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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

For many years some rhetoricians have been critical of the methods employed in the criticism of public address (19:283-291; 22:5-11; 34:277-284; 38:158-172). Those responsible for such judgments conclude that since the traditional method of criticism is ineffective, new methods are needed to improve the inherent obstacles to effective rhetorical criticism. But as Barnet Baskerville indicated:

Most of the critics of our criticism follow their attacks with suggestions for improvement, but without exception they are far more effective in demolishing the old than in constructing the new (4:191).

In the process of "demolishing the old" the critics have compared rhetorical criticism with the literature of the historian, the literary critic, and the journalist. They conclude that their comparisons justify the quest for the "modern" approach to rhetorical criticism.

I. THE PROBLEM

Statement of the problem. It is the purpose of this paper (1) to analyze the separate writings of a rhetorician and a journalist who both criticized selected campaign addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt, (2) to discover the differences in the critical products derived from different
purposes and methods, and (3) to describe these differences and possibly interpret them as examples which lead to the varying evaluations of rhetorical and journalistic criticism.

**Importance of the study.** Some critics of rhetorical criticism have referred to the journalist as a model of effective, interesting, critical writing. The ability of the journalist to add life and vitality to his writing with facts and objectivity has been compared with the rhetorician's lifeless analysis of historical speeches.

An investigation of the speech journals indicated an abundance of materials written on the criticism of speech criticism. Those which directed the reader to the critical writings of historians, the novelist, and the journalist will be considered because of the relationship these criticisms had to this study.

**II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

Twenty years ago a paper appeared in *The Quarterly Journal of Speech* in which S. Judson Crandell accused the critic in 1949 of being stuffy and dull (17:511). He stated that although criticism is germane because of the nature of the substance for which the critic is responsible, he nonetheless should attempt to make the form of his critical writing as interesting as possible for the reader. He used
as examples of good writing an essay by Frederick L. Allen, "The Goon and His Style" (1:121-123) and Rebecca West's "Opera in Greenville" (39:45-46). He concluded his criticism by stating that writers with much less knowledge of the theory and methodology of criticism have been able to add vividness to their writing. "Would it not be possible for the rhetorical critic to add to his documentation some of the color and force and aliveness of this kind of writing?"

Haberman invited congressional, journalistic, and academic critics to comment on the speech delivered by General Douglas MacArthur on April 19, 1951. The results of this symposium provided additional fuel for the critics of rhetorical criticism (21:321-333). Commenting on the symposium, Karl Wallace concluded that:

... a critic of the critics is almost bound to wonder whether the structure of public address is today being taken for granted and therefore not worthy of more than passing reference (37:74).

Nichols, in a reference to Haberman's study, stated in 1963 that:

It was very peculiar indeed that, not the professional rhetorical critics, but the journalists examining MacArthur's speech concerned themselves seriously with the truth of MacArthur's assertions, the accurate sizing up of conditions in Asia. With a certain frontal attack, uncomplicated by the study of rhetorical theory, they commented on the truth of the assertions (30:70).

Thonssen, in an article appearing in the summer 1968 edition of Western Speech, echoes a plea made by Crandell
that the critic's evaluation is dull and empty unless he is able to inject the spontaneity of the moment with vividness. The critic with his concern for data and footnotes is only able to present an empty evaluation of the events he is evaluating. Thonssen provided examples of what he considered vivid writings by contemporary historians, journalists, and news commentators. In reference to these gentlemen, Thonssen concluded his remarks by stating that these men contribute "... certain ingredients of interest, readability, and sensitivity to the power of the spoken word that we academics, in our reproachfully smug ways, sometimes shrug off with a convenient pooh-pooh" (36:191).

Wallace's earlier comments on the responsibilities of the critic are brought into focus by Ericson when he defined rhetorical criticism:

... the process of rhetorical criticism observes, analyzes, and describes the speech revealing the means used to express the ideas in the speech effectively. Criticism functions to evaluate and to formulate. Evaluation makes judgments about the rhetorical choices made by the speaker, and formulation follows when, on the basis of his observations, the critic adds to or revises the body of rhetorical theory (20:135-136).

The definition of rhetorical criticism and the criticisms of criticism make the opening statement by Baskerville most significant.
III. A PREFACE TO THE REMAINING CHAPTERS

Chapter II introduces Kenneth Burke's pentad and shows how it can be applied to the criticisms of a rhetorician and a journalist. Chapter III reveals the results of the analyses of the criticisms by the rhetorician Laura Crowell and the journalist Charles W. Hurd. Chapter IV is a summary of the criticisms of the rhetorician and the journalist, and it also includes conclusions drawn from the comparison of the products of Laura Crowell and Charles W. Hurd.
CHAPTER II

APPLICATION OF BURKEIAN METHODOLOGY

Chapter II introduces Kenneth Burke's philosophy, provides the reader with examples of how his methodology has been effectively used as a method in rhetorical criticism, and introduces and explains the terms of the dramatistic pentad which were used in the analysis of the criticisms of Laura Crowell and Charles W. Hurd.

I. BURKE'S PHILOSOPHY

Some clarification of Burke's philosophy is necessary in order to adequately understand the value of his pentad as a methodology for criticism. A survey of his major works indicates that the crux of his thinking is that man can best be studied by an analysis of his language. This philosophy of man as a "symbol using animal" is explicitly stated in Counter-Statement:

The whole project aims to round out an analysis of language in keeping with the author's favorite notion that, man being the specifically language-using animal, an approach to human motivations should be made through the analysis of language. It seeks for observations that, while central to the study of any given expression in its internality, also have references to human quandaries and human foibles generally (6:218-219).

Consideration of "human quandaries and human foibles" has led Burke to excursions into the disciplines of anthropology, sociology, and psychology in his effort to discover
"what makes man tick." Burke sees the analysis of man's linguistic products as the best means of disclosing man's purposes.

II. LITERATURE ON BURKE'S METHODOLOGY

Burke's discussion of the philosophy underlying his pentad as a method of critical analysis given in his essays in The Quarterly Journal of Speech (7:251-264; 8:446-460; 9:79-92; 13:209-216) and the publication of A Grammar of Motives (10) and A Rhetoric of Motives (15) has had a positive effect on rhetorical critics.

It was evident from the literature available that the dramatistic pentad has gained wide acceptance as a method of rhetorical criticism. Speaking of this method Nichols said, "It stands as a superb example of the fruitfulness of a method of comprehensive rhetorical analysis which goes far beyond conventional patterns" (29:144).

The pentad was deemed appropriate for the purpose of the present study for the following reasons: (1) This method freeing the critic from the conventional limitations which seem to be implicit as one focuses on an established set of rhetorical categories. (2) It is applicable to all literature. (3) It forces a consideration of all aspects of a problem. (4) Finally, it provides a framework for the analysis of criticism.

III. THE DRAMATISTIC PENTAD

The terms of the pentad. Burke introduces the pentad by asking five questions: "... what was done (act), when or where it was done (scene), who did it (agent), how he did it (agency), and why (purpose)" (10:X). An act is defined as a word that "names what took place, in thought or deed." The scene is defined as "the background of the act, the situation in which it occurred." The agent is the "person or kind of person [who] ... performed the act." The agency is the "means or instruments" the critic
uses. The purpose would provide the reason for the act.

Burke focuses on the terms themselves and also places emphasis on the formal interrelationships which "prevail" among these terms. The relationships which exist between the terms of the pentad Burke calls "ratios." The ten ratios are "(scene-act, scene-agent, scene-agency, scene-purpose, act-purpose, act-agent, act-agency, agent-purpose, agent-agency, and agency-purpose)" (10:15).

If the critic were able to acquire ample information about the "agent," "act," "scene" and "agency," his efforts would be focused on the "purpose" of the work he is investigating.

IV. THE ALIGNMENT AND EXPLANATION OF TERMS

"Agents." Information about the agents will assist in the application of the pentad to the criticisms of the rhetorician and the reporter and also lead to some predictions about possible differences between the two.

Laura Crowell completed her undergraduate studies and received a Master of Arts degree from South Dakota University. She received a Doctor of Philosophy degree from the State University of Iowa in 1948. Crowell has contributed articles to The Quarterly Journal of Speech, The Speech Teacher, Speech Monographs, and Western Speech. She collaborated with L. LeRoy Cowperthwaite and Earnest

Biographical data on Charles W. Hurd was obtained from an article in The Saturday Review by Ernest K. Lindsey (28:8-9). Lindsey said that Hurd was born in Oklahoma and completed his high school education in St. Louis, Missouri, in 1918. After he graduated from high school, he worked for the St. Louis Post-Dispatch and was later employed by the Associated Press. The critic was hired by the New York Times and was a member of the Washington Bureau at the time he wrote his criticisms of the Omaha and Chicago addresses. Hurd has written two books describing the Washington scene: The White House: A Biography, and Washington Cavalcade. A third book titled, The Veterans Program, was written when he was associated with the Veteran's Administration.

"Act." The act of criticism was created on the campus of a university in 1948, and in the cities of Omaha and Chicago in 1936. Both agents criticized Franklin D. Roosevelt's October 10, and October 14, 1936, campaign speeches (32:431-439, 480-489). (See Appendix C).

Crowell's criticisms were published in Speech Monographs in 1950. (See Appendix A). The article was
titled "Franklin D. Roosevelt's Audience Persuasion in the 1936 Campaign" and was a condensation of Crowell's doctoral dissertation completed at the State University of Iowa in 1948 (18:48-64).

The criticisms of Charles W. Hurd appeared in The New York Times on October 11, and October 15, 1936 (25:1,44; 26:1,22). (See Appendix B.)

The investigator will expect the criticisms of Hurd to reflect the changes in scene between Omaha and Chicago. As the agent on the scene his narrations should indicate the anxieties of the people in these cities. The "spontaneity" expected in the works of Hurd as the agent should not appear in Crowell's criticism.

It is expected that Crowell will base her judgments on the content of the speech delivered. The agent-act ratio requires the act to be representative of the agent. A representative act of a rhetorician would require judgments based on an analysis and evaluation of the speech criticized. The critic's acceptance or rejection of the speech would be reflected in the analysis of the agency used.

"Agency." A study of the agencies used by the critics should reveal similarities and differences in the methods and purposes of the critics Crowell and Hurd.
Burke defined agency as the "instrument" or "means" used by the agent to accomplish his purpose (10:X). The agency used by the rhetorician and the reporter will be compared by employing Burkeian methodology through the utilization of his "structure," "cluster," and "agon" analysis. The result of this comparison is reported in Chapter III.

A thorough study of the criticisms should reveal the arrangements employed by the critics in their work. Burke describes the arrangement, or characteristic structure, as the "form" of the discourse. In order to identify the forms used in the criticisms, a knowledge of Burke's "forms" is necessary. Burke says "a work has form in so far as one part of it leads a reader to anticipate another part, to be gratified by the sequence" (6:124). The forms he describes in Counter-Statement are:

"Syllogistic Progression . . . the form of a perfectly conducted argument, advancing step by step."

"Qualitative Progression . . . [lacks] the pronounced anticipatory nature of the syllogistic progression . . . we are put into a state of mind which another state of mind can appropriately follow."

"Repetitive form." This form, according to Burke, "is the consistent maintaining of a principle under new
guises. It is restatement of the same thing in different ways."

"Conventional form involves to some degree the appeal of form as form." An example of the use of this form might be the audience's expectations of a conclusion to a speech after listening to an introduction, and complete development of major issues in the development of a speech.

"Minor or incidental forms." Include such forms as "metaphor, paradox, disclosure, reversal, contraction, expansion, . . ." (6:124-128).

Burke indicates that there may be more than one form present in a given work of art. When this occurs there is an interrelationship between the forms in the criticism.

Structure analysis should reveal the form or forms used by the rhetorician and the journalist. It is postulated that since Crowell has had a background in rhetorical theory, she will use what Burke refers to as the conventional form. On the other hand, it is expected that the reporter will utilize his training as a journalist and concern himself with answers to the questions: Who? What? When? Where? and Why? By applying Burke's forms one would classify such an arrangement as conventional. If the movement in the criticism follows no conventional pattern but is still easy to follow, then it might best be classified as qualitative progression. In addition to the conventional form of
journalism the reporter is also expected to use the repetitive form. The latter prediction is based on the assumption that the reporter will present a preview of the criticism in his introduction, make his criticism and following a pattern of exposition found in a newspaper article review what had been analyzed in the criticism.

The second step in the study of the agency is called a "cluster" analysis. "Clusters," according to Burke, are "what goes with what" (14:65). In order to discover the "clusters" in the criticisms, it was found that an index of the criticisms was necessary. Only the nouns used by the critics needed to be tallied in this study. Twenty of the most frequently used nouns then became the basis for the study of clusters.

Once removed from their contextual arrangement as parts of sentences, these nouns are referred to as "terms." A study is then made of the terms to discover those which were most frequently used. The most frequently used terms form separate clusters. The remaining terms become adjuncts to either one, two, or all of the clusters identified.

The cluster analysis should identify the topic or subject of the criticism. The terms should also indicate the scene or scenes described in the criticism, and name the person who was the object of the criticism.
The rhetorician's work may not identify the subject of the criticism, but can be expected to include rhetorical terms. This of course follows from the previously stated expectation that a conventional, rhetorical form will be employed. Terms which identify the audience and the speaker should also be present.

The preliminary hypothesis suggests that the journalist's criticism will contain terms which identify the topic of the speech and will also include many terms which name the audience and scene. In sum, it is expected that the speaker and audience will be clearly identified by this cluster analysis.

The cluster analysis does not disclose the methods employed, nor the purposes of the criticisms. But knowledge of the content of the criticism as revealed in an "agon" analysis can be used as a means of directing one to the methods employed by the critics in achieving their purposes. The cluster analysis is a prerequisite to the "agon" analysis which is the third step in the analysis of the agencies used.

Rueckert describes the agon analysis as the "interplay between opposed principles." He says that "the opposed principles represent the self's choices" and "the progressive form of the work--represents self quest" (33:90).

For the purposes of this study, the clusters identified in the cluster analysis would be the "opposed principles"
and the "quest" would be the critics' analysis and evaluation of the speech as it develops. Thus as a result of comparing the results of the agon analyses, the differences between the rhetorician and the journalist should be clearly revealed.

The agon analysis should also indicate an acceptance or rejection of the speech criticized. The critic's reasons, stated or implied, for his judgment may lead one to an understanding of the purposes of the criticisms.

The investigator will expect a movement between the forces (i.e., clusters) in the criticisms. This movement should be prompted, in the case of the rhetorician using a traditional approach, by the critic's attention to the speaker's effect. This effect would have been measured by "the canons of rhetorical theory." "Transcendence," or what Burke refers to as the cessation of opposition, may or may not be evident in the agon of the rhetorician's criticism (5:336-337).

The analysis of the reporter's criticism will presumably reveal significant movement between forces. As an agent on the scene reporting what he saw and heard, the favorable responses by the audience to a speech which aims at compromises may limit the movement of clusters. Thus, transcendence is less likely to be evident in this form of criticism.
The analysis of the agency used by the critics becomes the "key" in the search for similarities and differences in the criticisms of the rhetorician and the journalist.

V. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

It was not the purpose of this thesis to pass judgment on the values of rhetorical or journalistic criticism. Neither did it attempt to measure the effects of "dull," "stuffy," or "interesting" criticisms. The purpose as it was stated in Chapter I is (1) to analyze the separate writings of a rhetorician and a journalist who both criticized selected campaign addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt, (2) to discover the differences in the critical products derived from different purposes and methods, (3) to describe these differences and possibly interpret them as examples which lead to the varying evaluations of rhetorical and journalistic criticism.

Such an analysis may focus attention on the inherent differences which exist in the agent, agency, and scene of the criticisms studied. The existence of such differences, it is hoped, would tend to mitigate the effect of rash comparisons of the criticisms of the rhetorician and the reporter.
CHAPTER III

THE RESULTS OF THE ANALYSES

This chapter reveals the results of the analyses of the criticisms by the rhetorician Laura Crowell and the journalist Charles W. Hurd. (See Appendixes A and B.)

Chapter II indicated that analysis of the agencies used by the critics was the key to the discovery of differences and similarities in the methods and purposes used. This chapter reports the results of that analysis.

I. STRUCTURE ANALYSIS

Crowell's criticism. The structure analysis of Crowell's criticism revealed what had been expected. The rhetorician had used the conventional form. Such an observation was most evident in Crowell's Chicago criticism to be discussed later. In the Omaha criticism the critic mentioned the president's effective use of contrast in the speech, described in detail the president's use of ethical and pathetic proofs, and continued with a brief discussion of Roosevelt's style and delivery. Her conclusion reflected some displeasure to the address by a few critics, but indicated an acceptance of the speech by the rhetorician. This acceptance was not evident in the criticism of the Chicago
speech because the critic questioned Roosevelt's use of ethical and logical proofs.

The Chicago criticism is a better example of what had been expected of a rhetorician. Here Crowell analyzed the arguments and pointed to Roosevelt's use of contrast as a means to indicate what his administration had done for business. The critic also commented upon the president's use of analogy to enhance his style. In reference to Roosevelt's use of pathetic and ethical proofs, Crowell indicated that it was used to show the administration's interest in business, and also to reaffirm his government's contribution toward the "recovery" of business. The rhetorician also stated that the president spoke with confidence and assurance.

The predictions made about Crowell's use of the conventional form given in Chapter II were supported in the structure analysis.

Hurd's criticism. It was predicted that the journalist Charles W. Hurd would use the conventional journalistic form in his criticisms. The anticipated answers to the questions who, what, when, where and why were answered, but did not function as the organizing principle of the criticisms. Instead the conventional journalistic form was only evident as a lead-in to the critic's analysis. One could
get a brief summary of the contents of both speeches after reading the first paragraph of the criticisms.

Hurd's work was easy to follow because the criticisms were divided into sections and each of these sections were identified by topical headings relating to the problems Roosevelt discussed or to the audience's reaction. The sections formed a complete unit in themselves. For this reason the form was qualitative progression. There was an interrelationship of forms in the reporter's criticism. In addition to the journalist-conventional and qualitative progression, the repetitive form was also evident. It was evident when the reporter stated the contents of the president's speech at the beginning of the criticism, repeated the previously stated ideas by direct quotations from Roosevelt's speech, and when Hurd made a complete analysis of the speech after he had described the president's immediate audience. The use of this repetitive form was noticed more in the Chicago criticism than it was in the Omaha. Another difference noted in Hurd's Chicago criticism was the critic's description of the scene. The Chicago analysis included the reporter's impressions of the huge crowds, packed stadium, and enthusiastic response given to Roosevelt. It had been anticipated that the agent on the scene would act in a manner that would be representative of the scene. Hurd acted in such a manner. Much of the criticism of both critics
concerned itself with the audience's reaction to the President's speech, but Hurd's much more so than Crowell's.

The structure analysis of these criticisms revealed the forms employed by the critics in analyzing Roosevelt's Omaha and Chicago addresses. It was mentioned earlier that Crowell's criticisms were developed by the use of the conventional-rhetorical form while the analysis of Hurd's work indicated the use of more than one form. These forms were identified as qualitative progression, repetitive, and the journalistic-conventional form.

Neither critic approached both the Omaha and the Chicago addresses in the same way. Crowell's Omaha work differed from her Chicago criticism because she was more descriptive than analytical in the former criticism. Hurd's work, on the other hand, revealed the opposite tendency. In the Chicago criticism he described what he saw, while in the Omaha criticism he engaged more in analyzing what he heard.

A structure analysis leads to the first step in the analysis of the agencies used by the rhetorician and the journalist. We now turn to the second step, the cluster analysis.

II. CLUSTER ANALYSIS

For purposes of presenting results for the cluster
analyses it was decided that the following convention would be adopted. The agent cluster contains the agent, the adjunct (i.e., the contextual relationship between the agent and another person or thing) and the number of times the terms had been used in the criticism. The scene cluster contains the audience, city, region, and terms which were a part of the cluster by reason of a contextual relationship. The counteragent cluster contains terms which were used by the agent to identify persons or measures that were opposed to him or to his administration.

Crowell's criticism. An index of Crowell's Omaha and Chicago criticisms identified the speaker, his audience, and the city where the speech was delivered. What had been expected of the rhetorician's criticisms did not materialize. As indicated in Tables I and II, only one term out of the twenty most frequently used terms in the Omaha address, and two terms in the Chicago address were rhetorical terms. As a result of the limited use of these terms, there were no rhetorical clusters formed.

Hurd's criticism. The clusters in Hurd's criticisms reveal a similarity with those in the criticisms of the rhetorician. The clusters in this criticism identified the speaker and the audience and also named the city, as did the cluster analysis of Crowell's criticism. A comparison
of the clusters in Tables I and III reveals that Crowell's agent cluster in her Omaha criticism contained more terms than did Hurd's agent cluster for that speech. In addition to this, Hurd's Omaha criticism contained more terms in the scene and counteragent clusters than did those of the criticism written by Crowell.

A review of the clusters in Tables III and IV revealed what had been noted in the structure analysis about Hurd's Chicago criticism. As would be expected given the greater amount of description, there were fourteen terms in the Chicago scene cluster as compared to eight in the Omaha scene cluster. Further support for the above interpretation comes from a comparison of the relative number of terms in the scene clusters as opposed to the counteragent clusters in the two speeches. Since a closed set of terms is in use, an increase in one cluster must be done at the expense of another cluster. The scene cluster in the Chicago criticism is more than twice the size of the counteragent cluster. In the Omaha criticism the counteragent cluster is even slightly larger than the scene cluster.

The consistent dominance of the agent cluster in Crowell's criticisms, as evidenced by the number of terms it contained in both the Omaha and Chicago criticisms, was in opposition to the shift noted in Hurd's agent cluster. Tables I and II reveal that in both her Omaha and Chicago
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>Adjuncts</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Adjuncts</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Adjuncts</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agent</td>
<td>Roosevelt</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Argument</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Speech</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Defense</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disparagement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Farm</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Farmer(s)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Norris</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tariff</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Problem</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scene</td>
<td>Farmer(s)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Omaha</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Farm</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Picture</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Problem</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Income</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counter-agent</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Landon</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tariff</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE II

CHICAGO CLUSTERS OF CROWELL'S CRITICISM AND FREQUENCY OF OCCURRENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>Adjuncts</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Adjuncts</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Adjuncts</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agent</td>
<td>Roosevelt</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Democrats</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Speech</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>President</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Arguments</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Omaha</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Proof</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scene</td>
<td>Businessmen</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Recovery</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counter-agent</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE III

OMAHA CLUSTERS OF HURD'S CRITICISM AND FREQUENCY OF OCCURRENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>Adjuncts</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Adjuncts</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Adjuncts</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agent</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Roosevelt</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speech</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Farm</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Norris</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Elections</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prosperity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scene</td>
<td>Nation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Conditions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Farm</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Prosperity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Surplus</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counter-agent</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Farm</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Promises</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dole</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Surplus</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Conditions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE IV

CHICAGO CLUSTERS OF HURD'S CRITICISM AND FREQUENCY OF OCCURRENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>Adjuncts</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Adjuncts</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Adjuncts</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agent</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Roosevelt</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speech</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Power</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Leaders</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scene</td>
<td>Stadium</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Crowd</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>America</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Businessmen</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Enterprise</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>System</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Applause</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bank</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bankers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Power</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counter-agent</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Leaders</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Power</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
criticisms, Crowell's agent cluster contained more terms than either the scene or the counteragent cluster. Hurd's agent cluster occupied a position of prominence only in the Omaha criticism and was second to the scene cluster in the Chicago criticism. This contrast indicated that although the rhetorician was more descriptive in the Omaha criticism, she nonetheless focused her attention on the agent in both criticisms. The reporter, on the other hand, concerned himself with the agent in the Omaha analysis and devoted much of his criticism to the description of the scene in his Chicago criticism.

As can be seen, differences noted through a study of the clusters found in the criticisms do provide information which can be useful in discovering the similarities and differences in the methods and purposes of the rhetorician and the journalist.

The study of the results of the cluster analysis leads to a report of the agon analysis.

III. AGON ANALYSES

The following conventions were adopted for presenting the movement of clusters in the agon analyses. The letters A., S., and CS., identify the agent, scene, and counteragent clusters in the agon. Movement toward or away from a cluster is indicated in Figures 1, 2, 3,
and 4 by a change in position of a cluster between time phases. The time phase is used to indicate the sequence in which there is a change in the alignment of the clusters. A positive relationship between clusters is indicated by a solid line. A broken line indicates opposition. A circle around two symbols identifies transcendence.

Crowell's criticism. The agon analysis of Crowell's Omaha and Chicago criticisms revealed that much of the movement between clusters was centered between the agent and scene clusters. A review of Figure 1 shows that in the Omaha criticism the agon is devoted to movements by the agent cluster toward and away from the scene cluster. The scene cluster moved away from the agent cluster once.

Activity between the agent cluster and the counteragent cluster was limited to four movements. All four of these moves were generated by the agent cluster. Predictions of a transcendence was realized by the merging of the agent and scene clusters. The hypothesized transcendence did not occur in the Chicago criticism. (See Figure 2.)

A review of Figure 2 shows that movement in the Chicago cluster is once again focused on the agent cluster and the scene cluster. The agon between these clusters is much greater in this criticism than it had been in the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time phase</th>
<th>Pictorial representation</th>
<th>Textual references</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A_______S</td>
<td>&quot;... Roosevelt assured twelve thousand Nebraskans and Iowans of their importance in the national picture...&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>S_______CA</td>
<td>&quot;... Landon's strong effort to win the farm belt to his candidacy...&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A- - - - - S</td>
<td>&quot;... the drought of mid-summer with resulting shortages which forcibly brought into question the administration's policy of production curtailment.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A_______S____CA</td>
<td>&quot;... that Roosevelt's appearance might further the re-election of Norris, veteran Republican New Deal Senator from Nebraska...&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>S- - - - - - CA</td>
<td>&quot;Analyzing the farmers' plight in 1932 as the result of surpluses caused by reduction of European markets, a condition worsened by the Republican Smoot-Hawley tariff...&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>A- - - CA</td>
<td>&quot;Roosevelt set forth a more thorough contrast of Republican and Democratic action on a definite problem than in any other address of the campaign.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>S____A</td>
<td>&quot;Pointing out the increasing farm income, he specified seven steps which the Democratic administration has taken for agriculture.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 1

AN AGON ANALYSIS OF CROWELL'S OMAHA CRITICISM
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pictorial representation</th>
<th>Textual reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 A- - - - - -CA</td>
<td>&quot;Roosevelt attacked Landon's suggestion of tariff-equivalent payments...&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 A- - - - - -CA</td>
<td>&quot;... but advocated conservation, farm tenancy, and crop insurance, as had his opponent.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 S- - - - - - - A</td>
<td>&quot;Roosevelt's presentation of the farm problem showed him a leader with a well-reasoned view of agriculture...&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 S- - - - - - - A</td>
<td>&quot;... he proclaimed the farmer's right to a share in the advantages of modern living, to security for his old people...&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 S- - - - - - - A</td>
<td>&quot;Again, Roosevelt's appeal to the basic drives of self-preservation, love of family and home...&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 S- - - - - - - A</td>
<td>&quot;After a strong solicitation for the support for Senator Norris, the President presented a unified argument on the single theme...&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 S- - - - - - - A</td>
<td>&quot;He centered attention on this theme, developed it vividly and roundly, and finally dignified it by showing its relationship to the welfare of the whole nation.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 A- - - - - - - - S</td>
<td>&quot;... by these methods he dealt vigorously with his enthusiastic farm audience.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 1 (continued)**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pictorial representation</th>
<th>Textual reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 A- - - - S</td>
<td>&quot;... speaking tour through 'doubtful' Midwest states. . .&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 A____ S</td>
<td>&quot;... welcomed in this businessminded city . . .&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 A____ S</td>
<td>&quot;... assured the businessmen that their welfare had been the care of the Federal government . . .&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 A- - - - S</td>
<td>&quot;... his chief opposition in this area came from men with small and medium-sized businesses.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 A____ S</td>
<td>&quot;... the time was likely considered ripe for an overture to small businessmen. . .&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 A____ S</td>
<td>&quot;Roosevelt's argument attempted to show businessmen that the administration had brought them recovery. . .&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 A____ S</td>
<td>&quot;He specified benefits brought to six groups of men. . .&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 A- - - - S</td>
<td>&quot;... but oversimplified the picture and assigned results to partial causes.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 A- - - - CA</td>
<td>&quot;... setting forth vividly the contrast between Democratic achievement and Republican failure.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 A____ S</td>
<td>&quot;Listing the Democratic gains as steps taken in answer to needs felt by businessmen in 1933. . .&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 2**

**AN AGON ANALYSIS OF CROWELL'S CHICAGO CRITICISM**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time phase</th>
<th>Pictorial representation</th>
<th>Textual reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 11         | A_S                      | "... all ethical proofs in this address sprang from the analysis of the Democratic government's achievements for business..."
| 12         | A---S                    | "... by characterizing the ingratitude of businessmen..."
| 13         | A____S                   | "No stronger pathetic proof could have been offered these businessmen..."
| 14         | A____S                   | "... Roosevelt appeared to be reasoning through these problems with his auditors...
| 15         | A_S                      | "The frequent storms of applause which punctuated the address were duplicated in the newspaper accounts of the effectiveness and vote-getting nature of the speech."
| 16         | A---S                    | "The main challenges of the speech were to its sincerity, to its interpretation of the facts in the situation, and to the issues which the President omitted."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time phase</th>
<th>Pictorial representation</th>
<th>Textual reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A_________S</td>
<td>&quot;... his farm program was designed to bring permanent prosperity to the farmer. .. &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A----CA</td>
<td>&quot;... denounced the Republican plan as one which could only lead the farmer back to the conditions of 1932.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A____S</td>
<td>&quot;... thus making available 'a larger and larger domestic market for the farmer.'&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A----CA</td>
<td>&quot;An attack on the 'evil of farm tenancy.'&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A__S</td>
<td>&quot;... a plea for the reelection of Senator George W. Norris .. ..&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>A--CA</td>
<td>&quot;In assailing the Republican farm plan he said that it 'would substitute a system of tariff equivalent payments .. ..&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>A--CA</td>
<td>&quot;He charged that the Republicans have made promises that cannot be fulfilled .. ..&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>S__CA</td>
<td>&quot;... pledging both to cut government expenditures and to give farmers ' a straight subsidy for unlimited production, or what amounts to a dole.'&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>S------CA</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;... this vast sum would be spent not to save agriculture, but to wreck it.'&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 3

AN AGON ANALYSIS OF HURD'S OMAHA CRITICISM
"The hall, the largest available in Omaha, was packed to its capacity..."

"...the presentation of the President by Mrs. Gilbert N. Hitchcock, widow of the former Senator and Publisher of the Omaha World Herald."

"Mrs. Hitchcock is part owner of the paper, which is opposing Mr. Roosevelt's re-election."

"The President was applauded frequently as he spoke and received an ovation when he closed."

"He asserted that the Republican farm program 'would junk the farmers' program of cooperation.'"

"He charged that the Republican program would subsidize unlimited production..."

"The President summarized in 'seven sentences' what his administration has done to restore farm prosperity."

"He then discussed the four major phases of his farm program which he proposed to develop..."

"The President struck out indirectly at those who have accused his administration of a 'program of scarcity.'"
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pictorial representation</th>
<th>Textual reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A__S__S</td>
<td>&quot;... his administration had saved them from ruin, rather than hurt them.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A__S__S</td>
<td>&quot;He stated emphatically that the 'system of private profit and free enterprise' had been saved by government action...&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A--S--CA</td>
<td>&quot;Denouncing the 'fairy tales' of his opponents, used to spread fear among the American people...&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A__S__S</td>
<td>&quot;... before 26,000 persons who packed the Chicago stadium...&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A__S__</td>
<td>&quot;The interdependence of all activities or the 'rounded whole' of the United States, was dwelt upon...&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A--CA</td>
<td>&quot;Challenging the argument that recovery 'just happened,' Mr. Roosevelt declared 'we acted' and made it happen...&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S__A__</td>
<td>&quot;... by saving 'the American system of private enterprise and economic democracy.'&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A--CA</td>
<td>&quot;The previous administration... had done nothing because it was 'not industrially minded--nor business-minded...&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 4**

AN AGON ANALYSIS OF HURD'S CHICAGO CRITICISM
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time phase</th>
<th>Pictorial representation</th>
<th>Textual reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>S_A</td>
<td>&quot;Mr. Roosevelt explained immediately that he was not criticizing all business or all businessmen, for the 'overwhelming majority of businessmen in this country are good citizens.'&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>A_ -CA</td>
<td>&quot;He referred, he explained, to a 'minority who speculate with other people's money,' and who say 'popular government cannot be trusted.'&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>S_A</td>
<td>&quot;He listed the administration's five accomplishments in aiding business. . .&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>A_S</td>
<td>&quot;The reception given to the President outdid anything, according to local observers, that Chicago had achieved in recent years.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 4 (continued)
Omaha criticism. The counteragent cluster appeared once in the Chicago criticism and the appearance of the cluster was the result of the president's comparison between his administration and the Republican administration. As was indicated earlier, transcendence did not occur in the Chicago criticism.

Hurd's criticism. The agon analysis of Hurd's criticism indicated greater movement among clusters than had been anticipated. Figure 3 reveals the movements of the agent cluster in Hurd's Omaha criticism. All movements toward the scene cluster by the agent cluster are positive movements and most of the moves toward the counteragent cluster are negative. The numerous appearances of the counteragent cluster indicate the attacks made by the president on the opposition party. The positive relationship between the agent cluster and the scene cluster reveals the attempts made by Roosevelt to establish identity with his audience. Transcendence was not evident in Hurd's Omaha criticism.

The activity noted in the agon analyses of the Omaha criticism was not present in the criticism of the Chicago address. (See Figure 4.) The number of moves by the agent cluster decreased. There were four moves toward the counteragent cluster, but six moves by the agent cluster toward the scene cluster. The one move noted for the
scene cluster was in the direction of the agent cluster. There were no moves initiated by the counteragent cluster. Transcendence was noted in the cluster analysis of Hurd's Chicago criticism, again between the agent and scene clusters.

The predictions made in Chapter II were partially supported in the agon analysis of the rhetorician's criticisms. Movement between clusters did occur in both analyses. However, this movement was between the agent and scene clusters. The absence of a rhetorical cluster did not provide for movements which would be indicative of the rhetorician's concern for the speaker's effect. Transcendence was evident in one of the criticisms.

The analysis of the reporter's criticism revealed an unexpected transcendence in the Chicago criticism and an agon in both criticisms. The agon analysis revealed a greater movement in Hurd's Omaha criticism. This compares with Crowell's Chicago criticism. The limited activity in Hurd's Chicago criticism compares with the lessening of movement in Crowell's Omaha work. Transcendence was noted in Crowell's Omaha criticism, and it was present in Hurd's Chicago criticism.

The methods employed by the critics in their analyses of the president's speech and the purposes they had for writing the criticism could have resulted in the differences
noted in the agon analysis. Crowell, the rhetorician, used the conventional-rhetorical form and directed her criticisms toward the effect it had on her as one trained in the field of rhetoric. Hurd, on the other hand, trained as a journalist, employed more than one of Burke’s forms and focused his attention on the effect Roosevelt’s speech had on him as a member of the president’s immediate audience. The results of the structure, cluster, and agon analyses reflect the reporter’s interest in the scene.

IV. SUMMARY

This chapter was concerned with the analyses of the agencies used by the rhetorician and the reporter in the criticisms of the speeches by Franklin D. Roosevelt.

A structure analysis identified the form used by the rhetorician and the journalist. It was noted that Crowell used the rhetorical-conventional form and the reporter employed the qualitative progressive form and the repetitive form in addition to the conventional journalistic form.

The cluster analyses revealed the presence of a limited number of rhetorical terms in Crowell’s work and the absence of a rhetorical cluster. The analyses also indicated that her criticisms were focused on the agent. Hurd’s criticisms were centered on terms which described
the scene and identified the counteragents, or forces in opposition to the president.

The results of the agon analyses indicated greater progression in Crowell's Chicago criticism than in Hurd's criticism of the same speech. The opposite was noted in the analyses of the criticisms of the Omaha address.

The differences noted in the agencies employed by the critics in this chapter can be attributed to the differences that exist in the agents, the agency, and the scene used by the rhetorician and the journalist in their criticisms.
CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Chapter IV contains a summary of the results of the comparison made of the criticisms of the rhetorician and the journalist. This chapter also identifies the significance of these results and applies them to the ratios in Burke's pentad. The conclusions reached in this study are contained in Part II.

I. SUMMARY

The predictions made by the observer in Chapter II were centered on three of the five terms in Burke's dramatic, tatic pentad: (1) the agent, (2) the scene, and (3) the agency. It was anticipated that differences both in the backgrounds of the agents and in the scenes in which they created the act of criticism would manifest itself in the study of the agencies used.

Crowell's Criticism: The Agent-Act Ratio. The observer anticipated that Crowell, as a rhetorician, would base her judgments on the content of the speech delivered; the agent-act ratio required the act to be representative of this type of agent.

The structure analysis supported the hypothesis that Crowell would use the rhetorical-conventional form, although
it was discovered that she was more descriptive in the Omaha criticism than in the Chicago. Structure analysis also indicated the presence of rhetorical terms in her criticisms.

Although these rhetorical terms appeared in her criticism, the results of the cluster analysis revealed that no rhetorical clusters were found to be present in either criticism. The absence of these clusters was due to the limited use of rhetorical terms in both criticisms. It was discovered that one rhetorical term appeared in the Omaha clusters and two in the Chicago. Terms which identified the speaker, the audience, and persons or measures that were opposed to the President appeared most frequently in the rhetorician's criticisms and formed the agent, the scene, and the counteragent clusters.

In both the Omaha and Chicago criticisms the agent cluster had more terms than any of the other clusters. This indicated that in both criticisms the rhetorician had focused her attention on a description of the speaker's activities.

Very little was known about the scene in which Crowell's act was performed. It had been reported in Chapter II that the critic completed this act on a university campus. The scene then became insignificant because of the agent-act ratio which had been established. The scene,
though insignificant in the criticisms of Crowell, occupied a position of prominence in the study of Hurd's criticisms.

The movements in the agon analysis of Crowell's criticism centered around the movements between the agent and the scene clusters. All moves, the results indicated, were initiated by the agent cluster. Transcendence was evident only in the Omaha criticism. It did not occur in the Chicago criticism because the rhetorician restated a negative evaluation made earlier in the criticism. The focusing of the criticism on the speaker became evident after both criticisms had been analyzed. This emphasis on the speaker rather than on the speech delivered was not a representative act of a rhetorician as discussed in Chapters I and II. Ericson indicated in Chapter I that "criticism functions to evaluate and to formulate." The results of the present analysis indicated that Crowell was more descriptive than analytical in her criticisms. The acts of the agent in this case were thus not representative of the agent; i.e., a rhetorician.

**Hurd's Criticism: The Scene-Act Ratio.** It was hypothesized in Chapter II that the analysis of the agency used by Hurd would indicate a relationship between the act and the scene. In addition it was postulated that the reporter would use the conventional-journalistic form to
describe what he saw and heard in Omaha and Chicago. This hypothesis was supported by the structure analysis which identified not only the journalistic-conventional and repetitive forms, but also revealed the presence of the qualitative progressive form. Although the lengthy descriptions of the audience and their reaction to the President's speech occupied most of Hurd's Chicago criticism, it further supported an earlier expectation that a change in scene would be reflected in the descriptions of the audience and their response to the President's speech. This expectation, which was evident in the results of the reporter's criticism was not apparent in the agent-act ratio applied to the criticisms of the rhetorician.

The results of the Omaha clusters showed that there were more terms in the agent cluster. The Chicago clusters, on the other hand, revealed that there were more terms in the scene cluster than any of the other clusters.

Hurd, as an agent on the scene, reported what he saw and heard. The act contains the scene, and the scene contains the act, a phrase used by Burke many times to describe the relationship which exists between the two terms in the **scene-act ratio**.

The results of the agon analysis of the reporter's criticisms were contrary to the predictions made in Chapter II because the predictions were made on the assumption
that the journalistic-conventional form would limit the movement of clusters. Answers to the five questions posed by the journalist in the writing of his criticism, it was thought, would not initiate much movement among the clusters. As an agent on the scene it was expected that the reporter would restrict his observations only to what he saw and heard and not reflect the forces in opposition to each other in his criticisms. However, movements between clusters in both criticisms were present and apparently resulted from the reporter's use of the qualitative progressive form. Transcendence was not noted in the Omaha criticism because the journalist continued with his analysis after describing the favorable response the President received from his audience. In this study transcendence did not occur in the more analytical criticisms of both critics and a greater movement between forces was noted when the critics were more analytical.

The counteragent cluster appeared more frequently in the Omaha criticism than it did in the Chicago, and there were not as many moves by the agent cluster in the Chicago analysis as there were in the Omaha. Greater movement was noted in the Omaha clusters than in the Chicago, supporting what had been stated previously, that greater movements were noted in the criticisms that were more analytical.
The focusing of the reporter's criticisms on the scene confirmed the predictions made earlier in this paper that Hurd's criticisms would reflect a change in scene between Omaha and Chicago and that his acts would reflect the anxieties of the people in those two cities. Hurd was an agent reporting on a scene. His act was equal to the scenes he described. The scene-act ratio required such a balance between the act of the agent and the scene described.

II. CONCLUSIONS

The critics of rhetorical criticism, identified in Chapter I, devoted much time attaching superfluous labels to rhetorical criticism without considering what the terms implied or investigating the differences which exist between rhetorical criticism and journalistic reporting.

This was not true of all the criticisms cited because Haberman sought answers to the differences which existed, and left the answering of the questions posed by his study to Karl Wallace. The other critics, on the other hand, continued their incessant attack on rhetorical criticism without any further investigation of the differences which may exist between rhetorical criticism and journalistic reporting.

The results of this study provide some answers to questions that might have been asked prior to the diatribe on the merits of rhetorical criticism and journalistic
reporting. It has been the assumption of this study that an examination of the agencies and purposes of the action would provide an adequate basis for posing such questions.

The observer hypothesized that differences which exist in the criticism of the reporter and the rhetorician may be identified by an investigation of the agents, scenes, and agencies. The study of the criticisms of Hurd and Crowell indicated that differences in the training and backgrounds of the critics, together with the fact that they created their criticisms in entirely different scenes, produced differences in their critical efforts. The reporter as the agent on the scene was able to add "vividness" and "spontaneity" to his criticisms. The rhetorician, separated by time from the event she was observing wrote her criticisms on a university campus. Consequently, a difference in the scene alone can contribute to "dull" criticism.

A study of the results of the agencies used by the critics revealed the existence of more similarities than differences. Both criticisms contained a conventional form. In spite of the differences in forms, however, the terms used in the criticisms were more similar than different. An examination of these terms without identifying labels would make it difficult to separate those of the journalist from the rhetorician. Both the rhetorician and the journalist focused their criticisms on the speaker and the
scene. The results also indicated that these critics were more analytical in one criticism and more descriptive in another. In sum, the analysis of the results of the agencies used by the critics indicated that both the journalist and rhetorician were more descriptive than analytic in their criticisms.

It was anticipated that the act of the rhetorician would exhibit characteristics indicative of one's training in rhetorical theory. In short, the observer expected the act of rhetorical criticism to not only describe, but also to analyze and evaluate the rhetorical act. The results of this study indicated that this was not the case. The presence of only two rhetorical terms in the clusters, the absence of a rhetorical cluster, and the focusing of the rhetorician's criticism on the speaker and the scene discloses that the rhetorician had devoted most of her criticism to a description of the speaker rather than evaluating the effectiveness of the speeches analyzed.

The terms in the agent-act ratio used in the study of the rhetorician's criticisms were not balanced because the act of the agent was not an act characteristic of one trained in rhetorical theory. The terms in the reporter's scene-act ratio were balanced because the observations made by the agent indicated a relationship between the scene described and the act of criticism created.
Similarities and differences inherent in the criticisms of the journalist and the reporter become evident only after an investigation of the criticisms of these critics. Labels and generalizations attached to assumptions adds nothing new to rhetorical theory.

Returning to the question of "interestingness," the reporter's act of criticisms was equal to the scene he observed. As a result his criticism was interesting and contained the qualities of readable literature.

Perhaps the question of interestingness is best pursued in terms of the interest a reader brings to a criticism and also the purposes of the author in formulating one. That is, the rhetorical critic can be assumed to differ from the journalist because the questions he attempts to answer are different. The quest of the rhetorical critic is one of evaluating the effectiveness of a speaker. The above analysis leads to the following possibilities for interpreting the criticisms of rhetorical criticism:

1. The rhetorician is describing rather than evaluating and is also using an inappropriate form for her description. She would be using a form designed for analysis as opposed to description. If this be the case, then the result would be "dull" and inadequate criticism.
2. The rhetorician is writing adequate rhetorical criticism but is being chastized because they are not sufficiently descriptive.

The results of this study indicate that the first possibility best describes the rhetorician and his critics. Those critics dwelling on the dullness of the rhetoricians' products thus are supported by the results of this study, but those focusing on the inadequacies of rhetorical criticism can also claim support from these results.
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APPENDIXES
APPENDIX A

CROWELL'S CRITICISM OF THE OMAHA ADDRESS

Address in Omaha, October 10

In an address of high artistic quality and oratorical power in Omaha, Nebraska, on October 10, Roosevelt assured twelve thousand Nebraskans and Iowans of their importance in the national picture. Certain factors had made a Presidential speech in the Midwest essential: Landon's strong effort to win the farm belt to his candidacy, and the drought of midsummer with resulting shortages which forcibly brought into question the administration's policy of production curtailment. The possibility that Roosevelt's appearance might further the re-election of Norris, veteran Republican New Deal Senator from Nebraska, also made such a speech desirable.

Analyzing the farmers' plight in 1932 as the result of surpluses caused by reduction of European markets, a condition worsened by the Republican Farm Board and Smoot-Hawley tariff, Roosevelt set forth a more thorough contrast of Republican and Democratic action on a definite problem than in any other address of the campaign. Pointing out
the increasing farm income, he specified seven steps which the Democratic administration had taken for agriculture.38 Roosevelt attacked Landon's suggestion of tariff-equivalent payments but advocated conservation, farm tenancy, and crop insurance, as had his opponent.

Roosevelt's presentation of the farm problem showed him a leader with a well-reasoned view of agriculture—he saw the farmer's position in the national picture and recognized the need of his help in setting up the policies;39 he proclaimed the farmer's right to a share in the advantages of modern living, to security for his old people and opportunities for his children. Furthermore, his explanation that Democratic aid to the farmers had redeemed his pledge to them was effective in demonstrating his integrity, an appeal of especial value in this contest over his use of delegated power. Again, Roosevelt's appeal to the basic drives of self-preservation, love of family and home, self-esteem and ownership of property was particularly strong in

38Specificity was desirable because the presumption would be in favor of his opponent who came from the farm area.

39George N. Peek and Hugh S. Johnson came from the Moline Plow Company of Illinois to Washington in the spring of 1933 to suggest plans for agricultural and industrial recovery. The Farm Bureau Federation, the National Grange, and several other large farm organizations had much to do with the planning of the Agricultural Adjustment Act. Rauch, op. cit., pp. 66, 68.
this address, an appeal directed to his farmer audience but forceful to all listeners who grasped the interrelation of welfare problems throughout the country.

After a strong solicitation of support for Senator Norris, the President presented a unified argument on the single theme that Democratic government, in contrast to Republican administrations, had acted and would act for the farmer in line with his best interests. He centered attention on this theme, developed it vividly and roundly, and finally dignified it by showing its relationship to the welfare of the whole nation. By transitional questions,\textsuperscript{40} colloquial terms for disparagement,\textsuperscript{41} indirect approach for disparagement,\textsuperscript{42} strong representation by voice of scorn,

\textsuperscript{40}Such phrasing of transitions increases their prospective force, for it concentrates the attention of the listeners upon a specified segment of the reasoning. Roosevelt used his questions thus: closing one segment with the words "we have done what we said we would do," he opened the following sentence with the question, "And what needed to be done?"

\textsuperscript{41}For example, he spoke of the Republican administration in the following fashion: "Do you want to turn it over to those who now make inconsistent, campaign-devised, half-baked promises which you and they know they cannot keep?"

\textsuperscript{42}Roosevelt minimized the Republican suggestion of tariff-equivalent payments by two devices: one, hesitation on the name of the plan as though it were too unfamiliar for one to be really certain of it; and the other, verbalization of this hesitation with the words, "I think they are called."
amusement, gravity, challenge and conviction—by these methods he dealt vigorously with his enthusiastic farm audience. And the President told Mayor Butler of Omaha on the way to the train at the conclusion of the address that he had never before had such an appreciative audience.

John T. Lambert pointed out that Roosevelt's speech was privately criticized on the basis that it might give his opponents too many openings, as on his defense of the tariff-trade treaties, for example. Two other arguments were severely attacked: his claim of Democratic credit for the improvement of the farmers' income and his defense of the

43 The effect of the closely-packed auditorium and the press of the thousands outside was doubtless greater upon the emotions and attitudes of a country audience, unused to the pressure of numbers. The sense of general excitement was pointed out by Mrs. Gilbert M. Hitchcock, widow of Nebraska's Senator. (Letter to writer, May 24, 1948) Also the influence of Farley's slighting reference to a "typical prairie state" may have put Nebraska upon its mettle in the quality of Roosevelt's reception. Note the key of this welcoming editorial in a Republican newspaper: "The keys of the city are his, the plaudits of its people and their neighbors. We hope the president of the United States will as thoroughly enjoy his visit as we of this typical prairie state enjoy his coming." Omaha Evening World-Herald, Oct. 10, 1936.

44 Ibid., Oct. 11, 1936.


46 This claim was challenged in view of the survey of world economic conditions prepared for the League of Nations, a report which cited "world-wide industrial recovery" as the major factor. Washington Post, Oct. 14, 1936.
cost of the Democratic farm program. Despite warm reception of this address in Omaha, Roosevelt continued his militant attitude on the agricultural issue as he pushed westward on his campaign tour. Thus Roosevelt seems to have met the situation with arguments and presentation highly acceptable to his immediate audience, regardless of interpretations vigorously questioned by his critics.

47 The Republican Committee issued a statement the following day, thanking Roosevelt for proving in this address that spenders couldn't be "trusted to balance the budget." New York Times, Oct. 12, 1936.
Crowell's Criticism of the Chicago Address

Address in Chicago, October 14

Roosevelt, swinging eastward on his speaking tour through "doubtful" Midwest states, delivered a powerful and politically astute address in the Chicago Stadium on October 14, 1936. Welcomed in this business-minded city by one hundred twenty-five thousand labor and ward marchers as well as by throngs on every street, and by laudatory speeches of introduction, Roosevelt assured the businessmen that their welfare had been the care of the Federal government and that they were, indeed, integral parts of the national structure.

The President had been told repeatedly on this Midwest tour by state leaders and candidates that his chief opposition in this area came from men with small and medium-sized businesses.\(^48\) Roosevelt's experienced political advisers indicated to him, however, that the "slide" to Democratic standards had begun;\(^49\) hence the time was likely considered ripe for an overture to small businessmen, who


\(^{49}\) Farley pointed out that private reports a few weeks before polling day made it clear to those experienced in politics that a "slide" was on. Behind the Ballots (New York, 1938, pp. 322-323.)
would now be seeking adjustments as they saw affairs beginning to take shape.

Roosevelt's argument attempted to show the businessmen that the administration had brought them recovery, that it neither had been, nor would be, antagonistic to their welfare. He specified benefits brought to six groups of men—depositors, investors, merchants, employers, railroad men, middlemen in farm products—but oversimplified the picture and assigned results to partial causes. He enhanced the strength of his argument (as in the Syracuse and Omaha addresses) by setting forth vividly the contrast between Democratic achievement and Republican failure. Listing the Democratic gains as steps taken in answer to needs felt by businessmen in 1933, he carefully differentiated between speculators and the majority of businessmen, declaring that he favored individual enterprise except at the expense of society.

With the exception of the opening salute to Chicago, all ethical proofs in this address sprang from the analysis of the Democratic government's achievements for business: Roosevelt emphasized his solicitation of good will by characterizing the ingratitude of businessmen who withheld credit due as patients who "throw their crutches at the doctor." No stronger pathetic proof could have been offered these businessmen than the contention woven throughout the
fabric of the entire address—that Roosevelt and his government had rescued private business from the plight into which the Republican administration had allowed it to fall. Denying that business had played a part in its own recovery, he forfeited this claim on the good will of his audience and maintained consistency with the thesis of his address.

Roosevelt's address to business used a significant metaphor to illustrate the principal thesis, comparing the rescue and repair of a derailed train with his administration's activities for the recovery of business; for a similar purpose he had used the baseball analogy in the Pittsburgh address and the changing car model comparison in the agriculture speech in Omaha. Using a conversational mode of speaking, Roosevelt appeared to be reasoning through these problems with his auditors, but he portrayed vocally his reactions of pride, conviction and irony.

The frequent storms of applause which punctuated the address were duplicated in the newspaper accounts of the effectiveness and vote-getting nature of the speech. The main challenges of the speech were to its sincerity to


its interpretation of the facts in the situation, and to the issues which the President omitted. There was some feeling that Roosevelt's assurances to business had dispelled fears, and persons close to the President predicted that he would carry Michigan and Illinois as a result of his work there in the last thirty-six hours. Hence it seems that Roosevelt's Chicago address showed him a clever campaigner in his deftness in discriminating between "the overwhelming majority of businessmen" and the monopolists, and in his encouragement to the business group to consider itself an integral part of the economic structure.

---

52 For example, his representation of high finance refusing credit to the industrialist, the businessman, etc. Washington Star, Oct. 15, 1936.

53 Roosevelt did not answer Governor Landon's direct question stated in his Detroit address of the preceding evening. "Does the administration plan to reenact the NRA?" New York Times, Oct. 14, 1936.

54 Hurd, Charles W., Ibid., Oct. 17, 1936.
HURD'S CRITICISM OF THE OMAHA ADDRESS

OMAHA, Oct. 10 - President Roosevelt in a speech here tonight declared that his farm program was designed to bring permanent prosperity to the farmer and denounced the Republican plan as one which could only lead the farmer back to the conditions of 1932.

He reviewed the accomplishments and philosophy of his emergency agricultural program and outlined plans for developing and expanding it along four major lines.

The long-time policy of the administration, as offered by the President, was based upon the following points:


2. Increasing consumer purchasing power so that the people can buy more and better food, thus making available "a larger and larger domestic market for the farmer."

3. An attack on the "evil of farm tenancy."

4. Making available to the farmer "a sound plan of crop insurance in kind against extreme fluctuations of supply and price."

Urges Norris Re-election

The President prefaced his address with a plea for the re-election of Senator George W. Norris, Progressive
Republican, running as an independent. He said the plea was "one magnificently justified exception" to his rule against participation in State elections. Senator Norris sat on the platform.

In assailing the Republican farm plan he said that it "would substitute a system of tariff equivalent payments, not for any permanent contribution to farm wealth or national income, but merely as a cash handout--or a dole."

"No plan could lead the nation back faster to such a crisis," he added, referring to the farm prices of 1932.

He charged that the Republicans have made promises that cannot be fulfilled in pledging both to cut government expenditures and to give farmers "a straight subsidy for unlimited production, or what amounts to a dole."

"What about the cost?" he asked, replying to his own question with the statement: "It would run to one and a half and even possibly two billion dollars every year. This vast sum would be spent not to save agriculture, but to wreck it."

Thousands in Overflow Crowd

At the end of a denunciation of Republican inactivity on behalf of the farmers in the past, Mr. Roosevelt asked if the farmers now wished to return control over agriculture to makers of "campaign-devised, half-baked promises which you know and they know they cannot keep."
The President's speech, the first major one of his 5,000-mile tour of the West and the first in his campaign dealing specifically with party differences over a major tangible issue, was at the Ak-Sar-Ben Coliseum.

The hall, the largest available in Omaha, was packed to its capacity of 12,000 and thousands outside heard the speech through amplifiers.

Noteworthy among the events of the evening was the presentation of the President by Mrs. Gilbert N. Hitchcock, widow of the former Senator and publisher of the Omaha World Herald. Mrs. Hitchcock is part owner of the paper, which is opposing Mr. Roosevelt's re-election.

The President was applauded frequently as he spoke and received an ovation when he closed.

The speech of the President was characterized by blunt phraseology.

He asserted that the Republican farm program "would end the farmers' program of co-operation," and finally "send them back to the free competition--or rugged individualism, if you will--that wrecked them in 1932."

Concerning the proposed "cash handout--or a dole," he declared that "these payments would be made only to the producers of exportable farm crops--specifically on hogs, wheat, cotton and tobacco."
"Dairymen, cattlemen, sugar growers and producers of other crops of which there normally is no exportable surplus would be left out," he added.

He charged that the Republican program would subsidize unlimited production and contended that "in a year or two of normal weather it would pile surplus on top of surplus, driving prices down and down."

"It is the Federal Farm Board all over again," he said, adding.

"Finally, to make the parallel with 1932 letter perfect, the Republican leaders now propose to repeal the Reciprocal Tariff Act and go back to the Smoot-Hawley tariff policy. Once again, as in 1932, the farmers would have price-crushing surpluses at home and no place to sell them abroad."

Charges Inconsistencies

After estimating the cost of the Republican plan he asserted that his opposition is trying to take two impossible steps concurrently.

"Either this plan which they advocate in the West," he said, "or the curtailment of expenditures they talk about in the East would have to be discarded. Both promises cannot possibly be carried out."

The President summarized in "seven sentences" what his administration has done to restore farm prosperity.
"That is the record," he announced with finality after reading off the seven points.

"For the first time in many cruel years," he asserted, "we are getting the problem of the business of farming well in hand. Do you now want to turn over that problem to the care of those who did nothing about it in the past? Do you want to turn it over to those who now make inconsistent campaign-devised, half-baked promises which you and they know they cannot keep?"

Turning to a criticism of his program to the effect that the administration "brings out a new model every year," as do automobile manufacturers, President Roosevelt laughed and frankly conceded the charge.

Farming conditions change from year to year, he pointed out, and accordingly methods must be changed to meet the new conditions.

"Passed Beyond Model T"

"It is the aim of our policy," he said, "not only to prevent the return of yesterday's model but to make tomorrow's model better than today's. Good as it was for its day, we have passed beyond model T farming."

He then discussed the four phases of his farm program which he proposed to develop and expand as major foundations for permanent farm prosperity.
He pointed out that the farm program also includes conservation of soil resources, and he added significantly that on Oct. 25, 1935, several months before the Supreme Court invalidated the Agricultural Adjustment Act, he announced that this emergency act was only the first phase in developing a more permanent plan for American agriculture.

The President struck out indirectly at those who have accused his administration of a "program of scarcity" by saying that the administration was "committed to a philosophy of continuous plenty" and that "we have set ourselves resolutely against waste—waste that comes from unneeded production, waste that imperils the nation's future by draining away the abundance with which God has enriched our soil."

The speech tonight closed the second day of an intensive campaign which will take President Roosevelt as far west as Denver, where he will speak Monday after spending tomorrow at Cheyenne.

Later next week he will deliver other major addresses in Chicago and Detroit and make tours of Michigan and Ohio.

Mr. Roosevelt divided his time today between public appearances and conferences with political leaders aimed at
unifying Democratic leadership in the State and overcoming differences caused by his espousal of the candidacy of Senator Norris.
HURD'S CRITICISM OF THE CHICAGO ADDRESS

CHICAGO, Oct. 14 - Business men of America were told by President Roosevelt tonight in straight-from-the-shoulder language that his administration had saved them from ruin, rather than hurt them. The address, one of the major speeches of the President's campaign for re-election, was delivered from the same platform where he accepted the nomination in 1932.

He stated emphatically that the "system of private profit and free enterprise" had been saved by government action, and could have been saved only in such a manner from monopolies developed under Republican administrations. These monopolies, he declared, set up "a kind of private government" which regimented "other people's money and other people's lives."

Denouncing the "fairy tales" of his opponents, used "to spread fear among the American people," Mr. Roosevelt said:

"The answer to that is the record of what we have done. It was this administration which saved the system of private profit and free enterprise after it had been dragged to the brink of ruin by these same leaders who now try to scare you."
Puts Questions to Listeners

The speech was broadcast over nation-wide radio chains. He put questions to his millions of listeners asking whether they were bank depositors, merchants or investors, and telling each what he owed to the administration.

"Today for the first time in seven years," he said, "the banker, the storekeeper, the small factory owner, the industrialist, can all sit back and enjoy the company of their ledgers. They are in the black. That is where we want them to be; that is where our policies aim them to be; that is where we intend them to be in the future.

"Some of these people really forget how sick they were. But I know how sick they were. I have their fever charts. I know how the knees of all our rugged individualists were trembling four years ago and how their hearts fluttered.

"They came to Washington in great numbers. Washington did not look like a dangerous bureaucracy to them then. Oh! No. It looked like an emergency hospital. All of the distinguished patients wanted two things—a quick hypodermic to end the pain and a course of treatment to cure the disease. We gave them both. And now most of the patients seem to be doing very nicely."
"Some of them are even well enough to throw their crutches at the doctor."

26,000 Pack the Stadium

The President made his speech before 26,000 persons who packed the Chicago Stadium, while uncounted thousands jammed the streets around the stadium, in order to see him enter and leave, and to listen to the talk through amplifiers.

His reception in Chicago showed the results of weeks of organization by the two Chicago Democratic leaders, Mayor Edward J. Kelly and Patrick A. Nash, Cook County Democratic chairman. The two leaders said that 250,000 people joined in welcoming Mr. Roosevelt. Thousands, estimated in some quarters as 150,000, participated in a parade that preceded the address, while the others stood in close-packed ranks on the sidewalks.

Never has Mr. Roosevelt been in better form, although his speech was delivered after a strenuous day which included a notable reception at St. Louis, where he spoke, and the delivery of six brief platform speeches in Illinois cities on his way.

He left tonight for a tour through Michigan tomorrow, ending with another major address in Detroit tomorrow night.
Pictures a Chicago Contrast

Mr. Roosevelt, opening his speech tonight, pictured a contrast between the Chicago of 1932 with its "factories closed, markets silent, banks shaky, ships and trains empty," and the Chicago of 1936, where "markets hum with bustling movement, banks are secure, ships and trains are running full," altogether "a city that smiles."

The interdependence of all activities, or the "rounded whole" of the United States, was dwelt upon: Bank deposits were safer today than any time in history; stocks and bonds are at "five and six year high levels," markets have been revived, industrial earnings are at four to seven year high levels and railroad business is increasing "because your government made the railroads cut rates and make money."

Challenging the argument that recovery "just happened," Mr. Roosevelt declared "we acted" and made it happen by a deliberate policy of saying "the American system of private enterprise and economic democracy." The previous administration, he declared, had done nothing because it "was not industrially minded--nor business-minded," but "was high-finance-minded, manned and controlled by a handful of men who in turn controlled and, by one financial device or another, took their toll from the greater part of all other business or industry."
Charges Aimed at a Minority

Mr. Roosevelt explained immediately that he was not criticizing all business or all business men, for the "overwhelming majority of business men in this country are good citizens." He referred, he explained, to a "minority who speculate with other people's money," and who say "popular government cannot be trusted."

"All that this administration has done, all that it proposes to do—and this it does propose to do," he said, "is to use every power and authority of the Federal Government to protect the commerce of America from the selfish forces which ruined it."

At another point he remarked: "We have had no Teapot Dome."

He listed the administration's five accomplishments in aiding business men as follows: (1) The stopping of deflation, (2) increased purchasing power of industrial workers in cities, (3) increased purchasing power of farmers, (4) decreased interest and transportation rates, (5) protection from losses due to crime, bank robbers, kidnappers and blackmailers. Business "did not get out of the ditch itself, it was hauled out by your government."

During "the years of false prosperity," he asserted, "a total of half the industrial wealth of the country had come under the control of less than 200 huge corporations"
which "themselves were tied together by interlocking directors, interlocking bankers, and interlocking lawyers."

"The people of America have no quarrel with business," he added. "They insist only that the power of concentrated wealth shall not be abused."

The reception given to the President outdid anything, according to local observers, that Chicago had achieved in recent years.

In the streets all ordinary police precautions were thrown aside, and for most of the ride of three miles and a half from the Illinois Central station to the stadium the crowds were permitted to overflow from the sidewalks into the streets, where spectators were literally close enough to touch the President's shoulder as he drove by in an open car, waving his hat in response to the greeting.

The crowd invented a new sport, booing newspaper correspondents. Epithets and sometimes obscenities were flung at the correspondents' ears as they passed.

The trip to the stadium took forty minutes. Not even for the national convention of 1932 was the stadium in such gala attire. Great floodlights, with colored shields before them, threw a rainbow across the white-walled structure, and daylight was simulated by the burning of large numbers of powerful flares, which added other bright tones to the spectacle of throngs massed on the plaza bordering
the stadium. The crowd outside was so dense that there was barely enough room remaining to provide a circular drive through which the Presidential party's cars could pass.

On entering the stadium, Mr. Roosevelt was greeted by an ovation which lasted for twelve minutes while the crowd roared and bands and the stadium organ played. The applause was finally stopped on a signal by Mr. Nash, so that the program could proceed in time to permit the President to "go on the air" promptly at 9:30 o'clock.

Kelly Cites Crowd as Evidence

"The 150,000 persons who marched on foot to this meeting and those inside constitute the best evidence of what we think of the President," Mayor Kelly said in presenting Mr. Roosevelt.

When the President stepped to the microphones there was another thunderous ovation which he stopped.

Despite the request for no applause there were frequent short outbursts. Although the route of the President's ride had been fringed with thousands of banners which called for his re-election, in the stadium only one banner was displayed: "Not a national bank failure from October, 1935 to October, 1936. A record for fifty-five years." High against the roof were two maps, one depicting the location of 8,923 bank suspensions "before Roosevelt," and the other
that of sixty-six which have failed since he became President.

Delayed five minutes in starting, by his introduction and the demonstration when he stepped to the speaker's desk, President Roosevelt exceeded the half-hour radio space by six minutes.

As he finished he was cheered again, and the demonstration continued until he disappeared from view of the crowd, to enter his car and return to his train.
APPENDIX C

CAMPAIGN ADDRESS AT OMAHA, NEBRASKA

OCTOBER 10, 1936

Mrs. Hitchcock, Governor Cochran, Mr. Mayor, you my friends of Nebraska and neighboring States:

I am glad to come back to Nebraska after an absence of only a few weeks; and I am especially glad to come for the first time to this marvelous Aksarben Coliseum, and to receive your greetings.

First of all, a word to you as Nebraskans. I hope that this word will be heard by the citizens of the other forty-seven States, because I know that what I am going to say represents the conviction of the great majority of those who are devoted to good government, clean government, representative government.

On this platform sits a man whose reputation for many years has been known in every community—a man old in years but young in heart—a man who through all these years has had no boss but his own conscience—the Senior Senator from the State of Nebraska, given to the Nation by the people of Nebraska—George W. Norris.

Outside of my own State of New York, I have consistently refrained from taking part in elections in any other State.
But Senator Norris' name has been entered as a candidate for Senator from Nebraska. And to my rule of non-participation in State elections I have made—and so long as he lives I always will make—one magnificently justified exception.

George Norris' candidacy transcends State and party lines. In our national history we have had few elder statesmen who like him have preserved the aspirations of youth as they accumulated the wisdom of years.

He is one of the major prophets of America.

Help this great American to continue an historic career of service.

Nebraska will be doing a great service not only to itself, but to every other State in the Union and to the Nation as a whole, if it places this great American above partisanship, and keeps George Norris in the Senate of the United States.

I want to take you back four years, to 1932. In that year, when I was a candidate for the Presidency, I pledged my Administration to a farm policy that would help the farmer. Tonight every man and woman on an American farm, east or west, who has read today's market reports knows that we have done what we said we would do.

What needed to be done?
You remember that in March, 1933, after twelve lean years, farm income was disappearing and farm prices had sunk to a bankruptcy level.

In 1932 America's farm population was the greatest in our history, and yet the farmers' income was the lowest for the quarter century for which we have records. Farmers represented 25 percent of the Nation's population—but they got only $7\frac{1}{2}$ percent of the national income.

The spectre of foreclosure stalked the farmer's plow.

American agriculture was on the road to pauperism. When the World War ended, the Nations of Europe whom we had been feeding went back to farming for themselves. Our farmers were left holding the bag—a bag that bulged with vast quantities of wheat and corn and cotton for which the market had disappeared.

That was the farmer's plight. What did Republican leadership do about it?

The best that it could offer was the Farm Board, a contraption that set an all-time high for extravagant futility. It met the problem of unsalable and unexplorable surpluses by piling up bigger surpluses.

To finish the job, the Republican Smoot-Hawley tariff robbed the farmer of his last chance for a foreign market.
We found that this conspicuous failure of Government to help the farmer had created--by March 4, 1933--a state of mind in the Nation which, itself, seemed to bar the way out for the farmer's difficulties. There was a defeatist attitude--a conviction that the farmer could not be helped, that all efforts were foredoomed to failure, that any party which dared to substitute action for talk would get its political fingers burned.

Along with this defeatism there was the belief that money spent on the farm problem was money wasted--that the only excuse for spending it was to keep the farmer in line--to buy political peace.

That was what had happened to American agriculture when this Administration came into office.

That was the debris of twelve years of failure which we had to clear away before we could begin to lay the basis for a permanent agricultural prosperity.

Tonight you know that the ground has been cleared of that debris. After twelve years in which he has been harassed and weighed down by the burdens of each succeeding day, the farmer at last has begun to get into the clear, so that he can begin again to take thought for tomorrow.

Back of what we did was the conviction that the agricultural problem is not a problem for the farmer alone--
that it is a problem for the Nation as a whole. That is the way we attacked it.

And the Nation is now going along with the farmer. Now for the first time in this industrial period of our history, the American people understand that there is a definite bond between agriculture and industry, that the money we have used for the restoration of American agriculture has been an investment in the restoration of American industry, an underwriting for the wages of American labor, a stimulus for profits in American business.

The defeatist attitude has at last itself been defeated.

Back of what we did was a second conviction—that a sound farm policy must be a policy run by farmers. Ours is that kind of policy. The farmers of America moved into the Department of Agriculture on the day that Henry Wallace set up shop there. For the very first time, a national farm program was made in conference with, and with the agreement of, the farm leaders of all our farm organizations—a program which came out of the free and open councils of farmers rather than out of the vote-catching schemes of politicians.

With these convictions, this Administration put its hand to the plow. It has not turned, it will not turn, back.

I am going to tell you in just seven sentences
what we have done. Every man and woman on an American farm can expand these seven sentences in terms of the recovery that has come to each of them in the last three and a half years.

First, by our Agricultural Adjustment Act, our monetary policy, our soil conservation program, and our assistance to farm cooperatives, we have raised the farmers' net annual income by three and a half billion dollars to a sum three times what it was in 1932.

Second, through the Farm Credit Administration we have saved thousands of homes and farms from foreclosure and have reduced the staggering burden of the farmers' debts.

Third, through reciprocal trade treaties and international currency stabilization, we have begun to recover the farmers' foreign markets in the only way in which they can be recovered and held—by a policy of mutual international advantage which today is bearing fruit in the reopening of markets for American farm products in all of the fourteen countries making these agreements—by a policy which, for example, within the last ten days has brought about lower tariffs in France, Italy and Switzerland for the benefit of our farmers. And, my friends, a growing trade is making for international peace.

Fourth, by our program to revive business, to
increase employment, to raise business and professional incomes and the wages of labor, and to increase the purchasing power and consumption of the average American family, we have restored national income, and prepared the way for the steady and long-time expansion of the farmers' home market.

Fifth, by our program of land use and conservation we have ended the policy of immediate glut and eventual waste, and have laid the basis for a permanent plenty.

Sixth, by our program of rural electrification, by our farm-to-market roads, by our aid to rural schools, we have begun to get for the farmer his fair share in the comforts, the advantages, the wider interests and the deeper satisfactions which go to make the good life for himself and for his children.

And seventh, when disastrous drought struck the land in many parts of our country, we rushed immediate and direct relief to the farmers and stockmen to save them from want—a policy that some people call waste, but that you and I call wise.

There is the record. In those seven sentences, the farmer and the farmer's family can measure for themselves the vast difference between the desperation which was theirs in the spring of 1933 and the recovery which is theirs in
1936. From what that record has done and is doing for you, judge for yourselves our determination and our capacity to carry this program through.

After having neglected a twelve-year opportunity for help to the American farmer, as his condition got worse and worse, what does Republican leadership now offer?

First of all, it would scrap the present program, which it has condemned as a "subterfuge" and a "stop-gap." It would junk the farmers' organization to carry it out. It would end the farmers' program of cooperation, and send them back to the "free competition"--or "rugged individual-ism" if you will--that wrecked them in 1932.

Next, it would substitute a system of tariff equivalent payments, not for any permanent contribution to farm wealth or national income, but merely as a cash hand-out--in other words, a dole. These payments, under their plan, would be made only to the producers of exportable farm crops--specifically hogs, wheat, cotton and tobacco. Dairy-men, cattlemen, sugar growers and producers of other varieties of crops of which there normally is no exportable surplus would be left out.

What about the effect of such a scheme? Would it serve to protect farmers from price collapse under a burden of surpluses? Would it guard them in the future against a disaster like 1932?
No plan could lead the Nation back faster to such a crisis.

The proposed plan of the Republican leaders is a straight subsidy of unlimited farm production. In a year or two of normal weather, it would pile surplus on top of surplus, driving prices down and down and down. It is the Federal Farm Board all over again, and it means nine cents for corn again as it did in 1932.

Finally, to make the parallel with 1932 letter perfect, the Republican leaders now propose to repeal the Reciprocal Tariff Act, and go back to the old Smoot-Hawley tariff policy. Once again, as in 1932, the farmers would have price-crushing surpluses at home, and no place abroad to sell them.

What about the cost? It would run to one and a half and possibly even two billion dollars every year. This vast sum would be spent not to save agriculture, but to wreck it and with it to wreck the Nation.

Either this plan which they advocate in the West, or the curtailment of expenditures which they talk about in the East, would have to be discarded. Both promises cannot possibly be carried out at the same time.

For the first time in many cruel years, we are getting the problem of the business of farming well in hand. Do you now want to turn that problem over to the
care of those who did nothing about it in the past? Do you
want to turn it over to those who now make inconsistent,
campaign-devised, half-baked promises which you and they
know they cannot keep?

It has been said that the Administration's farm
program changes each year like new models of automobiles.
I accept that simile. The automobile of today is the same
kind of vehicle, in principle, as it was twenty years ago.
But because the automobile manufacturer did not hesitate to
pioneer, because he was willing to make yearly changes in
his model, the Nation now drives a car that is vastly
improved. Farming, too, is the same in principle now as
it has always been. But because the farmer has been willing
to pioneer, because, with the aid of scientists, economists
and engineers he has been willing, year after year, to
change, because of these things both the product of the
farms and the business of farming have been vastly improved.
It is the aim of our policy not only to prevent the return
of yesterday's model, but to make tomorrow's model better
than today's. Good as it was in the old days, we have
passed beyond Model-T farming.

Our long-time policy of prudence and farm progress
includes a program of conservation against land wastage and
soil impoverishment. From the beginning, such a program
has been basic in our plans. On October, 25, 1935, months
before the action of the Supreme Court on the Triple A, I said publicly that it was the intention of the framers of that Act as it was my intention "to pass from the purely emergency phases necessitated by a grave national crisis to a long-time more permanent plan for American agriculture."

We knew that our soil had been recklessly impoverished by crops which did not pay. Because we stand committed to a philosophy of continuous plenty, we have set ourselves resolutely against waste—waste that comes from unneeded production, waste that imperils the Nation's future by draining away the abundance with which God has enriched our soil.

Increasing production alone in an unlimited way appeals to no person who thinks the problem through. Increasing consumption must go hand in hand with it. Here is a simple figure to mull over. If every family in the United States had enough earning capacity to live on what the doctors and dietitians call a Class-A Diet, we would need foodstuffs from forty million acres more than we are using today. America's diet is better than that of most other Nations, but from the point of view of better national health, it is still inadequate. I seek to increase purchasing power so that people can pay for more food and better food, and in turn provide a larger and larger domestic market for the farmer.
It is a further part of our long-time farm policy to attack the evil of farm tenancy. In this we have already made a good beginning with lower interest rates and better prices. We are preparing legislation, in cooperation with farm leaders, to submit to the Congress in January to help solve this problem. We cannot, as a Nation, be content until we have reached the ultimate objective of every farm family owning its own farm.

Further, we propose to give to the farmer and to the consumer, a sound plan of crop insurance in kind against extreme fluctuations of supply and of price. No one wins from such fluctuations except the speculator. The farmer and the consumer lose together. That is why crop insurance is a protection for both. At one and the same time it banishes the consumer's fear of a food shortage and the farmer's fear of a food surplus. Until both are protected, neither is safe. The ultimate interests of the farmer and the consumer of America are the same.

That, my friends, is why I am not making one kind of speech to the farmers out here and another kind of speech to consumers in the big cities of the East. The same speech and the same policy must go for both.

It has taken a lot of education in these last few years, but the city dweller has now come to know that unless the farmer receives fair prices for what he produces, he
cannot buy the things that are turned out in the shops and factories of the cities.

And so we plan for the future of agriculture—security for those who have spent their lives in farming; opportunity for real careers for young men and women on the farms; a share for farmers in the good things of life abundant enough to justify and preserve our instinctive faith in the land.

In all our plans we are guided, and will continue to be guided, by the fundamental belief that the American farmer, living on his own land, remains our ideal of self-reliance and of spiritual balance—the source from which the reservoirs of the Nation's strength are constantly renewed. It is from the men and women of our farms, living close to the soil that this Nation, like the Greek giant Antaeus, touches Mother Earth and rises with strength renewed a hundredfold.

We want to perpetuate that ideal, we want to perpetuate it under modern conditions, so that man may be strong in the ancient virtues and yet lay hold of the advantages which science and new knowledge offer to a well-rounded life.
Mr. Chairman, Governor Horner, Mayor Kelly, my friends of the great State of Illinois:

I seem to have been here before. Four years ago I dropped into this city from the airways—an old friend come in a new way—to accept in this hall the nomination for the Presidency of the United States. I came to a Chicago fighting with its back to the wall—factories closed, markets silent, banks shaky, ships and trains empty. Today those factories sing the song of industry; markets hum with bustling movement; banks are secure; ships and trains are running full. Once again it is Chicago as Carl Sandburg saw it—"The City of the big shoulders"—the city that smiles. And with Chicago a whole Nation that had not been cheerful for years is full of cheer once more.

On this trip through the Nation I have talked to farmers, I have talked to miners, I have talked to industrial workers; and in all that I have seen and heard one fact has been clear as crystal—that they are part and parcel of a rounded whole, and that none of them can succeed in his chosen occupation if those in the other occupations fail in their prosperity. I have driven home that point.

Tonight, in this center of business, I give the
same message to the business men of America—to those who make and sell the processed goods the Nation uses and to the men and women who work for them.

To them I say:

Do you have a deposit in the bank? It is safer today than it has ever been in our history. It is guaranteed. Last October 1st marked the end of the first full year in fifty-five years without a single failure of a national bank in the United States. Is that not on the credit side of the Government's account with you?

Are you an investor? Your stocks and bonds are up to five-and six-year high levels.

Are you a merchant? Your markets have the precious life-blood of purchasing power. Your customers on the farms have better incomes and smaller debts. Your customers in the cities have more jobs, surer jobs, better jobs. Did not your Government have something to do with that?

Are you in industry? Industrial earnings, industrial profits are the highest in four, six, or even seven years! Bankruptcies are at a new low. Your Government takes some credit for that.

Are you in railroads? Freight loadings are steadily going up. Passenger receipts are steadily going up—have in some cases doubled—because your Government made the railroads cut rates and make money.
Are you a middleman in the great stream of farm products? The meat and grain that move through your yards and elevators have a steadier supply, a steadier demand and steadier prices than you have known for years. And your Government is trying to keep it that way.

Some people say that all this recovery has just happened. But in a complicated modern world recoveries from depressions do not just happen. The years from 1929 to 1933, when we waited for recovery just to happen, prove the point.

But in 1933 we did not wait. We acted. Behind the growing recovery of today is a story of deliberate Government acceptance of responsibility to save business, to save the American system of private enterprise and economic democracy—a record unequaled by any modern Government in history.

What had the previous Administration in Washington done for four years? Nothing. Why? For a very fundamental reason. That Administration was not industrially-minded or agriculturally-minded or business-minded. It was high-finance-minded—manned and controlled by a handful of men who in turn controlled and by one financial device or another took their toll from the greater part of all other business and industry.

Let me make one simple statement. When I refer to high finance I am not talking about all great bankers, or
all great corporation executives, or all multimillionaires—any more than Theodore Roosevelt, in using the term "male-factors of great wealth," implied that all men of great wealth were "malefactors." I do not even imply that the majority of them are bad citizens. The opposite is true.

Just in the same way, the overwhelming majority of business men in this country are good citizens and the proportion of those who are not is probably about the same proportion as in the other occupations and professions of life.

When I speak of high finance as a harmful factor in recent years, I am speaking about a minority which includes the type of individual who speculates with other people's money—and you in Chicago know the kind I refer to—and also the type of individual who says that popular government cannot be trusted and, therefore, that the control of business of all kinds and, indeed, of Government itself should be vested in the hands of one hundred or two hundred all-wise individuals controlling the pursestrings of the Nation.

High finance of this type refused to permit Government credit to go directly to the industrialist, to the business man, to the home-owner, to the farmer. They wanted it to trickle down from the top, through the intricate
arrangements which they controlled and by which they were able to levy tribute on every business in the land.

They did not want interest rates to be reduced by the use of Government funds, for that would affect the rate of interest which they themselves wanted to charge. They did not want Government supervision over financial markets through which they manipulated their monopolies with other people's money.

And in the face of their demands that Government do nothing that they called "unsound," the Government, hypnotized by its indebtedness to them, stood by and let the depression drive industry and business toward bankruptcy.

America is an economic unit. New means and methods of transportation and communications have made us economically as well as politically a single Nation.

Because kidnappers and bank robbers could in high-powered cars speed across state lines it became necessary, in order to protect our people, to invoke the power of the Federal Government. In the same way speculators and manipulators from across State lines, and regardless of State laws, have lured the unsuspecting and the unwary to financial destruction. In the same way across State lines, there have been built up intricate corporate structures,
piling bond upon stock and stock upon bond--huge monopolies which were stifling independent business and private enterprise.

There was no power under Heaven that could protect the people against that sort of thing except a people's Government at Washington. All that this Administration has done, all that it proposes to do--and this is does propose to do--is to use every power and authority of the Federal Government to protect the commerce of America from the selfish forces which ruined it.

Always, month in and month out, during these three and a half years, your Government has had but one sign on its desk--"Seek only the greater good of the greater number of Americans." And in appraising the record, remember two things. First, this Administration was called upon to act after a previous Administration and all the combined forces of private enterprise had failed. Secondly, in spite of all the demand for speed, the complexity of the problems and all the vast sums of money involved, we have had no Teapot Dome.

We found when we came to Washington in 1933, that the business and industry of the Nation were like a train which had gone off the rails into a ditch. Our first job was to get it out of the ditch and start it up the track again as far as the repair shops. Our next job was to make
repairs—on the broken axles which had gotten it off the road, on the engine which had been worn down by gross misuse.

What was it that the average businessman wanted Government to do for him—to do immediately in 1933?

1. Stop deflation and falling prices—and we did it.

2. Increase the purchasing power of his customers who were industrial workers in the cities—and we did it.

3. Increase the purchasing power of his customers on the farms—and we did it.

4. Decrease interest rates, power rates and transportation rates—and we did it.

5. Protect him from the losses due to crime, bank robbers, kidnappers, blackmailers—and we did it.

How did we do it? By a sound monetary policy which raised prices. By reorganizing the banks of the Nation and insuring their deposits. By bringing the business men of the Nation together and encouraging them to pay higher wages, to shorten working hours, and to discourage that minority among their own members who were engaging in unfair competition and unethical business practices.

Through the A.A.A., through our cattle-buying program, through our program of drought relief and flood relief, through the Farm Credit Administration, we raised the income of the customers of business who lived on the farms. By our
program to provide work for the unemployed, by our C.C.C. camps, and other measures, greater purchasing power was given to those who lived in our cities.

Money began going round again. The dollars paid out by Government were spent in the stores and shops of the Nation; and spent again to the wholesaler; and spent again to the factory; and spent again to the wage earner; and then spent again in another store and shop. The wheels of business began to turn again; the train was back on the rails.

Mind you, it did not get out of the ditch itself, it was hauled out by your Government.

And we hauled it along the road. P.W.A., W.P.A., both provided normal and useful employment for hundreds of thousands of workers. Hundreds of millions of dollars got into circulation when we liquidated the assets of closed banks through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation; millions more when we loaned money for home building and home financing through the Federal Housing program; hundreds of millions more in loans and grants to enable municipalities to build needed improvements; hundreds of millions more through the C.C.C. camps.

I am not going to talk tonight about how much our program to provide work for the unemployed meant to the Nation as a whole. That cannot be measured in dollars and
cents. It can be measured only in terms of the preservation of the families of America.

But so far as business goes, it can be measured in terms of sales made and goods moving.

The train of American business is moving ahead.

But you people know what I mean when I say it is clear that if the train is to run smoothly again the cars will have to be loaded more evenly. We have made a definite start in getting the train loaded more evenly, in order that axles may not break again.

For example, we have provided a sounder and cheaper money market and a sound banking and securities system. You business men know how much legitimate business you lost in the old days because your customers were robbed by fake securities or impoverished by shaky banks.

By our monetary policy we have kept prices up and lightened the burden of debt. It is easier to get credit. It is easier to repay.

We have encouraged cheaper power for the small factory owner to lower his cost of production.

We have given the business man cheaper transportation rates.

But above all, we have fought to break the deadly grip which monopoly has in the past been able to fasten on the business of the Nation.
Because we cherished our system of private property and free enterprise and were determined to preserve it as the foundation of our traditional American system, we recalled the warning of Thomas Jefferson that "widespread poverty and concentrated wealth cannot long endure side by side in a democracy."

Our job was to preserve the American ideal of economic as well as political democracy, against the abuse of concentration of economic power that had been insidiously growing up among us in the past fifty years, particularly during the twelve years of preceding Administrations. Free economic enterprise was being weeded out at an alarming pace.

During those years of false prosperity and during the more recent years of exhausting depression, one business after another, one small corporation after another, their resources depleted, had failed or had fallen into the lap of a bigger competitor.

A dangerous thing was happening. Half of the industrial corporate wealth of the country had come under the control of less than two hundred huge corporations. That is not all. These huge corporations in some cases did not even try to compete with each other. They themselves were tied together by interlocking directors, interlocking bankers, interlocking lawyers.
This concentration of wealth and power has been built upon other people's money, other people's business, other people's labor. Under this concentration independent business was allowed to exist only by sufferance. It has been a menace to the social system as well as to the economic system which we call American democracy.

There is no excuse for it in the cold terms of industrial efficiency.

There is no excuse for it from the point of view of the average investor.

There is no excuse for it from the point of view of the independent business man.

I believe, I have always believed, and I will always believe in private enterprise as the backbone of economic well-being in the United States.

But I know, and you know, and every independent business man who has had to struggle against the competition of monopolies knows, that this concentration of economic power in all-embracing corporations does not represent private enterprise as we Americans cherish it and propose to foster it. On the contrary, it represents private enterprise which has become a kind of private government, a power unto itself—a regimentation of other people's money and other people's lives.

Back in Kansas I spoke about bogey-men and fairy
tales which the real Republican leaders, many of whom are part of this concentrated power, are using to spread fear among the American people.

You good people have heard about these fairy tales and bogey-men too. You have heard about how antagonistic to business this Administration is supposed to be. You have heard all about the dangers which the business of America is supposed to be facing if this Administration continues.

The answer to that is the record of what we have done. It was this Administration which saved the system of private profit and free enterprise after it had been dragged to the brink of ruin by these same leaders who now try to scare you.

Look at the advance in private business in the last three and a half years; and read there what we think about private business.

Today for the first time in seven years the banker, the storekeeper, the small factory owner, the industrialist, can all sit back and enjoy the company of their own ledgers. They are in the black. That is where we want them to be; that is where our policies aim them to be; that is where we intend them to be in the future.

Some of these people really forget how sick they were. But I know how sick they were. I have their fever
charts. I know how the knees of all of our rugged individualists were trembling four years ago and how their hearts fluttered. They came to Washington in great numbers. Washington did not look like a dangerous bureaucracy to them then. Oh, no! It looked like an emergency hospital. All of the distinguished patients wanted two things—a quick hypodermic to end the pain and a course of treatment to cure the disease. They wanted them in a hurry; we gave them both. And now most of the patients seem to be doing very nicely. Some of them are even well enough to throw their crutches at the doctor.

The struggle against private monopoly is a struggle for, and not against, American business. It is a struggle to preserve individual enterprise and economic freedom.

I believe in individualism. I believe in it in the arts, the sciences and professions. I believe in it in business. I believe in individualism in all of these things—up to the point where the individualist starts to operate at the expense of society. The overwhelming majority of American business men do not believe in it beyond that point. We have all suffered in the past from individualism run wild. Society has suffered and business has suffered.

Believing in the solvency of business, the solvency of farmers and the solvency of workers, I believe also in the solvency of Government. Your Government is solvent.
The net Federal debt today is lower in proportion to the income of the Nation and in proportion to the wealth of the Nation than it was on March 4, 1933.

In the future it will become lower still because with the rising tide of national income and national wealth, the very causes of our emergency spending are starting to disappear. Government expenditures are coming down and Government income is going up. The opportunities for private enterprise will continue to expand.

The people of America have no quarrel with business. They insist only that the power of concentrated wealth shall not be abused.

We have come through a hard struggle to preserve democracy in America. Where other Nations in other parts of the world have lost that fight, we have won.

The business men of America and all other citizens have joined in a firm resolve to hold the fruits of that victory, to cling to the old ideals and old fundamentals upon which America has grown great.