreciation of the value of æsthetic pleasures, these men were well fitted to make appeals for such things, and often did.

Ingersoll, in his eulogy of Lincoln, pays this tribute to life in the country, such as Lincoln lived.

It is no advantage to live in a great city, where poverty degrades and failure brings despair. The fields are lovelier than paved streets, and the great forests than walls of brick. Oaks and elms are more poetic than steeples and chimneys.

In the country is the idea of home. There you see the rising and setting sun; you become acquainted with the stars and clouds. The constellations are your friends. You hear the rain on the roof and

listen to the rhythmic sighing of the winds. You are thrilled by the resurrection called Spring, touched and saddened by Autumn — the grace and poetry of death. Every field is a picture, a landscape; every landscape a poem; every flower a tender thought, and every forest a fairy-land. In the country you preserve your identity—your personality. There you are an aggregation of atoms; but in the city you are only an atom of an aggregation.

In the country you keep your cheek close to the breast of Nature. You are calmed and ennobled by the space, the amplitude and scope of earth and sky — by the constancy of the stars.

8. *Negative Motives: Fear, Anger, Hatred, Jealousy.* It is very doubtful if these motives are to be regarded as having an independent status. The feelings which they denote are caused by the frustration of desire and have been developed in the competitive struggle for existence to give aid to the positive values. Fear, for example, is always a fear of something; it may be fear for one's life, or health, or for one's family; fear of losing wealth or social position; or some other fear. It is but the negative aspect of positive values, which it is made to serve. A child expresses anger when its movements are artificially hampered. The grown-up person expresses the same emotion when he feels that his pursuit of positive satisfactions is unduly interfered with. Similarly, hatred and jealousy are closely connected with the struggle for survival and are aroused by the threatened loss of positive values, or of desire defeated. The merchant may come to hate his competitor in business as the competitor continues to make inroads into his field; clearly, the real motive operating is the desire for gain or wealth, and all that wealth will buy. The lover is jealous of his rival because he is threatened with the loss of the affections of the one he loves.

In all these negative motives it is interference with the quest of positive values or satisfactions that causes the emotion. That does not mean that these negative motives are any less real. They are simply the other side of the shield. They may

be appealed to as directly and effectively as the positive ones. Iago appealed to Othello's jealousy, which in effect was to show that Othello was threatened with the loss of Desdemona's love.

Franklin D. Roosevelt in his acceptance speech before the Democratic National Convention, previously referred to, appealed to our fear of radicalism (negative motive), which in effect is fear for our economic and social security. This fear operates perhaps most strongly with the possessing classes, and Roosevelt's appeal may be construed as a bid for their support.

The failure of Republican leaders to solve our troubles may degenerate into unreasoning radicalism. . . . To meet in reaction the danger of radicalism is to invite disaster. Reaction is no barrier to the radical. It is a challenge, a provocation. The way to meet that is to offer a program of reconstruction.

The groups of human wants or motives treated here are not all-inclusive. Human wants are almost infinite in number. The classification given is comprehensive enough to open up the subject and to put the speaker on his guard to interpret his message in terms of vital human interests — vital especially to the audience he is addressing. Failure to do this concretely and vividly sounds the death knell of many a persuasive speech.

Tact and Technique in Want Appeal. Motives range up and down the ethical scale. Some are high; some are low. Some also are strong, and some are weak. No very definite rules can be given for the selection of motives. It is safe to say that the strongest motives consistent with good taste should be appealed to. In his addresses in England, 1863, Beecher appealed strongly to the money motive, which doubtless operated most strongly both with merchants and with laborers in the industrial centers. What he said in effect was this: "You are interested in selling finished goods to America. Free men consume more than slaves. A free South will be a much better customer than a slave South. You are interested therefore in the triumph of the Northern cause." Beecher also made it

plain that he knew the cause of human liberty was dear to the hearts of Englishmen. He made his listeners feel that in supporting the cause of the North they were moved by the loftiest sentiments that can actuate human beings. Everybody finds satisfaction in the feeling that he is moved to action by lofty considerations of liberty and justice, and especially in having his neighbors and fellow men think so. What Beecher did was to appeal to the strongest motives possible, and then *connect the lower motives with higher ones*. That is good technique.

In appealing to human wants, it is best not to make your method obtrusive. The same principle applies here as elsewhere: *conceal your art*. It is not necessary to say, "Ladies and Gentlemen, in this speech I shall appeal freely to your patriotism, your love of children, and your reputation." In fact, to put it in this form is to make it sound ridiculous. Go about your business, make your appeal, accomplish your aim. It is not necessary to say anything about your method. The important thing is to show your audience that the course you want them to pursue is in line with their best interests and will yield handsome returns in the satisfaction of their fundamental wants.

In Conclusion. This survey of the impelling motives of action will serve at least to open up the subject to you. It is a big subject and one of sovereign importance to the speaker. The trouble with so many persuasive speeches — most of them in fact — is that they are not made to touch our lives vitally and vividly, and so they do not grip. The alert speaker will seek to link up his subject with the life interests of his listeners. He will be constantly questioning himself as to how this may best be done. If he is advocating a certain course of action or line of conduct, he will aim to discover how this will favorably affect the lives of his audience. Will it help them to play safe, to conserve health, to escape hazards, to prevent disease? Will it affect the welfare of their family, friends, community, state, nation, or the world? Will it promote their personal

influence or power, socially, politically, professionally? Will it contribute to personality development? Will it be profitable or costly? Is there an ethical side to it? Is it right or wrong, just or unjust? Will it affect their reputation or standing in the community? How will it affect their opportunity to enjoy art in all its forms? In short, what fundamental human desires will it help to gratify? What satisfactions will it give?

These are the tests that should be applied to every subject, and every subject worth talking about lends itself to some form of want appeal. Civilization is built up to gratify human desires and satisfy human wants, and speeches of the persuasive kind are made presumably to promote a fairer distribution of life's satisfactions.

EXERCISES

1. Study the lecture, "Acres of Diamonds." Formulate a purpose sentence for the speech; also state the central idea. Observe the emphasis which Conwell places on sympathetic understanding of human wants. What relation does this idea have to the subject matter of this chapter? According to Conwell, a business man who studies people's wants and tries to satisfy them will be successful. What about a speaker who studies people's wants and then shows that what he advocates will satisfy those wants?

Criticize the speech from the point of view of want appeal. Also from the point of view of style, considering informality, diction, sentence structure, direct quotations, use of questions, and other matters of good style. Make a list of the forms of support. Which are most effective? Is the speech convincing? How would you classify it?

2. Look through a copy of the *Ladies' Home Journal* or some other women's magazine. Make a list of the different departments in the magazine and show how each aims to satisfy certain definite wants in the lives of women, such as health, comfort, attractiveness, bringing up children.
3. Analyze an advertisement in the *Saturday Evening Post* or some other magazine from the point of view of motives or want appeal.

4. Test your next speech for the appeal it makes to impelling motives. Is the appeal concrete and vivid?
5. Report in writing on a speech read for want-appeal analysis. What motives are appealed to? Is the appeal vivid and effective? Does the speech grip?

READINGS

Speeches

- "Acres of Diamonds," by Russell H. Conwell.¹
- "Farming in Illinois," by Robert Ingersoll (*Ingersoll*, Vol. I).
- "Public Duty of Educated Men," by George W. Curtis (*Mod. El.*: I, Vol. VII).
- "The Scholar in a Republic," by Wendell Phillips (*Phillips*, Vol. II).
- "Liverpool Speech," by Henry Ward Beecher (*Beecher*: IV).

References

- DeWitt Henry Parker: *Human Values* (1931).
- Harry Allen Overstreet: *Influencing Human Behavior* (1925), Chap. II.
- James Milton O'Neill and Andrew Thomas Weaver: *The Elements of Speech* (1926), Chap. XIX.
- Arthur Edward Phillips: *Effective Speaking* (1908), Chap. V.
- William Phillips Sandford and Willard Hayes Yeager: *Principles of Effective Speaking* (Revised Edition, 1930), Chap. V.
- James Winans: *Public Speaking* (Revised Edition, 1917), Chap. XI.

¹ This speech appears on page 379 of this volume.

CHAPTER X

MOTIVATION: SUGGESTION

For oral presentation, suggestion is more powerful than reasoning. —
WALTER DILL SCOTT

We have seen in the preceding chapter how important is the direct want appeal in influencing conduct. That is perhaps the most potent form of motivation. In this chapter, we shall treat another form of motivation, which frequently involves indirect want appeal. This method is known as *suggestion*.

Suggestion as a Method of Persuasion. Suggestion is an indirect method of persuasion, which consists in presenting ideas in such a way as to win for them uncritical acceptance. A speaker uses suggestion when he aims to influence behavior, not by telling people directly what he would like to have them believe or do, and giving reasons, but by presenting ideas in such a way as to lead people to draw for themselves the desired conclusions spontaneously. He does this usually by touching off familiar behavior patterns with which the listeners identify the course of conduct advocated by the speaker. We accept the new when it is brought into line with behavior patterns already approved.

The fertile oratorical mind [says Bain] is one that can identify a case in hand with a great number of the strongest beliefs of an audience; and more especially with those that seem, at first sight, to have no connection with the point to be carried. The discovery of identity in diversity is never more called for, than in attempts to move men to adopt some unwonted course of proceeding. . . . To be a persuasive speaker, it is necessary to have vividly present to the view all the leading impulses and convictions of the persons ad-

dressed, and to be ready to catch at every point of identity between these and the proposition suggested for their adoption.¹

If we would understand the extent to which this method is used by successful speakers, we have only to examine their speeches. We shall find that the men who have been masters in communicating ideas to mixed audiences, or in "humanizing knowledge," depend on suggestion much more than on logical argument. They do this largely by the use of illustrations. While suggestion is most effective with popular audiences — that is, persons who are not disposed to be critical — it is effective in some measure with all audiences.

Marc Antony's address to the Romans at Cæsar's funeral is generally regarded as one of the best examples we have of suggestion in speaking. If you will refer to it, you will observe that the speaker studiously avoids any direct statements as to what he wants his hearers to feel and do. He calls to their minds, on the other hand, incidents in Cæsar's life which will arouse the feelings he wants to arouse. Finally, by exhibiting the bloody garment in which Cæsar was assassinated, he arouses intense emotions and stirs the mob to mutiny and rage. He does not say — what is really in his mind — "Cæsar was a great general and a great statesman. The conspirators who killed him are traitors and should be punished." No. He says of Cæsar:

He hath brought many captives home to Rome,
Whose ransom did the general coffers fill:
Did this in Cæsar seem ambitious?

When that the poor have cried, Cæsar hath wept:
Ambition should be made of sterner stuff.

And so he leads them on by indirection and makes them draw their own conclusions about the virtues of Cæsar and

¹ Quoted in James Winans: *Public Speaking* (1915), p. 331.

the treason of the conspirators — the very conclusions which Antony wanted them to draw from the beginning.

Observe also how carefully he avoids anything that may arouse antagonism or a critical attitude. A critical attitude is inimical to suggestion.

Man's Susceptibility to Suggestion. All men are susceptible to suggestion, most of us much more so than we realize. We like to think that we are rational beings, and that we order our lives by carefully weighing reasons for and against any line of action. We do on occasion reason things out, but not as often as we think we do. Most persons are mentally indolent and lazy, and as Joshua Reynolds affirmed, "There is no expedient to which a man will not resort to avoid the real labor of thinking." Woodrow Wilson used to say that not one man in a thousand is governed by his mind. We are all creatures of habit, custom, emotion, imitation, suggestion. These are more often the guiding processes of our lives. As Sam Walter Foss puts it,

For men are prone to go it blind
Along the calf paths of the mind.
And work away from sun to sun,
To do what other men have done.

If some one were to ask us why we belong to a certain political party, or why we attend a certain church, or why we go to some college instead of to some other, or why we wear clothes of a certain cut, or shoes of a certain style, most of us could give no valid reasons. We should have to admit that we belong to a certain political party because our fathers did; we belong to a certain church because we were brought up in it; go to a certain college because our friends do; and wear the kinds of clothes we do because it is the fashion. Hardly a man has reasoned himself into a religious denomination; and they are few who have reasoned themselves into a political party. Our lives are ordered largely through social contact with our fellows. We catch opinions in much the same way that we do smallpox

or measles. Man is not essentially a reasoning being, but a *suggestible* one.

In the words of Boris Sidis:

Man is often defined as a social animal. This definition is no doubt true, but it conveys little information as to the psychological state of each individual within society. There exists another definition which claims to give insight into the nature of man, and that is the well-known ancient view that man is a *rational* animal; but this definition breaks down as soon as we come to test it by facts of life, for it scarcely holds true of the vast multitudes of mankind. Not sociality, not rationality, but *suggestibility* is what characterizes the average specimen of humanity, for man is essentially a *suggestible* animal.

The Meaning of Suggestion. Sidis defines suggestion and suggestibility as follows:

By *suggestion* is meant the intrusion into the mind of an idea; met with more or less opposition by the person; accepted uncritically at last; and realized unreflectively, almost automatically.

By *suggestibility* is meant that peculiar state of mind which is favorable to suggestion.¹

According to Walter Dill Scott, *suggestion* is used to denote actions which are marked by two characteristics:

(1) *The thought or action must be suggested by some external stimulus* — This external stimulus may be a spoken sentence, a *gesture*, a *look*, a ringing of a bell, the sight of an object, etc.

(2) The second characteristic of suggestion is that *the idea suggested results in action or belief without the ordinary amount of deliberation or criticism*. There is a narrowing of consciousness, and the idea suggested does not arouse any, or at least an adequate amount of resistance.²

Characteristics of Suggestion. In our endeavor to understand the processes of suggestion as applied to persuasive speak-

¹ *Psychology of Suggestion* (1898), p. 15.

² *Psychology of Public Speaking* (1926), p. 154.

ing, we have to consider a number of things. The first is that *suggestion is a process of communicating ideas*. The ideas may be communicated by any one of the agents of expression: formal language, voice, or gestures. What is needed is an external stimulus suggesting the action or belief.

The second thing to note about the process of suggestion is that *the distinctive characteristic of a suggestive idea is that it is realized in belief or action uncritically*. According to Münsterberg, "A suggestion is, we might say, at first, an idea which has a power in our mind to suppress the opposite idea. A suggestion is an idea which in itself is not different from other ideas, but the way in which it takes possession of the mind reduces the chances of any opposite ideas; it inhibits them."¹ "A suggestive idea," says Keatinge, "is one which exercises a disintegrating influence on the mind in such a way that critical and inhibitory ideas are rendered ineffective."² "Verbal suggestion produces belief by a process that is not consciously inferential at all."³ These statements should suffice to make clear the distinction between suggestion and the ordinary argumentative process. In suggestion the usual associative tendencies of an idea are suppressed: there is no balancing of reasons, pro and con. If the suggestive idea accomplishes its purpose, it results in belief, or motor tendencies to action immediately and uncritically.

Distinction between the Associative Value of an Idea and Its Suggestive Force. The associative tendency of an idea is not necessarily a tendency to belief or action. A person may, for example, receive an offer to go to a distant city at a larger salary than he is now drawing. The original tendency of the idea is to realize itself in action; but the field is not clear. A train of associative ideas is called up, some for the proposition, others against it. The increase in salary is favorable; so are the

¹ *Psychotherapy* (1909), p. 86.

² *Suggestion in Education* (Second Edition, 1907), p. 54.

³ James Sully: *Human Mind*, p. 498.

increased dignity and power of the proffered position, as well as the social and other advantages which those things carry with them. But there is the contrariant idea of leaving a host of friends and acquaintances, of leaving one's native city with all its associations and attachments. Opportunities for investment may not be so good in the new location; the climate may not be so favorable. It is clear that, while pondering the proposition may call up a host of associated ideas, the only effect may be a greater insight into the situation, a fuller appreciation of the advantages and disadvantages of making the change. The associative tendency of the idea, in other words, may be not at all toward belief or action.

On the other hand it is characteristic of an idea so far as it is *suggestive* to realize itself in belief or action, "quite apart from insight or understanding. . . . If the resulting train of association is abnormal so that adverse ideas and impulses seem to be non-existent, this is due to the *suggestive force of the idea*, and an idea is suggestive insofar as the train of association which it initiates is partial, or in other words, insofar as it realizes itself notwithstanding the existence within the total system of possible inhibitory ideas."¹

Methods of Using Suggestion in Speaking. We are now in a position to consider some examples of how suggestion may be applied in public address for persuasive ends.

There are several methods of using suggestion in speaking. Both the speech itself and the speaker may be considered as sources of suggestion. So far as suggestion is derived from the speech materials or forms of support, one method stands out above all others in importance, which we shall now consider.

A. *Suggestion through Transference of Feeling.* The most important form of suggestion, growing out of the speech itself, is the one that involves a *transference of feeling from one idea*

¹ Maurice Walter Keatinge: *Suggestion in Education* (Second Edition, 1907), p. 31.

*or thought pattern to another.*¹ The process is perhaps best explained in terms of belief gradients or belief potentials. The transference of feeling must be from a belief of high potential to one of lower potential. A belief or action tendency of a high potential cannot be changed by suggesting a belief or action tendency of a lower potential. We can best understand this by taking a concrete case. The following is probably as good an example of this form of suggestion as can be found. It was applied to an individual, to be sure, but it might just as well have been applied to any uncritical pioneer audience familiar with flintlock rifles.

In 1816 Henry Clay voted for a new Compensation Act of Congress. It aroused a tornado of popular wrath. Not even the great Commoner could stand against this, and sagaciously resolved to try to weather it. Meeting a staunch supporter who had turned against him, he said:

“Jack, you have a good flintlock rifle, haven’t you?”

“Yes.”

“Did it ever flash in the pan?”

“Once it did, but only once.”

“What did you do with it? Did you throw it away?”

“No, I picked the flint and tried it again.”

“Well,” said Mr. Clay, “I have flashed only once — on this compensation bill — and are you going to throw me away?”

“No,” cried the hunter, touched in his tenderest part. “No, Mr. Clay. I will pick the flint and try you again.”

Note what happens. The man addressed accepts the comparison made, and his strong conviction that it is not sensible to throw away a rifle because it fails to go off once — a perfectly familiar thought pattern with a high belief potential — is transferred to the idea of Clay’s failure to vote correctly on the Compensation Bill — a thought pattern not so familiar and involving a belief of low gradient. The comparison is in the form of a figurative analogy, and is from the *accepted* to the *unaccepted*.

¹ For this phrasing, I am indebted to Franklin H. Knower of the Department of Speech, University of Minnesota.

Suppose Clay had used logical argument to win over his old friend. Is it likely that he would have been so successful? Observe that Clay is not addressing a critical mind; also that very few minds are critical. Note also that an uncritical acceptance is here won for a hostile idea.

The effect of the following passage from a speech of the late Senator Robert La Follette is one of suggestion (U. S. Senate, May 23, 1911):

Nothing is ever really settled until it is settled right. It may seem to be settled. We may think in our imperfect human way that we have disposed of it, but it will come back to confront us. It is God's law of everlasting righteousness demanding judgment. As the law of gravity always pulls to make things plumb, so the eternal law of right goes on and on forever, exercising its tremendous unending, immutable decree that right shall prevail.

The illustration used not only illumines the subject, but it tends to produce conviction. The feeling that gravitation operates at all times to make things plumb tends to be transferred to the idea that, in the long run, righteousness is the only stable foundation on which to build. There is involved here also suggestion through *authority* ("God's law of everlasting righteousness"), which is treated later in this chapter.

The following illustration is a good example of how truth may be brought home by using the technique, "Put yourself in the other fellow's place." It is an example of the "imagined situation." It embodies familiar and vivid references to experience. It is also a good example of suggestion — of how one may take a short cut to win immediate belief or action for an idea.

A young country doctor was trying to educate his patients to send in as few night calls as possible, and to pay double for them when they were used. How to do it. Observe an example of his method. One night a wealthy farmer telephoned him to come out and see a member of his household. As the doctor was leaving, the farmer inquired the

cost of the visit. When told that the charge was six dollars he exclaimed:

“Six dollars! That’s just double what the old doctor ever charged.”

“This is a night visit,” was the calm reply. “It would have been only three if you had called me any time during the day.”

“But six dollars for one visit is outrageous, young man!”

“Very well,” responded the doctor. “I will make it three on one condition.”

“All right, name it!” returned the farmer.

“That condition is that when I need another load of hay I may call you up at ten o’clock at night; that you will get your man out, hitch up your team and bring in the hay inside of two hours, and that you will do so at the regular price and without a whimper or a complaint.”

“Say,” interrupted the farmer, “you’ve got me on the hay argument. Don’t need to go any further. You are all right.”

The method here used is essentially the same as the one in the previous illustration. The doctor selects a thought pattern perfectly familiar to the farmer and one having associated with it a feeling of deep conviction; namely, that it is a nuisance to get up in the middle of the night to deliver a load of hay. This conviction is transferred to the idea or thought pattern of the doctor’s having to get up at all hours of the night to make professional calls. The farmer accepts the comparison uncritically. *The comparison must be accepted if the suggested idea is to bear fruition in behavior.* It may be said that the comparison here is from the accepted to the unaccepted.

The Use of Illustrations. In the examples given, it will be seen that the force of the suggestion in each instance depended on the use of an illustration (analogy). So far as suggestion in speaking derives from the speech itself, as distinguished from the speaker, this is almost invariably true: *the suggestion takes some form of illustration or example*, either analogy, some figure of speech like the metaphor and simile, or the anecdote, fable, or parable. The parables in the New Testament are good examples of suggestion. The pictorial element in speaking — furnished largely by illustrations — is in large measure the sug-

gestive element. An analysis of our great speeches will make this plain.

There is a psychological reason for this. A suggested idea depends for its effectiveness largely on what it meets with in the consciousness of the listener. "Every normal suggestion," says Allport, "builds up its attitude upon some deep-lying reaction tendency already present. Interests, emotions, sentiments, derived drives, and innate prepotent reactions serve as basis."¹ When Clay met the old hunter and compared his own mistake in voting for the Compensation Bill to a flash in the pan of a flintlock rifle, he knew that he was referring to a very familiar and vivid experience in the life of the South Carolinian. When the doctor proposed that he be allowed to call on the farmer for a load of hay at any hour of the night, the farmer had vividly brought home to him what a doctor must go through in answering night calls. A suggestion depends for its effect on *setting off a familiar thought or emotional reaction in a conflicting pattern of reaction tendencies*, thus narrowing the field of consciousness and resulting in a motor attitude or action uncritically and at once. For this purpose, thought patterns embodying universal experiences are the most dependable, especially with large audiences. The experience referred to must be a familiar and vivid one with the audience addressed. As elsewhere noted, it is the essence of an illustration that it embodies experiences that are vivid and familiar. It is through illustrations also that we get vivid comparisons between the unaccepted and the accepted, between the unfelt and the felt, comparisons which will be found to underlie most of the examples of suggestion in speaking.

A good example of suggestion is the following illustration from Lincoln's "Springfield Speech." Observe how the illustration is adapted to a pioneer community and how vividly it must have come home to the farmers and woodsmen of early Illinois. Doubtless the illustration was intended for the less critical part

¹ Floyd H. Allport, *Social Psychology* (1924), p. 245.

of his audience. The illustration was used to drive home the point of conspiracy of certain national Democratic leaders, after a somewhat involved argument on the subject.

We cannot absolutely know that all these exact adaptations are the result of preconcert. But when we see a lot of framed timbers, different portions of which we know have been gotten out at different times and places, and by different workmen, — Stephen, Franklin, Roger, and James, for instance, — and we see these timbers joined together, and see they exactly make the frame of a house or a mill, all the tenons and mortises exactly fitting, and all the lengths and proportions of the different pieces exactly adapted to their respective places, and not a piece too many or too few, not omitting even scaffolding — or, if a single piece be lacking, we see the place in the frame exactly fitted or prepared yet to bring such piece in — in such a case we find it impossible not to believe that Stephen and Franklin and Roger and James all understood one another from the beginning, and all worked upon a common plan or draft drawn up before the first blow was struck.

Observe once more that Lincoln in this illustration chooses a thought pattern peculiarly familiar to an audience of pioneer farmers, and involving a belief of high potential; namely, that timbers fashioned like the ones Lincoln described must have been prepared by men working together in accordance with a prearranged plan. The feeling of conviction associated with this is here transferred to the idea of conspiracy among the Democratic leaders — a thought pattern much more involved, much less familiar and carrying with it only a vague belief of low potential. The comparison is from the familiar to the unfamiliar. It is probable that thousands of Lincoln's followers, who were wholly incapable of following a logical argument on the sinister import of the Kansas-Nebraska Bill and the Dred Scott Decision, could understand and carry in mind the illustration Lincoln gave them, and be properly suspicious of men who could, working independently, fashion political timbers that fitted like the ones Lincoln described.

When Bruce Barton wants to impress upon his hearers that a product needs to be continually advertised, even when well known, he does not argue the proposition. A simple illustration serves his purpose better.

Speaking of the advance advertising man for the old-fashioned circus, Mr. Barton says:

It was his function to precede the circus into various communities, distribute tickets to the editor, put up on the barns pictures of the bearded lady and the man-eating snakes, and finally to get in touch with the proprietor of some store and persuade him to purchase the space on either side of the elephant for his advertisement in the parade.

Coming one day to a crossroads town, our friend found that there was only one store. The proprietor did not receive him enthusiastically. "Why should I advertise?" he demanded. "I have been here for twenty years. There isn't a man, woman or child around these parts that doesn't know where I am and what I sell." The advertising man answered very promptly (because in our business if we hesitate we are lost), and he said to the proprietor, pointing across the street, "What is that building over there?" The proprietor answered, "That is the Methodist Episcopal Church." The advertising man said, "How long has that been here?" The proprietor said, "Oh, I don't know; seventy-five years probably." "And yet," exclaimed the advertising man, "they ring the church bell every Sunday morning."¹

The effect here is had through suggestion. The feeling or conviction that it is proper to ring a church bell every Sunday morning, even if the church is old and well known, is transferred to the idea that it is proper to advertise a store even if old and well known.

James Beck, who interpreted the La Follette progressive campaign of 1924 as an attack on the Constitution of the United States, gets a vivid effect through suggestion with this illustration:²

¹ Homer Dorr Lindgren: *Modern Speeches* (Revised Edition, 1930), p. 358.

² *Ibid.*, p. 431.

The La Follette party assault reminds me of an incident that happened to me many years ago when I made my first visit to Switzerland. I was in the lovely valley of Lauterbrunnen. Shut in by towering mountains of eternal granite, it is noted for a wonderful echo. The four notes of the common chord were sounded on an Alpine horn, and as the tones reverberated from cliff to cliff they intermingled until they sounded like the strains of a majestic organ. Then a little brass cannon was fired. The result was startling. The smoke drifted across my eyes and obscured the snowy summits of the Bernese Alps, while the echo was so deafening that it truly seemed as if the mountains had fallen from their bases into the valleys and primeval chaos had come again. Soon the smoke cleared from my eyes and the reverberations died away on the distant snow fields, and outlined against the infinite blue, untouched and unimpaired, was the white summit of the Jungfrau.

Similarly, we had last autumn for many months a popular upheaval that for a time seemed to obscure our vision and deafen our ears with its terrifying noise; but as the smoke of the battle cleared and the noise of the tumult died away, there was outlined against the infinite blue of the future, like a snowclad mountain upon a pedestal of eternal granite, the Constitution of the United States.

There is suggestive persuasion in the following fable from Beecher, illustrating the general idea that we find what we bring:

A cold cinder and a burning lamp started out, one day, to see what they could find. The cinder came back and wrote in its journal that the whole world was dark. It did not find a place wherever it went, in which there was light. Everywhere was darkness. The lamp when it came back, wrote in its journal, "Wherever I went it was light. I did not find any darkness in my journey. The whole world was light." What was the difference? The lamp carried light with it, and illumined everything about it. The dead cinder carried no light, and found none.

The Use of Figures of Speech. Figures of speech, another form of illustration, constitute a favorite device of successful speakers for getting effects through suggestion. The following

simile from the Autocrat has a weighty suggestion for keeping out of certain kinds of controversies.

If a fellow attacked my opinions in print, would I reply? Not I. Do you think I don't understand what my friend, the Professor, long ago called *the hydrostatic paradox of controversy*?

Don't know what that means? — Well I will tell you. You know, that, if you had a bent tube, one arm of which was of the size of a pipe-stem, and the other big enough to hold the ocean, water would stand at the same height in one as in the other. Controversy equalizes fools and wise men in the same way, — *and the fools know it.*

The conclusion of Bryan's famed "Cross of Gold Speech" employs figures of speech that have an intensely emotional association, and are therefore strongly suggestive. They touch off a powerful emotional pattern in referring to the crucifixion.

If they dare to come out into the open field and defend the gold standard as a good thing, we will fight them to the utmost. Having behind us the producing masses of this nation and the world, supported by the commercial interests, the laboring interests and the toilers everywhere, we will answer their demand for a gold standard by saying to them, You shall not press down upon the brow of labor this crown of thorns; you shall not crucify mankind upon a cross of gold.

Enough instances have been given to show the large part that illustrations play in *suggestive* persuasive speaking. The principal form that suggestion takes in speaking is a comparison between the belief or action sought to be induced and some belief or action familiar to the audience and accepted by them as sound. If the comparison is accepted, there is transference of feeling from one idea or belief to the other. The comparison is usually implied rather than expressed. This method of persuasion is, with the majority of people, more effective than logical reasoning, and far more widely used by great speakers. Attention has been called to the extensive use of illustrations by our popular orators, most of which have in them a large element of suggestion.

Importance of Choosing Right Comparisons. One or two observations should be made on these examples. It is clear that the effect of suggestion on the hearers depends largely on the thought pattern or belief set which is suggested to them or recalled for them. The belief set must be one of high potential; that is, one accepted by the audience without question, and one which does not arouse opposing ideas. This is in accordance with Münsterberg's statement that a suggestion depends for its effect on the "way in which it takes possession of the mind" and "reduces the chances of any opposite ideas." If, for instance, in the first illustration given, Henry Clay had suggested to the old hunter that he (Clay) should have at least the privilege of a sheep-killing dog — a second chance — the effect might have been different, depending on the hunter's attitude on whether a dog caught killing sheep ought to have a second chance.

A second thing to note is that the audience must accept uncritically the comparison which the illustration embodies. If the farmer, for example, had felt that being called upon to deliver a load of hay in the middle of the night was not at all like the case of the doctor being called upon to visit a patient at the same hour, the suggestion would have had no effect. It was the uncritical acceptance of the comparison flashed upon him which won him over. Suggestion in this form is not effective if there is serious doubt or deep-seated conviction in regard to the belief to be established or act to be performed. When the Fugitive Slave Law was passed, Beecher said it had scattered the Northern negroes in terror "like partridges hunted on the mountains." This might have won sympathy from the people of the North; it would not have had much effect on Southern slave owners. In the case of unaccepted beliefs, or disputed propositions, the critical judgment must first be satisfied, assuming the presence of people in which it operates. Lincoln in his "Springfield Speech" argued at length in support of his charge of conspiracy among national

leaders; then, he flashed conviction on his audience by the use of his timber illustration.

B. *Repetition as a Source of Suggestion.* It is possible to use restatement or repetition with suggestive effect, but it can hardly be said that it is a device often used in speaking. It is much more important in advertising than in public address. If it is to be effective, two conditions must be present: the resistance to be overcome must not be strong or doubt deep-rooted; the time element must have a chance to enter as a factor. In advertising a product, the popular attitude at first is likely to be one of indifference. Repeat the merits of the article with picture words of popular appeal, sing its praises often enough, and we shall eventually believe that it must be all right; and where we see it, we may buy it. It may take a long time for the suggestion to sink in.

In speaking, we may use this method to advantage if the resistance to be overcome is not too strong. The most striking example that I have known of this was that of a distinguished preacher in a sermon on the sinking of the *Titanic*. Many people at the time were led to question why such things could be in a world ruled over by a beneficent deity. This minister felt impelled to offer an explanation, and chose as his theme, *God Was There*. In the course of the sermon lasting perhaps forty minutes, he must have repeated this statement at least twenty times, or it may have been oftener. The suggestive effect was doubtless strong, especially with those who accepted the leadership of this man, and who were not disposed to be overcritical. The effect on me was to impress the thought indelibly on my memory, which suggests that this device not only impresses ideas on the mind, but also makes them stick there.

If used with art and discretion, the method is effective. It may be worthy of more cultivation than it has received. The danger of it is that it may be a source of boredom or offense if not used tactfully. Certain it is that it will not remove any great doubt from critical minds, and it may antagonize.

Slogans depend for their effectiveness on repetition as well as on the character of the appeal. Political slogans have been known to win elections. "The Full Dinner Pail," "Prosperity," have been potent factors in Republican victories. "He Kept Us Out of War" elected Wilson president in 1916. "Eventually, Why Not Now" has been a slogan to reckon with in the flour industry. All these depend on repetition, as well as on popular appeal, for their effectiveness. All of them have been built up through long periods of time.

Rendering an Audience Suggestible. Suggestibility has reference to that mental disposition which is favorable to suggestion. It is measured by the readiness of a subject to accept uncritically those propositions for which belief or action is sought by suggestion. Suggestibility to some degree is found in all normal persons, but varies greatly with different individuals, and is considerably affected by certain conditions. It is found in its most perfect form in the state of hypnotism, in which suggestions of all sorts are received and acted upon uncritically. It is greater in children than in adults, and greater in men accustomed to obey than in those accustomed to command. Persons that are educated, cultured, and well informed are less suggestible than those who are uncultured, uneducated, and ignorant. "The least degree of suggestibility is that of a wide-awake, self-reliant man of settled convictions, possessing a large store of systematically organized knowledge which he habitually brings to bear in criticism of all statements made to him."¹

From these facts we should naturally infer that suggestion is more effective with popular audiences than with others. It is unmistakably so. While some instances of suggestion are to be found in congressional and parliamentary oratory, they are few compared with the number found in popular addresses. The great masters of suggestion are our great popular orators — Wendell Phillips, Henry Ward Beecher, Robert Ingersoll,

¹ William MacDougall: *Introduction to Social Psychology* (1926), p. 98.

Abraham Lincoln, George W. Curtis, William Jennings Bryan. An examination of their addresses will reveal an astoundingly large number of suggestive illustrations and other forms of suggestion; while one is likely to find but very few intricate logical processes. The student of suggestion in speaking is referred to the addresses of these men for a variety of examples of suggestive speaking.

Let us now consider what steps a speaker may take to render an audience receptive to his message, and win for his views favorable attention.

A. *The Psychological Crowd.* It is not our purpose here to discuss at length the psychology of the crowd. Much of that is still in the controversial stage. The two authorities who have given the subject most careful thought are not able to agree as to what really happens when a group of people becomes a so-called crowd. We know pretty well, however, some things that do happen, and we may take advantage of that knowledge in managing an audience.

We know from experience, for example, that it is much easier to talk effectively to an audience if its members are sitting close together than if they are scattered. The reason is that each individual in a compact group observes more closely what his neighbors do and how they react to what is being said. Each can observe not only the more overt actions of the group, such as clapping of hands, laughing, hissing, and other signs of approval and disapproval, but even the facial expressions of those about him and their general attitude to the sentiments expressed by the speaker. The result is that each individual tends to be greatly influenced in his responses to the speaker by the responses which he sees others are making all about him. If they applaud, he will applaud; if they laugh, he will laugh; and if they hiss, he will probably hiss. The herd instinct in all of us tends to make us do as the group does, so far as we can observe what it does. So it comes about that the group tends to become homogeneous, more or less of one mind,

and uniform in reactions to the speaker addressing it. As for the individual member of the crowd, he is fortified by the thought that what he does has the approval of the group, and he is induced to express himself freely. The obvious advantage to the speaker is that while he still continues to address a group, it is essentially a group with one mind, and that a *suggestible* one.

Not all groups convert into a psychological crowd, although many groups may be so converted. Much depends on the character of the group, and more on the speaker.

B. *Audience Responses.* From what has already been said, it is plain that an audience may be made more suggestible by having its members act in unison, either in response to the speaker or otherwise. It is here that humor becomes a potent device for the speaker and fulfills one of its greatest functions. There is no more effective device for getting audience responses favorable to the speaker than a judicious use of humor. The trouble is that there is such a temptation to use it that many speakers abuse it. They will drag it into the speech for its own sake, without its having any relation to the message to be brought home. Especially is there a tendency at the beginning of a speech to abuse the story or anecdote in this way, and for the very good reason that it is the easiest way to get some kind of audience response. The skillful speaker will seek to avoid the abuse of so excellent a device. Humor in the introduction to a speech is to be commended for most occasions, and the speaker who has the art to introduce it in such a way as to serve his purpose and make it seem to spring naturally from the treatment of his subject has made a good beginning. In this respect, a speech well begun is half done.

It is worth noting that a great evangelist like Billy Sunday has with him a great singer, who not only can sing, but who can also lead the crowd in congregational singing. This means definite audience responses that pave the way for more of such responses when the speaker begins his address. We should not

overlook the fact that singing is a highly emotional performance, and stirs not only those who participate, but also those who listen. A great singer, therefore, renders an audience suggestible not only through overt audience responses, but also through stirring the emotions. And this leads us to consider still another way to make an audience suggestible.

C. Suggestibility and Emotional Appeal. It is well known that one of the best ways to make an audience suggestible — favorable for receiving suggestion — is to stir in them emotions favorable to the speaker and his purpose. Man is much like metal. A cold piece of steel is not very susceptible to moulding influences; but heat it white hot and it becomes soft and pliable, and may be bent or moulded into almost any shape. So with human beings. As long as an audience remains cold or indifferent toward the speaker's message, and untouched by emotion, the audience is not likely to be very tractable, or susceptible to any influences that the speaker may bring to bear upon them. But once arouse their feelings or emotions favorably and, like metal when heated, they become soft and pliable, easily moved and moulded — that is, they become suggestible. The speaker, therefore, who wishes to use suggestion with his audience will aim to touch their feelings, use emotional appeal.

We shall see in Chapter XIV, "The Impressive Speech," that the only way to stir the emotions is through the concrete — through examples and illustrations, or images. The emotions are stirred by presenting, through the imagination, images to the senses. Imagery, therefore, as exemplified in figures of speech and other forms of illustration, is one of the principal devices for getting results through suggestion in speaking.

Stereotypes. Walter Lippmann has given a new meaning to this word, which denotes a more or less vague thought pattern usually highly colored with emotion. A stereotype is a sort of label that we can conveniently attach to persons or ideas on very flimsy pretexts of identification. To a conservative, for

example, a person addressing a group on a street corner, and criticizing some public policy, is a Bolshevik with all the baleful implications of that term. To a group of laborers, a captain of industry is a pot-bellied individual with a rhinoceros hide, whose great aim in life is to squeeze as much out of a day's labor as possible and pay as little for it as he can.

Assimilating people and ideas to stereotypes of this sort is really a process of calling names, of finding sanctions in shibboleths. It is a convenient substitute for critical thinking and getting at the facts, for it is much easier to label a man or call him a name than to meet him in argument. This process is one of suggestion.

Here, as in direct want appeal, a speaker may abuse his power and lead people astray by false comparisons and suggestions, by using words or phrases weighted with emotion, such as *patriotism, liberty, the stars and stripes, equality, brotherhood of man, national honor, bolshevism, communism, capitalism, un-American*. Words like these are surcharged with feeling, and serve to mould the mob spirit. To bring persons, beliefs, and acts within these categories or stereotypes when they do not belong there is the work of the charlatan. One may cheat an audience with an epithet or a suggestion; but one may also cheat them with a logical argument, and make the worse appear the better reason.

The best way to be proof against sophistry of any kind is to understand clearly the character of the persuasive processes used, whether logical argument, direct want appeal, or suggestion. All three may be used in the same paragraph or in the same advertisement. In the ordinary persuasive speech, they mix and mingle so that it is not always easy to tell them apart. Logical argument and want appeal almost invariably go together in practical speaking. The amount of suggestion used depends on the speaker, and it is a safe statement that the more successful the speaker, the more suggestion he will use; or perhaps more accurately, the more he uses suggestion, espe-

cially with mixed audiences, the more successful he will be. All have their place, and the greatest art is to give each its appropriate place.

D. *The Speaker as a Source of Suggestibility.* There are certain other conditions that tend to make an audience suggestible. The most important of these is the relation of the speaker to his audience. If an audience is to accept more or less uncritically what a speaker says, its members must have confidence in him. They must feel that he is sincere and honest, and not motivated by ulterior purposes. One of the first things that a successful speaker tries to do is to get into the good graces of his audience; to win their good will and favorable attention. He does this usually by getting on common ground of pleasurable feeling, through a bit of humor, or perhaps judicious bestowal of praise where praise is due, and in general by those qualities of modesty, fairness, sincerity, which all people like to see in a speaker, and which naturally inspire confidence. Good speeches furnish an abundance of examples of how this is done. A somewhat unusual one is Lincoln's introduction to his "Columbus Speech," delivered in October, 1859, after his fame had spread somewhat as a result of the Lincoln-Douglas debates the previous fall.

Fellow-citizens of the State of Ohio: I cannot fail to remember that I appear for the first time before an audience in this now great State — an audience that is accustomed to hear such speakers as Corwin, and Chase, and Wade, and many other renowned men; and remembering this, I feel that it will be well for you, as for me, that you should not raise your expectations to that standard to which you would have been justified in raising them had one of these distinguished men appeared before you. You would perhaps be only preparing a disappointment for yourselves, and, as a consequence of your disappointment, mortification to me. I hope, therefore, that you will commence with very moderate expectations; and perhaps, if you will give me your attention, I shall be able to interest you to a moderate degree.

An introduction like this disarms suspicion. Only modest and sincere men speak like this. If a speaker can go a step farther and can make his hearers feel that he speaks out of an abundance of knowledge on the subject, and as an authority, he will gain prestige and tend to have his statements accepted as valid. In the New Testament we are told that Jesus of Nazareth spoke "as one having authority," and the people heard him gladly and believed. Elsewhere we have quoted Emerson to the effect that in any knot of men, the one who has the facts — that is, real knowledge of his subject — will have the ears of his hearers, and confidence as well. During several political campaigns the utterances of William Jennings Bryan were gospel to millions of voters, who accepted his statements uncritically at their face value.

Confidence, authority, and prestige in a speaker greatly enhance the suggestibility of the audience and so create a condition favorable for the uncritical acceptance of his utterances.

In Conclusion. Suggestion, as applied to persuasive speaking, is in fact an old process to which modern psychology has given a new name. It is the process of influencing behavior by presenting an idea in such a way as to win acceptance for it without critical deliberation. In its most important form it consists essentially in comparing an idea or belief which functions inadequately or not at all in behavior with an idea or belief which does function adequately, or at least more fully, in the minds of the listeners, with an accompanying transfer of feeling or emotion from one thought pattern to the other. The all-important thing is to select the right thought pattern for comparison, one that carries with it a belief which is familiar to the audience and accepted by them without question. This is on the theory that man is a suggestible rather than a reasoning being. Most of our beliefs and acts are the results of social contact with our fellows, rather than of any reasoning processes. Suggestibility varies with different persons, but all of us are more or less suggestible — principally more. The speaker uses

largely illustrations and examples to get results through suggestion. It is largely the pictorial element in speaking that produces suggestion. A study of our great speeches, especially those addressed to popular audiences, will reveal how extensively this process is used. It is a plain statement of fact to say that, for ordinary speaking, suggestion is far more serviceable and effective than logical argument. Logical argument and want appeal have their places — very important ones; but whoever would excel in presenting ideas — truth as he sees it — to popular audiences should cultivate the use of suggestion in speaking.

EXERCISES

1. Study critically one of the speeches assigned for the use of suggestion. Bring to class at least three good examples of suggestion from the speech you read. Explain effects in terms of *attitude*, *belief*, or *action*. Observe the connection between the pictorial element and suggestion.
2. Prepare to deliver a short speech in class, using suggestion as much as possible. Do not overlook the value of illustrations here.
3. Give orally a criticism of a speech you have lately heard which emphasized suggestion rather than logical argument and want appeal. Was the speech effective? What was the nature of audience? Was the element of suggestion overdone?

READINGS

Speeches

- “Which Knew Not Joseph,” by Bruce Barton (*Lindgren*).
- “The Reign of the Common People,” by Henry Ward Beecher (Vol. XIII).
- “The Scholar in a Republic,” by Wendell Phillips (*Phillips*, Vol. II).
- “Social Responsibilities,” by John B. Gough (Vol. XIII).
- “The Choice of Books,” by Frederic Harrison (Vol. VII).
- “The Battle of Life,” by Mary Livermore (*Mod. El.*: I, Vol. V).

References

Walter Dill Scott: *Psychology of Public Speaking* (1926).

James Milton O'Neill and Andrew Thomas Weaver: *The Elements of Speech* (1926), Chap. XIX, § 8.

Harry Allen Overstreet: *Influencing Human Behavior* (1925), Chaps. III-IV.

William Phillips Sandford and Willard Hayes Yeager: *Principles of Effective Speaking* (Revised Edition, 1930), Chap. VIII.

Boris Sidis: *Psychology of Suggestion* (1898).

Hugo Münsterberg: *Psychotherapy* (1909).

Maurice Walter Keatinge: *Suggestion in Education* (Second Edition, 1907).

CHAPTER XI

THE SPEAKING STYLE

It is proof of high culture, to say the greatest matter in the simplest way. — RALPH WALDO EMERSON

Herbert Spencer in his essay, "The Philosophy of Style," deduces a general principle from which are derived many of the rules of rhetoric ordinarily given for effective expression. The principle applies even more emphatically to speaking than to writing. Spencer thus states the principle:

On seeking for some clue to the law underlying these current maxims, we may see implied in many of them, the importance of economizing the reader's or hearer's attention. To so present ideas that they may be apprehended with the least possible mental effort, is the desideratum towards which most of the rules above quoted point. When we condemn writing that is wordy, or confused, or intricate — when we praise this style as easy, and blame that as fatiguing, we consciously or unconsciously assume this desideratum as our standard of judgment. Regarding language as an apparatus of symbols for conveying thought, we may say that, as in a mechanical apparatus, the more simple and the better arranged its parts, the greater will be the effect produced. In either case, whatever force is absorbed by the machine is deducted from the result. A reader or listener has at each moment but a limited amount of mental power available. To recognize and interpret the symbols presented to him, requires part of this power; to arrange and combine the images suggested by them requires a further part; and only that part which remains can be used for framing the thought expressed. Hence, the more time and attention it takes to receive and understand each sentence, the less time and attention can be given to the contained idea; and the less vividly will that idea be conceived.

It is of first importance that those who aspire to attain skill in speaking should become thoroughly familiar with the style and method of those who are acknowledged masters in that art and observe how they exemplify this fundamental principle of effective expression. You will find that *simplicity* is the keynote to their style; simplicity of diction, simplicity of sentence structure, and simplicity in the general manner of presenting things. You will do well to become thoroughly saturated with the best models that the literature of public address affords. This will require much reading, but time so spent will be well repaid. The literature of public address contains many of the most brilliant gems in our language, which should prove a source of inspiration in the pursuit of your work in speech training.

Style in Its Broad Sense. The word "style" as ordinarily used has a broad signification. It is plain that when we are considering specific speech materials, such as the concrete example, figures of speech, anecdotes, we are dealing in some measure with the elements of style. By style we mean not only the impress of a personality on the stuff that speeches are made of, but also the character of the materials out of which a speech is made. We speak of a simple style, an involved style, a dignified style, a picturesque style, a concrete style, an abstract style, an informal style, and so on. We use these adjectives to describe the dominant aspects of style. A style may be at once simple, informal, concrete, picturesque, vivid. Good diction, figures of speech, originality, more than most other elements, tend to give distinction to style. We have already considered figures of speech and other concrete materials that go to make up a speech. We shall here consider diction and some of the other more important elements of the speaking style.

Diction. Instant understanding is the first law of the speaking style. This is obvious enough when you consider that a speaker must be understood when he utters his words, or not

at all. When we read an essay or a poem, and come across something that is not plain, we can stop and read it again, and if necessary reflect upon it. We can even go to the dictionary and look up a word. Not so in listening to a speech. We cannot stop to ponder and inquire about the meaning. We must get it the moment the words fall from the speaker's lips. Good speakers understand this. They know the limitation of the human mind in following a speech, and that limitation is very marked. This is strikingly true with popular audiences, and is true in greater or less degree of all audiences. Hear what an experienced lecturer, Oliver Wendell Holmes, has to say on this subject:

The average intellect of five hundred persons, taken as they come, is not very high. It may be sound and safe, so far as it goes, but it is not very rapid or profound. A lecture ought to be something which all can understand. A thoroughly popular lecture ought to have nothing in it which five hundred people cannot all take in at a flash just as it is uttered.

A study of successful speakers reveals a wonderful simplicity in style. Especially is this true of the orators of the last fifty or seventy-five years, the period in which popular oratory spread through the lyceum and the Chautauqua as it has never spread before. There is a charm of simplicity in the addresses of such men as Beecher, Ingersoll, Lincoln, Grady, Talmage, Wendell Phillips, John B. Gough, Russell H. Conwell, and William Jennings Bryan. Their sentences are short and crisp and simple in structure, while by actual count, one may discover that for every one hundred words they use, about ninety to ninety-five are words of one and two syllables. Not the least element of attractiveness and popularity in Mr. Bryan's speaking was the simplicity of form and outline into which he threw all his speeches. These men understood their audiences and their genius impelled them to present truth in such simple form that the humblest of their hearers could grasp it. They

did this, not with a contemptuous air of condescension, but with a spirit of fine appreciation of the demands of their art. The ancients emphasized this aspect of the speaking style. Cicero impressed it on his readers in the following language:

While in other things *that* is most excellent which is most remote from the knowledge and understanding of the illiterate, it is in speaking even the greatest of faults to vary from the ordinary kind of language and the practice sanctioned by universal reason.

The diction of American orators, in point of simplicity, is indicated by the following table. The percentages have been found by counting one hundred words in twenty-five different places for each speaker. That may not give an absolutely accurate index, but it is close enough for our purpose.

TABLE SHOWING DICTION OF AMERICAN ORATORS

	<i>Words of One and Two Syllables</i>	<i>Words of More than Two Syllables</i>
Russell H. Conwell ¹	94.5%	5.5%
Robert Ingersoll	92.44	7.56
Wendell Phillips	91.96	8.04
Henry Ward Beecher	90.48	9.52
John B. Gough	90.3	9.7
Henry W. Grady	90.3	9.7
Abraham Lincoln	89.97	10.03
William Jennings Bryan	89.	11.

The Advantages of Simple Words. A word is not necessarily a good word because it contains only one or two syllables, nor is it necessarily a bad word because it contains more than two. *Caoutchouc*, *guano*, *legumes*, are words of two syllables, and still no speaker would get very far foisting such words upon a mixed audience unless he explained what they mean. The real test, of course, is that the word shall be easily understood,

¹ "Acres of Diamonds" only lecture considered.

and that it shall carry the richest and most vivid meaning possible for the accomplishment of the speaker's aim.

This much may be said : that a short word has at least two distinct advantages over a long one. For one thing, it is easier to understand. Its meaning can usually be grasped in a moment. The language of ordinary conversation is made up largely of words of one and two syllables. Such words carry definite and immediate meanings, and with the least expenditure of effort. There is some mental energy required to recognize the sounds of any word, and especially of a long one. This effort soon becomes fatiguing if words are spoken indistinctly and the voice is low and hard to hear. Whatever mental energy is expended in understanding the symbols is lost in getting and appreciating the full meaning. Other things equal, short words are, therefore, more easily grasped and more forceful than long ones.

Again, short words, as a rule, have richer associations and are more meaningful than long ones. The words of childhood, of fireside, family and friends are largely Anglo-Saxon words of one and two syllables. These words are bound up with our earliest experiences and associations and are full of color and warmth. The classical element in our language, on the other hand — made up largely of polysyllabic words — is borrowed, adventitious, foreign. It is cold and colorless. The difference between the two is the difference between *home* and *habitation*, *friend* and *associate*, *play* and *amusement*. The short Anglo-Saxon words, wrapped up as they are with our youthful experiences and memories, touch off thought and emotional patterns much more easily than the others. They are therefore more suggestive and forceful.

Hear what Henry Ward Beecher has to say about this in his lectures to Yale divinity students.¹

I have known a great many most admirable preachers who lost almost all real sympathetic hold upon their congregations because

¹ *Yale Lectures on Preaching*. Pilgrim Press: First Series, p. 131.

they were too literary, too periphrastic, and too scholastic in their diction. They always preferred to use large language, rather than good Saxon English. But let me tell you, there is a subtle charm in the use of plain language that pleases people, they scarcely know why. It gives bell-notes which ring out suggestions to the popular heart. There are words that men have heard when boys at home, around the hearth and the table, words that are full of father and of mother, and full of common and domestic life. Those are the words that afterward, when brought into your discourse, will produce a strong influence on your auditors, giving an element of success; words which will have an effect that your hearers themselves cannot understand. For, after all, simple language is loaded down and stained through with the best testimonies and memories of life.

It is worth noting that in this passage of 167 words, 151 words are of one and two syllables.

College students are frequently offenders through their use of involved, pedantic diction. They often sound as if they had swallowed the Standard Dictionary. They imagine that emitting big words and mouth-filling phrases is a sign of erudition. This is of course pure pedantry, and very bad psychology in the bargain. They carry into their speaking a ponderous, dray horse style, which they have developed in writing themes. Such a style is not at all adapted to public address, whatever may be said for it for writing purposes.

It is said that when John Heyl Vincent, the father of Chautauqua, once asked Dr. Hall, pastor of the Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church, what his methods were in dealing with young and immature minds, the latter deliberately replied:

“Ah, in the effort to establish relations of sympathetic receptivity in relatively crude and immature minds, I try to employ language that is essentially simple, and to rely upon concrete illustrations and imagery which may establish some connection with the apperceptive capacities of those whom I am addressing.”

Dr. Vincent then turned to Sam Jones, the Southern Evangelist, and asked, “Mr. Jones, what are your methods?”

Abruptly and sarcastically he replied, "Oh, I put the fodder on the ground where anything from a jackass to a giraffe can get at it."

This may be a homely way to put it, but it is sound advice.

It is a great mental strain to listen to a speech for an hour or more, and unless the effort to hear and understand is made as easy as possible, the speaker is likely, before he gets through, to be addressing deaf ears. So let us repeat that a speaker should not be merely understood; he should be *easily* understood. He must so speak that he not only *can* be understood, but that he *cannot help* being understood.

Picture Words. Still another aspect of words worth noting for speech-making purposes is their sensuous quality. Words that embody imagery are to be preferred to those that do not, especially visual imagery. Almost all persons are visual-minded and take in more experiences through the eye than in any other way. To say that a certain man is a live wire or a human dynamo is more forceful than to say that he is active or alert. To say that Anglo-Saxon words are "full of father and of mother" is much more vivid than to say they have emotional association.

Most good picture words are figurative. The following excerpt from Beecher's "Eulogy on Wendell Phillips" is an example of a simple speaking style with picture words prominent.

The power to discern right amid all the wrappings of interest and all the seductions of ambition was singularly his. To choose the lowly for their sake; to abandon all favour, all power, all comfort, all ambition, all greatness — that was his genius and glory. He confronted the spirit of the Nation and of the age. I had almost said, he set himself against nature, as if he had been a decree of God overriding all these other insuperable obstacles. That was his function. Mr. Phillips was not called to be a universal orator any more than he was a universal thinker. In literature and in history he was widely read; in person most elegant; in manners most accomplished; gentle

as a babe; sweet as a new-blown rose; in voice, clear and silvery. He was not a man of tempests; he was not an orchestra of a hundred instruments; he was not an organ, mighty and complex. The Nation slept, and God wanted a trumpet, sharp, far-sounding, narrow and intense; and that was Mr. Phillips. The long roll is not particularly agreeable in music or in times of peace, but it is better than flutes or harps when men are in a great battle, or are on the point of it. His eloquence was penetrating and alarming. He did not flow as a mighty Gulf Stream; he did not dash upon the continent as the ocean does; he was not a mighty rushing river. His eloquence was a flight of arrows; sentence after sentence, polished, and most of them burning. He shot them one after the other, and where they struck they slew; always elegant, always awful.¹

There is magic in words.

Seeking to be rich in speech, you will find that in the broad ocean of our English literature there are pearls of great price, our potent English words — words that are wizards more mighty than the old Scotch magician; words that are pictures bright and moving with all the coloring and circumstance of life; words that go down the century like battle-cries; words that sob like litanies, sing like larks, sigh like zephyrs, shout like seas. Seek amid our exhaustless stores, and you will find words that flash like the stars of the frosty sky, or are melting and tender like Love's tear-filled eyes; words that are fresh and crisp like the mountain-breeze in autumn, or are mellow and rich as an old painting; words that are sharp, unbending, and precise like Alpine needle-points, or are heavy and rugged like great nuggets of gold; words that are glittering and gay like imperial gems, or are chaste and refined like the face of a Muse. Search, and ye shall find words that crush like the battle-axe of Richard or cut like the scimitar of Solyman; words that sting like a serpent's fang or soothe like a mother's kiss; words that can unveil the nether depths of hell or point out the heavenly heights of purity and peace; words that can recall a Judas, words that reveal the Christ.²

Sentence Structure. Just as simple and easily understood words with a large picture element are the best in speaking, so

¹ *Lectures and Orations* (1913), p. 220.

² Beecher, et al.: *Oratory* (1897), p. 67.

short and simply constructed sentences are to be favored. We do not like long, involved sentences because of the mental effort necessary to carry the meaning. Robert Ingersoll, perhaps the most popular of all popular speakers, furnishes excellent models for study in the use of short and simple sentences. Here are examples from his eulogy of Lincoln.

Lincoln was by nature a diplomat. He knew the art of sailing against the wind. He had as much shrewdness as is consistent with honesty. He understood, not only the rights of individuals, but of nations. In all his correspondence with other governments he neither wrote nor sanctioned a line which afterward was used to tie his hands. In the use of perfect English he easily rose above all his advisers and all his fellows.

Lincoln always tried to do things in the easiest way. He did not waste his strength. He was not particular about moving along straight lines. He did not tunnel the mountains. He was willing to go around, and reach the end desired as a river reaches the sea.

Short sentences predominate in the following paragraph from the speech of Owen D. Young at Harvard, June 4, 1927.

Here in America, we have raised the standard of political equality. Shall we be able to add to that, full equality in economic opportunity? No man is wholly free until he is both politically and economically free. No man with an uneconomic and failing business is free. He is unable to meet his obligations to his family, to society, and to himself. No man with an inadequate wage is free. He is unable to meet his obligations to his family, to society, and to himself. No man is free who can provide only for physical needs. He must also be in a position to take advantage of cultural opportunities. Business, as the process of coördinating men's capital and effort in all fields of activity, will not have accomplished its full service until it shall have provided the opportunity for all men to be economically free. I have referred elsewhere to the cultural wage. I repeat it here as an appropriate term with which to measure the right earnings of every member of a sound society competent and willing to work.¹

¹ O'Neill and Riley: *Contemporary Speeches* (1930), p. 87.

Contrast. The principle of contrast runs through all art and all life. The effect is primarily to produce vividness. Just as certain colors in juxtaposition set each other off, so opposite ideas set against each other become more vivid. The words on this page are printed black on white to produce the clearest and most vivid images. Success is never so thrilling as when it follows close upon the heels of failure. The golden glow of sunset is never so bright as when it falls at the end of a cloudy day. "A sorrow's crown of sorrow is remembering happier things," sang Tennyson.

In persuasive speaking, when we aim to rouse an audience to more or less definite action, it is imperative to present ideas as vividly and forcefully as possible. The principle of contrast, therefore, becomes an exceedingly useful device for the public speaker.

Wendell Phillips in his lecture, "The Scholar in a Republic," seeks to make accomplishments of popular government stand out by contrasting civilization under democratic Athens with that under king-ridden and priest-ridden Egypt. Observe the effect he gets with an anecdote as well as the forcefulness of the contrast drawn.

Anacharsis went into the Archon's court at Athens, heard a case argued by the great men of that city, and saw the vote by five hundred men. Walking in the streets, some one asked him, "What do you think of Athenian liberty?" "I think," said he, "wise men argue cases, and fools decide them." Just what that timid scholar, two thousand years ago, said in the streets of Athens, that which calls itself scholarship here says today of popular agitation, — that it lets wise men argue questions and fools decide them. But that Athens where fools decided the gravest questions of policy and of right and wrong, where property you had gathered wearily today might be wrung from you by the caprice of the mob tomorrow, — that very Athens probably secured, for its era, the greatest amount of human happiness and nobleness, invented art, and sounded for us the depths of philosophy. God lent to it the largest intellects, and it flashes today the torch that gilds yet the mountain peaks of the Old World. While

Egypt, the hunker conservative of antiquity, where nobody dared to differ from the priest or to be wiser than his grandfather; where men pretended to be alive, though swaddled in the grave-clothes of creed and custom as close as their mummies were in linen, — that Egypt is hid in the tomb it inhabited, and the intellect Athens has trained for us digs today those ashes to find out how buried and forgotten hunkerism lived and acted.

Claude Bowers in his keynote speech at the National Democratic Convention, Houston, Texas, 1928, uses the principle of contrast to good purpose.

Thus they (Republicans) frankly base their policies on the political principles of Hamilton, and we go forth to battle for the principles of Thomas Jefferson. The issues are as fundamental as they were when Jefferson and Hamilton crossed swords more than a century ago. To understand the conflicting views of these two men on the functions of government is to grasp the deep significance of this campaign.

Now, Hamilton believed in the rule of an aristocracy of money, and Jefferson in a democracy of men.

Hamilton believed that governments are created for the domination of the masses, and Jefferson that they are created for the service of the people.

Hamilton wrote to Morris that governments are strong in proportion as they are made profitable to the powerful, and Jefferson knew that no government is fit to live that does not conserve the interest of the average man.

Hamilton proposed a scheme for binding the wealthy to the government by making government a source of revenue to the wealthy; and Jefferson unfurled his banner of equal rights.

Hamilton wanted to wipe out the boundary lines of States, and Jefferson was the champion of their sovereign powers.

Hamilton would have concentrated authority remote from the people and Jefferson would have diffused it among them.

Hamilton would have injected governmental activities into all the affairs of men; and Jefferson laid it down as an axiom of freedom that "that government is best which governs least."¹

¹ O'Neill and Riley: *Contemporary Speeches* (1930), p. 507.

Originality: Power of Statement. Emerson lists "power of statement" as one of the requisites of a great speaker. By that he means originality in the manner of saying things; the power to state an issue or an idea in such a way that it cannot be disregarded. When Lincoln, in his "Springfield Speech," uttered the historic statement: "This country cannot endure permanently half slave and half free," he put the question in a new light. Few persons had thought of it in that way before. They had supposed that the country *could* endure half slave and half free. Lincoln went a long way in the "Springfield Speech" to prove that the country was gradually being prepared for extending slavery and making it national.

H. G. Wells has said, "Civilization is a race between education and catastrophe." That is putting the value of education in a compelling way. When William Lloyd Garrison in 1831 stated editorially in *The Liberator*, "I will be as harsh as truth, as uncompromising as justice: I am in earnest; I will not equivocate; I will not excuse; I will not retreat a single inch; and *I will be heard*," people began to realize that a new force had to be reckoned with in American society.

The following passage is original in both thought and form. Observe the simple diction and the effective use of the direct quotation — both treated in this chapter.

At the threshold of our lives, society meets us and offers us the following agreement: I will feed you, nourish you, support you, you shall have clothing, warmth and shelter; your property shall be protected; your life shall be secure; you shall enjoy certain privileges, and all I ask in return is that you shall surrender to me your brain, your thought, your soul. "Think my thoughts and you shall eat my bread," is the silent compact to which society pledges every one of us. If nature is the mother of man, society is his step mother, and she has an elaborate system of education by which she seeks to reverse and neutralize that mother's instruction. You are dull; dullness is dangerous to society; therefore you shall be patched and mended, and shellacked and varnished, until you have reached the proper degree of

mediocrity. You are a genius; genius is equally dangerous to society; therefore you shall be trimmed and pruned, and mutilated, and dwarfed until you, too, are properly mediocre. Hence it happens that the nineteenth century is fertile beyond all other ages in great nations, great institutions, great societies and barren beyond most other ages in great men, for the state of society which tends to produce greatness in states is directly opposed to that which tends to produce greatness in individuals. Society is therefore perfectly logical in her conduct; she realizes that it is by stunting the individuals that the state can perfectly develop, by mutilating the separate twigs that the whole tree can be made symmetrical; she understands that as a great man is the highest of all blessings to a nation in adversity, so he is the greatest of all dangers to a nation in prosperity; and she guides her conduct by this principle.¹

The best way to appreciate what a force in effective speaking may be this power of statement is to observe how great speakers exemplify it. Many of them have had that universal quality of mind which formulates maxims, strikes off epigrams, and condenses large quantities of thought into an aphorism. Lincoln had it. Wendell Phillips had it. Ingersoll had it. Emerson had it beyond all other American lecturers and writers. Webster did not possess it in any marked degree. One finds very few quotable statements in Webster; that is, of the epigrammatic kind. This may seem strange considering the sweep of intellect ordinarily ascribed to that distinguished orator and statesman. Webster was a good logician, a good constitutional lawyer, and a powerful parliamentary orator. But he was not a popular speaker. His intellect was cast in a large mould, and he needed large issues to enlist his powers. On minor occasions he had difficulty in finding anything to say. Webster had little of the art of popular address that characterizes our great popular orators.

Lincoln had a singular felicity in getting to the heart of great issues and stating them so simply that all could understand,

¹ See page 422 of this book.

stripping them of all verbiage and presenting them in their naked strength. Douglas' doctrine of "popular sovereignty" he characterized as "the right of a people to exclude a thing from where it has a legal right to be." In the final debate at Alton he characterized it as "the most monstrous doctrine that ever emanated from the mouth of any respectable man on earth." In the "First Inaugural," he put the issue of secession up to the Southern people in the question, "Can enemies make treaties easier than friends can make laws?" "Let us have faith that right makes might, and in that faith let us in the end dare to do our duty as we understand it" was his simple peroration to the "Cooper Union Speech." Of the twenty-six words used in this sentence twenty-four are words of one syllable!

In power of statement, Wendell Phillips is probably without a peer among American orators. Many of his utterances are weighted with thought, are in fact condensed social philosophy. His speeches abound in epigrams and aphorisms. Here are a few.

The cause of truth is advanced in the long run by allowing all to air their prejudices and advocate all their errors.

Power is ever stealing from the many to the few.

Republics exist only on the tenure of being constantly agitated.

Whether in chains or in laurels, liberty knows nothing but victory.
(Inscribed on Phillips' monument, Boston Common).

Most men prudently lie down into nameless graves, while now and then one forgets himself into immortality.

A community that will not protect its humblest citizen in the free utterance of his opinions, no matter how false or hateful, is only a gang of slaves.

Invective, by which we understand a somewhat violent denunciation of other people's conduct, depends for its effectiveness largely on power of statement. Only occasions of great provocation justify invective. The following from Wendell Phillips is about as devastating as any we have on record. A group of men had broken up a meeting of abolitionists.

Who were they? [asks Phillips.] Weak sons of moderate fathers, dandled into effeminacy, of course wholly unfit for business. But overflowing trade sometimes laps up such, as it does all obtainable instruments. Instead of fire-engines, we take pails and dippers, in times of sore need. But such the first frost nips into idleness. Narrow men, ambitious of office, fancying that the inheritance of a million entitles them to political advancement. Bloated distillers, some rich, some without wit enough to keep the money they stole. Old families run to seed in respectable dulness, — *fruges consumere nati*, — born only to eat. Trading families, in the third generation, playing at stock-jobbing to lose in State Street what their fathers made by smuggling in India. Sweep in a hundred young rogues, the grief of mothers and the disgrace of their names, good as naughts to fill up a place in what is called “society,” and entitled as such to shrink from notice, — but the motes we do not usually see get looked at when they trouble our eyes. Snobbish sons of fathers lately rich, anxious to show themselves rotten before they are ripe. (Hitherto there had been no demonstrations from the hearers, except occasional suppressed laughter at the speaker’s sarcasms. The laughter here was received with hisses by a portion of the audience.) These, taking courage from the presence of bolder rogues, some from jail and others whom technical skill saved therefrom, — the whole led by a third-rate lawyer broken down to a cotton-clerk (hisses), borrowing consequence from married wealth, — not one who ever added a dollar, much less an idea, to the wealth of the city, not one able to give a reason or an excuse for the prejudice that is in him, — these are the men, this is the house of nobles, whose leave we are to ask before we speak and hold meetings. These are the men who tell *us*, the children of the Pilgrims, the representatives of Endicott and Winthrop, of Sewall and Quincy, of Hancock and Adams and Otis, what opinions we shall express, and what meetings we shall hold!¹

Rhythm, Alliteration. It is not to our purpose to consider minutely all those elements of oratorical composition which give distinction to style. Some of them are very subtle, much harder to describe than to feel. The styles of such men as Beecher and Ingersoll have much in common; they are also

¹ “Mobs and Education,” in *Speeches*, First Series, p. 215.

very different. The styles of Phillips and Starr King have many elements of likeness, and still they are different. Only a thorough study of all of them will impress on you the distinctive charm and merits of the style of each of these enchanting masters of speech.

H. A. Overstreet, in his *Influencing Human Behavior*, has done well to call attention to the very significant rôle which *rhythm* plays in writing. It is probably more important still in speaking, for voice cadences lend their effects to the rhythmic movement of the words. One may imagine the almost hypnotic effect of some passages in Ingersoll's lectures where the magic of monosyllabic words combines with rhythm to charm the ear and mind. An easy, flowing rhythm economizes mental effort and leaves the maximum of attention for appreciating thought and feeling; while an uncertain, jerky, hesitating, involved rhythm has the opposite effect.

The following from Sheil seems to me to present a jerky and involved rhythm, which not only makes the passage difficult of rendering, but hard to follow and understand as well. Especially is that true of the latter part.

Aliens! Good God! Was Arthur, Duke of Wellington, in the House of Lords, and did he not start up and exclaim, "Hold! I have seen the aliens do their duty?" He ought to have remembered that, from the earliest achievement, in which he displayed that military genius which has placed him foremost in the annals of warfare, down to the last and surpassing combat, which has made his name imperishable — from Assaye to Waterloo — the Irish soldiers, with whom your armies are filled, were the inseparable auxiliaries to the glory with which his unparalleled successes have been crowned. Whose were the arms that drove your bayonets at Vimiera, Badajos, Salamanca, Albuera, Toulouse, and, last of all, the greatest — tell me, for you were there (I appeal to the gallant soldier before me), tell me, if on that day, when the destinies of mankind were trembling in the balance, while death fell in showers, when the artillery of France was leveled with the precision of the most deadly science, when her legions, incited by the voice and inspired by the example of their

mighty leader, rushed again and again to the onset — tell me if for an instant, when to hesitate for an instant was to be lost, the “aliens” blanched?

Rhythm is a law of life, and figures in all great art. Much of the pleasure we derive from poetry we owe to its rhythm. It is probable that rhythm plays a larger part in poetry and oratory than in any other of the arts.

Take the following from Ingersoll, much quoted and declaimed. It possesses rhythm, alliteration, beauty, which certainly make a large contribution to the eloquence of the passage.

A little while ago, I stood by the grave of the old Napoleon — a magnificent tomb of gilt and gold, fit almost for a deity dead — and gazed upon the sarcophagus of rare and nameless marble, where rest at last the ashes of that restless man. I leaned over the balustrade and thought about the career of the greatest soldier of the modern world.

I saw him walking upon the banks of the Seine, contemplating suicide. I saw him at Toulon — I saw him putting down the mob in the streets of Paris — I saw him at the head of the army of Italy — I saw him crossing the bridge of Lodi with the tri-color in his hand — I saw him in Egypt in the shadows of the pyramids — I saw him conquer the Alps and mingle the eagles of France with the eagles of the crags. I saw him at Marengo — at Ulm and Austerlitz. I saw him in Russia, where the infantry of the snow and the cavalry of the wild blast scattered his legions like winter's withered leaves. I saw him at Leipsic in defeat and disaster — driven by a million bayonets back upon Paris — clutched like a wild beast — banished to Elba. I saw him escape and retake an empire by the force of his genius. I saw him upon the frightful field of Waterloo, where Chance and Fate combined to wreck the fortunes of their former king. And I saw him at St. Helena, with his hands crossed behind him, gazing out upon the sad and solemn sea.

I thought of the orphans and widows he had made — of the tears that had been shed for his glory, and of the only woman who ever loved him, pushed from his heart by the cold hand of ambition. And I said, I would rather have been a French peasant and worn wooden shoes. I would rather have lived in a hut with a vine growing over the

door, and the grapes growing purple in the amorous kisses of the Autumn sun. I would rather have been that poor peasant, with my loving wife by my side, knitting as the day died out of the sky — with my children upon my knees and their arms about me — I would rather have been that man, and gone down to the tongueless silence of the dreamless dust, than to have been that imperial impersonation of force and murder, known as Napoleon the Great.¹

Alliteration is essentially an emotional quality of style, and greatly adds to the impressiveness of language. It is a part of the poetry of eloquence. No one who has an ear attuned to pleasing combinations of articulate sounds can be deaf to its forcefulness, charm, and beauty.

Ingersoll exemplifies this quality of style more extensively than any orator of whom we have record. His lectures are prose poetry, or poetic prose. He is easily our greatest word painter. The criticism is sometimes made that he carries his art to the point of artificiality; as in his address at his brother's grave. This is probably true, but when allowance is made for that, Ingersoll's style still remains one of the most distinctive of all time.

Next to Ingersoll, in the use of alliteration as a quality of style, is Wendell Phillips. There is much alliteration, as well as pleasing rhythm and beauty, in all his speeches. The following may be regarded as a fair example.

Prove to me now that harsh rebuke, indignant denunciation, scathing sarcasm, and pitiless ridicule are wholly and always unjustifiable; else we dare not, in so desperate a case, throw away any weapon which ever broke up the crust of an ignorant prejudice, roused a slumbering conscience, shamed a proud sinner, or changed, in any way, the conduct of a human being. Our aim is to alter public opinion. Did we live in a market, our talk should be of dollars and cents, and we would seek to prove only that slavery was an unprofitable investment. Were the nation one great, pure church, we would sit down and reason of "righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come." Had slavery fortified itself in a college, we would load our cannon with cold facts,

¹ Robert G. Ingersoll: *Complete Works* (Dresden Edition), vol. I, p. 369.

and wing our arrows with arguments. But we happen to live in the world, — the world made up of thought and impulse, of self-conceit and self-interest, of weak men and wicked.¹

As no house can be regarded of a high order that does not appeal to our sense of the beautiful, so no speech can be called a truly great speech that does not in some measure possess the element of beauty. We may imagine a house with its frame completed. The walls are up, the roof is on, the shingles are in place, the partitions are erected, the floor is laid, the plaster is on the walls. But the house is still far from finished. If it is going to be a really beautiful home, it is probably not half finished. It is much the same with a speech. When you have so far constructed it as to know what your purpose is going to be, what ideas you are going to present to attain your purpose, what the order of these ideas is going to be, how you are going to introduce your subject to your audience, and in a general way how you are going to conclude it, the speech is yet far from completed. If we may continue the analogy, the house has yet to be painted, the windows have to be put in, the woodwork must be finished, the walls decorated, and the floors polished, the doors leading from one room to another carefully put in place. So in a speech, the transitions from one main division to another, and from each subdivision to another must be carefully worked out; the doors must not creak on their hinges. We must seek acceptable words. The sentences must be pleasing to the ear, and easily understood. The illustrations have to be put in — windows to let in the light. Some attention must be given to those elements that make for distinction of style. And all — materials and manner of presentation — must be adapted to the intelligence, taste, and culture of the audience to be addressed.

Importance of a Direct, Personal, Informal Style. The style of public address is strongly moulded by the fact that the

¹ *Speeches*: First Series, p. 109.

speaker stands face to face with a living, throbbing, pulsating entity — the audience — eager to understand all the speaker utters and to follow him in all his moods. The speaker naturally desires to establish between himself and his hearers as close *rapport* as possible. To accomplish this he uses an informal, personal style of speaking. This involves a lavish use of the personal pronouns in the first and second persons. The aim is to identify the interests of the speaker with those of his hearers, to establish the “you and I” relationship. The person who really succeeds in interesting an audience is likely to use these personal pronouns freely. Wendell Phillips, for instance, exhibits this informal, personal element in his style in a marked degree. One is almost amazed to find this most modest and self-effacing of men using the first personal pronoun more than a hundred times in some of his speeches, and the second personal pronoun perhaps half as often. No orator of whom we have any record had a closer personal contact with his audience than Phillips, nor has any shown greater mastery in holding the attention of his hearers. The testimony of those who had the privilege of hearing him was to the effect that an hour passed before anybody realized it. As one distinguished listener has put it, “there was no sense that time had passed.” If you will examine his address to the Boston school children in 1865, you will observe how he constantly finds occasion to address them personally: “I can boast, boys and girls, more than you”; “Now, boys, the glory of a father”; “Young men and young women”; etc.

Thomas Wentworth Higginson, in his “Hints on Speech Making” relates the following incident:

The late Judge B. R. Curtis once lost a case in which John P. Hale of New Hampshire, a man not to be compared with him as a lawyer, was his successful antagonist. When asked the reason, he said, “It was very curious. I had all the law and all the evidence, but that fellow Hale somehow got so intimate with the jury that he won the case.”

"I take my audience into my confidence much as I do a person," said Booker T. Washington, the greatest of negro orators. Webster spoke to his juries as if he were one of them. His legal opponents referred to him as "the thirteenth jury man."

The Rhetorical Question. The rhetorical question is much used by speakers, and is one of the most valuable aids to clearness and vividness. It gives variety to style for one thing, and moreover presents ideas in such a way as to invite attention to them. It tends to put the audience in an attitude of mental alertness. When we tire of being told things in a dogmatic way, we may be willing to be asked questions about them. In fact we rather like it. Questions arouse mental curiosity and give us the satisfaction of answering them ourselves in our own way. For the rhetorical question, remember, is one that is to be answered by the hearers, not by the speaker. In his debates with Douglas, Lincoln uses the rhetorical question extensively. It is one of the outstanding elements of his style, and contributes greatly to the clear and convincing progress of his arguments.

In the Charleston debate, Lincoln defended his statement, given in the "Springfield Speech," that this country cannot permanently endure half slave and half free. Observe the use of the rhetorical question.

I have said so, and I did not say it without what seemed to me to be good reasons. It perhaps would require more time than I have now to set forth these reasons in detail; but let me ask you a few questions. When are we to have peace upon it if it is kept in the position it now occupies? How are we ever to have peace upon it? That is an important question. To be sure, if we will all stop and allow Judge Douglas and his friends to march on in their present career until they plant the institution all over the nation, here and wherever else our flag waves, and we acquiesce in it, there will be peace. But let me ask Judge Douglas how he is going to get the people to do that? They have been wrangling over this question for at least forty years. . . . When is it likely to come to an end? He introduced the Nebraska bill in 1854 to put another end to the slavery agitation. He promised that it would finish it all up immediately. . . . Now he

tells us again that it is all over, and the people of Kansas have voted down the Lecompton constitution. How is it over? That was only one of the attempts at putting an end to the slavery agitation — one of these “final settlements.” Is Kansas in the Union? Has she formed a constitution that she is likely to come in under? Is not the slavery agitation still an open question in that Territory? Has the voting down of that constitution put an end to all the trouble? Is that more likely to settle it than every one of these previous attempts to settle the slavery agitation? Now, at this day in the history of the world we can no more foretell where the end of this slavery agitation will be than we can see the end of the world itself.

The Direct Quotation. A most excellent speech device is the direct quotation. This does not mean exact quotations from literature and authorities. It means putting into direct discourse what would ordinarily be expressed in indirect discourse. It means putting into the mouths of men, not the exact words which they have uttered, but words which in effect, and in the simplest possible language, express such views of theirs as the speaker wishes to bring before his hearers. Through this device, institutions, states, and societies are frequently personified and made to utter sentiments and views in a simple, direct way. Quotations of this kind are almost always short, seldom more than a sentence or two.

While this rhetorical device is the essence of directness and simplicity, it does have its drawbacks. It does not have the accuracy of the exact or actual quotation. In condensing a person's views on a great question into a simple sentence or two, it is not always easy to observe precision and accuracy.

Almost all speakers use this device more or less, Wendell Phillips more than any other American orator. It is not uncommon to find from fifteen to twenty-five instances of the direct discourse in a speech that occupied only a little over an hour in the delivery. The habit got him into trouble, at times, and even his friend, William Lloyd Garrison, found fault with

him for putting into the mouths of men loose statements that gave more or less biased views of their position.

The device, however, is well worth cultivating. Scrupulous care and fairness are needed to make it safe, but when rightly used, it is a matchless means for producing that instant understanding so much needed — and so much neglected — in oral discourse.

David Lloyd George, at a farewell dinner given in his honor in New York in 1923, used the direct quotation with excellent effect.

What is the real problem in Europe today? I will tell you. In spite of the war, because Europe has been left so much to herself, she still believes in force. Why?

France says: "Alsace-Lorraine was torn from our side fifty years ago. It was unjust; it was wrong; it was cruel; it was oppressive. Justice never gave it back to us. We had to lose 1,400,000 of our young men. You, in the British Empire, had to lose 900,000 of your young men. Force gave it back to us."

Poland! Poland says: "One hundred and fifty years ago our nationhood was destroyed. We were locked in the prison of great autocracies. We waited for justice. We thought we could hear possible footsteps, but they were simply the footsteps of our jailers outside. Force came at the end of 150 years and unlocked the door."

The Russian peasant says today: "We never saw the light of liberty until the revolutionist came with his powder and blew our prison walls down."

What does Germany say? Germany says: "We trusted to justice. We trusted to a treaty. We are broken; we are shattered. Why? We are disarmed. We have no force." That is why Europe believes in force.¹

There are other elements of style in speaking that may be cultivated to advantage, but those named are the most important. If you will practice consistently the use of the devices suggested, you will at least be understood. There is a charm in

¹ Homer Dorr Lindgren: *Modern Speeches* (Revised Edition, 1930), p. 340.

simplicity and easy understanding that holds true for speaking as for other arts.

In Conclusion. If by some mental seismograph one could determine how much of a speech an audience really grasps, and how much of it is lost from lack of understanding or otherwise, we might have some startling revelations. The problem of communicating ideas by word of mouth is peculiar, in that understanding must be *on the moment* or not at all. The speaker therefore must use every possible device to make comprehension easy. He must use simple diction, or at least words easily understood by the audience. He must use sentences that are short and crisp and easy to grasp. His attitude toward his hearers will be personal, informal, direct. That is, he will address them much as he addresses a group of friends. He will not be afraid to use the personal pronouns freely, even those of the first person. He will use such devices as the rhetorical question and the direct quotation. He will use concrete speech materials and illustrations freely. In his more finished efforts, he will have proper regard for such elements of style as give it distinction — alliteration, rhythm, beauty, elegance. A finished speech or lecture is a work of art. And lastly, let us remember with Beecher, “Simplicity of style both in language and manners is the shortest road to success.”

EXERCISES

1. Count 100 words in five different places in some selection from Henry Ward Beecher's speeches. Set down the number having one and two syllables, and the number having more than two syllables.

Do this for four other orators. You will find selections in the text. Ingersoll, Phillips, Thomas Starr King, and John B. Gough are suggested. Others will do.

2. Read critically Phillips' speech to Boston school children. Count the number of times he uses (1) the first personal pronoun; (2) the second personal pronoun; (3) the direct quotation; (4) the

- rhetorical question. What forms of support do you find? What motives are appealed to?
3. Bring to class specimens that exemplify the use of power of statement; also alliteration, rhythm, and beauty.
 4. Read one of the speeches listed in the readings for this chapter, and give a written or oral criticism of its style on the basis of criteria given in this chapter.

READINGS

Speeches

- "Aphorisms," by John Morley (*Mod. El.*: I, Vol. V).
 "Abraham Lincoln," by Robert Ingersoll (*Ingersoll*, Vol. III).
 "Address to the Boston School Children," by Wendell Phillips.
 "Against Centralization," by Henry W. Grady (*Grady*).
 "Big Blunders," by T. DeWitt Talmage (*Mod. El.*: I, Vol. VI).
 "The Prince of Peace," by William Jennings Bryan (Vol. XIII).
 "The Grandeur of Nations," by Charles Sumner (*Sumner*, Vol. I).
 "Cooper Union Speech," by Abraham Lincoln (Vol. XI).
 "Eulogy on Lincoln," by Henry Ward Beecher (*Beecher*: I).
 "Bunker Hill Oration," by Daniel Webster (Vol. XI).
 "Abraham Lincoln," by Stephen S. Wise (*Lindgren*).
 "Did Woodrow Wilson Fail?" by Charles Zeublin (*Lindgren*).

References

- James Milton O'Neill and Andrew Thomas Weaver: *The Elements of Speech* (1926), Chap. XVI.
 William Phillips Sandford and Willard Hayes Yeager: *Principles of Effective Speaking* (Revised Edition, 1930), Chap. XV.
 Arthur Edward Phillips: *Effective Speaking* (1908), Chap. XXI.

ADDRESS TO THE BOSTON SCHOOL CHILDREN

BY WENDELL PHILLIPS

Fellow-Citizens: I was invited by the Mayor to address the scholars of the schools of Boston, but like my friend, Mr. Dana, who preceded me, I hardly know in what direction to look in the course of this address for the scholars. I can hardly turn my back on them, nor can I turn my back on you. I shall have to make a compromise, —

that everlasting refuge of Americans. (Applause) I recollect, when I was in college, that when a classmate came upon the stage we could recognize in the audience where the family, the mother, or sister were, by noticing him when he made his first bow. He would look toward them, and they would invariably bow in return. By this inevitable sign, I have distinguished many a mother, sister, and father among the audience today.

This is the first time for many years that I have participated in a school festival. I have received no invitation since 1824, when I was a little boy in a class in a Latin school, when we were turned out in a grand procession on yonder Common at nine o'clock in the morning. And for what? Not to hear eloquent music. No; but for the sight of something better than art of music, that thrilled more than eloquence, a sight which should live in the memory forever, the best sight which Boston ever saw, — the welcome to Lafayette on his return to this country after an absence of a score of years. I can boast, boys and girls, more than you. I can boast that these eyes have beheld the hero of three revolutions; this hand has touched the right hand that held up Hancock and Washington. Not all this glorious celebration can equal that glad reception of the nation's benefactor by all that Boston could offer him, — a sight of its children. It was a long procession, and, unlike other processions, we started punctually at the hour published. They would not let us wander about, and did not wish us to sit down. I there received my first lesson in hero-worship. I was so tired after four hours' waiting I could scarcely stand. But when I saw him, — that glorious old Frenchman! — I could have stood until today. Well, now, boys, these were very small times compared with this. Our public examinations were held up in Boylston Hall. I do not believe we ever afforded banners; I know we never had any music. Now they take the classes out to walk on the Common at eleven o'clock. We were sent out into a small place eight feet by eleven, solid walls on one side and a paling on the other, which looked like a hencoop: there the public Latin scholars recreated themselves. They were very small times compared with these.

As Mr. Dana referred to the facilities and opportunities that the Boston boys enjoy, I could not but think what it is that makes the efficient man. Not by floating with the current; you must swim

against it to develop strength and power. The danger is that a boy, with all these facilities, books, and libraries, may never make that sturdy scholar, that energetic man, we would wish him to become. When I look on such a scene as this, I go back to the precedent alluded to by you, sir, of him who travelled eighteen miles and worked all day to earn a book, and sat up all night to read it. By the side of me, in the same city of Boston, sat a boy in the Latin school, who bought his dictionary with money earned by picking chestnuts. Do you remember Cobbett, — and Frederick Douglas, whose eloquent notes still echo through the land, who learned to read from the posters on the highway; and Theodore Parker, who laid the foundation of his library with the book for which he spent three weeks in picking berries?

Boys, you will not be moved to action by starvation and want. Where will you get the motive power? You will have the spur of ambition to be worthy of the fathers who have given you these opportunities. Remember, boys, what fame it is that you bear up, — this old name of Boston! A certain well-known poet says it is the hub of the universe. Well, this is a gentle and generous satire. In Revolutionary days they talked of the Boston Revolution. When Samuel Johnson wrote his work against the American colonies, it was Boston he ridiculed. When the king could not sleep over night, he got up and muttered "Boston." When the proclamation of pardon was issued, the only two excepted were the two Boston fanatics, — John Hancock and Sam Adams. (Applause.) But what did Boston do? They sent Hancock to Philadelphia to write his name on the Declaration of Independence in letters large enough, almost, for the king to read on the other side of the ocean. Boston then meant liberty. Come down to four or five years ago. What did Boston mean when the South went mad, and got up a new flag, and said they would put it in Boston on Faneuil Hall? It was Boston that meant liberty, as Boston had meant independence. And when our troops went out in the last war, what was it that gave them their superiority? It was the brains they carried from these schools.

When General Butler was stopped near the Relay House with a broken locomotive, he turned to the Eighth Regiment, and asked if any of them could mend it. A private walked out of the ranks, and patted it on the back and said, "I ought to know it; I made it."

When we went down to Charleston, and were kept seven miles off from the city, the Yankees sent down a New Hampshire Parrott that would send a two-hundred-pound shot into their midst. The great ability of New England has been *proved*. Now, boys, the glory of a father is his children. That father has done his work well who has left a child better than himself. The German prayer is, "Lord, grant I may be as well off tomorrow as yesterday!" No Yankee ever uttered that prayer. He always means that his son shall have a better starting-point in life than himself. The glory of a father is his children. Our fathers made themselves independent seventy or eighty years ago. It remains for us to devote ourselves to liberty and the welfare of others, with the generous willingness to do toward others as we would have others do to us.

Now, boys, this is my lesson to you today. You cannot be as good as your fathers, unless you are better. You have your fathers' example, — the opportunities and advantages they have accumulated, — and to be only as good is not enough. You must be better. You must copy only the spirit of your fathers, — and not their imperfections. There was an old Boston merchant, years ago, who wanted a set of China made in Peking. You know that Boston men sixty years ago looked at both sides of a cent before they spent it, and if they earned twelve cents, they would save eleven. He could not spare a whole plate, so he sent a cracked one, and when he received the set, there was a crack in every piece. The Chinese had imitated the pattern exactly.

Now, boys, do not imitate us, or there will be a great many cracks. Be better than we. We have invented a telegraph, but what of that? I expect, if I live forty years, to see a telegraph that will send messages without wire, both ways at the same time. If you do not invent it, you are not so good as we are. You are bound to go ahead of us. The old London physician said the way to be well was to live on a sixpence, and earn it. That is education under the laws of necessity. We cannot give you that. Underneath you is the ever-watchful hand of city culture and wealth. All the motive we can give you is the name you bear. Bear it nobly!

I was in the West where they partly love and partly hate the Yankee. A man undertook to explain the difference between a watch made in Boston and one made in Chicago. He asked me what I

thought of it. I answered him as a Boston man should: "We always do what we undertake to do thoroughly." That is Boston. Boston has set the example of doing; do better. Sir Robert Peel said in the last hours of his life, "I have left the Queen's service; I have held the highest offices in the gift of the Crown; and now, going out of public life (he had just removed bread from the tax-list), the happiest thought I have is that when the poor man breaks his bread in his cottage, he thanks God that I ever lived." Fellow-citizens, the warmest compliment I ever heard was breathed into my ears from the lips of a fugitive from South Carolina. In his hovel at home he said, "I thank God for Boston; and I hope before I die I may tread upon its pavements." Boston has meant liberty and protection. See to it in all coming time, *young men and women*, you make it stand for good learning, upright character, sturdy love of liberty, willingness to be and do for others as you would have others be and do unto you. But make it, young men and women, make it a dread to every one who seeks to do evil. Make it a home and a refuge for the oppressed of all lands.

CHAPTER XII

KINDS OF SPEECHES

In planning a speech, one of the important things is to determine precisely what one wishes to accomplish. The emphasis is on the word *precisely*, for vagueness or cloudiness of thought here is fatal to effective results.

All public speaking is purposeful. It aims to convey ideas and feelings with a sufficient degree of force and vividness to enable the speaker to attain his end, whatever that may be. The end sought is always some definite response on the part of the listeners. A speaker therefore must always have one eye on the group he expects to address. He must ask himself, what response do I want to get from my audience? Do I want them to understand something, do something, or just have a good time? On the answer depends the kind of speech he is going to make.

That is what we mean when we say that speaking is objective. It is not enough to have good ideas and noble feelings; you must express them in terms of symbols — words, voice, action — that come vividly into the lives and experiences of your listeners. As Henry Ward Beecher put it, a speech is not to be regarded as “a Chinese fire-cracker, to be fired off for the noise it makes.” It is to be regarded rather as a flight of arrows that must find their way into the minds of your listeners. You must hit your target or you accomplish nothing. A hunter may have a good gun and fancy ammunition, but unless he brings down his game, he is simply making noise, and filling the air with smoke. The reason so much of speech fails of its purpose is that it is aimed at nothing, and when we aim at nothing we always hit it. The first thing we have to do, then, is to take aim.

Taking Aim in Speaking. In taking aim in speaking we are face to face with the fact that the human mind is many-sided, and we cannot hope to touch it on all sides at the same time. Man is, for example, a being that understands, or can be made to understand. He is also a being that reasons, and by virtue of his reasoning powers he expresses judgment in the form of belief or disbelief. He is also a being that feels, or experiences emotion. He is capable, moreover, of experiencing pleasure and pain. In these beliefs and emotions are the main springs of action.

Now, we may address the understanding and aim to make an idea clear; we may address the judgment and aim to win belief; we may address ourselves to the feelings and aim to arouse emotion; or we may enlist the fancy and aim to entertain. As a rule, no speaker addresses himself to all these at the same time, although all may be involved in a single speech. We have, therefore, to consider the different kinds of speeches one may be called upon to make, on the basis of these different kinds of appeal.

Writers on the subject are not altogether agreed as to how best to classify speeches. No classification so far made is altogether satisfactory, and very likely no one can be found that is. The functions of the human mind defy accurate classification. It is not to our purpose here to go too minutely into these differences of opinion, for it would take us too far afield into the psychology of human behavior. A brief survey, however, of these views will be in order.

General Ends in Speaking. Aristotle recognized three divisions of oratory: deliberative, judicial, and demonstrative. By these he meant the oratory of the political assembly, of the bar, and of the popular forum. Quintillian, in his *Institutes of Oratory*, concludes that public address may serve any one of three primary ends; namely, "to inform, to move, and to please." If we interpret the word "move" to be equivalent to "persuade," this classification is worth remembering, for we

shall find that it fits in strangely well with present-day psychology.

Of modern writers on the subject of public address, Arthur Edward Phillips, in his *Effective Speaking*, was the first to depart somewhat radically from the old classification. He recognizes five ends of speech: (1) clearness; (2) impressiveness; (3) belief; (4) action; (5) entertainment. James Winans in his *Public Speaking* considers the speaker's purposes to be: (1) to interest; (2) to make clear; (3) to induce belief; (4) to influence conduct. O'Neill and Weaver in *The Elements of Speech* recognize five speech purposes: (1) to instruct; (2) to convince; (3) to actuate; (4) to impress; (5) to entertain. It will be seen that this follows Phillips rather closely. Charles H. Woolbert in *Fundamentals of Speech* treats four general purposes: (1) to divert; (2) to stimulate; (3) to inform; (4) to convince. Sandford and Yeager in *Principles of Effective Speaking* reduce the general ends to three: (1) to inform; (2) to persuade; (3) to entertain.

If we make allowance for some variations in terminology, we readily see that there is virtual agreement among these writers regarding at least two speech ends; namely, *information* and *entertainment*. It is only within the field of persuasive speaking that there is real divergence of opinion. Here, some give three general ends, others two, and one authority makes no division. Without undertaking to analyze these ends, for the purpose of finding points of agreement, and perhaps some points of difference, let us look at the problem from a somewhat different angle.

The Hierarchy of Beliefs. I believe it will be found on examination that *in persuasive speaking the speaker is always dealing with beliefs*, beliefs that vary greatly in their efficacy or power to influence human behavior. Some of our beliefs are absolute and dynamic, and operate with full force to influence conduct; others are wavering and doubtful; still others are dormant or dead. We believe, for example, that gravitation and other

natural laws are at work all the time, and that if we do not order our lives in harmony with those laws, we are liable to get into trouble. If, for example, we throw a stone or shoot an arrow into the air, we take it for granted that it will come down, and prefer not to take a chance on getting in its path. So there are numberless beliefs in the social sphere that are reasonably dynamic and operate with a fair degree of adequacy as determinants of behavior. Such we disregard at our peril. Others operate with more or less inadequacy. If the weather man tells us that tomorrow is going to be "fair," we shall probably believe it — 85 % if we happen to know that there is about 15 % error in such predictions. We may think we believe the time-honored principle, "Blessed are they that are persecuted for righteousness' sake," but most of us would be willing that some one else should get the benefit of the experience.

These examples will perhaps suffice to show that in human society there is a hierarchy of beliefs which operate in varying degrees to influence human conduct. They range from those that are unqualified and dynamic, which no normal person would ever think of disregarding in ordering his life, down the scale to those other beliefs that operate hardly at all as determinants of behavior. The potency of any particular belief varies with different individuals.

For speech-making purposes, it will be found convenient, I believe, to classify beliefs on the basis of our attitude toward them. Broadly speaking, either we accept a belief or we do not. We meet with many propositions, it is true, embodying beliefs that we are doubtful about or indifferent to, largely because we do not understand their implications. In such cases, it cannot be said that we accept them; and they would therefore fall into the latter class. Broadly, then, we may divide beliefs into two classes; those that we accept and do not significantly dispute, and those that we do not accept.

Within each class, we may recognize a gradation of beliefs in reference to the extent to which they function in behavior; or,

in the case of *unaccepted* beliefs, in regard to our hostility to them. We may accept one belief and act on it consistently; we may accept another and merely give it lip service. Much depends on the nature of the beliefs, how closely they touch our lives. In the case of disputed or unaccepted beliefs, we may be merely indifferent or in doubt, owing to lack of understanding of the facts involved; or we may be positively hostile. The more indifferent or hostile we are, the greater, of course, is the persuasive problem.

It is my opinion that each of these two classes of beliefs gives rise to a somewhat distinct type of speech, both of which we may consider briefly.

A. *Speeches Dealing with Accepted Beliefs or Undisputed Propositions.* We all recognize the fact that some of the best subjects for speeches are to be found in propositions that embody accepted beliefs and are not in any significant sense disputed. For example, "We should meet our appointments promptly" is a good subject for a class speech. No one will dispute that seriously, and consequently no *evidential* support is needed in the sense in which we are accustomed to understand that term. Neither do we have to go through a long rigmarole of expounding the meaning of the question, defining terms, giving the history of the question, lining up contentions on both sides, selecting the issues, and finally proving the issues with a long array of facts, figures, statistics, authorities, and more or less involved reasoning processes. Strictly speaking, there are no issues to prove, for an issue is always a disputed proposition, as we shall see later.

It is perfectly clear that while we give general assent — "mental assent" — to the proposition, we do not always order our behavior in conformity with it. There are people who are always late in keeping their appointments and thereby waste other people's precious time and jeopardize in some measure their own chances of success. The speech problem here is obviously to appeal to personal interests — to such motives as

ambition, reputation, fairness; to show that the effort necessary for promptness in keeping engagements will yield handsome dividends in return; in short, to *charge the proposition with feeling and emotion and make it dynamic so that action of the right kind may follow*. To do this, we may cite examples of men who have lost the confidence of their associates through being careless and undependable in keeping important engagements. We may also cite examples of men who have been appointed or promoted to responsible positions, in part at least as a result of being prompt and dependable. We may even quote great executives as to the value of forming habits of promptness, and in other ways bring to bear on the proposition as many and varied forms of support as are available.

The speaker here is concerned primarily with appeal to motives; that is, desires, feelings, and emotions that tend to action. His aim will be to link up this precept of promptness with the vital interests of the audience, by means of specific, concrete, vivid speech materials; to impress upon the hearers the value of dependable promptness in keeping important engagements as a factor in a successful life.

B. *Speeches Dealing with Unaccepted Beliefs or Disputed Propositions*. Let us now consider the problem which a speaker faces in establishing and making dynamic an unaccepted belief embodied in a disputed proposition.

In this type of speech we distinguish two kinds of propositions, which go by several names. If we are disposed to use philosophical language, we may call them judgments of fact and judgments of value. If we prefer less technical language, we may use the terms, propositions of fact and propositions of policy. It does not make a great deal of difference what terms we use provided we are agreed on the meaning. To say that chain stores provide substantial economies for their customers is to express a judgment of fact. So it is also a judgment of fact to say that the St. Lawrence waterway is feasible from an engineering point of view, or that the League of Nations has

prevented wars, assuming that to be true, or that automobile accidents killed over 35,000 people in 1932. The problem here is to prove these propositions true or false. This is the function of evidence and logical argument, and perhaps suggestion as well. The process of establishing the truth or falsity of these propositions has nothing to do with their social significance, or their interpretation in terms of the human values that may depend on them. In other words, it has nothing to do with motivation.

As examples of judgments of value, or propositions of policy, we may list almost any question for debate or argument. The United States should join with Canada in building the St. Lawrence waterway; compulsory military drill should be abolished in our colleges; a state income tax should supplement general property taxes — these are familiar examples. Almost invariably questions are argued or debated in this form. One might have a lively debate on the question whether the American protective tariff has been a burden on agriculture, which is purely a proposition of fact; but more often resolutions for debate involve questions of policy. It will be observed that all these questions lend themselves to motivation. That is, they raise the question: What is their social significance? What are they worth to society — or more particularly, from the point of view of the speaker, to the audience addressed — in human values, in satisfying human wants? Only so far as the speaker can interpret for his hearers the significance or value of these propositions and bring such value vividly home to them can he make such beliefs function in behavior.

It will be observed that, strictly speaking, propositions of policy (judgments of value) cannot be *proved* true or false. We may be able to prove true or false the propositions of fact on which they rest, but the propositions themselves, more accurately speaking, we *evaluate*, show what they are worth in terms of human satisfactions. We do not prove true or false the proposition that the United States should cancel the war

debts owed it by European nations; but by a careful examination of the facts involved we can interpret the meaning or value of the proposition, and on the basis of such evaluation win acceptance, and perhaps get active support, for it — make it function in behavior. It would be in the interest of accurate language, I believe, if we should limit the word *proof* to propositions of fact. Propositions of policy we *support* or *evaluate*. Every teacher of speech must have felt how unsatisfactory is the word *proof* to describe the support of propositions in an impressive speech, or propositions of policy in an argumentative speech. As a matter of fact, there is usually nothing to prove in an impressive speech. We do not prove that we ought to keep our appointments promptly, or be loyal to our convictions, or do a thousand other things that we may advocate in a speech. We admit it all beforehand. The problem is one of creating or interpreting values, of setting up a system of rewards in the minds of the audience, of making them want to do the things we want them to do. The problem, that is to say, is purely one of motivation.

The fact remains that, in this type of speech, propositions of fact generally predominate. It is precisely because there are so many propositions of fact at issue in questions argued or debated that the argumentative speech always deals with disputed ideas or beliefs.

Take as an example the question: The United States should join the League of Nations. This is a proposition of policy. Whether such a policy is sound, whether its adoption would redound to the benefit of America, depends in turn on several questions of *fact*; for example: Has the League, in some measure at least, prevented war or conflict among nations? Is it likely to do so increasingly in the future? Is the League dominated by two or three large European powers? On the answer to these questions and many others — all questions of fact — will depend the soundness of the policy of joining the League. When once these questions are answered favorably to the

League, assuming that the facts warrant it, then it becomes a simple matter to interpret the value of such an organization to human society. On that subject, most people are motivated in advance.

There is no doubt that beliefs not accepted vary greatly both in regard to the difficulty of proving true the propositions of fact on which they rest and in point of difficulty of evaluating them or motivating an audience in regard to them. The audience attitude may be, "We might accept your proposition, but what is it good for in satisfying our wants?" In other cases, it may be difficult to prove true the propositions of fact on which a judgment of value rests, and easy to motivate an audience in regard to it if the facts are proved favorable. There are times when an audience is motivated in advance in regard to a policy and asks only to be shown that the facts are favorable. As already suggested, that might be true of an audience assembled to hear a speech on the League of Nations. The audience attitude might be, "Show us that the League will prevent war and that it is not dominated by two or three European powers (or whatever the facts in dispute may be) and we will be with you." Still, even here, if the members of an audience were asked to make contributions to further the cause, they might need some motivation on the subject. It would probably be necessary to appeal to their feelings and emotions by presenting to them vivid images of what war does to us and what we would escape by making the League function.

On the other hand, a belief that might be easily supported as to the facts, and difficult in regard to evaluation or motivation, might be, "We should discourage the organization of chain stores." It would be easy to show that chain stores effect substantial economies for their customers, that they tend to wealth concentration, and that their local managers are seldom permanent residents of a community. We should recognize the first of these effects to be good, and the second and third bad. The real problem, however, is to discover how good is the first, and

how bad are the other two. That is a process of evaluation or motivation. In a question like this, it is fair to say that the real problem is one of motivation.

The alert speaker will always be on his guard to analyze carefully his speech problem and determine where his heavy artillery is most needed. If his problem is primarily that of proving true a proposition of fact, or establishing the probable correctness of an opinion, then he must center his energies in that direction. If the problem is essentially one of motivation, then he must proceed to meet that. If the persuasive problem involves both of these, then the speaker will order his attack accordingly. One thing he should never forget, and that is that he is dealing with a belief that does not properly motivate the behavior of his audience, and that it is his business to make such belief dynamic, prove it true if it is seriously denied; interpret its affective meaning to the audience, if that is necessary, by charging it with feeling and emotion, and linking it up with vital life interests of the listeners.

Degrees of Belief. We see from these examples that the same belief may have gradations of meaning for different individuals. One man may believe vaguely and uncertainly that he should keep his appointments promptly, and order his behavior accordingly. Another man may believe it to the point of deep conviction and act upon it consistently. One may entertain a kind of belief about the efficacy of the League of Nations to prevent war, which means next to nothing so far as influencing his conduct is concerned; or one may be fired with a flaming enthusiasm for it — believe in it so firmly as to give generously of his time and means to support it.

Belief and Action. The degree of belief in which a speaker is interested is the one that results in action or influences conduct. That is always the goal. The goal, of course, may not be attained at a single bound or in a single speech. Perhaps it is fair to say that there are no absolute beliefs in the social sphere. It is hardly possible to say that a man can be made one hundred

per cent courteous or prompt in keeping appointments, or one hundred per cent solicitous about preventing automobile accidents; or that he can be made to love his neighbor fully up to the Biblical injunction. Everything is relative. That speech best accomplishes its purpose which renders the belief it aims to vitalize most potent for influencing behavior. No definite, overt action need be contemplated; nevertheless, influencing action in some way is always the end of all persuasive speeches. A speaker may advocate temperance not only in consuming liquor but in all things, without having any definite, overt action in mind. Still, the more strongly an audience is motivated in regard to such belief, and the more potent such belief is made for influencing conduct, the more fully is the speech end attained.

Again, a speaker may have in mind a definite, overt action on the part of the audience. The overt action aimed at may be immediate or remote. A speaker, for instance, may ask for a vote on some question or resolution, or for a contribution to some cause. The action is definite and immediate. Or he may ask for a vote for a political candidate three months hence. The action is definite and remote. Even when no definite, overt action is aimed at, it is no less true that motivation is the process by which the end is attained, and as a rule the end is accomplished through making the necessary or appropriate belief potent and dynamic so that it will bear fruition in action.

In all these cases, the aim is to influence conduct, and whether it be to get definite, overt, immediate action or to set up attitudes or action tendencies — predispositions to act in a certain way — that will result in the appropriate conduct when the occasion presents itself, the persuasive problem is essentially the same. As William James¹ puts it: “A resolve, whose contemplated motor consequences are not to ensue until some far distant future condition shall have been fulfilled, involves all the psychic elements of a motor fiat except the word ‘*Now*.’”

¹ *Selected Papers on Philosophy* (Everyman's Library, 1917), p. 69.

The Problem of Persuasion. The problem of persuasion, then, is to take any so-called belief, no matter on what level or of what degree, and lift it to the level of dynamic action, by charging it with a richer meaning and more vital interest for the listeners. The degree of belief at the outset may vary from anything short of willingness to act upon it consistently, to open hostility or disbelief. It is difficult to give good examples of gradations of belief, especially as persons differ in regard to them. Most persons probably would give mental assent to the proposition that educated men and women should take an interest in public questions, but still the subject offers large opportunities for persuasion, for our behavior falls far short of squaring with our so-called belief. An easier persuasive problem would be to support properly the proposition that all drivers should stop at railroad crossings to prevent accidents. The persuasive problem becomes, of course, much more difficult when we get into the field of beliefs that are in doubt or in dispute, and reaches its maximum with an audience openly hostile to the speaker's purpose. There are problems in persuasion that any speaker of good taste will let alone. Deep-seated prejudices or convictions, religious, social, economic, political, are not easily set aside. Still, almost anything may be undertaken if done in the right spirit and in good taste. A person can say almost anything if he says it in the right way.

What is an adequate support to give a proposition in a persuasive speech? That depends altogether on the proposition. If the belief is vague, or dormant, or dead, it may require heroic support to make it dynamic. Then again, sometimes a single fact may flash conviction on us. If we are about to enter a house and see a smallpox sign on it, the sign alone creates at once an understanding of the situation, a very definite belief and a resultant action. A single statement of fact here sets off all our predispositions to avoid situations dangerous to health and life. A speaker may frequently, by touching off well selected thought and emotional patterns of the audience, seize

upon short cuts to desired ends. This is dealt with at length in Chapter X, "Motivation: Suggestion."

On the other hand, I may — and once did — listen to a colored orator discourse for an hour or more on the need and merits of industrial schools for negroes in the South. On the strength of facts and examples presented, I am made to believe — give tacit assent to — the proposition that these schools are worthy enterprises. As a result of pictures drawn of the handicaps under which these schools operate for lack of funds, I am moved to sympathy with the heroic efforts put forth in behalf of these schools. By skillful appeal to motives I am made to feel that the welfare of the whole country, my own included, depends on giving negroes adequate education and fair opportunities. By a final appeal to self-interest and patriotism, I am led to subscribe to the cause of these schools. Here the speaker has to run the whole gamut of appeal — exposition, logical argument, suggestion, and motivation in various forms — before his purpose is accomplished.

The Two Types of Persuasive Speeches Distinguished. It is plain that the two types of speeches given above — the one on keeping appointments and the one on the League of Nations — have much in common. Both aim to influence human behavior and are therefore persuasive. Both appeal to motives and emotions and have action as the general end, at least insofar as they aim to make beliefs more potent in determining conduct. Both may require almost any form or all forms of support. There are, however, some distinctions to be made. The speech on keeping appointments promptly deals with an accepted belief or undisputed proposition. The first requires very little exposition to make its meaning clear; the second requires much exposition. In the first, the appeal is very largely to the feelings and emotions — motives; in the second, the appeal is in part to the understanding and judgment, but also to the feelings and emotions. (It is in its failure to appeal to motives or emotions that the traditional argumentative

speech falls down.) In the first speech, certain forms of support would predominate, such as general and concrete examples, all forms of illustrations, and the literary quotation; in the second, the predominant forms of support would be logical argument or reasoning processes, facts, figures, statistics, authorities, and analogies. Both speeches may use all the forms of support, but in each the predominating forms will be as suggested.

On the basis of these differences we may distinguish two kinds of persuasive speeches: (1) persuasive speeches dealing with accepted beliefs — which we will call *impressive speeches*; (2) persuasive speeches dealing with unaccepted beliefs, or *argumentative speeches*.

Classification of Speeches. We are now prepared to divide speeches roughly into four classes:

Informative	}	Persuasive
Impressive		
Argumentative		
Entertaining		

These classifications are somewhat arbitrary, since an informative speech may be entertaining and more or less impressive; while an argumentative speech may be at once informative, impressive, and entertaining. While there is this overlapping, the classification is nevertheless useful and practical.

Let us now try to understand clearly what we really mean by these distinctions, and how they may serve a speaker in attaining his speech purposes.

A. *The Informative Speech.* There are many occasions when the aim of a speaker is primarily to impart information as such, and in as clear and impartial a manner as possible. Information so given may be more or less entertaining and more or less impressive, but these aspects are incidental. The primary purpose of this type of speech is to expound, inform, or instruct, and this fact governs largely the choice of materials and treat-

ment of the subject. Classroom lectures are usually regarded as of this type, although they may often involve acceptance as well. The charge of a judge to a jury is essentially informative. Scientific lectures are usually of this class, like Agassiz's lecture, "Man and Monkeys," and Huxley's lecture, "On a Piece of Chalk." A description of a mechanical device, like an electric transformer, or an explanation of a policy, like the Monroe Doctrine, or a theory, like Evolution, will be of the informative type.

Here are a few typical subjects for informative speeches. All of them lend themselves to expository treatment; that is, to the expounding of their meaning. Many of them would also lend themselves to treatment for other ends.

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. The Organization of the League of Nations | 16. The Organization of the Farm Board |
| 2. The Kellogg Pact | 17. Fascism: What is it? |
| 3. The United States of Europe | 18. Bolshevism: What is it? |
| 4. The British Labor Party | 19. Profit-Sharing in Business |
| 5. Espionage Legislation | 20. Legumes and Soil Improvement |
| 6. Communism: What is it? | 21. Benjamin Franklin's Plan for Self-development (See his autobiography.) |
| 7. The Malthusian Theory | 22. Football Signals |
| 8. New Occupations for Women | 23. How Oranges Are Sorted and Packed |
| 9. Free Speech: What does it mean? | 24. Milking Machines |
| 10. Liberty: What is liberty? | 25. The Operation of the Stock Exchange |
| 11. Road Construction | 26. The Single Tax: What is it? |
| 12. Technological Unemployment | 27. The Radio Vacuum Tube |
| 13. Correct Breathing | |
| 14. Vitamins | |
| 15. The Organization of the World Court | |

B. *The Impressive Speech.* This is a persuasive speech dealing with an undisputed proposition or an accepted belief. It is sometimes called an inspirational speech, for its aim is primarily to inspire or to stimulate the feelings and emotions in

regard to some belief pattern. This type of speech usually deals with ideas or beliefs that we accept in a general way, but which fail to function adequately in behavior. Many of these are to be found in the field of social customs, habits, morals. The aim of the impressive speech, therefore, is to vitalize certain beliefs, to build up for them a system of desires, and make them dynamic so that we shall order our behavior more fully in accordance with them. As already suggested, no definite, overt action need be contemplated, although it may be, and frequently is. One may speak on the value of patriotism and seek to arouse certain patriotic impulses without having any definite, overt action in mind into which such impulses might flow. On the other hand, a doctor may, in a five-minute speech on the prevention of tuberculosis, give certain definite directions for detecting early symptoms of the disease and motivate an audience to take definite steps for the proper diagnosis and treatment.

Whether the problem be to get definite, overt action, immediate or remote, or merely to charge a belief with a larger and more impressive meaning, so that it will more adequately function in behavior, the psychological problem involved is much the same. The end is achieved largely through appeal to self-interest, in which are to be found the leading motives that impel to action. We are all motivated primarily by our desires, wants, wishes — fundamental urges, which are the real determinants of our behavior.

There are many examples of these speeches. Virtually all sermons are of this type, so far as the ultimate end of such discourses is concerned. They may contain much exposition, as of Biblical texts, and frequently do, but such exposition has for its aim the enriching and vitalizing of beliefs and maxims, and to make conduct square with them. It is fair to say that most political speeches are of this type. On most occasions, the political speaker will content himself with bolstering up old convictions and giving solemn praise for things as they are.

This is not necessarily the highest type of political speech, but it is the most common one. If old beliefs are assailed, or new reforms advocated, the political speech becomes argumentative. Such were most of Lincoln's best known political speeches and debates.

Of this type of speech also are lectures on the lyceum and Chautauqua — if they go beyond the bounds of mere humor. This was especially true of the older lyceum, which counted among its devotees such distinguished lecturers as Oliver Wendell Holmes, Ralph Waldo Emerson, Henry Ward Beecher, Wendell Phillips, Thomas Starr King, and Robert Ingersoll. No one of these men ever made a lyceum speech with entertainment only as the end. They had a very definite message and aimed to "enrich the brain, ennoble the heart and quicken the conscience." Of later lyceum lecturers who exemplify this type of speaking may be mentioned William Jennings Bryan and Russell H. Conwell, both of whom exerted great influence through their distinguished careers on the platform.

In this class also must be included almost all eulogies — that is, speeches dealing with the lives and characters of great men. The primary aim of a eulogy is to hold up certain distinctive character and personality traits as examples to the living. Occasional addresses, such as the commencement address, commemorative address, address of welcome, farewell address, and others are of this class. It will be seen that this type of speech includes many of the most popular forms of public address.

That the eulogy is essentially an impressive type of speech hardly admits of doubt. Suppose we should choose to make a speech on the character of Lincoln, and select certain distinctive traits like (1) Lincoln's honesty; (2) his kindness; (3) his tolerance of other persons' views. Few would take issue with any of these, and still we recognize in this a good subject for a speech. Our aim would be to present these traits of Lincoln's in such a way that they would serve as examples to the rest of us who are groping our way towards a richer and more meaning-

ful life. Such a speech, if well made, would set up certain emotional attitudes and action tendencies that might find fruition in a better-ordered behavior.

I recently heard an excellent eulogy of George Washington, based largely on a three-volume biography recently completed. In his introduction the speaker remarked, "If I can build one stone into the characters of those who hear me, I shall feel that I have not spoken in vain." Again he said toward the close of the speech, "If the marble lips of his many statues could speak to us of the present generation, what would they say?" It is plain that the speaker conceived his purpose to be to inspire and motivate the living by holding before them the virtues and achievements of the illustrious dead.

Like the political speech, the eulogy is apt to shade off into the argumentative type. Such is Wendell Phillips' eulogy of Toussaint L'Ouverture, and in a measure, also, his eulogy of Daniel O'Connell. Phillips occupied such advanced ground in thinking that he usually was at odds with his contemporaries. The fact remains that most eulogies will be found to be of the impressive type of speech. The aim of a eulogy is to influence human behavior; and, as a rule, to avoid controversy.

Here are a few propositions and subjects which you can use for this type of speech. Note that the truth of any or of all of the propositions is not seriously disputed, and still we need to have these truths impressed upon us from time to time. All of them deal with human conduct, either directly or indirectly. The aim is to give fuller meaning to truths to which we only give lip service; to make our conduct square more fully with our professed ideals. On the subjects given, formulate propositions that are not essentially disputed.

1. Educated men have a public duty to perform.
2. Intemperance is a vice.
3. Intolerance is a mistake.
4. New occasions teach new duties.
5. Our biggest opportunities are near at hand.

6. "Want appeal" in speaking is important.
7. The life of Benjamin Franklin (or some one else) is an inspiration.
8. Lincoln (or some one else) was a great patriot.
9. Woodrow Wilson (or some one else) was a great President.
10. Theodore Roosevelt (or some one else) was an interesting personality.
11. Mental health is a requisite to wholesome living.
12. The challenge of youth.
13. The uses of courage.
14. The decay of the home.
15. Our hostility to new ideas.
16. The scholar in a republic.
17. Truth in advertising.
18. The full life.
19. The value of ideals.
20. Democracy and education.
21. Courage of youth.
22. The battle of life.
23. Struggle for social justice.
24. American ideals.
25. Bread and Lilies.

C. *The Argumentative Speech.* The chief earmark of the argumentative type of speech is that it deals with unaccepted beliefs or disputed propositions that require evidential support. The purpose here is always to win acceptance for an idea or proposition, the truth of which is in doubt or in dispute, and to vitalize it for influencing conduct. Action is, therefore, always the end of an argumentative speech. The action may be as already stated definite and immediate, or nearly so, as when Bryan made his speech in behalf of Woodrow Wilson at the Democratic Convention at Baltimore in 1912; or it may be more or less remote, as when some one speaks for the League of Nations, in the hope that some day the United States may join. It should be noted, however, that while the specific or overt action intended may be remote, the aim is always to dispose men's minds favorably, or to set up attitudes that may

immediately find expression in behavior favorable to the policy advocated. I may hear a convincing speech on the League of Nations and acquire a new attitude on the subject which will lead me to support the League when opportunity presents.

The argumentative speech is always controversial. It deals with propositions which some people affirm and others deny. Advocates are ranged on both sides. Shall we join the World Court? Shall we encourage students to go to a small college rather than to a large university? Shall we require Latin in the high school? All these are controversial. They have two sides either of which can be argued. In a speech on this kind of subject, the primary problem may be to remove doubt and win acceptance for the proposition. This requires evidential support, sometimes extensive. It also may require skillful appeal to motives and emotions that impel to action.

Argumentative speeches abound. All debates are of this class. Some political speeches, if they possess merit, will be of this type, although not many are. Speeches in deliberative assemblies — legislature, congress, parliament — are usually argumentative. In general, wherever a person or a group of persons seriously consider reasons and facts pro and con for doing something, or for adopting a policy, their deliberations will come within the scope of this end. It matters not whether it be within the family, club, community, state, or nation — the purpose would be the same; namely, to get belief or win acceptance for an idea, and set up attitudes that will result in favorable action.

Here are a few propositions you can use for speeches of the argumentative type. Observe that all these propositions are disputed. They are debatable. They have two sides. You can make a speech in support of either side. Choose the side that appeals to you.

1. Are our industries overexpanded?
2. Can we escape periodic depressions?
3. Does capital punishment deter crime?

4. Are athletics interfering too much with college education?
5. Should lobbying be condemned?
6. Is national income in the United States fairly distributed?
7. Should farming by corporations on a large scale be encouraged?
8. Can we instil patriotism by compulsory flag-waving or salute?
9. Should workingmen organize a Labor Party in the United States?
10. Are chain stores detrimental to our best interests?
11. Is the small college to be preferred to the big university?
12. Should there be national supervision of the production of moving pictures?
13. Is installment buying on a large scale sound economic practice?
14. Should house-to-house selling be prohibited?

D. *The Entertainment Speech.* We recognize a type of speech that has for its primary end entertainment. So-called after-dinner speeches, or some of them at least, fall within this class. We have on record a few lectures that are distinctly humorous and aim to serve no other end than entertainment. There are not many of them, and it is safe to say that only born humorists or eccentric geniuses can make them successful. Perhaps the most notable of these lectures is "The Mormons" by Charles Farrar Browne (Artemus Ward). Speeches at class reunions and group gatherings to commemorate some event probably would stress the entertainment feature. There may be some Chautauqua lectures, also, that properly belong to this class, although most of the worth-while ones have some ulterior aim besides mere entertainment.

Very few speeches, as a matter of fact, are made solely for entertainment purposes. It is a mistake to suppose that after-dinner speeches should consist merely of funny stories and jokes. Our published models certainly do not bear out that idea. The better class of after-dinner speeches have a more or less definite message, and frequently give expression to sentiments that are vital and dignified.

It may be said that an after-dinner speech may be almost anything from a few casual remarks with perhaps a story

attached — hardly worthy the name of a speech — to a somewhat lengthy and dignified discourse. It may also be said that a speech given after a dinner is not necessarily an after-dinner speech. A candidate for President comes to a city, is fêted at a banquet, and then talks about political issues for an hour and a half. That is not an after-dinner speech. What we mean by an after-dinner speech, usually, is a rather short, light, informal, humorous speech. It may or may not have a definite message. The more lengthy and better ones usually do.

The Entertainment Factor in Public Address. As for the place of entertainment in public lectures or addresses of the persuasive type, it may be said that there is often a temptation on the part of speakers to give it undue prominence. The following comment from Glenn Frank, himself an accomplished speaker, is worth heeding.

The attempt of the average lecturer to entertain has been the intellectual damnation of the present-day lecture platform. There is, of course, no excuse for the man who talks dully of great things, and then damns the stupidity of the people for walking away from him. The unpardonable sin of the platform is the sin of being uninteresting. But what would have happened to the public influence of those sturdy old publicists, the Hebrew prophets, if they had spent their time spinning yarns just to capture the applause of Israel? I mean no indictment of men who create their own material and cast it into fiction or character form. While such men entertain in the highest sense, their entertainment only wings the arrows of their philosophy. They are in the royal succession of real lecturers. Nor is reference intended to men who wisely use a story to illuminate a truth. Lincoln would weave a story into an address in a manner that visualized a principle, as a steel engraving or wood-cut adds to the appeal of a book. But such men never drag in a story to recapture an audience that absence of thought has lost.¹

We must of course distinguish sharply between mere *entertainment* and *interestingness*. Entertainment, by which we mean

¹ *An American Looks at His World* (1932), p. 67.

primarily the humorous element in a speech, is only one factor in interestingness. A speech is interesting, we say, when it holds the attention of those who listen, but not all methods of holding attention have equal value for accomplishing worthwhile ends in speaking. We have on more than one occasion in this text stressed the idea that a speech, in order to be interesting in the best sense, must touch vitally and vividly fundamental human interests. Whatever entertainment a speech affords should seem at least to spring naturally out of the development of the theme and the speech materials used. One man will treat a serious subject in such a way as to get a great deal of humor out of it, while moving to a definite goal, without seeming to go out of his way at all. Another man will treat the same subject and be unable to find any speech materials that yield genuine humor unless he goes out of his way to do so. There is no harm in a humorous story if it illuminates a point or, by subtle suggestion, points a moral. The harm comes in using it as an end in itself. It is a safe rule to follow that any speech materials that are introduced for the sake of amusement and not for the sake of advancing the end of the speech are better left out.

Let us not overlook, however, the fact that public lecturing is an art. It is not enough to have something to say; one must know how to say it. There is such a thing in a speech as charm of style and diction, in which humor and originality no doubt play a large part. Many good lectures have in them that which makes them enjoyable. They possess distinctive literary qualities. An examination of them will reveal this to a marked degree. One has but to read some of the speeches of platform masters like Thomas Starr King, Robert Ingersoll, George W. Curtis, and others to be impressed with their rhythmic charm and beauty. Among present-day speakers, Glenn Frank excels in the power to make truth palatable. His speeches exemplify not only virile thinking, but more than ordinary felicity of phrase and picturesqueness of style. They have what Emerson

would call power of statement; that is, power to state an issue in such a way that it cannot be disregarded. Thought cannot be separated from the language that expresses it.

Radio Talks and "Showmanship." Radio managers stress the importance of "showmanship" in the preparation of talks over the radio, especially in educational programs. The criticism is that educators are poor "showmen," and that they have not the knack of presenting their ideas in such a way as to interest any large portion of the people. The theory is that the "general public" is a thirteen-year-old in its capacity to understand and assimilate knowledge, and that any mental diet offered it must not only be in diluted form, but interspersed with still lighter offerings, presumably in the form of popular jazz melodies and other choice bits from the ordinary vaudeville menu. In this way only, it is said, can the general public be made to "listen in" at all on lectures and other educational programs.

Let it be said, first, that "showmanship" is a very poor term to apply to a speech, and certainly not a very illuminating one. It may be said also that there is very likely some basis for criticism here. College professors are accustomed to talk to college students in terminology that, in part at least, does not pass current outside the campus. If presented to an age level of thirteen years, the seed most assuredly would not fall on fertile ground. The reason is that the college professor does not speak to thirteen-year-olds, and does not have to concern himself much about getting an audience. His audiences are selected, and are furnished him through the arrangement of the curriculum. Students have to listen, whether they like it or not. On the radio, no one has to listen. The problem here, therefore, is not only to present the information in intelligible form, which is the only requirement of the classroom, but also to get an audience to listen to it. Showmanship presumably concerns itself with getting an audience on the air and holding their attention when there.

If by showmanship be meant that a minimum of truth or information shall be given, and that vaudeville methods are a necessary concomitant of educational programs, the answer is that such methods are not needed, and in the long run will defeat their own ends. If, on the other hand, showmanship means the presentation of ideas in such a way as to make them easily understandable and interesting, through simple diction, style with a large pictorial element, avoidance of technical terms, tactful linking of the talk with fundamental human interests, scrupulous regard for attention values or speech materials that hold the attention of the audience, interpretation of ideas and feelings in terms of familiar experiences of the listeners, the whole seasoned with a touch of humor and originality — the answer is, let us have showmanship. We may as well realize that in our effort to “humanize” knowledge we must cultivate the art of communicating ideas to the public, and meet them on the terms on which only they are willing to listen. There is no appeal from this popular mandate.

In Conclusion. We may divide speeches roughly into four classes, on the basis of the ends to be attained, or purposes to be accomplished: informative speeches, impressive speeches, argumentative speeches, and entertainment speeches. Impressive and argumentative speeches are both persuasive, and aim to influence human conduct. They have many things in common, but are distinguished by the fact that one deals with accepted beliefs or undisputed propositions, and the other with unaccepted beliefs or disputed propositions.

The impressive speech deals with ideas or beliefs that we acknowledge to be sound, but which do not function adequately in behavior. The aim of this type of speech is, therefore, to vitalize these beliefs and make them function more fully in behavior.

The argumentative speech takes a proposition that is not accepted as a basis for behavior. It may be in doubt, or it may be strenuously disputed. The speech aims not only to win

acceptance for the proposition which expresses its purpose, but also to interpret its worth to us in fundamental human interests, in its capacity to gratify human desires, and satisfy human wants. In this latter aspect, its problem is much the same as that of the impressive speech, although the emphasis may, and often does, fall on the process of proving true the propositions of fact involved. To emphasize one process at the expense of the other is liable to give an unbalanced argumentative speech. Something depends on the nature of the proposition. It may be difficult to get at the facts and easy to show the importance of the proposition to us if the facts are found favorable. Or it may be easy to get at the facts and difficult to evaluate the proposition. The speaker is the final judge as to what is the most judicious treatment to give a speech, after all the factors of the speech situation are considered — speaker, audience, occasion.

The informative speech aims to impart information clearly and impartially, to explain the new, and to make lucid the obscure. To be effective it must have interesting information to give.

The entertainment speech is what its name implies, although there are very few speeches on record that have been given exclusively for entertainment. So-called after-dinner speeches, of the better type, have as a rule a fairly definite message, or some thought-provoking suggestion to offer. We have plenty of good models to serve as guides.

EXERCISES

1. Read Huxley's lecture "On a Piece of Chalk," and report on it in writing. Do you find some traces of argument in it? Would you classify it as an argumentative speech? Comment on style, clearness of thought, forms of support, use of illustrations. (Aim to read other speeches assigned also and criticize them orally in class.)

2. Report to the class on a sermon or some other speech that you heard recently, answering the following questions:
 - a. What was the definite aim of the speaker?
 - b. By what means did he accomplish this aim? Briefly restate the ideas which supported or achieved his purpose.
 - c. Do you think he achieved his purpose? Answer this by analyzing the effect the sermon had on you — also by getting the reactions of others in the congregation.
3. Analyze some instructor's lecture as follows:
 - a. What other purposes besides that of giving information did he have?
 - b. What materials did he use for these purposes?
4. Prepare a ten-minute speech, giving special attention to the type of speech. Let it guide you in choice of materials.

READINGS

Speeches

INFORMATIVE: "Business — A Profession," by Louis D. Brandeis (Vol. IV). "On a Piece of Chalk," by Thomas H. Huxley (Vol. XIII).

IMPRESSIVE: "Social Responsibilities," by John B. Gough (Vol. XIII).

ARGUMENTATIVE: "Cooper Union Speech," by Abraham Lincoln (Vol. XI). "Why Men Strike," by Edward A. Filene (Vol. IV).

ENTERTAINMENT: "The Babies," by Samuel L. Clemens ("Mark Twain") (Vol. I). "The Pilgrim Mothers," by Joseph H. Choate (Vol. I).

References

Charles Henry Woolbert: *Fundamentals of Speech* (Revised Edition, 1927), Chap. XV.

James Milton O'Neill and Andrew Thomas Weaver: *The Elements of Speech* (1926), Chap. XII.

Arthur Edward Phillips: *Effective Speaking* (1908), Chap. II.

William Phillips Sandford and Willard Hayes Yeager: *Principles of Effective Speaking* (Revised Edition, 1930), Chap. III.

James Winans: *Public Speaking* (Revised Edition, 1917), Chap. X.

CHAPTER XIII

THE INFORMATIVE SPEECH

Some of your first speeches will very likely be of the informative type. Beginning students in speaking generally choose to make informative or expository speeches, probably because they are accustomed to giving talks of this kind in the classroom and elsewhere, and are, therefore, led to believe that they can do better with this kind than with any other. This may be correct, although the informative speech often presents real difficulties in point of interesting an audience and of holding attention.

Importance of the Informative Element in Speeches. Most good speeches are likely to have in them a large element of interesting information. It is, therefore, of some importance to know how to deal with it. Very often the best service one can render a subject is to riddle it with light. The most persuasive approach to a difficult question on which there are divergent views may be to make a clear and impartial statement of the issues. The process of making a certain belief or view clear may be the shortest road to winning acceptance for it. The chief distinction, as a matter of fact, between exposition and argument may be the use which is made of the materials. A scientist may expound the theory of evolution, seeking only to make it clear and having no particular interest in its acceptance; but the exposition may nevertheless cause acceptance and exercise far-reaching influence on the lives of the listeners. It may give them a wholly new outlook on life. "The Lost Arts," by Wendell Phillips, one of the most popular of all lyceum lectures, derives its power and charm largely from the unique and startling information that it contains. Still, it would not be classified as an informative speech, because it

has clearly an ulterior aim. Many of the speech materials used in this lecture are impressive as well; still, impressiveness is not the end. The speech is essentially argumentative, because the speaker intends that it shall be, and uses his materials to advocate a view that many persons will dispute. All depends on the speaker's purpose. Phillips, it may be said, found it difficult to agree with his contemporaries, and as a result almost all his speeches are of the argumentative type, whether eulogies, lyceum lectures, or even occasional addresses.

Clearness as an Objective in Speaking. Arthur Edward Phillips, in his *Effective Speaking*, emphasizes clearness as an end. Clearness is a quality of style, perhaps, rather than a general end, but it is worthy of special emphasis in relation to the informative element in speaking. Oliver Wendell Holmes, himself an accomplished lecturer, affirmed that nothing should go into a lecture which five hundred persons cannot grasp immediately. Nothing more effectually kills interest in a speech than cloudiness or confusion of thought. If the members of an audience cannot listen and comprehend what is being said with mental ease and comfort, they are likely not to listen at all. The speaker, as a rule, has difficulty in realizing that he, presumably, has a much clearer comprehension or view of the subject than his audience, and the fact that things are simple and clear to him does not mean that they are simple or clear to them. Clear presentation must always be considered from the point of view of the listeners.

It is sometimes difficult to realize the obscurities and ambiguities that lurk in language. I confess that I used the following sentence more than once before I noted its ambiguity: "Nothing as raw material for a speech is a failure." What I meant to say, of course, was that a speech cannot be made out of nothing, and that raw material of that order is a failure. What I did not see was that the sentence might also mean "There is nothing in the form of raw material for a speech that is a failure" — something I did not mean to say at all.

The informative element in a speech is therefore important. First, there is likely to be a great deal of it in almost any speech, for it may serve all ends. Second, in the presentation of information as such, the primary objective is clearness: the audience must be made to understand with the least mental effort.

The Nature of Exposition. In speeches that seek primarily to expound or impart information, it is well to bear in mind that the response desired from the audience is: "I understand" or "Your explanation is clear to me." The question now arises: What is the best and surest way of accomplishing this aim? How do we impart new information, new ideas, build up the image of a new object? What is the basis of understanding and agreement ultimately between speaker and audience? The answer is to be found in our experience. That is the ultimate common ground where we can meet.

The only way in which we can learn anything new through speech is by its being likened to something that we already know; that is, by its being expressed in terms of experiences that are familiar to us. We can have new experiences, of course; we can go to Africa or Australia and see strange animals and new landscapes that we have never seen before. But if we are going to make some one else see them by telling about them, we must describe them by likening them to other animals or scenes that are familiar. No matter how strong or creative our imagination may be, we cannot imagine anything that is not an element of past experience. Try it and be convinced. We can imagine an animal with the head of a horse, the body of an ox, and the tail of a lion, but while the animal is new, the parts are all old and familiar.

One method of exposition is by means of *definition*. Take the function of a dictionary, for example. What is it? It is to define words we do not understand in terms of words we do understand. If we do not know the meaning of the word *caoutchouc*, the only way we can be made to understand it is in terms of words we already understand. When the dictionary

defines caoutchouc as a kind of rubber, we know in a general way what it is. Incidentally, if we do not know how to pronounce it, the only way we can learn it is in terms of letter sounds that are familiar. If, for the purpose, we spell it *koó-chook*, we probably understand how it is pronounced.

Another method of exposition is by means of the *example*. A single example may sometimes flood a whole question with light, especially if it is a fair specimen and typical of a whole class. William Lyon Phelps in his commencement address to the graduation class of New York University, June, 1927, tells of an amusing incident to show that accuracy of statement does not always spell the truth. Said he:

We know the history of the great sailing ship that was far away in the Indian Ocean. The ship was in a calm and all the men were desperate and the mate got drunk for the first and only time in his life, and the captain kept the log that week and he wrote in the log, "Mate was drunk yesterday," and when the mate came to he said, "Now, captain, you must take off that statement from the log; that will ruin me." The captain said, "It is true. You were drunk yesterday." "I was, but I shall not get a berth again when we come to port and you must forgive me and take it out." The captain said, "No, I believe in writing the exact truth." "Very well," said the mate. A week later the mate was keeping the log and he wrote in it, "Captain was sober yesterday."¹

Sometimes we may find *testimony* an excellent method of exposition. Franklin D. Roosevelt, in his speech nominating Alfred E. Smith for President on the Democratic ticket, in Madison Square Garden, New York, 1924, thus expounded the source of public opinion: "It was the illustrious Woodrow Wilson, my revered chief and yours, who said, 'The great voice of America does not come from the university. It comes in a murmur from the hills and the woods, from the farms, the factories and the mills — rolling on and gaining volume until it comes to us from the homes of the common people.'"²

¹ Homer D. Lindgren: *Modern Speeches* (1930), p. 326. ² *Ibid.*, p. 137.

Still another method of exposition is by the use of *illustrations*. This is a very important method, for it is the method employed in likening the unknown to the known. In the early days of the automobile, when horses shied at every car they met on the highway, a little girl overheard one man ask another:

“Isn’t it strange that horses should be afraid of automobiles?”

“Well,” said the little girl, breaking into the conversation, “I guess you would be afraid if you saw a pair of pants come walking down the street with nobody in them.”

The child should be given credit for more than ordinary “horse sense.” The analogy embodies familiar elements of thought. For, while the idea of a pair of trousers walking by themselves is a novel one, the process of walking and a pair of trousers are familiar objects of thought. The relationship alone in which they are placed is new. It may be added that the phenomenon suggested would strike terror into the heart of the most valiant in broad daylight.

One more illustration. Lincoln once had occasion to explain to a jury of Illinois farmers the meaning of the phrase, “preponderance of evidence.” A large number of witnesses had been examined, all equally credible and all equally positive; so it was a question of where the preponderance of evidence lay. Lincoln told the jurors they must decide the case according to the impressions which the evidence had produced upon their minds, and if they felt puzzled at all, he would give them a test by which they could bring themselves to a just conclusion. “Now,” said he, “if you were going to bet on this case, on which side would you be willing to risk a quarter? That side on which you would be willing to bet a quarter would be the side on which rests the preponderance of evidence in your minds. It is possible that you may not be right, but that is not the question. The question is as to where the preponderance of evidence lies, and you can judge exactly where it lies in your minds by deciding which side you would be willing to bet on.”

This illustration flooded the question with light. Here was something in their own experience that they could understand. That which was not understood was likened to something which was perfectly well understood. This is what we may call "hitting the bull's-eye" in speaking. Observe that the comparison is from the unknown to the known. The mental response desired was, "We understand."

The principle here explained is the one that underlies all good speeches of the informative kind. Always you must move from the unknown to the known; from the unfamiliar to the familiar. The known and familiar are always to be understood in relation to your audience. This applies to the use of all speech materials. Your diction must be of a kind your audience can easily understand; your sentences so constructed as to be easily grasped; your method of presentation, in general, such that the information given may be comprehended with clarity and ease.

The Use of Charts and Maps. In presenting involved facts and statistics, it is sometimes a great advantage to use charts or maps. To show the growth of population, of national income, of increase in taxes, or of any one of a thousand things, it is hard to beat a graph with its ascending curves or mounting columns. If one were to show how the Versailles Treaty altered the national boundaries of Europe, it would be extremely difficult to do it without the use of maps. Charts and maps are in effect pictures and have all the advantages of the "eye appeal." They are excellent aids to the understanding and memory.

All such devices, however, should be used sparingly in speech training. They do not help much to develop ability in speaking; in fact, they may easily retard it. To make good charts is the work of scientists and statisticians, rather than that of a speaker. To speak from charts is a good deal simpler than to speak without them. Such aids are seldom used in public addresses except in scientific lectures and in technical subjects.

In some instances, as in certain intercollegiate debates, they have been forbidden on account of the tendency to abuse them.¹ In the early debates, charts cluttered the stage and were strung up on wires stretched over the platform, until the debates gave the appearance of a competition in chart-making. The audience kept looking at the charts rather than listening to the debaters. The result was that all such devices were ruled out by the constitution of the league.

Judicious use, however, of such devices on occasion may be proper. The tendency to abuse them or to make too much of them should be avoided. It is a good rule to use them only when adequate results cannot be had in any other way.

Requisites of a Good Informative Speech. A good informative speech should, to some extent at least, arouse curiosity. It should deal with a subject that your audience would really want to have explained or know something more about. Informative speeches are too often made on subjects that have only a mild interest for the audience, or on which the listeners are about as well informed as the speaker. Such speeches have, therefore, a tendency to degenerate into "an elaboration of the obvious." A girl in class, for example, is on part-time duty in a hospital, and undertakes to make a speech on the history and work of the institution. Unless that hospital is different from other hospitals, and treats cases that are out of the ordinary, the chances are good that the listeners are in for a dull speech. To be worth while, a speech of this kind should yield information that is really new to the audience and that adds to the sum total of their knowledge.

In an expository speech, there is not the same opportunity to link the subject up with the vital interests of the audience that there is in persuasive speeches. Very often, mental curiosity alone must sustain attention. I may be interested in understanding something about vacuum radio tubes, or Ein-

¹ Central Debating Circuit, formerly made up of the Universities of Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, Nebraska, and Wisconsin.

stein's theory of relativity; but after all, it is mere curiosity that supports attention in such a speech. I should not expect to put such information to practical use, or if I entertained any such expectation, it would be remote and uncertain. We have, therefore, to depend largely on certain factors of interestingness such as the unusual and the concrete. It is largely through the new and unusual, expressed in terms of familiar experiences, that informatory or expository speeches are made interesting.

Another requisite of a good informative speech is that the speaker shall know more about the subject than the listeners. Socrates is credited with the saying, "All men are sufficiently eloquent in that which they understand." Unfortunately, the obverse is even more true: no man can speak well on a subject that he does not understand, or on which he does not have more information than his audience. In class speeches students, as a rule, will not make the same painstaking effort in preparing an informative speech that they will in preparing other types of speeches. The temptation is to take something near at hand, too often a subject that they know no more about than their classmates. The result is a dull speech. A student will, for instance, read several magazine articles and perhaps portions of a book or two in preparing a speech — not to speak of a debate — on the League of Nations or on lobbying. But what student will make adequate preparation for a truly interesting speech on *The Intelligence of Monkeys*, *The Socratic Method*, or *The Culture of the Eskimos* — all excellent subjects for an informative speech?

Examples of Interesting Informative Speeches. As examples of interesting informative speeches may be cited lectures on the polar regions by noted explorers. When Admiral Byrd appeared at the Municipal Auditorium in Minneapolis, the estimated attendance at the two lectures given in the afternoon and evening of the same day was twenty thousand. No doubt there was good publicity both for the lecture and for the polar

expedition; but the principal reason for this record-breaking attendance must be found in the fact that he had unusual experiences and information to give and pictures of new and unknown scenes to exhibit. Few of us have first-hand knowledge of life and climate in the polar regions, and mental curiosity here is at high pitch. Vilhjalmur Stefansson, Arctic explorer and leading exponent of life and culture in the frozen North, can hold an audience spellbound for two or three hours relating personal experiences and discoursing on the life and culture of the Eskimos on the North American coast. And for the same reason: he deals with unique facts and experiences. The Roald Amundsen lecture on the discovery of the South Pole was of the same nature. Few of us have the unique experiences and information to impart that these bold adventurers in the polar regions have, but their lectures suggest the kind of materials wanted in an informative speech. They also show how desire, especially desire to know — curiosity — may be gratified and attention held by this type of address.

One of the earliest and most popular lectures of Wendell Phillips was "Street Life in Europe." A travel talk describing interesting places and persons is likely to hold attention, especially if the speaker has had opportunities for travel and can give first-hand information. If you have studied anthropology, astronomy, chemistry, or almost any science, it should yield interesting subjects for informative speeches.

An example of an exceptionally fine speech containing a wealth of unusual and interesting information is "The Lost Arts," by Wendell Phillips. This is regarded as the highest type of lyceum lecture. While information may not be the ultimate end in this speech, it is a very important subordinate end. The lecture abounds in concrete information that is striking and unique. Read it as an example of informative and attention-gripping speech materials.

Informative Speeches That Expound or Explain. The informative speeches so far instanced have dealt with unusual facts

that are interesting in themselves, and do not present any serious problem of interpretation for the ordinary audience. If one has the materials, such speeches are not difficult to make. They are likely to hold attention well.

Another class of informative speeches aims to explain new processes or new devices, and expound new theories, new proposals, new experiments. These may present a real problem in holding attention and connecting up with any vital interest on the part of the audience.

There are, for example, all kinds of mechanical devices and processes that are marvels in themselves; but to give a reasonably interesting explanation of them is another matter. It seems little short of miraculous that, in a city of several million people, we may in the course of a very few minutes speak to any one of them over the telephone. How are such connections made? Simple, when you once understand. But of several speeches I have listened to on that subject, not one of them really made it clear. Still more marvelous as a mechanical invention is the automatic telephone system, and probably too complicated to explain in a speech. The fact of the matter is that, in addition to the inherent difficulties of explaining these processes, we have only a very mild interest in understanding them. Many a person drives a car without being able to find either the carburetor or the crank case. So unless you have more than an ordinary interest in these mechanical devices or processes, and more than ordinary skill in presenting them, be on your guard against inflicting your explanations on innocent listeners.

As for new theories, experiments, proposals in the realm of economics, government, science, and so forth, they may be very interesting and furnish good subjects for expository speeches. The proposed United States of Europe, The Kellogg Pact, The Soviet Experiment, Birth Control, Violet Rays, Socializing the Radio, as in England and some European countries — these subjects should be interesting if intelligently

handled. If mere exposition is the aim, it should be made impartial, and everything that savors of advocacy should be avoided. Even then, exposition of such subjects may have a certain persuasive effect. To understand is frequently equivalent to believing. Perhaps we have to admit that any speech may indirectly influence conduct.

Forms of Support. Almost all forms of support may be used in the informative speech. Some will predominate. Concrete speech materials are the best. The general and specific examples will be found effective. The lectures of such men as Stefansson, Byrd, and Amundsen were replete with personal experiences, which as a rule take the form of the specific example. To show clearly how an Eskimo family lives and moves and has its being, how a penguin behaves, what are the effects of very low temperatures in the polar regions, can best be done by concrete examples.

In explaining the new and unfamiliar, in the form of mechanical processes or devices, economic theories and proposals, illustrations will be found extremely useful. Several examples have been given to show how valuable may be the analogy in making clear the meaning of a phrase, or a form of behavior. Illustrations derive their effectiveness largely from the fact that they embody well-known and familiar experiences. They are the chief means of likening the unknown to the known. In explaining the meaning of economic or political theories and institutions, such as the business cycle or the World Court, the use of testimony of authorities in these fields would prove effective.

In Conclusion. The informative element is prominent in all types of speeches, unless it be the purely entertaining speech. It is, therefore, well worth while to cultivate skill in presenting ideas simply and clearly so that the humblest may grasp them. In the argumentative speech, especially, the giving of information plays a large part. Frequently the only difference between exposition and argument is the use made of, or direction given

to, the materials. Exposition becomes argument when it bears a certain relation to a definite course of conduct. To present information, simply, clearly, vividly, is one of the prime requisites of effective speaking. Nothing so effectually kills attention as cloudiness and obscurity of thought, and the consequent inability of an audience to follow a speaker. We often hear the remark that a speaker must say the same thing in several different ways before it is really understood and appreciated. In a sense, that is true. First the general statement with some restatements; then a specific example or several examples; next perhaps testimony in some form; and finally a comparison in the form of a good illustration. When people take in ideas by the ear, they must take them in diluted form; and, paradoxical as it may sound, about the only way we can take in information through the ear is by taking it in through the eye. That is, we must see things in pictures before we fully understand and feel comfortable. Also, we remember things largely in terms of pictures.

As for informative speeches for class practice, one problem is to find suitable subjects. A few are suggested in Chapter III, "Choosing a Subject." Aim to avoid the trite and commonplace. Look for the unusual or the unique. With something out of the ordinary to offer, you can have your audience all attention. Make free use of concrete speech materials, and especially of illustrations to tide over difficult places.

EXERCISES

1. Report in writing on one of the speeches assigned for reading. Comment on it as a type. Is the informative element predominant? Is it clear? What forms of support are used? Which ones are most effective? Do you find the pictorial element strong? Comment on the style and such other points as occur to you.
2. In a three-minute speech, aim to make clear the meaning of the following. Be concrete and simple.
 - a. To equal a predecessor, a man must be twice his worth.

- b. We learn from history that we never learn anything from history.
 - c. He who has less than he desires should know that he has more than he deserves.
 - d. You can do anything with a bayonet except sit on it.
 - e. Riches are the baggage of virtue.
3. Read Watterson's description of Lincoln (page 484). Comment on it as to diction and other qualities of style. Does it present a clear picture of Lincoln?
 4. Give a report, oral or written, on a speech you have recently heard, which aimed primarily to make something clear or impart information.
 5. Plan three speech situations, choosing subject and audience, for an informative speech.
 6. Prepare an informative speech of eight or ten minutes on some interesting subject. Aim to get away from the trite and commonplace. Try to enlist as many factors of interestingness as possible.

READINGS

Speeches

- "Modern Education and the Government," by Franklin D. Roosevelt (*O'Neill and Riley*).
- "The Poetic Principle," by Edgar Allan Poe (*Mod. El.*: I, Vol. VI).
- "Man and Monkeys," by Louis Agassiz (*Mod. El.*: I, Vol. VI).
- "Aphorisms," by John Morley (*Mod. El.*: I, Vol. VI).
- "The Choice of Books," by Frederick Harrison (Vol. VII).
- "How to Fail in Literature," by Andrew Lang (Vol. VI).
- "The Future of the Supreme Court," by James M. Beck (*Lindgren*).

References

- William Phillips Sandford and Willard Hayes Yeager: *Principles of Effective Speaking* (Revised Edition, 1930), Chap. XII.
- James Winans: *Public Speaking* (Revised Edition, 1917), Chap. XI.
- Arthur Edward Phillips: *Effective Speaking* (1908), Chaps. X-VIII.

CHAPTER XIV

THE IMPRESSIVE SPEECH

All great thoughts come from the heart. — MARQUIS DE VAUVENARGUES

We have dealt briefly with the informative speech. We have now to consider the impressive speech. Both impressive and argumentative speeches as a rule are persuasive; that is, they aim to influence human behavior. The distinctive aspect of persuasive speaking is that it appeals to feelings and emotions or motives as well as to the intellect. In informative speeches, the appeal is primarily to the understanding or intellect.

We have already seen that the type of speech we are here dealing with is concerned with the support of propositions that are not disputed; or, to put it differently, with beliefs that are accepted, but which do not function adequately in behavior. We are all agreed, for example, that selfishness is an ugly trait, and we need not be convinced on that score. Still, hundreds of sermons have been preached on it, and hundreds more doubtless will continue to be preached. There are plenty of occasions for making speeches that aim to strengthen old loyalties, revive flabby faiths, bolster up old convictions, mobilize moral impulses, put a new edge on conscience, and hold up character traits that are altogether lovely and admirable. The problem of the impressive speech is essentially one of motivation.

Feelings, Emotions, Motives. In this chapter we shall have occasion to use freely such terms as *feelings*, *emotions*, *motives*. We often refer to *emotional appeal*. We should understand what these terms mean.

Psychologists refer to *feelings* in three dimensions; namely, pleasantness — unpleasantness, expectancy — release, excite-

ment — numbness.¹ We are concerned primarily with feelings in their aspect of being pleasant or unpleasant, for all of us are motivated by a desire to have pleasant experiences and to avoid unpleasant ones. It is difficult to see, moreover, how expectancy and excitement, or their opposites, can escape having a pleasant or unpleasant feeling tone. We may therefore say, roughly, that all feelings, so far as they motivate action, range themselves under these two heads, pleasant and unpleasant. By referring to our own experiences, we have a fairly clear idea of what that means.

An *emotion* is essentially an intensified feeling, and may be either pleasant or unpleasant. Familiar pleasant emotions are mirth, joy, love; unpleasant ones, grief, fear, anger, hate. An emotion “is a stirred up state of feeling. . . . Each emotion can be located in the tridimensional scheme of feeling, but such an analysis does not do full justice to the emotion. Fear is a state of excited, unpleasant expectancy, and mirth is excited pleasant relief, but each is something more. Emotion is like feeling in being diffuse and massive, but an emotion has more definiteness than a mere feeling, especially on the motor side. Each emotion is a sensation mass, and each is at the same time a motor set. Fear is a set for escape and anger for attack. These sets are more specific than the sets of mere pleasantness and unpleasantness.”² We shall not go far astray in regarding emotion as deep, intense feeling.

A *motive* is a feeling or emotion that prompts or incites to action. Not all emotions are necessarily motives in the sense of influencing conduct, although they may become so. A mother grieves over the loss of an only son. The grief may not motivate to any definite action. Again, it may. Suppose it is a wealthy woman. She might, by way of compensation for her grief, donate a memorial library to her community or an educational institution. A motive is always a determinant of behavior.

¹ Robert S. Woodworth: *Psychology* (1929), p. 282.

² *Ibid.*, p. 287.

Relation of Our Wants and Wishes to Our Emotions. There has been much confused thinking in regard to the relationship between our emotions and our wants or motives. It should be made plain that our feelings and emotions are as inseparably connected with our wants and desires as wind is inseparably connected with air. In fact, it may be said that just as wind is simply air in motion, so our feelings or emotions are simply our wants and wishes in action. To want something is to experience a feeling or emotion concerning it. If our wants are making progress in the direction of being satisfied, we experience pleasurable emotions. If our wants are not making progress in finding satisfaction or are in the process of being defeated or frustrated, we experience unpleasant emotions. If we are hungry and cannot get food, suffocating and cannot get air, lonely and cannot find friends, we have painful or unpleasant feelings or emotions. If we are looking forward to attending a fine concert, a play, or a football game, we have pleasurable feelings or emotions. The satisfaction of a want may be sudden and of short duration, as when we unexpectedly run across a friend; or it may be of long duration, as in the case of a composer writing a symphony, or it may have a long period of anticipation, as when we plan a trip abroad six months in advance.

Satisfaction is not limited to the actual appeasement of the impulse through action upon its object; it is no mere running down of a drive; for it contains, in addition, an anticipation of appeasement, an imaginative foretaste of the attainment of the goal. This is even true of the most primitive satisfactions of man. The satisfaction of hunger is not the simple appeasement of an organic craving, but a realization in imagination of the pleasures of dining, which may accompany the whole process of eating. Anticipation thus provides an ideal component in all satisfaction. — The appeasement of impulse in action is the focus, as it were, of the satisfaction; but around it lies like a penumbra the anticipation of appeasement. Sometimes one, sometimes another of these factors in satisfaction predominates.¹

¹ DeWitt Henry Parker: *Human Values* (1931), p. 24.

In Chapter IX, "Motivation: Want Appeal," it was made plain that negative motives like fear, anger, jealousy, hate, are emotions that have been developed in the competitive struggle as a result of interference with our quest of satisfying human wants. Pleasant emotions, on the other hand, are always the result of wants satisfied or desires fulfilled. *An emotion is therefore always symptomatic of a human want in the process of being either satisfied or frustrated.*

Emotional appeal is always want appeal. It is plain from what has been said that emotional appeal in speaking has to do in some way with the satisfaction of human wants and desires. Every emotion that we can experience is grounded in desire of some sort. When Franklin D. Roosevelt, in his speech of acceptance of the Democratic nomination for the Presidency in 1932, appealed to the fear of radicalism, he knew that, with a large group of Americans, the spread of radicalism means threatened interference with the desire for free opportunity to carve out careers for themselves through unhampered indulgence of the profit-making motive. The appeal to ethical sentiments — rather frequent in persuasive speaking — is based on the desire of all normal persons to see fair dealing and justice prevail. The fact is that we are made to feel uncomfortable when human misery and suffering are brought imaginatively to our attention, and we find satisfaction in a course of conduct which will allay the suffering of others. So also with every other form of emotional appeal, whether the emotion sought to be aroused is pleasant or unpleasant; its basis is always some form of desire, in the process either of fulfillment or of defeat.

The Value of Emotional Appeal. Why, then, do we aim to arouse people's feelings and emotions on subjects that we discuss? The answer is plainly that *our feelings and emotions are symptomatic of human wants and are the mainsprings of action.* "The chief motives of human actions lie in the feelings and emotions," says an eminent psychologist. "There is no light in souls in which there is no warmth" is a French aphorism.

Walter Dill Scott affirms: "An understanding of the emotions is of primal importance to every public speaker, for his success or failure depends more on his ability to stir the emotions than upon his ability to instruct the intellect or move the will."¹

"No movement gets far on a purely intellectual basis," says John Dewey.² "It has to be emotionalized; it must appeal to the social imagination. Man is so constituted that every great movement in history has owed its force to the stirring of emotions." This is equivalent to saying that all great movements must be linked up with fundamental human wants. A man's eloquence is measured largely by his ability to stir the emotions. He who cannot touch the heart will never be a successful speaker.

The manner in which we give beliefs a richer meaning and so make them more potent for a better-ordered behavior is by linking them up with human wants or by charging them with feeling, just as a wire is charged with a current of electricity. The difference between a dynamic belief and a dormant one is the difference between a live wire and a dead one. We do the things we feel deeply about and leave undone the things that we do not feel or care about. All stimulation of the feelings, all emotional appeal, must be interpreted to have value only insofar as it revives dormant beliefs, strengthens and vivifies weak and wavering ones, and renders strong ones still more potent and dynamic. It is not enough that a eulogy of George Washington, for example, shall make us feel deeply in regard to that gentleman. It must hold up for our emulation definite personality traits, inspire us by definite acts of heroism or statesmanship, and so give a richer and more dynamic meaning to certain definite beliefs that we hold concerning the Great Virginian.

Our feelings or desires are the basis of human values. Many persons seem to think that there is something tricky and ignoble in an emotional appeal. If that is really so, we had better

¹ *Psychology of Public Speaking* (1925), p. 50.

² *New Republic*, April 8, 1931, p. 203.

keep a watchful eye on our poets, for their appeal is primarily to the feelings and emotions. It is not the function of a poet to give facts or impart scientific information impartially. Great poetry, like great oratory, is pictorial and, by means of presenting vivid imagery of power and beauty to the senses, stirs in us appropriate feelings and emotions, inspiring us to love what is beautiful and righteous, and to hate what is ugly and base.

It is our feelings and emotions that make life interesting and determine all its values. The goal of all living is to get as many pleasurable feelings and emotions as possible, and to avoid the unpleasant ones. (This may include the next world.) Our reason serves to evaluate human behavior and to help us to choose. The best our intellect can do is to guide us into pleasurable feelings and away from disagreeable ones. But always the choice is made on the basis of desire, of wants.

Our judgments concerning the worth of things, big or little, depend on the *feelings* [which] the things arouse in us. Where we judge a thing to be precious in consequence of the idea we frame of *it*, this is only because the idea is itself associated with a feeling. If we were radically feelingless, and if ideas were the only thing our mind could entertain, we should lose all our likes and dislikes at a stroke, and be unable to point to any one situation or experience in life more valuable or significant than any other.¹

We even speak of *intellectual emotions*; for example, satisfactions derived from great accomplishments in literature, art, invention, administration — further proof that all our experiences, even intellectual, have a feeling or emotional tone. Our feelings and emotions are the colors in life's picture. Without them, life would be drab indeed.

Understanding is not enough. We often hear that what is needed to inculcate the right behavior is understanding and a knowledge of the facts. That is important. It was a part of the

¹ William James: *Talks to Teachers* (1915), p. 229.

Socratic gospel that truly virtuous conduct rests on understanding. But is understanding enough? Remember that impressive speeches deal with propositions that are not disputed. Our *reason* tells us that such propositions are true or valid. Should a citizen in a republic vote? Our reason says yes. Do we therefore always vote? Should we behave in a selfish way toward our associates? Our reason says no. Do we therefore always behave or act unselfishly? Our reason tells us we should take outdoor exercises regularly, eat slowly, select our food on the basis of its nourishing quality, and do or not do a thousand other things. Do we follow reason in these matters? No. The spirit may be willing, but the flesh is weak. We do not live up to our aspirations. It is precisely with this problem of making our action patterns conform to our beliefs and ideals that a quarter of a million pulpits are occupied every Sunday morning.

Appeal to interests or motives is necessary. If, then, reason is powerless to motivate human beings in regard to the most vital truths of life, or plays at best a minor rôle, is it not poor psychology to depend too much on it in influencing audiences? Must not the speaker of necessity appeal to such mental processes as in reality impel men to action? If it is a fact that we are governed largely by our wishes, wants, desires, prejudices, customs, habits, feelings, emotions, then obviously the speaker must address himself to these. He must bring his message, or the course of action which he advocates, into line with the listeners' wants, wishes, desires, customs, habits, because, in general, we do not like to adopt the new unless it is made to look much like the old and familiar. "I have only one lamp by which my feet are guided," said Patrick Henry, "and that is the lamp of experience." It is only in our experiences that we meet on common ground.

Steps in Preparing an Impressive Speech. Having said this much in justification of our methods, we are now prepared to take up the more important steps in the preparation of speeches of this type.

1. *Analyze your audience for motives.* This holds good for all persuasive speeches, impressive and argumentative as well. It is not always easy to see and appreciate what motives may be appealed to in any particular audience. It is well to look for two kinds of motives: those that are common to all people, and those that are peculiar to the audience in question. Professional men and laborers have many interests in common, but each class as well has certain interests peculiar to the group. As a rule, there are many more of the first order than of the second, depending somewhat on the subject. If you are talking about a citizen's obligation to take an active interest in public affairs, the motives you will appeal to are largely those common to all people, for we all have much the same stake in government. The motives that could be appealed to have an extremely wide range. Suppose you are addressing an audience of college students on this subject. Consider the possibilities of appeal to the following motives:

- a. *Self-preservation: Playing Safe.* Does not safety lie in the direction of an intelligent interest in public questions? Consider what the World War did to us, and will continue to do to us for the next half-century or so. Is it probable that we can prevent wars until we develop an intelligent and socially-minded citizenship in the leading nations of the world?
- b. *Property.* We have an interest in avoiding corruption in government — that running sore of democracy — whether local, national, or international. Corruption and misgovernment may be costly. The estimated cost of the World War was 350 billion dollars. We pay a costly toll annually for bad government.
- c. *Reputation.* We wish to be known as good citizens, as persons with enough intelligence to do our part in getting good government. Any other attitude is cynical.
- d. *Affections.* The interests of family and friends are involved in an efficient and stable government. The ramifications of bad government are endless. Consider the effects of the Russian Revolution on the middle classes in Russia.
- e. *Moral Sentiments.* Intelligence and education are trusts with

which to serve society. The scholar who does not recognize such obligations is recreant to his trust. (See "The Scholar in a Republic," by Wendell Phillips.)

- f. *Æsthetic Tastes.* What is the relation of an efficient government to the development and enjoyment of the highest culture and art — great music, drama, oratory, painting? There may be a very definite one. What would a revolution do to art? Revolutions come from lack of intelligent interest in government.

This is merely suggestive. It is intended to serve primarily to stress the importance of centering attention on the audience and motives. In preparing a speech, always keep one eye on the audience. Try to discover their interests in your question, not in a vague and nebulous way, but in a specific and concrete way. Your subject must touch your audience at some point vitally, or else it is not a good subject for that particular audience.

As an example of what may happen under a government that suppresses public discussion and in which the electorate has no voice, consider the following contrast drawn between democracy in America and despotism in Russia under the Czarist régime.¹

I know what reform needs, and all it needs, in a land where discussion is free, the press untrammelled, and where public halls protect debate. There, as Emerson says, "What the tender and poetic youth dreams today, and conjures up with inarticulate speech, is tomorrow the vociferated result of public opinion, and the day after is the charter of nations." Lieber said, in 1870, "Bismarck proclaims today in the Diet the very principles for which we were hunted and exiled fifty years ago." Submit to risk your daily bread, expect social ostracism, count on a mob now and then, "be in earnest, don't equivocate, don't excuse, don't retreat a single inch," and you will finally be heard.

In such a land he is doubly and trebly guilty who, except in some most extreme case, disturbs the sober rule of law and order.

But such is not Russia. In Russia there is no press, no debate, no

¹ Wendell Phillips: "The Scholar in a Republic."

explanation of what government does, no remonstrance allowed, no agitation of public issues. Dead silence, like that which reigns at the summit of Mont Blanc, freezes the whole empire, long ago described as "a despotism tempered by assassination." Meanwhile, such despotism has unsettled the brains of the ruling family, as unbridled power doubtless made some of the twelve Cæsars insane, — a madman sporting with the lives and comfort of a hundred millions of men. The young girl whispers in her mother's ear, under a ceiled roof, her pity for a brother knouted and dragged half dead into exile for his opinions. The next week she is stripped naked and flogged to death in the public square. No inquiry, no explanation, no trial, no protest; one dead uniform silence, — the law of the tyrant. Where is there ground for any hope of peaceful change? Where the fulcrum upon which you can plant any possible lever?

This is a powerful emotional (want) appeal intended to rouse sympathy for the Russians struggling for liberty. Of the scholar's place in a democracy, Wendell Phillips says elsewhere in the same speech:

Let us inaugurate a new departure, recognize that we are afloat on the current of Niagara, eternal vigilance the condition of our safety, that we are irrevocably pledged to the world not to go back to bolts and bars, — could not if we would, and would not if we could. Never again be ours the fastidious scholarship that shrinks from rude contact with the masses. Very pleasant it is to sit high up in the world's theatre and criticize the ungraceful struggles of the gladiators, shrug one's shoulders at the actors' harsh cries, and let every one know that but for "this villainous saltpetre you would yourself have been a soldier." But Bacon says, "In the theatre of man's life, God and his angels only should be lookers-on." "Sin is not taken out of man as Eve was out of Adam, by putting him to sleep." "Very beautiful," says Richter, "is the eagle when he floats with outstretched wings aloft in the clear blue; but sublime when he plunges down through the tempest to his eyry on the cliff, where his unfledged young ones dwell and are starving." Accept proudly the analysis of Fisher Ames: "A monarchy is a man-of-war, stanch, iron-ribbed, and resistless when under full sail; yet a single hidden rock sends her to the bottom. Our

republic is a raft hard to steer, and your feet always wet; but nothing can sink her." If the Alps, piled in cold and silence, be the emblem of despotism, we joyfully take the ever-restless ocean for ours, — only pure because never still.

2. *Formulate the purpose and main divisions of your speech to permit of the greatest want appeal.* This can be done only after a careful survey of the question, and a careful analysis of your audience for their interest in it. Too often important propositions in a speech are selected and formulated without any reference to audience interest. That tends to make an aimless and a dull speech, one that does not grip your hearers. You begin to grip your audience only when you begin to show them that their interests are involved.

Suppose we use as an example the subject of taking an interest in public affairs. The plan of such a speech might be somewhat as follows:

MAIN IDEA I. The privilege of citizenship in a democracy was acquired only after a long and bitter struggle.

MAIN IDEA II. Good government, with all its advantages, can be had only by an interested citizenship.

MAIN IDEA III. You can discharge your obligation as scholars only by taking an active interest in public affairs.

This plan is only a suggestion, and perhaps you can find a better one. You will find, however, that the main ideas of the speech are vital propositions and lend themselves to want appeal. If you will read Phillips' "The Scholar in a Republic," you will readily discover what powerful appeals may be made to some of the motives suggested, and how much persuasive dynamite there is in this question. Phillips takes a broad view of the subject, maintaining with matchless eloquence that educated men must not only vote, but assume a leadership in the agitation and discussion of public questions.

Specific Methods of Emotional or Want Appeal. Let us now consider specific methods of emotional appeal, remembering

that an emotional appeal is always an appeal to motives. There are at least two ways of appealing to the feelings.

1. *Give such facts and incidents as have a direct bearing upon the feelings to be aroused.* Hear what a veteran in the field, Henry Ward Beecher, has to say on this subject:

You can never make people *feel* by scolding them because they do not feel. You can never move anybody by saying "Feel." Feeling is just as much a product of cause as anything else in the world. I could sit down before the piano and say, "A, come forth"; and it won't. But if I put my finger on the key it will, and that is the only way to make it. The human soul is like a harp; one has but to put his hand to a chord and it will vibrate to his touch, accordingly as he knows how. It is the knowing how that you are to acquire. It is the very business that you are going out into the world for; it is to understand human nature so that you can touch the chords of feeling.

In general, feeling results from the presentation of some fact or truth that has a relation to the particular feeling you wish to produce. If I wanted to make you weep, I would not tell you an amusing story; I would if I wanted to make you laugh and that story had a relation to laughing. If I wished to make you weep, I would tell you some pathetic incident, the truth embodied in which had some sympathetic relation to feeling.¹

If you wish to rouse your hearers to righteous indignation, you must present such facts as will produce that emotion; if to admiration, then such facts as will awaken that feeling; if to loathing, the appropriate ideas must be presented; and so on through the whole gamut of the emotions. The ideas introduced must have the proper emotional association.

Suppose we have occasion to make an appeal for a Red Cross drive during a period of depression. We can say: "People are in need. They need clothes to wear and food to eat. It is your duty to contribute out of your means and help." This line of talk has a certain effect and would doubtless get some response. The appeal to duty has considerable weight with many persons,

¹ *Yale Lectures on Preaching.* Pilgrim Press: Second Series, p. 95.

but still it seldom puts much currency on the plate or signatures on large pledges.

Suppose now we give a concrete example of what happens to many families during panics or hard times, and relate the following incident.

A school nurse in a graded school in a large city noticed one morning that one of the girl pupils looked pale and wan. She questioned her.

“Are you sick?”

“No,” replied the little girl.

“Do you feel hungry?”

“Yes.”

“Didn’t you have breakfast this morning?”

“No. It was not my turn.”

The value of an incident like this is that it is highly suggestive. Psychologically speaking, it sets off a feeling pattern with which we are all familiar; namely, that of hunger. We may not have been placed in the same position economically as this schoolgirl, but most people know from experience something about the pangs of hunger and can imagine themselves in the predicament of this girl. We read into an example like this not only the condition of this one family, but that of many others similarly placed. The incident gives us a point of contact with reality.

We should not overlook the fact that a speaker deals with reality. When he advocates a course of action which seeks to remove certain conditions inimical to social welfare, such as child labor, distress in economic crises, intolerance, excessive drinking, his aim is unmistakably to bring such conditions clearly and imaginatively to the minds of his listeners, to make them see things as they actually are in terms of human experiences. *We are moved to emotion only by images that can be brought vividly to our senses.* And we are likely to act on such matters as we feel deeply about.

To make people appreciate a situation, the ideal way is to have them see it, and so present to their senses the concrete

elements. If all people could actually see before their eyes all the things that happen during a modern battle, or if they could have vivid pictures of them brought to their senses, probably no war would last thirty days. If all the automobile accidents that happen in a year, with their accompanying sufferings, could be flashed before our eyes, we would drive more carefully. The difficulty is with the limitations of our imagination. Juries are sometimes taken to the place where the cause of action arose, so that they can see with their own eyes just how things happened, and be the more properly impressed. But this is not practicable for an audience. So we have to resort to presenting to the imagination as vividly as possible such pictures as are most representative of the situation we wish to portray, and most suggestive. This requires careful selection of facts and incidents. The trouble with broad generalities is that they are only nebulous adumbrations of reality. They are too much up in the clouds. They do not get down to earth, and into concrete human experiences. Observe how powerful would be the motivation in the imaginative appeals suggested, which in both instances cited would be highly emotional. Some of the strongest impelling motives of action would be involved: self-preservation or playing safe; affections, danger to one's family and friends; moral sentiments, the injustice of endangering the lives of others.

The difference between a good lawyer and a poor one, or a good life-insurance salesman and a poor one, is not so much in their relative ability to sift testimony, analyze evidence, or indulge in long and learned reasoning processes, important as that may be, as it is in their ability to draw pictures and make tactful, imaginative appeals to the feelings at the right moment. One of the most striking bits of persuasion for the value of life insurance I ever saw was a letter written by a father to his daughter — a piece of literary art, by the way — to be opened only upon the death of the father. The letter contained a touching message to the daughter and enclosed was a \$10,000

life-insurance policy! The letter moved one almost to tears and made one feel that if one wanted to do something handsome for one's children, that was the way to do it. Great criminal lawyers are known not so much for their ability to analyze evidence as for their ability to make jurors suggestible and move them to tears by appropriate emotional appeals.

The following from Webster's "Reply to Hayne" is an illustration in point, and a very good one. In defending the course of Massachusetts and New England, Webster did not deem it necessary to introduce any evidence on the subject. He was aware that his audience knew well the proud part that Massachusetts had played in shaping national policies, and he understood what keys to strike to touch the chords of sympathy and admiration in his hearers.

Mr. President, I shall enter on no encomium upon Massachusetts. She needs none. There she is. Behold her and judge for yourselves. There is her history; the world knows it by heart. The past at least is secure. There is Boston, and Concord, and Lexington, and Bunker Hill; and there they will remain forever. The bones of her sons falling in the great struggle for independence, now lie mingled with the soil of every state from New England to Georgia; and there they will lie forever. And, sir, where American liberty raised its first voice, and where its youth was nurtured and sustained, there it still lives in the strength of its manhood and full of its original spirit. If discord and disunion shall wound it; if party strife and blind ambition shall hawk at and tear it; if folly and madness, if uneasiness under salutary and necessary restraint, shall succeed to separate it from that Union by which alone its existence is made sure; it will stand, in the end, by the side of that cradle in which its infancy was rocked; it will stretch forth its arm with whatever of vigor it may still retain, over the friends who gather round it; and it will fall at last, if fall it must, amidst the proudest monuments of its own glory, and on the very spot of its origin.

Here again is a good example of strong motivation in an emotional appeal. The appeal is not only to New England pride

for the large and honorable part played by Massachusetts in early American history, but also to patriotism and the safety of the Union, which Webster held up as the fountain head of liberty and prosperity.

2. *Feeling may be aroused with reference to one idea by likening it to another idea that has the right emotional association.* This is the method of suggestion, which involves a transference of feeling from one thought pattern to another. It is a striking fact that one idea, emotionally colorless, may become suffused with feeling by merely likening it to another idea about which we are accustomed to think with a certain emotion. Suppose, for instance, an instructor wishes to make his students feel that aspirants for honors in debate and oratory owe it to themselves as well as to their Alma Mater to make the most careful preparation, through class instruction, practice in literary societies, and reading of good oratorical literature. A mere statement of the proposition makes no impression. He may, however, liken the art of speaking to the art of music, and dwell upon the long-continued and painstaking drill which a musical student must undergo before he masters his art. He may suggest that just as the student in music who is not willing to give the proper amount of time and effort to his art never rises above the ragtime variety, so the student in speaking who is too lazy or indolent to give his subject his best efforts never gets beyond the ragtime variety of speaking.

In the agitation against child labor, the following stanzas have been given wide circulation:

No fledgling feeds the father bird!

No chicken feeds the hen!

No kitten mouses for the cat —

This glory is for men.

We are the wisest, strongest race —

Loud may our praise be sung!

The only animal alive

That lives upon its young.

There is no argument in this, and no one pretends there is, in the sense of evidential support. But there is an impressive comparison, or rather contrast, made between the customs of the lower animals and man, much to the disadvantage of man. We may not be moved by the idea that children labor in factories, but we are deeply moved by the idea that such labor is, in effect, adults feeding on the substance of these wretched children. In this way the idea of child labor is invested with a feeling of horror; in other words, the idea of child labor, which may not have any emotional coloring to begin with, becomes suffused with feeling when likened to the idea of adults feeding on the substance of their children. The comparison is from the unfelt to the felt. The appeal is to the moral sentiments. The feeling aroused is one of strong repulsion which may become a powerful motive.

In this respect, ideas are like metals. A metal heated to high temperature will, when brought in contact with another of lower temperature, transfer heat to the latter. So an idea highly colored with emotion will, when associated with another idea that is emotionally cold or colorless, give to the latter its feeling tone. This is what William James called the *sympathetic induction of feeling*.

A comparison must be accepted to be effective. In order to get results in this way, the audience must accept the comparison as valid. If there is doubt in their minds about the fairness of the comparison, or about the truth of the idea presented, you will get no results. If there is doubt in the minds of your listeners, for instance, that child labor is an evil, and if they are inclined to look upon it as a good, or at least as a necessary evil, then no amount of invidious comparisons will have any effect. That is why illustrations of this kind are effective in impressive speeches, where we usually deal with propositions not disputed. In argumentative speeches, dealing with disputed propositions, acceptance must sometimes first be won by evidence and authorities. When that is done, emotional appeal is frequently

in order. This applies not only to the speech as a whole, but also to subordinate propositions.

Examples of emotional appeal through comparisons are innumerable, and abound in almost all speeches of this type that possess merit.

At the International Convention of Methodist Episcopal Churches held in Minneapolis in the summer of 1912, the question of the retirement of bishops came up for consideration. After a bitter debate lasting several days, the convention finally voted to retire three or four bishops. One of these, facing the men who had voted to retire him, uttered these memorable words:

It is better to have your head off and rolling in the basket than to live for ten days and look upward at the keen edge of the guillotine, as I have done. I urge you to adopt some system like that suggested by the Dean of the Yale Law School for the automatic retirement of bishops. It would save you from the possibility of political temptation and us that of anguish and humility. You have done what you thought was your duty and I am submissive to your will. You have discovered that I am not effective. I have not discovered it, but your judgment is better than mine, and this is not to be the finish. I shall still be permitted to show you how far the Gulf Stream of my youth can extend into the Arctic Ocean of old age.

The quotation is given at some length to show the spirit of it, as well as the dignity and self-control with which it was given. It is, however, the illustration at the beginning that claims attention. That simple comparison brings out more vividly and forcefully the feelings of the speaker than would several pages of discussion. We may not have seen a guillotine, but we have read about it. The French Revolution established it as one of the most gruesome forms of execution; so that while our knowledge of it is an indirect experience, it is an extremely vivid one. Noticeable also is the strikingly effective and beautiful comparison (metaphor) in the last sentence.

Observe the effect of the following from a prize-winning student oration on "Modern Feudalism":

Ancient feudalism has long been a synonym for oppression. It made of men masters and slaves. It robbed the masses of their rights, while it concentrated power and wealth in the hands of the few. It was founded upon barbarism and tyranny, and enforced at the point of the sword.

That feudalism, however, is dead. The quarrelsome barons, under whose despotism Europe once trembled, now live only in song and story. Their frowning castles, which once rang with shouts of revelry and merriment, and which were long the strongholds of feudal aristocracy and power, now lie in crumbling ruins. But out of the ruins of ancient feudalism, modern feudalism arose. The spirit which had built castles and conquered continents, now impelled men to amass fortunes and master the world's commerce. Discarding the rusty sword for a bag of gold, this new form of feudalism sought on the American shores a new home. Its old barons became the modern money magnates, the captains of finance, who immediately took possession of all our industries. One of these sunk a shaft into the plain, and the earth poured forth its wealth in bubbling streams of petroleum. Another, an ingenious Scotchman, building a furnace on the mountain side, laid the foundation for the modern iron works. Some dug into the bowels of the mountains and drew forth untold riches of useful and precious metals. Others, entering the field of invention, built telegraphs and organized gigantic systems of railroads, and today the wealth of these is over one-seventh of the total wealth of the Union.¹

•The force of the comparison lies in the fact that feudalism stands for tyranny and oppression on the one hand, and serfdom on the other. The speaker aims to arouse in his hearers the same feeling or attitude toward what he calls American industrial feudalism that people ordinarily have toward historical feudalism. In the language of suggestion, there is a transference of feeling from one thought pattern to the other. It is

¹ Sigurd Peterson, University of Minnesota, Second Prize, Northern Oratorical League, 1909.

worth noting that the speaker uses this illustration in the introduction to link up his subject at once with a fundamental human want (desire for economic freedom) and the corresponding emotion that results from a frustration of that want or desire. The excerpt also is an interesting study in style. Note the words with strong emotional connotation — *quarrelsome, despotism, crumbled, frowning, crumbling ruins*. The passage has rhythmic charm and power.

Forms of Support for Impressive Speeches. All forms of support may be used in the impressive speech, but certain ones will predominate. The best way to find out which ones are important is to examine a few models. The aim must always be to find materials with the right feeling content.

1. *Facts and Figures.* These are not impressive, as a rule, unless they are put in such form as to appeal to the imagination. To say that the World War cost twenty million lives does not make much of an impression; but if in imagination you march the ghosts of the dead in solemn procession before a reviewing stand and suggest how long it would take for the ghostly column to pass a given point, so many deep, the picture may be impressive. Observe that it is the *picture* you draw — the appeal to the eye — that gives the presentation of the facts an emotional content.

The following is impressive as an effort to suggest that eternity is a long time.

Suppose that every flake of snow that ever fell was a figure nine, and that the first flake was multiplied by the second, and that product by the third, and so on to the last flake. And then suppose that this total should be multiplied by every drop of rain that ever fell, calling each drop a figure nine; and that total by each blade of grass that ever helped to weave a carpet for the earth, calling each blade a figure nine; and that again by every grain of sand on every shore, so that the grand total would make a line of figures so long that it would require millions upon millions of years for light, traveling at the rate of one hundred and eighty-five thousand miles per second, to reach the end. And

suppose, further, that each unit in this almost infinite total stood for billions of ages — still that vast and almost endless time, measured by all the years beyond, is as one flake, one drop, one leaf, one blade, one grain, compared with all the flakes, and drops, and leaves, and blades, and grains.

2. *The General Example.* The general example is a very effective form of support for impressive speeches. By means of it we may present not specific but general images to the senses, and so stir the emotions. The following from Ingersoll, which is regarded one of the most eloquent extracts in the English language, is built up exclusively with the general example. Observe how familiar emotion patterns are touched off and with what consummate skill the images are selected for emotional effect. While most of the images are visual, there are a number of effective auditory images.

The past rises before me like a dream. Again we are in the great struggle for national life. We hear the sounds of preparation — the music of boisterous drums — the silver voices of heroic bugles. We see thousands of assemblages, and hear the appeals of orators. We see the pale cheeks of women, and the flushed faces of men; and in those assemblages we see all the dead whose dust we have covered with flowers. We lose sight of them no more. We are with them when they enlist in the great army of freedom. We see them part with those they love. Some are walking for the last time in quiet, woody places, with the maidens they adore. We hear the whisperings and the sweet vows of eternal love as they lingeringly part forever. Others are bending over cradles, kissing babes that are asleep. Some are receiving the blessings of old men. Some are parting with mothers who hold them and press them to their hearts again and again, and say nothing. Kisses and tears, tears and kisses — divine mingling of agony and love! And some are talking with wives, and endeavoring with brave words, spoken in the old tones, to drive from their hearts the awful fear. We see them part. We see the wife standing in the door with the babe in her arms — standing in the sunlight sobbing. At the turn of the road a hand waves — she answers by holding high in her loving arms the child. He is gone, and forever.

Refer to the speech of Jane Addams at the end of Chapter XVII, "The Occasional Address" (page 302), and observe the effect she gets with the general example. The whole speech is built up with this form of support almost exclusively.

In her lecture, "The Battle of Life," Mary Livermore uses general examples to make impressive some maladjustments in modern society.

It [Christianity] is yet to conquer the realm of trade and commerce, and to readjust all the relations of man with man, on the basis of human brotherhood. It will not then be possible for a million or more of men, with hungry wives and children, to beg for work, which will be refused them by millionaire employers, living in luxury. We shall not read of women and children starving and freezing in the midst of our nation's abundance, nor of daily suicides in our great cities, because of homelessness, lack of friends, inability to obtain work, and utter despair of any change for the better. Our papers will not drop as now with the foul accounts of business frauds and betrayal of trusts, with reports of defalcations and embezzlements, and the dishonesty of trusted officials. Armenians will not be hunted like "partridges on the mountains," and tortured and slaughtered by Moslem hate, while all the civilized world stands idly looking on. (*Applause.*) It will then be possible for an inferior race to live comfortably amid dominant Anglo-Saxon people, with no danger of being enslaved or destroyed by them.¹

3. *The Specific Example.* Always it is the specific and concrete that arouses the feelings and brings vividly home to us the worth of ideas and their vital interest to us. Abstract ideas and broad general statements are almost devoid of emotional coloring. So are reasoning processes. To say that the United States lost a million men in the Civil War does not arouse any strong feelings. To recount the sufferings of a single individual soldier in Libby Prison might move us to tears.

The facts in the following are grim enough, and still they are too general to make any strong emotional impression.

¹ *Modern Eloquence* (First Edition, 1900), Vol. V.

PARIS, *August 28*. An officer who returned here wounded after participating in the battle of Charleroi, declares that in the three days there the Germans lost 60,000 in killed and wounded. . . . At many places, he says, the piles of dead were so high that they had to be moved to permit the guns to retain the range.

— MINNEAPOLIS JOURNAL

In contrast with this, consider the emotional effect of the following:

Sir, I have read in some account of your Battle of Monterey, of a lovely Mexican girl, who, with the benevolence of an angel in her bosom and the robust courage of a hero in her heart, was busily engaged during the bloody conflict, amid the crash of falling houses, the groans of the dying, and the wild shriek of battle, in carrying water to slake the burning thirst of the wounded of either host. While bending over a wounded American soldier, a cannonball struck her and blew her to atoms! Sir, I do not charge my brave, generous-hearted countrymen who fought that fight with this. No, No! We who send them — we who know that scenes like this, which might send tears of sorrow “down Pluto’s iron cheek,” are the invariable, inevitable attendants on war — we are accountable for this. And this — this is the way we are to be made known to Europe. This — this is to be the undying renown of free, republican America! “She has stormed a city — killed many of its inhabitants of both sexes — she has room!” So it will read. Sir, if this were our only history, then may God of His mercy grant that its volume may speedily come to a close.¹

A good example of the value of the concrete in arousing feelings and setting up action tendencies is *Uncle Tom’s Cabin*, in which Harriet Beecher Stowe (sister of Henry Ward Beecher) gave such a vivid picture of slavery days. This may be regarded as a concrete example on a grand scale. Opinions will differ as to which exerted the greatest influence in moulding antislavery sentiment: Garrison with his *Liberator*, Phillips with his eloquence, or Mrs. Stowe with *Uncle Tom’s Cabin*. We need not decide the issue. We know that *Uncle Tom’s Cabin* exerted

¹ Thomas Corwin: *Against War with Mexico*.

an overwhelming influence in rousing slumbering consciences against negro slavery in the United States. We know that, from the time of its appearance, antislavery sentiment rolled a giant wave over the North. There was no argument, no reasoning, no statistics; simply a picture. The picture showed both the brighter and the darker side of slavery. The darker side proved too ugly for Northern sensibility.

John B. Gough, one of the most popular of lyceum speakers, when the American lyceum was in its heyday, got his greatest effects with dramatic illustrations, mostly in the form of concrete examples and analogies. Gough was a great mimic and actor, and acted out some of his more lengthy illustrations in dramatic form. He was not a man of literary attainments. The two sources of his power were his acting and his use of concrete incidents borrowed largely from his own experiences, and charged with deep emotion. Billy Sunday uses much the same method.

4. *Testimony.* Testimony, especially of authorities and experts, is not as a rule impressive. It belongs primarily to the argumentative speech. There are times, however, when it is given in such form as to appeal to the feelings. The following from Franklin D. Roosevelt's speech nominating Alfred E. Smith for the Presidency in 1924 is in point: "It was the illustrious Woodrow Wilson, my revered chief and yours, who said, 'The great voice of America does not come from the University. It comes in a murmur from the hills and the woods, from the farms, the factories and the mills, — rolling on and gaining volume until it comes to us from the homes of the common people.'" ¹

5. *The Literary Quotation.* Often the literary quotation plays a primary part in impressive speeches. In length it may vary from a short sentence to several stanzas of poetry. A speaker may even read a whole poem with good effect, if the poem is

¹ Homer Dorr Lindgren: *Modern Speeches* (Revised Edition, 1930), p. 137.

not too long. The primary aim of a literary quotation is to add impressiveness to the thought. It must therefore have a clear and obvious bearing on the proposition to be supported. A good literary quotation, moreover, enriches style and adds adornment to a speech. It is plain that the feeling or emotion aroused by the quotation must be of the appropriate kind — one that will help make vivid and drive home to the listeners the idea to be supported.

The following paragraph from Field's lecture, "Masters of the Situation," illustrates the effect of well-selected short quotations, as well as of the anecdote.

Now, no man ever became master of the situation by accident or indolence. I believe with Shelley that the Almighty has given men and women arms long enough to reach the stars if they will only put them out. It was an admirable saying of the Duke of Wellington, "No general ever blundered into a great victory." St. Hilaire said, "I ignore the existence of a blind chance, accident, and haphazard results." "He happened to succeed" is a foolish, unmeaning phrase. No man happens to succeed. "What do you mix your paints with?" asked a visitor of Opie, the painter. "With brains, sir," was the artist's reply.

6. *Illustrations.* An impressive speech without illustrations is a good deal like a home without furnishings. It is possible to have a fairly good speech of this type without many illustrations, just as it is possible to have a fairly comfortable home without much upholstery. But as variety and richness of furnishings give distinction to a home, so variety and richness of illustrations lend distinction to the impressive speech. One has only to examine a few good models to be impressed with the wealth of illustrative materials to be found in them. One may count as many as a hundred metaphors in many of the speeches of Phillips, Ingersoll, and Beecher, a goodly number of similes, a liberal sprinkling of analogies and anecdotes, and an occasional fable and parable. These illustrations largely consti-

tute the pictorial element in the impressive speech, which is one of the chief sources of its effectiveness.

Appealing to Base Motives. Whoever understands the springs of human behavior and possesses in some measure the art of appeal wields a power that may be used for good or evil. The manner of its use falls within the field of ethics rather than that of public address. All power is subject to abuse. The aim of speech training is frankly to increase the power of the individual over his fellows. If a scoundrel wields it, he will be all the more a dangerous scoundrel for knowing something about the laws of his art. We have no course except to trust truth to its own defense, and to assume that "truth crushed to earth will rise again." We proceed on the theory that there is more good than evil in the world, and that the race gradually gravitates toward right and justice. This may be a sublimely audacious assumption, but it is one on which all progress rests. No rules or even suggestions can be given as to what is ethically proper in a given situation. We must leave to the individual the right to use his powers as he chooses, subject only to such restraints as society imposes.

In Conclusion. The impressive speech is by all odds the most common and the most popular of all forms of public address. An overwhelming majority of all sermons, all so-called lyceum lectures, all political speeches, all business speeches that aim to stimulate interest and arouse enthusiasm, all occasional addresses, are of this type. It is therefore eminently worth while for the young student to understand thoroughly the principles that govern the effectiveness of this type of speech. It deals principally with beliefs, truths, and precepts that are not disputed, but that fail to find full measure of fruition in practical living. The aim of such speeches is to interpret for us and make impressive the worth and value of these beliefs in terms of vital life interests, as means of satisfying fundamental human wants. Such speeches therefore make a strong appeal to those universal desires, wants, wishes,

and urges that motivate all normal human beings. So-called emotional appeals are always appeals to fundamental human wants and desires. While all forms of support may be useful in the impressive speech, certain forms will predominate, such as the general and the concrete example, illustrations in all forms, the literary quotation. It is the more concrete speech materials that are effective in rousing the feelings and stirring the emotions — those that present concrete images to the senses, and therefore deal in pictures. The pictorial quality is what gives effectiveness and distinction to the impressive speech. If you cannot make speeches like the great masters, do not be discouraged. Students in painting do not paint like Michelangelo and Rembrandt. Use the great models as sources of inspiration as well as guides to better speaking. Hitch your wagon to a star.

EXERCISES

1. Read carefully and report in writing on Gough's speech, "Social Responsibilities." Note especially the dramatic effect he gets with his illustrations. What forms of support does he use principally? Characterize his style. How does it compare with Beecher's? Wendell Phillips'? Ingersoll's? What do you think of Gough's method of getting his effects largely by high-powered emotional illustrations? Is it well adapted to Gough's subject and purpose? Are the effects likely to be permanent? If you have heard Billy Sunday, compare the methods of the two men. Comment on Gough's use of suggestion.
2. Prepare a ten-minute speech on some subject that lends itself to impressive treatment, and the purpose sentence of which is not disputed. Use freely the general and specific example, illustrations, the literary quotation. Use a definite outline.
3. Read "Acres of Diamonds,"¹ by Russell H. Conwell, again, and report on it as a popular lecture. This lecture has a remarkable history. Look it up. It was delivered several thousand times,

¹ See page 379 of this volume.

and yielded an income of millions of dollars. Try to discover reasons for its popularity in terms of criteria set down in this text.

READINGS

Speeches

- “Acres of Diamonds,” by Russell H. Conwell.¹
 “The Lost Arts,” by Wendell Phillips (Vol. XIII).
 “Shakespeare,” by Robert Ingersoll (Vol. XIII).
 “Wastes and Burdens of Society,” by Henry Ward Beecher
 (*Beecher*: I).
 “Last Days of the Confederacy,” by John B. Gordon (Vol. XIII).
 “The Battle of Life,” by Mary Livermore (*Mod. El.*: I, Vol. V).
 “Through the Great Forest,” by Henry M. Stanley (Vol. XIII).
 “American Wit and Humor,” by Minot J. Savage (*Mod. El.*: I,
 Vol. VI).
 “Big Blunders,” by T. DeWitt Talmage (*Mod. El.*: I, Vol. VI).
 “Social Responsibilities,” by John B. Gough (Vol. XIII).
 “Abraham Lincoln,” by Stephen S. Wise (*Lindgren*).
 “The Press and the Government,” by Irvine L. Lenroot (*Lindgren*).

References

- Arthur Edward Phillips: *Effective Speaking* (1908), Chaps. III–XVI.
 Charles Henry Woolbert: *Fundamentals of Speech* (Revised Edition,
 1927), Chaps. XV–XVI.

¹ This speech appears on page 379 of this volume.

CHAPTER XV

THE ARGUMENTATIVE SPEECH

No appeal to reason that is not also an appeal to a want can ever be effective. — HARRY ALLEN OVERSTREET

The argumentative speech is in some respects the most difficult of all speeches to prepare well, and it is safe to say that more argumentative speeches miss fire than any other kind. It is comparatively easy to make impressive the idea that Washington was a great patriot, or that Lincoln had in him much of the milk of human kindness; or to explain almost anything short of Einstein's theory of relativity and the fourth dimension. It is quite another matter to persuade a doubting Thomas that the United States should join the League of Nations, that the government should own the railroads, or that Congress should have passed the McNary-Haugen Bill.

Difficulties Involved in Argumentative Speeches. One reason an argumentative speech is often difficult to prepare is that in such a speech we have to move through more stages than in any other. We may have to do a great deal of explaining or informing before we can begin to argue; then we have to offer evidential support, sometimes voluminous and extensive; and finally we have to appeal to motives and feelings very much as we do in the impressive speech — an aspect, by the way, often very much neglected in argumentative speeches. Thus we may have in this type of speech, as it were, three speeches in one. Especially is this true of subjects that have not been much before the public, like the St. Lawrence-to-the-Gulf waterway; or that, having been before the public, are technical or involved, like the question of our entrance into the World Court or the League of Nations.

Again, many of the questions we argue about are extremely complex. That is doubtless why we differ in regard to them. For example: Is the United States justified in making such large appropriations for national defense as it does? In an effort to come to a conclusion on that question, one might have to read extensively, interview many leading men in this country and in other countries, and study congressional and parliamentary debates, with the result that probably he would be about as far from a solution as at the beginning. The best-informed men would disagree; the wisest could only guess. Again, whether or not the United States should undertake to build the St. Lawrence waterway can only be determined by the opinions of technical engineering experts after an exhaustive survey lasting perhaps several years.

In making argumentative speeches, therefore, you will find use for all you have learned about informative and impressive speeches; besides, you will have to learn a new process: namely, that of proving the truth of propositions of fact that are in dispute. When the attitude of your audience is one of lack of knowledge or indifference, as is often the case, the task is not so difficult. If your audience is in disagreement with you or openly hostile, then you have a very delicate problem on your hands, which requires tact and skill of a high order. For then what you have to get from your hearers is a mental response in the form of an admission: "You are right, and we were wrong. We now agree with you." You realize how difficult a task that may be.

It is characteristic of a good speaker or debater that he understands the difficulties in the way and does not claim for his argument more than it is really worth. One way to bore an audience is to make extravagant statements, draw conclusions recklessly, and claim infinitely more for the evidence offered than it is worth. The persuasive speaker moves humbly and cautiously, and does not ask his audience to accept propositions on evidence ludicrously insufficient.

With this preliminary survey, let us see what may be accomplished with the argumentative process in winning acceptance for ideas that we cherish and that we wish others to cherish and act upon.

Distinction between Impressive and Argumentative Speeches. Let us recall that in impressive speeches we are dealing with accepted beliefs, or propositions that are not seriously disputed; that is, the truth of them is not in question. The problem is to give such beliefs a richer and a more vital meaning; make them dynamic by charging them with feeling and emotion; show that by acting in accordance with them we shall be able to satisfy more abundantly the fundamental wants of human nature — material, spiritual, æsthetic.

In argumentative speeches we are dealing with propositions that are disputed, involving both judgments of fact and judgments of value. Their truth is in doubt or even positively denied. They are questions of opinion: different persons hold different views on them. The argumentative speech, therefore, presents a double problem. One is to establish the truth or falsity of propositions of fact; the other is to interpret the worth of propositions of policy in terms of their capacity to satisfy human wants, and thus drive them home through appeal to motives. There is always this twofold aspect of the persuasive problem in argumentative speeches. Some examples will make this plain.

Suppose our purpose is to show that college athletics interfere too much with college education. The extent of interference is a question of fact. Suppose we succeed in establishing with a reasonable degree of probability that college athletics interfere to some extent with study. The question still remains: How does this interference affect student life? To what extent is it bad? To what extent may it be good? That is a matter for interpretation in terms of vital life interests. Such interpretation would involve an appeal to motives.

Again, are we to regard chain stores as detrimental to our

best interests? That will depend on several questions, which are matters of fact. Do chain stores effect substantial economies for consumers? Do they tend to wealth concentration? Are local chain store managers likely to become permanent residents of a community? All these are questions of fact, and we have to estimate them the best we can by direct and indirect evidence. It would probably be easy to show that chain stores do offer economies to consumers, that they tend to wealth concentration, or that local managers are seldom permanent residents of a community. Most people would probably regard the first effect good, and the other two not so good. The question still remains: How good is the first, and how bad are the other two? Opinions would differ. When we come to interpret these effects in terms of the satisfaction of human wants, we are in the field of motivation.

In Argumentative Speeches We Depend on Probabilities. It is a safe statement to make that no proposition affording a good subject for an argumentative speech or a debate can be *conclusively* proved. If it could be, it would no longer be in doubt, and would not, therefore, by definition, be a subject for an argumentative speech. To what extent do chain stores effect economies for consumers? We do not know. It is extremely difficult to get at the facts. We have to depend on probabilities. Will the League of Nations succeed in preventing great wars? We do not know. Some people think they do know, but enthusiasm does not spell certainty. Would a labor party in the United States be as successful as it has been in England? We cannot be sure of it. We can only guess. Always there is an element of uncertainty; always we must act, if at all, on the strength of probabilities.

What Is Adequate Support for a Disputed Proposition? When we have established the truth of a proposition or the correctness of an opinion with a reasonable degree of probability so far as the facts involved are concerned — given it an adequate *proof* — that does not mean that we have given the proposition

adequate *support*. We have still to determine its affective meaning; that is, what it may be worth in the way of satisfying human wants. We may show plausibly, for example, that the St. Lawrence waterway is feasible from an engineering point of view, financially possible, and that Canada will join in the construction. When that is accomplished — and it may be a long and laborious process — we have still the same problem before us as in impressive speeches; namely, to drive home with impressive facts, vivid examples or hypothetical cases, illustrations, pictures, what the project or proposal is worth in terms of purposeful and pleasurable living — of satisfying fundamental human wants.

These two processes are the warp and woof of argument. They are involved in supporting the main ideas of the speech as well as the whole purpose of the speech. It may be a question as to which should come first. As a rule, it is better to connect at once with the interests of the audience in a general way, at least, before indulging in lengthy proof. When once it can be shown that the members of the audience have a vital interest in a proposition, they will listen to arguments and authorities as to its technical and practical aspects.

The Informative Process in Argumentative Speeches.

1. *Defining Terms.* There are certain preliminaries that have to be attended to in an argumentative speech. Frequently a great deal of exposition is necessary before we really know what we are arguing about. It is historically true that many of our controversies have resulted from failure to understand the meaning of words and phrases, so that while people thought they were disputing about the same proposition, they were in fact disputing about different propositions. Suppose one were to argue that we should uproot Bolshevism in America; one might have a hard time defining the term *Bolshevism*. Or suppose the proposition is that the United States should adopt unemployment insurance. There are several forms of unemployment insurance, and the term would have to be carefully

defined before an argument on the question could proceed. The word *adopt* might need some attention also.

In an intercollegiate debate several years ago the question was: That the United States should adopt a policy of shipping subsidies. That looked innocent enough, but four months of intensive study failed to reveal any clear meaning for the phrase, "policy of shipping subsidies." At the time the question was being discussed, the United States was paying out between one and two million dollars a year to certain mail and passenger lines. Was that a shipping subsidy? If so, how could any additional subsidy be called *adopting* a policy? England was paying to mail and passenger lines over eight million dollars a year. Was that a subsidy? English statesmen strenuously denied that it was. They affirmed that the government was getting value received in service. Did the question mean that the United States government should pay subsidies to ocean freight lines? There was no sentiment for aid of that kind. On the basis of these facts, how would you define a "policy of shipping subsidies"? The question really was: Should the United States give additional aid to certain mail and passenger lines?

John T. Flynn, writing in the *New Republic* for April 25, 1931, on chain stores and the independent merchant, makes the following statement: "My own impression is that almost all the folly and confusion in the whole discussion arises out of a stubborn refusal of everybody engaged in it to define the term 'independent'" — and then proceeds to clarify the discussion by defining the term "independent."

The dictionary sometimes helps to define terms, but not always. No dictionary would have thrown any light on the shipping subsidy question. In the course of discussion, words come to have a technical meaning which no dictionary can reckon with. In questions for argumentative speeches or debates, it is well to scrutinize every word, and to give such definitions as are necessary for a clear understanding of the question and no more.

An excellent example of how disputes arise and flourish through failure to define terms is given by William James. Members of a camping party, from which the author had been absent on "a solitary ramble," had got into a dispute as to whether a person chasing a squirrel around a tree *went round the squirrel or not*.

Mindful of the scholastic adage that whenever you meet a contradiction you must make a distinction, I immediately sought and found one, as follows: "Which party is right," I said, "depends on what you *practically mean* by 'going round' the squirrel. If you mean passing from the north of him to the east, then to the south, then to the west, and then to the north of him again, obviously the man does go round him, for he occupies these successive positions. But if on the contrary you mean being first in front of him, then on the right of him, then behind him, then on his left, and finally in front again, it is quite obvious that the man fails to go round him, for by compensating movements the squirrel makes, he keeps his belly turned towards the man all the time, and his back turned away. Make the distinction, and there is no occasion for any further dispute. You are both right and both wrong, according as you conceive the verb 'to go round' in one practical fashion or the other."¹

2. *Clash of Opinion*. An argumentative speech deals with controversial questions. Opinions are ranged on both sides. Some people believe one way, some another. A good speech of this type must not only have arguments for one side; it must reckon with arguments on the other side as well. Answering objections usually goes by the name of *refutation*. An argumentative speech, if it is carefully prepared, will have both constructive arguments and refutations.

A good way to get at the heart of a controversial question is to line up opinions and contentions of both sides. To do that, one must make a careful survey of the whole field. Let us take as an example a question that is a bone of contention between capital and labor: namely, that of the closed shop.

¹ *Selected Papers on Philosophy* (Everyman's Library, 1917), p. 198.

The leading arguments on both sides would run something like this:

CONFLICT OF OPINION

Affirmative Contentions

- I. Labor unions have greatly benefited the laboring classes.
 - A. They have helped to raise wages in many industries.
 - B. They have shortened hours in many industries.
 - C. They have widely improved the sanitary conditions in shops and factories.
- II. The closed shop is necessary to the effectual maintenance of trade unions, for
 - A. It is necessary to successful collective bargaining — the chief end of trade unions.
- III. The closed shop is not unfair to the employer.
 - A. It does not unduly interfere with his business.
- IV. The closed shop is not unfair to the non-union man.
 - A. It is not unreasonable to ask him to join a union.
 1. It is for the benefit of himself and his class.

Negative Contentions

- I. (Negative would probably admit this.)
- II. The closed shop is not necessary to effectual maintenance of trade unions, for
 - A. Collective bargaining is carried on successfully without it.
- III. The closed shop is unfair to the employer.
 - A. It unduly interferes with him in the management of his business.
- IV. It is unfair to the non-union man.
 - A. It forces him either to join a union or remain unemployed.
 - B. Frequently, he is even refused entrance to the unions through high fees and membership restrictions.

V. General recognition of the closed shop principle would not result in a dangerous labor monopoly.

A. The proportion of non-union labor to union labor would always be too great for such a result.

V. The closed shop would result in a dangerous labor monopoly.

While this does not represent all the clash on this question by any means, it is enough to serve as an example. You will observe that there are several head-on clashes in the conflict of opinion. When stated in the question form, these constitute the real issues in the controversy.

Every good subject for an argumentative speech lends itself to analysis of this kind, although the clash may not always be quite so pronounced. The important thing is to realize that there are two sides to the question, and to understand if possible the reasons for the opposing views. We cannot meet objections, remove doubts, or replace opinions unless we understand on what foundations those objections, doubts, or opinions rest. We have to assume that people who hold divergent opinions from our own are just as reasonable and intelligent as we are. The whole of truth is not on either side of any debatable question. It is a Lincoln tradition that he always understood the other side of a legal case so well that he could afford to make more admissions than any man in court. It is characteristic of one who has a large perspective and a broad view of a question that he is not afraid to make admissions and grant concessions to the other side. Only he knows what to admit or grant, and what not to admit or grant.

Forms of Support in Argumentative Speeches. 1. *Logical Argument.* Having selected from the clash of opinion the *contentions* to be supported or proved, the next step is to find proper supports for those contentions. A very important form

of support is logical argument, a form of support to which we wish now to give special attention.

A logical argument rests always on two things: *evidence*, which may consist of either facts or opinions or both; and *reasoning*, or inferences drawn from facts and opinions. "Evidence is the material from which we generate proof, and reasoning is the process by which we generate it."¹

We get facts from our own observation and the testimony of others as to their observation. Observation is ultimately the source of all facts. To get at facts or establish them may mean a long process of observation, experiment, and testing of hypotheses. We distinguish between testimony as to facts and testimony in the form of opinions, or expert testimony. Almost anybody may testify as to a fact; only those who are recognized as authorities can give dependable opinions.

We distinguish several kinds of logical arguments, based on the nature of the inference made; namely: (a) *generalization*; (b) argument based on *causal relationship*; and (c) *analogy*. These constitute what in law is known as circumstantial evidence, as distinguished from direct evidence; that is, testimony as to facts, and authorities. Let us look at these in turn.

a. The Generalization. A generalization is an inference from a number of observed examples of the same class to the whole number of examples included in that class. Suppose a survey of the life earnings of five thousand college graduates and of a like number of high school graduates should show that the college graduates average almost twice as much in earnings as the high school graduates. We should be justified in drawing the general conclusion that on an average college graduates earn almost twice as much as high school graduates in the course of a lifetime. There might be some exceptions, but the conclusion would be very nearly true for the whole number of these two classes of students. The inference is clearly from a

¹ James Milton O'Neill and Andrew Thomas Weaver: *The Elements of Speech* (1926), p. 232.

relatively few examples (although in fact a goodly number) to all the examples of the class, or classes in this instance. The observed examples here would not constitute one-half of one per cent of college students, and a much smaller percentage of high school students. Still the generalization would be recognized as carefully made and scientifically valid. This is a typical example of the generalization. Observe that the inference is from the known to the unknown, and that as a rule it involves some degree of uncertainty. Every inference is more or less a "leap in the dark." That is, we draw a conclusion for a whole class of objects or phenomena on the basis of only a relatively few known examples of the class.

TESTS OF ARGUMENT FROM GENERALIZATION

1. Is there a sufficiently large number of observed, as compared with unobserved, instances to warrant the conclusion?
2. Are the instances observed fair specimens of the class?
3. Are there any known exceptions?
4. Is there a reasonable probability that such a general statement is true?

In practical speech-making, we cannot always be so careful and so scientific as this example suggests. It is often very difficult to get a sufficient number of examples to establish the law of averages, or a reasonable degree of probability for the general statement advanced.

Much depends on the nature of the examples. In some cases a single instance may support a conclusion; in others, nothing short of all the examples of a class will support it. If a chemist should discover that two elements combine in a certain proportion to form a new chemical compound, that single instance would be enough to warrant the conclusion that these elements would always so combine. On the other hand, nothing short of a complete enumeration would support the generalization that all the members of a certain state legislature are over thirty years of age.

To generalize on too few examples is certainly one of the master fallacies of the human mind. We make the statement that the people of a certain race are thrifty, or honest, or acquisitive; and in support give a few examples of individuals that we have observed or heard about. We say that labor unions, when they once get control of a shop so that all labor employed is union labor, will make unreasonable and annoying regulations; and, in support of that, quote an example or two that we happen to know about. While such examples may be worth quoting, and have a certain probative value, the fact remains that they fall far short of giving adequate support to these propositions. In the first instance given, their value as proof is not worth much. A few instances out of millions, where there are involved the variations in behavior which the human species exemplifies, cannot be taken as typical for a whole race. Examples of the second class carry more weight, for the reason that there is at least a degree of probability that the ever-present conflict of interest between the employer and the union may result in more or less drastic regulations.

Exceptions do not prove a rule. There is a superstition abroad having to do with argument from generalization which frequently finds expression even by learned people; and it is that exceptions prove the rule. "These are the exceptions that prove the rule," we hear so often. A moment's reflection will convince any thinking man that exceptions never prove a rule, either singly or in numbers. If for example we say that a certain college employs for its faculty only men who have Ph.D. degrees, and some one points to an exception which he knows about — would that exception prove that all the rest of the faculty had Ph.D. degrees? Suppose, on investigation, we should find several exceptions; would they prove the rule? Would they not do just the opposite and prove that the general statement was wholly unsound? Or suppose we make the statement that coöperative enterprises in America have been failures, and some one points to several conspicuous successes,

should we be justified in saying that those exceptions prove that all the rest were failures? Assuredly not.

Exceptio probat regulam is the Latin sentence. The error is in translating the last word as "prove" instead of "probe" or "test." Exceptions *test* a rule. If there are many exceptions to a generalization, they show that, to that extent at least, the generalization is not sound.

b. Arguments Based on Causal Relationship. There are two kinds of arguments based on causal relationship: (*a*) argument from cause to effect; and (*b*) argument from effect to cause. Occasionally we have an inference from effect to effect.

Argument from Cause to Effect. We use this form of argument constantly in our discussion of social, economic, and political reforms. We propose a certain measure, or changes in an old one, and infer from the nature of our proposal or changes to be made (cause) that certain beneficial results (effect) will follow. We passed the prohibition amendment, and supposed we should do away with drinking on any large scale. The effect was disappointing. We passed certain legislation for farm relief, and supposed we should get higher prices for farm products, and again the effect was disappointing. Lincoln used this form of argument in his "Springfield Speech," showing that legislation sponsored by the Democratic leaders would tend to make slavery national. A college student spends four or more years in getting an education in the hope that such education or training (cause) will yield returns in larger earning power and happier living (effect). In the last case, the inference is reinforced by a large number of known examples in which the results have been somewhat like those described; that is, larger earning power, and supposedly a life with larger satisfactions.

Senator William E. Borah used an argument from cause to effect in his speech before the Philadelphia Academy of Music, December 17, 1924, when in substance he said that if European nations are not ready to be governed by a code of international

law (cause), then the United States is not prepared to join them in a League of Nations (effect):

Lord Cecil, lately honored for his services in the cause of peace, has been quoted as saying: "We have not reached the state in international relations at which it is desirable to attempt the codification of international law," which is in effect to say we cannot now consent to be governed by international law. Why it is not desirable we are not informed. Not desirable to be governed by law and the courts rather than secret diplomacy, intrigue, overreaching imperialism, politics and force? It would seem at least to be desirable. We have waited three thousand years. If the time has not come for Europe to acknowledge the reign of law and to be governed by it in international affairs, then it is positively certain that the time has not come for the people of this country to be governed by European politics. We will hesitate to enter a game the rules of which are not known but exist, if they exist at all, in the caprice and the ambitions of a few men.¹

Argument from Effect to Cause. Suppose that we are passing through a business depression. That is an effect of some cause or causes. We are trying to discover the causes. So complex are they that not even the greatest economic authorities can agree on them. Some think the flow of money, or the currency in some way, is a primary cause. Others think the business cycle accounts for depressions. Still others think it is primarily a matter of psychology; that if people would assume that good times are coming and buy freely, prosperity soon would perch on our banner. This is a good example of how difficult it may be to find the cause or causes of a given effect.

In the Lincoln-Douglas debates, Douglas repeatedly made the statement that he did not care whether slavery was voted up or voted down. Lincoln took him at his word, and used an effect-to-cause argument by trying to show that Douglas in this way was preparing the public mind for making slavery a national institution. In other words, the proclaiming of such a sentiment was an effect of a disposition or at least a willingness on

¹ Homer Dorr Lindgren: *Modern Speeches* (Revised Edition, 1930), p. 75.

Douglas' part to see slavery become a national institution (cause).

Chief Justice Charles E. Hughes, in his speech before the American Bar Association, September, 1925, draws conclusions from certain observed facts, based on effect-to-cause inferences.

While with a different purpose, we observe the manifestations of the same spirit in the efforts to interfere with instruction in our schools, not to promote the acquisition of knowledge, but to obstruct it. The Supreme Court of the United States has had occasion to deal with such an attempt to control teaching in private schools. Under a statute, forbidding the teaching of any other than the English language to a pupil who had not passed the eighth grade, a teacher was subjected to a criminal prosecution for teaching the German language. Even the court, with its necessarily limited judicial vision, could see what lay behind such an enactment and condemned it as an unwarranted interference with the constitutional guarantee of liberty. "Evidently," said the court, "the legislature has attempted materially to interfere with the calling of modern language teachers, with the opportunities of pupils to acquire knowledge, and with the power of parents to control the education of their own children." The statute as applied was found to be arbitrary and without reasonable relation to any end within the competency of the state. The same principle was applied in the Oregon school case where the statute under review in substance attempted to interfere with the privilege in instruction in private schools. "The child," said the Supreme Court, "is not the mere creature of the state. Those who nurture him and direct his destiny have the right coupled with the high duty to recognize and prepare him for additional obligations." Manifestly the purpose of the statute was not to aid education, but arbitrarily to interfere with the freedom of instruction.¹

TESTS OF ARGUMENT FROM CAUSAL RELATIONSHIP

In testing the strength of this argument, it is well to ask:

1. Is the cause sufficient to produce the effect?
2. Could other causes have produced or helped to produce the effect?
3. Is it possible to eliminate other causes than the one assigned?

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 176.

c. The Analogy. The analogy, as a form of support, occupies so important a place in argumentative speeches and debates that it requires special attention. We distinguish between the analogy as a form of argument and the analogy as a form of illustration.

The analogy is essentially an inference that, because two things are alike in certain known particulars, they are probably alike in certain unknown particulars. For instance, in a certain experiment with deep and shallow plowing for oats, it was found that a field plowed four inches deep yielded twenty-seven bushels an acre while another field, plowed ten inches deep, yielded seventy bushels. If a farmer were to conclude that by plowing ten inches deep for oats, he, too, could raise as much as seventy bushels an acre, he would reason by analogy. The two undertakings would be alike in certain known particulars: the soil in the two places would, perhaps, be much the same; so would be the seed, climate, rainfall, time of planting, and other factors. These are the points of known resemblance. From these we infer that the two examples would be alike in the one unknown particular — namely, the big yield. In the same way we might infer that, because in England the British Labor Party has made such rapid progress and won such signal success, a labor party organized in the United States in much the same way would be successful here. So far as it can be shown that conditions affecting the progress of such a party are alike in the two countries, just so far would our inference be valid. If, on the other hand, it can be shown that conditions in certain vital respects are essentially different — e.g., that labor receives a fairer share of the national income here than it does in Great Britain — then that would be a vital fact to reckon with and would affect the conclusion drawn. We infer by analogy that because the city manager plan has worked well in some cities, it will work well in others.

It will be seen that the argument is much like the generalization. Both are inductive arguments, based on examples. The

difference is that in the argument from generalization we usually have a considerable number of instances on which to base our inference, and we base our conclusion on the assumption that what is true of the instances or examples observed is true of the whole class of such related instances; while in the analogy there is frequently only one or, at most, only a very few examples, the inference being based on the resemblances between the instances given rather than on any general truth with reference to all such instances.

Sometimes the analogy is a comparison of relationships rather than matters of fact. In that form the analogy is more an illustration than an argument. Webster used this form of analogy in opening his "Reply to Hayne":

Mr. President, when the mariner has been tossed for many days in thick weather and on an unknown sea, he naturally avails himself of the first pause in the storm, the earliest glance of the sun, to take his latitude and ascertain how far the elements have driven him from his true course. Let us imitate this prudence, and, before we float farther on the waves of this debate, refer to the point from which we departed, that we may, at least, be able to conjecture where we now are. I ask for the reading of the resolution before the Senate.

TESTS OF THE ARGUMENT FROM ANALOGY

1. Are the two examples alike in all essential particulars; that is, particulars necessary to reach a conclusion on the point of issue?
2. Are the facts on which the analogy is based true? If we argue that a certain state should have an income tax because such a tax has been successful in another state, we should satisfy ourselves that the tax has in fact been successful where tried.

2. *Facts and Statistics.* "The orator is thereby an orator," says Emerson, "that he keeps his feet ever on a fact."

Arguments frequently rest largely on facts, and sometimes the facts are voluminous and involved. An argument either for or against chain stores must necessarily deal at length with

the economies of that method of retailing and the social effects of replacing the independent merchant. What economies are there in buying in large quantities, in eliminating middlemen, in larger volumes of retail sales, in the "cash and carry" system? On questions like these, facts speak. Such facts must come from authentic sources.

Recently, in a speech, a student undertook to show that electric rates given by private utilities in the United States compared favorably with the rates given by the publicly owned electric utilities in Ontario, Canada, when all factors in the situation were considered. He presented figures that were derived from a study of the Ontario system by an official of one of the large electric companies of America, with which he was associated. Such a source is so likely to be prejudiced and unreliable that it should be carefully scrutinized before being used. In any event, popular distrust of statistics prepared by interested parties robs the data, however sound, of much of their effectiveness as support, and a speaker will do well to avoid them.

An argument on farm relief would be in large part statistical. It would probably aim to show in graphic form the decrease in the purchasing power of the farmer. It would probably show the cost of production of different farm products in different parts of the country so as to get something approaching an average. To do that, it would be necessary to take advantage of surveys made in the field of farm production. One can readily realize how involved such figures might be. The same holds true for many questions that we argue about.

Figures require the same careful analysis and clear presentation as other ideas. One must have constant regard for the limitations of an audience in following and analyzing complicated statistics. Give no more figures than are necessary to make your point. Reduce them to their simplest terms. Comparisons and contrasts are effective here as elsewhere. Charts are

a great aid here for public presentation, but should be guardedly used in practice speaking.

3. *Testimonial Evidence.* We have already discussed testimony as a form of support in Chapter VII. In argumentative speeches the testimony of specialists or authorities is often very important. This is true especially of questions that involve broad interests and technical knowledge. The ordinary person has no opportunity to acquaint himself with all the possible angles of a big question. There is, moreover, a limit to the amount of logical argument that the average audience will listen to on any question. We have therefore to depend on the opinions of men who are authorities, who have had opportunity to study the question perhaps for many years.

Edward Steiner has been a close student of American immigrants for thirty years. His opinion on the subject of immigration is valuable. A. Eustace Haydon of the University of Chicago has made an exhaustive study of the great religions of the world; his opinions in that field have much weight. Roger Babson has spent most of his life trying to understand the neurology of American business. His opinion in that field should be worth something. And so on.

Here it is worth stressing that what is wanted is acceptance for ideas, and not quotations from authorities for their own sake. In debates especially, one frequently hears so many authorities quoted that one almost comes to believe that they are an end in themselves. They are not. They are used to support propositions. Of good authorities, those most acceptable to the audience are the ones to use. An authority should be well informed, unprejudiced, and, above all, acceptable to the audience.

4. *Restatement, Repetition.* We have occasion to use restatement and repetition in argumentative speeches more than in any other, the reason being that they are likely to be the most difficult to follow. It is literally true that in order to have the members of an audience follow an argumentative speech, we

must first tell them what we are going to do; then, as we proceed to do it, we must constantly remind them that we are now doing it; and when we have done it, we must tell them that we have concluded. What we mean more specifically is that when we begin the speech, or any main division of it, we usually point out the direction in which we are going to move, by means of questions direct and indirect. We say after stating a proposition, "Let us look at this a moment." Then, as we proceed with each main idea of the speech, we relate our speech materials to that idea, to link up purpose and thought constantly. Only by so doing can we have a coherent speech. Finally, when we have covered the ground, we take a backward glance, make a brief survey of what we have said in the form of a summary. All this requires repetition; it also requires art not to make our method too obtrusive. Usually there is too much perfunctory summarizing in an argumentative speech. There should be no more summarizing than is necessary for clear progress.

We also repeat for emphasis as well as for clearness. To repeat a significant word or statement, or the substance of an argument, is to emphasize it, to make it occupy a larger place than other ideas in the consciousness of an audience. The human mind is so constituted that its tendency is to accept ideas presented to it unless there is considerable reason for doubt. Especially is this true of the mind in its native and uncultivated state. Even with trained minds, repetition tends to remove doubt if it is not too pronounced. In Dooley's version of it, "If you tell me a thing often enough, I will believe it." There is much good psychology in this; only, like most general statements, we have to accept it with some reservation. If doubt is pronounced, no amount of repetition will remove it from a cultivated mind.

5. *Illustrations.* Illustrations have their place in argumentative speeches, although they are not likely to be used so freely here as in other types, especially in the process of establishing

the truth of propositions. They are especially useful in establishing a common ground of interest and feeling through reference to experience. Hear what Henry Ward Beecher has to say on the subject.

An illustration is a window in an argument, and lets in light. You may reason without an illustration; but where you are employing a process of pure reasoning and have arrived at a conclusion, if you can then by an illustration flash back light upon what you have said, you will bring into the minds of your audience a realization of your argument that they cannot get in any other way. I have seen an audience, time and again, follow an argument, doubtfully, laboriously, almost suspiciously, and look at one another, as much as to say, "Is he going right?" — until the place is arrived at, where the speaker says, "*It is like* —" and then they listen eagerly for what it is like; and when some apt illustration is thrown out before them, there is a sense of relief, as though they said, "Yes, he is right." If you have cheated them, so much the worse for you; but if your illustrations are as true as your argument, and your argument true as the truth itself, then you have helped them a great deal. So that, as a mere matter of help to reason, illustrations are of vast utility in speaking to an audience.¹

This comment of Beecher's is suggestive of the difficulty which the ordinary audience finds in following a logical argument. Even Beecher's audiences, who were more than ordinarily cultured, apparently were not sure of themselves until they had their views grounded in solid experience — the common meeting ground for us all. "There is an inherent difficulty," as Walter Lippmann says, "about using the method of reason to deal with an unreasoning world." Hence the value of illustrations to illumine the dark places in an argument.

When Wendell Phillips expresses an idea that he wishes to drive home, he does not beat around the bush, nor argue any more than is necessary. He immediately touches off a thought pattern that brings the idea within the experience of his hearers. The new is at once connected with the old and assimilated to it.

¹ *Yale Lectures on Preaching.* The Pilgrim Press: First Series, p. 158.

To dwell too long on the new and unfamiliar, without relating it to the old and familiar, tires the mind and puts too heavy a burden on the attention.

Appeal to Motives in Argumentative Speeches. In considering this phase of the subject, we have to remember that the argumentative speech, as a rule, deals with two kinds of propositions: namely, those based essentially on facts, and those based on matters of policy. To put it another way, and perhaps more accurately, an argumentative speech deals with beliefs based on facts, and beliefs based on desire. The same belief may be based on both fact and desire, and very often is. Let us make this clear by examples. Suppose one is arguing for support of the League of Nations, and the advisability of the United States joining it. One of the propositions he would probably discuss is this: Has the League exercised salutary influence in preventing warfare? And if so, to what extent? This is first of all a question of fact, and as such, any motivation in regard to it is beside the point. What is needed is evidence and logical inference to establish the truth in regard to it, whatever that is. Suppose, now, that there is reasonably satisfactory evidence to show that the League has been instrumental in preventing conflict. Then it becomes proper to interpret that fact for the audience in terms of wants satisfied and desires fulfilled. This is an appeal to motives. Here is a proposition, then, that requires support both in the form of logical argument and in the form of motivation. Just how much of each form of support to give would depend altogether on the nature of the occasion and the audience. If the audience were hostile to the League, it would be difficult to create in them a "desire system" in regard to joining it. In other words, motivation would be extremely difficult. Whereas with an audience favorable to the League, motivation would be easy.

Suppose we were to have a debate on the question considered above: Resolved, that the League of Nations has been instrumental in preventing conflict among nations. When so limited,

the question is one solely of fact, and affords no opportunity for any appeal to motives. It is very seldom, however, that a question is so limited for debate. Usually questions for debate or for argumentative speeches are stated as questions of policy, and afford ample opportunities for motivation. It is, then, just as important in argumentative speeches as in impressive speeches to link up your discussion with the interests of the audience. Your aim here is not only to win acceptance for beliefs, but make them potent for influencing behavior. The ultimate aim is exactly the same as in the impressive speech.

Some of the first questions, then, to ask in any argumentative speech are these: What interest does my audience have in this subject? What interest can I make them have in it? How does it touch their lives? What wants will it satisfy? What satisfactions will it give? What fears will it allay? What pleasures will it afford? Every question worth discussing must affect our lives, in the long run, more or less vitally and concretely. The problem is to discover how, and to bring the "how" vividly home to your hearers.

Refer to Chapter IX, "Motivation: Want Appeal," and then ask yourself as many questions as you can touching the interests of your audience in the subject like the following:

1. Does it affect their property interests — touch their pocketbooks?
2. Does it affect their safety, health; tend to prevent disease, accident?
3. Does it affect family life, home, children, friends?
4. Can you appeal to rivalry, pride, desire for power, personal worth, social recognition?
5. Is the reputation of the members of your audience involved? Fear of ridicule or public censure?
6. Are human rights involved? Justice, liberty?
7. How does the question affect opportunities to enjoy art, drama, and in general gratify æsthetic tastes?
8. Is patriotism involved?

These are suggestions only to open up to you opportunities along this line. Human wants and desires are varied. It is your problem to discover as many as possible and show how the belief or action you desire from your audience will satisfy these wants.

Main Contentions and Motives. Every main contention, or leading proposition, in your argumentative speech should be selected and phrased so as to permit of appeal to motives, whenever possible. For example, in a debate on the abolition of the jury, a question recently used in a college debating league, those who defended the jury system used such contentions as the following:

1. The conditions under which the jury arose are still with us.
2. The jury is made up of fairly intelligent common people who understand life.
3. Delays in trials are caused by court procedure rather than by juries.
4. Judges are more subject than juries to political influence.

These propositions are all usable, but better ones probably could have been selected. Consider the following:

1. The jury is still needed to protect common people in their property rights.
2. The jury is our greatest safeguard of Anglo-Saxon liberties.
3. The jury is less subject to sinister influences than any body of judges.

The first and second of these propositions lend themselves readily to the so-called want appeal; the third one less so perhaps, although not necessarily. It is difficult to see the importance of this until you come to develop your argument. Under the first as restated, you could deal with the historical evolution of the jury, but always to show that the jury is still needed to protect property rights. In the second, you would have an excellent opportunity to show how much the jury has meant as an instrument for preserving our liberties. In fact,

in one of the debates on this question, I heard a student present on this very subject one of the most powerful appeals I have ever heard in a debate. I was made to forget that I was listening to a debate, and to remember only that here was a question of supreme importance, and that neither life nor property would be safe if the jury were once abolished! The speaker dwelt at length on the price in blood and treasure at which our liberties have been bought, and thus impressed upon us how much was at stake. It was an unusually effective emotional appeal, with powerful motivation.

In arguing for the St. Lawrence waterway, it would be a great mistake to open with a technical argument on its feasibility. It would be tedious and tire any ordinary audience in a short time. The proper method of approach is to show what the waterway will do for the people of the Northwest. Will it give farmers seven or eight cents more per bushel for their wheat as claimed for it? If it will, that is of importance, not only to farmers, but to all who do business with them. Will it lower carrying charges on goods from Europe and the East? That is vital too. First show what the waterway will accomplish, what wants it will satisfy; and when you have done that, you will find your listeners eager to hear arguments on the technical aspects of it.

H. A. Overstreet, in his *Influencing Human Behavior*, has this to say on this subject:

“No appeal to reason that is not also an appeal to a want is ever effective.” That ought to dispose of a good deal of futile arguing. . . .

Thought (reason) is, at bottom, an instrument of action; and action, whatever it may be, springs out of what we fundamentally desire. There is, indeed, a place in life — a most important place — for pure thought — thought, that is, which has no interest in immediate action. But for the most part, thought (reason) is, for us, an instrument of exploration; it enables us to see more clearly where we are going, and how we may best go. But where do we actually wish to go? If we are sure of that, then we gladly enough busy ourselves to find ideas which point the path and clear the way.

Hence, as we have seen, the arguer must first arouse in his respondent a real want to know what is being argued about, a real wish to understand, or his argumentation is only words. The trouble with most arguers is that they are too much in a hurry to unload *themselves*. They quite forget that, preliminary to the unloading, there must be awakened in the respondent an eagerness to want.

That perhaps is the best piece of advice which can be given to would-be persuaders, whether in business, in the home, in the school, in politics, etc.: first arouse in the other person an eager want.

He who can do this has the world with him. He who cannot, walks a lonely way.

Getting on Common Ground. This is the aim of all speaking — to get on common ground with one's listeners; common ground of understanding, common ground of belief, common ground of interest and feeling. Even in entertainment speeches, the aim is unmistakably to get on common ground of pleasurable feeling. This is a point of view which a speaker should always keep in mind. It is a sort of touchstone, serving as guide for the selection and handling of materials, for all ideas and forms of support must be moulded in harmony with that aim. Logical argument is good only in so far as it helps to bring policies and beliefs into line with the views and vital interests of the listeners. It is a laborious method that taxes mental effort to the maximum, and should be used cautiously with mixed audiences, and only with a liberal sprinkling of concrete speech materials.

Here is the opinion of a platform genius after fifty years in the pulpit and on the platform:

Most men are feeble in logical power. So far from being benefited by an exact concatenated development of truth, they are in general utterly unable to follow it. At the second or third step they lose the clew. The greatest number of men, particularly uncultivated people, receive their truth by facts placed in juxtaposition rather than in philosophical sequence. Thus a line of fact or a series of parables will be better adapted to most audiences than a regular unfolding of a

train of thought from the germinal point to the fruitful end. The more select portion of an intelligent audience, on the other hand, sympathize with truth delivered in its highest philosophic forms. There is a distinct pleasure to them in the evolution of an argument. They rejoice to see a structure built up, tier upon tier, and story upon story. They glow with delight as the long chain is welded, link by link. And if the preacher himself be of this mind, and if he receive the commendations of the most thoughtful and cultured of his people, it is quite natural that he should fall wholly under the influence of this style of sermonizing; so he will feed one mouth, and starve a hundred.¹

To get on common ground of belief with your hearers, it is important that you should understand what their beliefs are. A careful analysis of their views, prejudices, and preconceived notions is necessary to get the best results. When Beecher was in England, before hostile audiences that would not let him speak, he did not argue with them about the sacred right of free speech. He knew that Englishmen prided themselves on their practice of fair play, and so he immediately struck that note. "If I do not mistake the tone and temper of Englishmen," he said in his "Liverpool Speech," "they had rather have a man who opposes them in a manly way than a sneak that agrees with them in an unmanly way."

An unusual example of the method of getting on common ground is that of Lincoln in the "Cooper Union Speech." Lincoln, in the first half of his "Cooper Union Speech," 1860, sought to show that the policy of the Republican Party with reference to slavery was in line with the policy of the framers of the government. Douglas sought to do the same thing. Why? Because both knew that their followers had almost a reverential regard for the opinions of the founding fathers. Lincoln proved with reasonable conclusiveness that he was advocating the same policy as the founders, and the result was that thousands of people flocked to his standard, saying in effect, "That policy

¹ Henry Ward Beecher: *Yale Lectures on Preaching*. The Pilgrim Press: First Series, p. 219.

suits us. We'll be right with you." Lincoln did not argue the case on its merits at that time, although he had done so in the Lincoln-Douglas debates. He simply sought to bring his principles within an approved line of policy acceptable to his constituents. He likened the unaccepted to the accepted. In this way he got on common ground with his hearers.

Consider what a labored argument might be made on the question whether our experiment in popular government is worth while. By a single illustration (analogy), Beecher not only floods the subject with light but goes a long way toward winning acceptance for his proposition.

A worse thing is sometimes a great deal better than a better thing. William has been to school for more than a year, and his teacher says to him one day: "Now, William, I am afraid your father will think that I am not doing well by you; you must write a composition — you must send your father a good composition to show what you are doing." Well, William never did write a composition, and he does not know how. "Oh, write about something that you do know about — write about your father's farm," and so being goaded to his task, William says: "A cow is a useful animal. A cow has four legs and two horns. A cow gives good milk. I love good milk. William Bradshaw." The master looks over his shoulder, and says: "Poof! your father will think *you* are a cow. Here, give me that composition, I'll fix it." So he takes it home and fixes it. Here it reads: "When the sun casts off the dusky garments of the night, and appearing o'er the orient hills, sips the dewdrops pendant from every leaf, the milkmaid goes afield chanting her matin song," and so on, and so on. Now while, rhetorically, the master's composition was unspeakably better than William's, as a part of William's education, his own poor scrawly lines are unspeakably better than the one that has been "fixed" for him. No man ever yet learned by having somebody else learn for him. A man learns arithmetic by blunder in and blunder out, but at last he gets it. A man learns to write through scrawling; a man learns to swim by going into the water; a man learns to vote by voting. Now we are attempting to make a Government; we are attempting to teach sixty millions of men how to conduct a Government by self-

control, by knowledge, by intelligence, by fair opportunity to practice. It is better that we should have sixty millions of men learning through their own mistakes how to govern themselves, than it is to have an arbitrary Government with the whole of the rest of the people ignorant.¹

When the Audience Is Hostile. While the argumentative speech has a large place in our life economy, still it is a fact that outside of deliberative assemblies the occasions are few when a speaker sets out to change other persons' views in the face of hostile opinion. As has already been suggested, an audience assembled to hear a speaker is almost invariably favorable to the speaker's views in overwhelming numbers. A Republican spellbinder, as a rule, talks to an audience predominantly Republican. A Democrat talks to an audience largely Democratic in sympathy. A Socialist talks to an audience whose views are much like his own. It is the same in business circles, religious circles, and any other circles or groups. There are exceptions, of course, especially in great crises, where there is always a violent clash of conflicting interests; but in the main the statement holds true. There is usually a fringe of non-sympathizers or, it may be, hostile hearers, but they almost always are in the small minority.

When a speaker is venturesome enough to try to win over a hostile audience, his problem is one of bridging the gulf between himself and his hearers by the use of propositions that are accepted by the audience. There is no use in trying to win assent to one unwelcome proposition by the use of another unwelcome one. The most effective process is to avoid saying anything that the audience can take issue with; or, in psychological parlance, the speaker must scrupulously avoid stirring up contrariant ideas. Can this be done? Probably, if the speaker has the art to do it. The differences in views and convictions among people are due more to misunderstanding and ignorance than to any differences in mental make-up, not to

¹ "The Reign of the Common People."

say to perversity. On the basis of the same facts, most persons will act in the same way although predispositions may influence their conduct. There are conflicts of interest, to be sure, and people hold opinions because it is to their interest to hold them, or at least they think so. But for every real conflict of interests causing divergent views, there are a hundred instances where differences in opinions result from ignorance and misunderstanding.

The real problem, therefore, is to discover the sources of opinions and to understand on what foundations they rest. This may require a thorough understanding of the whole question and, what is more important still, a sympathetic understanding of the opinions and beliefs which you wish to change. Lincoln has well expressed this attitude as follows:

When the conduct of men is designed to be influenced, *persuasion*, kind, unassuming persuasion, should ever be adopted. It is an old and true maxim that a drop of honey catches more flies than a gallon of gall. So with men. If you would win a man to your cause, first convince him that you are his sincere friend. There is the drop of honey that catches his heart, which, say what he will, when once gained, you will find but little trouble in convincing his judgment of the justice of your cause, if indeed that cause really be a just one. On the contrary, assume to dictate to his judgment, or to command his action, or to mark him as one to be shunned and despised, and he will retreat within himself, close all the avenues to his head and heart; and though your cause be naked truth itself, and though you throw it with more than Herculean force and precision, you will be no more able to pierce him than to penetrate the hard shell of a tortoise with a rye straw. Such is man, and so must he be understood by those who would lead him even to his own best interests.

Emerson, in his lecture on eloquence, has expressed what some will regard as an extreme view of what may be accomplished by way of influencing hostile opinion:

There is for every man a statement possible of that truth which he is most unwilling to receive, — a statement possible, so broad and so

pungent, that he cannot get away from it, but must either bend to it or die of it. Else there would be no such word as eloquence, which means this. The listener cannot hide from himself that something has been shown him and the whole world, which he did not wish to see; and as he cannot dispose of it, it disposes of him. The history of public men and affairs in America will readily furnish tragic examples of this fatal force.

Strategy of Approach. What approach a speaker should make to his audience is a matter of strategy. Suppose his audience is largely favorable, with a small element hostile. Should a political speaker, for example, aim to win over the few intransigents with logical argument, authorities, and whatever persuasive means are at his command? Or should he aim to fire his large group of sympathizers with enthusiasm for the cause, in the hope that the enthusiasm will spread to as large a number in the community as possible? As a matter of hard, practical sense, the latter aim will probably be productive of the best results. That course is much easier, involves a much simpler process, assuming that the bulk of the audience is friendly. At any rate, we may feel sure that it is the course pursued by most political speakers, and others as well. As Phillips put it in the antislavery struggle, "There are far more dead hearts to be quickened than confused intellects to be cleared up: more dumb dogs to be made to speak than doubting consciences to be enlightened." In the choice of aims or purposes, a speaker will always be guided by the character of his audience.

In Conclusion. We probably reach more decisions through the argumentative process than we are generally given credit for. Whenever we consider reasons pro and con for any opinion or course of conduct, whether it be in conversation, in the club, political forum, convention, legislative assembly, congress, parliament, we use the argumentative method. We should therefore be familiar with the different types of logical argument, so that we can check up on our thought processes. It may

reveal to us how flimsy are the foundations on which most of our opinions rest. We should remember that logical argument tends merely to establish the truth of propositions or the correctness of opinions, with varying degrees of probability. It is therefore only one kind of support in the argumentative speech. When the truth of a proposition has been established with some degree of probability, there still remains the problem of interpreting and driving home the affective meaning of the idea or proposition. We do this through an appeal to motives, to fundamental human wants — intellectual, material, æsthetic. The problem here is exactly the same as the problem in the impressive speech. It is to charge ideas with a richer meaning, through appeal to the feelings and emotions. Concrete speech materials, such as the general and specific example and all forms of illustrations, are all-important for this purpose. To influence action in some form is always the end in an argumentative speech. It may aim at an immediate and definite overt action; or it may aim at establishing certain views or attitudes which at the appropriate time may result in action. The end is always to make beliefs function in behavior.

EXERCISES

1. Make a written report on one of the speeches assigned for reading, on the following points:
 - a.* Give an outline of purpose and main divisions of speech.
 - b.* What forms of support predominate?
 - c.* What illustrations are used? Are they effective?
 - d.* Give examples of comparing the unaccepted to the accepted.
 - e.* Classify the motives appealed to.
 - f.* In what respects is the speech weak and unconvincing? Is it sufficiently concrete?
 - g.* Which is the greater problem in this speech: to establish the probable truth of the propositions, or to show their worth to us in gratifying desires and satisfying wants?

2. Discuss orally in class an argumentative speech that you have recently heard, using the above criteria as the basis in part for your criticism.
3. Bring to class examples of the different kinds of logical argument: (1) generalization; (2) causal: cause to effect, and effect to cause; (3) analogy. Apply tests.
4. Aim to determine the prejudices and mental attitudes in general of your classmates on some subject of current interest on which there is a difference of opinion. Decide in your own mind how many believe as you do on the subject, and how many believe some other way. Try to discover one or two of the main reasons why a number of the class disagree with you, and aim to understand those reasons as fully as you can. Work out a carefully prepared argument for presentation to the class, aimed at those who hold opinions different from your own. When you are through, get a frank expression from these hearers as to what effect your argument had. Do they still think and feel as they did, or are they persuaded to your views?

READINGS

Speeches

- “Columbus Speech,” by Abraham Lincoln (*Nicolay and Hay*).
- “Liverpool Speech,” by Henry Ward Beecher (*Beecher: IV*).
- “Reply to Hayne,” by Daniel Webster (Vol. XI).
- “Capital Punishment,” by Wendell Phillips (*Phillips, Vol. II*).
- “Speech on Government Ownership,” by Herbert Hoover (*O’Neill and Riley*).
- “Speech on Government Ownership,” by Alfred E. Smith (*O’Neill and Riley*).

References

- William Phillips Sandford and Willard Hayes Yeager: *Principles of Effective Speaking* (Revised Edition, 1930), Chap. XIII.
- Arleigh Boyd Williamson: *Speaking in Public* (1929), Chap. XIII.
- Frederick Hansen Lund: *The Psychology of Belief*. (Thesis: Columbia University, 1905.)
- William Trufant Foster: *Argumentation and Debating* (Revised Edition, 1917).

CHAPTER XVI

THE ENTERTAINMENT SPEECH

What we really mean by an entertainment speech, as already explained, is one in which the entertainment feature is predominant. Of this type, the after-dinner speech is the one conspicuous example. To do this well is something of an accomplishment, and really requires special gifts — a vivid sense of humor and originality of treatment. All may try it, and many will make at least a tolerable success of it.

Hints for the After-Dinner Speaker. 1. *Observe the spirit of the occasion.* The atmosphere which naturally pervades an occasion of that kind is one of geniality and good cheer. It is not an occasion for argument or for airing one's prejudices. Controversial topics are usually regarded as contrary to the spirit of festive occasions. At a banquet celebrating the season's victories of a football team, we do not offer adverse criticism of the coach and players. If we have any, we reserve it for other times and other places. We avoid anything that may sound like a discordant note.

2. *The best after-dinner speeches have a message.* While some after-dinner speeches are made for mere entertainment, the best ones, let it be repeated, have in their composition something more than mere humor. The good after-dinner speech will have an idea and develop it; and while the development may be partly in light vein and humorous, it will be something more than that. Wholly humorous speeches are, as a matter of fact, not necessarily the most interesting and entertaining. Originality in thought and style may be more captivating than any effort at being funny. If you can combine originality of treat-

ment and humor, you will probably be a good after-dinner speaker.

3. *Careful preparation is necessary.* If you expect to make a good after-dinner speech, you had better make careful preparation for it, just the same as for any other speech. There may be those who can acquit themselves creditably on such occasions without much preparation. For the rank and file, however, trusting to the inspiration of the moment is too hazardous. Careful preparation in advance is the only insurance of comfort and safety. In preparing such a speech, one should be careful to reckon with all the factors in the situation: the nature of the occasion, the number of speakers, the probable length of the speech, what the other speakers may say, and other essential matters. If one can weave one's own speech into a unified plan or pattern with the rest, so much will be gained.

4. *Care must be exercised in the selection of forms of support.* As to forms of support, the most useful are likely to be personal experiences, concrete examples, the literary quotation, the anecdote, and other forms of illustration. If you can offer as supports for any point you may choose to develop one good example, a literary quotation, and an anecdote, the chances are good that your point will "go over." If these forms of support are definitely determined, you may use them as islands, and take a chance on swimming between. The amateur, however, will do well if he fortifies himself with some practice in swimming between.

The best humor is that which seems to grow out of the subject or occasion and is not introduced for its own sake, in connection with something that has nothing to do with the theme. This applies to anecdotes as well. They should illustrate points that are in some way connected with the subject, and should not give the impression of being dragged in for their own sake. Be sure that the story is appropriate, does in fact illustrate the point you want it to illustrate.

With some men, humor comes naturally; with others it seems too often forced. I recall going with an oriental lecturer to a noon luncheon of Shriners, at which he spoke for half an hour. He had occasion to refer, in the course of his speech, to a correspondent in China that a leading English newspaper had sent over, and took it upon himself to criticize this correspondent for his attitude on Chinese problems, and also for his ignorance. "Why," said he, "that man does not know any more about China than a lawyer knows about the Bible." Coming so naturally and unexpectedly, the reference threw the audience of about three hundred Shriners into convulsions of laughter. Later on, in his address, he pleaded for a better understanding among races and nations. "When we come to understand each other a little better," he said, "we shall find that the Black is not so black as he is painted; the Yellow, not so yellow; and White, not quite so white." That was originality! A good message spiced with humor and originality goes to make up a good after-dinner speech. While this may not have been strictly an after-dinner speech, it had in it many of the elements of such an address.

Of all speeches, the after-dinner speech should be presented with the ease and informality of conversation. Thomas Wentworth Higginson in his "Notes on Speech Making" offers a suggestion which should not only start one off in the conversational mode, but also give to the address an air of spontaneity, of being born of the occasion.

If people are shy and awkward and conscious about their speeches, how shall they gain an easy and unconstrained bearing? That is, how shall they begin their speeches in that way? — for after the beginning, it is not so hard to go on.

There is one very simple method, — as simple as to swallow a mouthful of water slowly to cure one's hiccough, — and yet one which I have seldom known to fail. Suppose the occasion to be a public dinner. You have somebody by your side to whom you have been talking. To him your manner was undoubtedly natural; and

if you can only carry along into your public speech that conversational flavor of your private talk, the battle is gained. How, then, to achieve that result? In this easy way: Express to your neighbor conversationally the thought, whatever it is, with which you mean to begin your public speech. Then, when you rise to speak, say merely what will be perfectly true, "I was just saying to the gentleman who sits beside me, that" — and then you repeat your remark over again. You thus make the last words of your private talk the first words of your public address, and the conversational manner is secured. This suggestion originated, I believe, with a man of inexhaustible fertility in public speech, Rev. E. E. Hale. I have often availed myself of it, and have often been thanked by others for suggesting it to them.

5. *Observe the time limit*, whatever it is. It is necessary to speak of this because it is so much abused. It is not unusual for an occasion of that kind to last until late hours in the night or early hours in the morning until everybody is tired out, and half the audience gone, simply because speakers do not know when to stop; or, perhaps more accurately, they do not know how to stop. It is of some importance, therefore, to have the power and the good sense to stop at the right time. If a time limit is set, observe it, and don't embarrass the chairman by making it necessary for him to ask you to end your speech. If no time limit is set, gauge the amount of time you may reasonably occupy from the number of speakers on the program and the lateness of the hour. If in doubt, give the audience the benefit of the doubt.

EXERCISES

1. Read Beecher's after-dinner speech, "Merchants and Ministers,"¹ and hand in a written criticism of it, covering as many points as you can. Does it have a definite message? Is the message appropriate? What are the chief sources of humor? Is there originality in thought and style? What are the principal forms of support? Is the style conversational? Does the speech have the effect of spontaneity? Give such other criticisms as you can.

¹ See page 438 of this volume.

2. Report on an after-dinner speech you have recently heard, with criticism on points of effectiveness and ineffectiveness.
3. Give an oral or written report on two of the speeches assigned for reading at the end of this chapter. Make your criticism orderly, and cover as many points as you can. To what extent is humor derived from the occasion? To what extent from the originality of the speaker?
4. Prepare to give in class a five-minute after-dinner speech, imagining an occasion proper for such a speech. Do not depend too much on stories. Aim to be humorous without them.

READINGS

Speeches

- "The Yankee," by Irving Bacheller (Vol. I).
 "Liberty under the Law," by George W. Curtis (Vol. I).
 "The Pilgrims," by Wendell Phillips (*Phillips*, Vol. I).
 "The Mormons," by Charles Farrar Browne ("Artemus Ward") (Vol. XIII).
 "The Bench and the Bar," by Joseph Choate (Vol. I).
 "A 'Littery' Episode," by Samuel L. Clemens ("Mark Twain") (Vol. I).
 "Woman," by Chauncey M. Depew (Vol. I).
 "The Music of Wagner," by Robert Ingersoll (Vol. II).
 "Andrew Carnegie — His Methods with His Men," by Charles M. Schwab (Vol. IX).

References

- Thomas Wentworth Higginson: "Hints on Speech Making," *Modern Eloquence* (Third Edition, revised in 1929), Vol. II, pp. xv-xxii.
 William Phillips Sandford and Willard Hayes Yeager: *Principles of Effective Speaking* (Revised Edition, 1930), Chap. XIV.
 James Milton O'Neill and Andrew Thomas Weaver: *The Elements of Speech* (1926), Chap. XXVII.
 Lorenzo Sears: *Modern Eloquence* (First Edition, 1900), Vol. I, pp. xiii-xxxv.

CHAPTER XVII

THE OCCASIONAL ADDRESS

If you have mastered well the principles governing the preparation of the types of speeches already treated, speeches for special occasions should not present any great difficulties, except such as are met with in the preparation of any speech. When we come to analyze the aims of the various occasional addresses, we shall find that they are usually of the impressive type, and governed by the same rules in regard to organization and the choice of speech materials. This is true also of the after-dinner speech when it is more than a string of stories and a succession of jokes.

There are many forms of the so-called occasional address. The principal ones are the following: (1) the address of welcome; (2) the introductory address; (3) the anniversary address; (4) the eulogy; (5) the farewell address.

The Speech of Welcome. There are many occasions for speeches of welcome, not so much to individuals as to organizations. Conventions of all kinds assemble nowadays in large cities and small, made up of representatives from large areas, at times from the whole country, at other times from the whole world. Ordinarily the mayor of the city or some local dignitary is called upon to address the gathering and extend the welcome of the city. These speeches are usually in a light, humorous vein, seldom occupying more than five minutes, consisting of a few appropriate pleasantries, and making the delegates feel "at home" during their deliberations — and sight-seeing. It is something of an art to do this well and handsomely, but it is difficult to give very definite rules, as so much depends on the occasion and the originality of the speaker.

Certain it is that an address of welcome is essentially neither informative nor argumentative. It must, therefore, be primarily either an impressive or an entertainment speech, and that is exactly what it is. Whether one element or the other predominates will depend on the speaker and the occasion. Very often addresses of welcome are predominantly in a humorous vein; and again they may stress some idea or give expression to some sentiments that make them predominantly impressive. Probably the best address of welcome is one that is both impressive and entertaining, and uses speech materials to further both ends, just as a good after-dinner speech may do.

To discover the most appropriate sentiments to express, it is always in order to question yourself about the occasion and particularly about the organization or individual welcomed. What is the character of the organization? What does it stand for? What outstanding thing has it done? How does it touch our lives? What is its program for the future? What is its relation to our community?

From queries like these — and they apply as well to individuals — a speaker will hit upon some appropriate idea or sentiment to develop briefly. The more specific and concrete the treatment, the better. We may say that an address of welcome should aim to accomplish at least two things: (1) make the guest or guests feel at home, and give them assurance that the community takes pleasure in entertaining them, and pride in having them as guests; (2) strike a note or two of appreciation of the work being done by the organization and suggest concretely how vitally it may affect individuals and the community.

Liberal seasoning with humor and gracious sentiment by means of personal experiences, literary quotations, anecdotes, and other forms of illustration is appropriate and desirable.

The Introductory Address. Almost anything may be forgiven in an introductory speech if it is short enough. The record for brevity is very likely held by Shailer Mathews, who, in pre-

sending President Woodrow Wilson on one occasion, said, "Ladies and Gentlemen, the President." Robert Ingersoll, however, improved on that slightly by doing without introductory speeches altogether. He simply walked out on the platform and began to speak. While that may do for one so well known as he became in his later years, still an introduction has its place for most speakers. Its aim is to establish an intelligent and friendly relation between speaker and audience. A speaker may have attained considerable distinction — be a member of the English parliament, say — and still be virtually unknown to an American audience. It is of interest to the audience and of advantage to the speaker that his political and other accomplishments be briefly surveyed. On an occasion like that, the introducer will seize upon the outstanding achievements of the speaker and present them with due impressiveness, and at the same time with genuine sincerity. The better known the speaker, the briefer may be the introductory speech.

An audience is impatient of long introductory speeches, unless they really say something vital and interesting relating to the speaker. It is bad form for one who introduces a speaker to launch into a speech of his own, no matter how brilliantly it may be done. It is also at times unbearably tedious and tiring on such occasions to have to listen to a half-dozen or so announcements, in most of which the audience has no interest. The members of the audience are there to hear the speaker, and unless there are some weighty reasons to the contrary, they should be allowed to hear him promptly and without unnecessary delay. Two or three minutes, as a rule, should be the time limit for an introductory speech.

The Eulogy. The eulogy, as a rule, is predominantly an impressive speech. It may take several forms. It may be a relatively short address, in the form of a tribute at the time of a man's death, like Wendell Phillips' tributes to Lincoln, Garrison, Harriet Martineau, and others. These are as fine models as we have of this form of address.

Or the eulogy may be a lengthy discourse occupying an hour or more in the delivery. There are two types of this eulogy: the selective eulogy, like Phillips' eulogy of Daniel O'Connell and Toussaint L'Ouverture, in which certain character traits are chosen and developed, or certain historical movements dealt with, in which the subject of the eulogy had a large part; and the biographical eulogy, which aims to give the life history of a man, and point some moral from this life history. Such are usually congressional eulogies, delivered by a colleague when a Congressman dies. Of this type also is Edward Everett's eulogy of Washington.

No matter what form it takes, the eulogy is essentially an impressive speech. It may be informative also, but information is not the ultimate end. The primary aim of a eulogy is to hold up as examples to the living the virtues and accomplishments of the dead. The eulogy is a persuasive speech. It does not advocate any specific action, but it does aim to set up attitudes and action tendencies of a certain kind, so that we shall act in accordance with them when the occasion comes.

Eulogies on occasion are argumentative, although such eulogies are exceptions. Wendell Phillips' eulogy of Toussaint L'Ouverture is of this kind. It was given at a time when the antislavery struggle was raging and the worth of the negro much discussed. Phillips made his speech both a eulogy and an argument for recognizing the worth of the negro race. It is one of our greatest eulogies. Read it.

The Anniversary Address. There are many occasions for the anniversary address, and correspondingly many calls for speeches to interpret and give freshness of meaning to such occasions. You are familiar with the observance of Memorial Day, Fourth of July, Labor Day, Armistice Day, Mothers' Day, Old Settlers' Day, the birthdays of distinguished men like Washington, Lincoln, Jefferson, Hamilton, and others. Then there are class reunions and anniversaries. Such occasions are legion and offer much opportunity for speaking.

All such speeches are of the impressive type, and governed accordingly as to choice of speech materials and organization. They are usually in serious vein and should have a definite message. The fact that the people who gather on such occasions are from all stations in life, and form, therefore, a decidedly mixed audience, renders it advisable to make such speeches light in substance and to intersperse some humor, although the occasion is essentially impressive. Personal incidents, general and concrete examples, well-selected quotations, a few good anecdotes and illustrations, will serve best. An important requisite of such a speech is a good message, one that undertakes to interpret the meaning of the occasion in relation to present-day problems. The speech of Jane Addams at the end of this chapter is an excellent example of this method of treatment. It has a good message and aims to give significance to certain character traits of the great Virginian by suggesting how he would react to present-day problems. Lincoln's "Gettysburg Address" derives its power and popularity in no small measure from its happy choice of message.

The Farewell Address. Like other occasional addresses, the farewell address is an impressive type of speech. The school valedictory address is an example. Occasions every once in a while arise in a community when a distinguished citizen moves away for one reason or another. He may be a candidate-elect for some political office, a minister, a teacher, or some other beloved member of the community. A banquet is prepared and speeches arranged.

Speeches on such occasions are usually brief, and while properly somewhat sentimental, they will show moderation and good taste. They should above all things be genuine. Whatever is said should come from the heart. Note with what deep sincerity and affection Lincoln addresses his Springfield friends on his departure for Washington.

My Friends: No one, not in my situation, can appreciate my feeling of sadness at this parting. To this place, and the kindness of these

people, I owe everything. Here I have lived a quarter of a century, and have passed from a young to an old man. Here my children have been born, and one is buried. I now leave, not knowing when or whether ever I may return, with a task before me greater than that which rested upon Washington. Without the assistance of that Divine Being who ever attended him, I cannot succeed. With that assistance, I cannot fail. Trusting in Him who can go with me, and remain with you, and be everywhere for good, let us confidently hope that all will yet be well. To His care commending you, as I hope in your prayers you will commend me, I bid you an affectionate farewell.

EXERCISES

1. The following speech was given by Jane Addams, world-famed for her work at Hull House, Chicago, at the dinner of the Union League Club, Chicago, February 23, 1903. Study it, and then either write out, or be prepared to give orally, a criticism of the speech, touching the message, the method of treatment, the character of the style, and the forms of support. Would concrete materials add to the effectiveness of the speech? If so, what materials would you suggest? Note the careful structure of the speech.

WASHINGTON'S BIRTHDAY

We meet together upon these birthdays of our great men, not only to review their lives, but to revive and cherish our own patriotism. This matter is a difficult task. In the first place, we are prone to think that by merely reciting these great deeds we get a reflected glory, and that the future is secure to us because the past has been so fine.

In the second place, we are apt to think that we inherit the fine qualities of those great men, simply because we have had a common descent and are living in the same territory.

As for the latter, we know full well that the patriotism of common descent is the mere patriotism of the clan — the early patriotism of the tribe. We know that the possession of a like territory is merely an advance upon that, and that both of them are unworthy to be the patriotism of a great cosmopolitan nation whose patriotism must be

large enough to obliterate racial distinction and to forget that there are such things as surveyor's lines. Then when we come to the study of great men it is easy to think only of their great deeds, and not to think enough of their spirit. What is a great man who has made his mark upon history? Every time, if we think far enough, he is a man who has looked through the confusion of the moment and has seen the moral issue involved; he is a man who has refused to have his sense of justice distorted; he has listened to his conscience until conscience becomes a trumpet call to like-minded men, so that they gather about him and together, with mutual purpose and mutual aid, they make a new period in history.

Let us assume for a moment that if we are going to make this day of advantage to us, we will have to take this definition of a great man. We will have to appeal to the present as well as to the past. We will have to rouse our national conscience as well as our national pride, and we will all have to remember that it lies with the young people of this nation whether or not it is going to go on to a finish in any wise worthy of its beginning.

If we go back to George Washington, and ask what he would be doing were he bearing our burdens now, and facing our problems at this moment, we would, of course, have to study his life bit by bit; his life as a soldier, as a statesman, and as a simple Virginia planter.

First, as a soldier. What is it that we admire about the soldier? It certainly is not that he goes into battle; what we admire about the soldier is that he has the power of losing his own life for the life of a larger cause; that he holds his personal suffering of no account; that he flings down in the gage of battle his all, and says, "I will stand or fall with this cause." That, it seems to me, is the glorious thing we most admire, and if we are going to preserve that same spirit of the soldier, we will have to found a similar spirit in the civil life of the people, the same pride in civil warfare, the spirit of courage, and the spirit of self-surrender which lies back of this.

If we look out upon our national perspective, do we not see certainly one great menace which calls for patriotism? We see all around us a spirit of materialism — an undue emphasis put upon material possessions; an inordinate desire to win wealth; an inordinate fear of losing wealth; an inordinate desire to please those who are the possessors of wealth. Now, let us say, if we feel that this is a menace,

that with all our power, with all the spirit of a soldier, we will arouse high-minded youth of this country against this spirit of materialism. We will say to-day that we will not count the opening of markets the one great field which our nation is concerned in, but that when our flag flies anywhere it shall fly for righteousness as well as for increased commercial prosperity; that we will see to it that no sin of commercial robbery shall be committed where it floats; that we shall see to it that nothing in our commercial history will not bear the most careful scrutiny and investigation; that we will restore commercial life, however complicated, to such honor and simple honesty as George Washington expressed in his business dealings.

Let us take, for a moment, George Washington as a statesman. What is it he did, during those days when they were framing a constitution, when they were meeting together night after night, and trying to adjust the rights and privileges of every class in the community? What was it that sustained him during all those days, all those weeks, during all those months and years? It was the belief that they were founding a nation on the axiom that all men are created free and equal. What would George Washington say if he found that among us there were causes constantly operating against that equality? If he knew that any child which is thrust prematurely into industry has no chance in life with children who are preserved from that pain and sorrow; if he knew that every insanitary street, and every insanitary house, cripples a man so that he has no health and no vigor with which to carry on his life labor; if he knew that all about us are forces making against skill, making against the best manhood and womanhood, what would he say? He would say that if the spirit of equality means anything, it means like opportunity, and if we once lose like opportunity we lose the only chance we have towards equality throughout the nation.

Let us take George Washington as a citizen. What did he do when he retired from office, because he was afraid holding office any longer might bring a wrong to himself and harm to his beloved nation? We say that he went back to his plantation on the Potomac. What were his thoughts during the all too short days that he lived there? He thought of many possibilities, but, looking out over his country, did he fear that there should rise up a crowd of men who held office, not for their country's good, but for their own good? Would he not have

foreboded evil if he had known that among us were groups and hordes of professional politicians, who, without any blinking or without any pretense that they did otherwise, apportioned the spoils of office, and considered an independent man as a mere intruder, as a mere outsider; if he had seen that the original meaning of office-holding and the function of government had become indifferent to us, that we were not using our foresight and our conscience in order to find out this great wrong which was sapping the foundations of self-government? He would tell us that anything which makes for better civic service, which makes for a merit system, which makes for fitness for office, is the only thing, which will tell against this wrong, and that this course is the wisest patriotism. What did he write in his last correspondence? He wrote that he felt very unhappy on the subject of slavery, that there was, to his mind, a great menace in the holding of slaves. We know that he neither bought nor sold slaves himself, and that he freed his own slaves in his will. That was a century ago. A man who a century ago could do that, would he, do you think, be indifferent now to the great questions of social maladjustment which we feel all around us? His letters breathe a yearning for a better condition for the slaves, as the letters of all great men among us breathe a yearning for the better condition of the unskilled and underpaid. A wise patriotism, which will take hold of these questions by careful legal enactment, by constant and vigorous enforcement, because of the belief that if the meanest man in the republic is deprived of his rights, then every man in the republic is deprived of his rights, is the only patriotism by which public-spirited men and women, with a thoroughly aroused conscience, can worthily serve this republic. Let us say again that the lessons of great men are lost unless they reënforce upon our minds the highest demands which we make upon ourselves; that they are lost unless they drive our sluggish wills forward in the direction of their highest ideals.

2. Report on an occasional address that you have heard recently, with criticism as to effectiveness. Be specific.
3. Prepare an eight- or ten-minute speech on one of the following, in the form of selective or biographical eulogy. Aim to select interesting facts in the person's life and his distinctive character traits.

Theodore Roosevelt	Jane Addams
Calvin Coolidge	Carrie Chapman Catt
William Jennings Bryan	Julia Ward Howe
William Lloyd Garrison	Florence Nightingale
Woodrow Wilson	Frances Willard
Thomas Jefferson	Selma Lagerlöf

Some one of your own choice

4. Make a written report on one of the speeches for reading; touch on as many points as possible.
5. Formulate in a sentence the message of the "Gettysburg Address."

READINGS

Speeches

- "New Critics of Democracy," by Nicholas Murray Butler (*O'Neill and Riley*).
- "Abraham Lincoln," by Henry Watterson (Vol. IX).
- "Dedicating the George F. Baker Foundation," by Owen D. Young (*O'Neill and Riley*).
- "Toussaint L'Ouverture," by Wendell Phillips (Vol. XIII).
- "Wendell Phillips," by Henry Ward Beecher (*Beecher: I*).
- "The Glories of Duluth," by James Proctor Knott (Vol. VIII).
- "Adams and Jefferson," by Edward Everett (Vol. IX).
- "Charles Henry Woolbert," by Andrew T. Weaver (*O'Neill and Riley*).
- "The American Scholar," by Ralph Waldo Emerson (Vol. VI).
- "James A. Garfield," by James G. Blaine (Vol. IX).
- "Marcus Aurelius," by Felix Adler (Vol. VII).
- "First!" by Henry Drummond (Vol. VII).
- "Blaine — The Plumed Knight," by Robert Ingersoll (Vol. XI).
- "Nominating Alfred E. Smith for the Presidency (1928)," by Franklin D. Roosevelt (*O'Neill and Riley*).

References

- Lorenzo Sears: "The History of Oratory," *Modern Eloquence* (Third Edition, revised in 1929), Vol. X, pp. xvii-xxxviii.
- Lorenzo Sears: *The Occasional Address*. London (1897).

CHAPTER XVIII

WHAT HOLDS ATTENTION

In preceding chapters, many references have been made to the problem of holding the attention of an audience during a speech. Especially has this been stressed in connection with the choice of speech materials. Some writers treat all speech materials from the point of view of their attention values. "The person who can capture and hold attention, is the person who can effectively influence human behavior," says H. A. Overstreet.¹ It is plain that a speaker must hold the attention of his listeners if he wishes to do more than make noise. To continue to speak to the members of an audience after they have ceased attending to what the speaker is saying is like administering medicine to the dead. But should a speaker, in choosing his speech materials and planning his speech, center his thoughts primarily on what holds attention, or on what will drive home truth and accomplish his purpose? That is worth considering.

The question is how best to regard this problem of holding attention. Is it not possible that centering on attention as a goal in speaking may be a good deal like centering on happiness as a goal in life? We all wish to attain happiness, but even if we accept a hedonistic interpretation of life and assume that men are motivated primarily by considerations of self-interest, it is still a question of how best to attain this goal. Do we necessarily attain it best by keeping it constantly before us and seeking it out? Or is it essentially a by-product of correct and purposeful living? Similarly, do we hold attention best

¹ *Influencing Human Behavior* (1925), p. 11.

by keeping the problem constantly before us? Or is attention largely the by-product of those speech processes which are effective in accomplishing a certain end? Do we use concrete examples because they have attention values, or because they tend to flood a subject with light? Do we seek the humorous, the unusual, the unique, because we want to hold attention, or because we want to entertain, or present interesting information? I think these questions answer themselves.

Attention Values Are Not the Primary Test of Speech Materials. May there not be, as a matter of fact, a very serious objection to regarding attention as the primary aim in selecting speech materials? Is it not a fact that just as a newspaper man develops a "nose for news," so a person who is much before public audiences is likely to develop a "nose" for materials that are strong in attention values? A lecturer observes, for instance, that a good story always grips the crowd, and will immediately revive attention when attention lags. Every one knows how speakers constantly yield to the temptation of telling funny stories and jokes, even if they have not the slightest, or at best only the remotest, bearing on the subject in hand. They observe that a humorous incident of any kind is likely to make the audience prick up its ears. Dramatic narrative, too, will hold attention more than ordinarily well, as will certain other forms of support. Is it not reasonable to suppose that many such lecturers will move along the line of least resistance and see to it that their lecture materials will hold the crowd whatever else they will not do? Is it not precisely this that so often happens with lyceum lectures, and in the manner suggested? These lectures are interesting, they entertain, they are humorous, they hold attention; but in point of ideas they are often very thin. A little thought is made to go a long way. They may satisfy the groundlings, but for the judicious they are skim milk.

The trouble is that lectures of this order are built around the thought of holding the attention of and entertaining lyceum

audiences, and they do this very well. As for conveying vital and interesting information, or serving as irritants for thought, they do not do it. The fact that certain speech materials have strong attention values is no guarantee that they have any great persuasive value for specific ends. The converse of the statement would be much truer; namely, that speech materials that have great persuasive force are likely to have good attention values.

Glenn Frank voices this view as follows:

Many lecturers who began their careers with worthy standards have permitted the acid of applause to eat the value out of their service. One night the lecturer strikes a certain string that vibrates easily; thereafter he finds it difficult to avoid striking that string again and again not because it gives the note needed, but because there he is assured of ready response from his audience. He discovers that the anecdote gets response more easily than does analysis; straightway he multiplies his anecdotes. He finds that it is easier to storm the emotions than to convince the reason; he sets about adding pathos to his technic. He sees that an epigram galvanizes the attention of an audience; forthwith he peppers his lecture with epigrams, although the average epigram is only half true. The dwindling of his audience would imperil his income. His audience is to him what the tiger is to its trainer; he must become either the master or the victim of its moods. Unconsciously he allows the instinct of self-preservation to dictate his assertions. His mind becomes a weathercock, nervously sensitive to the automatic applause of flattered prejudice.

Of exactly this type was a certain lecture I recently heard by a distinguished woman at a convocation hour. The lecture consisted almost wholly of a dramatic narrative of personal experiences, done with matchless skill. The speaker occupied about fifty minutes. While she spoke, you could have heard the proverbial pin drop in any corner of the audience room — which, by the way, seats five thousand people. Almost everything was there that we like to have in a lecture; interesting (attention-holding) speech materials, charming personality,

pleasing presentation, conversational mode with never a variation from it, humor — everything except stimulating thought moving towards a definite goal. In this respect the speech was a disappointment to many persons. It was in fact a typical lyceum lecture of the lighter type.

We have to distinguish between ideas that merely hold the attention of an audience for the moment and ideas that tend to persist in consciousness, and so greatly influence behavior. It is possible to hold the attention of an audience for an hour or more without using ideas that are in any significant sense determinants of behavior, or in any true sense interesting. When William James says, "What-we-attend-to and what-interests-us are synonymous terms,"¹ he means simply that what we attend to has enough interest for us to attend to it. I may listen to a speech for an hour; and to that extent, and to that extent only, need I be interested in it. In any deep or significant sense I may not be interested in it at all. I may in fact have been bored every minute of the time. Nothing is plainer than that we must distinguish between different methods of holding attention, and that the only method which can be seriously considered is the one that most advances the speech end, whatever that may be. It goes without saying that a speaker who can rouse in the minds of his listeners ideas that grip and motivate, and tend to dominate consciousness, will command attention, and by so doing influence conduct. But we must distinguish between that method of holding attention and the method that merely commands the attention for the passing moment, through appeal to fancy, or novelty or humor, or some shallow tricks of the declaimer.

All of which is not to say that the attention-holding power of speech materials may not be regarded as a factor in choosing them. It goes without saying that any form of support that properly serves the specific end of a speech will be all the more valuable for being interesting. Of two illustrations serving

¹ *Psychology: Briefer Course*, p. 48.

much the same end, the one that has the greater attention value is the better. A speaker may well scan his materials occasionally for their capacity to sustain interest, just as we may with advantage occasionally reflect on what manner of living holds for us the largest satisfactions; but his primary aim will be to accomplish his purpose.

What Makes a Speech Interesting? It is well enough, however, to have proper regard for the requirements of attention in any speech. To do that right, we must understand something about the sources of interest in a speech. That which interests holds attention. The question is, then, what interests us?

The Vital. We are interested, first of all, in those things that vitally affect our lives, provided we can be made to see that they do so. This matter has been treated in Chapter IX, "Motivation: Want Appeal." The ordinary imagination does not operate at very long range; so there are all kinds of questions that in the long run affect us vitally, but in which we have very little interest. Our distance vision is very poor. It took us a long time to realize that clothes made in sweatshops might carry in them germs that would kill the wearer. Every worthwhile speech on a well-selected subject will touch the listeners' lives somewhere, vitally and concretely. The art of speaking is to show where and how. The speaker must furnish the audience with vision.

The struggle for existence is still severe enough so that any one who has ambition to succeed must avail himself of all possible sources of information and counsel. The business man whose chief problem is to promote sales will listen with avidity to the publicity specialist. Farmers will crowd a meeting to hear an agronomist talk on crop rotation. Ministers will crowd to hear an outstanding man in their profession, to catch inspiration from his personality and counsel from his wide experience. College students will attend class lectures for four or five years to equip themselves properly for their professions. East Indian

occultists and "personality power" promoters draw large multitudes to hear them because of the specific nostrums they offer for the attainment of health and happiness. We are all creatures of self-interest and desire, not of choice but of necessity. Human wants are almost infinite in variety, and many of them almost insatiable or impossible of satisfaction.

The successful speaker, therefore, will be a student of human wants and of how to satisfy them. A very suggestive study in this field is the life of Edward Bok and his long service as editor of the *Ladies' Home Journal*. No one can read Bok's Life without being impressed with his genius in understanding sympathetically human wants and desires, and with his skill in providing means of satisfying those desires through the pages of this popular magazine. Russell H. Conwell's lecture, "Acres of Diamonds," stresses the idea that success in business depends largely on one's sensitivity to human wants and resourcefulness in satisfying them. Whatever promises to satisfy fundamental human wants holds the attention.

The Unusual, the New. Everyday existence must of necessity have in it much of the humdrum and monotonous. The quest for something different provides an escape from the drabness of life. We are therefore materially interested in novel experiences, in facts that are striking and out of the ordinary. People who can afford it go to the ends of the earth to see new places and people, new scenery, new art galleries, to hear great singers, actors, and artists. For many fashionable folk, life is a grand search for the new, the novel, in apparel, architecture, house furnishings, amusements, and even friends. To designate anything as "ordinary" is to damn it to the lowest depths. The essence of fashion, whether it be in attire, automobiles, or anything else, is not that the new shall be more beautiful than what preceded, but something more striking.

Mention has already been made of the popularity of lectures on polar expeditions by men like Stefansson, Byrd, Amundsen. Stefansson gave fifteen or more lectures at the University of

Minnesota in the course of about five weeks, and all of them were well attended — by lecture-ridden students. Such lectures are interesting because they offer new and interesting information about portions of the globe not accessible to most of us. There is about them also the charm of romance.

When university professors give examinations to students, nobody thinks of making news of it. But when students give examinations to university professors, as a group of Columbia students did recently, every national news association in America laps it up as news of the first water. It is unusual, novel, in fact unheard of.

A good example of the unusual is the following from Senator Irvine Lenroot's speech before the Inland Press Association, Chicago, 1923. Senator Lenroot was discoursing on the alertness and resourcefulness of Washington correspondents.

There was an important conference one evening at the home of Senator Lodge attended by about a dozen Senators. When it broke up, it was agreed that nothing should be given out to the newspapers concerning it. Later in the evening I was called on the 'phone by one of the correspondents, who stated that he had been told that there was to be nothing given to the Press, and would not ask me to state what it was about, but would like to ask me a simple question that could be answered by yes or no — and stated it. I saw no possible harm in answering, — for standing alone, it could give him no information, — and I did so. But the next morning there was a very complete story of the meeting, and we afterwards found that each Senator present had been asked but one question; but no two questions were alike, and like myself the other Senators had answered, and when all the questions and answers were studied together, the correspondent had the story.¹

So a speaker who can present information that is out of the ordinary — new discoveries, new inventions, great and unusual achievements, thrilling adventures — who can afford a measure

¹ Homer Dorr Lindgren: *Modern Speeches* (Revised Edition, 1930), p. 40.

of relief from the ordinary, the drab and commonplace, will get a hearing. Speech materials of this order have great attention values.

The attention value of the unusual has a number of implications for the speaker. Unusualness in thought content is no more gripping than unusualness or originality in style or mode of expression. The speaker who is listened to is the man who not only has original ideas, but who can state them in an original way. When James Russell Lowell remarked that the poorly informed have a tendency to spell "evolution" with an initial *r*, he said something in an unusual way. When Rochefoucauld coined his famous aphorism, "You can do anything with a bayonet except sit on it," he expressed his thought in a manner at once striking and original. This is treated more at length in Chapter XI, "The Speaking Style."

Observe how the unusualness of the ideas and the manner of expressing them grips the attention in the following:¹

There is a very general tendency to deny that ideal forces have any practical power. But there have been several thinkers whose skepticism has an opposite direction. "We cannot," they say, "attribute external reality to the sensations we feel." We need not wonder that this theory has failed to convince the unmetaphysical common sense of people that a stone post is merely a stubborn thought, and that the bite of a dog is nothing but an acquaintance with a pugnacious, four-footed conception. When a man falls down stairs it is not easy to convince him that his thought simply tumbles along an inclined series of perceptions and comes to a conclusion that breaks his head; least of all, can you induce a man to believe that the scolding of his wife is nothing but the buzzing of his own waspish thoughts, and her use of his purse only the loss of some golden fancies from his memory. We are all safe against such idealism as Bishop Berkeley reasoned out so logically. Byron's refutation of it is neat and witty: —

When Bishop Berkeley says there is no matter,
It is no matter what Bishop Berkeley says.

¹ Thomas Starr King: "Substance and Show."

Variety. It is a well-known psychological fact that we cannot attend to any one thing for any length of time. Fix your attention on some part of a picture or a page and observe how soon the field of vision becomes blurred. Center thought on the meaning of a word or phrase, and soon it ceases to have any meaning at all.

A moving object, or an object that is doing something, or even a complex object that presents a number of parts to be examined in turn, can hold the eyes for some time. But it is almost impossible to hold them fixed for any length of time on a simple, motionless, unchanging object.

Attention is mobile because it is exploratory; it continually seeks something fresh for examination. In the presence of a complex of sights, sounds and touch stimuli, it tends to shift every second or two from one part of the situation to another. Even if you are lying in bed with your eyes closed, the movement of attention still appears in the rapid succession of thoughts and images.¹

This is true not only of thought content, but also of all agents of communication such as voice and bodily action. We know how deadly is monotony of voice, whether in pitch, force, quality, or rate of utterance. Sameness fatigues. So with action. A gesture constantly repeated tires and distracts. No action, which is sameness, has a similar effect. We do not like to listen to a man who stands motionless in the same place all the time. We demand variety in voice and action.

Attention demands variety in speech materials. A speech that uses logical argument to the exclusion of other forms of support soon exhausts an audience. It is too much of a strain on the attention. The mental effort necessary to follow logical reasoning is much greater than the effort required for any other form of support. This is true especially of persons not used to sustained thinking, and very few persons are. It is true for all persons to a degree. A closely knit argument will tire any

¹ Woodworth: *Psychology* (1929), p. 367.

audience in half an hour or so, although a good deal depends on the presentation. A rapid rate of utterance will hasten the loss of attention, as the mental effort required to follow is too great; while a slow rate of utterance will retain attention longer. Any form of support if used to the exclusion of others, or nearly so, will tend to lose attention. Variety of speech materials is absolutely necessary. Facts, testimony, reasoning, illustrations in the form of metaphor, simile, anecdotes, parables, must all be taken together to make truth palatable and a speech interesting.

By the same token, a speech must have movement. There must be change from one point to another. *Attention will best be sustained when a speech has a definite movement toward a definite goal, with many kinds of speech materials, and a pleasing variation in voice and bodily action.* Variety is the keynote to holding attention.

Humor. Humor is admittedly one of the great sustaining pillars of attention. All normal people recognize the value of humor in a speech. In fact, a lively sense of humor in a speaker is a gift of the gods. If you have a speculative turn of mind, you can delve into the problem of the nature of humor; and when you have done that, you will discover that no one really knows much about it, and that most of what is written on the subject is light without illumination. Fortunately, it is not necessary to know much about the science of humor to appreciate its importance and value in a speech.

Humor furnishes largely the entertainment feature in speaking. It is the open sesame to a receptive mood on the part of an audience.

One need be only a casual observer to be impressed with the fact that to be amused and entertained is one of the major pursuits of life. Even when bankruptcy sits on the ledger of many business enterprises, the amusement business flourishes. An audience will come to a lecture in part at least on the supposition that they will have a good time. Our usual comment

is: "We *enjoyed* the lecture very much," or "The lecture was a *bore*." Of course the enjoyable element in a lecture is to be interpreted broadly. Humor is only one factor, but it is a large one. Whatever interests or grips us is enjoyable, unless it is negative, or detrimental to our welfare.

Virtually all our great popular speakers have had a lively sense of humor. Robert Ingersoll was a capital entertainer, one of the finest the platform has ever had, and unquestionably the biggest drawing card as a speaker. Not that entertainment was ever an ultimate end with Ingersoll — never, unless perhaps on some after-dinner occasions. In all his lectures — and he was on the platform for forty years — Ingersoll never was known to go out of his way to be funny. He did not have to. Humor was bred in him. If Hugh Walpole is right in saying, "To those who feel, life is a tragedy: to those who think, life is a comedy," Ingersoll was a thinker, and to him life was to a great extent a comedy. He was capable of the most devastating ridicule of which we have record. Beecher said of Wendell Phillips that he never slew an adversary except with a sunbeam. Ingersoll wrought the most devastating havoc among his adversaries with bubbling humor and ridicule.

When Beecher was in England pleading the cause of the North in 1863, with every audience in part a howling mob, and with heavy responsibilities on his shoulders, he was able to relieve the tensest moments with flashes of wit and humor. "In my own land," he remarks in his "Glasgow Speech," "I have been the subject of misrepresentation and abuse so long that when I did not receive it, I felt as though something was wanting in the atmosphere!" (*Laughter and applause.*)

Observe the humor and originality of the following from Thomas Starr King's lecture, "Substance and Show":

Our conceptions of strength and endurance are so associated with visible implements and mechanical arrangements that it is hard to divorce them, and yet the stream of electric fire that splits an ash is not a ponderable thing, and the way in which the loadstone reaches

the ten-pound weight and makes it jump is not perceptible. You would think the man had pretty good molars that should gnaw a spike like a stick of candy, but a bottle of innocent-looking hydrogen gas will chew up a piece of bar-iron as though it were some favorite Cavendish; and Mr. Faraday, the great chemist, claims to have demonstrated that each drop of water is the sheath of electric force sufficient to charge eight hundred thousand Leyden jars. In spite of Maine liquor laws, therefore, the most temperate man is a pretty hard drinker, for he is compelled to slake his thirst with a condensed thunderstorm. The difference in power between a woman's scolding and a woman's tears is explained now. Chemistry has put it into formulas. When a lady scolds, a man has to face only a few puffs of articulate carbonic acid, but her weeping is liquid lightning.

Humor runs through virtually all of Wendell Phillips' speeches and addresses. During the dark days of the antislavery crusade, the skies were never so black, the lightning flashes never so blinding, but that Phillips could find some humor in the situation. Even in the "Harper's Ferry Address," delivered in Beecher's famous church in Brooklyn while John Brown's life was hanging in the balance, and when Phillips was in one of his ugliest moods, he managed to draw peals of laughter from his audience more than once. It is proof of the fine composure of the man and his serene spirit that humor was always a ready outlet for even the tensest emotion. Henry Ward Beecher dared to use humor even in the pulpit, and was criticized for doing so.

In one of his lectures to Yale students, Beecher made some comment on the use of humor in a sermon. An auditor asked, "Is it the proper thing to make an auditor laugh by an illustration?" Beecher replied:

Never turn aside from a laugh any more than you would a cry. Go ahead on your Master's business, and do it well. And remember this, that every faculty in you was placed there by the dear Lord God for his service. Never *try* to raise a laugh for a laugh's sake, or to make men merry as a piece of sensationalism, when you are preaching on solemn things. That is allowable at a picnic, but not in a pulpit

where you are preaching to men in regard to God and their own destiny. But if mirth comes up naturally, do not stifle it; strike that chord, and particularly if you want to make an audience cry. If I can make them laugh, I do not thank anybody for the next move; I will make them cry. Did you ever see a woman carrying a pan of milk quite full, and it slops over on one side, that it did not immediately slop over on the other also? ¹

It is significant that all these masters of the platform, who exercised powerful influence over their audiences, used humor freely in their speeches. It should be remembered that they talked mostly to mixed audiences. Not all speech situations lend themselves equally well to the use of humor. One must have a sense of the divine proprieties. Still, it is probably safe to say that the occasions are rare when a little humor is not appropriate. A very popular lecturer of the day on the subject of art enlivens all his speeches with a liberal sprinkling of humor. Even in the deliberative assembly humor has a distinct place, as evidenced by the best traditions of English and American parliamentary eloquence.

The Concrete. The concrete has some distinct advantages in relation to attention. The first is that it is easy to understand and so economizes the mental effort in following a speech. So pronounced is this that, in comparison with involved abstractions, the concrete, we often say, *rests* attention. Recently I heard a speaker open a lecture on "American Education" by reading a book review that he had written. The review proved fatiguingly abstract and uninteresting, and it is safe to say that when the speaker came to the end of it — in about fifteen minutes — not one-fourth of the audience was listening to him. Most persons think in terms of images, and must receive their information in images or pictures. They are not interested in the abstract. The concrete furnishes the pictures and affords the principal means of making ideas vivid and impressive. It

¹ Henry Ward Beecher: *Yale Lectures on Preaching*. The Pilgrim Press: First Series, p. 178.

is largely through the use of concrete examples and illustrations that we liken the new to the old in point of understanding, belief, and feeling.

Another advantage is that the concrete sticks in the memory much longer than the abstract. We are influenced in the long run by the ideas that persist in consciousness. We are doubtless influenced too by ideas that are below the threshold of consciousness — subconscious — but not so much, at least not so far as overt action is concerned. It is the ideas that are remembered and that come to dominate consciousness that are the most influential in determining behavior. Therefore, the speaker who wishes to influence conduct must learn to be concrete, and talk in terms of pictures. Especially is the concrete important in rousing the feelings. We have already seen, in Chapter XIV, "The Impressive Speech," that only the concrete has much effect on the emotions.

It is possible to overestimate the inherent interest value of the concrete. A speaker may be concrete and be an intolerable bore, although he is not likely to be. All depends on what the concreteness is about. One may recount personal experiences, tell stories, and give examples, and not hold the attention of his audience. The supreme value of the concrete is in making clear, vivid, and impressive ideas in which the audience is presumed to have an interest. The unusual, on the other hand, has an inherent interest value.

Attention has already been called to the startlingly large element of concreteness to be found in our great speeches. Most of them have about enough framework of general ideas to hold the supporting examples and illustrations in place. Men who are much before audiences learn more about the psychology of attention through experience than they could from textbooks. The best way to understand the significance of the concrete in speaking is to become thoroughly familiar with the methods of men who know. Their names should be familiar to you by this time.

Curiosity and Attention. Mental curiosity, some writers tell us, is at the bottom of much of our desire for education. It is certain that we often go to hear a speech largely out of curiosity. If the speaker is well known, we are curious to see and hear him and perhaps meet him. We are motivated powerfully also by a desire to know what he has to say. Will he give us some new ideas? Will he make new use of old materials, as Lincoln did in his "Cooper Union Speech"? Will he prove to be a real explorer in the realm of thought? A cultivated audience expects that. A mixed audience does not care for so much of the new. In either instance, the new must be judiciously mixed with the old to be acceptable.

It is curiosity in reference to such things that always rivets attention on a speaker for the first few minutes. This is his opportunity to get started right and make the audience feel that he has something for them that will be at least refreshing.

In the course of a speech a speaker enlists our curiosity in several ways besides that of original thinking. Every story or anecdote involves curiosity as to the outcome. If the plan of the speech is not revealed too fully at the outset, as it should not be, in general, the development of it may arouse some curiosity. We wonder what will come next. Dramatic narrative of unusual incidents or experiences keeps curiosity on edge.

For example, a speaker, in talking about "Measuring Life," began by saying that life could not be measured by length of time, the number of years a man lived, or by his possessions, or by his successes, or by his achievements — and we began to wonder what it could be measured by. That was finally revealed in the last ten minutes of the speech — by growth. As the speaker proceeded from one point to another he kept us guessing as to what was coming next, and much curiosity was aroused as to what his yardstick for measurement was.

Advertisers frequently play on this motive. At times one sees a whole street-car card with only a question mark in the middle. One wonders what it is all about. Then a word

appears, and the more it arouses curiosity the better. Then another, and so on until the advertisement is complete. The trick draws attention to itself and causes many to see and read who otherwise might have paid no attention to it in ordinary form. Novelty here — of method — is an element also.

Curiosity may be aroused by well-selected titles to lectures. "Measuring Life," "From Capitalism to Freedom — not via Socialism," "Superstitions of Advanced People," "The Lost Arts," "Making Democracy Safe for the World," "To Hell in a Pullman," are examples of titles that may arouse interest through curiosity. The last one is perhaps somewhat of the sensational type.

The Speaker and the Occasion as Sources of Attention. A distinguished person with a wide reputation will be listened to even if his utterances do not assay very high. People will listen with breathless attention to a candidate for President, almost irrespective of what he has to say. If he has a real message for his hearers, in the bargain, then the occasion will be one to be remembered. When Lincoln delivered his "Gettysburg Address," he had an impressive occasion. It is said that there was a complete hush among the vast assemblage, which continued for some time after the President had finished. That was one reason why Lincoln felt his address had not been well received. Webster addressed a hundred thousand people at the dedication of the Bunker Hill Monument. The occasion was an impressive one, rich in historic memories, which made it extremely favorable for holding the attention of those who could have heard. As a matter of fact, aside from two or three passages, the speech itself is weak in attention values, as it is made up largely of platitudes and is lacking in concrete and interesting materials. The speaker and the occasion probably atoned for the deficiencies in the speech.

The Challenge Technique. We are all interested in a good "scrap," especially if it involves the other fellow. Some there are who are not averse to getting into one. Just what the

genetics of this racial propensity may be, we need not here inquire; but we must acknowledge that we have a sinister satisfaction in seeing other people, or even animals, in conflict. It is likely that interest in scandal derives largely from the fact that it always involves conflict. It is well known that clashes of some consequence between great personages, great statesmen, not to speak of great states, are among the major finds of the newspaper office.

To suggest the operation of this propensity on a low level, one need merely call attention to the very respectable crowd that a good dog fight will draw. As we ascend the scale, we are impressed with the popularity of bull-fight exhibitions in Spain and Mexico. At the top we have those spectacular, white-light, pugilistic encounters of modern times, known as prize fights, which in glamour, dramatic interest, drawing power, and profit put in the shade the gladiatorial combats of ancient Rome. A debate will draw a crowd where a speech does not. The Lincoln-Douglas debates drew several times the crowds that the individual campaign speeches of the participants ever drew — from 6,000 to 20,000 for each of the seven debates. Drama and fiction derive their interest largely from portraying people in conflict.

The speaker may take advantage of this human interest in the antagonistic. The preacher will seek to show that his is a battle for righteousness against the powers of evil, and that his adherents must enlist in the service under his banner. The politician will emphasize the forces arraigned against him and marshal his constituents against the hosts of error. Lincoln took particular delight in Douglas' references to the divisions within his own ranks, and made the most of it with his audiences; while Douglas, of course, sought to pour oil on the troubled waters. A dramatic narrative interests usually by depicting conflict of forces, whether human or otherwise. It is probable that men like Wendell Phillips and Robert Ingersoll derived their popularity in part from the fact that each flung

a challenge to a powerful social institution; the first to slavery, the second to Christianity. There was something bold and daring and venturesome in their challenge that captured the imagination and drew the crowd.

There is a challenge to party adherents to buckle on their armor for the fray, in the following from Franklin D. Roosevelt's speech nominating Alfred E. Smith for President in 1924.

Four years ago lying opponents said that the country was tired of ideals — they waged a campaign based on an appeal to prejudice — based on the dragging out of bogies and hobgoblins — the subtle encouragement of false fears. America has not lost her faith in ideals — idealism is of her very heart's blood. Tricked once we have been — millions of voters are waiting today for the opportunity next November to wreak their vengeance on those deceivers — they await the opportunity to support a man who will return America to the fold of Decency and Ideals from which she has strayed, and who will bring the government back to the people. This our candidate will do — his is the quality of militant leadership.¹

The alert speaker will be on his guard to seize opportunities to enlist the antagonistic factor in speech-making. It may take many forms and involve forces both animate and inanimate. The conflict may include the speaker as one of the antagonists, or it may be one simply related by the speaker. If the challenge is one thrown out by the speaker, it must have the semblance of reality. He cannot put up straw men for the mere pleasure of knocking them down.

In Conclusion. This does not pretend to be an exhaustive treatment of all the sources of attention. Enough has been said to center thought on the problem, and to suggest how it may best be dealt with. The attainment of a purpose would seem to be the primary aim of a speech. This aim is best accomplished by careful search and selection of materials that serve the specific end of the speech, whatever that may be. The

¹ Homer Dorr Lindgren: *Modern Speeches* (Revised Edition, 1930), p. 138.

character of those materials and their proper adaptation to ends has been dealt with at length in the chapters dealing with the different kinds of speeches. If a speaker has ideas that grip, illustrations that illumine and impress, language that is clear and contains a liberal element of imagery, and a touch of originality that gives distinction to the whole, the problem of attention will largely take care of itself.

One may, however, to great advantage, keep an eye on the attention values of all speech materials and present them in such a way as to win for them the maximum of audience interest. The factors that enter into that problem have been briefly treated in this chapter. If a speaker can, in addition to what has just been suggested, give information that is new or out of the ordinary, keep up variety both in matter and in manner, arouse mental curiosity with the progress of his speech, leaven the whole with humor and genial good nature; and if, finally, he has an impressive occasion and perhaps individual prestige — the stage is set favorably for holding the interest and attention of his listeners.

EXERCISES

1. Hand in a written criticism of one of the lectures assigned for reading. "The Lost Arts," "Acres of Diamonds," and "Substance and Show" are all good specimens of popular platform speaking in America, although not equally great. Analyze at least one of them carefully for sources of interestingness. If you have time, make a comparative study of them. The first two lectures mentioned were delivered to American audiences for about half a century. Try to discover the sources of their remarkable popularity. Consider also the message, style, speech materials, use of illustrations, etc.
2. Comment on a speech you have recently heard which held your attention well. Aim to discover reasons in terms of criteria suggested.
3. Prepare to give a ten-to-fifteen-minute speech with special regard for attention values. Do not forget that your first aim will be to accomplish your speech purpose, but aim also to make the speech interesting and enjoyable.

READINGS

Speeches

"Memories of the Lyceum," by James B. Pond (Vol. XIII).

"The Lost Arts," by Wendell Phillips (Vol. XIII).

"Acres of Diamonds," by Russell H. Conwell.¹

"Substance and Show," by Thomas Starr King (*Mod. El.*: I, Vol. V).

"Big Blunders," by T. DeWitt Talmage (*Mod. El.*: I, Vol. VI).

"Shakespeare," by Robert Ingersoll (Vol. XIII).

"The Rescue of Emin Pasha," by Henry M. Stanley (*Mod. El.*: I, Vol. VI).

"Dollar Chasing," by Roe Fulkerson (*Lindgren*).

"Speech at Bar Dinner," by Oliver Wendell Holmes (*O'Neill*: I).

"Keynote Speech (1928)," by Claude G. Bowers (*O'Neill and Riley*).

References

Arthur Edward Phillips: *Effective Speaking* (1908), Chap. VI.

James Winans: *Public Speaking* (Revised Edition, 1917), Chaps. III and X.

Harry Allen Overstreet: *Influencing Human Behavior* (1925), Chap. VI.

William Phillips Sandford and Willard Hayes Yeager: *Principles of Effective Speaking* (Revised Edition, 1930), Chap. V.

¹ This speech appears on page 379 of this volume.

CHAPTER XIX

ACTION: GESTURE, POSTURE, MOVEMENT

All time and money spent in training the voice and body is an investment that pays a larger interest than any other. — WILLIAM E. GLADSTONE

Tradition has it that some one once asked Demosthenes, the greatest of Greek orators, "What is the first requisite of good speaking?" and the famed orator replied, "Action!" "What is the second requisite?" the questioner continued, and the answer was, "Action!" "What is the third requisite?" And still the answer was "Action!"

A Free, Unfettered Personality. What did Demosthenes mean? Obviously that no one can become a successful speaker who merely utters words with his organs of speech. What we all like to see in a speaker is a free, unfettered personality, completely forgetful of self and completely dominated by the message to be delivered or the purpose to be attained. Emerson's definition of an orator is in point here: "a man drunk with an idea." Not only should a speaker have a firm grip on his subject; the subject should have a firm grip on the speaker. When a man can surrender himself completely to the message in hand, and devote all his powers to the attainment of his purpose, bodily activity will largely take care of itself. This does not mean that gestures and bodily movements are necessarily graceful or quite equal to giving adequate expression to the thought and feeling, but it does mean that the whole personality is speaking, which in point of action is the great desideratum.

The best way to appreciate the importance of bodily activity in speaking is to observe a person on the platform who merely

utters words, stands firmly fixed to the floor like a marble statue, with face blank, and with no gestures of any kind. It will be found that a monotonous voice and a total lack of variety in emphasis usually go with that kind of speaking. Most of us are only too familiar with such deadly performance. Then, on the other hand, observe a speaker who is animated from head to foot, who moves about the floor from time to time, and always with a purpose, who uses appropriate gestures to reinforce expression of thought and feeling, and who enlists his whole personality in the speaking process. How much more effective is such presentation, and how much more pleasing to the listeners.

What bodily activities mean in a play, for instance, was made impressive by the success of the silent movies. Here no one said anything that could be heard. We did get a few captions or headlines to indicate the progress of the play. Aside from that, all we got came through the eye. What we see is apparently of much more consequence than what we hear even in spoken drama. Thus we usually say, "Let us go and see the play." We saw Irving in *Shylock*, Sothorn in *Hamlet*, Joe Jefferson in *Rip Van Winkle*. This is eloquent testimony, in the broad sense, as to how valuable are appeals to the eye, and how important it is that action and gestures shall express adequately and correctly what we are trying to say.

One need only observe any ordinarily animated conversation to be impressed with the part action plays in speaking. We shall find that all bodily agents of expression are alert and in action — head, eyes, arms, hands, fingers. It is only on the public platform that persons stand like Egyptian mummies wrapped in linen, without moving a muscle or a joint, except such as are absolutely necessary to mumble the words. To overcome bodily inertia, caused in part by nervous tension and in part by not knowing what to do, and to free the body for animated and effective expression, is a very important part of training in any beginning course in speech.

Lack of action is a common fault in speaking. In class speaking as a rule, and even in speech contests, students exhibit only a fraction of the radiating power they possess. The reason is that no one has revealed to them their possibilities, by catching a vision of what they can do and holding it before them. They speak mostly without action, with only a faint consciousness of a listening audience. Only on rare occasions does the spirit surge and seek to find a free and untrammelled outlet.

Recently I had occasion to hear a regional declamatory contest, with three groups competing in oratorical, dramatic, and humorous selections. Four boys appeared in oratorical selections in work that did not rise above the level of mediocrity. No selection received anything approaching adequate expression. Gestures were few, and physical reinforcement of any kind largely absent.

In the humorous division, one boy competed with three girls. The work here was of a much higher order, and action was conspicuous. All contestants appeared to be animated from toe to crown, all bodily agents finding the freest expression. Especially was this true of the boy, who impersonated a number of Chautauqua performers, including a Congressman. The manner of utterance was of a kind to give one pause. He absolutely dominated the situation, with a profuseness of action appropriate to the sentiments uttered, and so held the audience spellbound. The thought which impressed one at the time was that if this boy had delivered one of the oratorical selections, he probably would have done much the same as the other boys did — utterly failed to give any adequate expression to it. He would have failed there to realize his powers and to have had revealed to him what voice and action and a truly animated personality can do. In an oratorical selection he doubtless would have used fewer gestures, and properly so; but if he had shown the same alertness and freedom on the floor, and a personality pervaded with a message and keenly responsive to the thought and feeling uttered, as he did in mimicking the

Congressman, the effect would have been nothing short of electrical, compared with what the others did.

The supreme importance of action and animation holds, of course, for speech-making as well as for declamations.

A speech is judged by its immediate effect. We should always remember that a speech or a debate is to be judged by the effect it makes on an audience, and only by that effect. A speech is made to be heard, not read. That being true, what boots it to have prepared a good speech or a good debate if it is so presented that every idea in it is either buried or massacred in the process? Henry Ward Beecher, having in mind the manner in which discourses are presented in the pulpit, used to say that sermons were the "funerals of great subjects." The only things that count in speaking are the ideas and feelings that find a vivid and definite response in the audience. Everything else in the speech is dead matter. Carefully composed speeches may easily become the funeral of great subjects if little or no attention is given to the manner of presentation.

Recently a girl won an oratorical contest at a Midwest university. It was the consensus of several teachers of speech in the audience that the speech was a weak one, but the fair contestant had a presentation that was superb. Alert, animated, aggressive — her actions spoke so loud that you hardly heard what she said. Later, in a contest with several Midwest universities competing and with heads of speech departments as judges, she won first place again.

Posture. By posture, we mean the position which a speaker takes on the platform. It has reference not only to the feet, but also to the hands and arms when in repose or not engaged in gestures, to the legs, head, and body in general. There are many ways of taking a position on the floor — especially a poor one. One may slouch forward, with shoulders stooped, lean limply on the speaker's desk with one hand and arm, stick the other hand in the pocket and begin to jingle coins that may be heard all over the room, cross one's legs, look out of the

window or up at the ceiling, and begin to speak. This does not overdraw many a picture that one sees on the platform.

In describing a correct or an effective position on the platform, one must not become too dogmatic or rigid in one's rules. Since many beginning students feel a real problem in how to comport themselves on the floor, a few suggestions may be given. It is not necessary that the feet shall be exactly six inches apart and that the heel of the left foot shall point directly at the instep of the right, at an angle slightly acute, as the older texts used to have it, although that is not at all a bad position. The feet should not be too far apart, nor too close. Perhaps four to six inches will be found the proper distance for most persons. The so-called military position, in which the heels come together at an acute angle, should be avoided, for it is one of inferiority and stiffness. Neither should the feet parallel each other, although they may approach that position. Any one with a little practice can discover what for him or her is a comfortable and graceful standing position on the platform.

As for the weight of the body, a good way to discover how it is best distributed is to do some experimenting. You will probably find that in animated speaking, as all speaking should be, the weight will shift more or less from one foot to the other, and from the balls of the feet to the heels. The weight will be, as a rule, much more on one foot than on the other, and much more on the balls of the feet than on the heels. The weight will very likely be on the right foot more than on the left, for the very same reason that we gesture more with the right hand than with the left. We are right-footed as well as right-handed, most of us. An alert and animated speaking position will find the weight largely on the ball of one foot, with the other serving as auxiliary support. In a more relaxed position, the weight will likely shift more to the heels. There will be frequent changes in position if a speaker adopts an aggressive attitude in delivery and is bent on accomplishing something with his audience.

The general bodily position, at the outset at least, will be one

of fulness of stature, with chest well forward, shoulders straight, and head erect. The speaker will look at his audience and not through a window, unless he is willing to lose the confidence of his listeners. He will not be in too much of a hurry to begin to speak, but will wait until quiet has settled over the audience room. As he proceeds, his posture will vary, for variety of posture, as of other behavior, helps to give life to delivery. When he has something of particular interest to convey to his audience, or in his more dramatic moments, he will likely bend forward, using gestures that are appropriate. When a speaker warms up, he need not bother much about his posture, although grace and easé and power should be sought at all times.

Gestures. By action we mean total bodily activity in speaking — the totality of the appeal to the eye. By gestures we mean essentially the movements of arms, hands, head, and shoulders, as well as facial expression.

There are no set rules for gestures, although there are a few guiding principles. Much may be left to the speaker's individuality. It may be safely said that the plane or level of gestures corresponds roughly to the plane or level of the ideas and sentiments expressed. For example, a speaker seeking to give expression to lofty sentiments and ideals, having to do with what is just, right, noble, or holy, would probably gesture in a high plane and in an ascending direction. If, on the other hand, he wished to give expression to thought or feeling of a low order, suggesting the vile, the base, the contemptible or degrading, he would very likely gesture on a low plane and in a descending direction. Matters of fact, of everyday life, of history or science, he would probably place on a medium plane. This holds true either for one hand or for both hands used together.

Again, the principle of gravitation applies to gestures. A speaker who wished to suggest something light, airy, ethereal, would probably do so with an upward movement of the hands and arms; if he wished to suggest something weighty or ponderous, he would use a downward gesture.

We speak of *symmetry* in gestures and position on the floor. If you make a gesture, for example, with your right arm extended toward the side, the tendency is to move the body in the direction of the gesture. Instead, the body should move slightly in the opposite direction, so as to preserve symmetry in relation to the center of gravity. Otherwise, the position on the floor seems unsteady, and too much on one side.

So, too, gestures vary in regard to the direction outward from the body. We may gesture directly in front of the shoulder, or toward the side, approaching an angle of 90° , or anywhere in between. Thoughts or objects present in time or space, those that are close to us and to the audience, we are likely to gesture in a forward direction; those remote in time or space, toward the side; and those neither very close nor very remote, in a direction somewhere between the two. Side gestures with both arms extended suggest, among other things, large bodies or vast expanses.

Gestures directly in front of the body should be avoided. The right hand should be used to gesture on the right, and the left hand to gesture on the left. *Cultivate the use of both hands*, the left as well as the right. It is very seldom that we have occasion to gesture with the hands in front of the body. There are exceptions, as in the case of an attitude of devotion or prayer, or of dramatic gestures. But for ordinary speaking the rule holds.

In gesturing with either hand, use the hand as a whole, and be sure to vitalize it to the finger tips. A limp hand expresses nothing but limpness. Avoid it. Avoid, also, all contortions of the hand — as, for instance, keeping the thumb and two first fingers open, and the other two closed. While the hand should not be limp, neither should it be stiff, with fingers straight out and close together. Cultivate a graceful hand gesture. You can determine what a graceful hand gesture is by practice, especially practice under guidance from your instructor.

All gestures of the hands and arms should proceed from the

shoulder as a pivot, rather than from the elbow. A gesture from the elbow only is awkward, as you can readily see by trying it out. The elbow joint will be used more or less, but only in connection with movement from the shoulder.

It is customary to speak of a gesture as having three parts or movements: preparation, execution, and devitalization. This, of course, is not intended to imply that a gesture is deliberate. Gestures, as a rule, are unconscious, and in all public performances ought to be. By executing a gesture, especially of the emphatic type, we mean that the hand and arm make a *decided movement* on the emphatic word or phrase. Without such a movement or stroke, the gesture may have no meaning. Before that can be done, the hand is unconsciously brought into readiness to do it. When a gesture has been executed, the hand and arm drop "dead" to the side, unless they become engaged in another gesture.

You will observe, also, that in a graceful gesture of the arm and hand, the hand is likely to move in something approaching an arc of a circle rather than in a straight line. A movement of the hand in a straight line from the side of the body does not look right and does not give the most effective gesture. A little practice in all these aspects of gesturing will reveal to you what is reasonably graceful and correct, and what is awkward and wrong.

There are a few *positions of the hand* that may be noted to advantage; that is, positions which the hand may take when the gesture is executed. Ordinarily the hand assumes a fixed position for only a moment, either moving into another gesture, or else dropping to the side.

1. *The Hand Supine.* This means that the hand is in a plane that may approach the horizontal, with palm up. As a matter of fact, the so-called hand supine, instead of being horizontal or nearly so, will on most occasions be more nearly at an angle of about 45° with the horizontal. You can easily test this out. This is the gesture of presentation, and, in speak-

ing, is probably the most common of all gestures. We use it to present ideas that have our approval — accepted truth. “This is our view.” “I present this for your consideration.” “It was an interesting occasion.”

2. *The Hand Prone.* The hand prone, palm down and at an angle, denies, suppresses, disapproves; it expresses dislike, disgust — negative attitudes. “I disagree with you.” “Let us keep this quiet.” “Let us have done with all such nonsense!” In proportion as the negative feeling is intense, you will find that the hand will assume a position that approaches the vertical with palm toward the audience. This position of the hand not only denies and disapproves, but it does so vigorously and intensely. It is a gesture of unqualified rejection. “I scorn your offer!” “Away with your hirelings!”

3. *The Hand with Index Finger Prominent.* This gesture may vary somewhat, and may take two fairly definite forms. If the hand is prone and the index finger only moderately prominent, it is essentially a descriptive gesture, used to point out an object, a person, or a scene. It is used much in drawing vivid pictures. If the index finger is firm and pointed straight ahead, and the others closed more or less tightly, it becomes essentially an intellectual gesture, used to rivet attention to a point or fact. When directed at a person, it becomes a gesture of accusation. “I want you to be sure to get this.” “Did you notice the admission that my opponent made?” “I accuse you of unfair tactics.” “You are a coward!”

4. *The Clenched Fist.* When we use the clenched fist, as we may often do with propriety, it suggests that we are expressing ideas that are charged with deep emotion, usually of the more or less violent kind. The clenched fist expresses defiance, contempt, righteous indignation. It expresses moral certainty and deep conviction of any kind. “I scorn ridicule.” “I defy accusation. Here I stand. Let them come forth!” “It is my sincere belief.” “I would not for this right hand of mine.” “May my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth!”

Gestures should be practiced, preferably before a mirror. You will never learn to gesture if you do not try to gesture, any more than you will ever learn to swim if you do not try to swim. Graceful and appropriate gestures do not just happen. They come only as a result of practice, and all practice is mechanical at first. You will know, if you ever play tennis, how simple and easy it seems to swing the racquet just right — until you come to try it! So with gestures. Your first attempts will be awkward and mechanical. You will look like a wooden Indian. But you will soon get over the awkward stage, and when you do, you will feel a new source of power that you may not have dreamed you had.

Movement. Movement refers to changes in position on the floor. Every movement which the speaker makes carries some meaning. If the movement is an aimless one, it may simply detract attention from the speech and serve no good purpose. If it is made to serve the speaker's end, then it becomes a positive factor in purposeful speaking.

There are several ways in which movement on the floor may serve the speaker's purpose. We should remember that while a writer may indicate transitions and progress in the thought by paragraphs, sections, and chapters, the speaker has no such devices at his disposal. One way a speaker may suggest transition in the thought is by changing his position on the floor. Some kind of movement on the floor, accompanied by a pause, is a very common way of suggesting to the audience the end of one line of thought and the beginning of another. The construction of the speech may serve the same purpose. It may be said with some emphasis that youthful speakers are inclined to neglect *all* methods for suggesting to their listeners transition and progress in their thought. A speech should "march," says H. A. Overstreet, and that is a picturesque way to put it. One way to make a speech march is to use appropriate movements at the proper time on the floor. Movement on the floor may be made to suggest movement in the speech toward a goal.

A speaker may also emphasize a point of importance by a step or two forward. This is in fact a common form of emphasis. I recall Robert Ingersoll, when he wanted to drive home some favorite point of his; he would take several steps forward to the very front of the stage and deliver himself of what he wanted to say. This movement forward, with other appropriate forms of emphasis, made the thought outstanding for the audience.

Every movement on the floor will carry some meaning. The significant thing is to have it carry the kind of meaning that we want it to carry and help us accomplish our purpose.

There is no doubt room for much variety and individuality in behavior here. A great deal depends on the speaker and the occasion. Some speakers will "use the stage," as they say in dramatics, extensively and be effective; others will use it very little and be almost equally effective. I recall a convocation speaker who moved back and forth — slowly, be it said — over a distance of at least forty or fifty feet on the platform and still did not offend with his movements. He was an unusually engaging speaker, free from all inhibitions so far as one could observe, and used gestures profusely. A Catholic priest of tall stature stood on the left of the desk with his right hand resting on it, and with virtually no variation from that position during an hour's lecture. He was effective, too, but lack of variety in movement and gesture probably detracted somewhat from his effectiveness. A distinguished woman speaker stood on the right of the desk, with left arm and hand resting on it, and held an audience of 5000 students spellbound for fifty minutes, with hardly a variation from that position. Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver of Cleveland, standing behind the desk, consistently, for about the same length of time, captivated his audience with a presentation that left very little to be desired.

There are no broad rules that can be laid down and made to apply to all people. For most speakers the golden mean will probably serve best; that is, an occasional change of position.

The gentleman who walked about the floor for long distances did not gain anything by it. Neither did he lose much by it; but only persons with complete abandon on the stage can do that. The presentation of the woman speaker, as well as that of the Catholic priest, was, for me at least, slightly marred by lack of movement and monotony of position. Still, both were effective. Speakers who walk much and speak slowly are likely to inflict considerable suffering on their listeners. Common sense must rule. Large audiences will probably inspire more movement than small ones; informal occasions more than formal ones. Imaginative and dramatic speakers will, as a rule, use much more stage than those of the more intellectual and abstract type. Movement on the floor, like gestures, will be, or at least become, largely unconscious. In the beginning, practice under guidance is helpful.

Mannerisms on the Floor. It is a broad principle, but one worth remembering, that whatever mannerisms on the platform call attention to themselves detract just that much attention from the thought, and so should be avoided. The outlandish things that one may do on the platform to distract attention are legion, and only a few specific warnings can be given.

The highest platform art is so to comport oneself as to leave manner of utterance in the background and give to one's message or purpose at all times the center of attention.

Avoid monotony in any kind of action — in movement, gesture, or posture. The speaker who paces the floor, back and forth, like a lion in a cage, will soon have every person in the audience watching his gait and engaging in a walking match with him. This gets very tiresome to the audience, for the reason that every person in the room tends to do the very things that the speaker does. You have observed that when you watch a football game, you frequently find yourself occupied, unconsciously, in doing incipiently the very things the players are doing, and going through much the same muscular movements. If the team is pushing their opponents toward the goal on the

right, the chances are that you are pushing the person next to you in the same direction. If we see an accident even at a distance, we jerk back, as if to avoid it. Watching a foot race, we speed up our muscles with the runners. To understand this empathic tendency to action is of some importance to a speaker, for it makes clear why all action not related to giving your thoughts effective expression tends to distract attention and tire an audience. All such action should be avoided.

Just as it is bad to move about too much, so it is also bad not to move about at all. To stand in the same place and in the same position all the time is tiresome for a speaker, and soon gets tiresome for the audience. No speaker does it who feels free to do as he pleases on the floor. Monotony in negative action — that is, no action at all — may be almost as bad as monotony in positive action.

Monotony in gesture should be avoided as well as monotony in no gesture. To “punch” the air constantly with the right hand — or left, for that matter — tends to drive an audience distracted, for reasons already given. To emphasize constantly with vertical hand — meat-axe gesture — has the same effect. So with any other gesture: it gets tiresome if overdone. All such action tends to direct attention to the behavior of the speaker and away from what he is saying. Not to gesture at all is equally bad. What serves our purpose best is variety and moderation.

All action should be purposeful; let us remember that. The whole body, though not tense, should be attuned to the accomplishment of an aim. All movements that do not contribute to that end, or that hinder it, should be sedulously avoided. Holding the hands behind the back is not against the law, but if done for any length of time, it limits a speaker. Thrusting one hand into a pocket is not a felony, but the hand is useless or worse while there. Running one's fingers through one's hair has no persuasive power, and may annoy an audience if persisted in. Leaning against a desk too much, crossing one's legs

in a standing position, holding a pencil in one hand, jingling money in one's pocket, are so many things to be avoided.

Vocalizing when not speaking is a habit many platform speakers have. "Now — er — I wish to say something — er — about — er —" etc. Avoid it. Almost any one may be caught doing it occasionally, but if carried to an extreme it may become an intolerable nuisance.

If you have difficulty in observing these directions, it may comfort you to know that you may be a successful speaker even if you do not follow them exactly. One of the most engaging speakers on the American platform today begins his speech by sticking both hands into his pockets, and he keeps them there most of the time until he is through speaking. Of course, he is a good speaker in spite of this mannerism, not because of it. Lincoln was awkward on the platform, and divided his weight about equally between both feet. He was effective not because of that habit, but in spite of it. Your speaking will gain in effectiveness by graceful and appropriate action, but you can become a good speaker without all the graces.

EXERCISES

1. Take a comfortable and graceful position on the floor. Observe the position of your feet and your general bodily posture. Practice this in your study. In the classroom, let this be done under guidance of your instructor.
2. Aim to use appropriate gestures with the following utterances. Pay particular attention to the hand.
 - a. "It looks very much like a cloud."
 - b. "I want to call your attention to *this*."
 - c. "Please be quiet."
 - d. "I will have nothing to do with such a proposal."
 - e. "This vast throng before me."
 - f. "I defy the gentlemen. I defy their whole phalanx. Let them come forth."

3. Tell a simple story with appropriate action about "a memorable hunting trip," "an auto accident," or some similar subject.
4. Take such a speech as "Grattan's Reply" and deliver it with great freedom of gesture, yet without exaggeration.
5. Practice gestures in the upper plane for:
 - a. "These are the ideals for which we live and die."
 - b. "We declare before God that our intentions are just."
 - c. "He towers above them all in his fearless integrity."
6. Practice gestures in the lower plane for:
 - a. "That slinking, cowardly fool."
 - b. "I abhor such trickery."
 - c. "Just forget such ideas."
7. Practice gestures in the middle plane for:
 - a. "We must consider both sides."
 - b. "Yes, I agree with you."
 - c. "Now, wait a minute!"

Practice like this should be a daily exercise for several weeks if you want to develop graceful gestures. You can suit gestures to any selection of your choice. Do not overlook the fact that every gesture involves total bodily action.

8. Read Herndon's description of Lincoln before an audience. It is presented here, not to be copied altogether, but because it is interesting. The fact that Lincoln, with many handicaps, achieved world-wide fame as a speaker — richly deserved, for his speeches are among our best models — should prove an inspiration to those who aspire to become speakers.

LINCOLN THE ORATOR¹

BY WILLIAM H. HERNDON

A brief description of Mr. Lincoln's appearance on the stump and of his manner when speaking may not be without interest. When standing erect he was six feet four inches high. He was lean in flesh and ungainly in figure. Aside from the sad, pained look due to habitual melancholy, his face had no characteristic or fixed expression. He was thin through the chest, and hence slightly stoop-shouldered.

¹ *Abraham Lincoln* (1890), Vol. II, p. 405.

When he arose to address courts, juries, or crowds of people, his body inclined forward to a slight degree. At first he was very awkward, and it seemed a real labor to adjust himself to his surroundings. He struggled for a time under a feeling of apparent diffidence and sensitiveness, and these only added to his awkwardness. I have often seen and sympathized with Mr. Lincoln during these moments. When he began speaking, his voice was shrill, piping, and unpleasant. His manner, his attitude, his dark, yellow face, wrinkled and dry, his oddity of pose, his diffident movements — everything seemed to be against him, but only for a short time. After having arisen, he generally placed his hands behind him, the back of his left hand in the palm of his right, the thumb and fingers of his right hand clasped around the left arm at the wrist. For a few moments he played the combination of awkwardness, sensitiveness, and diffidence. As he proceeded he became somewhat animated, and to keep in harmony with his growing warmth his hands relaxed their grasp and fell to his side. Presently he clasped them in front of him, interlocking his fingers, one thumb meanwhile chasing the other. His speech now requiring more emphatic utterance, his fingers unlocked and his hands fell apart. His left arm was thrown behind, the back of his hand resting against his body, his right hand seeking his side. By this time he had gained sufficient composure, and his real speech began. He did not gesticulate as much with his hands as with his head. He used the latter frequently, throwing it with vim this way and that. This movement was a significant one when he sought to enforce his statement. It sometimes came with a quick jerk, as if throwing off electric sparks into combustible material. He never sawed the air nor rent space into tatters and rags as some orators do. He never acted for stage effect. He was cool, considerate, reflective — in time self-possessed and self-reliant. His style was clear, terse, and compact. In argument he was logical, demonstrative, and fair. He was careless of his dress, and his clothes, instead of fitting neatly as did the garments of Douglas on the latter's well-rounded form, hung loosely on his giant frame. As he moved along in his speech he became freer and less uneasy in his movements; to that extent he was graceful. He had a perfect naturalness, a strong individuality; and to that extent he was dignified. He despised glitter, show, set forms, and shams. He spoke with effectiveness and to move the judgment as

well as the emotions of men. There was a world of meaning and emphasis in the long, bony finger of his right hand as he dotted the ideas on the minds of his hearers. Sometimes, to express joy or pleasure, he would raise both hands at an angle of about fifty degrees, the palms upward, as if desirous of embracing the spirit of that which he loved. If the sentiment was one of detestation — denunciation of slavery, for example — both arms, thrown upward and fists clenched, swept through the air, and he expressed an execration that was truly sublime. This was one of his most effective gestures, and signified most vividly a fixed determination to drag down the object of his hatred and trample it in the dust. He always stood squarely on his feet, toe even with toe; that is, he never put one foot before the other. He neither touched nor leaned on anything for support. He made but few changes in his positions and attitudes. He never ranted, never walked backward and forward on the platform. To ease his arms he frequently caught hold, with his left hand, of the lapel of his coat, keeping his thumb upright and leaving his right hand free to gesticulate. The designer of the monument recently erected in Chicago has happily caught him in just this attitude. As he proceeded with his speech the exercise of his vocal organs altered somewhat the tone of his voice. It lost in a measure its former acute and shrilling pitch, and mellowed into a more harmonious and pleasant sound. His form expanded, and, notwithstanding the sunken breast, he rose up a splendid and imposing figure. In his defence of the Declaration of Independence — his greatest inspiration — he was “tremendous in the directness of his utterances; he rose to impassioned eloquence, unsurpassed by Patrick Henry, Mirabeau, or Vergniaud, as his soul was inspired with the thought of human right and Divine justice.” His little gray eyes flashed in a face aglow with the fire of his profound thoughts; and his uneasy movements and diffident manner sunk themselves beneath the wave of righteous indignation that came sweeping over him. Such was Lincoln the orator.

CHAPTER XX

VOICE: PRONUNCIATION, ENUNCIATION

The living voice; the greatest force on earth among men.

— HENRY WARD BEECHER

A story is told of Helena Modjeska, the great Polish actress, who was a favorite on the American stage for many years. Once when she had received repeated calls from her audience, feeling that she had to make an acknowledgment and not knowing the English language, she resolved to meet the situation by simply repeating the Polish alphabet. This she did with such beautiful effect that she moved her audience to tears. If the incident is correctly reported, as it may very well be, it is plain that the voice alone was made to carry the meaning.

We are all familiar with the quality of voice used in expressing joy, grief, anger, affection, and other emotions. What the distinguished actress did was to use the vocal quality appropriate for expressing a feeling of pathos or sadness, sufficiently intense to draw tears from her listeners. This is suggestive of how important a part the voice plays in speaking.

It is not our purpose here to present an exhaustive treatise on voice, but only to give a few suggestions to those who need it.

Requisites of a Good Voice. A pleasing and adequate voice is one of the greatest gifts that a speaker can have, just as a thin, strident, or raucous voice is an unfortunate handicap. A good voice should be firm and strong, with good breath support; possess a rich and resonant tone; and, above all things, manifest variety in tonal elements. A voice that moves in monotone, with unvarying emphasis and rate of speed, carries no distinction of meaning either in thought or feeling, and soon tires the

listener; while a voice of good texture, well modulated, moving easily from one pitch to another and from one tonal quality to another, and varying the amount of stress in accordance with the emphasis desired, is always a delight to hear.

The majority of young speakers, it may safely be said, do not have any great difficulty with their voices. That does not mean, however, that voice training will not improve their voices and make them very much more efficient instruments. There are, moreover, some in every group whose voices, for one reason or another, are either disagreeable or wholly inadequate for effective expression. Since the foundation of a good voice is correct and adequate breathing, some attention may properly be given to that first.

Correct Breathing. Breathing is one of those things that we are likely to take for granted, like so many other aspects of speech. But there is correct breathing and there is incorrect breathing. The proper method of breathing is the active diaphragmatic method. This means that the proper action of the diaphragm and of the abdominal muscles is the basis of sound and efficient breathing. The diaphragm, as you may know, is the strong partition muscle separating the abdomen from the chest.

When we breathe correctly, there is a movement of expansion throughout the whole trunk or torso. The impulse to expand will take effect first through the waist and later through the chest. If the expansion is principally through the chest, you may know that you are breathing incorrectly. The floating ribs should move outward and the abdominal wall forward, and there should be an expansion both through the waist and through the chest.

When you place your hands flat on the floating ribs at your side and take a deep breath, your hands should be pushed outward at the same time that the abdominal wall moves forward. A few exercises taken regularly for thirty or sixty days will establish this method. There are few things of more vital im-

portance to a speaker than adequate breathing. On that depends the motor power for effective expression.

Not only for voice production but for health is correct breathing important. The technique of efficient and adequate breathing should be taught to every child in the land. In normal breathing, only about one-third of the lung capacity is filled. This means that many of the lung cells are not vitalized by fresh air, except when we take deep breaths, and so become the prey for disease-breeding germs, such as that of tuberculosis. It requires conscious effort to fill the lungs to capacity and bring fresh air to all their parts. Doctors are pretty well agreed that consistent deep breathing of outdoor air several times a day, especially in cold weather, is the best preventive of all pulmonary ailments, such as colds, coughs, tuberculosis, pneumonia.

Open and Relaxed Throat. For efficient voice production, the most important requisite is an open and relaxed throat. A few primitive grunts, *ugh, ugh, ugh*, with throat open and relaxed, will probably call into action the diaphragm, and give the vocal column the right start. It is more important to take a few simple exercises regularly than a large number irregularly. Regular practice until correct habits are formed is the important thing.

EXERCISES FOR DEEP BREATHING

1. Put your hands flat against your floating ribs at side. Inhale slowly through nose, filling lungs completely, pushing hands out and abdominal wall forward. If you do this right, there should be a gradual expansion through the waist and chest. Exhale slowly, as if you were gently blowing out a candle flame. Repeat five times. *This exercise should be taken several times a day until correct breathing habits are formed.*
2. Same position as in 1. Inhale rapidly through nose, filling lungs as well as you can. Exhale slowly on *äh*. See how steady you can keep the flow of air. Prolong as much as you can. Repeat several times.

3. Fill lungs slowly as in 1. Expel breath in a whisper *without vocalizing*, on the vowels, *a, e, i, o, u*, using aspirate *h* before vowels; e.g., *hay, he, hi, ho, who*. *Throat open and relaxed*. Repeat many times.
4. Fill lungs full, breathing through nose. Count 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, etc., as far as you can in a whisper; that is, without vocalizing. If you can count from 55 to 65 distinctly, you have good breath control.
5. Fill lungs full. Pant, *ha, ha, ha, ha*, etc. Observe action of diaphragm.

Vocalizing the Breath. The breath is vocalized in the larynx, as it passes over the vocal cords, thus producing sound. The tones so formed are enriched and amplified by means of *resonance*.

Resonance is the mainstay of all tone production, whether originated by the vocal cords in the human body or any other sound instrument. As examples of resonators, we are familiar with the sounding board of the piano, harp, and violin, and with the air column in the organ pipe, flute, and other wood instruments.

If we pluck a taut violin string with no sounding board near, the string makes a sound that is hardly audible. On the violin, this same string, when the bow is drawn over it, may produce a tone that is loud, rich, and clear. The difference is due to resonance. Sound, from the point of view of physics, is simply air in vibration. The violin is so constructed that the sound waves set in motion by the vibrating strings strike the sounding board of the instrument and cause in it harmonious vibrations which greatly augment the loudness of the tone. The same principle holds for the sounding board of any other instrument. The bony structure of the body in some measure acts as a sort of sounding board for amplifying vocal sounds. This is true especially of the sternum and the head.

It is well known that a taut string, when plucked, vibrates not only as a whole, but also in segments. The principal tone is produced by the vibration of the string as a whole, while the

quality of the tone, or *timbre*, depends largely on the vibrations of the segments which produce the overtones.

A familiar example of resonance to all students of physics is that produced by holding a tuning fork over a tube or air column of the right length. In the same way, the tones of the human voice are amplified through resonance. The chief resonance chambers for the voice are the pharynx — the opening extending from the larynx to the bony structure of the head, back of the nose — the mouth, the sinuses, and the nose.

When we speak, the vocal column passes through the pharynx and the mouth for most of the sounds. The exception is the consonant sound *ng*. In forming this, the vocal column passes largely or entirely through the nasal cavities. In forming the sounds *m* and *n*, the uvula is partly closed, sending part of the breath through the nasal cavities, while the resonance is probably largely in the mouth.

Resonance for different pitches is regulated primarily by the length of the column of air in the pharynx and mouth. The lower the pitch, the larger the air column necessary to support it and produce resonance. The higher the pitch, the shorter the air column needed. If you will note what happens in the pharynx when you vary the pitch of your tones, you will find that for the lower pitches the vibrating air column occupies a much larger space; while for the higher pitches, it is much more restricted. The adjustments are made unconsciously by us to suit the different pitches.

Nasal twang is caused by allowing part of the air column to pass through the nose on sounds that are not at all nasal. The nasal tones *m*, *n*, and *ng* are produced by directing either a part or all of the air column through the nasal cavities. When we form these tones, the soft palate is lowered to meet the back of the tongue, thus partly or wholly closing the passage into the mouth and directing the air column through the nose. So nasal twang, or disagreeable nasality, is caused by allowing a part of the air column to go through the nose, on sounds that normally

should have no nasal sound. It is still true that nasal twang is caused by our speaking through the nose; that is, by allowing a part of the breath to escape through the nose on sounds not normally nasal. This is a defect in vocalization and should be remedied.

In order to detect whether there is noticeable nasal quality in your voice, try saying words without nasals, such as the following, pinching your nose with thumb and forefinger so as to close the nasal passage.

This is the hour for rehearsal.

We are pleased with the results.

Then repeat them with the nasal channels open. There should be no difference if your voice is normal. If there is a noticeable difference, then you should endeavor to get rid of it, under guidance from your instructor.

EXERCISES FOR VOICE

1. Inhale through nose, filling lungs. Exhale slowly, vocalizing principal vowel sounds, *ä**h*, *a**w**e*, *ō**h*, *ō**ō*, *ē*, all in the same breath. Do this on different pitches. Aim to use lips freely and keep them flexible.
2. Fill lungs as above. Prolong vowel sound *ä**h* for several seconds. Do this on different pitches. Do the same for the other vowel sounds, *a**w**e*, *ō**h*, *ō**ō*, *ē*. Use lips freely.
3. Inhale, filling lungs. Take the vowel sounds in turn *ä**h*, *a**w**e*, *ō**h*, *ō**ō*, *ē*, giving each an upward inflection. Make range of pitch as wide as possible. Use words also, *what*, *where*, *who*, *why*, etc. In the same manner give each vowel downward inflection.
4. Put aspirate *h* before vowel sounds and vocalize vigorously, all in one breath, *hay*, *hē*, *hī*, *hō*, *who*. Keep throat open and muscles of throat relaxed. Start slowly and increase speed.
5. Put vocal organs in position to say *ng*. Prolong sound, opening and closing mouth as you do so. Observe that vocal column passes through nose.

6. Count up to 10 *expulsively*; that is, with fair degree of vigor. As you repeat, gradually increase force.
7. Count up to 10 *explosively*; that is, with great vigor, reducing time element to a minimum. Repeat, increasing vigor gradually.
8. Express vowel sounds, *a, e, i, o, u*, *expulsively; explosively*.
9. Give proper expression to these sentences. Shout.
 - a. Avaunt, and quit my sight!
 - b. A horse! A horse! A kingdom for a horse!
 - c. Forward the Light Brigade!
 - d. Charge, Chester, charge! On, Stanley, on!

Daily Drill

Deep breathing — one minute.

Vocalizing on vowels — two minutes.

Shouting — two minutes.

Reading oratorical selections — five minutes — paying particular attention to voice, enunciation, and pronunciation.

Exercises if properly taken will render a voice rich, mellow, and flexible.

The Vocal Elements. There are four aspects or elements of voice to be considered: (1) *vocal quality*; (2) *force*; (3) *time*; (4) *pitch*. Let us look at each of these in turn, briefly.

1. *Vocal Quality.* For expressing emotion, vocal quality is all-important. Through long racial experience, we have come to associate certain qualities of voice with emotional states. We know the voice in grief, fear, anger, love, joy, ridicule, the sneer, the laugh, the cry. The voice alone expresses these different moods and emotions, and many others. The effective speaker will be careful to adapt his voice to the varying mental states he seeks to express. One has but to observe a great actor on the stage to be impressed with the part that the voice plays in the expression of emotion. Often it is true that, unless the right quality of voice is used to express a specific emotion, the words lose their meaning. A student, for instance, will try to read a soliloquy of Hamlet's in an ordinary conversational tone,

as if he were giving information about the price of eggs. The words sound ridiculous. Only a deep, low-pitched voice and a slow rate of utterance will express the despondent mood of Hamlet in the following soliloquy. Try it.

To be, or not to be: that is the question:
 Whether 't is nobler in the mind to suffer
 The slings and arrows of outrageous fortune,
 Or to take arms against a sea of troubles,
 And by opposing end them? To die: to sleep;
 No more; and by a sleep to say we end
 The heart-ache and the thousand natural shocks
 That flesh is heir to, 't is a consummation
 Devoutly to be wish'd.

Again, only a delicate, high-pitched, tender voice will express the emotion that Robert Burns felt when he wrote the poem "To a Mouse."

Wee, sleekit, cow'rin, tim'rous beastie,
 O, what a panic's in thy breastie!
 Thou need na start awa sae hasty,
 Wi' bickering brattle!
 I wad be laith to rin an' chase thee,
 Wi' murd'ring pattle!

I'm truly sorry man's dominion
 Has broken Nature's social union,
 An' justifies that ill opinion,
 Which makes thee startle,
 At me, thy poor, earth-born companion,
 An' fellow-mortal!

There are certain specific vocal qualities, or kinds of voice, such as the *orotund*, the *aspirate*, the *pectoral*, the *guttural*. Except the *orotund*, these are not much used in ordinary platform speaking, but more in acting and impersonation.

The *orotund* is a full, well-rounded voice suitable for expressing

earnest, vigorous, and dignified thought. Before a large audience, one will use this voice much of the time. One may practice it on any good oratorical selection, or a poem like Byron's "Apostrophe to the Ocean," especially the second stanza.¹

The *aspirate* quality of voice is the one used in a whisper. This is really not a quality of voice in the sense of vocalized breath. There is no vocalization, strictly speaking. Whispering is simply breath formed by the organs of articulation into vowel and consonant sounds. In speaking, we may use a whisper for emphasis by way of contrast, although we do not often do so. A whisper also expresses a state of fright or terror. Its most obvious use in speaking is to express secrecy.

The *pectoral* quality is a deep, hollow-sounding voice that is associated with chest resonance, although the resonance is probably mostly in the pharynx. It is used mostly in impersonation. Those familiar with the Seth Parker hour on the radio will recall that the impersonation of Cephas depends almost wholly on a pectoral quality of voice.

The *guttural* quality of voice is, as its name implies, a throaty voice. In ordinary conversation and platform speaking, it is to be avoided, although it may occasionally be used to express scorn and anger. It is used most in acting and impersonation. Try the following with clenched teeth and a guttural voice.

Many a time and oft
In the Rialto you have rated me
About my moneys and my usances:
Still have I borne it with a patient shrug,
For sufferance is the badge of all our tribe.
You call me misbeliever, cut-throat, dog,
And spit upon my Jewish gaberdine,
And all for use of that which is mine own.
Well then, it now appears you need my help:
Go to, then; you come to me, and you say
"Shylock, we would have moneys:" you say so;

¹ See page 463 of this volume.

You, that did void your rheum upon my beard
 And foot me as you spurn a stranger cur,
 Over your threshold: moneys is your suit.

2. *Force.* Voice is air or breath in vibration. The vibrations are set in motion by the vocal cords when air is pumped through the larynx by the breathing mechanism. Vocal *force*, in terms of physics, has to do with the amplitude and frequency of these vibrations. The greater the amplitude, or the distance through which a string vibrates, and the greater the frequency of the vibrations, the greater the intensity of the tone. Vocal force, therefore, depends largely on the pressure exerted by the breathing muscles on the air column as it is forced through the larynx, since this determines the amplitude of the vibrations. *Volume* of voice is a term used somewhat loosely to indicate the amount of breath that passes through the larynx. It will depend on the size of the opening in the larynx through which the air column passes and the amount of pressure exerted on it. Volume will vary somewhat directly with the lowness of pitch. That is, the lower the pitch, the greater may be the volume. Volume of voice is usually associated with low pitch.

We must be on our guard against thinking that the use of an intense or voluminous voice necessarily spells forceful or effective expression. A loud, sonorous voice, if used without variation in degree of force, soon becomes tiresome and painful to an audience. Sameness of vocal force suggests sameness of values, and an utter lack of discrimination in meanings. The effective speaker is the one who cultivates all degrees of force; a soft and low voice as well as a loud, voluminous one. It is contrast and variety in force that really give emphasis. A good way to appreciate this is to listen to good speakers, and observe how they vary the degree of force they use. I once heard Norman Thomas address a convocation of about thirty-five hundred students. His most striking and effective form of emphasis was a sudden drop from a loud, full voice to a soft, low one. The effect was at

times almost electrical. It is a mistake to think that a soft, low voice may not be used to advantage even with a large audience, especially if one is gifted with a voice of good carrying power. A soft voice will often carry almost as far as a loud one. Much depends on the resonance quality of the voice.

We recognize roughly three varieties of force: (1) the effusive; (2) the expulsive; (3) the explosive. It is convenient for the student of speech training to understand these terms.

The *effusive* form of voice is one of very moderate volume and intensity and is supported by a gentle, steady pressure of the breathing muscles, giving it a smooth flow. It is used to express calm emotions, such as awe, reverence, wonder, the sublime. An effusive voice would be appropriate for the following stanza:

With deep affection
And recollection
I often think of
 Those Shandon bells,
Whose sounds so wild would,
In the days of childhood,
Fling round my cradle
 Their magic spells.

The *expulsive* form of voice has a medium degree of volume and intensity, such as we use in ordinary animated conversation, and most often in platform speaking before audiences of moderate size. It is considerably more abrupt and energetic than the effusive form, and is supported by a sharper attack of the abdominal and intercostal muscles. We would use the expulsive form of voice in the following:

And what is so rare as a day in June?
 Then, if ever, come perfect days;
The heaven tries the earth if it be in tune,
 And over it softly her warm ear lays;
Whether we look, or whether we listen,
We hear life murmur, or see it glisten;

Every clod feels a stir of might,
 An instinct within it that reaches and towers,
 And, grasping blindly above it for light,
 Climbs to a soul in grass and flowers;

The *explosive* form of voice is the product of a sudden, sharp, intense vocalization that reduces the time element to a minimum. We use it when shouting and before large audiences, for there are times when one almost has to shout to be heard. It is always heard in college yells. We also use it to express sudden and somewhat violent emotions. When used with discretion and when under control, it may be a very powerful form of emphasis.

There is not much doubt that vocal force when used with taste and discretion has a peculiar persuasive effect on audiences. Many of our great speakers have had voices of catapultic power. Forceful expression suggests strong conviction on the part of the speaker, which tends to be transferred to the hearers. Besides this, thought and feeling when adequately expressed are more fully and easily comprehended by the audience, thus affording the largest measure of appreciation.

3. *Time*. There are several aspects to the time element in speech. One has to do with the average rate of utterance best suited to an audience; another with prolonging syllables in words for purposes of emphasis as in accentuation; still another with retardation in rate of speaking — a very common form of emphasis. Let us consider these in turn.

There is no one *rate of utterance* in speaking, adaptable to all persons. The rate of speaking is at least partly temperamental. It is just as natural for some persons to speak fast as it is for others to speak slowly. Floyd Gibbons on the radio must speak close to two hundred words a minute. He speaks distinctly and “gets away with it.” To many persons, it is not a pleasing rate of speaking. On the other hand, it is entirely possible to move too slowly, especially if a man has not much to say. A slow, ponderous, hesitant presentation may be distracting to an audi-

ence and anything but effective. The rate of utterance is affected by the size of the audience. The larger the audience, the more slowly will the speaker move. No average can be struck, suitable for all speakers and all audiences. It is probable, however, that a rate of about 125 words a minute will be suitable for the majority of speakers and pleasing to most audiences. The weightier the thought and the deeper the emotions, the more slowly one will move; conversely, the lighter the vein in which one speaks, the faster will be the movement, barring individual differences. One thing may safely be affirmed; namely, that one should speak slowly enough to enunciate distinctly and be heard clearly and easily by those who listen. The tendency of young speakers is almost invariably to speak too fast and to enunciate in a more or less slovenly manner.

In speaking or reading, we do not dwell the same length of time on all syllables. Some syllables are long and some are short, as a result of language development. We naturally observe this in speaking. So again, some syllables are accented; some are not. We dwell longer on accented syllables than on the unaccented. The chief differences, however, in tone duration, or in the time one takes to utter a syllable, depend on the emotional content of the thought or our personal attitude toward it. One may give almost any turn one wishes to a thought by dwelling longer on a certain syllable or word than on the rest. Lengthening the time element — *retardation* — is usually accompanied by other forms of emphasis, as for instance greater or less force. When Hamlet soliloquizes,

To die; to sleep; no more.
Perchance to *dream*; *aye*, *there's* the rub.

he very likely dwells much longer on the italicized words than on the others. This is a most effective form of emphasis.

When Webster, in his Dartmouth College argument, said, "I would not for this right hand of mine have her turn to me and say . . ." we can imagine he spoke very slowly and deliberately.

When Wendell Phillips, in "The Scholar in a Republic," uttered a somewhat radical sentiment about the Russian government, and followed it with the statement: "I at least can say nothing else and nothing less. No, not if every tile on Cambridge roofs were a devil hooting my words" he probably uttered the last statement very slowly, almost with a pause between the words. He may have used more force also and combined the two forms of emphasis.

Take the following from O'Connell:

Gentlemen, God knows I speak for the saddest people the sun sees; but may my right hand forget its cunning and my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth, if to help Ireland — even Ireland — I forget the Negro one single hour.

Say this rapidly and see how ridiculous it sounds. It is strong language and must be spoken slowly.

4. *Pitch*. As a tonal element, pitch serves primarily to express distinctions in meaning, both intellectual and emotional — intellectual perhaps more than emotional. It is the mark of a finely modulated voice that it not only moves through a wide range of pitch, but that it does so easily and smoothly. It is only through variety in this vocal element that we can express delicate refinements of meaning. A voice that moves in a monotone is incapable of suggesting discriminations in values. It is true, also, that a voice that lacks variety in pitch is likely to lack variety in all the other tonal elements — quality, force, time. One has only to listen to a person partly or wholly deaf to observe the deadly monotony in all tonal elements. On the other hand, one need only listen to an animated discussion to note the variety in pitch and other vocal elements — the easy "swing" of conversation. It is largely in its pitch transitions or modulations that the trained voice of the actor is distinctive.

Variety in pitch gives emphasis. This may take at least two forms: the *inflection*, or slide, and sudden, abrupt *transition* from one pitch to another. The downward slide is one of the

most common forms of emphasis. It marks, for example, the difference between merely enumerating objects and giving them individuality. We can say, "There was Boston and Concord and Lexington and Bunker Hill," merely naming them as towns or cities, and using a sustained inflection. If we put emotional meaning into these places, such as Webster meant they should have, each one will probably have a marked downward inflection.

Again, a somewhat abrupt change from a high pitch to a low pitch, or the opposite, gives emphasis. In the selection from O'Connell above, emphasis may be had with perfect naturalness by using a much lower pitch of voice for the last clause, "if I forget the Negro one single hour." Try it.

Enough has been said to impress upon you how all-important it is to have variety of tonal elements in your voice. When we speak naturally, and without the inhibitions of appearance in public, there is not much difficulty about variety and emphasis. Even a child of tender age knows how to emphasize. If his mother asks him to do something, perhaps wash his face, and if he is in the right mood, he may answer, "I will not"; using all the voice he can and prolonging each word as he utters it, so that it will sound something like this, "*I w-i-l-l N-O-T.*" This is a perfectly sound method of emphasizing, involving as it does both force and retardation, probably the most common forms of emphasis. The youngster can do this right, because he is not bothered with any inhibitions, and he has the proper emotional urge to resist his mother's suggestion.

Mental Content Important. The real trouble with a speaker who moves in a monotone of voice through the whole of a ten-minute speech is that there is nothing in his mind except words. His personality has not properly reacted to the ideas and feelings he is trying to express. If it had, the emphasis would largely take care of itself. The four-year-old reacted fully to his mother's suggestion, and hence his high degree of effectiveness in emphasis.

We may set it down as a sound principle that, just so far as the mind reacts to the thought and feeling content of a given sentence or selection and comprehends it with a fulness of meaning, just so far will proper expression result, with proper emphasis, variety, and general effectiveness. This assumes, of course, that the voice is adequate and that bodily agents of expression are free.

A mechanical approach should be avoided. It may be well here to guard the student against a too mechanical approach toward getting effective expression either for his own speech or for any selection that he may undertake to interpret and express. A technical knowledge of voice and tonal elements is worth while, for it is necessary to enable us to talk intelligently about such matters. But while such knowledge may serve as a standard by which to check our vocal processes and suggest need for improvement, it does not necessarily, nor in fact at all, afford the best method of approach for getting at meanings or giving them adequate expression. We do not get the best results by saying to ourselves, "I am going to emphasize this word and that word, use a high-pitched voice here and a low-pitched voice there." That method will very likely give us just words and certain pitches of voice. To have such things in mind at the time of utterance is to introduce extraneous or adventitious elements into the mental content. Remember it is the mental content that counts. In the long run, you will express what is in your mind. If you are thinking of words and forms of emphasis, all you will express will be words and forms of emphasis. The question always to ask is: What does this mean? What does the author mean to convey in ideas and feelings? Meaning always has two aspects: intellectual and emotional. Words in their ordinary meaning express the former; the latter has to do with the *attitude* of the author or speaker toward the ideas so expressed. There is no difficulty about the meaning of the words in this passage from *Macbeth*:

If it were done when 'tis done, 'twould be well it were done quickly.

But the greatest actors and interpreters are not agreed as to the author's personal attitude in regard to this, or as to its emotional meaning. It is possible to render it so as to give it a variety of meaning, simply by emphasizing different words. It is the emotional meaning, the personal attitude, that is in dispute. So it is, almost invariably, when differences of opinion arise as to matters of interpretation.

In working up selections — that is, giving them interpretation and expression — a few suggestions may be given.

1. Get the factual or historical background of the selection. Under what circumstances did the author write it? How was he motivated? What was his purpose?
2. Get at meanings and values, and not merely at symbols. We do not get at values through proper emphasis. We get at proper emphasis through understanding values, or meanings, especially emotional ones. Within limitations, the voice will express what you really think and feel.
3. Visualize pictures as vividly as you can. Vivid images arouse the feelings, and help you get at values.
4. Memorize the selection as a whole, rather than in parts. Experiments seem to have shown that this is the most economical and effective method.

Enunciation. Enunciation has reference to a clear and distinct utterance of words. This sounds very simple, but it is one of the most difficult objectives to obtain in speech. When we reflect that the organs of speech — tongue, lips, teeth, palate — have to form from 500 to 750 articulate sounds in one minute (an average of ten to twelve a second), it would be a miracle if all of them were executed with precision. The miracle, as a matter of fact, seldom happens. The tendency for most persons is to form more or less careless and slovenly habits of speech utterance. Vowel sounds are not properly brought out, consonant sounds are slurred or even disregarded, and whole syllables are sometimes omitted or clipped off. Distinct enunciation is necessary for clearness; it also adds charm and effectiveness to speech.

Take the following words much used these days. All have four syllables. How often do you hear them so given?

āē'rial

ā'ēronaut

ā'ēroplane

Take the sentence from "Toussaint L'Ouverture": "Go to Hayti." A large number of students will say this without using the *t* sound at all. The sound actually given for *t* approaches *hr*. Substitute this for *t*, and you will get it as usually given.

A combination much abused is the ending *sts*. Usually the *t* is simply omitted. So, for *interests* we have *interest*; for *trusts*, *truss*; etc.

To those who have a propensity to slur the *sts* ending, the following old stanza may prove useful. Memorize it, and get the consonant sounds right.

Amidst the mists and coldest frosts,
With stoutest wrists and loudest boasts,
He hits his fists against the posts,
And still insists he sees the ghosts.

There is no panacea for slovenly enunciation, unless it be the will to enunciate clearly and distinctly. It is a matter of habit formation. If you are not willing to put forth the effort necessary to speak distinctly, no amount of direction will do you any good. If you are willing to concentrate attention on this, you should proceed to make a thorough study of vowel and consonant sounds, as they are combined in words, and then practice getting them right. The dictionary will guide you, and so will your teacher. *Distinct utterance should be insisted on in every course in speech.*

Let it be said that distinct enunciation is not an end in itself. It is only a means to an end. It may be overdone and may make speech pedantic. The same is true of using the lips. Some persons will mouth their words. The tendency, however, is usually in the other directions — careless enunciation and stiff lips. The golden mean is the proper goal.

Pronunciation. In its broad aspects, the problem of pronunciation is a big one, as the pronunciation of words varies in different parts of the country and in different countries of the English-speaking world. What is correct in Minneapolis is not necessarily correct in New York; and what is correct in New York is often not good form in London. English people insist on pronouncing *i* long in words ending in *ization* — like *civilization*, *organization*. In the United States we make it short.

The dictionary is the most dependable source of information on pronunciation, but even it has its limitations. To begin with, the same consonant sounds and vowels with their diacritical marks do not mean the same thing to people in different sections of the country. The Middle-Westerner looks at the word *girl*, puckers his lips, and pronounces it *gurl*, thinking that this is in accordance with the dictionary. The Easterner looks at the same word, pronounces it without puckering his lips, or at most very slightly, gives it a vowel sound that is somewhere between *ě* in *mět* and *ů* in *chůrch*, virtually omits the *r* sound, and affirms that he is pronouncing the word according to the dictionary and best usage. The same symbols mean different things to these two groups. This is true of several symbols.

Again the values or characters of certain symbols, especially vowel sounds, as given by the dictionaries, are deliberately disregarded by whole sections of the United States. The vowel in certain words, such as *läugh*, *mäst*, *cläss*, is, in certain sections of the country, as the Middle West, not so pronounced, except perhaps by a few professional teachers of speech, and by persons who have come from the East or from abroad. The question may be asked: Should the student of speech try to give these vowel sounds their acknowledged values and pronounce them in accordance with the dictionary? Whether he should or not, we may be sure that he will do no such thing. He is likely to be guided, not so much by the dictionary, as by the usage of the *majority* of the cultured people in his community or section of the country. He may admire the speech habits of the cultured

few who have brought with them more correct usage from another section of the country, but he will not follow them. A teacher of English, with reputation as a critic on both sides of the Atlantic, used to say that no one should affect new vowel sounds after he is fifteen years of age. With some reservations, that may be sound advice. Usage that runs counter to the cultural standard of a section is hard to inculcate.

This should not mean, however, that certain errors shall not or cannot be corrected. Some errors are much easier to correct than others, for the reason that correction of them does not sound so affected as in other instances. The preferential pronunciation of the vowel sound in *haunt*, *taunt*, *laundry*, *staunch*, etc., is the same as for *a* in *ärm*. In the Middle West, at least, it is almost invariably given as the vowel sound in *lawn*. A student of speech may correct this without seeming affected. A still more important error, common in many parts of the United States, is the prostitution of the long *ū* sound to the sound of *ō*, giving us *constitootion*, *soot* for *suit*, *noo* for *new*. One may correct this without seeming affected, and it is the consensus, I believe, that the language gains immensely by observing the best usage here. No student of speech ought to tolerate anything but an adequate bringing out of this important vowel sound. There is a noticeable improvement in this respect, in the Middle West at least, as a result probably of speech training and the standard set in radio announcing.

With some reservations, mostly of a character already pointed out, the dictionary is the safest guide we have for pronunciation. This may be supplemented by the usage practiced by the majority of cultured people. With some sectional differences, there is a fair uniformity of pronunciation in the United States. There is, for example, only one way to pronounce most of the following words. Consult the dictionary and see what it is. A few words permit of more than one pronunciation, and in such cases it is important to know what they are.

A LIST OF WORDS FOR PRONUNCIATION

a (article)	comely	inclement
abdomen	comparable	indisputable
absent (<i>v.</i>)	condolence	indissoluble
address (<i>v.</i>)	creek	long-lived
address (<i>n.</i>)	culinary	margarine
adult	data	maritime
aërial	despicable	mediæval
aëronautics	discourse	new (not <i>noo</i>)
ally	discern	nude
almond	docile	pianist
architect	draught	prairie
amateur	ennui	presentation
aunt	exquisite	romance
ay (yes)	forehead	status
aye (always)	gala	suit (not <i>soot</i>)
betrothal	granary	thither
biography	grimace	tomato
Celtic	harass	vagary
chauffeur	hygiene	
combatant	impious	

The dictionary is not necessarily final authority on pronunciation, but it is usually correct, and the best available guide we have. If you pronounce words according to the dictionary (latest edition), you will be forgiven any errors you may commit. The trouble is that we take pronunciation, like so many other things, for granted when we hear it. It is a mark of the educated man that he does not take things for granted. He questions all things, including the pronunciation of words that may pass current around him. Why take for granted the pronunciation of a word when we can settle it for life, probably, in fifteen seconds? Students of speech should form a critical attitude toward pronunciation and cultivate habits in accordance with the best usage.

Correct and distinct utterance adds greatly to the distinctive

charm of cultivated speech. Practice it diligently and you will be building up an enduring personality trait.

SQUANDERING OF THE VOICE

BY HENRY WARD BEECHER

How much squandering there is of the voice! How little is there of the advantage that may come from conversational tones! How seldom does a man dare to acquit himself with pathos and fervor! And the men are themselves mechanical and methodical in the bad way, who are most afraid of the artificial training that is given in the schools, and who so often show by the fruit of their labor that the want of oratory is the want of education.

How remarkable is sweetness of voice in the mother, in the father, in the household! The music of no chorded instruments brought together is, for sweetness, like the music of familiar affection when spoken by brother and sister, or by father and mother.

Conversation itself belongs to oratory. Where is there a wider, a more ample field for the impartation of pleasure of knowledge than at a festive dinner? and how often do we find that when men, having well eaten and drunken, arise to speak, they are well qualified to keep silence, and utterly disqualified to speak! How rare it is to find felicity of diction on such occasions! How seldom do we see men who are educated to a fine sense of what is fit and proper at gatherings of this kind! How many men there are who are weighty in argument, who have abundant resources, and who are almost boundless in their power at other times and in other places, but who when in company among their kind are exceedingly unapt in their methods! Having none of the secret instruments by which the elements of nature may be touched, having no skill and no power in this direction, they stand as machines before living, sensitive men. A man may be as a master before an instrument; only the instrument is dead; and he has the living hand; and out of that dead instrument what wondrous harmony springs forth at his touch! And if you can electrify an audience by the power of a living man on dead things, how much more should that audience be electrified when the chords are living and the man is alive, and he knows how to touch them with divine inspiration! . . .

How many men are there that can speak from day to day one hour, two hours, three hours, without exhaustion, and without hoarseness? But it is in the power of the vocal organs, and of the ordinary vocal organs, to do this. What multitudes of men wear themselves out because they put their voice on a hard run at the top of its compass! — and there is no relief to them, and none, unfortunately, to the audience. But the voice is like an orchestra. It ranges high up, and can shriek betimes like the scream of an eagle; or it is low as a lion's tone; and at every intermediate point is some peculiar quality. It has in it the mother's whisper and the father's command. It has in it warning and alarm. It has in it sweetness. It is full of mirth and full of gayety. It glitters, though it is not seen with all its sparkling fancies. It ranges high, intermediate, or low, in obedience to the will, unconsciously to him who uses it; and men listen through the long hour, wondering that it is so short, and quite unaware that they have been bewitched out of their weariness by the charm of a voice, not artificial, not prearranged in the man's thought, but by assiduous training made to be his second nature. Such a voice answers to the soul, and it is its beating.

“But,” it is said, “does not the voice come by nature?” Yes; but is there anything that comes by nature which stays as it comes if it is worthily handled? We receive one talent that we may make it five; and we receive five talents that we may make them ten. There is no one thing in man that he has in perfection till he has it by culture. We know that in respect to everything but the voice. Is not the ear trained to acute hearing? Is not the eye trained in science? Do men not school the eye, and make it quick-seeing by patient use? Is a man, because he has learned a trade, and was not born with it, thought to be less a man? Because we have made discoveries of science and adapted them to manufacture; because we have developed knowledge by training, are we thought to be unmanly? Shall we, because we have unfolded our powers by the use of ourselves for that noblest of purposes, the inspiration and elevation of mankind, be less esteemed? Is the school of human training to be disdained when by it we are rendered more useful to our fellow men?

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX I

SUGGESTIONS FOR CRITICISM OF SPEECHES

A. COMPOSITION ¹

1. What type of speech is it? Informative? Impressive? Argumentative? Entertaining?
2. If persuasive (most speeches are), what is the purpose sentence? Central idea, if used? Sub-ideas? (Every speech studied should be subjected to this analysis.)
3. Consider the audience and the occasion. What is the relation of the speaker to the subject and the audience? What is the relation of the subject to the audience?
4. Is the speech well begun? Properly related to the interests of the audience? Does the speaker make plain what he is talking about?
5. What speech materials, or forms of support, are used? Are they well selected and effective, considering the audience and the occasion? Which forms predominate? Are propositions adequately supported?
6. Are illustrations used freely? If so, are they effective and in good taste?
7. Does the speaker use suggestion? If so, how, and with what effect?
8. Is the speech or message consistently linked up with vital life interests of the audience? Is there judicious and adequate want appeal? Are points brought home concretely and vividly to listeners?
9. Does the speech exemplify an effective speaking style? Simple? Direct? Informal? Personal? Original? Pictorial?

¹ This is only a guide. It does not pretend to cover all points.

10. Does the speech hold attention? Does it possess sufficient variety in speech materials? Does it exemplify the leading factors of interestingness, such as the vital, the unusual, conflict, or challenge technique?
11. Is the speech brought to a close effectively? Or is the conclusion too long and scattered in its appeal? Is there a summary? Emotional appeal? Is the final appeal properly related to the message of the speech?

B. DELIVERY OR PRESENTATION

1. Does the speaker use the *conversational mode*, as if speaking *to* or *with* a group of friends? Or does he speak *at* his audience? Does he show any tendency toward ranting?
2. Does the speaker use his voice well? Not too much of it, and still enough so that all can hear comfortably? Does his voice possess variety in tonal elements — *quality, force, pitch, rate*? That is, is his voice well modulated? Or is there a tendency toward monotony?
3. Is the speaker's attitude toward his audience good, or persuasive? Does he show those qualities we like to see: geniality, humor, modesty, tact, confidence, moral earnestness, tolerance of the views of other persons? Or is he egotistic, unduly aggressive, antagonistic or negative, nervous, self-conscious, timid?
4. Is his enunciation distinct, especially in difficult consonant combinations like *sts*? Or is his enunciation overdone, so that it calls attention to itself?
5. Does he pronounce words correctly? Are his vowel sounds correct? Does he pronounce *soot* and *suit* the same way? Etc.

APPENDIX II
SPECIMEN SPEECHES

INFORMATIVE: "Social versus Biological Inheritance," by Clifford Kirkpatrick.	372
IMPRESSIVE: "Acres of Diamonds," by Russell H. Conwell.	379
"Get Facts; Look Far; Think Through," by William C. Redfield.	413
"The Usurpations of Society," by Oscar W. Firkins .	421
ARGUMENTATIVE: Lincoln's "Springfield Speech." . . .	426
ENTERTAINMENT: "Merchants and Ministers," by Henry Ward Beecher.	438

SOCIAL VERSUS BIOLOGICAL INHERITANCE

BY CLIFFORD KIRKPATRICK

(This is a radio speech by a member of the faculty of the University of Minnesota.)

What is the social heritage or culture as it is now more commonly called? For our purposes it may be very simply defined as an accumulation of socially acquired objects and impressions in a given group. Locomotives, steel rails, tools, and machines are socially acquired objects. They are socially acquired since they are made by men rather than occurring in nature as do cliffs and lakes. These useful objects are made possible by socially acquired impressions, for the habits and ideas involved in smelting and working iron are impressions passed from one generation to another.

However, we can best grasp the significance of the atmosphere of culture in which we live, move, and have our being by attempting to imagine a group of humans without a social heritage. It is apparent that culture in the scientific sense is much broader in scope than traits such as good table manners, a well modulated voice, a knowledge of foreign languages, and a familiarity with literature, which are considered signs of culture in the popular sense. Let us suppose that a score or more of infants are selected from the homes of artists, doctors, teachers, wealthy business men, and statesmen. These children are transported to a fertile island in the South Seas, previously uninhabited, and are there abandoned. If left with an initial supply of food they might survive, but would be absolutely lacking in the social heritage that would have been theirs had they remained in the United States. An explorer visiting the island twenty or thirty years later would probably report the discovery of the lowest tribe of

savages in the world. The children have been deprived of the customs, ideas, beliefs, skill, knowledge, tastes, values, morals, and language which they would have acquired in their native land. Furthermore, there would be no heritage of material objects such as tools, machines, buildings, libraries, museums, theatres, railways, electric lights, the telephone, schools, churches, and the like. Even the use of fire might be unknown to them. They would have been cut off from the precious stores of wealth and knowledge so painfully accumulated during many thousand years of human history. We now see that a social heritage or culture consists of all the things that would be lacking under the circumstance; that is to say, socially acquired objects and impressions.

Let us consider for a moment the traits which distinguish man from the other animals. First, man is possessed of an upright posture which leaves the forelimbs free for the manipulation of objects. The upright posture, when acquired, probably improved man's power of vision and, by removing his mouth from the ground, further stimulated the use of his forelimbs.

Second, it is to be noted that the human hand is unique in the position of the thumb and finger and in its general adaptability for complex movements such as those involved in the use of tools.

Third, the large human brain with its well developed association areas in the front portion is of utmost importance. The human brain has well been called the organ of civilization. It is probable that the use of the hands furthered this important development.

Fourth, man's capacity for language and other forms of meaningful communication is probably the result of his large brain. It is also likely that this trait developed under the stimulation of social life, man probably having lived in groups from the beginning. Group life in itself, however, is not sufficient, for other social animals do not have language. Man's four distinctive traits, upright posture, flexible hand, large brain, and linguistic

ability, lead to a fifth characteristic. Man is a culture-building animal; that is to say, his culture accumulates far beyond the simple group habits of beavers or apes.

Let us now see just how the possession of a social heritage separates man from the lower animals. In the first place, man has a great deal added to his biological inheritance while the lower animals have but little. In a hill of ants, for example, there is practically nothing but biological inheritance, the social organization, coöperation and complex activities of these insects being determined for the most part by the inherited structure of individual ants. The same is true of bees. An entire society is potential within the queen bee. Her offspring are able to gather honey, build a hive, and perform many varied tasks; yet she did not teach them: they were born with these instinctive capacities. Some of the higher animals learn from each other. Birds, for example, acquire the song of those of another species with whom they are associated. Yet man alone has an actual stream of socially acquired objects and impressions flowing from generation to generation. Man profits by what others learn and do, as well as from his own biological inheritance.

In the second place, the possession of a culture means that man changes through social rather than biological adaptation. The beast grows a fur coat, but man invents heat. The biological inheritance of the lower animals may be slowly altered, but it is knowledge and wealth, in other words the social heritage of man, that varies rather than his original nature. He makes inventions and achievements which accumulate during the passage of time, thus giving him an artificial control over nature. As a great sociologist puts it, "The environment transforms the animal while man transforms the environment." Man, then, is pre-eminently a culture-building animal, and we owe much to those far-off ancestors of ours who first lit the torch of civilization and passed the flame from hand to hand, ever growing brighter through new inventions and more splendid achievements.

Can it be that culture makes us human beings? The infant

certainly comes into the world with a structure and with potentialities characteristic of the human species; but, equipped only with this original human nature, he is the most helpless of creatures. Mere original human nature in itself does not make an organism a human being like those around us. Furthermore, if we imagine an adult stripped of all the culture that he has acquired as a member of a group, he is reduced to an essentially animal status. There are several cases on record of infants growing up in isolation or with animals such as wolves, bears, and baboons. These children remained at an animal level of existence. The primitive traits and behavior of these creatures tended to persist even after being restored to civilization. Some of these children may have been feeble-minded in the first place, but it would be a strange coincidence if this were true of all of them. In general, man becomes human by contact with a social heritage.

Culture is transmitted by education, but not solely the formal education of the classroom. While the science of chemistry that has accumulated for generations may be passed on to the student in the school, he may also learn from his contemporaries.

Learning from one's own generation might be called horizontal education in contrast to the vertical education that is transmitted down through the centuries from one generation to another. Culture, therefore, not only descends vertically with the passage of time, but it also diffuses horizontally through space. There is a process of informal horizontal education whenever one personality is modified by another. The average college student is fully as much educated by his fraternity brothers as by his professors who seek to transmit the culture of the past.

Culture is made continuous by education, while biological continuity depends on the union of germ cells from two parents. Social immortality is due to education after birth, and the process must be repeated in each generation, for the germ cells are not affected by changes in the nervous system. It is apparently no easier to learn English now than formerly in spite of genera-

tions of ancestors who learned to speak that language. If all education, direct and indirect, formal and informal, should cease for a generation, the continuity of the social heritage would be broken and it would cease to exist, just as a species becomes extinct when a single generation fails to produce offspring. If our schools were blown up and left in ruins for a few decades, civilization would take on a very different appearance. As it is, the continuity remains unbroken and the average high school student knows far more about the universe than did the greatest of ancient philosophers, thanks to the richer social heritage which he has absorbed.

There is great danger of confusing social with biological inheritance; and where no actual confusion exists, a lively controversy rages over the relative importance of heredity as compared with culture. For example, are instincts really inborn, or are they partly habits? Are athletes born or trained? Are the negroes of different ability as compared with whites? Are men insane because they drink, or do they drink because they have a hereditary taint of insanity? Is a person good natured because of happy circumstances or because he was born that way? Is a student indifferent because his work is uninteresting or because he is dull? Is it possible to keep a good man down? Did the child contract tuberculosis through infection by the parent or because it inherited the parent's weak lungs? All these questions are involved in the heredity versus environment controversy, but are not matters which can be settled in this brief talk. We must content ourselves with noting that social and biological inheritance are always in combination and that they are often confused in regard to (1) traits of the individual personality, (2) sex differences, (3) race differences, and (4) relations of biological and social change.

In the first place, then, there is danger of confusion in regard to the individual. John Doe's native traits have interacted with his social heritage to form that personality we know as John Doe. Suppose that he becomes a criminal. We might then be

inclined to say that he was born bad and by nature a criminal, but investigation would probably show that his particular social heritage was poor. His parents may have been ignorant and vicious, his house a shack, his playground the street, his companions a gang, his schooling inadequate. Evil conduct does not always mean evil nature originally, nor does ignorance always mean stupidity.

In the second place, there is a tendency to confuse social and biological inheritance in considering the differences between men and women. Women, for instance, are supposed by the popular mind to be interested in personal affairs, to be inclined to gossip, and to have less regard than men for details of the truth and all of this by virtue of their organic structure as women. This might conceivably be true, but it should not be accepted as truth until the influence of culture has been exhausted as an explanation. In regard to interest in personal affairs, it should be noted that woman's activity tended, at least in the past, to be restricted to the sphere of the family and to center around husband, children, and social relations. If women gossip (and I am not so bold as to assert that they do), it may not be innate malice that impels them, but rather a desire to escape from boredom when recreational channels open to men are denied them. If women are deceitful, it should be remembered that for centuries they occupied an inferior social status and were forced to gain their ends by indirect means since direct aggression was impossible.

In the third place, it may be pointed out that social and biological inheritance are often confused in connection with questions of race. An American business man does not speak English, use the multiplication table, pound a typewriter, and attend baseball games because he has a white skin. If transported as an infant to a Chinese family he would be exposed to different customs, usages, ideals, and a different art and literature. His plastic mind would be bent to a Chinese pattern of life just as that of a Chinese boy in this country becomes es-

entially American. We are inclined to consider certain races as by nature inferior, when their culture differs from our own, especially if it is more simple. It may be, however, that they never had a chance to borrow culture from others as we have done. Our material civilization of steam and electricity is merely due to the fact that we developed a mode of thinking known as the scientific method and a systematic body of knowledge known as science. When we say that the splitting of a tree by a bolt of lightning is due to electricity rather than an angry spirit, we are reflecting our social heritage just as much as the savage and are not necessarily more intelligent.

Finally, care must be exercised that biological and social change be not confused. Organically man is almost identical with the cavemen who lived in western Europe. Furthermore, there is reason to believe that his intelligence was equal to our own. Members of the race who decorated the caves of France with their painting some twenty-five thousand years ago might be members of Phi Beta Kappa and football stars if living today. The invention of wireless telegraphy by Marconi probably required no greater mental ability, given the contribution of Hertz, Lodge, and others, than that of the unknown genius who long before the dawn of human history invented the bow and arrow. Culturally, man stands on the shoulders of his ancestors, but is of no greater mental stature in his own right than the hunters who pursued the wild horse in Europe many thousand years ago. Civilization is an accumulated social heritage rather than a sudden increase in mental ability.

Our social destiny depends upon using our relatively fixed abilities to accumulate a knowledge of social relations that can more nearly keep pace with the transformations and problems created by mechanical inventions.

ACRES OF DIAMONDS

BY RUSSELL H. CONWELL

(Russell H. Conwell, born in South Worthington, Massachusetts, February 15, 1843, was a famous clergyman and platform orator. He was pastor of the Baptist Temple, Philadelphia, and president of Temple College. "Acres of Diamonds" is the most famous of his series of popular lectures. It was Dr. Conwell's custom to adapt it more or less to local audiences. This accounts for the variations in different editions of the speech.)

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: — The title of this lecture originated away back in 1869. When going down the Tigris River, we hired a guide from Bagdad to show us down to the Arabian Gulf. That guide whom we employed resembled the barbers we find in America. That is, he resembled the barbers in certain mental characteristics. He thought it was not only his duty to guide us down the river, but also to entertain us with stories; curious and weird, ancient and modern, strange and familiar; many of them I have forgotten, and I am glad I have. But there was one which I recall tonight. The guide grew irritable over my lack of appreciation, and as he led my camel by the halter he introduced his story by saying: "This is a tale I reserve for my *particular friends*." So I then gave him my close attention.

He told me that there once lived near the shore of the River Indus, toward which we were then traveling, an ancient Persian by the name of Al Hafed. He said that Al Hafed owned a large farm, with orchards, grain fields, and gardens; that he had money at interest, had a beautiful wife and lovely children, and was a wealthy and contented man. Contented because he was wealthy, and wealthy because he was contented.

One day there visited this old Persian farmer one of those

ancient Buddhist priests, one of the wise men of the East, who sat down by Al Hafed's fireside and told the old farmer how this world was made. He told him that this world was once a great bank of fog, and that the Almighty thrust his finger into this bank of fog, and began slowly to move his finger around, and then increased the speed of his finger until he whirled this bank of fog into a solid ball of fire; and as it went rolling through the universe, burning its way through other banks of fog, it condensed the moisture, until it fell in floods of rain upon the heated surface of the world, and cooled the outward crust; then the internal fires, bursting the cooling crust, threw up the mountains, and the hills, and the valleys of this wonderful world of ours.

"And," said the old priest, "if this internal melted mass burst forth and cooled very quickly, it became granite; if it cooled more slowly, it became copper; if it cooled less quickly, silver; less quickly, gold; and after gold, diamonds were made." Said the old priest, "A diamond is a congealed drop of sunlight." That statement is literally true.

And the old priest said another very curious thing. He said that a diamond was the last and the highest of God's mineral creations, as a woman is the last and highest of God's animal creations. That is the reason, I suppose, why the two have such a liking for each other. (Applause.)

The old priest told Al Hafed if he had a diamond the size of his thumb, he could purchase a dozen farms like his. "And," said the priest, "if you had a handful of diamonds, you could purchase the country; and if you had a mine of diamonds, you could purchase kingdoms, and place your children upon thrones, through the influence of your great wealth."

Al Hafed heard all about the diamonds that night, and went to bed a poor man. He wanted a whole mine of diamonds. Early in the morning he sought the priest and awoke him. Well, I know, by experience, that a priest is very cross when awakened early in the morning.

Al Hafed said: "Will you tell me where I can find diamonds?"

The priest said: "Diamonds? What do you want of diamonds?"

Said Al Hafed: "I want to be immensely rich."

"Well," said the priest, "if you want diamonds, all you have to do is go and find them, and then you will have them."

"But," said Al Hafed, "I don't know where to go."

"If you will find a river that runs over white sands, between high mountains, in those white sands you will always find diamonds," said the priest.

"But," asked Al Hafed, "do you believe there is such a river?"

"Plenty of them; all you have to do is just go where they are."

"Well," said Al Hafed, "I will go."

So he sold his farm; collected his money that was at interest; left his family in charge of a neighbor, and away he went in search of diamonds.

He began his search, very properly to my mind, at the Mountains of the Moon. Afterwards he came around into Palestine, and then wandered on into Europe. At last, when his money was all gone and he was in rags, poverty and wretchedness, he stood on the shore at Barcelona, in Spain, when a great tidal wave swept through the Pillars of Hercules; and the poor, starving, afflicted stranger could not resist the awful temptation to cast himself into that incoming tide; and he sank beneath its foaming crest, never to rise in this life again.

When the old guide had told me that story, he stopped the camel I was riding upon and went back to arrange the baggage on another camel, and I had an opportunity to muse over this story. And I asked myself this question: "Why did this old guide reserve this story for his *particular friends*?" But when he came back and took up the camel's halter once more, I found that was the first story I ever heard wherein the hero was killed in the first chapter. For he went on into the second chapter, just as though there had been no break.

Said he: "The man who purchased Al Hafed's farm led his camel out into the garden to drink, and as the animal put his nose into the shallow waters of the garden brook, Al Hafed's successor noticed a curious flash of light from the white sands of the stream. Reaching in he pulled out a black stone containing a strange eye of light. He took it into the house as a curious pebble and putting it on the mantel that covered the central fire went his way and forgot all about it.

"But not long after that that same old priest came to visit Al Hafed's successor. The moment he opened the door he noticed the flash of light. He rushed to the mantel and said: —

"'Here is a diamond! Here is a diamond! Has Al Hafed returned?'

"'Oh no, Al Hafed has not returned and we have not heard from him since he went away, and that is not a diamond. It is nothing but a stone we found out in our garden.'

"'But,' said the priest, 'I know a diamond when I see it. I tell you that is a diamond.'

"Then together they rushed out into the garden. They stirred up the white sands with their fingers, and there came up other more beautiful, more valuable gems than the first.

"Thus," said the guide, — and, friends, it is historically true, — "were discovered the diamond mines of Golconda, the most valuable diamond mines in the history of the ancient world."

Well, when the guide had added the second chapter to his story, he then took off his Turkish cap, and swung it in the air to call my special attention to the moral; those Arab guides always have morals to their stories, though the stories are not always moral.

He said to me: "Had Al Hafed remained at home, and dug in his own cellar, or underneath his own wheat field, instead of wretchedness, starvation, poverty and death in a strange land, he would have had ACRES OF DIAMONDS."

Acres of Diamonds! For every acre of that old farm, yes,

every shovelful, afterwards revealed the gems which since have decorated the crowns of monarchs.

When the guide had added the moral to this story, I saw why he reserved it for his *particular friends*. But I didn't tell him that I could see it. It was that mean old Arab's way of going around a thing, like a lawyer, and saying indirectly what he didn't dare say directly; that in his private opinion "there was a certain young man traveling down the Tigris River, who might be better at home, in America." (Laughter.)

I told him his story reminded me of one. You all know it. I told him that a man in California, in 1847, owned a ranch there. He heard that they had discovered gold in Southern California, though they had not. And he sold his farm to Colonel Sutter, who put a mill on the little stream below the house. One day his little girl gathered some of the sand in her hands from the raceway, and brought it into the house. And while she was sifting it through her fingers, a visitor there noticed the first shining scales of real gold that were ever discovered in California. Acres and acres of gold. I was introduced, a few years ago, while in California, to the one-third owner of the farm, and he was then receiving one hundred and twenty dollars in gold for every fifteen minutes of his life, sleeping or waking. You and I would enjoy an income like that, now that we have no income tax.

Professor Agassiz, the great geologist of Harvard University, that magnificent scholar, told us, at the Summer School of Mineralogy, that there once lived in Pennsylvania a man who owned a farm, — and he did with his farm just what I should do if I had a farm in Pennsylvania. He sold it. (Applause.) But, before he sold it, he decided to secure employment, collecting coal oil. He wrote to his cousin in Canada that he would like to go into that business. His cousin wrote back to him: "I cannot engage you, because you do not understand the oil business." "Then," said he, "I will understand it," and with commendable zeal, he set himself at the study of the whole

theory of the coal oil subject. He began away back at the second day of God's creation. He found that there was once another sun that shone on this world, and that then there were immense forests of vegetation. He found that the other sun was put out, and that this world after a time fell into the wake of the present sun. It was then locked in blocks of ice. Then there rose mighty icebergs that human imagination cannot grasp, and as those mountains of ice did ride those stormy seas, they beat down the original vegetation, they planed down the hills, toppled over the mountains, and everywhere buried this original vegetation which has since been turned by chemical action to the primitive beds of coal, and in connection with which only is found coal oil in paying quantities.

So he found out where oil originated. He studied it until he knew what it looked like, what it smelled like, how to refine it, and where to sell it.

"Now," said he to his cousin in a letter, "I know all about the oil business, from the second day of God's creation to the present time."

His cousin replied to him to "come on." So he sold his farm in Pennsylvania for \$833 — even money, no cents.

After he had gone from the farm, the farmer who had purchased his place went out to arrange for watering the cattle; and he found that the previous owner had already arranged for that matter. There was a stream running down the hillside back of the barn; and across that stream, from bank to bank, the previous owner had put in a plank edgewise at a slight angle, for the purpose of throwing over to one side of the brook a dreadful looking scum through which the cattle would not put their noses, although they would drink on this side below the plank. Thus that man, who had gone to Canada, and who had studied all about the oil business, had been himself damming back for twenty-three years a flood of coal oil which the state geologist said in 1870 was worth to our state a hundred millions of dollars. A Hundred Millions! The city of Titusville stands bodily on

that farm now. And yet, though he knew all about the theory, he sold the farm for \$833 — again I say “no *sense*.” (Applause.)

I need another illustration. I find it in Massachusetts. The young man went down to Yale College and studied mines and mining, and became such an adept at mineralogy that during his senior year in the Sheffield School they paid him as a tutor fifteen dollars a week for the spare time in which he taught. When he graduated they raised his pay to forty-five dollars a week and offered him a professorship. As soon as they did that he went home to his mother! If they had raised his salary to fifteen dollars and sixty cents, then he would have stayed. But when they made it forty-five dollars a week he said: “I won’t work for forty-five dollars a week! The idea of a man with a brain like mine, working for forty-five dollars a week! Let us go out to California and stake out gold and silver and copper claims, and be rich.”

Said his mother: “Now, Charley, it is just as well to be happy as it is to be rich.”

“Yes,” said he. “It is just as well to be rich and happy too.” (Applause.)

They were both right about it. And as he was the only son, and she was a widow, of course he had his way. They always do. So they sold out in Massachusetts and went, not to California, but to Wisconsin, and there he entered the employ of the Superior Copper Mining Company, at fifteen dollars a week again. But with the proviso that he should have an interest in any mines he should discover for the company. I don’t believe he ever discovered a mine there. Still I have often felt, when I mentioned this fact in northern Wisconsin, that he might be in the audience and feel mad at the way I speak about it. Still here is the fact, and it seems unfortunate to be in the way of a good illustration. But I don’t believe he ever found any other mine. Yet I don’t know anything about that end of the line. I know that he had scarcely gone from Massachusetts, before

the farmer who had purchased his farm was bringing a large basket of potatoes in through the gateway. You know in Massachusetts our farms are almost entirely stone wall. (Applause.) Hence the basket hugged very close in the gate, and he dragged in on one side and then on the other. And as he was pulling that basket through the gateway, the farmer noticed in the upper and outer corner of that stone wall next to the gate, a block of native silver eight inches square. And this professor of mines and mining and mineralogy, who would not work for forty-five dollars a week, because he knew so much about the subject, when he sold that homestead, sat on that very stone to make the bargain. He was born on that farm, and they told me that he had gone by that piece of silver and rubbed it with his sleeve, until it reflected his countenance and seemed to say to him, "Here, take me! Here is a hundred thousand dollars right down here in the rocks just for the taking." But he wouldn't take it. This was near Newburyport, Massachusetts. He wouldn't believe in silver at home. He said: "There is no silver in Newburyport. It is all away off, — well, I don't know where," — and he didn't. But somewhere else. And he was a Professor of Mineralogy. I don't know of anything I would better enjoy in taking the whole time, than telling of the blunders like this which I have heard that "Professors" have made.

I say that I would enjoy it. But after all there is another side to the question. For the more I think about it, the more I would like to know what he is doing in Wisconsin to-night. I don't believe he has found any mines, but I can tell you what I do believe is the case. I think he sits out there by his fireside to-night, and his friends are gathered around him and he is saying to them something like this: —

"Do you know that man Conwell who lives in Philadelphia?"

"Oh, yes, I have heard of him."

"Well, you know that man Jones who lives in ——"

"Yes, I have also heard of him," say they.

Then he begins to shake his sides with laughter, and he says: —

“They have both done the same thing I did precisely!” And that spoils the whole joke.

Because you and I have done it. Yet nearly every person here will say: “Oh, no, I never had any acres of diamonds or any gold mines or any silver mines.”

But I say to you that you did have silver mines, and gold mines, and acres of diamonds, and you have them now.

Now let me speak with the greatest care lest my eccentricity of manner should mislead my listeners, and make you think I am here to entertain more than to help. I want to hold your attention on this oppressive night, with sufficient interest to leave my lesson with you.

You have an opportunity to be rich; and to some of you it has been a hardship to purchase a ticket for this lecture. Yet you have no right to be poor. It is your duty to be rich. You have no right to be poor. It is all wrong.

Oh, I know well that there are some things higher, sublimer than money! Ah, yes, there are some things sweeter, holier than gold! Yet I also know that there is not one of those things but is greatly enhanced by the use of money.

“Oh,” you will say, “Mr. Conwell, can you, as a Christian teacher, tell the young people to spend their lives making money?”

Yes, I do. Three times I say, I do, I do, I do. You ought to make money. Money is power. Think how much good you could do if you had money now. Money is power and it ought to be in the hands of good men. It would be in the hands of good men if we comply with the Scripture teachings, where God promises prosperity to the righteous man. That means more than being goody-good — it means the all-around righteous man. You should be a righteous man, and if you were, you would be rich. (Applause.)

I need to guard myself here. Because one of my theological students came to me once to labor with me, for heresy, inasmuch as I had said that money was power.

He said: "Mr. Conwell, I feel it my duty to tell you that the Scriptures say that money is 'the root of all evil.'"

I asked him: "Have you been spending your time making a new Bible when you should have been studying theology?" He said: "That is the old Bible."

I said "I would like to have you find it for me. I have never seen it."

He triumphantly brought a Bible, and with all the bigoted pride of a narrow sectarian, who founds his creed on some misinterpretation of Scripture, threw it down before me and said: "There it is! You can read it for yourself!"

I said to him: "Young man, you will learn before you get much older that you can't trust another denomination to read the Bible for you. Please read it yourself, and remember that 'emphasis is exegesis.'"

So he read: "The *love* of money is the root of all evil."

Indeed it is. The *love* of money is the root of all evil. The love of the money, rather than the love of the good it secures, is a dangerous evil in the community. The desire to get hold of money, and to hold on to it, "Hugging the dollar until the eagle squeals," is the root of all evil. But it is a grand ambition for men to have the desire to gain money, that they may use it for the benefit of their fellow men. (Applause.)

Young man! you may never have the opportunity to charge at the head of your Nation's troops on some Santiago's heights; young woman, you may never be called to go out in the seas like Grace Darling to save suffering humanity. But every one of you can earn money honestly, and with that money you can fight the battles of peace; and the victories of peace are always grander than those of war!

I say then to you, that you ought to be rich.

"Well," you say, "I would like to be rich, but I have never had an opportunity. I never had any diamonds about me!"

My friends, you did have an opportunity. And let us see where your mistake was.

What business have you been in?

“Oh,” some man or woman will say, “I keep a store upon one of these side streets, and I am so far from the great commercial center that I cannot make any money.”

“Are you poor? How long have you kept that store?”

“Twenty years.”

“Twenty years, and not worth five hundred thousand dollars now? There is something the matter with you. Nothing the matter with the side street. It is with you.”

“Oh, now,” you will say, “any person knows that you must be in the center of trade if you are going to make money.”

The man of common sense will not admit that that is necessarily true at all. If you are keeping that store and you are not making money, it would have been better for the community if they had kicked you out of that store, nineteen years ago.

No man has a right to go into business and not make money. It is a crime to go into business and lose money, because it is a curse to the rest of the community. No man has a moral right to transact business unless he makes something out of it. He has also no right to transact business unless the man he deals with has an opportunity also to make something. Unless he lives and lets live, he is not an honest man in business. There are no exceptions to this great rule. (Applause.)

You ought to have been rich. You have no right to keep a store for twenty years and still be poor. You will say to me:—

“Now, Mr. Conwell, I know the mercantile business better than you do.”

My friend, let us consider it a minute.

When I was young, my father kept a country store, and once in a while he left me in charge of that store. Fortunately for him it was not often. (Laughter.) When I had it in my charge a man came in the store door and said:—

“Do you keep jack-knives?”

“No, we don’t keep jack-knives.” I went off and whistled a tune, and what did I care for that man? Then another man would come in and say: —

“Do you keep jack-knives?” “No, we don’t keep jack-knives.” Then I went off and whistled another tune, and what did I care for that man?

Then another man would come in the same door and say: “Do you keep jack-knives?”

“No, we don’t keep jack-knives. Do you suppose we are keeping this store just for the purpose of supplying the whole neighborhood with jack-knives?”

Do you carry on your business like that? Do you ask what was the difficulty with it? The difficulty was that I had not then learned the foundation principles of business success and the foundation principles of Christianity, itself, are both the same. It is the whole of every man’s life to be doing for his fellow men. And he who can do the most to help his fellow men is entitled to the greatest reward himself. Not only so saith God’s holy book, but also saith every man’s business common sense. If I had been carrying on my father’s store on a Christian plan, or on a plan that leads to success, I would have had a jack-knife for the third man when he called for it.

But you say: “I don’t carry on my store like that.” If you have not made any money you are carrying on your business like that, and I can tell you what you will say to me to-morrow morning when I go into your store.

I come to you and inquire: “Do you know neighbor A?”

“Oh yes. He lives up in the next block. He trades here at my little store.”

“Well, where did he come from when he came to ——”

“I don’t know.”

“What business is he in?”

“I don’t know.”

“Do his children go to school?”

“I don’t know.”

“What ticket does he vote?”

“I don’t know.”

“What church does he go to?”

“I don’t know, and I don’t care.”

Do you answer me like that to-morrow morning, in your store? Then you are carrying on your business just as I carried on my father’s business in Worthington, Massachusetts.

You don’t know where neighbor A came from and you *don’t care*. You don’t care whether he has a happy home or not. You don’t know what church he goes to, and you don’t care! If you had cared, you would have been a rich man now.

You never thought it was any part of your duty to help him make money. So you cannot succeed! It is against every law of business and every rule of political economy, and I would give five dollars myself, to see your failure in the “Ledger” tomorrow morning. What right have you to be in business taking no interest in your fellow men, and not endeavoring to supply them with what they need? You cannot succeed.

That merchant, who, in the City of Boston, made his fifteen millions of dollars, began his enterprises out in the suburbs where there were not a dozen houses on the street; although there were other stores scattered about. He became such a necessity to the neighborhood that when he wished to move into the city to start a wholesale house, they came to him with a great petition, signed by all the people, begging that he would not close that store, but keep it open for the benefit of that community. He had always looked after their interests. He had always carefully studied what they wanted and advised them rightly. He was a necessity; and they must make him wealthy; for in proportion as you are of use to your fellow men, in that proportion can they afford to pay you.

Oh, my friend, going through this world and thinking you are unjustly dealt with! You are poor because you are not wanted. You should have made yourself a necessity to the world, and then the world would have paid you your own price. Friends,

learn that lesson. I would speak tenderly and kindly to the poor; but I sometimes need to speak decidedly.

Young man, remember if you are going to invest your life or talent or money, you must look around and see what people need and then invest yourself, or your money, in that which they need most. Then will your fortune be made, for they must take care of you. It is a difficult lesson to learn.

Some young men will say to me: —

“I cannot go into that mercantile business.”

“Why not?”

“Because I have no capital.”

Capital! Capital! Capital! Capital! is the cry of a dudish generation which cannot see over its collar. (Laughter and applause.)

Who are the rich men now? The poor boys of fifty years ago. You know it. The rich men of your town, in whatever profession or calling they are, as a rule were the poor boys of forty or fifty years ago. If they had not been poor they wouldn't be rich now.

The statistics of Massachusetts say, and I presume it holds good in your State, that not one rich man's son in seventeen ever dies rich. I pity the rich man's son. He is not to be praised for his magnificent, palatial home, not to be congratulated on having plenty of money, or his yachts, carriages, and diamonds. Oh no, but rather to be commiserated. It is often a misfortune to be born the son of a rich man. There are many things a rich man's son cannot know, because he is not passing through the school of actual experience.

A young man in our college asked me: “What is the happiest hour in the history of a man's life?” The definition I gave him was this: The happiest hour in the history of a man's life is when he takes his bride for the first time over the threshold of his own door, into a house which he has earned by his own hands; and as he enters the nest he has built he says to her, with an eloquence of feeling no words of mine can ever touch: “Wife, I earned this

home myself!" Oh, that is the grandest moment a man may ever know. "Wife, I earned this home. It is all mine, and I divide it with thee!" (Applause.) It is a magnificent moment!

But the rich man's son cannot know that. He may go into a house that is more beautiful; but as he takes his wife into his mansion he will go all through it and say to her: "My mother gave me that! My mother gave me that. My mother gave me that!" — until his wife wishes he had married his mother. (Applause.)

I pity such a young man as that.

It is said that the elder Vanderbilt, when a boy, went to his father and said: —

"Father, did you earn all your money?"

And the old Commodore said: "I did, I earned every penny of it."

And he did. It is cruel to slander the rich because they have been successful. It is a shame to "look down" upon the rich the way we do. They are not scoundrels because they have gotten money. They have blessed the world. They have gone into great enterprises that have enriched the nation and the nation has enriched them. It is all wrong for us to accuse a rich man of dishonesty simply because he secured money. Go through this city and your very best people are among your richest people. Owners of property are always the best citizens. It is all wrong to say they are not good.

The elder Vanderbilt went to his father and said: "Did you earn all your money?"

And when the Commodore said that he did, the boy said: "Then I will earn mine."

And he insisted on going to work for three dollars a week. If a rich man's son will go to work like that he will be able to take care of his father's money when the father is gone. If he has the bravery to fight the battle of poverty like the poor boy, then of course he has a double advantage. But as a rule the rich father won't allow his son to work; and the boy's mother! —

oh, she would think it a social disgrace for her poor, weak, little, lily-fingered, sissy sort of a boy to earn his living with honest toil. And so I say it is not capital you want. It is not copper cents, but common sense. (Applause.)

Let me illustrate it again. A. T. Stewart had a dollar and fifty cents to begin life on. That was of course before he was a school-teacher. He lost eighty-seven and a half cents on his very first venture. How did he come to lose it? He lost it because he purchased some needles, thread, and buttons to sell, which people did not want. And he said: "I will never do that again." Then he went around first to the doors of the houses and asked the people what they did want; then when he found out what they wanted he invested his sixty-two and a half cents and supplied a "known demand."

Why does one merchant go beyond another? Why does one manufacturer outset any other? It is simply because that one has found out what people want, and does not waste his money buying things they do not need. That is the whole of it. And A. T. Stewart said: "I am not going to buy things people do not want. I will take an interest in people and study their needs." And he pursued that until he was worth forty millions of dollars.

"But," you will say, "I cannot do that here." Yes you can. It is being done in smaller places now, and you can do it as well as others.

But a better illustration was John Jacob Astor, the elder. They said that he had a mortgage on a millinery store. I never reach this point without thinking that the ladies will say, that "Fools rush in where angels fear to tread." (Laughter.) But John Jacob Astor had a mortgage on a millinery store, and foreclosed the mortgage and went into business with the same people who had failed on his hands. After he entered into partnership, he went out and sat down on a bench in the Park. What was the successful merchant doing out there, in partnership with people who had just failed on his own hands? Ah, he had the most important and, to my mind, the pleasantest part of that

partnership. He was out there watching the ladies as they went by — and where is the man who would not get rich at that business? As he sat upon that bench if a lady passed him with her shoulders thrown back and her head up, and looking straight to the front, as though she didn't care if all the world did gaze on her, then John Jacob Astor studied the bonnet she wore; and before it was out of sight he knew the shape of the frame, and the curl of the lace, and crimp of the feathers, and lots of intricate things that go into a bonnet which I cannot describe. Then he went to his millinery store and said: "Now put in the show window just such a bonnet as I describe to you, because I have just seen a real lady who likes just such a bonnet." Then he went and sat down again. Another lady, with another form and complexion, came, and, of course, she wore another style of bonnet. He then went back and described that and had that put into the window. He didn't fill his show window full of hats in the back of the store and bewail because people went somewhere else to trade. (Applause.) He didn't have a hat or a bonnet that some lady didn't like. That has since been the wealthiest millinery firm on the face of the earth. There has been taken out of that business seventeen millions of dollars and over, by partners who have retired. Yet not a dollar of capital have they ever put into that business, except what they turned in from their profits — to use as capital. Now John Jacob Astor made the fortune of that millinery firm not by lending them money, but by finding out what the ladies liked for bonnets, before they wasted any material in making them up. And if a man can foresee the millinery business, he can foresee anything under Heaven. (Laughter and applause.)

But perhaps a better illustration may strike closer home. You ought to go into the manufacturing business. But you say there is no room here. Great corporations which have gotten possession of the field make it impossible to make a success of a small manufacturing business now. I say to you, young man, that there was never a time in your history and never will be in your

history again when the opportunity for a poor man to make money in the manufacturing business is so clearly apparent as it is at this very hour.

“But,” says some young man to me, “I have no capital.”

Oh, capital, capital! Do you know of any manufacturer around here who was not born poor? Capital! you don't want capital now. I want to illustrate again, for the best way to teach is always by illustration.

There was a man in Hingham, Massachusetts, who was a carpenter and out of work. He sat around the stove until his wife told him to “go out of doors”; and he did, — what every man in Massachusetts is compelled to do by law, — he obeyed his wife. (Applause.) He went out and sat down on the shore of the bay and he whittled out an oak shingle into a wooden chain. His children that evening quarreled over it. So he whittled another to keep peace in the family. While he was whittling the second toy a neighbor came and said to him: “Why don't you whittle toys and sell them? You can make money.” The carpenter said, “I could not whittle toys, and if I could do it, I would not know what to make!” There is the whole thing. It is to know what to make. It is the secret of life everywhere. You may take it in the ministry. You may take it in law. You may take it in mechanics or in labor. You may take it in professional life, or anywhere on earth — the whole question is what to make of yourself for other people. “What to make” is the great difficulty.

He said he would “not know what to make.” His neighbor said to him, with good New England common sense: “Why don't you ask your own children what to make?”

“Oh,” said he, “my children are different from other people's children.”

I used to see people like that when I taught school.

But he consulted his children later, and whittled toys to please them and found that other people's children wanted the same things. He called his children right around his feet and whittled

out of firewood those "Hingham tops," the wooden shovels, the wooden buckets and such things, and when his children were especially pleased, he then made copies to sell. He began to get a little capital of his own earning, and secured a footlathe, and then secured a room, then hired a factory, and then hired power; and so he went on. The last law case I ever tried in my life was in the United States Courtroom at Boston, and this very Hingham man who had whittled those toys stood upon the stand. He was the last man I ever cross-examined. Then I left the law, and went into the ministry — left practising entirely and went to preaching exclusively. But I said to this man as he stood upon the stand: —

"When did you begin to whittle those toys?"

He said: "In 1870."

Said I: "In these seven years how much have those toys become worth?"

He answered: "Do you mean the taxable value or the estimated value?"

I said: "Tell his Honor the taxable value, that there may be no question about it." He answered me from the witness-stand under oath: —

"Seventy-eight thousand dollars."

Seventy-eight thousand dollars in only seven years, and beginning with nothing but a jack-knife (and a few hundred dollars of debts he owed other people), and so he was worth at least \$100,000. His fortune was made by consulting his own children, in his own house, and deciding that other people's children would like the same thing. You can do the same thing if you will. You don't need to go out of your house to find out where the diamonds are. You don't need to go out of your own room.

But your wealth is too near. I was speaking in New Britain, Connecticut, on this very subject. There sat five or six rows from me a lady. I noticed the lady at the time, from the color of her bonnet. I said to them, what I say to you now, "Your

wealth is too near to you! You are looking right over it!" She went home after the lecture and tried to take off her collar. The button stuck in the buttonhole. She twisted and tugged and pulled and finally broke it out of the buttonhole and threw it away. She said: "I wonder why they don't make decent collar buttons?"

Her husband said to her: "After what Conwell said to-night why don't you get up a collar button yourself? Did he not say that if you need anything other people need it; so if you need a collar button there are millions of people needing it. Get up a collar button and get rich. 'Wherever there is a need there is a fortune.'" (Applause.)

Then she made up her mind to do it; and when a woman makes up her mind, and doesn't say anything about it, she does it! (Applause.) And she invented this "Snap button," a kind of a button that snaps together from two pieces, through the buttonhole. That very woman can now go over the sea every summer in her own yacht and take her husband with her. And if he were dead she would have enough money left to buy a foreign count or duke, or some such thing. (Laughter and applause.)

What is my lesson in it? I said to her what I say to you, "Your fortune is too near to you! So near that you are looking over it." She had to look over it. It was right under her chin. And it is just as near to you.

In East Brookfield, Massachusetts, there was a shoemaker out of work. His wife drove him out of doors with a mopstick, because she wanted to mop around the stove. He went out and sat down on the ash barrel in the back yard. Close by that ash barrel ran a little mountain stream. I have sometimes wondered if, as he sat there on that ash barrel, he thought of Tennyson's beautiful poem: —

"Chatter, chatter, as I flow,
To join the brimming river,
Men may come and men may go,
But I go on forever."

I don't believe he thought of it, because it was not a poetical situation, on an ash barrel in the back yard. (Laughter.) But as he sat on that ash barrel he looked down into the stream, and he saw a trout go flashing up the stream and hiding under the bank. He leaped down and caught the fish in his hands and took it into the house. His wife sent it to a friend in Worcester. The friend wrote back that they would give five dollars for another such trout. And the shoemaker and his wife immediately started out to find one. They went up and down the stream, but not another trout to be found. Then they went to the preacher. But that is not half as foolish as some other things young people go to a preacher for. That preacher could not explain why they could not find another trout. But he was true to his profession; he "pointed the way." He said: "Secure Seth Green's book on the 'Culture of Trout,' and it will give you the information you need." They got the book and found that if they started with a pair of trout, a trout would lay thirty-six hundred eggs every year, and that every trout would grow an ounce the first year, and a quarter of a pound every succeeding year, so that in four years a man could secure from two trout four tons per annum to sell. They said: "Oh, we don't believe such a great story as that. But if we could raise a few and sell them for five dollars a piece, we might make money." So they purchased two little trout and put them in the stream, with a coal sifter down the stream and a window screen up-stream to keep the trout in. Afterwards, they moved to the banks of the Connecticut River, and afterwards to the Hudson, and one of them has been on the United States Fish Commission, and had a large share in the preparation for the World's Fair in 1900 in Paris. But he sat that day, on that ash barrel in the back yard, right by his acres of diamonds. But he didn't see them. He had not seen his fortune although he had lived there for twenty-three years, until his wife drove him out there with a mopstick. It may be you will not find your wealth until your wife assumes the sceptre of power! But nevertheless, your wealth is there. (Applause.)

But the people who make the greatest mistakes are the farmers. When I could not keep my father's store he set me to work on the farm, knowing that as the ground was nearly all rock I could not do much harm there. (Laughter.)

I know by experience that a very ordinary man can be a lawyer. I also know that it does not take a man with a gigantic intellect to be a preacher. It takes a greater man than either to make a successful farmer to-day. The farmer will be more successful when he gives more attention to what people want and not so much to what will grow, though he needs them both. But now the whole time of most of our farmers is taken up with the finding out of "what will grow."

I was going up through Iowa a while ago and saw the wheat decaying in mud, and I said to a farmer: —

"Why is it that all this grain here is decaying?"

"Oh," he said, "it is the 'awful' monopoly of the railroads." He didn't use the word "awful," but he used a word that he thought was more emphatic. (Laughter.)

I got into the train and I sympathized with the poor down-trodden farmer. The conductor came along and I asked him: —

"How much dividend does this railroad pay on its stock?"

He looked at me and said: "It has not paid any for nine years, and it has been in the hands of the receiver the most of the time."

Then I changed my mind. If that farmer had raised what the people wanted, not only would he have been rich, but the railroad would have paid interest on its stock. (Applause.)

I was at Evansville, Indiana, and a man drove up in his beautiful carriage and told me: "Eighteen years ago I borrowed two hundred dollars and I went into farming. I began the first year to raise wheat, rye, and hogs. But the second year I decided to raise what the people wanted, so I ploughed the ground over and put in small fruits. Now, I own this farm and a great deal more." They told me at the hotel that he owned two-thirds of the stock in the bank of which he was president.

He had made his money all because he planted what people wanted.

Let me go down through the audience now, and ask you to show me the great inventors here. You will say: "That doesn't mean me." But it does mean you. Great inventors that hear me now! Oh, you will say, we don't have any inventors here. They all live away off somewhere else. But who are the great inventors? Always the men who are the simplest and plainest. They are the great inventors. The great inventor has the simple mind, and invents the simplest machine.

Did you ever think how simple the telephone and the telegraph are? Now the simplest mind is always the greatest. Did you ever see a great man? Great in every noble and true sense? If so, you could walk right up to him and say: "How are you, Jim?" Just think of the great men you have met and you find this is true.

I went out to write the biography of General Garfield and found him crowded with other people. I went to a neighbor's to wait until they were gone. But the neighbor told me that if I wanted to get a chance to see him I had better go over at once, and he offered to introduce me. He took his old hat and stuck it on the back of his head, and climbed over the fence and went to the back-door of the house, and shouted: —

"Jim! Jim! Jim!"

Very soon "Jim" came to the door; and the neighbor said: "Here is a man who wants to see you."

I went into the house of one of the grandest men that America has ever raised. To his neighbors he was "Jim," a plain man, a simple man. (Applause.)

I went to see President Lincoln one time when I was an officer in the War of 1861. I had never seen him before, and his secretary sent me in to see him as one would enter a neighbor's office. Simple, plain "old Abe." (Applause.)

The simple men are the greatest always. Did you ever see a man strut proudly along, puffed up in his individual pride, not

willing to notice an ordinary mechanic? Do you think he is great? Do you really think that man is great? He is nothing but a puffed-up balloon, held down by his big feet. There may be greatness in self-respect, but there is not greatness in feeling above one's fellow men. (Applause.)

I asked a class in Minnesota once, who were the great inventors, and a girl hopped up and said, "Columbus." (Laughter.) Columbus was a great inventor. Columbus married a wife who owned a farm, and he carried it on just as I carried on my father's farm. He took the hoe and went out and sat down on a rock. But as Columbus sat on that rock on the Island of Porto Santo, Spain, he was thinking. I was not. That was a great difference. Columbus as he sat on that rock held in his hand a hoe-handle. He looked out on the ocean and saw the departing ships apparently sink into the sea, and the tops of the masts went down, out of sight. Since that time some "other Spanish ships have sunk into the sea!" (Applause.) Said Columbus: "This world is like a hoe-handle, the further off the further down, the further off the further down, — just like a hoe-handle. I can sail around to the East Indies." How clear it all was! Yet how simple the mind! It is the simplest minds that observe the very simplest things, which accomplish the greatest marvels.

I went up into New Hampshire and when I came back I said I would never go to New Hampshire to lecture again. And I said to a relative of mine, who was a professor at Harvard: —

"I was cold all the time I was there and I shivered so that my teeth shook."

Said he: "Why did you shiver?"

"Because it was cold."

"No, that is not the reason you shivered."

Then I said: "I shivered because I had not bedclothes enough."

"No, that is not the reason."

"Well," said I, "Professor, you are a scientific man, I am not.

I would like to have an expert, scientific opinion now, why I shivered.”

He arose in his facetious way and said to me: “Young man, you shivered because you did not know any better! Didn’t you have in your pocket a two-cent paper?”

“Oh yes, I had a Herald and a Journal.”

“That is it. You had them in your pocket, and if you had spread one newspaper over your sheet when you went to bed, you would have been as warm, as you lay there, as the richest man in America under all his silk coverlids. But you shivered because you didn’t know enough to put a two-cent newspaper on your bed, and you had it in your pocket.” (Applause.)

It is the power to appreciate the little things that brings success. How many women want divorces, and ought to have them too; but how many divorces originate like this? A man will hurry home from the factory, and his wife rushes in from the kitchen with the potatoes that have been taken out before they seem to be done, and she puts them on the table for her husband to eat. He chops them up and eats them in a hurry. They go down in hard lumps; he doesn’t feel good, and he is all full of crankiness. He frets and scolds, and perhaps swears, and there is a row in the family right there. And these hearts that were almost divinely united will separate to satanic hatred. What is the difficulty? The difficulty is that that lady didn’t know what all these ladies do know, that if with potatoes raised in lime soil she had put in a pinch of salt when she put them in the kettle, she could have brought them forth at the right time, and they would have been ready to laugh themselves to pieces with edible joy. He would have digested them readily, and there would have been love in that family, just for a little pinch of salt. (Applause.)

Now, I say, it is the appreciation of these things that makes the great inventors of the world. I read in a newspaper the other day that no woman ever invented anything. Of course this didn’t refer to gossip; but machines and improvements.

(Laughter.) If it had referred to gossip, it would have applied better to that newspaper than to women. (Renewed laughter.) Who invented the Jacquard loom? Mrs. Jacquard. Who invented the printer's roller? A woman. Who invented the cotton-gin? Mrs. Green; although a patent was taken out on an improvement in Mr. Whitney's name. Who invented the sewing-machine? A woman. Mrs. Howe, the wife of Elias Howe. If a woman can invent a sewing-machine, if a woman can invent a printing roller, if a woman can invent a cotton-gin, we men can invent anything under Heaven! (Laughter and applause.) I say that to encourage the men. Anyhow, our civilization would roll back if we should cross out the great inventions of women, though the patents were taken out often in the names of men.

The greatest inventors are those who see what the people need, and then invent something to supply that need. Let me illustrate only once more. Suppose I were to go through this house and shake hands with each of you and say: "Please introduce me to the great men and women in this hall to-night."

You would say: "Great men! We don't have any here. There are none in this audience. If you want to find great men you must go to some other part of the world! Great men always come from somewhere else."

How many of your men with vast power to help your city, how many with great genius, or great social power, who might enrich and beautify and elevate this, their own city, are now taking their money and talents and spending them in some foreign place, instead of benefiting their own people here? Yet here is the place for them to be great. There are as great men here as in any other place of its size. But it is so natural for us to say that great men come from afar. They come from London, from Rome, from San Francisco, from New York, from Manayunk, or anywhere else. But there are just as great men hearing me speak to-night as there are elsewhere, and yet, who,

because of their simplicity, are not now appreciated. But "the world knows nothing of its greatest men," says the great philosopher; and it is true. Your neighbor is a great man and it is time you appreciated it, and if you do not appreciate it now, you never will. The only way to be a true patriot is to be a true patriot at home. A man who cannot benefit his own city should never be sent to Washington. Towns and cities are cursed because their own people talk them down. A man who cannot bless his own community, the place in which he lives, should not be called a patriot anywhere else. To these young men I want to utter this cry with all my force. Here is the place for you to be great, and here are your great men.

But we teach our young people to believe that all the great people are away off. I heard a professor in an Illinois college say, that "nearly all the great men are dead." We don't want him in Philadelphia. (Laughter.) They don't want him anywhere. The greatest men are living now, and will only be exceeded by the generations to come; and he who appreciates that fact will look around him and will respect his neighbor, and will respect his environment. I have to say to-night, that the great men of the world are those who appreciate that which is next to them, and the danger now to our nation is that we belittle everything that is at home.

Have you heard the campaign speeches this year? I heard a man at the Academy of Music say that our nation is going to ruin; that the Ship of State is drifting upon the rocks and will soon be shattered into ten thousand fragments, and this Republic will be no more; that there will be founded an empire, and upon the empire we will put a throne, and upon the throne will be placed a tyrant, and he with his iron heel will grind the people into dust. It is a lie! (Applause.) Never in the history of God's government of mankind was there a nation stepping upward more certainly toward all that is grand and beautiful and true than is the Nation of America to-day! Let the politicians say what they will for personal greed, let them declaim

with all their powers, and try to burden the people, you and I know that whichever way the elections may go, the American people are not dead, and the nation will not be destroyed. It is a living body, this mighty Republic, and it cannot be killed by a single election. And they that will belittle our nation are not patriots. Let the land be filled with hope. Some young men will say: "Oh well, the nation is having a hard time." But it is not. The Bible says: "It is good for me that I was afflicted." We are getting down to where we can consider and take account of stock. In the next five years from this 1893 you will see the most flourishing institutions; all through this land will be united a prosperity such as this nation never knew before. Whatever the result of the election, don't belittle your own nation.

Some young man is saying: "There is going to be a great man here, although I don't know of any now."

"Young man, when are you going to be great?"

"When I am elected to some political office, then I will be great."

Oh, young man, learn right now, in these exciting times, that to hold a political office under our form of government is no evidence of greatness. Why, my friends, what would become of this nation if our great men should take office? Suppose you select the greatest men of your city right now, and ask them to leave their great enterprises and go into some political office. My friends, what a ruin would be left if the great men were to take political offices! The great men cannot afford to take political office, and you and I cannot afford to put them there. To hold a political office is to be a servant of the people. And the Bible says, "He that is sent cannot be greater than he who sends him," and "the servant cannot be greater than his master." The office-holder is the servant of others. He is sent by the people, he cannot be greater than the people. You think you are going to be a great man by being elected to some political office! Young man, greatness is intrinsic; it is in the personality,

not in the office. If you are not great as an individual before you go into the office, you may rattle around in it after you get in, like "shot in a tin pan." There will be no greatness there. You will hold the office for a year or more and never be heard of again. There are greater things than political office. Many a young man's fortune has been made by being defeated when he was up for political office. You never saw a really great man in office who did not take the office at a sacrifice to himself.

Another young man says: "There is going to be a great man here."

"When?"

"When there comes a war! When we get into another conflict with Spain over Cuba; with England over the Monroe Doctrine, or over the Russian boundary, or with New Jersey, or some distant country of the world (Laughter), then I will sweep up among the glittering bayonets, then I will tear down their flag from the staff, bear it away in triumph, and come home with stars on my shoulders, and hold every office in the gift of the nation; then I will be great!"

Young man, remember greatness does not consist in holding office, even in war. The office does not make the great man. But, alas, we mislead the young in teaching history. If you ask a scholar in school who sank the "Merrimac," he will answer "Hobson," and tell seven-eighths of a lie. For eight men sank the "Merrimac" at Santiago. Yet where are the women here to-night who have kissed the other seven men? (Laughter.)

A young man says: "I was studying the history of the War the other day and read about Generals Grant, Meade, Beauregard, Hood, and these great leaders, and they were great."

Did you read anything about their predecessors? There is very little in history about them. If the office had made their predecessors great, you would not have heard of Grant, or Sherman, or McClellan. But they were great men intrinsically, not made so by the office. The way we teach history leads the

young to think that when people get into office they then become great men. But it is terribly misleading.

Every great general of the war is credited with many victories he never knew anything about, simply because they were won by his subordinates. But it is unfair to give the credit to a general who did not know anything about it. I tell you if the lightning of heaven had struck out of existence every man who wore shoulder-straps in our wars, there would have arisen out of the ranks of our private soldiers just as great men to lead the nation on to victory.

I will give one more illustration. I don't like to give it. I don't know how I ever fell into the habit. Indeed, it was first given offhand to a Grand Army post of which I was a member. I hesitate to give it now.

I close my eyes and I can see my own native hills once more. I can see my mountain town and plateau, the Congregational Church, and the Town Hall. They are there spread before me with increasing detail as my years fly by. I close my eyes and I can see the crowd again that was there in that war-time, 1864, dressed in red, white, and blue; the flags flying, the band playing. I see a platoon of soldiers who have returned from one term of service and reënlisted for the second, and are now to be received by the mountain town. Oh, well do I remember the day! I was captain of the company. Although in my teens, I was marching at the head of that company and puffed out with pride. A cambric needle would have burst me all to pieces! (Laughter.) I am sincerely ashamed of the whole thing now. But what august pride, then in my youth, marching at the head of my troops, being received by the country town authorities! We marched into the Town Hall. They seated my soldiers in the middle of the hall, and the crowds came in on the right and on the left. Then the town officers filed upon the stand and took up their position in a half-circle. The good old Mayor of the town, and the Chairman of the Selectmen (his family gave me permission to use this without offense to them), he sat there in

his dignity, with his powerful spectacles. He had never held an office in his life before. He may have thought that if he could get into office that would give him power to do almost anything. He never held an office before, and never made a speech before. When he had taken his place he saw me on the front seat, and he came right forward and invited me up on the platform with the "Selectmen." Invited me, me! up on the stand with the town officers! Why, no town officer ever took any notice of me before I went to war; yet perhaps I ought not to say that, because one of them, I remember, did advise a teacher to "whale" me; but I mean no "honorable mention." (Laughter and applause.) Now I am invited on the stand with the Selectmen. They gave me a chair in just about this relation to the table. (Indicating the position.) I sat down, let my sword fall to the floor and waited to be received — Napoleon the Vth — "Pride goeth before destruction," and it ought. When the Selectmen and the Mayor had taken seats the Mayor waited for quite a while, and then came forward to the table. Oh, that speech! We had supposed he would simply introduce the Congressional minister, who usually gave such public addresses. But you should have seen the surprise when this old man arose to deliver the address, on this august occasion. He had never delivered an address before. He thought the office would make him an orator. But he forgot that a man must speak his piece as a boy if he wishes to become an orator as a man. Yet he made a most common mistake. So he had written out his speech and learned it by heart. But he brought his manuscript with him, very wisely, and took it out, opened it, and spread it on the table, and then adjusted his spectacles that he might see it. Then he walked back and came forward again to deliver that address. He must have studied the idea a great deal, because he assumed an "elocutionary attitude." He "rested heavily on his left heel, slightly advanced his right foot, threw back his shoulders, and advanced his right hand at an angle of forty-five." (Laughter.) As he stood in that elocutionary attitude, this is just the way he

delivered that speech. Friends often ask me if I do not exaggerate it. You couldn't exaggerate it. I haven't the power to exaggerate it. —

“Fellow citizens!” — and then he paused until his fingers and knees shook, and began to swallow, then turned aside to look at his manuscript.

“Fellow citizens: — We are — we are — we are — we are very happy. We are very happy — we are very happy — we are very happy. We are very happy — to welcome back — to their native town — to their native town — these soldiers — these soldiers — who have fought and bled, and are back again in their native town. We are especially, — we are especially pleased to see with us to-night this young hero, — (that meant me) — who in imagination — (friends, remember he said that; if he hadn't said that I wouldn't have been egotistic enough to refer to it to-day, I assure you) — who, in imagination, — we have seen leading his troops on to the deadly breach. We have seen his shining — we have seen his shining — his shining sword — we have seen his shining sword, flashing in the sunlight, as he shouted to his troops, ‘Come on!’” (Laughter and applause.)

Oh, dear, dear, dear! He was a good old man, but how little he knew about the War. If he had known anything about war at all, he ought to have known that it is next to a crime for an officer of infantry ever, in time of danger, to go ahead of his men. I, with “my shining sword flashing in the sunlight,” and calling to my troops, “Come on!” I never did it. Do you suppose I would go in front of my men to be shot in front by the enemy, and in the back by my own men? It is no place for an officer. The place for an officer in time of danger is behind the private soldier. It is the private soldier who faces the enemy. Often, as a staff officer, I have ridden down the line, before the battle, and as I rode I have given the general's order, shouting “Officers to the rear!” And then every officer goes behind the line of private soldiers, and the higher the officer's rank, the farther behind he goes. It is the place for him; for, if your officers and

your generals were killed on the first discharge, where would the plan of the battle be? How ashamed I was of the whole affair! In actual battle such an officer has no right to go ahead of his men. Some of those men had carried that boy across the Carolina rivers. Some of them had given him their last draught of coffee. One of them had leaped in front of him and had his cheek-bone shot away; he had leaped in front of the boy to save his life. Some were not there at all, and the tears flowing from the eyes of the widows and orphans showed that they had gone down for their country. Yet in the good man's speech he scarcely noticed those who had died; the hero of the hour was that boy. We do not know even now where many of those comrades do sleep. They went down to death. Sometimes in my dreams I call, "Answer me, ye sighing pines of the Carolinas; answer me, ye shining sands of Florida; answer me, ye crags and rocks of Kentucky and Tennessee, — where sleep my dead?" But to my call no answer comes. I know not where many of those men now sleep. But I do know this, they were brave men. I know they went down before a brave foe, fighting for a cause both believed to be right. Yet the hero of this hour was this boy. He was an officer, and they were only private soldiers.

I learned a lesson then I will never forget, until the bell of time ceases to swing for me, — that greatness consists not in holding an office. Greatness really consists in doing great deeds with little means, — in the accomplishment of vast purposes; from the private ranks of life — in benefiting one's own neighborhood, in blessing one's own city, the community in which he dwells. There, and there only, is the great test of human goodness and human ability. He who waits for an office before he does great and noble deeds must fail altogether.

I learned that lesson then, that henceforth in life I will call no man great simply because he holds an office. Greatness! It is something more than office, something more than fame, more than genius! It is the great-heartedness that encloses those in need, reaches down to those below, and lifts them up. May

this thought come to every one of these young men and women who hear me speak tonight and abide through future years. (Applause.)

I close with the words of Bailey. He was not one of our greatest writers, but after all, in this he was one of our best: —

“We live in deeds, not years,
In feelings, not in figures on a dial,
In thoughts, not breaths;
We should count time by heart throbs; (in the cause of right)
He most lives who *thinks most*.”

Oh, friends, if you forget everything else I say, don't forget these two lines; for, if you think *two* thoughts where I think *one*, you will live twice as much as I do in the same length of time. —

“He most lives who thinks most
Who feels the noblest,
And who acts the best.”

(Great applause.)

GET FACTS; LOOK FAR; THINK THROUGH

WILLIAM C. REDFIELD

(This address was delivered at Boston University, September 25, 1916, before the student assembly of the College of Business Administration.)

I have been cudgeling what serves me for a brain in an effort to find something to say to you that would "stick." Of course it must be worth sticking or it will not stick, and therein lies the difficulty. One does not wish to place before you a series of bromidioms nor to repeat that which instructors will tell you far better in the coming weeks.

Casting about, therefore, for something real, and looking back for that purpose over a long business life, two or three brief phrases have occurred to me, which as they are looked at from different angles seem to present principles so clear, so sound, so proven, as to be worth stating. Let us take then the subject for this evening's talk the following terse business maxims:

Get facts; look far; think through.

In these six words lie packed masses of worldly and of spiritual wisdom. They are easy words to say, but the processes they represent are most difficult to do. They involve abandonment of mental habits, the forsaking of preconceived ideas, the non-acceptance of many current doctrines, the assertion of individuality, the restraint from hasty conclusions, the formation of unwonted habits; they call for effort, training, and long practice.

I think it is true no man has ever succeeded largely in the business world without having all three of these principles present in his work to some degree. On the other hand, the presence of one or another of them without the rest often works serious damage. For these principles are full of power, and power that is uncontrolled works harm.

For one to get facts may make him but a grubber into old tomes, if he does naught else. For one to look far may mean to become visionary, if that be all he does. For one to think through may make him a dreamer in an active world or lead to indecision. The facts must be used with the thorough thought and the far outlook if the balance of mental power in business life is to be fruitful. Let us, then, look briefly at these three principles to see something of what they involve.

First, then, get facts. If we apply this principle as a measure to the business world we shall soon see that the men who live up to this principle are relatively few and lonely, and that most of us deal to a greater or less extent with fancies or with fallacies which we hope or believe are facts. Few of us will go as far in practice as the man who said to me, "If I don't know why I know what I think I know, then I want to know." Most of us are content with assumptions, and few follow the scriptural maxim to prove all things and to hold fast that which is good. Yet facts, as has been well said, are stubborn things, and you may make up your mind now that if during your business lives you do not get the facts, the facts will get you.

It is not always easy to get the facts. On the contrary, it is commonly hard to get them, and because it is hard we are apt to accept assertions as to the facts from those who we think ought to know instead of exerting ourselves to learn them directly. A business man feels, for example, that his competitor uses unworthy practices and is tempted himself to follow the bad example lest in competition he be outdone. He does not certainly know his competitor does these things. He is told it and believes it because perhaps he cannot otherwise explain some success that competitor has won. It is commonly a mistake, and if he sought patiently for the facts he would often find them and save himself from an error of judgment respecting another and from business mistakes upon his own part.

Another man — many a man — thinks he knows what it costs him to do business. He does not know that he knows. He

merely thinks he does. He gets along, perhaps for years, without actually learning the truth about the cost of his own business. You will say that self-interest, common sense, and other equally strong motives would make him learn the truth. I agree they ought to do so, but the fact is they do not. The Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission says half the business concerns do not know what it costs them to do business, and the experience of the accountants of my own department justifies the statement. I once worked as bookkeeper for a man who would not allow a trial balance to be taken. Although for my own protection, under the advice of wiser men, I took this trial balance privately, he never knew, or inquired, what the full facts were respecting his own business. I was accountant for a man who after thirty years' experience sold for \$8000 an apparatus which, including overhead, cost him \$9000 to produce, and he was angry when a younger man than he suggested the facts to him. A friend was employed to examine into the operations of an industry only to find the methods of the management were bad; but that management strenuously objected to being told so. One must not go so far as to forget that there are in the business world thousands of men accurate and careful in the matters we are discussing, but there are more of the other kind, and some of them sit in high places.

Again there are the men who want all facts which concur with their preconceived opinions and who resent facts which do not so agree. Such concerns have little use for the cold and searching light of science, to which all truth is of equal value. They are content with a portion of the facts and object to being shaken out of the rut in which they run.

Furthermore the business world is full of facts which fight. There are moral facts which oppose immoral facts; honest facts which hate dishonest facts; partial facts which hate whole facts; crooked facts which abhor the straight ones. Yet the stern teaching of experience is that the crooked and the dishonest facts when the light is thrown on them prove not to be facts at

all, but only pseudo facts, having the appearance but not the reality.

To get facts, then, is fundamental. With them you stand on solid ground. Without them, or with them but partially, your footing is uncertain. You must have a docile mind, however, if you are to follow this rule, a mind open to truth, even to unpleasant truth, even to truth which sets awry that which you have believed and been taught. Yet the strong man sets his mind four-square to the truth and abhors that particularly villainous form of falsehood which tells but half of it.

First and foremost, then, as a mental quality and as a business practice, let me urge upon you this simple yet complex duty, Get facts. Do not be afraid of them, for they have no fear of you. If you have them with you, you are safe. Without them you are always in danger. Know your job. Don't merely think you know it. There is always place in the world for the man that knows and who knows that he knows.

This done you have well begun. Candidly, you will probably spend a lifetime in the doing of it and meanwhile have other serious work to do.

Next I have set the principle "Look far." Let no pent-up Utica confine your powers. The way in which you treat this second principle will show if you are large or little men. A little man may get facts, but he cannot use them largely for he is too small himself. A blind man might have certain facts at hand of which he knew, but he could not use them well since he is blind. In the mental world there are relative shades of blindness. There is a great deal of nearsight, a very large mass of ordinary sight; but the men of far mental sight, those who are called men of light and leading, are few and far between. Yet on your ability to see far depends your power to use the facts you get. You may, for example, some day run a factory and be concerned with paying wages. You may, if you do not look far, even speak of the men you employ as "hands." There are plenty of short-sighted men who call them so. If you look far,

however, you will see that it would be wiser to think of them as minds, or even as souls. For men do not work with hands alone but with heart and brain. You can never lead hands; but you may, if you have facts and look afar, come to lead men. If you look far you will never describe human beings in terms of arithmetic, for you will see that the arithmetic is dead and that the men are living. You will not, if you look far, think there is such a thing as a day's work, for there is no such thing and will be none until all men work alike everywhere. There are as many kinds of day's work, as there are kinds of men, but men are infinitely variable. If you look far you will not think that a fixed rate of pay produces a fixed result, for you will know that men are unlike and that what one can do another cannot, and that what a second will do a third will not. You will see that in dealing with men you are dealing with character and temperament and health and heredity and a mass of other things that make up the complex being we call "man," and which sometimes in our nearsightedness we describe as a two-dollar man or a three-dollar man.

If you look far you will see beyond a whole mass of current phrases and ideas which are the outward and visible expression of the average mind but across which he who looks far sees clearly a more distant and more fruitful horizon. Nay, the very act of looking far will make facts precious to you, for the broad vision will bring them to your sight and make you value them.

There are all sorts of phrases which describe nearsight but which farsight overrules. Nearsight says, Charity begins at home. Farsight adds, But does not end there. Nearsight would say, A bird in the hand is worth two in the bush. Farsight would say, What kind are in the bush and can I get them? Nearsight would say, Thus I have been taught. Farsight would say, Is this teaching true? Nearsight would have you live in a parish and be a parochial business man. Farsight would have you live in the world and draw upon the richness of it all for the enlarging

of your life. It is one of the great phrases of the Old Book, and an inspiring one, which says, "Thou hast taken me and thou hast set me in a large place."

Having acquired the habit of getting facts and having caught the vision of things from afar, make your thinking straight. How many men there are in the business world who think in circles or at best in curves; whose minds lack the penetrating power which goes to the heart of things. If you have gotten facts and have the farsight, use the latter on the former to make all things mentally clear. If you do not think clearly you cannot talk clearly. Good salesmanship is not a product of mental indigestion. Do you want to be able to state the facts of business to men of business? Then you must think through those facts so that they are wholly controlled by you, so that they have become a part of your mental self, so that you will not stumble over your own mental obstructions in the very act of stating your case. A business problem will arise before you. First get the facts about it and treat them in a broad way, not in a narrow way. Do not stick them in a groove in which you like to run because it is easy and attempt to push them ahead of you in that same old line. Get them all and spread them on your mental table; get their bearings and adjust them in their actual relations, so that you may know how they lock and interlock. In this process you are thinking through those facts, and if you continue it to the end you will control the use of those facts. Again and again one sees in life men who mean well, who are willing to get the truth and willing to use it broadly, who do neither effectively because they have not thought the thing through. This thorough thinking is one of the finest safeguards a man can have against error, because as he sits down with his facts and chews the cud upon them over and over again they fall into relations, the false separates itself from the truth, the trifling from the essential, the strong from the weak, and by a process of mental discarding the useless are set aside and true values come to light.

Again and again I have found men in business problems who had thought pretty well but not thoroughly upon the thing in hand. Many times also I have met men who are masters of the thing with which they dealt. Thorough thinking would remove many a phantom which, though a ghost, still exerts power upon our thought. Thorough thinking will destroy many a false ideal. Slavery could not endure thinking through that subject. The dueling practice, with its false sense of honor, could not endure thorough thinking upon the subject. Many a business and political fallacy will die an early death to him who thinks it through. Many a teacher, I fear, may be embarrassed to have his pupils do thorough thinking, but it will do both the teacher and the pupil good to have this so. The process is not one which lends itself to smartness. To think through a thing is not always a quick process. There are men with minds like light, which seem to penetrate into the recesses of a subject. One of slower mental habit need not worry. He may in the end go deeper and stand on firmer ground. Quick comprehension is the most desirable business quality to be sought and valued, but it is not the same thing as thorough thinking and it does not take its place.

Finally, permit me a few words on the ideals of business. The business life will, if you treat it fairly, call forth your best. It will mean the search for truth. It will mean a broad and human philosophy. It will mean keen, incisive thought. All these are good. But your business is not to be your life. It is the means whereby you live, but your life is something else. To be absorbed in business so that you live for it is to be intellectually and spiritually maimed. One who does so is not a whole man but only part of what might be a complete man. Of course to gain has wonderful interest. It is fascinating to pit mind against mind, knowledge and acumen and reflection and energy against the similar powers in other men. It is a splendid and in the best form an ennobling part of life, but it is only a part. There is a certain shallow criticism among us, which does not get the facts and does not see far and does not think through, which would

teach at times that business is sordid and its motto "An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth." Yet this city and others are full of the works of men who, after they have won in the business arena, have given their ideals play in enriching the towns which gave them birth or in which they live. Every such gift is a protest against the shallow cry that business is wholly sordid. Yet in saying this I have not given you even a glimpse of all the facts about it. There are today factories all over this land, thank God, in which men think through the problems of business with a far vision of the facts and who have grasped the ideal of service to and through those whom they employ and are holding up before them and to the world examples of leadership that make the business life stand on a level with all that is best in statesmanship and art and music and the law and the ministry and the other great and beautiful productive professions.

It is true of course, it is a part of the facts, that there are those — many of them — in business who only seek to get and who never think to give either of themselves or of that which they possess. So there are weak, wicked men in other high professions, men that prostitute art and medicine and perhaps the pulpit; who separate themselves from the great facts of life and with narrow vision think only on the surface of their own petty and selfish desires. Still, if the mills of the gods grind slowly they grind exceeding small. If we watch the facts of the growth of public thought and the increase of broad vision and of the habit of thorough thinking we shall see, if we look far enough, that these things are doomed; that selfishness is taken at its true lack of value; that littleness is known to be a small thing; that wealth without vision or ideals is power misplaced, and is sternly judged as such. So we may hope that as the love of truth and obedience to it shall grow and as with firmer footing thereon we look afar and think clearly on what we see, we shall see our beloved America advancing to that primacy among the nations which awaits the nation which honors the facts, which looks afar, and which thinks clearly.

THE USURPATIONS OF SOCIETY

BY OSCAR W. FIRKINS

(This is a prize college oration delivered by Oscar W. Firkins, University of Minnesota, 1885. Mr. Firkins later attained international reputation as a literary critic. Note the simple diction, profuse imagery — pictorial element — and originality of style.)

Nature has two great modes of existence, the crystalline and the organic. Society has two stages which likewise correspond to the crystal and the organism. Take up and analyze any common stone and you will notice that the individual crystals which it contains are each perfect, complete, and beautiful, while the stone itself is rough, incomplete, unsymmetrical. Take up any organism and you will notice that the cells of which it is composed are by themselves worthless and imperfect, their beauty, usefulness, and perfection lie in their relation to the central whole, which is the only complete, entire, and symmetrical thing in the organism.

Society, in its barbarous state, is the group of crystals; in its civilized state it is the agglomeration of cells. Take any uncultivated society and you will notice two things, first, the perfect development of the individual members, and second, the rudeness and incompleteness of the society itself. It advances, however, it gains harmony, symmetry, perfection, unity, it becomes an organic whole; while the members that compose it slowly lose more and more of their individual perfection until their whole greatness, power, life, and existence lie in their relation to the complete organism of society.

This is the state of affairs at the present day; man's whole soul and being lie in his social relation. He has ceased to be an integer; he has become a fraction. Our objects are social aims;

our ideas are social thoughts; our feelings are social emotions; our lives are social existences. Our deepest thoughts are a species of private theatricals that we play before an imaginary audience. For what were we created? To have deep relations with God, to hold in our hearts a sacred chamber which should be to us a holy of holies, to build up in our lives cathedrals to the honor of Deity, to be, in the words of Emerson, "inlets into the deeps of reason." No; we were made to be little wedges and screws, whose only use is to fit into the great machine of society, and which apart from that use are merely worthless old iron.

Man's nature has become like the water drops in the ocean, which by themselves are absolutely transparent and colorless, and only when grouped together in large masses form the bright and beautiful blue of the sea.

At the threshold of our lives, society meets us and offers us the following agreement: I will feed you, nourish you, support you, you shall have clothing, warmth, and shelter; your property shall be protected; your life shall be secure; you shall enjoy certain privileges, and all I ask in return is that you shall surrender to me your brain, your thought, your soul. "Think my thoughts and you shall eat my bread," is the silent compact to which society pledges every one of us. If nature is the mother of man, society is his step mother, and she has an elaborate system of education by which she seeks to reverse and neutralize that mother's instruction. You are dull; dullness is dangerous to society; therefore you shall be patched and mended, and shellacked and varnished, until you have reached the proper degree of mediocrity. You are a genius; genius is equally dangerous to society; therefore you shall be trimmed and pruned, and mutilated, and dwarfed until you, too, are properly mediocre. Hence it happens that the nineteenth century is fertile beyond all other ages in great nations, great institutions, great societies and barren beyond most other ages in great men, for the state of society which tends to produce greatness in states is directly opposed to that which tends to produce great-

ness in individuals. Society is therefore perfectly logical in her conduct; she realizes that it is by stunting the individuals that the state can perfectly develop, by mutilating the separate twigs that the whole tree can be made symmetrical; she understands that as a great man is the highest of all blessings to a nation in adversity, so he is the greatest of all dangers to a nation in prosperity; and she guides her conduct by his principle.

But if society is logical in endeavoring to stunt man, is man equally logical in allowing himself to be stunted? If the spirit of self-preservation leads the one to enforce this system, should not the same spirit lead the other to resist it? I am far from undervaluing the importance of social relations, but those elements of man's nature by which he is related to his fellow man are generally the more shallow and superficial parts of his character, and therefore when these relations become the sole object of his life, it is evident that his superficial qualities are developing at the expense of his profounder ones. We must certainly give society a prominent place in the formation of man's character; if solitude is the mother of great thoughts, society is the nurse of great actions; yet even those actions have their source in qualities which solitude only can develop. The petals and stamens of the lily are indeed open to the light, but the roots, through which alone the petals form their crown of brightness and the stamens uplift their spires of gold, are deep hidden in the darkness under ground. The true glory, the true beauty of man's life is always his relation to God and to himself; his social life is only noble as it is the expression and embodiment of these.

This predominance of the social qualities has rendered life extremely superficial. The nineteenth century regards with the utmost indifference those great questions and principles which were the very life and being of former ages, while it concentrates its highest thought and feeling on those external and surface qualities which former epochs would have regarded as trifles. There have been men to whom life was a holy and an awful thing, in whose hearts forevermore, "Michael and his angels

fought against the dragon and his angels," to whom every moment was the gateway of an Elysium, or the threshold of a Tartarus; who heard in their own souls the awful thunders of Sinai, and who felt in their own bosoms the holy calm of an Olivet; who knew that the hours are the sculptors of the eternities, that every pure thought, every holy feeling, is, in the words of the most sublime of poets,

"The golden key
That opes the palace of eternity."

To them life was an Alpine country; it had its great mountains towering skyward, its dark and bottomless abysses, its caverns haunted by unknown horrors, its mighty glaciers, and its awful precipices; it was a chaos of sublimity and horror, of grandeur and desolation. Now, what have we done? We have leveled, smoothed, graded this wild and barbarous country, we have torn down every mountain, we have filled up every chasm, we have reduced it to a perfectly even lawn, an admirably trimmed and exquisitely decorated park, infinitely more comfortable and infinitely less grand. Life has lost its heights, and its depths; its summits and its abysses; all its grandeurs, and all its horrors; all its sublimity and all its barbarity. Earth, once a vast cathedral, is now a ball room, where we are doomed to dance away, talk away, eat away, sleep away, life. Life, instead of being a holy trust from God, a thing of infinite sublimity, and infinite sacredness, is now a mere toy, a plaything with which we are to amuse ourselves.

The soul of man has, like gases, the great capacity of expanding itself so that it will fill a universe, or contracting itself so that it can be contained in a nutshell. The great crime of the nineteenth century is that it offers us the nutshell, and not the universe. I do not desire to underrate the great qualities of our epoch; it is the happiest, the most intellectual, the most moral of all ages; it is a proper, decorous and well behaved epoch, to characterize it in one word, it is an eminently respectable age;

but it is narrow in feeling, it is limited in soul; it has substituted a religion of the intellect for the religion of the heart; it has exalted man's lower qualities almost into sublimity, while it has degraded his higher ones almost into baseness; it has dwarfed man by making his social qualities the sum of his being, and by sacrificing each individual soul, to that vast nothing, that infinite shadow, that lifeless sum total of all lives, which we call humanity.

I would give all this metaphysical speculation, with its Penelope's web forever unraveling what it has woven before, all these achievements of physical science evermore offering to us a false mirage of happiness, all these brilliantly fruitless inventions and discoveries of ours, for one spark of that intense fire which lighted the soul of Wickliffe and burned in the bosom of Luther. I would sacrifice all this rainbow tinted art and culture, all this flash and sparkle and glow of intellect, all this brilliancy of thought and beauty of expression, for one drop of that terrible earnestness in the spirit of Milton, one breath of that storm of passion raging in John Bunyan's soul. In view of these facts the nineteenth century might well exclaim:

“Life's but a walking shadow, a poor player
That struts and frets his hour upon the stage
And then is heard no more: it is a tale
Told by an idiot, full of sound and fury,
And signifying nothing.”

But the doom is not irreversible, the decrees of destiny never become law, until they are ratified by our own wills. It rests with each one of us to resist, to battle, to conquer these tendencies of our age, to make our aim not the fleeting and ephemeral gifts of society, but the eternal and limitless grandeur of man.

LINCOLN'S "SPRINGFIELD SPEECH"

(Speech delivered at Springfield, Illinois, at the close of the Republican State Convention, by which Lincoln had been named as their candidate for United States Senator, June 16, 1858.)

MR. PRESIDENT, AND GENTLEMEN OF THE CONVENTION:

If we could first know where we are, and whither we are tending, we could better judge what to do, and how to do it. We are now far into the fifth year since a policy was initiated with the avowed object and confident promise of putting an end to slavery agitation. Under the operation of that policy, that agitation has not only not ceased but has constantly augmented. In my opinion, it will not cease until a crisis shall have been reached and passed. "A house divided against itself cannot stand." I believe that this government cannot endure permanently half slave and half free. I do not expect the Union to be dissolved — I do not expect the house to fall — but I do expect it will cease to be divided. It will become all one thing or all the other. Either the opponents of slavery will arrest the further spread of it, and place it where the public mind shall rest in the belief that it is in the course of ultimate extinction; or its advocates will push it forward till it shall become alike lawful in all the States, old as well as new, North as well as South.

Have we no tendency to the latter condition?

Let any one who doubts carefully contemplate that now almost complete legal combination — piece of machinery so to speak — compounded of the Nebraska doctrine and the Dred Scott decision. Let him consider not only what work the machinery is adapted to do, and how well adapted; but also let him study the history of the construction, and trace, if he can, or rather fail, if he can, to trace the evidences of design and concert of action among its chief architects, from the beginning.

The new year of 1854 found slavery excluded from more than half the States by State constitutions, and from most of the national territory by congressional prohibition. Four days later commenced the struggle which ended in repealing that congressional prohibition. This opened all the national territory to slavery, and was the first point gained.

But, so far, Congress only had acted; and an indorsement by the people, real or apparent, was indispensable to save the point already gained and give chance for more.

This necessity had not been overlooked, but had been provided for, as well as might be, in the notable argument of "squatter sovereignty" otherwise called "sacred right of self-government," which latter phrase, though expressive of the only rightful basis of any government, was so perverted in this attempted use of it as to amount to just this: That if any one man choose to enslave another, no third man shall be allowed to object. That argument was incorporated into the Nebraska bill itself, in the language which follows: "It being true intent and meaning of this act not to legislate slavery into any Territory or State, nor to exclude it therefrom; but to leave the people thereof perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States." Then opened the roar of loose declamation in favor of "squatter sovereignty" and "sacred right of self-government." "But," said opposition members, "let us amend the bill so as to expressly declare that the people of the Territory may exclude slavery." "Not we," said the friends of the measure; and down they voted the amendment.

While the Nebraska bill was passing through Congress, a law case involving the question of a negro's freedom, by reason of his owner having voluntarily taken him first into a free State and then into a Territory covered by the congressional prohibition, and held him as a slave for a long time in each, was passing through the United States Circuit Court for the District of Missouri, and both Nebraska bill and lawsuit were brought to a

decision in the same month of May, 1854. The negro's name was Dred Scott, which name now designates the decision finally made in the case. Before the then next presidential election, the law case came to and was argued in the Supreme Court of the United States; but the decision of it was deferred until after the election. Still, before the election, Senator Trumbull, on the floor of the Senate, requested the leading advocate of the Nebraska bill to state his opinion whether the people of a Territory can constitutionally exclude slavery from their limits; and the latter answered: "That is a question for the Supreme Court."

The election came. Mr. Buchanan was elected, and the indorsement, such as it was, secured. That was the second point gained. The indorsement, however, fell short of a clear popular majority by nearly four hundred thousand votes, and so, perhaps, was not overwhelmingly reliable and satisfactory. The outgoing President, in his last annual message, as impressively as possible echoed back upon the people the weight and authority of the indorsement. The Supreme Court met again; did not announce their decision, but ordered a reargument. The presidential inauguration came, and still no decision of the court; but the incoming President in his inaugural address fervently exhorted the people to abide by the forthcoming decision, whatever it might be. Then, in a few days, came the decision.

The reputed author of the Nebraska bill finds an early occasion to make a speech at this capital indorsing the Dred Scott decision, and vehemently denouncing all opposition to it. The new President, too, seizes the early occasion of the Silliman letter to indorse and strongly construe that decision, and to express his astonishment that any different view had ever been entertained!

At length a squabble springs up between the President and the author of the Nebraska bill, on the mere question of fact, whether the Lecompton constitution was or was not, in any just sense, made by the people of Kansas; and in that quarrel

the latter declares that all he wants is a fair vote for the people, and he cares not whether slavery be voted down or voted up. I do not understand his declaration that he cares not whether slavery be voted down or voted up to be intended by him other than as an apt definition of the policy he would impress upon the public mind — the principle for which he declares he has suffered so much, and is ready to suffer to the end. And well may he cling to that principle. If he has any parental feeling, well may he cling to it. That principle is the only shred left of his original Nebraska doctrine. Under the Dred Scott decision "squatter sovereignty" squatted out of existence, tumbled down like temporary scaffolding, — like the mold at the foundry, served through one blast and fell back into loose sand, — helped to carry an election, and then was kicked to the winds. His late joint struggle with the Republicans against the Lecompton constitution involves nothing of the original Nebraska doctrine. That struggle was made on a point — the right of a people to make their own constitution — upon which the Republicans have never differed.

The several points of the Dred Scott decision, in connection with Senator Douglas's "care not" policy, constitute the pieces of machinery in its present state of advancement. This was the third point gained. The working points of that machinery are:

(1) That no negro slave, imported as such from Africa, and no descendant of such slave, can ever be a citizen of any State, in the sense of that term as used in the Constitution of the United States. This point is made in order to deprive the negro in every possible event of the benefit of that provision of the United States Constitution which declares that "the citizens of each state shall be entitled to all the privileges and immunities of citizens of the several states."

(2) That, "subject to the Constitution of the United States," neither Congress nor a territorial legislature can exclude slavery from any United States Territory. This point is made in order

that individual men may fill up the Territories with slaves, without danger of losing them as property and thus enhance the chances of permanency to the institution through all the future.

(3) That whether the holding a negro in actual slavery in a free State makes him free as against the holder, the United States courts will not decide, but will leave to be decided by the courts of any slave State the negro may be forced into by the master. This point is made not to be pressed immediately, but, if acquiesced in for a while, and apparently indorsed by the people at an election, then to sustain the logical conclusion that what Dred Scott's master might lawfully do with Dred Scott in the free State of Illinois, every other master may lawfully do with any other one or one thousand slaves in Illinois or any other free State.

Auxiliary to all this, and working hand in hand with it, the Nebraska doctrine, or what is left of it, is to educate and mold public opinion, at least Northern public opinion, not to care whether slavery is voted down or voted up. This shows exactly where we are now, and partially, whither we are tending.

It will throw additional light on the latter, to go back and run the mind over the string of historical facts already stated. Several things will now appear less dark and mysterious than they did when they were transpiring. The people were to be left "perfectly free," "subject only to the Constitution." What the constitution had to do with it, outsiders could not then see. Plainly enough now, it was an exactly fitted niche for the Dred Scott decision to afterward come in, and declare the perfect freedom of the people to be just no freedom at all. Why was the amendment expressly declaring the right of the people voted down? Plainly enough now, the adoption of it would have spoiled the niche for the Dred Scott decision. Why was the court decision held up? Why even a senator's opinion withheld until after the presidential election? Plainly enough now, the speaking out then would have damaged the "perfectly free" argument upon which the election was to be carried. Why the

outgoing President's felicitation on the indorsement? Why the delay of the reargument? Why the incoming President's advance exhortation in favor of the decision? These things look like the cautious petting and patting of a spirited horse preparatory to mounting him, when it is dreaded that he may give the rider a fall. Any why the hasty after-endorsement of the decision by the President and others?

We cannot absolutely know that all these exact adaptations are the result of preconcert. But when we see a lot of framed timbers, different portions of which we know have been gotten out at different times and places, and by different workmen, — Stephen, Franklin, Roger, and James, for instance, — and we see these timbers joined together, and see they exactly make the frame of a house or a mill, all the tenons and mortises exactly fitting, and all the lengths and proportions of the different pieces exactly adapted to their respective places, and not a piece too many or too few, not omitting even scaffolding — or, if a single piece be lacking, we see the place in the frame exactly fitted and prepared yet to bring such a piece in — in such a case we find it impossible not to believe that Stephen and Franklin and Roger and James all understood one another from the beginning, and all worked upon a common plan or draft drawn up before the first blow was struck.

It should not be overlooked that, by the Nebraska bill, the people of a State, as well as Territory were to be left "perfectly free," "subject only to the Constitution." Why mention a State? They were legislating for Territories, and not for or about States. Certainly the people of a State are and ought to be subject to the Constitution of the United States; but why is mention of this lugged into this merely territorial law? Why are the people of a Territory and the people of a State therein lumped together, and their relation to the Constitution therein treated as being precisely the same? While the opinion of the court, by Chief Justice Taney, in the Dred Scott case, and the separate opinions of all the concurring judges, expressly declare that the

Constitution of the United States neither permits Congress nor a territorial legislature to exclude slavery from any United States Territory, they all omit to declare whether or not the same Constitution permits a State, or the people of a State, to exclude it. Possibly, this is a mere omission; but who can be quite sure, if McLean or Curtis had sought to get into the opinion a declaration of unlimited power in the people of a State to exclude slavery from their limits, just as Chase and Mace sought to get such declaration, in behalf of the people of a Territory, into the Nebraska bill — I ask, who can be quite sure that it would not have been voted down in the one case as it had been in the other? The nearest approach to the point of declaring the power of a State over slavery is made by Judge Nelson. He approaches it more than once, using the precise idea, and almost the language too, of the Nebraska act. On one occasion his exact language is: "Except in case where the power is restrained by the Constitution of the United States, the law of the State is supreme over the subject of slavery within its jurisdiction." In what cases the power of the States is so restrained by the United States Constitution is left an open question, precisely as the same question as to the restraint on the power of the Territories was left open in the Nebraska act. Put this and that together, and we have another nice little niche, which we may, ere long, see filled with another Supreme Court decision declaring that the Constitution of the United States does not permit a State to exclude slavery from its limits. And this may especially be expected if the doctrine of "care not whether slavery be voted up or down" shall gain upon the public mind sufficiently to give promise that such a decision can be maintained when made.

Such a decision is all that slavery now lacks of being alike lawful in all the States. Welcome, or unwelcome, such decision is probably coming, and will soon be upon us, unless the power of the present political dynasty shall be met and overthrown. We shall lie down pleasantly dreaming that the people of Missouri are on the verge of making their state free, and we

shall awake to the reality instead that the Supreme Court has made Illinois a slave state. To meet and overthrow the power of that dynasty is the work now before all those who would prevent that consummation. That is what we have to do. How can we best do it?

There are those who denounce us openly to their own friends, and yet whisper us softly that Senator Douglas is the aptest instrument there is with which to effect that object. They wish us to infer all from the fact that he now has a little quarrel with the present head of the dynasty; and that he has regularly voted with us on a single point upon which he and we have never differed. They remind us that he is a great man, and that the largest of us are very small ones. Let this be granted. But "a living dog is better than a dead lion." Judge Douglas, if not a dead lion for this work, is at least a caged and toothless one. How can he oppose the advances of slavery? He doesn't care anything about it. His avowed mission is impressing the "public heart" to care nothing about it. A leading Douglas Democratic newspaper thinks Douglas's superior talent will be needed to resist the revival of the African slave-trade. Does Douglas believe an effort to revive that trade is approaching? He has not said so. Does he really think so? But if it is, how can he resist it? For years he has labored to prove it a sacred right of white men to take negro slaves into the new Territories. Can he possibly show that it is less a sacred right to buy them where they can be bought cheapest? And unquestionably they can be bought cheaper in Africa than in Virginia. He has done all in his power to reduce the whole question of slavery to one of a mere right of property; and as such, how can he oppose the foreign slave-trade? How can he refuse that trade in that "property" shall be "perfectly free," unless he does it as a protection to the home production? And as the home producers will probably not ask the protection, he will be wholly without a ground of opposition.

Senator Douglas holds, we know, that a man may rightfully

be wiser today than he was yesterday — that he may rightfully change when he finds himself wrong. But can we, for that reason, run ahead, and infer that he will make any particular change of which he, himself, has given no intimation? Can we safely base our action upon any such vague inference? Now, as ever, I wish not to misrepresent Judge Douglas's position, question his motives, or do aught that can be personally offensive to him. Whenever, if ever, he and we can come together on principle so that our great cause may have assistance from his great ability, I hope to have interposed no adventitious obstacle. But clearly, he is not now with us — he does not pretend to be — he does not promise ever to be.

Our cause, then, must be intrusted to, and conducted by, its own undoubted friends — those whose hands are free, whose hearts are in the work, who do care for the result. Two years ago the Republicans of the nation mustered over thirteen hundred thousand strong. We did this under the single impulse of resistance to a common danger, with every external circumstance against us. Of strange, discordant, and even hostile elements, we gathered from the four winds, and formed and fought the battle through, under the constant hot fire of a disciplined, proud and pampered enemy. Did we brave all then to falter now? — now, when that same enemy is wavering, dissevered, belligerent? The result is not doubtful. We shall not fail — if we stand firm we shall not fail. Wise counsels may accelerate or mistakes delay it, but, sooner or later, the victory is sure to come.

OUTLINE: "SPRINGFIELD SPEECH"

PURPOSE: To get voters to support Republican Party.

Introduction

- I. Slavery agitation still continues.
- II. It will continue until a crisis shall have been reached and passed, in that
 - A. We must make a decision as to whether the country shall become all slave or all free.
 - B. My purpose will be to show that we are headed in the first direction.

Body

- I. Leaders of the Democratic Party are in a conspiracy to nationalize slavery, for
 - A. We can trace the successive steps in the process, for
 1. In 1854, the enactment of the Kansas-Nebraska bill opened the new national territory to slavery, for
 - a. A quotation from the bill makes it plain.
 2. The election of Buchanan was regarded as a popular indorsement of this liberal policy toward slavery.
 3. The third point gained was the Dred Scott decision, in connection with Judge Douglas' "care not" policy, for
 - a. Decision holds that negroes cannot be citizens.
 - b. Neither Congress nor a territorial legislature can exclude slavery from a territory.
 - c. It is an open question whether the *states* can exclude slavery, for
 - (1) This is made to depend on a Supreme Court decision.

- B. Many things about this conspiracy now become plain when viewed in the light of the progress of events, for
 - 1. The phrase, "subject only to the Constitution" now becomes plain, for
 - a. It formed a niche for the Dred Scott decision.
 - 2. The voting down of the Chase amendment now becomes plain, for
 - a. Passing it would have defeated the purpose of the conspirators.
 - 3. Several other things also become plain now.
 - 4. An illustration will drive these points home — (illustration of timbers).
 - C. The reference, in the Dred Scott decision, to the right of a *state* to exclude slavery tends to show intention to nationalize slavery, for
 - 1. The right of a *state* to exclude slavery was not before the court.
 - 2. The language of Judge Nelson suggests that here is another niche for a Supreme Court decision declaring that *states* cannot exclude slavery, for
 - a. He says, "Except in case where the power is restrained by the Constitution of the United States, the law of the state is supreme over the subject of slavery within its jurisdiction."
 - 3. Such a decision would make slavery national.
- II. The best way to overthrow this dynasty is to elect a Republican senator, for
- A. Douglas, the Democratic candidate, is not a fit man for that work, for
 - 1. The fact that he has voted with Republicans on points on which the two parties have not differed, is of no consequence.
 - 2. The fact that he is a great man will not help, if his principles are wrong.
 - 3. His principles are wrong, for

- a. He says himself he "does not care" whether slavery is voted up or voted down.
 - b. If consistent, he would have to favor revival of African slave trade.
4. We cannot depend on Judge Douglas changing his views on important principles.

Conclusion

- I. Our cause must be entrusted to the friends of freedom.
- II. We shall win if we stand together firmly.

MERCHANTS AND MINISTERS

BY HENRY WARD BEECHER

(Speech delivered in New York City, May 8, 1883, at the 115th annual banquet of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York.)

MR. PRESIDENT AND GENTLEMEN MERCHANTS:— It may seem a little strange that, in one toast, two so very dissimilar professions should be associated. I suppose it is partly because one preaches and the other practices. (Laughter.) There are very many functions that are performed in common. Merchants are usually men forehanded; ministers are generally men emptyhanded. (Laughter.) Merchants form important pillars in the structure of the Church. Ministers are appointed often to go forth to council and associations, and a delegate is always sent with them. The object of the delegate is to keep the minister sober and to pay his expenses. (Laughter.) They are a very useful set of men in the Church. (Laughter.) But there are some moral functions that they have in common. It is the business of the minister to preach the truth. It is the interest of the merchant to practice it. I hold that not even the Church itself is more dependent upon fundamental moralities than is the whole commercial structure of the world. (Cries of "That's so!")

There are three great elements that are fundamental elements. They are the same everywhere — among all people and in every business truth, honesty and fidelity. (Applause.) And it is my mission tonight to say that, to a very large extent, I fear the pulpit has somewhat forgotten to make this the staple of preaching. It has been given too largely, recently, from the force of education and philosophical research, to discourse upon what are

considered the "higher" topics — theology — against which I bring no charge. (Laughter.) But theology itself, that is not based on the profoundest morality, is an empty cloud that sails through the summer air, leaving as much drought as it found. I believe that there is a theology that pertains to the higher experiences of the human soul. As profoundly as any man, I believe in that.

Today I have been transplanting magnolia trees. I am speaking tonight as the farmer of Westchester County. (Laughter.) There is one that stands among the earliest I planted, twenty years ago, and now it is a vast ball of white. I suppose five hundred thousand magnificent cups are exhaling thanksgiving to God after the long winter has passed. Now, no man need tell me that the root that nestles in the ground is as handsome or smells as sweet as these vases in the air; but I should like to know what would become of all these white cups in the air, if the connection between the dirt-covered roots and the blossoms should be cut tonight. The root is the prime provider, and there can be no life and no blossom where there is no root connection.

Theology and all the rhetoric of preaching is well enough in its place, provided there is a clean and clear passage from all beauty, and all speculations, and all doctrine, down to fundamental common practical moralities without doubt. (Applause.) I hold, then, that it is the interest both of the Church and the State to see to it that truth is spoken, and that honesty and equity prevail between man and man, nation and nation, people and people, and that men should be worthy of trust all over the world. (Applause.)

Speaking the truth is an artificial matter. (Laughter.) Men are no more born to speak the truth than they are to fire rifles, and, indeed, it is a good deal like that. It is only now and then that a man can hit the bull's-eye, and a great many can't hit the target at all. (Laughter.) Speaking the truth requires that a man should know a little about what is truth. It is not an easy thing to be a true man. We part with our fancies and call them

truth. We part with our interests and call them truth. We part with our consciences, more often and call that truth. (Laughter.)

The reason why these are fundamental moralities, and why they are so important to the commercial interests of men is this: commerce dies the moment, and is sick in the degree in which men cannot trust each other. (Applause.) That is the case in the smallest community, and it is more marked, the greater the magnitude of commercial enterprises. And it is one of the evidences that things are not so far gone as some would have us suppose, that men are willing to trust each other so largely in all parts of the earth. If a man can invest his hundreds of thousands of dollars on the ocean or in distant countries, where men cannot understand the documents we write, it shows that there is trust between man and man, buyers and sellers; and if there is trust between them it is because experience has created the probabilities of truthfulness in the actions of men and all the concordant circumstances. If men did not believe in the truth of men, they never would send to China, Japan or Mexico their great properties and interests, with no other guarantee than that the men are trustworthy. The shipmaster must be trustworthy, the officers of the government must be trustworthy, and that business goes on and increases the world over is a silent testimony that, bad as men do lie, they do not lie bad enough to separate man from man. (Laughter.)

Now, I wish to call your attention to one unpleasant state of affairs. It is not to me so very surprising that men intrusted with large interests are found to be so breakable. There is nothing in the make-up of a president that should cause him to make off with the funds committed to his management. There is nothing in being a cashier or director that ought to rot out a man so that he snaps under temptation. I admit that all men are breakable. Men are like timber. Oak will bear a stress that pine won't, but there never was a stick of timber on the earth that could not be broken at some pressure. There never was a

man born on the earth that could not be broken at some pressure — not always the same nor put in the same place. There is many a man who cannot be broken by money pressure, but who can be by pressure of flattery. There is many a man impervious to flattery who is warped and biased by his social inclinations. There is many a man you cannot tempt with red gold, but you can with dinners and convivialities. One way or the other, every man is vincible. There is a great deal of meaning in that simple portion of the Lord's prayer, "Lead us not into temptation."

No man knows what he will do, according to the nature of the temptation as adapted to the peculiar weakness of his constitution. But this is that which is peculiar — that it requires piety to be a rascal. (Laughter.) It would almost seem as if a man had to serve as a superintendent of a Sunday School as a passport to Sing Sing. (Laughter.) How is it that pious men are defrauding their wards? That leading men in the Church are running off with one hundred thousand or two hundred thousand dollars? In other words, it would seem as if religion were simply a cloak for rascality and villainy. It is time for merchants and ministers to stand together and take counsel on that subject. I say the time has come when we have got to go back to old-fashioned, plain talk in our pulpits on the subject of common morality, until men shall think not so much about Adam as about his posterity (applause,) not so much about the higher themes of theology, which are regarded too often as being the test of men's ability and the orthodoxy and salvability of churches.

Well, gentlemen, in regard to what men think in the vast realm of theology, where nobody knows anything about it, does not make any difference. (Laughter.) A man may speak and be lying, and not know it, when he has got up overhead in the clouds. But on the ground, where man meets man, where interest meets interest, where temptation pursues every man, where earthly considerations — greediness, selfishness, pride, all influences are working together — we need to have every man,

once a week at any rate, in the church, and every day at home, cautioned on the subject of the simple virtues of truth and honesty and fidelity; and a man that is, in these three respects, thoroughly educated, and education has trained him so that he is invincible to all the other temptations of life, has come not necessarily to be a perfect man, because he is ignorant of all theology; but I say that, over all the theories of theology, I think that education will lead more men to heaven than any high Church theology, or any other kind that leaves that out. (Applause.)

What, then, are we going to do? It seems to me there are three things that must be done. In the first place, the household must do its own work. The things that we learn from our fathers and mothers we never forget, by whichever end they enter. (Laughter.) They become incorporated into our being, and become almost instincts, apparently. If we have learned at home to love and honor the truth, until we come to hate, as men hate filth, all lying, all double-tongued business, — if we get that firmly ingrained, we shall probably carry that feeling to the end of life — and it is the most precious thread of life — provided we keep out of politics. (Laughter.)

Next, it seems to me that this doctrine of truth, equity and fidelity must form a much larger part and a much more instructive part of the ministrations of the Church than it does today. Wonder is a great many times expressed why the churches are so thin, why men do not go to meeting. The churches are always popular when people hear something there that they want to hear — when they receive that which gives them light, and food for thought, and incitement in all the legitimate ways of life. There they will go again and again. And if churches are supported on any other ground, they are illegitimate. The Church should feed the hungry soul. When men are hungry and get what they need, they go every day to get such food as that. (Applause.)

Next there must be a public sentiment among all honorable

merchants, which shall frown, without fear or favor, upon all obliquity, upon everything in commerce, at home or abroad that is violative of truth, equity and fidelity. (Applause.) These three qualities are indispensable to the prosperity of commerce. With them, with the stimulus, enterprise, opportunities and means that we have in our hands, America can carry the world. (Applause.) But without them, without these commercial understrata in the commerce of America, we shall do just as foolishly as other people have done, and shall come to the same disasters in the long run as they have come to. (Applause.)

So, then, gentlemen, this toast, "Ministers and Merchants," is not so strange a combination after all. You are the merchants and I am the minister, and I have preached to you and you have sat still and heard the whole of it; and with this simple testimony, and with this foundation laid before you for your future prosperity, I have only to say, if you have been accustomed to do what the Mosaic law wisely forbids, you must not twine the hemp and the wool to make a thread under the Mosaic economy.

You, merchants, must not twine lies and sagacity with your threads in weaving, for every lie that is told in business is a rotten thread in the fabric, and though it may look well when it first comes out of the loom, there will always be a hole there, first or last, when you come to wear it. (Applause.) No gloss in dressing, no finishing in bargain or goods, no lie, if it be an organic lie, no lie that runs through whole trades or whole departments, has any sanity, safety or salvation in it. A lie is bad from top to bottom, from beginning to end, and so is cheating — except in umbrellas, slate-pencils and such things. (Laughter.) There is a little line drawn before you come quite up to the dead line of actual transgression. (Laughter.) When a young man swears he will teach a whole system of doctrines faithfully, no one supposes he means it; but he is excused because everybody knows that he does not know what he is saying, and doesn't understand. Of course, there is the lying of permission, as

when a lawyer says to a jury, in a bad case: "On my soul, gentlemen of the jury, I believe my client to be an injured man." We know he is lying; he knows it, and the jury knows it, and so it is not lying at all, really. (Laughter.) And even when engineers make one estimate (glancing humorously in the direction of the gentleman who had eulogized the bridge management) — but we pay up another bill. (Prolonged laughter.) Leaving out these matters, lies of courtesy, lies of ignorance, professional lies, lawyers' lies, theologians' lies — and they are good men (laughter) — I come to common, vulgar lies, calico lies, broadcloth lies, cotton lies, silk lies, and those most verminous and multitudinous lies of grocers. (Roars of laughter.)

Gentlemen, I have been requested to say a word or two on monopoly. I wish, on my soul, there were a few men who had the monopoly of lying, and that they had it all to themselves. (Applause.) And now I go back to my first statement. The Church and the Store have a common business before them, to lay the foundation of sound morality, as a ground of temporal prosperity, to say nothing of any other direction. The minister and the merchant have a like interest. The minister for the sake of God and humanity, and the merchant for his own sake, to see to it that, more and more, in public sentiment, even in newspapers — which are perhaps as free as any other organs of life from bias and mistake (laughter) — lying shall be placed in the category of vermin. (Applause.) And so, with my benediction, gentlemen, I will leave you to meditate on this important topic. (Applause.)

APPENDIX III

SELECTIONS FOR PRACTICE

The following selections are submitted for practice. In almost every class in speech training there are occasions when selections serve a very useful purpose in working for specific ends, whether it be to improve voice, learn emphasis, enrich the variety in tonal elements, or what not. There are often difficulties experienced by individual students that can best be met in that way. The selections have been chosen for their adaptation to beginners. Many of the poems are narrative poems. Several offer opportunities for more or less advanced work.

- Abraham Lincoln*: Henry Watterson, 484
Apostrophe to the Ocean: George Gordon Byron, 463
Bells of Shandon, The: Francis Mahony, 476
Boys, The: Oliver Wendell Holmes, 474
Calf Path, The: Sam Walter Foss, 447
Columbus: Joaquin Miller, 466
Daffodils, The: William Wordsworth, 471
Day in June, A: James Russell Lowell, 449
Death of Copernicus, The: Edward Everett, 453
Each in His Own Tongue: William Herbert Carruth, 452
Exile of the Acadians: Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, 480
Her Letter: Bret Harte, 455
House by the Side of the Road, The: Sam Walter Foss, 460
Indirection: Richard Realf, 458
Lincoln, the Man of the People: Edwin Markham, 469
Lisper, The: Anonymous, 462
Little Boy Blue: Eugene Field, 478
Man with the Hoe, The: Edwin Markham, 446
My Love: James Russell Lowell, 464
Old Clock on the Stairs, The: Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, 467
Petrified Fern, The: Mary Lydia Bolles, 459
Thanatopsis: William Cullen Bryant, 472
War Dead, The: Anonymous, 451
Wendell Phillips: James Russell Lowell, 479

THE MAN WITH THE HOE

*Written after seeing Millet's world-famous painting of a brutalized toiler
in the deep abyss of labor*

God made man in His own image
in the image of God He made him. — GENESIS

Bowed by the weight of centuries he leans
Upon his hoe and gazes on the ground,
The emptiness of ages in his face,
And on his back the burden of the world.
Who made him dead to rapture and despair,
A thing that grieves not and that never hopes,
Stolid and stunned, a brother to the ox?
Who loosened and let down this brutal jaw?
Whose was the hand that slanted back this brow?
Whose breath blew out the light within this brain?

Is this the Thing the Lord God made and gave
To have dominion over sea and land;
To trace the stars and search the heavens for power;
To feel the passion of Eternity?
Is this the dream He dreamed who shaped the suns
And marked their ways upon the ancient deep?
Down all the caverns of Hell to their last gulf
There is no shape more terrible than this —
More tongued with censure of the world's blind greed —
More filled with signs and portents for the soul —
More packed with danger to the universe.

What gulfs between him and the seraphim!
Slave of the wheel of labor, what to him
Are Plato and the swing of Pleiades?
What the long reaches of the peaks of song,
The rift of dawn, the reddening of the rose?
Through this dread shape the suffering ages look;

Time's tragedy is in that aching stoop;
Through this dread shape humanity betrayed,
Plundered, profaned and disinherited,
Cries protest to the Powers that made the world,
A protest that is also prophecy.

O masters, lords and rulers in all lands,
Is this the handiwork you give to God,
This monstrous thing distorted and soul-quenched?
How will you ever straighten up this shape;
Touch it again with immortality;
Give back the upward looking and the light;
Rebuild in it the music and the dream;
Make right the immemorial infamies,
Perfidious wrongs, immedicable woes?

O masters, lords and rulers in all lands,
How will the future reckon with this Man?
How answer his brute question in that hour
When whirlwinds of rebellion shake all shores?
How will it be with kingdoms and with kings —
With those who shaped him to the thing he is —
When this dumb Terror shall rise to judge the world,
After the silence of the centuries?

— EDWIN MARKHAM

THE CALF PATH

One day through the primeval wood
A calf walked home, as good calves should;
But made a trail all bent askew,
A crooked trail, as all calves do.
Since then, two hundred years have fled,
And, I infer, the calf is dead.
But still, he left behind his trail,
And thereby hangs my moral tale.

The trail was taken up next day,
By a lone dog that passed that way;
And then a wise bell-wether sheep,
Pursued the trail o'er vale and steep,
And drew the flock behind him, too,
As good bell-wethers always do.
And from that day o'er hill and glade,
Through those old woods a path was made.

And many men wound in and out,
And dodged and turned and bent about,
And uttered words of righteous wrath
Because 'twas such a crooked path;
But still they followed — do not laugh —
The first migrations of that calf,
And through this winding wood-way stalked,
Because he wobbled when he walked.

This forest path became a lane
That bent and turned and turned again;
This crooked lane became a road,
Where many a poor horse with his load,
Toiled on beneath the burning sun,
And traveled some three miles in one;
And thus a century and a half
They trod the footsteps of that calf.

The years passed on in swiftmess fleet,
The road became a village street,
And this, before men were aware
A city's crowded thoroughfare.
And soon the central street was this
Of a renowned metropolis,
And men two centuries and a half
Trod in the footsteps of that calf.

Each day a hundred thousand rout
Followed this zig-zag calf about;
And o'er his crooked journey went
The traffic of a continent.
A hundred thousand men were led
By one calf near three centuries dead;
For thus such reverence is lent
To well-established precedent.

A moral lesson this might teach
Were I ordained and called to preach.
For men are prone to go it blind
Along the calf paths of the mind;
And work away from sun to sun
To do what other men have done.
They follow in the beaten track,
And in and out and forth and back,
And still their devious course pursue,
To keep the path that others do;
But how those wise old wood gods laugh
Who saw that first primeval calf!
Ah! many things this tale might teach,
But I am not ordained to preach.

— SAM WALTER FOSS

A DAY IN JUNE

I

And what is so rare as a day in June?
Then, if ever, come perfect days;
Then Heaven tries earth if it be in tune,
And over it softly her warm ear lays;
Whether we look, or whether we listen,
We hear life murmur, or see it glisten;

Every clod feels a stir of might,
An instinct within it that reaches and towers,
And, groping blindly above it for light,
Climbs to a soul in grass and flowers;

II

The flush of life may well be seen
Thrilling back over hills and valleys;
The cowslip startles in meadows green,
The buttercup catches the sun in its chalice,
And there's never a leaf or a blade too mean,
To be some happy creature's palace;

III

The little bird sits at his door in the sun,
Atilt like a blossom among the leaves,
And lets his illumined being o'errun
With the deluge of summer it receives;
His mate feels the eggs beneath her wings,
And the heart in her dumb breast flutters and sings;
He sings to the wide world, and she to her nest —
In the nice ear of Nature which song is the best?

IV

Now is the high tide of the year,
And whatever of life hath ebbed away
Comes flooding back, with a ripply cheer,
Into every bare inlet and creek and bay;
Now the heart is so full that a drop overfills it;
We are happy now because God wills it;
No matter how barren the past may have been,
'Tis enough for us now that the leaves are green;

V

We sit in the warm shade, and feel right well
 How the sap creeps up and the blossoms swell;
 We may shut our eyes, but we cannot help knowing
 That skies are clear and grass is growing;
 The breeze comes whispering in our ear,
 That dandelions are blossoming near,
 That maize has sprouted, that streams are flowing,
 That the river is bluer than the sky,
 That the robin is plastering his house hard by;
 And if the breeze kept the good news back
 For other couriers we should not lack!

VI

We could guess it by yon heifer's lowing —
 And hark! how clear bold chanticleer,
 Warmed with the new wine of the year,
 Tells all in his lusty crowing!
 Joy comes, grief goes, we know not how!
 Everything is happy now,
 Everything is upward striving
 'Tis as easy now for the heart to be true
 As the grass to be green, or the skies to be blue —
 'Tis the natural way of living.

— JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL

THE WAR DEAD

“I was a peasant of the Polish plain;
 I left my plow because the message ran:
 Russia, in danger, needed every man
 To save her from the Teuton; and was slain.
 I gave my life for freedom; this I know;
 For those who bade me fight had told me so.”

“I was a Tyrolese, a mountaineer;
 I gladly left my mountain home to fight
 Against the brutal, treacherous Muscovite;
 And died in Poland on a Cossack spear.
 I gave my life for freedom; this I know;
 For those who bade me fight had told me so.”

“I worked in Lyons at my weaver’s loom,
 When suddenly the Prussian despot hurled
 His felon blow at France and at the world;
 Then I went forth to Belgium and my doom.
 I gave my life for freedom; this I know;
 For those who bade me fight had told me so.”

“I owned a vineyard by the wooded Main,
 Until the Fatherland, begirt by foes
 Lusting her downfall, called me, and I rose
 Swift to the call and died in far Lorraine.
 I gave my life for freedom; this I know;
 For those who bade me fight had told me so.”

“I worked in a great shipyard by the Clyde;
 There came a sudden word of war declared,
 Of Belgium, peaceful, helpless, unprepared,
 Asking our aid; I joined the ranks, and died.
 I gave my life for freedom; this I know;
 For those who bade me fight had told me so.”

EACH IN HIS OWN TONGUE

A fire-mist and a planet, —
 A crystal and a cell, —
 A jellyfish and a saurian,
 And caves where the cave-men dwell;
 Then a sense of law and beauty,
 And a face turned from the clod, —

Some call it Evolution,
And others call it God.

A haze on the far horizon,
The infinite, tender sky,
The ripe, rich tint of the cornfields,
And the wild geese sailing high, —
And all over upland and lowland
The charm of the goldenrod, —
Some of us call it Autumn,
And others call it God.

Like tides on a crescent sea-beach
When the moon is new and thin,
Into our hearts high yearnings
Come welling and surging in, —
Come from the mystic ocean,
Whose rim no foot has trod, —
Some of us call it Longing,
And others call it God.

A picket frozen on duty —
A mother starved for her brood, —
Socrates drinking the hemlock,
And Jesus on the rood;
And millions who, humble and nameless,
The straight, hard pathway plod, —
Some call it Consecration,
And others call it God.

— WILLIAM HERBERT CARRUTH

THE DEATH OF COPERNICUS

1. At length he draws near his end. He is seventy-three years of age, and he yields his work on "The Revolutions of the Heavenly Orbs" to his friends for publication. The day at last

has come on which it is to be ushered into the world. It is the 24th of May, 1543.

2. On that day — the effect, no doubt, of the intense excitement of his mind, operating upon an exhausted frame — an effusion of blood brings him to the gates of the grave. His last hour has come; he lies stretched upon the couch from which he will never rise.

3. The beams of the setting sun glance through the Gothic windows of his chamber; near his bedside is the armillary sphere which he has contrived to represent his theory of the heavens; his picture painted by himself, the amusement of his earlier years, hangs before him; beneath it are his astrolabe and other imperfect astronomical instruments; and around him are gathered his sorrowing disciples.

4. The door of the apartment opens; the eye of the departing sage is turned to see who enters: it is a friend who brings him the first printed copy of his immortal treatise. He knows that in that book he contradicts all that has ever been distinctly taught by former philosophers; he knows that he has rebelled against the sway of Ptolemy, which the scientific world has acknowledged for a thousand years; he knows that the popular mind will be shocked by his innovations; he knows that the attempt will be made to press even religion into the service against him; but he knows that his book is true.

5. He is dying, but he leaves a glorious truth as his dying bequest to the world. He bids the friend who has brought it place himself between the window and his bedside, that the sun's rays may fall upon the precious volume, and he may behold it once more before his eye grows dim. He looks upon it, takes it in his hands, presses it to his breast, and expires.

6. But no, he is not wholly gone. A smile lights up his dying countenance; a beam of returning intelligence kindles his eye; his lips move; and the friend who leans over him, can hear him faintly murmur the beautiful sentiments which the Christian lyricist of a later age has so finely expressed in verse:

“Ye golden lamps of heaven, farewell, with all your feeble light;
Farewell, thou ever-changing moon, pale empress of the night;
And thou, effulgent orb of day, in brighter flames arrayed,
My soul, which springs beyond thy sphere, no more demands
thy aid.

Ye stars are but the shining dust of my divine abode,
The pavement of those heavenly courts where I shall reign
with God.”

So died the great Columbus of the heavens.

HER LETTER

I'm sitting alone by the fire,
Dressed just as I came from the dance,
In a robe even *you* would admire,—
It cost a cool thousand in France;
I'm be-diamonded out of all reason,
My hair is done up in a cue:
In short, sir, “the belle of the season”
Is wasting an hour on you.

A dozen engagements I've broken;
I left in the midst of a set;
Likewise a proposal, half spoken,
That waits — on the stairs — for me yet.
They say he'll be rich, — when he grows up, —
And then he adores me indeed.
And you, sir, are turning your nose up,
Three thousand miles off, as you read.

“And how do I like my position?”
“And what do I think of New York?”
“And now, in my higher ambition,
With whom do I waltz, flirt, or talk?”

“And isn’t it nice to have riches,
And diamonds, and silks, and all that?”
“And aren’t it a change to the ditches
And tunnels of Poverty Flat?”

Well, yes, — if you saw us out driving
Each day in the park four-in-hand, —
If you saw poor, dear mamma contriving
To look supernaturally grand, —
If you saw papa’s picture taken
By Brady, and tinted at that, —
You’d never suspect he sold bacon
And flour at Poverty Flat.

And yet, just this moment, when sitting
In the glare of the grand chandelier, —
In the bustle and glitter befitting
The “finest *soirée* of the year,”
In the mists of a *gauze de Chambéry*,
And the hum of the smallest of talk, —
Somehow, Joe, I thought of the “Ferry,”
And the dance that we had on “The Fork”;

Of Harrison’s barn, with its muster
Of flags festooned over the wall;
Of the candles that shed their soft luster
And tallow on head-dress and shawl;
Of the steps that we took to one fiddle;
Of the dress of my queer *vis-à-vis*;
And how I once went down the middle
With the man that shot Sandy McGee;

Of the moon that was quietly sleeping
On the hill, when the time came to go;
Of the few baby peaks that were peeping
From under their bedclothes of snow;

Of that ride, — that to me was the rarest;
Of — the something you said at the gate, —
Ah, Joe, then I wasn't an heiress
To "the best paying lead in the State."

Well, well, it's all past; yet it's funny
To think, as I stood in the glare
Of fashion, and beauty, and money,
That I should be thinking, right there,
Of someone who breasted highwater,
And swam the North Fork, and all that,
Just to dance with old Folinsbee's daughter,
The Lily of Poverty Flat.

But goodness! what nonsense I'm writing!
(Mamma says my taste still is low,)
Instead of my triumphs reciting,
I'm spooning on Joseph, — heigh-ho!
And I'm to be "finished" by travel, —
Whatever's the meaning of that, —
Oh! why did papa strike pay gravel
In drifting on Poverty Flat.

Good-night, — here's the end of my paper;
Good-night, — if the longitude please, —
For maybe while wasting my taper,
Your sun's climbing over the trees.
But know if you haven't got riches,
And are poor, dearest Joe, and all that,
That my heart's somewhere there in the ditches,
And you've struck it, — on Poverty Flat.

— BRET HARTE

INDIRECTION

I

Fair are the flowers and the children, but their subtle suggestion
is fairer:
Rare is the rose-burst of dawn, but the secret that clasps it is
rarer;
Sweet the exultance of song, but the strain that precedes it is
sweeter;
And never was poem yet writ, but the meaning outmastered
the metre.

II

Never a daisy that grows, but a mystery guideth the growing;
Never a river that flows, but a majesty sceptres the flowing;
Never a Shakespeare that soared, but a stronger than he did
infolld him,
Nor ever a prophet foretells, but a mightier seer hath foretold
him.

III

Back of the canvas that throbs the painter is hinted and hidden;
Into the statue that breathes the soul of the sculptor is bidden;
Under the joy that is felt lie the infinite issues of feeling;
Crowning the glory revealed is the glory that crowns the re-
vealing.

IV

Great are the symbols of being, but that which is symbolled is
greater;
Vast the created and beheld, but vaster the inward creator;
Back of the sound brooks the silence, back of the gift stands the
giving;
Back of the hand that receives thrill the sensitive nerves of re-
ceiving.

V

Space is as nothing to spirit, the deed is outdone by the doing;
The heart of the wooer is warm, but warmer the heart of the
wooing;

And up from the pits where these shiver, and up from the heights
where those shine,

Twin voices and shadows swim starward, and the essence of life
is divine.

— RICHARD REALF

THE PETRIFIED FERN

I

In a valley, centuries ago,

Grew a little fern-leaf, green and slender,

Veining delicate, and fibres tender;

Waving, when the wind crept down so low.

Rushes tall, and moss, and grass grew round it,

Playful sunbeams darted in and found it,

Drops of dew stole in by night and crowned it.

But no foot of man e'er trod that way;

Earth was young and keeping holiday.

II

Monster fishes swam the silent main,

Stately forests waved their giant branches,

Mountains hurled their snowy avalanches,

Mammoth creatures stalked across the plain;

Nature reveled in grand mysteries,

But the little fern was not of these,

Did not number with the hills and trees;

Only grew and waved its wild, sweet way,

None ever came to note it day by day.

III

Earth, one time, put on a frolic mood,
 Heaved rocks, and changed the mighty motion
 Of the deep strong currents of the ocean,
 Moved the plain and shook the haughty wood,
 Crushed the little fern in soft, moist clay,
 Covered it and hid it safe away.
 Oh the long, long centuries since that day!
 Oh the agony! Oh life's bitter cost
 Since that useless little fern was lost!

IV

Useless? Lost? There came a thoughtful man,
 Searching Nature's secrets, far and deep;
 From a fissure in a rocky steep
 He withdrew a stone, o'er which there ran
 Fairy pencilings, a quaint design,
 Veinings, leafage, fibres clear and fine,
 And the fern's life lay in every line!
 So, I think, God hides some souls away,
 Sweetly to surprise us, the last day.

— MARY LYDIA BOLLES

THE HOUSE BY THE SIDE OF THE ROAD

There are hermit souls that live withdrawn
 In the peace of their self-content;
 There are souls, like stars, that dwell apart,
 In a fellowless firmament;
 There are pioneer souls that blaze their paths
 Where highways never ran —
 But let me live by the side of the road
 And be a friend to man.

Let me live in a house by the side of the road,
 Where the race of men go by —
 The men who are good, and the men who are bad,
 As good and as bad as I.

I would not sit in the scorner's seat,
 Or hurl the cynic's ban;
 Let me live in a house by the side of the road
 And be a friend to man.

I see from my house by the side of the road,
 By the side of the highway of life,
 The men who press with ardor of hope,
 The men who are faint with the strife,
 But I turn not away from their smiles nor their tears —
 Both parts of an infinite plan;

Let me live in a house by the side of the road
 And be a friend to man.

I know there are brook-gladdened meadows ahead,
 And mountains of wearisome height;
 That the road passes on through the long afternoon,
 And stretches away to the night.

And still I rejoice when the travelers rejoice
 And weep with the strangers that moan,
 Nor live in my house by the side of the road
 Like a man who dwells alone.

Let me live in my house by the side of the road,
 Where the race of men go by —
 They are good, they are bad, they are weak, they are strong,
 Wise, foolish — so am I.

Then why should I sit in the scorner's seat,
 Or hurl the cynic's ban?
 Let me live in my house by the side of the road
 And be a friend to man.

THE LISPER

Elsie Mingus *lisps*, she does!
 She lives wite acrosst from us
 In Miz. Ayers'uz house 'at she
 Rents part to the Mingus'uz. —
 Yes, an' Elsie plays wiv me.

Elsie lisps so, she can't say
 Her own name, ist *anyway!* —
 She says "*Elthy*" — like they wuz
 Feathers on her words, an' they
 Ist stick on her tongue like fuzz.

My! she's *purty*, though! — An' when
 She *lisps*, w'y, she's *purty nen!*
 When she telled me, wunst, her doll
 Wuz so "thweet," an' I p'ten'
 I lisp too, — she laugh' — 'at's all! —

She don't never git mad none —
 'Cause she know I'm ist in fun. —
 Elsie she ain't one bit sp'iled. —
 Of all childerns — ever' one —
 She's the ladylikest child! —

My Ma *say* she is! One time
 Elsie start to say the rhyme
 "Thing a thong o' thixpenth" — *Wh'ee!*
 I ist *yell!* An' Ma say I'm
 Unpolite as I can be!

Wunst I went wiv Ma to call
 On Elsie's Ma, an' eat an' all;
 An' nen Elsie, when we've et,
 An' we're playin' in the hall,
 Elsie say: It's etikett

Fer young gentlemens, like me,
 Eatin' when they's *company*,
 Not to never ever crowd
 Down their food, ner "thip their tea
 Ner thup thoop so awful loud!"

— ANONYMOUS

APOSTROPHE TO THE OCEAN

There is a pleasure in the pathless woods,
 There is a rapture on the lonely shore,
 There is society, where none intrudes,
 By the deep sea, and music in its roar.
 I love not man the less, but Nature more,
 From these our interviews, in which I steal
 From all I may be, or have been before,
 To mingle with the universe and feel
 What I can ne'er express, yet cannot all conceal.

Roll on, thou deep and dark blue Ocean — roll!
 Ten thousand fleets sweep over thee in vain,
 Man marks the earth with ruin — his control
 Stops with the shore; — upon the watery plain
 The wrecks are all thy deed, nor doth remain
 A shadow of man's ravage, save his own,
 When for a moment, like a drop of rain,
 He sinks into thy depths with bubbling groan,
 Without a grave, unknelled, uncoffined, and unknown.

The armaments which thunderstrike the walls
 Of rock-built cities, bidding nations quake,
 And monarchs tremble in their capitals;
 The oak leviathans, whose huge ribs make
 Their clay creator the vain title take

Of lord of thee, and arbiter of war, —

These are thy toys and, as the snowy flake,
They melt into thy yeast of waves, which mar
Alike the Armada's pride, or spoils of Trafalgar.

— GEORGE GORDON BYRON

MY LOVE

Not as all other women are
Is she that to my soul is dear;
Her glorious fancies come from far,
Beneath the silver evening star,
And yet her heart is ever near.

Great feelings hath she of her own,
Which lesser souls may never know;
God giveth them to her alone,
And sweet they are as any tone
Wherewith the wind may choose to blow.

Yet in herself she dwelleth not,
Although no home were half so fair;
No simplest duty is forgot,
Life hath no dim and lowly spot
That doth not in her sunshine share.

She doeth little kindnesses,
Which most leave undone, or despise;
For naught that sets one heart at ease,
And giveth happiness or peace,
Is low-esteemed in her eyes.

She hath no scorn of common things,
And, though she seem of other birth,

Round us her heart entwines and clings,
And patiently she folds her wings
To tread the humble paths of earth.

Blessing she is — God made her so —
And deeds of weekday holiness
Fall from her noiseless as the snow,
Nor hath she ever chanced to know
That aught were easier than to bless.

She is most fair, and thereunto
Her life doth rightly harmonize;
Feeling or thought that was not true
Ne'er made less beautiful the blue
Unclouded heaven of her eyes.

She is a woman, one in whom
The springtime of her childish years
Hath never lost its fresh perfume,
Though knowing well that life hath room
For many blights and many tears.

I love her with a love as still
As a broad river's peaceful might,
Which, by high tower or lowly mill,
Goes wandering at its own will,
And yet doth ever flow aright.

And, on its full, deep breast serene,
Like quiet isles my duties lie;
It flows around them and between,
And makes them fresh and fair and green,
Sweet homes wherein to live and die.

— JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL

COLUMBUS

Behind him lay the gray Azores,
 Behind the Gates of Hercules;
Before him not the ghost of shores;
 Before him only shoreless seas.
The good mate said: "Now must we pray,
 For lo! the very stars are gone.
Brave Adm'r'l, speak; what shall I say?"
 "Why, say: 'Sail on! sail on! and on!'"

They sailed. They sailed. Then spake the mate:
 "This mad sea shows his teeth tonight.
He curls his lip, he lies in wait,
 With lifted teeth, as if to bite!
Brave Adm'r'l, say but one good word;
 What shall we do when hope is gone?"
The words leapt like a leaping sword:
 "Sail on! sail on! sail on! and on!"

"My men grow mutinous day by day;
 My men grow ghastly wan and weak."
The stout mate thought of home; a spray
 Of salt wave washed his swarthy cheek.
"What shall I say, brave Adm'r'l, say,
 If we sight naught but seas at dawn?"
"Why, you shall say at break of day:
 'Sail on! sail on! sail on! and on!'"

They sailed and sailed, as winds might blow,
 Until at last the blanched mate said:
"Why, now not even God would know
 Should I and all my men fall dead.
These very winds forget their way,
 For God from these dread seas is gone.

Now speak, brave Adm'r'l; speak and say —”

He said: “Sail on! sail on! and on!”

Then, pale and worn, he kept his deck,

And peered through darkness. Ah, that night
Of all dark nights! And then a speck —

A light! A light! A light! A light!

It grew, a starlit flag unfurled!

It grew to be Time's burst of dawn.

He gained a world; he gave that world

Its grandest lesson: “On! sail on!”

— JOAQUIN MILLER

THE OLD CLOCK ON THE STAIRS

Somewhat back from the village street

Stands the old-fashioned country-seat.

Across its antique portico

Tall poplar-trees their shadows throw,

And from its station in the hall

An ancient timepiece says to all, —

“Forever — never!

Never — forever!”

Half-way up the stairs it stands,

And points and beckons with its hands

From its case of massive oak,

Like a monk, who, under his cloak,

Crosses himself, and sighs, alas!

With sorrowful voice to all who pass, —

“Forever — never!

Never — forever!”

By day its voice is low and light;

But in the silent dead of night,

Distinct as a passing footstep's fall,
It echoes along the vacant hall,
Along the ceiling, along the floor,
And seems to say, at each chamber-door, —
 "Forever — never!
 Never — forever!"

Through days of sorrow and of mirth,
Through days of death and days of birth,
Through every swift vicissitude
Of changeful time, unchanged it has stood,
And as if, like God, it all things saw,
It calmly repeats those words of awe, —
 "Forever — never!
 Never — forever!"

In that mansion used to be
Free-hearted Hospitality;
His great fires up the chimney roared;
The stranger feasted at his board;
But, like the skeleton at the feast,
That warning timepiece never ceased, —
 "Forever — never!
 Never — forever!"

There groups of merry children played,
There youths and maidens dreaming strayed;
O precious hours! O golden prime!
And affluence of love and time!
Even as a miser counts his gold,
Those hours the ancient timepiece told, —
 "Forever — never!
 Never — forever!"

From that chamber, clothed in white,
The bride came forth on her wedding night;

There, in that silent room below,
The dead lay in his shroud of snow;
And in the hush that followed the prayer,
Was heard the old clock on the stair, —

“Forever — never!
Never — forever!”

All are scattered now and fled,
Some are married, some are dead;
And when I ask, with throbs of pain,
“Ah! when shall they all meet again?”
As in the days long since gone by,
The ancient timepiece makes reply, —

“Forever — never!
Never — forever!”

Never here, forever there,
Where all parting, pain and care,
And death and time shall disappear, —
Forever there, but never here!
The horologe of eternity
Sayeth this incessantly, —

“Forever — never!
Never — Forever!”

— HENRY WADSWORTH LONGFELLOW

LINCOLN, THE MAN OF THE PEOPLE

When the Norn Mother saw the Whirlwind Hour
Greatening and darkening as it hurried on,
She left the Heaven of Heroes and came down
To make a man to meet the mortal need.
She took the tried clay of the common road —
Clay warm yet with the genial heat of Earth,

Dashed through it all a strain of prophecy,
Tempered the heap with thrill of human tears,
Then mixed a laughter with the serious stuff.
Into the shape she breathed a flame to light
That tender, tragic, ever-changing face;
And laid on him a sense of the Mystic Powers,
Moving — all hushed — behind the mortal veil.
Here was a man to hold against the world,
A man to match the mountains and the sea.

The color of the ground was in him, the red earth,
The smack and tang of elemental things:
The rectitude and patience of the cliff,
The good-will of the rain that loves all leaves,
The friendly welcome of the wayside well,
The courage of the bird that dares the sea,
The gladness of the wind that shakes the corn,
The pity of the snow that hides all scars,
The secrecy of streams that make their way
Under the mountain to the rifted rock,
The tolerance and equity of light
That gives as freely to the shrinking flower
As to the great oak flaring to the wind —
To the grave's low hill as to the Matterhorn
That shoulders out the sky. Sprung from the West,
He drank the valorous youth of a new world.
The strength of virgin forests braced his mind,
The hush of spacious prairies stilled his soul.

Up from log cabin to the Capitol,
One fire was on his spirit, one resolve —
To send the keen ax to the root of wrong,
Clearing a free way for the feet of God,
The eyes of conscience testing every stroke,
To make his deed the measure of a man.

He built the rail-pile as he built the State,
Pouring his splendid strength through every blow:
The grip that swung the ax in Illinois
Was on the pen that set a people free.

So came the Captain with the mighty heart;
And when the judgment thunders split the house,
Wrenching the rafters from their ancient rest,
He held the ridgepole up, and spiked again
The rafters of the Home. He held his place —
Held the long purpose like a growing tree —
Held on through blame and faltered not at praise —
Towering in calm rough-hewn sublimity.
And when he fell in whirlwind, he went down
As when a lordly cedar, green with boughs,
Goes down with a great shout upon the hills,
And leaves a lonesome place against the sky.

— EDWIN MARKHAM

THE DAFFODILS

I wandered lonely as a cloud
That floats on high o'er vales and hills,
When all at once I saw a crowd, —
A host of golden daffodils
Beside the lake, beneath the trees,
Fluttering and dancing in the breeze.

Continuous as the stars that shine
And twinkle on the Milky Way,
They stretched in never-ending line
Along the margin of a bay;
Ten thousand saw I, at a glance,
Tossing their heads in sprightly dance.

The waves beside them danced, but they
Outdid the sparkling waves in glee;

A poet could not but be gay
In such a jocund company;
I gazed — and gazed — but little thought
What wealth the show to me had brought.

For oft, when on my couch I lie,
In vacant or in pensive mood
They flash upon that inward eye
Which is the bliss of solitude;
And then my heart with pleasure fills,
And dances with the daffodils.

— WILLIAM WORDSWORTH

THANATOPSIS

To him who, in the love of Nature, holds
Communion with her visible forms, she speaks
A various language: for his gayer hours
She has a voice of gladness, and a smile
And eloquence of beauty; and she glides
Into his darker musings with a mild
And gentle sympathy, that steals away
Their sharpness, ere he is aware. When thoughts
Of the last bitter hour come like a blight
Over thy spirit, and sad images
Of the stern agony, and shroud, and pall,
And breathless darkness, and the narrow house
Make thee to shudder, and grow sick at heart,
Go forth under the open sky, and list
To Nature's teachings, while from all around —
Earth and her waters, and the depth of air —
Comes a still voice, — Yet a few days and thee
The all-beholding sun shall see no more
In all his course; nor yet in the cold ground,
Where thy pale form was laid, with many tears,

Nor in the embrace of ocean, shall exist
Thy image. Earth, that nourished thee, shall claim
Thy growth, to be resolved to earth again;
And, lost each human trace, surrendering up
Thine individual being, shalt thou go
To mix forever with the elements;
To be a brother to the insensible rock,
And to the sluggish clod, which the rude swain
Turns with his share, and treads upon. The oak
Shall send his roots abroad, and pierce thy mould.

Yet, not to thine eternal resting-place
Shalt thou retire alone, — nor couldst thou wish
Couch more magnificent. Thou shalt lie down
With patriarchs of the infant world, — with kings,
The powerful of the earth, — the wise, the good,
Fair forms, and hoary seers of ages past,
All in one mighty sepulchre. The hills,
Rock-ribbed, and ancient as the sun; the vales
Stretching in pensive quietness between;
The venerable woods; rivers that move
In majesty, and the complaining brooks,
That make the meadows green; and, poured round all,
Old ocean's gray and melancholy waste, —
Are but the solemn decorations all
Of the great tomb of man! The golden sun,
The planets, all the infinite host of heaven,
Are shining on the sad abodes of death,
Through the still lapse of ages. All that tread
The globe are but a handful to the tribes
That slumber in its bosom. Take the wings
Of morning, traverse Barca's desert sands,
Or lose thyself in the continuous woods
Where rolls the Oregon, and hears no sound
Save his own dashings, — yet the dead are there!

And millions in those solitudes, since first
The flight of years began, have laid them down
In their last sleep, — the dead reign there alone!
So shalt thou rest; and what if thou withdraw
In silence from the living, and no friend
Take note of thy departure? All that breathe
Will share thy destiny. The gay will laugh
When thou art gone, the solemn brood of care
Plod on, and each one, as before, will chase
His favorite phantom; yet all these shall leave
Their mirth and their employments, and shall come
And make their bed with thee. As the long train
Of ages glide away, the sons of men —
The youth in life's green spring, and he who goes
In the full strength of years, matron and maid,
And the sweet babe, and the gray-headed man —
Shall, one by one, be gathered to thy side
By those who in their turn shall follow them.

So live, that when thy summons comes to join
The innumerable caravan that moves
To the pale realms of shade, where each shall take
His chamber in the silent halls of death,
Thou go not, like the quarry-slave at night,
Scourged to his dungeon, but, sustained and soothed
By an unfaltering trust, approach thy grave
Like one who wraps the drapery of his couch
About him, and lies down to pleasant dreams.

— WILLIAM CULLEN BRYANT

THE BOYS

Has there any old fellow got mixed with the boys?
If there has take him out, without making a noise.
Hang the Almanac's cheat and the Catalogue's spite!
Old Time is a liar! We're twenty tonight!

We're twenty! We're twenty! Who says we are more?
He's tipsy — young jackanapes! show him the door!
“Gray temples at twenty?” — Yes! *white* if we please;
Where the snowflakes fall thickest there's nothing can freeze!

Was it snowing I spoke of? Excuse the mistake.
Look close — you will see not a sign of a flake!
We want some new garlands for those we have shed,
And these are white roses in place of the red.

We've a trick, we young fellows, you may have been told,
Of talking (in public) as if we were old;
That boy we call “Doctor,” and this we call “Judge”;
It's a neat little fiction — of course it's all fudge.

That fellow's the “Speaker” — the one on the right;
“Mr. Mayor,” my young one, how are you tonight?
That's our “Member of Congress,” we say when we chaff;
There's the “Reverend” What's-his-name? — don't make me
laugh.

That boy with the grave mathematical look
Made believe he had written a wonderful book,
And the ROYAL SOCIETY thought it was *true!*
So they chose him right in; a good joke it was, too!

There's a boy, we pretend, with a three-decker brain,
That could harness a team with a logical chain;
When he spoke for our manhood in syllabled fire,
We called him “The Justice,” but now he's “The Squire.”

And there's a nice youngster of excellent pith;
Fate tried to conceal him by naming him Smith;
But he shouted a song for the brave and the free —
Just read on his medal, “My country . . . of thee.”

You hear that boy laughing? You think he's all fun;
But the angels laugh, too, at the good he has done.
The children laugh loud as they troop to his call,
And the poor man that knows him laughs loudest of all!

Yes, we're boys — always playing with tongue or with pen;
And I sometimes have asked, Shall we ever be men?
Shall we always be youthful and laughing and gay,
Till the last dear companion drops smiling away?

Then here's to our boyhood, its gold and its gray!
The stars of its winter, the dews of its May!
And when we have done with our life-lasting toys,
Dear Father, take care of Thy children, THE BOYS!

— OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES

THE BELLS OF SHANDON

With deep affection
And recollection
I often think of
 Those Shandon bells,
Whose sounds so wild would,
In the days of childhood,
Fling round my cradle
 Their magic spells.

On this I ponder
Where'er I wander
And thus grow fonder,
 Sweet Cork, of thee, —
With thy bells of Shandon,
That sound so grand on
The pleasant waters
 Of the river Lee.

I've heard bells chiming
Full many a clime in,
Tolling sublime in
 Cathedral shrine,
While at a glib rate
Brass tongues would vibrate;
But all their music
 Spoke naught like thine.

For memory, dwelling
On each proud swelling
Of thy belfry, knelling
 Its bold notes free,
Made the bells of Shandon
Sound far more grand on
The pleasant waters
 Of the river Lee.

I've heard bells tolling
Old Adrian's Mole in,
Their thunder rolling
 From the Vatican, —
And cymbals glorious
Swinging uproarious
In the gorgeous turrets
 Of Notre Dame!

But thy sounds were sweeter
Than the dome of Peter
Flings o'er the Tiber,
 Pealing solemnly.
Oh! the bells of Shandon
Sound far more grand on
The pleasant waters
 Of the river Lee.

There's a bell in Moscow;
While on tower and kiosko
In St. Sophia
The Turkman gets,
And loud in air
Calls men to prayer,
From the tapering summit
Of tall minarets.

Such empty phantom
I freely grant them;
But there's an anthem
More dear to me —
'Tis the bells of Shandon,
That sound so grand on
The pleasant waters
Of the river Lee.

— FRANCIS MAHONY

LITTLE BOY BLUE

The little toy dog is covered with dust,
But sturdy and stanch he stands;
And the little toy soldier is red with rust,
And his musket moulds in his hands.
Time was when the little toy dog was new,
And the soldier was passing fair;
And that was the time when our Little Boy Blue
Kissed them and put them there.

“Now, don't you go till I come,” he said,
“And don't you make any noise!”
So, toddling off to his trundle-bed,
He dreamt of the pretty toys;

And, as he was dreaming, an angel song
Awakened our Little Boy Blue —
Oh! the years are many, the years are long,
But the little toy friends are true!

Ay, faithful to Little Boy Blue they stand,
Each in the same old place —
Awaiting the touch of a little hand,
The smile of a little face;
And they wonder, as waiting the long years through
In the dust of that little chair,
What has become of our Little Boy Blue,
Since he kissed them and put them there.

— EUGENE FIELD

WENDELL PHILLIPS

There, with one hand behind his back,
Stands Phillips, buttoned in a sack,
Our Attic orator, our Chatham;
Old fogies, when he lightens at 'em,
Shrivel like leaves; to him 'tis granted
Always to say the word that's wanted,
So that he seems but speaking clearer
The tiptoe thought of every hearer;
Each flash his brooding heart lets fall
Fires what's combustible in all,
And sends the applauses bursting in
Like an exploded magazine.
His eloquence no frothy show,
The gutter's street-polluted flow,
No Mississippi's yellow flood
Whose shoalness can't be seen for mud; —
So simply clear, serenely deep,
So silent-strong its graceful sweep,

None measures its unrippling force
Who has not striven to stem its course;
How fare their barques who think to play
With smooth Niagara's mane of spray,
Let Austin's total shipwreck say.

— JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL

EXILE OF THE ACADIANS

I

Pleasantly rose next morn the sun on the village of Grand-Pré.
Pleasantly gleamed in the soft, sweet air the Basin of Minas,
Where the ships, with their wayering shadows, were riding at
anchor.

Life had long been astir in the village, and clamorous labor
Knocked with its hundred hands at the golden gates of the
morning.

II

Now from the country around, from the farms and the neigh-
boring hamlets,

Come in their holiday dresses the blithe Acadian peasants.
Many a glad good-morrow and jocund laugh from the young
folk

Made the bright air brighter, as up from the numerous meadows
Where no path could be seen but the track of the wheels in the
greensward,

Group after group appeared, and joined, or passed on the
highway.

III

Long ere noon, in the village all sounds of labor were silenced.
Thronged were the streets with people; and noisy groups at
the house-doors

Sat in the cheerful sun, and rejoiced and gossiped together.

Every house was an inn, where all were welcomed and feasted;
For with this simple people, who lived like brothers together,
All things were held in common, and what one had was another's.

IV

Under the open sky, in the odorous air of the orchard,
Bending with golden fruit, was spread the feast of betrothal.
There in the shade of the porch were the priest and the notary
seated;

The good Benedict sat, and sturdy Basil the blacksmith.
Not far withdrawn from these, by the cider-press and the bee-
hives,

Michael the fiddler was placed, with the gayest of hearts and
of waistcoats.

Shadow and light from the leaves alternately played on his
snow-white

Hair, as it waved in the wind; and the jolly face of the fiddler
Glowed like a living coal when the ashes are blown from the
embers.

V

Gayly the old man sang to the vibrant sound of his fiddle,
And anon with his wooden shoes beat time to the music.
Merrily, merrily whirled the wheels of the dizzying dances
Under the orchard-trees and down the path to the meadows;
Old folk and young together, and children mingled among them.

VI

So passed the morning away. And lo! with a summons sonorous
Sounded the bell from its tower, and over the meadows a drum
beat.

Thronged ere long was the church with men. Without, in the
churchyard,

Waited the women. They stood by the graves, and hung on
the head-stones

Garlands of autumn leaves and evergreens fresh from the forest,

VII

Then came the guard from the ships, and marching proudly
 among them
 Entered the sacred portal. With loud and dissonant clangor
 Echoed the sound of their brazen drums from ceiling and case-
 ment, —
 Echoed a moment only, and slowly the ponderous portal
 Closed, and in silence the crowd awaited the will of the soldiers.
 Then uprose their commander, and spake from the steps of the
 altar,
 Holding aloft his hands, with its seals, the royal commission.

VIII

“You are convened this day,” he said, “by his Majesty’s orders.
 Clement and kind has he been; but how you have answered
 his kindness,
 Let your own hearts reply! To my natural make and my
 temper
 Painful the task is I do, which to you I know must be grievous.
 Yet must I bow and obey, and deliver the will of our monarch;
 Namely, that all your lands, and dwellings, and cattle of all
 kinds
 Forfeited be to the crown; and that you yourselves from this
 province
 Be transported to other lands. God grant you may dwell there
 Ever as faithful subjects, a happy and peaceable people!
 Prisoners now I declare you; for such is his Majesty’s pleasure!”

IX

As, when the air is serene in the sultry solstice of summer,
 Suddenly gathers a storm, and the deadly sling of the hail-
 stones
 Beats down the farmer’s corn in the field and shatters his
 windows,

Hiding the sun, and strewing the ground with thatch from the
house-roofs,
Bellowing fly the herds, and seek to break their inclosures;
So on the hearts of the people descended the words of the
speaker.

X

Silent a moment they stood in speechless wonder, and then rose
Louder and ever louder a wail of sorrow and anger,
And, by one impulse moved, they madly rushed to the doorway.
Vain was the hope of escape; and cries and fierce imprecations
Rang through the house of prayer; and high o'er the heads of
the others
Rose, with his arms uplifted, the figure of Basil, the black-
smith,
As, on a stormy sea, a spar is tossed by the billows.

XI

Flushed was his face and distorted with passion; and wildly he
shouted —
“Down with the tyrants of England! we never have sworn
them allegiance!
Death to these foreign soldiers, who seize on our homes and our
harvests!”
More he fain would have said, but the merciless hand of a
soldier
Smote him upon the mouth, and dragged him down to the
pavement.

XII

In the midst of the strife and tumult of angry contention,
Lo! the door of the chancel opened, and Father Felician
Entered, with serious mien, and ascended the steps of the
altar.
Raising his reverend hand, with a gesture he awed into silence
All that clamorous throng; and thus he spake to his people:

XIII

“What is this that ye do, my children? what madness has seized you?

Forty years of my life have I labored among you, and taught you,

Not in word alone, but in deed, to love one another!

Is this the fruit of my toils, of my vigils and prayers and privations?

Have you so soon forgotten all lessons of love and forgiveness?

This is the house of the Prince of Peace, and would you profane it

Thus with violent deeds and hearts overflowing with hatred?”

XIV

Few were his words of rebuke, but deep in the hearts of his people

Sank they, and sobs of contrition succeeded that passionate outbreak;

And they repeated his prayer, and said, “O Father, forgive them!”

— HENRY WADSWORTH LONGFELLOW

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

BY HENRY WATTERSON

I look into the crystal globe that, slowly turning, tells the story of his life, and I see a little heart-broken boy, weeping by the outstretched form of a dead mother, then bravely, nobly trudging a hundred miles to obtain her Christian burial. I see this motherless lad growing to manhood amid the scenes that seem to lead to nothing but abasement; no teachers; no books; no charts, except his untutored mind; no compass, except his own undisciplined will; no light, save light from Heaven; yet, like the caravel of Columbus, struggling on and

on through the trough of the sea, always toward the destined land, I see the full-grown man, stalwart and brave, an athlete in activity of movement and strength of limb, yet vexed by weird dreams and visions; of life, of love, of religion, sometimes verging on despair. I see the mind, grown as robust as the body, throw off these phantoms of the imagination and give itself wholly to the work-a-day uses of the world; the rearing of children; the earning of bread; the multiplied duties of life. I see the party leader, self-confident in conscious rectitude; original, because it was not his nature to follow; potent, because he was fearless, pursuing his convictions with earnest zeal, and urging them upon his fellows with the resources of an oratory which was hardly more impressive than it was many-sided. I see him, the preferred among his fellows, ascend the eminence reserved for him, and him alone of all the statesmen of the time, amid the derision of opponents and the distrust of supporters, yet unawed and unmoved, because thoroughly equipped to meet the emergency. The same being, from first to last; the poor child weeping over a dead mother; the great chief sobbing amid the cruel horrors of war; flinching not from duty, nor changing his life-long ways of dealing with the stern realities which pressed upon him and hurried him onward. And last scene of all, that ends this strange, eventful history, I see him lying dead there in the capitol of the nation, to which he had rendered "the last full measure of devotion," the flag of his country around him, the world mourning, and, asking myself how could any man have hated that man, I ask you, how can any man refuse his homage to his memory? Surely, he was one of God's elect; not in any sense a creature of circumstance, or accident. Recurring to the doctrine of inspiration, I say again and again, he was inspired of God, and I cannot see how any one who believes in that doctrine can regard him as anything else. (Applause.)

From Cæsar to Bismarck and Gladstone the world has had its statesmen and its soldiers — men who rose to eminence and

power step by step, through a series of geometric progression as it were, each advancement following in regular order one after the other, the whole obedient to well-established and well-understood laws of cause and effect. They were not what we call "men of destiny." They were "men of the time." They were men whose careers had a beginning, a middle and an end, rounding off lives with histories, full it may be of interesting and exciting event, but comprehensive and comprehensible; simple, clear, complete.

The inspired ones are fewer. Whence their emanation, where and how they got their power, by what rule they lived, moved and had their being, we know not. There is no explication to their lives. They rose from shadow and they went in mist. We see them, feel them, but we know them not. They came, God's word upon their lips, they did their office, God's mantle about them; and they vanished, God's holy light between the world and them, leaving behind a memory, half mortal and half myth. From first to last they were the creations of some special Providence, baffling the wit of man to fathom, defeating the machinations of the world, the flesh and the devil, until their work was done, then passing from the scene as mysteriously as they had come upon it.

Tried by this standard, where shall we find an example so impressive as Abraham Lincoln, whose career might be chanted by a Greek chorus as at once the prelude and the epilogue of the most imperial theme of modern times?

Born as lowly as the Son of God, in a hovel; reared in penury, squalor, with no gleam of light or fair surroundings; without graces, actual or acquired; without name or fame or official training; it was reserved for this strange being, late in life, to be snatched from obscurity, raised to supreme command at a supreme moment, and intrusted with the destiny of a nation.

The great leaders of his party, the most experienced and accomplished public men of the day, were made to stand aside; were sent to the rear, whilst this fantastic figure was led by

unseen hands to the front and given the reins of power. It is immaterial whether we were for him, or against him; wholly immaterial. That, during four years, carrying with them such a weight of responsibility as the world never witnessed before, he filled the vast space allotted him in the eyes and actions of mankind, is to say that he was inspired of God, for nowhere else could he have acquired the wisdom and the virtue.

Where did Shakespeare get his genius? Where did Mozart get his music? Whose hand smote the lyre of the Scottish plowman, and stayed the life of the German priest? God, God, and God alone; and as surely as these were raised up by God, inspired by God, was Abraham Lincoln; and a thousand years hence, no drama, no tragedy, no epic poem will be filled with greater wonder, or be followed by mankind with deeper feeling than that which tells the story of his life and death. (Loud applause.)

APPENDIX IV

COMPILATIONS OF SPEECHES

- Henry Ward Beecher: I. *Lectures and Orations*, edited by Newell Dwight Hillis. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1913.
- II. *Yale Lectures on Preaching*. Chicago: The Pilgrim Press, First, Second, and Third Series.
- III. *A Treasury of Illustration*. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1904.
- IV. *Patriotic Addresses*. Chicago: The Pilgrim Press, 1887.
- William Jennings Bryan: *Speeches*. 2 vols. New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1909.
- Henry W. Grady: *Orations and Speeches*. New York: Hinds, Noble and Eldridge, 1910.
- Robert G. Ingersoll: *Complete Works* (Dresden Edition). 13 vols. New York: C. P. Farrell Publishing Company, 1912.
- Homer Dorr Lindgren: *Modern Speeches* (Revised Edition). New York: F. S. Crofts and Company, 1930.
- Modern Eloquence*: I. First Edition. 15 vols. Philadelphia: John D. Morris and Company, 1900.
- II. Second Edition. 12 vols. New York: Modern Eloquence Corporation, 1923.
- III. Third Edition. 15 vols. New York: Modern Eloquence Corporation, revised in 1929.
- John G. Nicolay and John Hay: *Lincoln*. New York: Francis D. Tandy Company, 1905.
- James Milton O'Neill: I. *Modern Short Speeches*. New York: The Century Company, 1923.
- II. *Models of Speech Composition*. New York: The Century Company, 1921.
- James Milton O'Neill and Floyd K. Riley: *Contemporary Speeches*. New York: The Century Company, 1930.
- Wendell Phillips: *Speeches*. 2 vols. Boston: Lee and Shepard, 1891.
- Charles Sumner: *Works*. Boston: Lee and Shepard, 1870.

INDEX

- Acquisitive motive, 124
- Action, bodily, 327-343; lack of, common fault in speaking, 329
- Æsthetic sentiments, as motives, 130
- Aim in speaking, taking, 192
- Alliteration, as a quality of style, 179
- Ambition, as a motive, 123
- Analogy, as a form of illustration, 100; as a form of logical argument, 274
- Anecdote, as a form of illustration, 102
- Argumentative speech, 209; difficulties involved, 259; distinction between impressive and argumentative speeches, 261; example of, Appendix II; forms of support for, 267; informative process in, 263; nature of, 210; preparation of, 259-291; subjects for, 210
- Aspirate voice, 352
- Bain, Alexander, on suggestion, 137
- Barton, Bruce, 148
- Beck, James, 149
- Beecher, Henry Ward, 9, 57, 72, 96, 98, 104, 108, 113, 126, 166, 168, 318, 364
- Beveridge, Albert J., 100
- Bose, Sir J. C., 17
- Bowers, Claude, 172
- Bradford, Gamaliel, 4
- Breathing, correct, 345
- Bright, John, 63
- Bryan, William Jennings, 14, 50
- Burns, Robert, 341
- Cards, use of, for recording materials, 35-36
- Carlyle, Thomas, 1, 90
- Catt, Carrie Chapman, 4, 83
- Central idea, 50
- Challenge technique, 321
- Charts and maps, use of, 223
- Cicero, on diction, 165
- Clash of opinion in argumentative speeches, 266
- Clearness, as an objective in speaking, 219
- Communicative attitude, 9
- Concrete, attention value of the, 319
- Contrast, as a quality of style, 171
- Conversational mode, 10
- Conwell, Russell H., 85, 143, 379-412
- Criticism of speeches, suggestion for, 369
- Crowd, the psychological, 154
- Cumulation, as a form of support, 90
- Current magazines, as sources of materials, 33
- Delivery of speech, 56-78; criticism of, 370
- Diction in speaking, 163; of American orators, 165
- Direct quotation, advantages of, 183-184
- Douglas, Stephen A., 72

- Dread of public censure, as a motive, 127
- Emerson, Ralph Waldo, 25
- Emotional adjustment, 17
- Emotional appeal, always want appeal, 234; value of, 234
- Enunciation, 360; distinctness of, 361
- Everett, Edward, 98
- Exceptions, as tests of a rule, 270
- Expositions, nature of, 220
- Extempore method, 58; use of, by great speakers, 66
- Fable, as a form of illustration, 104
- Fact, as a form of support, 81
- Figures, as a form of support, 81
- Firkins, Oscar W., 100, 173, 421-425
- Forms of support, 78-95; cumulation, 90; facts, figures, statistics, 81; general example, 83; hypothetical case, 89; literary quotation, 87; reasoning from facts and authorities, 88; restatement, 82; specific example, 84; testimony, 86
- Foss, Sam Walter, 139
- Frank, Glenn, 212, 309
- Fulkerson, Roy, 103
- General ends in speaking, 192
- General example, as a form of support, 83
- George, David Lloyd, 103, 184
- Gestures, 332; clenched fist, 335; guiding principles, 333-334; hand prone, 335; hand supine, 334; hand with index finger prominent, 335; importance of practice, 336; symmetry of, 333
- Grady, Henry W., 91
- Guttural voice, 352
- Haddock, Frank C., 16
- Higginson, Thomas Wentworth, 180
- Hillis, Newell Dwight, 106
- Holmes, Oliver Wendell, 109, 150, 164
- Humor, anecdote as a source of, 102; as a means of getting audience response, 155; attention value of, 316; important element in good speaking, 317
- Hypothetical case, as a form of support, 89
- Illustrations, 96-117; as aids to memory, 110; as means of economizing attention, 110-111; as source of pictorial element in speaking, 106-107; in speeches of Wendell Phillips, 107; kinds of, 97; sources of, 109; use of, with mixed audiences, 112-113
- Impressive speech, emotional appeal in, 241-250; examples of, Appendix II; forms of support for, 250; nature of, 205; preparation of, 231-258; subjects for, 208
- Informative speech, examples of, Appendix II; forms of support for, 228; nature of, 204; preparation of, 218-230; requisites of, 224; subjects for, 205
- Ingersoll, Robert Green, 91, 92, 93, 100, 105, 131, 170, 178
- Interestingness, in a speech, 311
- Interpretation of selections, suggestions for, 360
- James, William, 201, 236, 265
- Kinds of speeches, 191-217; entertainment, 193; informative, 193; speeches dealing with accepted beliefs, 195; speeches dealing with

- unaccepted beliefs, 196-199; the two types of persuasive speeches distinguished, 203
- King, Thomas Starr, 314, 317
- Knower, Franklin H., 143
- La Follette, Robert, 144
- Lenroot, Irvine, 313
- Lincoln, Abraham, 3, 8, 52, 67, 72, 88, 98, 145, 158, 182, 341-343, 426-434
- Lippmann, Walter, 125
- Literary quotation, as a form of support, 87
- Livermore, Mary, 101
- Logical argument, 268
- Love of family, home, and friends, as a motive, 122
- Lowell, James Russell, 354
- Main divisions of a speech, 42
- Mannerisms on the floor, 338
- Manuscript, reading from, 72
- Mechanical approach to expression to be avoided, 359
- Memorizing and the extempore method, 64
- Memory, auditory, muscular, visual forms of, 65
- Mental content important, 358
- Metaphor, as a form of illustration, 98
- Mill, John Stuart, 6
- Moral sentiments, as motives, 128
- Motivation, 118-136
- Motives, acquisitive, 124; æsthetic sentiments as, 130; classification of, 119; moral sentiments as, 128; negative, 132
- Movement on the floor, 336
- Nasal twang, 348
- Naturalness, 13
- Negative motives, 132
- Nervousness, 14-16
- Notebooks, use of, 35
- Observation, as source of speech materials, 34
- O'Connell, Daniel, 357
- Organization, speech, 39-55
- Originality, 173
- Orotund voice, 351
- Outline, 44-45; kinds of, 45; of Lincoln's "Springfield Speech," 435; relation to speech, 52
- Outline, logical, for persuasive speech, 47; example of, 48
- Outline, topical, for informative speech, 45
- Parable, 105
- Parker, DeWitt Henry, 118, 119
- Pectoral voice, 352
- Personal experiences, value of, 27
- Personality, a free, 327
- Persuasion, problems of, 202
- Pharynx, as resonator, 348
- Phelps, William Lyon, 221
- Phillips, Arthur Edward, 42, 80, 90
- Phillips, Charles, 123
- Phillips, Wendell, 13, 14, 50, 67, 70, 72, 89, 104, 107, 171, 175, 176, 177, 186-189
- Pictorial element, in speaking, 106
- Picture words, 168
- Posture, 330
- Pronunciation, dictionary as guide, 363; limitations of correcting, 363; list of words often mispronounced, 364; problems of, 362; sectional differences, 362
- Propositions in a speech, 44
- Purpose, importance of a definite, 42

- Radio talks and showmanship, 214
- Reasoning from facts and authorities, 88. *See also* Logical argument
- Regard for reputation, as a motive, 128
- Repetition, as source of suggestion, 152
- Restatement, as a form of support, 82; in summaries, 83
- Rhetorical question, 182
- Rhythm, as an attribute of style, 176
- Roosevelt, Franklin D., 122, 133, 221, 323
- Root, Elihu, 82
- Ruskin, John, 1
- Sarcey, M., 62
- Scott, Walter Dill, 140
- Self-preservation, as a motive, 120
- Sentence structure, 169
- Shakespeare, Marc Antony's Address, 138
- Shiel, Richard, 177
- Sidis, Boris, 140
- Simile, 97
- Slogans, 153
- Specific example, as a form of support, 84
- Speech materials, finding and recording, 31-38; nature of good materials, 79; sources of, 31-34
- Speeches, classification of, 204
- Spencer, Herbert, 162
- Stereotypes, 156
- Story, Joseph, 129
- Style, speaking, 162-190
- Subject, choosing a, 20-29; requisites of, 21
- Suggestion, 137-161; characteristics of, 140; illustrations and suggestion, 145; man's susceptibility to, 139; meaning of, 140; methods of, 142; through transference of feeling, 142
- Tact and technique in want appeal, 133
- Testimony, as a form of support, 85
- Throat, open and relaxed, 346
- Unusual, attention value of the, 312
- Vincent, John Heyl, on diction, 167
- Vital, attention value of the, 311
- Vocal drill, 350
- Vocal elements, 350; force, 353; pitch, 357; time, 355
- Vocal quality and emotion, 350
- Vocalizing the breath, 347
- Voice, 344; aspirate, 352; guttural, 352; orotund, 352; pectoral, 352; requisites of a good voice, 344
- Walking and speech preparation, 61
- Want appeal, 118-136; meaning of, 118
- Wants and wishes, relation of emotions to, 233
- Ward, Cornelia C., 15
- Washington, Booker T., 182
- Webster, Daniel, 4, 5, 66, 75-77, 121, 356
- West, Robert, 16
- Woodworth, Robert S., 315
- Woolbert, Charles H., 15, 28
- Writing out speeches, 63
- Young, Owen D., 170





JAN.-FEB. 1987

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 013 742 544 0

