Introduction

On the morning of September 11, 2001, four airliners hijacked by terrorists took an awful toll of life in the Eastern United States. Ask those who lived through that day what they first did upon hearing of the events and most will report they went to the nearest television or radio to find out what was happening. Most will also report that they searched out media in a commons where they watched and talked about the event with others. Although it is true that we engage in communication to learn all we can in such moments of confusion and uncertainty, equally certain is that our search for information is motivated by our search to understand the meaning of such stark events. We receive very little information from those friends, workmates, or even non-acquaintances with whom we watch the television set, but with them we share memories of other such moments, speculate on who is responsible, and exchange opinions about responding to the events. And at times like these, we demand to hear from the leaders of our culture. Indeed, one of the early themes in response to such events is: "When will we hear from the president?" And in such moments writing will not do. We demand that our leaders speak to us. When they do, they tell us what they know about the situation and how they plan to respond in our name. All of this web of communication in which we are immersed is rhetorical discourse. We seek meaning in a process that involves others and does so by knitting events into the texture of our history, our commitments, and our times.

On August 28, 1963, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., stood in the shadow of a massive statue of Abraham Lincoln and declared that he had a dream. Initial national response to his speech was not particularly dramatic. Newspapers reported the Rally for Civil Rights the next day and noted that King spoke, but they did not generally feature his speech.[1] But King touched a chord in his time, and as the years passed, as his cause advanced civil rights, and after he was assassinated in Memphis, his speech grew in stature. The speech articulated a motivation for African Americans' struggle for inclusion in American culture, a motivation deeply rooted in the values and motives of the American experience. In 2000, the speech was voted the most powerful of the twentieth century by experts on American speaking.[2] Even forty years later, the playing of King's words touches a chord with students and the public, bringing tears to the eyes of many.

These two days represent two of the most dramatic instances of the power of rhetorical discourse. These two motivations – people coming to terms with the public crises of their time and leaders seeking to guide the direction of their public culture – are the two great motivations for rhetorical discourse. This collection

presents exemplars of nearly four centuries of discourse in the American public arena for which this introduction provides a guide for study.

I. What is "rhetorical discourse"?

In its broadest usage, "discourse" is the product of any process of communication. A common dictionary definition is "verbal interchange of ideas." An even more specific definition found in many dictionaries narrows the concept to "formal and orderly and usually extended expression of thought on a subject." The material contained in this volume fits these narrower definitions.

A more difficult question is: What makes a discourse *rhetorical*? The term "rhetoric" is not a term with a stable meaning. One of its most common uses is a pejorative characterization of discourse as empty and without substantial meaning. "What we need is less rhetoric, and more action!" goes a political bromide. Clearly this is a definition of no use in understanding the content of this volume. Others use the term with nearly the opposite meaning: the discourse generated by an accomplished artist of language who is able to effectively and persuasively influence others. Such a definition is closer to the use in this volume, but we need to complicate it a bit.

Rhetoric has been a focus of Western philosophers, teachers, and researchers for 2500 years. Although the definitions that have guided this study of rhetoric vary, they organize into three clusters. The first is exemplified by Quintilian's definition: "a good man speaking well."[3] Quintilian was a citizen of Rome, son of a teacher of rhetoric, and a teacher of rhetoric himself. His definition stressed the aesthetic art of rhetoric. As students of rhetoric, we study the character of the speaker, the speech, and the general principles of good speaking. We evaluate the speaker by his/her modeling of our ideals. The speaker is a person of the highest ethical and moral principles who is accomplished in the beauty of speaking.

A second cluster is exemplified by Aristotle's definition in his treatise *Rhetorica*: "discovering in the particular case what are the available means of persuasion."[4] This definition stresses that rhetoric is a technique called upon by individuals seeking to achieve their purposes through language. Rhetorical theory that follows Aristotle describes the way in which people effectively advocate through discourse. This cluster of definitions – given modern interpretation in the movement called "Neo-Aristotelianism" – dominated the study of rhetoric in the early to mid twentieth century. Neo-Aristotelianism emphasized the effects and effectiveness of speeches, particularly in swaying the courts, the government, and public opinion.

These first two clusters of definition share certain characteristics. Primarily, the two clusters view rhetoric from the perspective of the speaker preparing and delivering a message to an audience. They view rhetoric as a practical activity and rhetorical theory as a practical mapping, preparing the speaker for his/her moment on the platform. The central act at the heart of rhetoric in these definitions is the speaker making decisions about what to say and how to say it.

A third cluster of definition is exemplified by Kenneth Burke's definition: "the use of language as a symbolic means of inducing cooperation in beings that by nature respond to symbols."[5] This cluster focuses attention not on the individual

formulating a message, but on a society using communication to understand and respond appropriately to the events of life. Burke stressed that human societies do so with language. Society builds great symbolic structures to coordinate the ways in which it lives life. These symbols have a wide "range," Burke proffered, including everything from simple requests to great monuments. At the heart of rhetoric are the common themes, arguments, and narratives with which societies organize their citizens into cooperative action. Learning and using these common rhetorical forms was the essence of humanity to Burke. The study of rhetoric for the followers of Burke concentrates on humans using language as what Burke calls "equipment for living."

We need not become disciples for one definition of rhetoric in studying the speeches in this volume. Included in these pages are the speeches of our greatest artists of oral discourse. Included also are the speeches that moved the American nation to its greatest exertions. And taken together, the speeches of this volume reveal the common themes, arguments, and narratives that define the heritage of American rhetorical discourse that moves us still to work together to make a just and successful society. These speeches constitute rhetorical discourse by all three definitions: the words chosen by artists, the words crafted by pragmatic achievers of influence through language, and the words through which our culture responds to events and constitutes our rhetorical heritage.

The speeches also help us, however, in seeing the commonalities in these definitions. All definitions of rhetoric point to the essential role of language in human life. To be human is to be a user of language. Furthermore, the use of language as a practical instrument is also common to all these definitions. Even definitions that stress the aesthetic qualities of rhetoric note that the art is using language in practical endeavor. There is a common logic that governs the thinking dictated to the study of rhetoric by these definitions. Action is called for. As humans we have choice; we can act this way or that way. In addition, as humans we appeal to others as we act; we ask others to join us or at least to recognize the appropriateness of our action. In combining our choice of action with our appeal to others, we invent rhetorical discourse. The framework for this practical element may be the goals and purposes of the individual or the goals and purposes of a society coming to terms with its events, but rhetoric in either framework is a practical activity. Finally, all three stress that rhetoric occurs in public arenas and deals with subject matters of public interest. The speeches reprinted in this volume reflect that emphasis on issues faced by the dominant North American culture during its four centuries on the continent.

II.   What is "public discourse"?

We opened this introduction by describing the rhetorical mileu surrounding two pivotal events in recent United States history. They were public events. If there is a term that rivals "rhetoric" for its uncertainty of meaning, it may be "public." Today we know it most often in the phrases "to make public," "public relations," and "public opinion poll." Each of these reduces the meaning of the term from the rich notion of public that is integral to a democracy.

Alexis de Tocqueville journeyed through the United States in the 1830s. Although his tour was so to study prisons, he made it much more: a study of the character of the democratic experiment in the United States. He wrote:

> Among democratic peoples all the citizens are independent and weak. They can do hardly anything by themselves, and none of them is in a position to force his fellows to help him. They would all therefore find themselves powerless if they do not learn to help each other voluntarily.[6]

In many definitions, "public" is contrasted with "private." De Tocqueville points to the way in which power over our lives is expanded by our joining with others in seeing problems as best addressed through socially engaged action. Indeed, we all engage in deliberation about the line between public and private concerns. That line is contested in every society. Today, the moral education of children is still considered a private matter. So also, are our basic economic choices such as what profession we choose to pursue, lifestyle choices such as what house we choose to live in, and fundamental ethical choices such as our filial and financial responsibilities to our parents. Other matters are considered public concerns such as the provision of youth sports opportunities for our children, the availability of universities of outstanding quality, protection against crime, and the general health of our economy. Because the line between the private and the public is contested, we revise our understanding often. When Hillary Clinton wrote a book entitled, *It Takes a Village*, she urged that we think of the raising of children as more of a public responsibility.[7] Recently, our culture has become increasingly concerned with how parents discipline their children, and how parents may see their power over their children, and have defined child abuse as a public concern that limits decisions and powers that we once viewed as private. Today, we view the choice to smoke tobacco products as a matter of public concern, not a right of individual choice.

Public discourse or public address is, then, *communicative exchange which frames its subject matter as a concern of the community.* Public speakers assume the responsibility to engage the communicative process in which democratic societies come to decide the actions that they will accept as a culture.

The definition we have posited is more complex than simply "addressing messages to a general audience." For example, we referred at the beginning of this section to three phrases that are most often associated with the term "public." The phrase "to make public" refers most often to a process we now call "outing": taking something that is private and releasing it to general awareness. This is the activity of the tabloid media and the local town gossip. It is, however, the very opposite of our sense of public. It depends for its force on the information revealed being judged by the general public as private. The profession called "public relations" is often understood as designing messages with spin at the minimum and falsehoods on occasion to influence the ways in which companies or people are viewed. Responsible practitioners of public relations understand that their role is more complex: to relate their clients to the publics that form a context for their activities. At their best, "public opinion polls" reduce the complex discourse on matters of

public concern to quantifiable token responses. In doing so, they remove the diversity and complexity from the opinion of a public.

These three phrases have come to attain their meaning in the age of mass communication. C. Wright Mills drew the distinction between mass communication and public communication:

> The public and mass may be most readily distinguished by their dominant modes of communications: in a community of publics, discussion is the ascendant mode of communication, and the mass media, if they exist, simply enlarge and animate discussion, linking one primary public with the discussions of another.[8]

It is often easy to view moments of public speaking as times when a single accomplished speaker addresses a large and generally passive collection of hearers. Mills' distinction urges us to think of the public speech in a more complex way. Speakers enact moments of public speaking in interaction with an audience. Some speakers may, indeed, assume an attitude of power that forecloses community response. They may seek to deaden the involvement of the community in their own lives and urge forfeiture of public power to single individuals. But when we begin talking about "good men speaking well" in a democratic society, we view public speaking as most accomplished when the speaker assumes the responsibility entailed in Mills' description of public communication: the speaker engages an audience composed of others in his/her community seeking to advise them on his/her understanding of the moment and the appropriate response of the community to it.

In the discussion just completed, we turned our adjective "public" into a noun. In doing so, we defined the notion more narrowly than merely "the hearers of a message." Rather, we specified a people engaged in a complex process through which their community acts as an integrated society in responding to the events of their world. A public accepts de Tocqueville's charge, recognizes the importance of coordinating responses to matters that transcend individual interest and power, and engages with others in a process of communication and decision making that defines a vital society.

A final observation about the definition of "public" seems important. The idea of a public and of public address is not confined to government. Indeed, de Tocqueville did not marvel at the culture he found in the United States because of its government, but because "if they did not learn some habits of acting together in the affairs of daily life, civilization itself would be in peril."[9] An active democratic government is one of the manifestations of public life, but not the only nor even the dominant expression. Martin Luther King may have been urging passage of a Civil Rights Act in 1963, but he spoke not to government but to our public culture, urging us to embrace his dream and form a culture that judged others not "by the color of their skin but by the content of their character."

In summary, the speeches in this volume are public addresses in the sense that they engaged the concerns that defined public life in their times.

III. Why study rhetorical discourse of the past?

The different definitions of rhetoric give rise to different answers to this question. For those who view rhetoric as a performative art the question is answered in the education of the rhetorical artist: We learn from studying the performances of great rhetors. Indeed, the study of great exemplars is nearly as old as the study of rhetoric itself. Declamation, or the memorization and recitation of the great speeches as an educational exercise, was an integral part of a Roman education. The great speakers of the United States – Daniel Webster, Abraham Lincoln, Susan B. Anthony, Franklin Roosevelt, Martin Luther King – provide no less insight into the importance of the rhetor's art.

For those who view rhetoric as selecting the right strategies for responding to the situations of life, we study to understand the successes and failures in past responses to moments of great demand on rhetorical resources. Patrick Henry rallying his countrymen to revolution; Madison and Henry locked in desperate debate over the ratification of the Constitution; Webster, Clay, and Calhoun persuading their Senate colleagues of the necessity for the Compromise of 1850; Franklin Roosevelt needing to restore faith in the government and the economy in the depths of the Great Depression; all are moments where our study of the strategies with which audiences were persuaded to meet the challenge instruct us on rhetorical choice.

For those who view rhetoric as a public response to moments demanding attention, the reasons for our study are several. First, we study speeches as intellectual history. Speeches record the responses of those confronting the difficulties of their era. Appreciating those responses places us into contact with citizens of the socio-political culture of that time. When speeches are fully encountered in the context of *their* time, they increase our appreciation for cultural variety, breaking down our chrono-centric tendency to understand all speeches in terms of our own time. Why was Webster's speech at Bunker Hill so ponderous? Why did Clay view the Compromise of 1850 as the final opportunity to save the nation? What was the impact of Lincoln's jeremiad in the second inaugural address on responses to the Civil War? Speeches are a vital gateway to understanding the past.

Second, we study speeches as a method of understanding the genealogy of our rhetorical practice. We can appreciate the past not just for its own sake, but for its formative power on our own time. The speeches collected in this volume provide four centuries of voices that echo into our discourse today. Understanding Samuel Danforth's belief that New England was a special place given by God to demonstrate the virtues of a Christian society helps us to understand a viewpoint that accepts an American responsibility to bring democracy to the Middle East. Reading Lincoln's Gettysburg Address helps us to locate the importance of equality in the pantheon of American values. Hearing Franklin Roosevelt promise governmental action in response to the Great Depression helps us to understand the certainty with which the viability of today's presidential administrations turn on the state of the economy.

Finally, we use the past as a pragmatic resource from which to draw in responding to the key moments of our time. Sensitivity to the variety and the continuity of public responses in the American experience enriches the possibilities

that our responses today will meet the exigence of our moment. There is empowerment in the study of the texture of public life punctuated in the speeches of the past. Just as those from the past expressed the hopes and dreams of possibility in American public life, so today we draw from those voices to guide our public enterprise.

IV. How to read speeches

This short section is not intended as a complete guide to the description, interpretation, and evaluation of speeches. Full textbooks are available for that purpose. Our goals rather are to introduce fruitful ways to interpret the rhetorical quality of texts and proffer some additional suggestions for developing skill in dealing with texts.

A. Preliminary inquiries

We begin by focusing on preliminary inquiries that provide a background for analysis of texts. The first three inquiries pose questions that require our going beyond knowledge of rhetorical theory to provide context for rhetorical analysis. The fourth calls upon rhetorical knowledge to place speeches into the context of rhetorical history. The student of speeches must determine which of these inquiries are critical to their own journey through the speech and then conduct the preliminary inquiry themselves or rely on other historians for the information required.

1. The authenticity of texts

We begin with a difficult problem that the editor of a speech anthology and students working with new texts inevitably encounter: the authenticity of texts. Speech is a perishable medium of communication. Prior to the twentieth century, methods for recording the words of important speeches were crude at best. For example, the stirring words spoken by Patrick Henry at St. John's Church in Richmond on the eve of the American revolution come to us through his biographer, William Wirt. Wirt reported his effort to establish what Henry said through the notes and interviews with those who heard him,[10] but the speech recorded in this volume as "Give Me Liberty, or Give Me Death" is only an approximation. We know the content of the most famous debates in American history – the Lincoln-Douglas debates – because many newspapers of the day sent reporters whose task it was to record those debates. Yet, when we examine the various published accounts we find vast differences. Our best texts today are an edited compilation of those newspaper reports.

The twentieth century introduced various electronic techniques for recording the words of a president. Yet, there are surprising discrepancies between our written texts and the precise words uttered by speakers. For example, on Sunday, September 8, 1974, President Gerald R. Ford gave a speech in which he announced that he had pardoned Richard M. Nixon. Ford had already signed a formal document executing

the pardon, but he read that document within the text of the speech. Tape recordings of the speech prove that as he delivered the inclusive dates within which Nixon's actions were pardoned, Ford spoke the wrong dates. Yet, copies of the speech generally available in print provide the dates intended, not the dates spoken. Is this discrepancy important? Similarly, Haig Bosmaijian has documented the number of errors in the print record of the most famous speech of the twentieth century: Martin Luther King's "I Have a Dream" speech.[11]

How important such problems are to us, turns on two important questions. First, which text is important to our analysis? Is it the text prepared by the speaker or his/her speechwriters? This may be the case if the claims we are making about the speech have to do with the invention process. For example, if we want to know how extensively Secretary of State William Seward influenced Lincoln's words in the Second Inaugural Address, we want to see the texts as Lincoln prepared and revised the speech. Or, is the important text the one delivered to the audience? If we are interested in how Lincoln's immediate audience responded to the religious quality of that speech, we want as full a recording as possible of the speech as he delivered it. Or, is the important text one that passed into print and was circulated more broadly? If we are interested in how Lincoln's speech shaped the response of the South to their loss of the Civil War, the more important text for us is the reproduction of the speech that circulated throughout the country. The text we seek depends on the questions we are asking in our analysis of the speech.

The second key question is: What qualities of the speech are central to our analysis? If our analysis of the Lincoln-Douglas debates is concerned with whether Lincoln used "negro," "black man," "slave," or "nigger" to refer to those of African ancestry enslaved in the American system, we need precision at the level of the word. If, on the other hand, our analysis of the debates is to track the arguments of the debaters, we require a reliable source of claims and support but the precise words employed are less crucial. We would always prefer the most precise recording of the text, but full precision may or may not be necessary to the validity of our analysis.

How does this volume deal with such problems in collecting and criticizing texts? The first principle is to investigate the origins of the text of the speech and provide as close to the accurate version as possible. Second, report which version of the speech is provided. Your analysis will determine whether the text provided is appropriate for your work.

2. Biography of the speaker

At least two of the definitions of rhetoric provided above view a speech as first and foremost the product of a speaker, produced from his/her life history and preparation for speaking. Nearly all important speeches, even those produced by speechwriters, are shaped in fundamental ways by the participation of the speaker in their preparation. And regardless of how produced, the utterance by the speaker makes the speech a part of his/her biography and shapes the response to that speaker from that moment forward.[12] Thus, our interest in both the shaping of the rhetorical message and its impact requires our understanding the speech within the biography of the speaker.

Generally, students of speeches find it useful to first collect information on the life course of the speaker. When and where was s/he born? Under what circumstances did s/he grow to adulthood? Who were the important influences on his/her life? What type and quality of education did s/he receive, particularly training in rhetorical practice? What did s/he read as his/her mind was being shaped? What circumstances most shaped his/her adult life? How did s/he earn a living as an adult? What experiences were most memorable and noteworthy to him/her? What were his/her moments of greatest fame? Of greatest disrepute? What power did s/he exercise over others? over whom? What was the rise and fall of that power? When did the speaker's skills, power, and life course begin to decline? When did s/he die? In nearly all consideration of speeches, such knowledge will be useful to the student of the speech. Which elements from the biography are most important will vary from insight to insight, but a student who approaches a speech with more knowledge of the speaker will always be a more sensitive reader of the possibilities for rhetorical significance.

Today, it is, however, not enough to simply understand the life course of the individual speaker. A greater understanding of the culture of the speaker and his/her audience will provide the student of the speech a greater understanding of the relationship of the speech to the people of its time. For example, the tone of our answer to the question about Lincoln's choice of terminology to refer to Americans of African ancestry alters as we understand the most common ways of referring to those Americans in the culture of Lincoln's day and how it differed from our patterns of talking today. How important this broader cultural understanding becomes depends on the questions being asked about the speech, but sensitivity to these relationships will nearly always benefit the student of the speech. What did that culture value? What opportunities did it provide people like the speaker? How did the social classes interact to give the culture its shape? Of what class was the speaker? Of what class was his/her audience? What was the place of oral speaking in that culture?

The biography produced from this research into the speaker and his times is shaped by a sensitivity to the elements of the life course and culture that may then shape the rhetorical exchange having the speech at its center. Each commentary in this book provides basic biographical facts to contextualize the speech as a product of the speaker's life.

3. The historical situation

Speeches are delivered in historical moments. In fact, neo-Aristotelian definitions of rhetoric make this the central fact of rhetoric. Under such definitions history attains an hourglass shape with rhetorical messages at its narrow neck. The events of history give shape to the demands on the persuasive situation. The rhetorical moment becomes powerful as it exercises influence on subsequent moments. Understanding the historical situation becomes a critical element of preparation to analyze a speech in its moment.

The historical understanding required to analyze speaking situations must be diachronic: that is, although it must know facts about people and events in history,

it must also arrange those facts into patterns that construct accounts of the influence of antecedent events on the time of the speech. Similarly, historical understanding queries the connections between the speech and subsequent events. The context for speeches invokes many types of historical construction.

- Social and cultural history places a speech into the evolving values and social arrangements of the culture. For example, the Declaration of Sentiments from the 1848 Seneca Falls Convention that founded the women's movement must be understood within the restricted role that had evolved for women and became institutionalized into law by the 1840s.
- Political history relates the speech to the crises and decisions of leaders that shaped the culture. For example, the speeches by Daniel Webster, John Calhoun, and Henry Clay during Senate debate on the Compromise of 1850 must be understood in light of the deadlock the government had reached on solving the problem of slavery.
- Economic history backgrounds the speech against the material well-being and the institutions of production and exchange in the culture. Thus, Franklin Roosevelt's First Fireside Chat must be understood in terms of the suffering and impoverishment that characterized the Great Depression that was in its fourth year by the time Roosevelt took office, and the role of the banking collapse in deepening that crisis.
- Intellectual history relates the speech to the evolving ideas that structured the activities of those living in the culture. For example, an understanding of the evolution in the meaning of "all men are created equal" between the Declaration of Independence and the Gettysburg Address will cast new light on the importance of Lincoln's statement of the commitments of the Civil War articulated at Gettysburg.

Public discourse plays a vital role in shaping that rich tapestry of facts and relationships that tell the story of the evolving United States. A full grasp of the role of speeches will be best understood when the historical moment of the speech is understood.

It is important to emphasize before leaving the topic that the student of speeches engages history from a point of view. History is a sorting of facts and relationships based on three criteria: relevance, accuracy, and significance. The reader of speeches works his/her knowledge of the speech back and forth into and out of the historical moment in search of an understanding of the accurate history relevant and significant in explaining the speaker's choices and their impact on history.

Each of the commentaries provided for the speeches in this volume will briefly set the historical context for the speech. Investigating and expanding the understanding of the history that contextualizes the speech enhances the sensitivity of the reading.

4. The rhetorical context

Although the emphasis in an anthology is on the individual speech as a focus for understanding, that emphasis requires a countervailing perspective: speeches must be read in the context of other speeches and speaking traditions. The most obvious and limited example of the importance of this maxim is the speech that is part of a debate: Webster's reply to Hayne, Henry Clay on the Compromise of 1850, John Kennedy responding to Richard Nixon in their 1960 presidential campaign debate. But many other speeches are best understood within rhetorical contexts broader than the individual speech.

As is the case with the other preliminary inquiries above, the influence of the rhetorical context on speeches varies. Also in the same way that secondary sources may inform knowledge of the first three inquiries, the research of other rhetorical scholars may identify genres, campaigns, movements, themes, or traditions that enhance understanding of the individual speech. Just as a sound reading of a speech may reveal the speech's impact on the speaker's life story or the history of the time, so also a sensitive reading of the rhetorical context may lead to an understanding of the speech's influence on generic expectations, the success of a campaign or movement, or the expectations of rhetorical tradition.

Genre. The notion of speeches fitting into generic patterns is as old as classical Greece. Aristotle described three genres of speeches: the epideictic or speech of celebration, the forensic or speech of accusation and defense, and the deliberative. Although Aristotle's theory of genre is complex beyond what we will describe here, it aligned situations of speaking with purposes, classed speeches along those lines of demarcation, and elaborated on the characteristics of each genre.[13]

Recent research in rhetorical genre has started at a different place.[14] When a presidential speechwriter sits to compose a draft of a presidential message – let's say President Bush's response to September 11 – s/he will consider previous moments when presidents have faced similar situations – Franklin Roosevelt responding to Pearl Harbor, Woodrow Wilson responding to the Lusitania, William McKinley responding to the destruction of the battleship Maine, come immediately to mind. The speechwriter will look at the statements by those leaders at those moments to see their responses. Using a form of neo-Aristotelian analysis, as we have defined it, s/he will make judgments about how well those previous presidents responded, what their purposes were, what their strategies for achieving those purposes were, and how well the speeches accomplished those purposes. They will also be sensitive to the expectations of the public in such moments. How, for example, were Roosevelt's words molded to the expectations of the nation in the face of the attack on Pearl Harbor? From this understanding, the speechwriter drafts a suitable response to the present moment.

This special case is part of a larger cataloging of speaking situations, and expectations and possibilities in such situations. Any eulogist for a deceased friend understands some of the expectations that the situation defines for the tribute. The speech invented in that situation will be heard by its audience against the

background of those expectations. Speakers may not always fulfill those expectations; like Antony over Caesar's body, they may turn the expectations into a background for altering perspective, but Antony's speech works because it works contra expectations. Puritan sermons, presidential inaugurals, declarations of war, and acceptance speeches by presidential candidate are examples of the genres that form context for speeches in this collection. Reading speeches in such situations requires an appreciation for the generic expectations of an audience and the generic demands thus placed upon a speaker.

Campaigns. The focus on individual speeches may also be too restrictive because speeches often are a part of a sequence of speeches designed to work together toward a rhetorical purpose. The simplest example of this may be within the context of a debate. At the Virginia convention considering the ratification of the Constitution, a series of speakers spoke for the Federalists and for the Anti-federalists as the debate progressed. Each speech did not make the entire case; each was partial in relationship to the other speeches when understanding the debate as a whole.

Outside the formal sequencing of debate, however, a similar structure for messages often influences the individual message. When Bill Clinton introduced his health care proposal in September 1993, he did so with a series of presentations. On September 20, Clinton addressed a friendly audience of physicians and reporters. On September 22, he addressed Congress and the public. The next day he appeared before a rally of supporters and on national television through *Nightline*. His weekly radio address the following Saturday was also on health care. Meanwhile, Hillary Rodham Clinton testified before congressional committees. When modern presidents pursue a policy initiative, they normally do so with a series of speeches to a number of audiences in a coordinated campaign. The comment has been made that policy initiatives are modeled on election campaigns and this multi-speech structure is one of the characteristics that is shared.

In this volume, Tecumseh's speech to the Choctaw Council, Wilson on the League of Nations, and several presidential campaign speeches are examples of speeches drawn from sequenced speaking occasions that together composed a campaign.

Movements. Beyond the sequencing of speeches in a rhetorical campaign, individual speeches may be contextualized by their importance within rhetorical movements. Scholars seeking to understand rhetorical movements have developed a plethora of definitions and viewpoints for their study. For our purposes a loose definition will suffice: *rhetorical movements are complexes of purpose and discursive strategy pursued by a group of people cooperating in an effort to increase the power of their influence on an issue and/or society.* Speeches within rhetorical movements have, by definition, a complex rhetorical situation, typically having to account for multiple purposes and multiple audiences. Those who spoke against the Vietnam war in the 1960s and 1970s were opposing the United States' policy toward Vietnam, but they were also trying to grow a movement of citizens united to varying degrees in their opposition to the war. In doing so, they drew

together a tenuous coalition of people with a range of beliefs and commitments: some pacifists who opposed war as always immoral, some who opposed the Cold War as a dangerous diplomatic misadventure, some simply opposed to Vietnam as the wrong war at the wrong time. In addition, these speakers spoke against the background of a counter-movement supporting patriotic allegiance and specifically the United States' involvement in its Asian adventure. Any given moment within this complex calculus of relationships was subject to these various influences and limitations. Understanding the impact of a speech contextualized within a movement requires an explanation of the speech's relationship to the evolving rhetorical texture of the movement's discourse.

This volume contains many examples of discourse located within the context of rhetorical movements. Several speeches are drawn from different moments in women's search for social and civic equality. Speeches from the labor movement form a section of the collection. African Americans' efforts toward liberation and equality are another important component.

Themes and traditions. A historical study of rhetorical discourse reveals the diachronic continuity and evolution of characteristics through the four centuries encompassed within this anthology. Reading speeches in their rhetorical context requires a sensitivity to the relationship of particular speeches to those traditions. For example, John Winthrop on board the Arbella off the coast of Massachusetts described the special place that New England was to have in God's plan for the earth. This theme of American exceptionalism, arguably born in that speech, has evolved over the years. Today, the theme is most often secularized to being about how American democracy stands as an example to the world. But seeing how the theme evolved and how the connection of the justification of the Iraq War to Winthrop on board the Arbella is one of the important sensitivities with which the reader may open new understanding of contemporary speeches.

The commentaries accompanying the speeches in this volume will provide some clues to the themes and traditions drawn upon in the speeches. But the complex history of American rhetorical discourse is such that a full catalog of such influences would excessively precondition reading of the texts. Searches for interactions between the individual speech and rhetorical traditions will be creative avenues for exploring the place of the speech in its moment.

B.   Reading for the substance of speeches

The next few pages identify several ways to read public discourse to analyze its place in shaping our history as a nation and culture. An obvious option to begin our study explores the simple act of sensitively reading speeches to understand what they say and how an audience heard the speech as it was delivered, and as it subsequently developed as a significant document in American cultural history.

1.   Understanding the viewpoint of the speech

Whatever else we may say about public discourse, it is about something. A speech must by its nature express a point of view on a subject. Sensitive readers, like the audiences of the day the speech was delivered, must understand that point of view. At the most basic level, speakers shape their speeches by combining certain functional intentions: to describe the world they share with their audiences; to praise or condemn, to celebrate or berate, the object of their speech within their conception of the public values of their time; to urge a public course of action as appropriate or demanded by the circumstances of the moment. All of these functional intentions involve choices by the speaker that together compose his/her viewpoint on the speech's moment.

Speeches at pivotal moments in history often arise in response to the disorientation that the public feels toward events. The public seeks to understand, and the speech offers an understanding. George W. Bush provided the Congress and the public a description of the world that "would never be the same" after the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001. Typically, however, all speeches situate the public in a description of their moment. In constructing descriptions, certain choices shape discourse. Initially, the speaker's narrative power is to select among events, designating some as important and others as insignificant. Secondly, descriptions explain how events have unfolded. Webs of sequence and causality mark rhetorical descriptions. There may be multiple theories of how events unfold, but typically a speaker makes a selection and presents the events within that chosen theory of explanation. Thirdly, descriptions distribute responsibility for the situation. No question is of more urgency in many descriptions than: Why did this happen? When George W. Bush presented his description of the events of September 11, he fixed responsibility on the *evil* terrorists. This choice dismissed other explanations that others might have pointed to as contributing: the failure of security systems at airports, lax immigration regulations, responses by people in other cultures to the overwhelming cultural power of American secularism, or the United States' support for oppressive regimes in the region of the world from which the terrorists came. The careful student reads speeches with an awareness of the choices of significance, sequence, and responsibility embodied in the description of the moment the speech is about.

Speeches also seek to celebrate or condemn people, actions, values, or groups. Often these attitudes are a part of descriptions that establish the bases for action. At other times, the celebration or condemnation is the central purpose of the speech. Either way, the praise or condemnation that are a part of these speeches revolve around values that the speaker endorses to the public. Often such speeches are times to reaffirm these values as central to what unites the public as a rhetorical audience. Sensitive reading of these speeches requires an understanding of how the evaluation of the speaker is shaped in the language of eulogy or dislogy and connected to the values of the day. When Daniel Webster delivered his oration at Bunker Hill, he lauded the bravery and dedication of the Revolutionary War generation, and particularly the veterans seated in front of him. His was a celebration of the values

that shaped the emergence of the United States from her British colonial history. Webster urged his generation to embrace those values as a guide for their own lives.

In many speeches the complex of description and value pays off in the call for action. As Patrick Henry addressed the Virginia Convention in his ringing "Give me liberty or give me death" speech, he described the gathering war and even the title we have given the speech rings with Henry's celebration of values, but in the end the speech was delivered to move the Convention to act in the revolutionary cause. Sometimes the actions demanded by a speech are detailed, sometimes the call is more generally to act. Sometimes the call is to sacrifice, sometimes it is to accede to the leadership of the speaker. Sometimes the call is surrounded by cold logic, at other times an emotional summons moves the audience more to act than to contemplate the direction of action. These choices shape the speaker's plea to the audience.

2. Rhetorical discourse as argumentative exchange

The rhetorical theory and the democratic political theory on which Western notions of public discourse turn features the importance of rationality as a background for public action. Daniel J. O'Keefe has differentiated two senses in which the term "argument" is employed in rhetorical theory, roughly the sense in which we say someone is "making an argument" and the sense in which we say two or more people are "having an argument."[15] In understanding the reasoning in discourse we search for both of these senses. We want to know the claim the speaker is asserting to be true and the reasons s/he proffers to support that claim, but we also want to understand how the speech enters the texture of the dispute in which it participates. Thus, we want to know how Abraham Lincoln argued that the American nation cannot continue to exist half slave and half free, but we also want to know how his positions altered, and were in turn altered by the positions of Stephen Douglas as the two candidates argued about slavery.[16]

In its simplest form argumentative analysis is sensitive to the claims that speakers make in a speech and the way they shape support for the claims. A claim is an assertion of the truth of a statement about the context of a speech or the wisdom of an action. Speakers forward claims seeking the audience's assent. To secure that assent they provide support, evidence and reasons that they feel warrant the audience's acceptance of the claim. A sensitive reading of the substance of a speech catalogs the claims and support offered by the speaker. A diachronic reading of both senses of argument over time yields an understanding of the evolving argumentative texture of a culture's rhetoric.

This reading of claims and support addresses O'Keefe's notion of "making an argument." Particularly important in democratic practice is a classical form of "having an argument": deliberative debate. Several debates are included in this volume. Debates are interactions of viewpoint and proposed action, each presented with the reasons for their support. Such discourse should be read as exchange, with the arguments of each party to the debate traced and compared.

3. Rhetorical discourse as intellectual history

Rhetorical scholar Ernest Wrage believed that the task of public address scholarship is to record the evolution of the ideas with which a culture responds to the crises of its world. "From the study of speeches may be gained additional knowledge about the growth of ideas, their currency and vitality, their modifications under the impress of social requirements, and their eclipse by other ideas with different values."[17] Wrage's vision requires the scholar of public address to develop an ear for the patterns of ideas emerging across important speeches. Ideas are viewed as diachronic. Indeed, Wrage focused on the life cycle of ideas: they emerge, they mature, they rule, they ebb, they die. Ideas are birthed in the incubator of public discourse. Messages introduce ideas, they urge them on the public thus strengthening them, they alter them as required to meet the exigence of the moment, and their power eventually fades. Ideas are in juxtaposition with other ideas in struggles in which some triumph and others lose. Following Wrage, students of public address track this history of the ideas as a force that shapes society's response to situations of their lives.

Celeste Condit and John Lucaites illustrated Wrage's concern in their study of the evolution of the ideograph <equality> through American speaking.[18] Robert Ivie illustrated the method in his study of presidential motives for war.[19] Other similar studies present themselves easily in the study of American discourse. How did the identity of Americans as Americans rather than Englishman emerge in early American public discourse? How has that identity evolved through eras of immigration and diversification of the citizenry? How did Henry Clay construct his notion of the American system and use it to advocate his policies and his leadership over four decades? How did the South develop the ideas known as the "Lost Cause" in the face of the threat to its white aristocracy following the Civil War? How did the Cold War construct the notion of the internal Communist menace and empower Joseph McCarthy as its voice? How was McCarthy brought down and with him the notion of the "Communist witch hunt" created and defined as "McCarthyism"?

The tracery of ideas through American discourse becomes an important ongoing dimension of the study of American public discourse. It lifts the student's focus from the individual speech to the texture of American rhetorical culture.

4. Ideological criticism

Wrage's focus in the study of public discourse develops a record of ideas. Rhetorical theory posits, however, that symbols do not simply record ideas; rather they bring ideas into power as shapers of culture. In the words of rhetorical theorist Richard Weaver, "ideas have consequences."[20] Rhetorical discourse is subject to criticism as a creator of cultures. This criticism is often called "ideological criticism." Three examples will illustrate the power of such analysis.

First, ideological criticism can work from the fact that rhetoric contains a description of the world to which it responds. One of the criteria that ought be applied to discourse is its ability to present that world fairly and with attention to truth. When Secretary of State Colin Powell described in detail the large-scale

production of weapons of mass destruction by the regime of Saddam Hussein of Iraq and when that description was used to justify war, critics of discourse must ask whether Powell's portrayal was fair and accurate. When it is found wanting, the critic must ask whether Powell knew that the claims he was defending were untrue. Discourse such as Powell's speech to the United Nations presents itself as an accurate presentation of facts.[21] On that basis, it must be judged.

Second, ideological criticism can consider the role of public discourse in maintaining systems of power. Students reading Thomas Dew's defense of Southern slavery will ask questions about how Dew and his fellow Southerners defended their peculiar institution. They will question the use of religion, the role of race in the characterization of Americans of African ancestry, and the paternalistic ethic of the master-slave relationship as strategies that normalized the enslavement of millions. The point of ideological criticism in such a study is not to merely condemn slavery, but to ask how a culture employed logic, motivation, and the powers that rhetoric endows on speakers to perpetuate such an institution.

Third, ideological criticism queries more specific moments in which speakers employ the power of speech to their specific ends. Franklin Roosevelt focused the attention and ultimately the power of the American society toward making war and defeating Japan following the latter's attack on the American military base at Pearl Harbor. How did Roosevelt's speech condense the motivational resources of American rhetoric to launch American participation in World War II?

Reading speeches for ideas begins by understanding the underlying substantial choices of speakers that shape their speeches and follows through to the impact of those ideas on the world in which they live. Learning to understand how ideas are presented and empowered in rhetoric is a central path to understanding rhetoric's power in the world.

C. Reading speeches as responses to situations

We earlier identified Aristotle's definition of rhetoric as "discovering in the particular case what are the available means of persuasion." Neo-Aristotelian criticism views the speech as an appropriate analysis and response to the particular situation faced by the speaker. This is one of the most prominent ways of analyzing the speeches contained in this volume.

Such an analysis is best explained by working four different sets of vocabulary that together capture the neo-Aristotelian's mode of thinking. The first set includes *speaker*, *message*, *audience*, and *effect*. In the neo-Aristotelian speaking moment a speaker analyzes a situation and an audience, and formulates an appropriate persuasive message with more or less effect on the audience. Each of these terms is treated straightforwardly, although some complexity is recognized. The *speaker* is the one planning and pronouncing the message. This despite the recognition that in doing the analysis and making choices the speaker may have assistance, indeed, may have a speechwriter perform substantial portions of the task. The *message* is the text of the words chosen and delivered at the moment. *Audience* locates those the speaker wishes to reach or those hearing the message. A speaker may anticipate multiple audiences, his/her message being distributed beyond the immediate

audience either in a filtered or electronically mediated form and thus reaching broader audiences. As this phenomena has become most prominent, the choice of audience shaping the message design has become a part of the planning process. *Effect* is the accomplishment of the speech on the audience.

The second set of terms includes *purpose* and *strategy*. These terms provide a vocabulary for understanding the planning process of the speaker. The speaker's analysis first yields a formulation of a purpose for the message. To meet that purpose the speaker makes various strategic selections: choices of content and technique designed to achieve the persuasive purpose. The term *appeal* is often introduced at this point to stress that the speaker's task is to formulate his/her strategy in a way that has impact on the audience. Such strategies are evaluated by how well they appeal to the audience and thus achieve the purpose.

The third set of terms includes *exigence*, *constraints* – including *obstacles* and *opportunities* – *audience* and *strategies*. This set is most explicitly deployed by Lloyd F. Bitzer who constructs a method of evaluating the speaker by how well s/he responds to the rhetorical situation.[22] The *exigence* is the element of the situation that brings forth rhetoric, that requires the intervention of the speaker in an effort to alter the situation. In formulating his/her message to meet that exigence the speaker encounters some elements of the situation that are *obstacles* to his/her success. Other elements, however, provide *opportunities* for appeal to the audience. The key to the analysis is understanding the ways in which the speaker selects *strategies*, given his/her constraints, to meet the exigence of the situation.

The final set of terms important in such criticism is: *ethos*, *logos*, and *pathos*. These three terms, rendered in the Greek, identified for Aristotle the powers of persuasion in the rhetorical act.[23] Roughly, *ethos* is the power of persuasion brought to the speaking event by the speaker's character and history. *Logos* is the power of the words, themes, and forms chosen by the speaker that compose the logical appeal of the speech. *Pathos* is the bond of emotion that draws the audience toward the speaker's persuasive purpose.

Together these four sets of vocabulary provide a way of discussing the skill of the speaker in using public discourse to confront the needs of his/her society. Evaluation focuses on two questions: How well did the speaker and speech respond to the situation? and With what impact? A student of William Jennings Bryan's "Cross of Gold" speech might analyze the magic of that speech's moment at the 1896 Democratic Convention. S/he would note that Bryan was not the favorite to be the party's candidate for president but that the debate over the party platform provided him the opportunity to establish a special relationship with the convention. Through a number of strategies which the student could discuss at length, Bryan appealed to his audience of farmers and laborers and established himself as their choice for the presidential nomination. Bryan captured the exigence of the destructive powers of big business that motivated the convention and the Democratic electoral base beyond the convention. To ever increasing intensive response by those in the convention hall, Bryan built to his great climax: "You shall not press down upon labor this crown of thorns; you shall not crucify mankind on a Cross of Gold." This is one of the speeches in American history that we can certainly say determined an historical event: Bryan's nomination for the presidency.

D.   Reading speeches as aesthetic performance

A final option for the analysis of speeches that we will discuss is marked more by its method for analysis than by its focus on aesthetics or performance. The two thousand year history of rhetorical theory contains many accounts of the ideal rhetorical performance. Some of these ideals are, in fact, aesthetic, that is concerned with beauty and taste in the use of language. Because rhetoric involves the use of language in shaping social order, other ideals involve the effective use of language in making persuasive appeals. Students may use these principles of rhetorical excellence as criteria to evaluate the quality of public discourse.

Typically, there are four domains of judgment that characterize the evaluation of rhetorical performance.   First, there is a judgment of truth and character. Quintillian valued the good man speaking well. This judgment focuses upon the first quality of Quintillian's vision. We believe that public speaker's have an obligation to tell the truth as they understand it. We also believe that the words uttered by speakers help to shape their character. Good character is a kind of quality of sincerity, honesty, and altruism that contributes to the kind of society that we all want to live in. The specific qualities of good character are culture bound and may differ by time and locality. But nowhere is character quite so evident as in public speaking. We may judge Bill Clinton wanting in character because he lied to the American public. We find Franklin Roosevelt admirable because he told the truth even when painful, and did so with a sincerity that we heard in his voice, even through the mediation of radio.

The second domain of judgment in evaluating rhetorical performance is beauty in the use of speech. Many would argue that there is no more beautiful speech in the American language than Martin Luther King's "I Have a Dream" speech with its rich rhythmic cadences, use of metaphors and Biblical illusion, and poetic meter.

The third domain of judgment is clarity of presentation. Our rhetorical theory disparages obfuscation and confusion and privileges clarity and straightforwardness. We admire Abraham Lincoln's ability to define the purposes of the Civil War. We admire Ronald Reagan's ability to bring clarity to the purpose of space exploration and meaning to the lives of the astronauts lost in the Challenger disaster.

The final domain of judgment is persuasiveness. The centrality of persuasion to our definitions of rhetoric requires that the student of speeches attend particularly to the ability of a message to appeal to its audience with the central purpose of the speech.

Of course, judgments of speeches become very complex. What are we to make of Thomas Dew's defense of American slavery? Although ultimately slavery was recognized as an evil by our culture, Dew and his compatriots convinced half the nation of the justice of the practice. Certainly we can recognize the effective appeals that Dew employed. His use of religion in a religious country to defend slavery seems an effective choice. He presented his arguments forthrightly and clearly, forwarding his claims and providing support for them.   Thus, he was an accomplished arguer for his contested position. Although we might not use the term "beautiful" to characterize Dew's prose, we might call his effort eloquent. He employed many rhetorical figures that demonstrated his powers of eloquence. Can

we defend the character of a speaker who would use his rhetorical abilities to defend such a practice? Is the portrayal he provided of the practices of slavery an accurate and a full presentation? Here we may question Dew. We may sense his racism and his willingness to deny to others the values he cherished.

V. **Selection of speeches**

The primary problem for the editor of an anthology is always selecting which speeches to include and which to exclude from the collection. Those who produced the many multiple volume sets of speeches that line the shelves of our libraries *must* have had a better idea! But alas, even they still faced that fine line where speeches they yearned to include had to be excluded.

An important initial point to make about selection is that criteria are actually applied to the whole anthology rather than to individual speeches. There are three objectives that have governed our project. First, we have tried to present the United States' most historically significant speeches. This does not simply mean those with the greatest effect, although it could. It also means the speeches delivered at the most significant turning points. For example, that the Compromise of 1850 altered the United States' trajectory is questionable (except by postponing the Civil War for a decade), but it did stand at a dramatic moment and represented the last great effort by the earlier generation (Clay, Webster, and Calhoun) to avoid the war that eventually came.

A second desire is that in this collection we have traced the major ideas that have emerged and clashed through United States' history. The relative importance of equality, the place of the frontier, the notion of the United States as a laboratory for democratic principles, the search for unity in American diversity, the involvement or isolation of the United States from foreign affairs are all ideas that were debated and came to shape the nation's actions. For example, that Lincoln's speech at Gettysburg redefined the meaning of constitutional government to place it more overtly into the context of the Declaration of Independence is an arguable thesis. On a broader scale, the ways in which late nineteenth century speeches faced the closing of the geographical frontier by taking the motivational power of the frontier in the lives of ordinary Americans and turning it in different directions is a theme that can be traced in our speeches from that period.

The third desire in our selection is to provide some range of the voices that have shaped the texture of the nation's history. We have provided a flavor of the speaking on the frontier and in the teeming tenements of the Lower East Side. We have sought to capture the evolving confidence with which American women assumed a public voice. We have listened for the plight of the farmer, the industrial laborer, the Native American, the freed slave. In the words of Whitman, we have attempted to hear America singing and to provide you a sense of the evolving voices. We confess that the voice of politics and governing have more prominence than the voices of religion, education, the politically excluded, or the public intellectual. But we have strived to represent these voices as well, if not as thoroughly.

In assembling the collection, we have avoided excerpts and abridgements as much as we believed reasonable space would allow. We admit possible error in doing so, since some of the longer selections may have eliminated the possibility of publishing additional speeches. But we have always strived to present the fullest sound of the speech and let the reader decide what is significant and what deserves less attention in a speech.

As much as we can escape the inevitable task, we have tried to avoid canonization of American speeches. Obviously we elevate some voices to the reader's consciousness while leaving others silent, to be discovered another day. But our performance of our task will satisfy us most if variety and drift are the watchwords of our selections than if the elevation to immutable status is the effect.

Each selection or group of selections is accompanied by a commentary. The commentaries are intended to establish some context for the speech. They generally include some material from each of the contextual factors we called "preliminary inquiries" earlier in this introduction: authenticity, biography, historical, and rhetorical context. They are not criticism of the texts, but attempts to introduce important contextualizing information. We would anticipate that those wishing to work deeply with a speech would move quickly beyond them to more detailed examination.

Material has been arranged into fifteen sections. Although the general direction of the collection is chronological, in this edition the thematic grouping of the sections have taken precedent over strict chronological order.

One other commitment is well to articulate: we believe that the power of orality is evident in history. Writing certainly has a place in modern literate culture. There are even rare samples of rhetorical acts committed in writing included in this volume. We are even beyond writing now, even beyond the age of mass distribution of messages, into the age of the internet. But the human contact when speakers and audiences face each other and respond to each other, thus making a speech together, is an act that is always in the texture of human society. The moments we have captured will, we hope, testify to this historical claim. That is why on September 11, 2001, people demanded to hear from the president. That is why, on August 28, 1963, Martin Luther King and the megaphone of hundreds of thousands gathered on the mall in Washington altered the course of history.

Notes

[1] The newspaper headlines of the day featured not King but the size and orderliness of the rally. Typical was the *Washington Post* headline: "200,000 Jam Mall in Mammoth Rally In Solemn, Orderly Pleas for Equality" (29 August 1963, p. A1). The stories listed the speakers, typically in the order of their appearance, so King's name appeared near the end of the list. The *Post* included an article of excerpts from the speeches at the rally, again arranged in order with no greater attention to King's than any others ("Excerpts From Remarks Made at Civil Rights Program," p. A14). The exception to this coverage was a "News Analysis" by James Reston in the *New York Times*: "'I Have a Dream . . .': Peroration by Dr. King Sums Up a Day the Capital Will Remember" (29 August 1963, p. A1). Reston wrote, "It was Dr. King who, near the end of the day, touched the vast audience." Reston's analysis was the first magnification of the resonances of King's

speech that echo down to us today.

[2] http://www.americanrhetoric.com/top100speechesall.html

[3] Quintilian's interest was in the training of the orator, and thus he was defining the rhetor or orator as much as defining the term "rhetoric." The strictest translation of his definition (section 12.1.1) was "a good man, skilled in speaking." Quintilian attributes this definition to Marcus Cato. *The Institutio Oratoria of Quintilian*, trans. H. E. Butler (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press, 1998), 355.

[4] Aristotle, *Rhetorica*, 1355b. The translation cited here is Lane Cooper's (New York: Appleton Century Crofts, 1932), 7. W. Rhys Roberts translates the passage "observing in any given case the available means of persuasion" (New York: Modern Library, 1954), 24. George Kennedy translates the passage "in each (particular) case, to see the available means of persuasion." (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1991), 36.

[5] *Rhetoric of Motives* (1950; Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1969), 43.

[6] *Democracy in America*, trans. George Lawrence (1835; 1966; New York: Harper Perennial, 1989), 514.

[7] Hillary Rodham Clinton, *It Takes a Village: And Other Lessons Children Teach Us* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1996).

[8] "Democracy and Liberal Education," in *Power, Politics, and People: The Collected Essays of C. Wright Mills*, ed. Irving Louis Horowitz (London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1939), 355.

[9] de Tocqueville, 514.

[10] William Wirt, *The Life of Patrick Henry* 4th rev. ed. (New York: McElrath and Bangs, 1831), v-xi, 137-42. See also Judy Hample, "The Textual and Cultural Authenticity of Patrick Henry's 'Liberty or Death' Speech," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 63 (1977): 298-310.

[11] "The Inaccuracies in the Reprintings of Martin Luther King's 'I Have a Dream' Speech." *Communication Education* 31 (1982): 107-14.

[12] Carl Burgchardt (*The Will, the People, and the Law: A Rhetorical Biography of Robert M. LaFollette, Sr.*, Ph.D. dissertation, Univ. of Wisconsin, 1982) stressed the mutual influence of life course and speaking in the development of the speaker's biography. So influential is this link, Burgchardt argued, that the study of speeches can be a method to establishing "a rhetorical biography." See also Carl R. Burgchardt, *Robert M. LaFollette, Sr.: The Voice of Conscience* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1992).

[13] Aristotle, 1358a-1359a.

[14] Karlyn Kohrs Campbell and Kathleen Hall Jamieson, *Form and Genre: Shaping Rhetorical Action* (Annandale VA: Speech Communication Association, n.d.).

[15] "Two Concepts of Argument." *Journal of the American Forensic Association* 13 (1977): 121-28.

[16] David Zarefsky, *Lincoln, Douglas, and Slavery: In the Crucible of Public Debate* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1990) provides an argumentative analysis of the debates.

[17] "Public Address: A Study in Social and Intellectual History." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 33 (1947): 453-54.

[18]Celeste Michelle Condit and John Louis Lucaites, *Crafting Equality: America's Anglo-African Word* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993).

[19] Robert L. Ivie, "Presidential Motives for War." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 60 (1974): 337-45.

[20] Richard M. Weaver, *Ideas Have Consequences* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1948).

[21] Colin S. Powell, "Address to the U. N. Security Council," February 5, 2003. Available at http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2003/02/20030205-1.html.

[22]Lloyd F. Bitzer, "The Rhetorical Situation," *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 1 (1968): 1-14. Bitzer's construction indicates that the rhetorical situation defines the nature of the rhetor's message. Most neo-Aristotelians would grant a speaker greater control over the rhetorical situation than Bitzer does. Thus, we might say the common neo-Aristotelian criticism skews the speaker-situation ratio more toward the power of the speaker than does Bitzer.

[23] *Rhetorica*, 1356a.