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INTRODUCTION

Research in the area of speech criticism has listed ethical appeal as one of the most important determinants of a speaker's effectiveness. Aristotle in his Rhetoric said, "We might almost affirm that the speaker's ethos is the most potent of all the means to persuasion."\(^1\) Ethos can be determined by the audience's previous knowledge of the speaker or by the speech itself, although the layman usually considers ethical appeal only on the basis of what is known about the speaker before he begins speaking. Aristotle, however, believed that ethical appeal "should be created by the speech itself, and not left to depend upon an antecedent impression that the speaker is this or that kind of man."\(^2\) Ethical appeal created by the speech itself is somewhat more difficult to discover than ethical appeal determined by the audience's impression of the speaker as this or that type of person. But Aristotle believed that the ethical appeal evinced by the speech itself is the controlling factor in the persuasiveness and success of the speaker.

---

2. Cooper, p. 8.
PURPOSE

In accord with Aristotle's theory that ethical appeal should be created by the speech itself, the purpose of this study is to analyze three selected speeches of a contemporary speaker in order to discover the nature or the sources of the ethical appeal as evidenced in his or her speeches.

The speeches to be analyzed are those of Margaret Chase Smith--Senator from Maine. Senator Smith has served in the House of Representatives and is the first woman in history to serve in the Senate without first having been appointed, suggesting to the women of America that a woman can be successful in the political world.

DEFINITIONS

Since the object of this study is to make a rhetorical analysis of three speeches of Margaret Chase Smith in order to discover the nature of her use of ethical appeal, it is necessary to define two terms--rhetorical analysis and ethical appeal. These definitions are offered as those to be employed in this study.

When determining a definition for the term rhetorical analysis, both the word rhetoric and the word analysis must be considered. "Rhetoric is the science which treats of discourse. Discourse is any communication of thought by
words, either oral or written. The term rhetoric is derived from the Greek rhetorike, the art of speaking. 3 The term analysis can be defined as "the separating or breaking up of any whole into its parts in order to find out their nature, proportion, or function, and a statement of the results of this process." 4 Combining these two definitions, rhetorical analysis is to be considered a study of oral discourse, in order to discover its nature or function, and a statement of the findings.

The second term requiring definition is ethical appeal. Aristotle defined three kinds of persuasion. He said, "The first kind resides in the character or ethos of the speaker; the second consists in producing a certain attitude in the hearer; the third appertains to the argument proper, in so far as it actually or seemingly demonstrates." 5 These kinds of persuasion are also known as ethical appeal, emotional appeal, and logical appeal respectively. This study is concerned only with the first type of persuasion--ethical appeal or that "method by which the speaker influences the thought and conduct of the audience through his own personality." 6


Since ethical appeal is primarily dependent upon the ethos or character of the speaker, a definition of ethos and its components must be considered. In the speaking situation, ethos is "the means of persuasion by which the character of the speaker makes us believe or disbelieve the speech." There are certain elements which prove to be an indication of ethos in public speaking. Aristotle stated that "there are three things, apart from demonstrative proofs, which inspire belief, viz., sagacity, high character, and good will." A more recent source says that "competence, integrity, and good motives are the basic elements in a speaker's ethos. In any given situation in which confidence in the speaker is at all important, he is more likely to accomplish his purpose if his listeners believe him to be capable, trustworthy, and well disposed toward them." These elements will be defined more thoroughly in Chapter II of this study and will be considered in the analysis of the ethical appeal employed by Margaret Chase Smith.

METHOD OF STUDY

As has been previously stated, ethical appeal is primarily derived from the character of the speaker. Chapter I

7. Cooper, p. 9.


of this study will, therefore, contain a biographical sketch of the speaker, which will include not only her early life, political career, political philosophy, and ethos, but the public's response to Senator Smith as an individual as well. By including this data, certain elements which help to determine ethical appeal will be evidenced. Chapter II will be concerned with a discussion of ethical appeal and the criteria used for judging this means of persuasion in the selected speeches. A description of the factors determining the selection of three speeches to be analyzed in this study will be considered in Chapter III. Chapter III will also contain the application of the established criteria in a critical analysis of the three selected speeches. These addresses were taken from the Congressional Record during a ten year period extending from 1945 to 1955.

The speeches to be analyzed were selected according to the three speech types described by Aristotle: Deliberative, a speech of counsel or advice; judicial, a speech of prosecution or defense; and epideictic, a speech of praise or blame. One of each type of speech will be analyzed. The method of selecting the speeches will be discussed further in Chapter III. The concluding chapter will attempt to answer the following questions concerning the use of ethical appeal by Margaret Chase Smith in selected speeches:

10. Cooper, p. 17.
1. Was ethical appeal as a means of persuasion found in selected speeches of Margaret Chase Smith?

2. If ethical appeal was employed by Margaret Chase Smith, what was its nature and its sources?

3. If there was evidence of ethical appeal, how effectively was it employed by Senator Smith?

The primary sources of data for this study were books and periodicals. In addition to these materials, a letter containing a questionnaire was composed and sent to Senator Smith. The questionnaire contained queries concerned with the speaking background, personal philosophy, and political philosophy of the speaker; the answers received from Mrs. Smith will be included in this study. This information will provide a background for the speeches themselves.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Certain limitations arise in a study when the primary sources of data are books and periodicals; the main problem is to determine the accuracy of the speech texts. As Auer so aptly points out, "this is one of the most difficult problems in rhetorical criticism. Clearly, the critic needs genuine materials, if he is to appraise oratory without prejudice and folly." He further states that

the text may be deliberately distorted in order to prejudice its readers, or if the speaker provides an advance copy of his speech for the press

---

he may still revise his reading copy. If the text is based upon a version of a speech prepared by the speaker after his speech has been delivered, it may contain what he wished he had said, or what he wants posterity to think he said, rather than what he did say.\footnote{12}

It is difficult to determine whether any of these distortions are present in the speech texts to be analyzed, but it can be assumed that speech texts in the Congressional Record are relatively complete, and this must be used since it is the only available source.

Another limitation in this type of study is "distinguishing the literal and real meanings of a document. It is not always easy to determine what a given statement really says."\footnote{13} When analyzing an orally delivered speech for ethical appeal, it is often difficult to determine with exactness what the speaker wanted to say. With a written text in hand, however, it is possible for the rhetorical critic to study each statement carefully.

REVIEW OF PREVIOUS LITERATURE

Before pursuing this study, a survey was made of previous studies that had been completed on Margaret Chase Smith. In the sources available at the University of Arizona, only two studies could be found. These were listed in the Index

\footnote{12} Auer, pp. 128-129.

\footnote{13} Auer, p. 135.
of Graduate Theses compiled by Franklin H. Knowler in *Speech Monographs* dated June, 1953 and June, 1955.

The first study listed was done at the University of South Dakota in 1952, and was entitled *The Effectiveness of Selected Speeches of Margaret Chase Smith*. The author of this thesis, Ruth M. Adkins, selected speeches of Margaret Chase Smith and analyzed them for content, types of appeals, and the effect of the speech upon the audience. This study, which is presently being done, does not duplicate the study made by Miss Adkins for she was primarily concerned with a complete rhetorical criticism of the speeches of Senator Smith, whereas, this study proposes to analyze only the nature of ethical appeal.

The second study, entitled *A Study of Margaret Chase Smith as an Orator and of Her Senatorial Address of June 1, 1950*, was made by Agnes Doody in 1954 at Pennsylvania State University. Since Miss Doody's thesis was concerned with a complete rhetorical analysis of one address and encompassed all aspects of effective speaking, her work will not be duplicated in this study.

**SUMMARY**

In brief, the purpose of this study, as stated in this chapter, is to analyze three of the speeches of Margaret Chase Smith in order to ascertain the nature and sources of ethical appeal employed by her as a means of persuasion. The
Senator's life and personal characteristics will be studied in order to provide a background for the speeches. A discussion of ethical appeal will be pursued in order to make clear what one must consider when attempting to discover ethical appeal. It is hoped that this study will provide a better understanding of ethical appeal as an important element in persuasive speaking.
CHAPTER I

MARGARET CHASE SMITH--THE SPEAKER

Our definition of ethical appeal states that it is the character of the speaker which determines, to a large degree, the type of ethical persuasion he will employ in a speaking situation. Therefore, it is the purpose of this chapter to record certain information concerning the life and beliefs of Margaret Chase Smith in order to provide a basis for observing in later chapters how these elements are reflected in certain speeches. Data is here assembled containing information about Senator Smith's early life and employment, her appearance, and her contributions to the House of Representatives and the Senate. Since this study is concerned primarily with ethical appeal Mrs. Smith's political philosophy and ethos will be considered in detail, because both the philosophy and the ethos of a speaker determine to what extent ethical appeal is employed in her speeches. The opinions of qualified observers frequently help to describe the character of a speaker; therefore, remarks concerning the public's response to Senator Smith will also be included in this chapter.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Margaret Chase Smith was born Margaret Madeline Chase in Skowhegan, Maine, on December 14, 1897. She was
the daughter of George and Carrie Chase and was the eldest of six children. All her schooling was completed in Skowhegan, Maine where she attended Skowhegan High School from 1912 to 1916.14

After finishing high school in 1916, she spent a winter as a teacher in a one-room rural school in Skowhegan. Other employment consisted of positions as office executive for the Independent Reporter, a weekly newspaper in Skowhegan, Maine, from 1919 to 1928, and treasurer of the New England Process Company, a woolen mill in Skowhegan, from 1928 to 1936.15

While working for the Independent Reporter she began a four year courtship with the paper's owner, Clyde H. Smith, whom she married on May 14, 1930.16 After her marriage she became active in politics doing "a thousand thankless party tasks."17 Mrs. Smith served on the Republican State Committee of Maine from 1930 to 1936 and was also president of the Maine Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs.18

In 1936 Clyde H. Smith was elected to the House of Representatives of the United States. Margaret Chase Smith became her husband's secretary, working fifteen hours a day

taking care of all the Congressional routine office work, personally handling his mail and doing research on the subjects of various bills.\textsuperscript{19} While living in Washington, Mrs. Smith served as treasurer of the Congressional Club, an organization composed of the wives of Congressmen and Cabinet members.\textsuperscript{20}

On April 8, 1940, Representative Smith died of a coronary thrombosis. Before his death, he issued a statement to the press asking his constituents to elect his wife to Congress to fill his vacancy, and in a special election on June 3, 1940 Mrs. Smith was chosen to fill the unexpired term of her husband. In September, 1940, she was re-elected as a member of the House of Representatives.\textsuperscript{21}

Margaret Chase Smith served in the House from 1940 until 1949. After her election she requested a seat on the Labor Committee since she was a representative of an industrial district. She was assigned, however, to the committees on Education, Invalid Pensions, and Post Offices and Post Roads.\textsuperscript{22} In 1943 she was appointed to serve on the Committee on Naval Affairs\textsuperscript{23} and was the author of the bill "raising the maximum WAVE rank from lieutenant commander to captain, entitling WAVES to dependents' allowance (except for husbands),

\begin{itemize}
\item[19.] Rothe, p. 559.
\item[20.] Rothe, p. 559.
\item[21.] Rothe, p. 559.
\item[22.] Rothe, p. 559.
\item[23.] \textit{Congressional Record}, LXXXIX, Part 1 (1943), 355.
\end{itemize}
and allowing the assignment of WAVES to duty overseas. The bill was passed by the House without debate on June 8, 1943. 24

An inspection of the installations of Women's Naval Service was conducted by Senator Smith from September to December, 1944. Her recommendations after this inspection included plans for the demobilization of the women, improved housing arrangements, and the continuation of the Women's Naval Service after the war. She also made a tour of advanced South Pacific bases in December, 1944. Upon returning from this 25,000 mile inspection trip she asked that the morale and living conditions at these bases be improved, and her recommendations were put into effect by Secretary of the Navy, James Forrestal. 25

While serving as a Representative, Mrs. Smith generally voted along Republican lines, but cast an occasional vote for Administration measures. On farm affairs she opposed incentive payments to farmers, increased appropriations for soil conservation, funds for crop insurance, and more money on rural electrification. She voted against the $25,000.00 (after taxes) limit on salaries and in favor of the income tax bill which broadened the tax base to include more people with small incomes. She favored increased payment to Federal employees and opposed the reduction of Old Age Pensions. In accord with the Administration, she voted to pass the Fulbright


resolution which pledged the country to join in a world peace organization. 26

After serving as a member of the House of Representatives in the Seventy-sixth, Seventy-seventh, Seventy-eighth, Seventy-ninth, and Eightieth Congresses, Margaret Smith entered a campaign to secure the nomination as Senator from Maine in 1948. In this Maine primary she opposed Governor Horace Hildreth, former Governor Sumner Sewall, and Reverend Albion P. Beverage. She won the primary election receiving 63,941 votes over Hildreth's 31,228, Sewall's 21,916, and Beverage's 6,684. 27 About her victory Mrs. Smith said, "It is a grassroots victory that springs from the people themselves. It is a victory of a cause rather than of a candidate or a personality." 28 She went on to win the 1948 general election as Senator from Maine and was re-elected in 1954 and 1960.

During her 1954 campaign for Senator, "Senator Smith received the endorsement of Labor's League for Political Education in Maine. This is the political adjunct of the State Federation of Labor, which was holding its fiftieth annual convention in Augusta. The federation represents some 38,000 union workers." 29 It is interesting to note

that Mrs. Smith received this support although she had voted for the Taft-Hartly Act earlier.  

While serving in the Senate, Mrs. Smith has been quite active on various committees including the National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission, 1949, Appropriations Committee, 1953, Armed Services Committee, 1953 through 1958, Government Operations Committee, 1953, Minority Policy Committee, 1955, Standing Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, 1958, Committee on Appropriations, 1959, and Committee on Armed Services, 1959.

The political philosophy of Senator Smith is reflected by her work in both branches of the United States Congress. She describes herself as a "Moderate Republican," saying, "I conceive a Moderate to be one who is somewhat more Liberal, and somewhat less Conservative, than one in the past category of 'middle-of-the-road.' But a policy of moderation must avoid the weakness of pseudo-liberals who attempt to be 'all things to all men all of the time.' It must not be mistaken for 'straddling' that rightfully results in political suicide."  

Concerning the political philosophy of Margaret Chase Smith, the New York Times says, "She voted with the Republicans often enough not to be termed a Maverick, but was an outspoken


supporter of much of the Roosevelt Administration's social and labor legislation, and is now and has been a member of the internationalist wing of her party." 32

Although she does not feel that being a woman was one of the most important factors assisting her in being elected to the United States Senate, she does believe that the United States will some day have a woman President. 33 She has expressed belief that women can have a great deal of influence in politics, stating

The opportunities for women in politics are expanding, but the expansion will be slow. A woman must have the same qualities for political success as a man, but in greater abundance. The qualities she most needs, as distinguished from those most essential to a man, are unlimited courage and patient perseverance. It is true of any work or profession outside the home, of course, that a woman must be at least twice as good as a man in actual performance to get anywhere. I realize that my position in the Senate is unique, but I don't recall ever receiving any favors because I am a woman. When I speak on the Senate floor, my words get just as much attention as those spoken by any of my ninety-five colleagues. 34

In support of her beliefs concerning women in the political world, she was one of the first members of Congress to vote for the Equal Rights Amendment. "This proposed amendment states that men and women shall have equal rights in the United States and all places subject to its jurisdiction. The bill


33. Letter to the author from Senator Margaret Chase Smith.

was defeated because it could be so construed as to invali-
date existing health legislation."\textsuperscript{35}

Although the data recorded above are important in
order to give a background, Senator Margaret Chase Smith's
appearance and speaking characteristics can be considered of
even greater importance in a study of her speeches. Little
information is available, but popular magazines do describe
her as being five feet four inches tall with a "clean-cut
face," and short wavy, gray hair.\textsuperscript{36} "Her short, gray hair
is streaked with white, perhaps the only dramatic touch about
the quiet and unassuming Republican."\textsuperscript{37} She has been said to
be "the best-groomed woman on Capitol Hill. Mrs. Smith wears
simple, dressmaker suits in pastel shades of green and blue
and in shocking pink, which always bear a 'Made in Maine'
label."\textsuperscript{38}

Concerning her speaking it has been remarked that
Senator Smith is a woman who "is spare with words. On the
lecture platform she delivers a speech with deliberate ease,
her voice moderate and lowered for emphasis, and her accent
sharply Down East."\textsuperscript{39} Senator Smith has had no speech

\textsuperscript{35} Rothe, p. 560.

\textsuperscript{36} "The Lady from Maine," \textit{Newsweek}, XXXV, No. 24
(June 12, 1950), 24.

\textsuperscript{37} Rothe, p. 561.

\textsuperscript{38} Lilian Rixey, "Mrs Smith Really Goes to Town," \textit{Colliers}, CXXVI, No. 5 (July 29, 1950), 82.

\textsuperscript{39} Beatrice Blackman Gould, "Gentlewoman from Maine,
Margaret Chase Smith," \textit{Ladies' Home Journal}, LXXVII, No. 1
(January, 1961), 65.
training, but lists experience as her way of learning good speaking techniques. She prepares her own speeches with assistance from her Executive Assistant in research. When asked which groups she felt she was most successful before, she answered "no one group." She considers belief in what she is saying and her sincere approach as her greatest assets in speaking. 40

ETHOS OF SENATOR SMITH

The philosophy and speaking characteristics of any one speaker are in part determined by that speaker's character. For this reason, a discussion of the ethos of Senator Smith must be considered.

When Mrs. Smith was asked what her personal philosophy towards life was, her answer was very simply stated--"the Golden Rule." In other people she admires, more than any others, the two traits of honesty and of belief in oneself. 41 These two traits, along with courage, sincerity, and forthrightness, appear evident in her famous "Declaration of Conscience," a speech which Senator Smith prepared and signed with six other GOP colleagues and delivered before the Senate on June 1, 1950. Her courage appears evident when she attacks the Democrats for "lack of effective leadership....complacency to the threat of Communism here at home....oversensitivity to rightful criticism, petty bitterness against its

40. Letter to the author from Margaret Chase Smith.
41. Letter to the author from Margaret Chase Smith.
critics.\textsuperscript{42} Another example of her courage is the accusation directed against her own party, the Republicans, when she says they are "materially adding to this confusion in the hopes of riding to victory through the selfish political exploitation of fear, bigotry, ignorance and intolerance."\textsuperscript{43}

Examples of sincerity and forthrightness appear in the next statements. She appears to be sincere in her services to the American people, and her reference to the Constitution and freedom of speech seems to indicate that she has beliefs which she is not afraid to express. She says:

I think it is high time for the United States Senate and its members to do some soul searching--for us to weigh our consciences--on the manner in which we are using or abusing our individual powers and privileges.

I think that it is high time that we remembered that we have sworn to uphold and defend the Constitution. I think that it is high time that we remembered that the Constitution, as amended, speaks not only of the freedom of speech but also of trial by jury instead of trial by accusation.\textsuperscript{44}

Senator Smith's high regard for human life and an individual's character appears to be indicated by her statement, "Whether it be a criminal prosecution in court or a character prosecution in the Senate, there is little practical distinction when the life of a person has been ruined."\textsuperscript{45}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{42} "The Lady from Maine," \textit{Newsweek}, XXXV, No. 24 (June 12, 1950), 24.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{43} "The Lady from Maine," p. 24.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{44} Speech text received from Senator Margaret Chase Smith by the author, "For Release Upon Delivery, Statement of Senator Margaret Chase Smith, June 1, 1950."
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{45} Speech text received from Senator Smith by the author.
\end{flushright}
In the next three paragraphs Mrs. Smith's honesty appears evident. She continues:

As a United States Senator, I am not proud of the way in which the Senate has been made a publicity platform for irresponsible sensationalism. I am not proud of the reckless abandon in which unproved charges have been hurled from this side of the aisle. I am not proud of the obviously staged, undignified countercharges that have been attempted in retaliation from the other side of the aisle.

I don't like the way the Senate has been made a rendezvous for vilification, for selfish political gain at the sacrifice of individual reputations and national unity. I am not proud of the way we smear outsiders from the Floor of the Senate and hide behind the cloak of Congressional immunity and still place ourselves beyond criticism on the Floor of the Senate.

As an American, I am shocked at the way Republicans and Democrats alike are playing directly into the Communist design of 'confuse, divide and conquer.' As an American, I don't want a Democratic Administration 'white wash' or 'cover up' any more than I want a Republican smear or witch hunt.46

These remarks also seem to show that Senator Smith has the courage to emphasize the ideals of which she is proud and to degrade those things of which she is ashamed. Sincerity appears evinced in the remarks concerning her pride as an American citizen and United States Senator.

Mrs. Smith's remarks were well accepted by the members of the press. The New York Post lauded her "memorable remarks" and called them "new proof that decency and tolerance are bipartisan qualities in American life." The Washington

46. Speech text received from Senator Smith by the author.
Star said, "Not in a long time, in either house of Congress, has there been a finer or more pertinent address....A much needed breath of fresh air in the fetid atmosphere."\(^47\)

Another speech which was delivered in April, 1951, at the Hood College Convocation seems also to depict the character of Senator Smith. This speech is concerned with some of the faults of the American people and a plea for people to better themselves. Again her courage appears evident as she speaks out against the people in general. She says:

One of the basic causes of the trouble in the world today is that people talk too much and think too little. I urge you to think well and deeply before you talk--but once you have made up your mind, don't hesitate to speak your mind. As long as you speak your mind, dictators and demagogues will never take control of this country.\(^48\)

One of her strongest beliefs seems to be that only a person who is able to reason and think well, and then express his beliefs, can save our country.

In addition to the speeches of a political speaker a description of a campaign will often provide insight into the person's character. Senator Smith is the type of person who believes in considering people of all classes in her campaigns. In her campaign for Senator in 1948, Mrs. Smith "carried her campaign to places where a house is called a village. Booted and bemittened, on days when the fog was so

---


\(^48\). Margaret Chase Smith, "We Can Forfeit Freedom," The Nation, CLXXIII (July 7, 1951), 13.
thick a man could hardly spit, on days when the natives allowed 'it wuz cold enough to freeze two dry rags together' she made the rounds of the state.\textsuperscript{49}

Consideration for the "common-man" is only one of Senator Smith's ideals. Other ideals can be shown in her list of the qualifications she considers necessary for the man who is president. This list shows the attributes she considers important in individuals in politics. These qualifications are:

1. Initiative or the will to act now. He must possess constructive imaginative powers.

2. Courage in abundance. He must possess political courage to take a stand that he knows is right even if it is unpopular.

3. A leader of his people. He must be the type of a man who can guide his people in forming opinions.

4. Physical courage. He must keep at his job even though he knows the wear and tear bring him closer to death.

5. He should be a person of great self-discipline.

6. Patience and kindness. He must refuse to carry grudges against those who do not always do or vote as he would have them.

7. Warm hearted. He should so give of himself in his genuine friendliness to people that he inspires them to greater accomplishments.

8. He must have a real and personal meaning to the people.\textsuperscript{50}

We cannot assume that these are the traits that Senator Smith possesses, but her character can be depicted through her admiration for courage, leadership, self-discipline, patience, kindness, and warm heartedness.

**PUBLIC RESPONSE TO THE SPEAKER**

Another way of discovering the nature of Senator Smith's ethos is to assess her character through the public's response to her as an individual.

Senator Smith was considered as "one of the most active members of the House of Representatives."\textsuperscript{51} When she moved into the Senate in 1949 it was said that "the freshman senator was as full of sparks as a blacksmith's shop and the words she spoke had the solid authority of a sledge hammer on steel."\textsuperscript{52} Because of her active participation in politics, the public felt that Mrs. Smith was deserving of her political position. It was said that she earned her promotion to the Senate by "her hard work, her resolute independence of opinion, her internationalist record, and her service as the only woman member of the House Armed Services Committee."\textsuperscript{53}

\begin{thebibliography}{9}
\bibitem{51} Greenberg, p. 21.
\bibitem{52} "A Mighty Smith is She," *Colliers*, CXXXII, No. 5 (August 7, 1953).
\bibitem{53} "Ballot Box Autopsy," *Newsweek*, XXXII, No. 1 (September 27, 1948), 20.
\end{thebibliography}
Public opinion of Margaret Chase Smith can best be summed up by the honors that have been conferred upon her. On June 18, 1955, she received an honorary degree of Doctor of Letters from the Drexel Institute of Technology at Philadelphia. The citation printed in the Congressional Record reads as follows: DOCTOR OF LETTERS, HONORIS CAUSA MARGARET CHASE SMITH, SUCCESSFUL BUSINESSWOMAN, ABLE JOURNALIST, AND HONORED PUBLIC SERVANT.54

The article printed in the Congressional Record following the citation told of the outstanding contributions Senator Smith has made to politics.

Through her record in the Congress of the United States as a Representative and as a Senator from the state of Maine, she has become a distinguished public figure, the only woman to have served in both branches of our highest legislative body. Her legislative services have stemmed from her diligence in committee work, now a potent force in National Government; and she has assumed responsibilities in this connection altogether worthy of the sturdiest among her senatorial colleagues. Her independent and courageous interpretation for many years of public issues and challenges through a syndicated newspaper column earned for her recognition as an informed and effective commentator.55

The honorary degree bestowed upon Senator Smith by Drexel Institute of Technology is not the only recognition she has received from the public. Leading political scientists of the United States have selected her as one of the six best of the Senators and she has repeatedly been designated woman of

the year in the United States. The Gallup Poll selected her as one of the four most admired women in the world in 1955. In 1951 when Liberty magazine honored ten members of Congress with awards, Senator Smith was among the ten. Liberty magazine said these Senators were "not just politicians who keep out of trouble and in office; they were dynamic and outspoken. These lawmakers were picked because Liberty believed that they all sincerely try to serve the people. The ten that were picked deserved respect because they have risked their political necks for principles and have been able to win elections without selling their souls." Following is the article that first appeared in Liberty magazine and was later reprinted in the Congressional Record:

Senator Margaret Chase Smith of Maine, but for her enemies would merely be known as the first woman to enter the Senate strictly on her own merit. Last year she issued a "Declaration of Conscience," a clarion call for Congress to make a stand for decency. Leveling fire on Senator McCarthy, she denounced efforts to turn Congress into a forum of hate. Those who hoped to ride to a Republican victory through the selfish political exploitation of fear, bigotry, ignorance and intolerance winced under her seething indictment. The McCarthy block is now sharpening knives for vengeance against Mrs. Smith.

With her New England conscience the Senator combines a sincere human approach which has given Maine an effective Washington advocate. She likes to have major issues thoroughly discussed.


at home before voting on them. In Maine, frankness is a political asset.58

These honors conferred upon Senator Smith offer proof that she is respected by the people of the United States. Perhaps her entire life can be condensed into this statement which appeared in the Congressional Record: "Successful businesswoman, skilled interpreter of vital issues, and conscientious public servant, her career is a brilliant example of the achievements of women in high affairs of state, and stands as an inspiration to all who would devote their talents to the welfare of our country."59

SUMMARY

From the information here assembled concerning the life and work of Senator Margaret Chase Smith, it appears that she is a conscientious, American woman who has contributed much to our Government. Honors conferred upon her support the idea that she is held in high esteem by the people of the United States. In addition, this information also shows that Senator Smith is a woman of reputable character. However, since it was previously stated that this study was to analyze only the speech texts for ethical appeal, this information has been offered as background to provide a better understanding of the speeches. In the next chapter ethical appeal and the methods of discovering it in a speech will be considered.


CHAPTER II

ETHICAL APPEAL--THE CRITERIA FOR JUDGING

Ethical appeal must be thoroughly understood before one can determine its sources in a speech. In this chapter ethical appeal will be explained according to the opinions of Aristotle, the first authority on the subject, and five contemporary writers—William Phillips Sandford, whose work appeared in 1934, Willard Hayes Yeager, 1940, Lester Thonssen and A. Craig Baird, 1948, and Wayne C. Minnick, 1957. After this discussion, certain criteria to be used for discovering ethical appeal in selected speeches of Margaret Chase Smith will be established.

DISCUSSION OF ETHICAL APPEAL

Aristotle discusses three means of "persuasion supplied by the speech itself, the first residing in the character of the speaker." It is this means of persuasion with which this study deals. Concerning ethical appeal as a means of persuasion Aristotle says:

The character (ethos) of the speaker is a cause of persuasion when the speech is so uttered as to make him worthy of belief; for as a rule we trust men of probity more, and more quickly about things in general, while on points outside the realm of exact knowledge, where opinion is divided, we trust them absolutely. This trust, however, should be created by the speech itself, and not left to

60. Cooper, p. 8.
depend upon an antecedent impression that the speaker is this or that kind of man. It is not true, as some writers on the art maintain, that the probity of the speaker contributes nothing to his persuasiveness; on the contrary, we might almost affirm that his character (ethos) is the most potent of all the means to persuasion. 61

A more recent author defines ethical appeal as "the method by which the speaker influences the thought and conduct of the audience through his own personality." 62 These definitions show that a speaker will increase the popularity of his beliefs if he first wins acceptance of himself.

It is possible for a speaker to win acceptance of himself in two ways—by what he says and by the manner in which he delivers what he has to say. Although this study is concerned only with what the speaker says it must be realized that "in most cases the attitude of the audience toward the speaker--based upon previous knowledge of the latter's activities and reputation--cannot accurately be separated from the reaction the speaker induces through the medium of the speech." 63 However, Aristotle pointed out that "trust should be created by the speech itself," 64 and a contemporary writer on the subject of speech says, "Some qualities of speakers' personalities can be measured by careful analysis of written reports of what they said. Speakers' expert knowledge of their subjects and

63. Thonssen and Baird, p. 384.
64. Cooper, p. 8.
their intimate knowledge of their audiences are revealed almost entirely through the words they use.\textsuperscript{65}

In Chapter I, data were assembled concerning the character of Margaret Chase Smith. Through such data it was established that Senator Smith is considered a woman of high repute and good character, which should aid her in her effectiveness as a speaker. The problem in this study, however, is to analyze only the speeches to discover if ethical appeal is present in the words of the speeches themselves.

Since ethical appeal is the means of persuasion by which the character of the speaker makes us believe or disbelieve the speech, and the revelation of character must come from the words of the speech, it is necessary to consider some of the elements which must be present if the speaker intends to employ ethical appeal effectively. In regard to the characteristics which aid a speaker in the use of ethical appeal Aristotle says:

As for the speakers themselves, the sources of our trust in them are three, for apart from the arguments there are three things that gain our belief, namely, intelligence, character, and good will. Speakers are untrustworthy in what they say or advise from one or more of the following causes. Either through want of intelligence they form wrong opinions; or, while they form correct opinions, their rascality leads them to say what they do not think; or, while intelligent and honest enough, they are not well-disposed and so perchance will fail to advise the best course, though they see it.\textsuperscript{66}


\textsuperscript{66} Cooper, p. 92.
There must be an explanation about the three items of which Aristotle spoke--intelligence, character, and good will. Naturally an audience prefers a speaker who is well informed about his subject and has the ability to express his ideas clearly and in a manner which is easily understood. A speaker must evince intelligence about his subject, his audience, and his knowledge in general. If a speaker shows a thorough knowledge of his subject matter, confidence will be inspired in his audience, but if his knowledge concerning his subject is lacking, distrust will be established. A speaker must also be familiar with his audience's desires, its likes and dislikes. A speaker should portray sympathy, understanding, and friendliness towards his audience through the words of his speech. An audience will more readily accept a speaker if he has its interests in mind. The third way in which the speaker may evince intelligence is by displaying a general knowledge of the world in which we live.

Aristotle's second element of ethical appeal is character. The audience will accept a speaker more readily if they have confidence in his honesty, fairness, courage, and wisdom. Through the words of his speech the speaker should attempt to convince the audience that he possesses these traits.

Good will is the final important element of ethical appeal. Friendliness towards his audience is important to the speaker who hopes to establish a feeling of good will. Often a speaker will praise his audience or some item it holds dear when beginning his speech. In this way he establishes good will.
In addition to intelligence, character, and good will, there are other traits which a speaker must possess if he intends to employ ethical appeal effectively. William Albig, in his book *Public Opinion*, reports a survey of the traits ascribed to successful leaders by recognized scholars in the fields of psychology and public opinion. He reports that some of these traits are mentioned by so many writers that they could be said to represent unanimous choices. The traits listed by Albig are as follows:

1. Confidence and poise--an old aphorism states that we do not follow frightened leaders.

2. Physical energy and tonus--a good orator speaks with electric energy and tension. He must be erect, active and vital.

3. Sincerity and conviction--if the orator can make his hearers believe that he is not only a stranger to all unfair artifice, but even destitute of all persuasive skill whatever, he will persuade them more effectively; and if there ever could be an absolutely perfect orator, no one would discover that he was so.

4. Mental alertness, intelligence, and knowledge--these things suggest that the speaker will make decisions on the basis of pertinent facts. Quintilian said, "What is of most weight in deliberative speeches is authority in the speaker."

5. Fairness and justice--a speaker must fight fair.

6. Self-discipline, even temper, and restraint--a speaker who loses control of his emotions, who weeps or rages, offends most of his audience.

7. Sympathy and understanding.

9. Color, eccentricity, and uniqueness—colorful traits provide a focus, an attention getter, a kind of trademark which identifies the speaker and fixes his personality in the minds of his followers.\(^67\)

Intelligence, sympathy, and understanding have already been mentioned and discussed previously in this study. However, the speaker can employ many other traits if he is relying on ethical appeal as a means of persuasion. A person must display confidence in himself and his beliefs through his choice of words. He must be fair and refrain from such things as name calling or the use of false testimony and evidence. The speaker should also take a stand in his speech and have the courage to discuss his point of view thoroughly. In this manner he will show his audience that he is decisive and will gain their confidence more readily. Another way in which a speaker can increase his ethos is to add color or uniqueness to his speech by using colorful words, slogans, or other phrases which the audience will remember.

There are other methods for establishing ethical appeal which must be discussed before a yardstick for measuring it can be established. These methods are those described by Lester Thonssen and A. Craig Baird in their book, *Speech Criticism*.

A speaker can focus attention upon the probity or honesty of his character by first associating himself or his message with what is virtuous and by bestowing praise upon himself.

---

or his cause. Conversely, the speaker may link his opponent or his opponent's cause with what is bad. This type of ethical persuasion is often found in political speeches when the speaker is attempting to win acceptance of his beliefs or when he is campaigning for a political office and wishes to make his cause more acceptable than that of his opponent. If the speaker knows that the audience has an unfavorable impression of him due to some previously established information, he should attempt to reduce this antagonism before proceeding to the discussion of his cause. This can be done by relying upon authority derived from his personal experiences or by establishing confidence in his audience by quoting the remarks of notable people who are in agreement with his beliefs. The final way in which a speaker can establish honesty is by proving that he is sincere; showing the audience that he completely believes in his cause.

If the speaker desires to establish the impression of wisdom he should first use what is called common sense. Tact must be evident in the words he chooses. Tact is the ability "to say the right thing, at the right time, and in the right way, or a display of sympathy and understanding of the other man's point of view." The speaker must display tactfulness in his choice of subject and in his choice of words. Wisdom can also be revealed by showing a familiarity with the interests of the day. These items can be used in the speech to

68. Sandford and Yeager, p. 44.
show that the speaker not only possesses a knowledge of his subject but that he also possesses information concerning areas outside the realm of his subject.

One of the most important elements in ethical appeal is good will. A speaker should offer some praise of his audience, but he must be careful not to overdo it. He should attempt to identify himself with the members of his audience or their problems in order to gain their confidence. If the speaker is in disagreement with his audience he should proceed with tact and consideration, yet he should be straightforward when presenting his ideas. Good will cannot be established if the speaker is not direct, honest, and forthright because he fears his audience is likely to disagree with him. Instead, he should attempt to state his beliefs in such a way that the audience can see he has its interests in mind.69

In addition to establishing honesty, intelligence, and good will, the speaker should reveal his character somewhere in his speech. This can be accomplished either by a direct or indirect method. In employing the direct method, the speaker openly tells the audience of his good reputation by either "assuring the audience of his good intentions, or indicating that he possesses admired virtues by citing the testimony of others."70 If the speaker desires to tell the audience of his good intentions, he can explain his cause and indicate why it

69. Thonsseen and Baird, p. 387.
is good and worthwhile. If he cites the testimony of others, it is effective for him to cite remarks made by a well-known individual--one who is qualified to give this testimonial.

The speaker may wish to be unobtrusive in the revelation of his character and imply that he is a man of good repute. This is the indirect method of establishing character and can be accomplished in one of two ways:

1. The speaker may refer to experiences and facts which reveal incidentally that he is well educated. Often a speaker does this by stating important positions he has held, or articles he has written. He may show himself to be acquainted with some of the great scholars and leaders of his time by referring to them in his speech, or he may reflect a knowledge of music, literature, science, or the arts.

2. Personal experiences may be used to indirectly show the character of the speaker. These experiences should be ones in which the speaker took part; and they should show that his behavior was evidently courageous, intelligent, fair, sympathetic, or whatever else he may wish to convey in a particular speech. 71

Although either of these methods can be employed effectively, the indirect method of revealing character is probably the more tactful.

In a speaking situation prestige is directly related to ethical appeal. Usually, a speaker will attempt to establish his prestige at the beginning of the speech, because if he can gain the respect and admiration of his audience early, 71. Minnick, p. 121.
it is more likely he will win belief. Prestige generally arises from one of three sources—"the known reputation of the speaker before the delivery of the speech, the character and personality revealed by the speaker as he utters the speech, or the coincidence of the speaker's proposals with the rigid beliefs and attitudes of the audience." This study will be concerned only with the third source as this is the only one that is revealed primarily within the text of the speech itself.

There are five methods, discussed by Wayne Minnick in his book The Art of Persuasion, which any speaker can employ in order to build esteem. First, the speaker can attempt to discover something which he has in common with his audience and suggest that he and his audience agree on important matters such as parentage, schooling, religious beliefs, experiences, or class distinction. People have a tendency to trust those with whom they agree and for this reason this method of establishing esteem is known as the Common-Ground Method. Another method is to ask a series of questions which the audience will answer yes. After establishing a positive attitude in his hearers, the speaker can proceed to his proposition. This is known as the Yes-Yes Method. Similar to the Yes-Yes Method is the Yes-But Method in which the speaker first agrees with the beliefs of his audience and later states his proposition according to his beliefs and attitudes. The fourth way in which a speaker can establish prestige is to avoid discussing

72. Minnick, p. 113.
his proposition immediately, but begin talking about irrelevant material such as the weather, the occasion, or the audience. This method is known as the Oblique Method because it avoids discussion of the speaker's cause until the audience has a favorable impression of him. The Implicative Method is the final way in which a speaker can build esteem. When employing this method the speaker states examples, one after the other, with the hope that the listeners will be able to draw the conclusion themselves. Any one of these methods may be employed by the speaker in order to gain the respect and attention of his audience.

A discussion of ethical appeal and methods of employing ethical appeal has been presented to provide background for the following questions which will be applied to selected speeches of Margaret Chase Smith, in order to discover any ethical appeal which may exist in her speeches. Sources for this criteria are Lester Thonsen and A. Craig Baird's *Speech Criticism* and Wayne Minnick's *The Art of Persuasion*.

**CRITERIA FOR JUDGING**

1. Does the speaker focus attention upon the probity or honesty of his character by employing any one of the following methods:
   a. Associating himself or his message with what is good?
   b. Bestowing tempered praise upon himself or his message?
   c. Linking the opponent or the opponent's cause with what is not virtuous?
2. Does the speaker establish the impression of sagacity, wisdom, or intelligence by any of the following devices:
   a. Creating an attitude of friendliness towards his audience?
   b. Displaying common sense and tact?
   c. Revealing a broad familiarity with the interests of the day?
   d. Creating the impression of confidence in his ideas?
3. Does the speaker show good will in one or more of these ways:
   a. Praising his audience with moderation?
   b. Identifying himself with the audience?
   c. Being straightforward?
   d. Creating the impression of sympathy and understanding towards his audience?
4. Does the speaker reveal his character directly by either of the following methods:
   a. Openly assuring the audience of his good intentions?
   b. Citing testimonies of others?
5. Does the speaker reveal his character indirectly in any of the following ways:
   a. Referring to experiences and facts which indicate that he is well educated?
   b. Indicating his acquaintance with the works of great scholars or leaders?
   c. Citing personal experience which show him to possess intelligence, fairness, sympathy, understanding, or courage?
6. Does the speaker use any of the various methods of building esteem for himself before launching into his main idea?

7. Does the speaker show color or uniqueness in his speeches?

Although there may be other methods for determining ethical appeal, in this study the above questions will be applied to three selected speeches of Margaret Chase Smith.

SUMMARY

In this chapter ethical appeal has been defined as the means of persuasion by which the speaker's character makes us believe or disbelieve the speech. Methods of establishing this type of appeal have been discussed, and the criteria for discovering the sources of ethical appeal in a speech have been established. We can now proceed to discuss the reasons for selecting certain speeches, and to apply the established criteria to the analysis of these speeches of Senator Margaret Chase Smith in order to determine the nature of her ethical appeal and some of its sources.
The three speeches to be analyzed were selected from a ten year period in Margaret Chase Smith's career extending from 1945 to 1955. One speech dated July 8, 1946 was selected from the beginning of this period, one dated February 10, 1950, from the mid-part, and another dated June 18, 1955, from the latter part.

The speeches selected were delivered to three different audiences. This made it possible to observe how ethical appeal was used in a variety of occasions. The first audience was composed entirely of women, the second of members of one political party, and the third of a variety of individuals of both sexes and different ages.

In addition to the considerations just mentioned, each speech was chosen to represent one of the three types described by Aristotle in the Rhetoric. These are: (1) speeches of counsel or advice or deliberative speeches, (2) speeches used in prosecution and defense or forensic or judicial speeches, and (3) speeches of praise or blame or epideictic speeches.73
The first speech is a deliberative address for it is primarily concerned with the future, and its purpose is to offer advice.

73. Cooper, p. 17.
for things to come. It is the aim of this type of address to recommend an advantageous course of action which will in some way better the audience or deter the audience from something which is meant to hinder them.\textsuperscript{74}

The second speech is a judicial speech. It talks about things that have already happened, for it is concerned with accusing one party and cause and defending another. This type of speech is usually one that is concerned with justice and injustice and similar matters.\textsuperscript{75} A good example of a judicial speech is that of a lawyer in a court of law.

The third address is an epideictic one concerned primarily with honor and dishonor. Praise or blame is leveled at things which are happening at the present time. It is also possible for a speaker to draw upon past experiences in order to strengthen his position when he is delivering a speech of praise or blame.\textsuperscript{76}

METHOD OF ANALYSIS

The criteria set up in the preceding chapter will now be applied to the selected speeches of Margaret Chase Smith. After studying these speeches, the author chose words, sentences, or phrases which, according to the criteria used in this study, appear to contain evidence of the use of ethical

\textsuperscript{74} Cooper, pp. 17-18.

\textsuperscript{75} Cooper, pp. 17-18.

\textsuperscript{76} Cooper, pp. 17-18.
appeal. All quoted material has been taken directly from the Congressional Record in which the speech appeared.

In the process of analysis the first item noted was whether the speaker focused attention upon her honesty or probity by associating her message with what was good, bestowing praise upon herself or her cause, or linking the opponent's cause with what was bad. Next, a study of the establishment of intelligence or sagacity was made. An attempt was made to discover whether the speaker created an attitude of friendliness toward her audience, displayed common sense, revealed a broad familiarity with the interests of the day, or created the impression of confidence in her ideas. Next, there was an attempt to determine to what extent the speaker promoted good will toward the audience through praise, identification with the audience, straightforward manner, or sympathetic and understanding attitude. In addition, methods used by the speaker to reveal her character, either directly or indirectly, and methods of building esteem were discovered. Finally, any colorful or unique statement used by Senator Smith was located and analyzed. The procedure was followed for all three speeches.

ADDRESS BEFORE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL WOMEN'S CLUBS

The first speech was read into the Congressional Record, Volume XCII, Part 12, Pages A4378-A4379, upon request of Senator Smith. It is a speech that was delivered before the National
Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs in Cleveland, Ohio, on July 8, 1946.77

The purpose of the speech was to stimulate the women of these organizations to become better citizens by taking an active part in government. According to the three types of speeches discussed by Aristotle, this address was primarily deliberative in nature for it offered advice to the women of America. There were also some elements of epideictic speaking for the speech did praise the accomplishments of women in the past.

In attempting to focus attention upon the probity of her character, Senator Smith said, "But now the challenge to women is to match their amazing wartime record with the battles for peace and the orderly reconversion to normal living." Here, she associated her message with peace—something the audience was certain to favor. She then said, "For lasting world peace, the wives and mothers in all nations must get together for a common understanding—in like manner the business and professional women." Once again Senator Smith associated her message with what was good by indicating that it was the women of the world who could promote world peace. In addition to associating her message with what was good, Mrs. Smith bestowed praise upon herself by saying:

But in the past the women have permitted the balance to swing too heavily to the Government's

77. See Appendix A.
influence over the home rather than having the home exercise its proper influence over the Government. How can this be remedied? By taking a greater interest in our greatest investment, our biggest business--our Government--in seeking and accepting public office.

Since Senator Smith was presently active in government this indicated that she was doing what was right and should be emulated by other women. In attempting to focus upon her honesty, Senator Smith met all the criteria previously established for this type of ethical appeal with the exception of linking her opponent or her opponent's cause with that which was not virtuous. Since she did not have an opponent in this particular address, this criterion cannot be considered.

There was evidence in this speech which appeared to show that Senator Smith was attempting to establish the impression of sagacity. She first said, "Citizenship is without sex. It makes no distinction between the rights and responsibilities of men and women." Here, she appeared friendly toward her audience--all of whom were women--by showing them they had the same rights as men. She also said, "I am confident that the women of the world will reach a real and genuine understanding, if given the means of communication and personal exchange, far more satisfactorily than men have yet been able to do." Again she appeared friendly toward her audience by displaying her confidence in women, and indicating they could accomplish worthy tasks more effectively than men. There was an example of the use of common sense when Senator Smith said, "Some claim that the availability of leadership to women has been unfairly
limited. I have no sympathy with this view because it is only those who 'make the breaks' that 'get the breaks.' Mrs. Smith displayed her common sense when she referred to the long established belief that people usually get out of something that which they put into it. She displayed common sense and tact when she remarked, "Women fought for the right to vote. They won this battle, but they haven't followed through. They do not take the proper advantage of their voting privileges. With one-half of the population, women could easily become the most powerful single group in the electorate." This was a tactful way of telling the women that they were not fulfilling their obligations adequately. Mrs. Smith continued to use tact when she said:

It is regrettable that so few women have been chosen to participate in the UN, and that none sit as members of the Security Council. It is amazing when one realizes that women constitute at least one-half of the world's population. But this can be attributed to women themselves for lack of interest and aggressiveness—and the will to public careers—in this and other countries. We can't become leaders of the world until we have become leaders within our own Nation.

In these statements Senator Smith first explained there was something wrong and then tactfully indicated that it was the women of the world who were at fault. She continued by saying, "Our influence upon others must come from within ourselves individually. In as great a measure, our influence, as a Nation upon the rest of the world in creating and maintaining permanent peace, must first flow from within this country." This statement revealed Senator Smith's confidence in the women whom
she was addressing. Another example of the establishment of sagacity was, "An American-educated woman of China, Madame Chiang Kai-shek has led the political emancipation of the women of China. Japanese women, under our occupation of that country, have been given the right to vote and hold office and are emulating American women by seeking and obtaining public office in Government places such as the Japanese Diet." This reference indicated that Margaret Chase Smith was not only aware of the work of American women in government, but also government work being done by women in other countries. Thus, it is evident that the speaker established, in the minds of the listeners, that she was a sagacious and intelligent individual.

Senator Smith employed ethical appeal frequently in this speech by showing good will through the praise of her audience. She began by saying, "This convention is an example of democracy at work. It is more particularly a most impressive example of the acceptance by women of their responsibility as citizens--to think constructively and to make their thinking articulate." In another statement she said, "I do want to take this occasion to urge you and your organization to continue your splendid contribution to women's leadership and to urge you to extend your beneficial influence as widely as possible." Mrs. Smith was praising the women for the work they had been doing and was appealing to them to continue this work. Another statement which showed ethical appeal in its praise of the audience was, "Women, such as you, individually can provide
leadership in industry and business. You have already proved your leadership ability in the field of management." Senator Smith was not only appealing to her audience as a whole, but also to each individual member by indicating that each person had contributed something to her society and could continue to expand these contributions into other fields. Another example of praise for the audience was, "Much, if not most, of the past leadership of women in this country has come through civic organizations and through organizations such as your own." In addition to praising the women for leadership, Mrs. Smith said, "In the schools as educators women have and will continue to instill in coming generations the very will to peace and the very necessary guards to insure that peace." In this remark, Senator Smith referred to other areas in which the women had been influential. In addition to establishing good will through the praise of her audience, Mrs. Smith also attempted to identify herself with her audience by the use of the pronoun we. "If we are to claim and win our rightful place in the sun on an equal basis with men, then we must not insist upon those privileges and prerogatives identified in the past as exclusively feminine." Senator Smith demonstrated that she was considering herself as one of the women to whom this address was directed. Another example of good will was Senator Smith's straightforwardness when she said, "All of these phases of activity are summed up in the observation that women must give greater meaning to their role of public citizens." Here,
Mrs. Smith bluntly told the women that they were at fault and must remedy the situation themselves. Although no one statement indicated sympathy for the women, Mrs. Smith showed her understanding of the problems women face and of their position in society in all of her remarks. All of the criteria for establishing good will were discovered in this speech.

Senator Smith revealed her character directly by stating:

"Dirigo"—"I lead"—is the motto on the official emblem of my own State of Maine. Women of this Republic could well adopt it as their motto. The question is, Where can they exert leadership? The answer is, Everywhere: (1) in the home as wives and mothers, (2) in organized civic, business, and professional groups such as your own, (3) in industry and business, both management and labor, (4) in public offices, such as legislatures and schools, (5) in politics, and (6) as public citizens.

In this paragraph Mrs. Smith revealed that she had the interests of her audience in mind not only by telling them what was wrong, but also by offering valid suggestions for alleviating the situation.

There was also indirect revelation of character in this address when Senator Smith said:

Perhaps the most lasting and basic influence of women is in the home for behind all men, great or small, are women. This might appear too obvious for mention. But it is too often that we overlook the obvious. Can the dynamic influence of Eleanor Roosevelt be denied when you compare the respectful number of women appointments in the Roosevelt administration to the almost complete absence of such appointments in the Truman administration?
These remarks showed that Senator Smith was aware of the accomplishments of one of the well-known women in the world. Mrs. Smith further revealed her character by saying, "In other words, women should become more politically minded, regardless of party." This statement indicated that Senator Smith wanted the women to take an active interest in government regardless of party affiliation. The remark showed fairness and understanding. She continued along these lines when she said, "They should be workers and officials in political parties in influencing the platforms of the parties, in getting out the maximum vote, in demanding strict administration adherence to platform promises, in stimulating women to vote and be active, and in demanding only the proper representation of women based upon population and degree of public, both political and civic, activity." Senator Smith's political career is evidence that she has actively participated in all the areas in which she asked her audience to take part, and her statement showed her to possess the attributes which she asked the women of her audience to acquire. These traits included an interest in government and a desire to work diligently to remedy an unsatisfactory situation.

At the beginning of this speech, Senator Smith built esteem by employing the Implicative Method. She first cited examples implying that there was something wrong with American women and built up to her proposition by asking the women to become more active as citizens.
One statement in particular showed color and uniqueness. In this statement, Senator Smith appealed to two common loves that Americans share—the love for the family and the love for America. She said, "In one sense of the word, the United States Government is really one big family—the all-American family."

Examples indicative of ethical appeal have been quoted from this speech to the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs. There appeared to be evidence that Margaret Chase Smith focused attention upon the probity of her character by associating her message with what was good, bestowing praise upon herself and creating the impression of sincerity. She did not link the opponent or the opponent's cause with what was not virtuous, because she had no opponent in this speech. An impression of sagacity arose through the creation of a friendly attitude toward her audience, the use of common sense and tact, an indication of knowledge of the interests of her audience, and a confident statement of her beliefs. Ethical appeal was employed through the use of good will more often than any other method in this speech. The speaker praised her audience quite frequently and identified herself with them. In addition, she was straightforward and showed understanding for the problems women face in becoming better citizens. There was evidence of both a direct and an indirect revelation of character when Mrs. Smith assured the audience of her good intentions and referred to experiences
which showed her to be intelligent, fair, sympathetic, and understanding. At the beginning of the speech, Senator Smith built esteem through the use of the Implicative Method. There was also one statement which appeared to be colorful and unique.

LINCOLN DAY ADDRESS

This speech was read into the Congressional Record, Volume XCVI, Part 14, Pages A1591-A1592, by the Honorable Owen Brewster of Maine. The speech was delivered before the Portland Lincoln Club in Portland, Maine, on February 10, 1950. The address was primarily forensic in nature for it accused the Democratic Party of incompetency and defended the ideals of the Republican Party. 78

The primary nature of ethical appeal in this speech can be determined by citing examples. Mrs. Smith attempted to focus attention upon the probity of her character by associating her message, her party, and herself with what was good and linking her opponents' party with what was considered bad. Senator Smith first stated, "Monday in Washington we had the kick-off Lincoln Day dinner. It was a dollar box-lunch affair--a common man's affair, not a $100-a-plate rich man's affair like the Democrats have in building up their campaign war chest." She continued to employ this type of ethical appeal when she said:

My boiled-down version of the Republican restatement of principles is not only a mere 89 words of Republican Party position, but also an indictment of the Democratic Party on 10 counts
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for the Democratic Party has not only failed miserably on each of these points but has made it clear that it opposed each of these points. My concept of what the Republican Party stands for and what the Democratic Party is against is: (1) Reducing taxes; (2) balancing the budget; (3) fighting deficit spending and government waste; (4) fighting communism here instead of complacently condoning it; (5) making foreign policy truly bi-partisan instead of merely rubber-stamped; (6) fighting and exposing something-for-nothing deception, whether it be socialized medicine, socialized farming, or hidden taxes; (7) preventing either management or labor from getting too much power at the expense of the public; (8) maintaining an adequate social-security system that does not limit opportunity nor discourage initiative and saving; (9) opposing any curtailment of veterans' benefits; (10) smashing the filibuster on civil rights.

In this paragraph Senator Smith attempted to elevate her message by associating her cause and herself with what was virtuous, and to lower the cause of the opposing party by connecting it with failure to accomplish worthy goals. In addition to these remarks, Senator Smith said:

The Republican Party created the Department of Agriculture. It is the original trust-busting, anti-monopoly party that gave us the Sherman Antitrust Act. The Republican Party is the party that gave women the right to vote—the party that got Alaska from Russia for only $7,000,000, the party in power when we acquired Hawaii, Guam, Puerto Rico, Midway, and the Panama Canal.

In these statements Senator Smith not only elevated her message but also bestowed praise upon her cause and herself. Mrs. Smith then began linking her opponent with what was not virtuous by stating:

Now what has the Democratic Party given the American people? Time permits me to mention only one thing—and I have chosen that which you are most aware of now—taxes. The Democrats have
given you the highest taxes in the history of
the country and the Democratic administration
has asked that those heavy taxes be made even
higher and heavier.

In these statements, Senator Smith made the opposing party
appear bad by showing that it did not have the best interest
of the people in mind. She continued to show her cause as good
and her opponent's as bad when she declared:

The Republican Party is the party that stopped
a Democratic President from packing the Supreme
Court and from destroying the independence of our
judicial branch. It is the party that discarded
the spoils system and set up the civil-service
system on Government jobs by merit and qualifica-
tion instead of by the political patronage stand-
ard of whether you voted for the winning party.

These remarks made the Republican Party appear virtuous and the
Democratic Party unethical in its practices.

In addition to these remarks, Senator Smith continued
to elevate her cause and connect her opponent's cause with what
was bad by saying, "Our Democratic President campaigned suc-
cessfully in 1948 on the slogan of 'Telling the people the facts
of life.' We Republicans can well take a cue from the opposi-
tion and start 'Telling the people the tax facts of life.'"
She then remarked, "The Republican Party now has the fighting
spirit of the underdog. It has the most admirable of causes to
fight for. It has the ammunition to fight with—a past record
of positive accomplishments—and the stumbling, fumbling errors
and deliberate deceptions of the Democratic administrations for
the past 18 years." In this statement, Senator Smith used three
methods of focusing attention upon the probity of her character.
She associated her cause with what was good, she bestowed praise upon her cause by stating the qualifications of her party, and she connected the opponent with what was bad by referring to them as fumblers and deceivers. Even in the concluding remarks of this address, Senator Smith employed ethical appeal by connecting her cause with what was good and linking the opponent's cause with what was bad. She stated, "We can and we will win with our undeniable cause and record, if we just keep fighting to tell the people the facts of life that the Democratic administration is trying to keep from them."

In attempting to focus attention upon the probity of her character Senator Smith met all the criteria previously established for discovering this type of ethical appeal. However, focusing attention upon her honesty was not the only means of ethical appeal in this address.

Mrs. Smith established the impression of sagacity in the examples already stated. There appeared to be evidence that she was friendly toward her audience for she continually praised their accomplishments and elevated them to what was virtuous. She employed common sense and tact by recognizing the nature of her audience and referring to items which it valued. She also revealed a broad familiarity with the accomplishments of the Republican Party and established the impression that she was confident that the Republicans could win the next election if they continued to fight for what she believed they rightfully deserved.
Senator Smith showed good will by first praising her audience when she said:

Monday in Washington we had the kick-off Lincoln Day dinner. It was a dollar box-lunch affair—a common man's affair, not a $100-a-plate rich man's affair like the Democrats have in building up their campaign war chest. There were those who said it would be a flop—that it was fantastic to try to get a crowd of any size in the Democratic jobholder city of Washington. But it wasn't a flop. A record, roaring crowd of 12,000 cheering people jammed the Uline Arena. There was hardly breathing space and there were 3,000 people outside who couldn't get in because there just wasn't room for them. I have never seen so much enthusiasm in a crowd.

By saying this she showed the members of her audience that their party was enthusiastic and was willing to fight. She continued by stating, "Yes, I think the Republican Party was resurrected this past Monday night." She identified herself with her audience by remarking, "Let's lift the iron curtain set up here in America by the Democratic administration between the people and the Government. In that way, we can return the American people to the most basic of all freedoms—the freedom to be let alone."

In this statement Senator Smith not only said that it was necessary for the audience to alleviate the present situation which the Democrats had established, but also, by using the words let us and we, referred to herself as one of the individuals who must begin explaining to the people what the Democrats had been doing to them.

Throughout the speech Senator Smith was straightforward. She brought the facts, as she saw them, to the audience and stated them in a clear, understandable fashion. There was
evidence that Mrs. Smith was sympathetic and understanding of her audience when she said, "Last year... I addressed the attending Republicans as 'fellow mourners.' ... This year I address you as 'fellow fighters.'" Here, Senator Smith indicated her sympathy for the Republicans when they were the underdog party, and her understanding when the Republicans had begun to fight for their cause. It is evident that Senator Smith met all the necessary criteria for establishing good will.

There was no direct revelation of character in this speech by either an open assurance to the audience of her good intentions or cited testimonies of other persons. Mrs. Smith did, however, imply that her intentions were good and in sympathy with the interests of her audience.

Senator Smith did reveal her character indirectly when she said, "I was elected to the Senate in 1948 on the slogan of 'Don't Trade a Record for a Promise.' That is equally applicable for 1950 and 1952." The reference to the fact that she was elected showed that she had been successful. Her slogan showed her as an intelligent and fair person who, to win an election, relied on past accomplishments rather than on insincere promises. In addition to referring to past success, Mrs. Smith also indicated that she was acquainted with the attributes of a great man in high esteem by her audience. She remarked, "These are the facts that the party of Abraham Lincoln--the most human, the greatest representative of the common man ever to be president--must bring home to the American people if our
free way of life is to be recaptured and preserved, if we are to remain loyal to the principles of Lincoln." This statement also appeared to indicate that she was interested in all the people and not only in a selected few and that she valued freedom and loyalty.

At the beginning of the speech Senator Smith built esteem by employing the Common-Ground Method, that in which a speaker talks about items he and his audience have in common. She began by saying:

"Last year at the Lincoln Day dinner in Washington, I addressed the attending Republicans as "fellow mourners." That dinner was more like a wake at which we were making post mortems on why we had lost the Presidency for the fifth straight time. We talked about the mistakes that the Republican Party had made. But this year it is different. This year I address you as "fellow fighters" because something happened in Washington this week that convinces me that the underdog Republican Party has started on the comeback trail and has started fighting.

Referring to last year's dinner as a sad occasion and this year's dinner as a happy affair, Mrs. Smith built esteem in the eyes of her audience by establishing that she and her audience had something in common both times.

One colorful and unique statement appeared when Senator Smith said, "The Democratic Party has turned what was once a cooperative two-way street into their own secretive, one-way back alley where only the Democrats make the decisions and then try diplomatic blackmail under the guise of unity to make Republicans mere spineless, rubber stamps." Here, Senator
Smith cleverly exemplified the unethical procedures of the Democratic Party.

According to the criteria for discovering ethical appeal in speeches, this speech contained a considerable amount of ethical appeal. The speaker focused attention upon the probity of her character by associating herself and her cause with what was good, by bestowing praise upon her cause, and by linking the opponent and his cause with what was not virtuous. The impression of sagacity was established by creating an attitude of friendliness, using common sense and tact, and creating the impression of confidence. Although there was no revelation that Mrs. Smith was familiar with the interests of the day, it was clear that she was aware of the political interests of her audience. Examples were not specifically cited to indicate these elements, but the quotations used in the analysis showed that these elements were present. The speaker displayed good will by praising and identifying herself with the audience and by being straightforward. Throughout the speech she appeared to possess sympathy for and understanding of the problems of her audience. While there was no one example of a direct revelation of character, Senator Smith did reveal it indirectly by referring to past accomplishments and referring to a great man who was held in high esteem by the audience. At the beginning of her speech Mrs. Smith built esteem by referring to the common interests she had with her audience. There was one statement which appeared to be colorful and unique.
The speech was well written and demonstrated that the nature of the audience was considered before the speech was prepared.

SPEECH AT THE DREXEL INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

The final speech was read into the Congressional Record, Volume CI, Part 7, Pages 8718-8719, upon request of Senator Martin of Pennsylvania. The speech was delivered on June 18, 1955, before an audience composed of faculty members, students, and guests of the Drexel Institute of Technology at Philadelphia. On this same day, Senator Smith received the honorary Doctor of Letters degree mentioned earlier in this study.

The speech was primarily epideictic since its purpose was to praise an intangible object dear to the hearts of all Americans--freedom. It also offered advice on how to maintain the freedom which Americans enjoyed.

In attempting to focus attention upon the probity of her character Senator Smith said, "Somewhere between the extremes of anarchy and the so-called 'statism,' there is a happy medium--an ideal balance between freedom and security that establishes order and eradicates injustice and poverty." Here she elevated her message to what was good by speaking of the "happy medium" which was to be her cause--the American Government. Continuing along these lines, Senator Smith stated, "I think, and I believe achievement records of history show, that the nearest to the perfect, happy medium has been
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our Federal Republic with its system of checks and balances through the separation of authority into the legislative, executive, and judicial." Again, she associated her message, which was concerned with government and freedom, with what was good by referring to American government as the most impeccable means of control.

In her next remarks Senator Smith bestowed praise upon her cause:

Just as man has tinkered with various types of political government so has he experimented with various types of economic systems in the pursuit of prosperity. He has run the gamut of the 'isms' --capitalism, socialism, communism, fascism, and statism--and the greatest of these has been capitalism--not unrestrained and unlimited capitalism, but capitalism the American way, limited by laws restraining monopoly. It has given us the highest standard of freedom man has ever enjoyed. Under it the ownership of land and natural wealth, the production, distribution, and exchange of goods, and the operation of the system itself, are effected by private enterprise and control under competitive conditions.

In this paragraph Mrs. Smith referred to our form of government as the best form. She stated some of the values of the American system, indicating that the American people were fortunate to live under this type of government. Since her address was primarily concerned with the American government and the idea of freedom, this remark praised her cause.

In the preceding quotations, evidence has been offered which appears to be indicative of ethical appeal through the association of Senator Smith's cause with what was good and praise for this cause. There was no evidence that Senator
Smith attempted to link her opponent or opponent's cause with what was not virtuous, because in this type of speech she did not have an opponent.

Senator Smith appears to have established the impression of sagacity when she told her audience:

The first formally recorded guide of freedom was relayed to the world by Moses when he brought the Ten Commandments down from Mount Sinai. Their common basis was the ordained freedom of everyone from arbitrary and unlawful interference with his life and property. This freedom from which all freedoms spring was formally revived and recorded by the Magna Carta in 1215. It was reasserted in our Declaration of Independence. It was refined and delineated in our Bill of Rights, the first ten amendments to our constitution. From the Ten Commandments to the ten amendments freedom has been defined.

Such awareness of the documents of American freedom showed that Mrs. Smith possessed a breadth of information. She continued:

The less you exercise and jealously guard that freedom the more you surrender the authority and responsibility for freedom to your Government—and the more the Government controls and regulates your daily life and your destiny, the more the Government becomes a dispenser of promised security and the less it remains a guardian of freedom.

Here, Mrs. Smith created an attitude of friendliness toward her audience by showing them that she had their interests in mind. She employed common sense to explain what could happen if the American people did not take an interest in this freedom which they enjoyed, and she then tactfully proceeded to blame the people for extensive governmental control. Once more she employed common sense and tact when she stated, "Freedom is everybody's responsibility. It's something so
taken for granted in our American way of life that we are rarely aware of it. Freedoms only come to seem important to many of us when we have lost them." By the use of this statement she tactfully told her listeners it was their duty to maintain freedom and criticized the apathetic attitude that American people have toward freedom. Common sense was again evident in the statement, "No government can devise a system of security that will completely eliminate the struggle in life." Although it was difficult to determine whether Senator Smith was confident that her ideas were right, her strongly worded statements indicated that she did possess confidence in them. In establishing an impression of sagacity Mrs. Smith met all the criteria previously established. She created an impression of friendliness, used common sense and tact, revealed intelligence, and appeared confident in what she was saying.

Margaret Chase Smith also showed good will in this address when she referred to her column which one of the papers in Philadelphia printed. She said, "And my column that was carried by the Bulletin here for five years brought such a kindly response from Philadelphia readers that I came to think of them as I would next-door neighbors." Later Senator Smith stated, "There are many other things about my experience with Philadelphia that makes me feel as though I am one of you. But there is none that makes me prouder than the honor that Drexel Institute of Technology grants me today." Here, Senator Smith not only identified herself with the audience by referring to herself as one of them, but she also expressed sincere
appreciation and pride in the honor conferred upon her. Continuing her speech, she once again established good will when she said, "Drexel Institute is truly an integral part of the traditions of your great metropolis that cradled the Declaration of Independence. Drexel has kept the faith of the Declaration in that the object of Drexel training has been to open for its students the way of happiness through usefulness." She praised the audience by praising something they regarded highly—Drexel Institute. In addition to this remark, Mrs. Smith continued to praise Drexel by stating, "In faithful adherence to its illustrious founder and to its many dedicated philanthropists, Drexel has always been sensitive and adaptable to social and economic change." The next few statements not only praised Drexel Institute but also referred directly to a certain portion of her audience:

To those of you who graduate today to go forth to make your place in the sun, to stand on your own feet, Drexel has given you excellent tools with which to pursue and capture happiness. It has cultivated your value of freedom. It has shown you the way to be free and remain free—and how to protect not only your freedom but the freedom of your fellowman and of those less fortunate than you. It has trained you in the ways of achieving security—security for yourselves and your families, whether they be present or future.

By references to one portion of the audience and its institution, Mrs. Smith confirmed good will. Next, she identified herself with her audience by saying, "You and I cannot escape the fact that the ultimate responsibility for freedom is personal. Our freedoms today are not so much in danger because people are
consciously trying to take them away from us as they are in
danger because we forget to use them." This statement placed
the blame not only on her audience but on herself as well, thus
establishing her as one of the people to whom this address was
directed. Although Senator Smith appeared sympathetic and
understanding, she was also straightforward when she said,
"Shirking of individual responsibility is outright surrender
of individual authority." Another example of straightforward-
ness was, "The test-proven way of successfully meeting the
struggle of life is self-development. The best thing that our
Government can give to you and me is not a State-controlled
security or special advantage but rather the opportunity for
self-development." In showing this good will, Senator Smith
praised her audience, identified herself with her audience,
and appeared to be straightforward, sympathetic, and under-
standing.

In this address Margaret Chase Smith did not directly
reveal her character by openly stating her good intentions or
citing testimonies of others, but she did indirectly reveal
her character by remarking, "If I am ever tempted to return
to the heavy chores of writing a column again it will be because
of such inspirational experiences as I received from Philadelphia
on daily publication of my views." Reference to work done in
the past indicated that the job was one which took strength and
courage to perform. This was also an example of ethical appeal
through association with her audience. In addition to referring
to her work in order to reveal her character, Mrs. Smith also indicated that she was intelligent in her references to the words of great men. She said:

Woodrow Wilson had something to say about liberty that I think is worth repeating when we start thinking about government and freedom. He said: 'Liberty has never come from the government. Liberty has always come from the subjects of it. The history of liberty is a history of limitations of governmental powers, not the increase of it.'

Her next quotation was borrowed from Abraham Lincoln:

On the score of the basic freedom of the right to be let alone, Abe Lincoln superbly but simply stated the thought with: 'I believe each individual is naturally entitled to do as he pleases with himself and the fruits of his labor, so far as it in no wise interferes with any other man's rights.'

Her third quotation which showed her intelligence and judgment stated, "Perhaps Thomas Jefferson stated the proper balance of freedom and government most tersely when he said: 'That government is best that governs least.'" It appeared evident that Senator Smith indirectly revealed her character by referring to famous men and their words and by citing past experiences which took her courage and strength to perform.

In the opening remarks of her speech Senator Smith used the Common-Ground Method of building esteem. She said:

I have looked forward to coming to Drexel for some time now. I have because of the very great esteem that is held for your institution. And I always like to return to Philadelphia--the City of Brotherly Love. In a way, Philadelphia seems like another home to me. For Philadelphia was the very first place I came and made my first speech after winning the Senatorial nomination for the first time.
Since the members of the audience were all interested in their city and institution, it was natural that they would agree with her.

Finally, in this speech Senator Smith showed her ability to use uniqueness and color when she took the word freedom and transformed it into something meaningful and vivid. She said:

We can't see freedoms, we can't hear freedoms, we can't grab freedoms in our hands. Because we can't, we are always in danger of losing the intangible freedoms gradually and without realizing it—-to put it another way, without sensing it.

The final sentence in the speech was also both colorful and unique. It left the audience with a good impression of the speaker because of her intelligent and carefully worded phrase. She ended her speech by saying, "Freedom unexercised may be freedom forfeited."

Thus, in this the third and final speech analyzed, ethical appeal appeared in various forms. According to the criteria established for discovering ethical appeal, Margaret Chase Smith focused attention upon the probity of her character by associating herself and her message with what was good and by bestowing praise upon her cause. Since she had no opponent in this speech, there was no opportunity to connect her opponent with what was not virtuous. Sagacity was established by creating an attitude of friendliness toward her audience, displaying common sense and tact, and revealing a familiarity with items outside the realm of her subject. She was confident in what she had to say. Good will was shown by praising the
audience, by identifying herself with the audience, and by being understanding of the problems of her listeners. Mrs. Smith was also straightforward in her remarks. There was no evidence of a direct revelation of character, but there was evidence of an indirect revelation through references to great men of the past and to her own accomplishments. The Common-Ground Method of building esteem was used in a reference to the city of Philadelphia and Drexel Institute. Two statements exemplified color and uniqueness.

SUMMARY

Three speeches have been analyzed to discover the nature and sources of ethical appeal as employed by Margaret Chase Smith. There is evidence of the use of various kinds of ethical appeal in all three speeches. In the conclusion of this study the questions which were established in the introduction will be answered in order to evaluate the nature and sources of her ethical appeal.
CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study was to analyze three speeches of Margaret Chase Smith in order to discover the nature and the sources of the ethical appeal as evidenced in her speeches. Data concerning the life of Senator Smith was assembled as background for the study, followed by a discussion of ethical appeal according to the viewpoints of Aristotle, the first authority on ethical appeal, and five contemporary speech critics. As a result of the study of these authorities, a series of seven criteria was established from which an analysis of three selected speeches was made. The purpose of the analysis was to answer three main questions: (1) Was ethical appeal as a means of persuasion found in selected speeches of Margaret Chase Smith? (2) If ethical appeal was employed by Margaret Chase Smith, what was its nature and its sources? (3) If there was evidence of ethical appeal, how effectively was it employed by Senator Smith?

The analysis revealed that all seven criteria--focusing attention upon the probity of her character, establishing the impression of sagacity, showing good will toward the audience, revealing her character directly, revealing her character indirectly, building esteem, and using color or uniqueness in her speeches--were present in the three speeches analyzed. It
can, therefore, be said that Margaret Chase Smith employed ethical appeal in these speeches.

Since ethical appeal was employed, the next step was to determine the nature and sources of it. This was done by applying each of the seven criteria to each address.

Attention was focused upon probity in all three addresses by means of associating the message with something which was good and of interest to the audience. Mrs. Smith also bestowed praise upon her cause by showing it to be a worthy one. She further established the impression of her own honesty in the "Lincoln Day Address" by associating the opposing party with actions which were lacking in virtue.

The impression of sagacity was evidenced in Senator Smith's friendly words which were directed to her listeners to indicate that she had their interests in mind. She used common sense and tact in informing her listeners of their faults. While seldom revealing a broad familiarity with the interests of the day, she demonstrated a thorough acquaintance with the interests of her audience. Her confidence in her own ideas was indicated by strong, carefully worded sentences.

Good will was established by praising the audience or its interests in each speech. She not only complimented her listeners but also identified herself with them by using the pronouns we and us. This helped to draw her closer to her audience. Her straightforwardness was evidenced in remarks in which she stressed what she believed. Many of her remarks
made it obvious that Mrs. Smith understood the problems of her audience and sympathized with these problems.

A direct revelation of character was apparent in the "Speech to the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs" when Senator Smith openly assured her audience of her good intentions. No one speech, however, included testimonies of others regarding her admirable traits.

An indirect revelation of character was evidenced by remarks which indicated Mrs. Smith's knowledge of the ideas and works of great scholars and outstanding leaders. Frequently, personal experiences were cited which disclosed her admirable character traits. In the "Speech at the Drexel Institute of Technology" she referred to experiences and facts indicating her breadth of knowledge.

Personal esteem was built by employing two devices. The Implicative Method was used in the "Speech to the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs" by citing examples which implied that something was wrong with American women. In the two other addresses the Common Ground Method was employed in that before commencing her speech she referred to those interests she held in common with her audience.

Color and uniqueness were exemplified in only a few statements of the addresses used in this study. These examples showed that while Senator Smith possessed the ability to state her beliefs cleverly, the speeches analyzed were not outstanding in the use of exceptionally well-turned phrases.
The three speeches analyzed gave evidence of the nature and sources of ethical appeal employed by Mrs. Smith. The next step was to answer how effectively it was employed.

The examples used in the analysis reveal that ethical appeal was an outstanding means of persuasion in the three speeches analyzed. Since Mrs. Smith has been successful in her political career, it may be postulated that her use of ethical appeal in her speeches has contributed to this success.

From the analysis, the fact that Senator Smith did employ ethical appeal has been proven, the nature and the sources of it described, and its effectiveness evaluated. It can, therefore, be assumed that Senator Margaret Chase Smith employs ethical appeal as a means of persuasion in her speaking.
APPENDIX A

ADDRESS BEFORE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF
BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL WOMEN'S CLUBS*

This convention is an example of democracy at work. It is more particularly a most impressive example of the acceptance by women of their responsibility as citizens—to think constructively and to make their thinking articulate.

Citizenship is without sex. It makes no distinction between the rights and responsibilities of men and women. Since the granting of suffrage to women the only differential between men and women as citizens has been the availability and acceptance of leadership.

Some claim that the availability of leadership to women has been unfairly limited. I have no sympathy with this view because it is only those who "make the breaks" that "get the breaks." In other words, to increase the availability of leadership, we must by our own actions create and force that increased availability. If we are to claim and win our rightful place in the sun on an equal basis with men then we must not insist upon those privileges and prerogatives identified in the past as exclusively feminine.

To some extent, women have made the "breaks" for greater leadership opportunities. Especially is this the

*Congressional Record, XCII, Part 12, 1946, A4378-A4379.
case in their superb performance in many fields during the war. Their contribution to the war was far beyond anything that anyone had even hoped for. Even the hardest cynics now acclaim their performance.

But now the challenge to women is to match their amazing wartime record with the battles for peace and the orderly reconversion to normal living. While their war records will be difficult to match, they are far better equipped for the task of winning the peace because they possess certain abilities and understanding of matters basic to peace that men do not possess.

Dirigo—"I lead"—is the motto on the official emblem of my own State of Maine. Women of this Republic could well adopt it as their motto. The question is, Where can they exert leadership? The answer is, Everywhere: (1) in the home as wives and mothers, (2) in organized civic, business, and professional groups such as your own, (3) in industry and business, both management and labor, (4) in public offices, such as legislatures and schools, (5) in politics, and (6) as public citizens.

Perhaps the most lasting and basic influence of women is in the home for behind all men, great or small, are women. This might appear too obvious for mention. But it is too often that we overlook the obvious. Can the dynamic influence of Eleanor Roosevelt be denied when you compare the respectful number of women appointments in the Roosevelt
administration to the almost complete absence of such appoint-
ments in the Truman administration?

For lasting world peace, the wives and mothers in all
nations must get together for a common understanding—in like
manner the business and professional women. I am confident
that the women of the world will reach a real and genuine
understanding, if given the means of communication and personal
exchange, far more satisfactorily than men have yet been able
to do.

The fight for decent conditions in communities, for
improvements in food, housing, school, recreation, and health
facilities, must come from the women of the home—the wives
and the mothers. Yes, even the critical fight against dis-
astrous inflation, black markets, and uncontrolled price rises
must be led by the housewives. If necessary, they should be
the leaders of a buyers' strike—those who have the courage
to refuse to buy at unreasonable and profiteering prices.

Much, if not most, of the past leadership of women in
this country has come through civic organizations and through
organizations such as your own. It would be unnecessary and
presumptuous for me to elaborate on this type of opportunity
of leadership. Yet, I do want to take this occasion to urge
you and your organization to continue your splendid contri-
bution to women's leadership, and to urge you to extend your
beneficial influence as widely as possible.

Women, such as you, individually can provide leader-
ship in industry and business. You have already proved your
leadership ability in the field of management. But there is a discouraging dearth of women leaders in the field of labor and labor relations. Women constitute a great part of the labor force. If there is any one way that labor unions can improve themselves, and members benefit it is to have more women labor leaders, qualified for their jobs.

The Government is no more important than the home, just as the home is no more important than the Government--both can control and influence the other, both are dependent upon each other. But in the past the women have permitted the balance to swing too heavily to the Government's influence over the home rather than having the home exercise its proper influence over the Government.

How can this be remedied? By taking a greater interest in our greatest investment, our biggest business--our Government--in seeking and accepting public office. In this way women can bring the wholesome viewpoint and influence of the home more directly into the formulation and administration of Government policy.

In the schools as educators women have and will continue to instill in coming generations the very will to peace and the very necessary guards to insure that peace.

Women fought for the right to vote. They won this battle, but they haven't followed through. They do not take the proper advantage of their voting privilege. With one-half of the population, women could easily become the most powerful single group in the electorate.
In other words, women should become more politically minded, regardless of party. They should be conscientious voters. They should develop the incentive and perseverance to organize politically into articulate groups that espouse their views, opinions, and desires on vital issues, and independently of party affiliation.

They should be workers and officials in political parties in influencing the platforms of the parties, in getting out the maximum vote, in demanding strict administration adherence to platform promises, in stimulating women to vote and be active, and in demanding only the proper representation of women based upon population and degree of public, both political and civic, activity. They should seek public office, and their appointments to high Government positions should be vigorously advocated, supported, and even forced by organized groups whether political or nonpolitical like yours.

All of these phases of activity are summed up in the observation that women must give greater meaning to their role of public citizens. For the protection of the family, the basic principles for governing a wholesome family life should be emulated to a greater degree in the administration of our Government. The basic principles of our Government should stem from the home. In one sense of the word, the United States Government is really one big family--the all-American family.

American women have reason to be proud of what they have done so far in influencing greater participation by women
of other nations in their governments. An American-educated woman of China, Madame Chiang Kai-shek, has led the political emancipation of the women of China. Japanese women, under our occupation of that country, have been given the right to vote and hold office and are emulating American women by seeking and obtaining public office in Government places such as the Japanese Diet. This in itself is the greatest promise against future Japanese war lords. It is a shining example of how women can make the most effective contribution to the enforcement of a lasting peace by becoming leaders in their own nation and then graduating to the roles of leaders of the world.

It is regrettable that so few women have been chosen to participate in the UN, and that none sit as members of the Security Council. It is amazing when one realizes that women constitute at least one-half of the world's population.

But this can be attributed to women themselves for lack of interest and aggressiveness--and the will to public careers--in this and other countries. We can't become leaders of the world until we have become leaders within our own Nation. Our influence upon others must come from within ourselves individually. In as great a measure, our influence, as a Nation upon the rest of the world in creating and maintaining permanent peace, must first flow from within this country.
APPENDIX B

LINCOLN DAY ADDRESS*

Last year at the Lincoln Day dinner in Washington, I addressed the attending Republicans as "fellow mourners." That dinner was more like a wake at which we were making post mortems on why we had lost the Presidency for the fifth straight time. We talked about the mistakes that the Republican Party had made.

But this year is different. This year I address you as "fellow fighters" because something happened in Washington this week that convinces me that the underdog Republican Party has started on the comeback trail and has started fighting.

Monday in Washington we had the kick-off Lincoln Day dinner. It was a dollar box-lunch affair—a common man's affair, not a $100-a-plate rich man's affair like the Democrats have in building up their campaign war chest. There were those who said it would be a flop—that it was fantastic to try to get a crowd of any size in the Democratic jobholder city of Washington.

But it wasn't a flop. A record, roaring crowd of 12,000 cheering people jammed the Uline Arena. There was
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hardly breathing space and there were 3,000 people outside who couldn't get in because there just wasn't room for them. I have never seen so much enthusiasm in a crowd.

Yes, I think the Republican Party was resurrected this past Monday night.

Monday, the Republicans issued a 2,500-word restatement of principles. Eloquent as it might be, I think that it could have been stated in less than 100 words—and in common, everyday words of the average man in the street—the man whose vote we have to get to win in 1950 and 1952. My boiled-down version of the Republican restatement of principles is not only a mere 89 words of Republican Party position but also an indictment of the Democratic Party on 10 counts: for the Democratic Party has not only failed miserably on each of these points but also has made it clear that it opposes each of these points. My concept of what the Republican Party stands for and what the Democratic Party is against is:

(1) Reducing taxes; (2) balancing the budget; (3) fighting deficit spending and Government waste; (4) fighting communism here instead of complacently condoning it; (5) making foreign policy truly bi-partisan instead of merely rubber-stamped; (6) fighting and exposing something-for-nothing deception, whether it be socialized medicine, socialized farming, or hidden taxes; (7) preventing either management or labor from getting too much power at the expense of the public; (8) maintaining an adequate social-security system that does not limit
opportunity nor discourage initiative and saving; (9) opposing any curtailment of veterans' benefits; (10) smashing the filibuster on civil rights.

No other political party can make that statement—much less the Democratic Party. Only 89 simple words to show the basic issues between the Republicans and the Democrats—to tell the difference between the two parties.

I was elected to the Senate in 1948 on the slogan of "Don't Trade a Record for a Promise." That is equally applicable for 1950 and 1952. The Republicans promise changes if they are put into power. The voters can rightfully ask, "Do you have a record to back up your promises?" And the Republican Party can confidently say, "I'm glad you asked that question. The answer is unqualifiedly 'Yes.' Here is the record."

1. The only tax reduction that has been given to the American people in a generation was by the Republican Eightieth Congress, the only Republican controlled Congress in the last 20 years;

2. The only time that the budget has been balanced during the last 20 years was in 1947 and 1948 by the Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress;

3. The only real fight that has been made against deficit spending and Government waste is the fight made by the Republicans;

4. The only real fight to expose and purge Communists and their fellow travelers from key posts in our Government so
that they could not send our vital secrets to Russia has been made by the Republicans in Congress;

5. Republicans have made our foreign policy bipartisan. But the Democratic administration is now excluding Republicans from a voice on policy formulation. The Democratic administration has turned what was once a cooperative two-way street into their own secretive, one-way back alley where only the Democrats make the decisions and then try diplomatic blackmail under the guise of unity to make Republicans mere spineless, rubber stamps;

6. The only effective efforts to expose the something-for-nothing fraud and deception practiced upon the American people by the Democratic administration under the policies of socialized medicine, socialized farming and hidden taxes, have been the efforts of the Republican Party to warn the people that they were in danger of trading away their individual freedom without realizing it for the mental opiate of a false sense of security;

7. It was the Republican Eightieth Congress that passed the Taft-Hartley Act to prevent either management or labor from getting too much power at the expense of the public. Republicans created the Department of Labor. One of labor's greatest champions, Senator George Norris, was a Republican;

8. As far as social security is concerned, it was Republicans that first adopted a valid old-age assistance program in Montana 12 years before the Federal Social Security Act;
9. As far as veterans are concerned, the Republican Eightieth Congress was the champion of them all, passing more favorable legislation for veterans and reservists than any other Congress in history;

10. As far as the opposition to civil rights is concerned, everyone knows that it is the Democrats who are blocking it with filibusters. The Republicans are constantly trying to break those filibusters. And does anyone dare deny that Abraham Lincoln, greatest of all Republicans, was the father of civil rights?

If any of you are still unconvinced, try this for size. The Republican Party created the Department of Agriculture. It is the original trust-busting, anti-monopoly party that gave us the Sherman Anti-trust Act. The Republican Party is the party that gave women the right to vote—the party that got Alaska from Russia for only $7,000,000, the party in power when we acquired Hawaii, Guam, Puerto Rico, Midway, and the Panama Canal.

The Republican Party is the party that stopped a Democratic President from packing the Supreme Court and from destroying the independence of our judicial branch. It is the party that discarded the spoils system and set up the civil-service system on Government jobs by merit and qualification instead of by the political patronage standard of whether you voted for the winning party.
Now what has the Democratic Party given the American people? Time permits me to mention only one thing—and I have chosen that which you are most aware of now—taxes. The Democrats have given you the highest taxes in the history of the country and the Democratic administration has asked that those heavy taxes be made even higher and heavier. You realize that now by merely looking at your income-tax return. But what most of us don't realize is what we pay that doesn't meet the eye—in hidden taxes. Were it not for hidden taxes, the quart of milk you pay 21 cents for you could get for 14 cents because now you pay 7 cents in hidden taxes on that 21-cent quart of milk—were it not for hidden taxes, you could get that 47-cent can of baby powder for only 29 cents, that $2,100 car for only $1,400, that $10,000 house for only $7,000, that 10-cent candy bar for only 7 cents (look back in Republican days, full-size candy bars were only 5 cents), that 15-cent loaf of bread for only 10 cents, that 25-cent gallon of gas for only 14 cents, that 50-cent movie for only 30 cents.

Our Democratic President campaigned successfully in 1948 on the slogan of "Telling the people the facts of life." We Republicans can well take a cue from the opposition and start "Telling the people the tax facts of life." I could go on for hours talking about the tax facts of life on examples of hidden taxes on specific products and services that most of us don't realize, but let me conclude with one of the best of all examples on hidden taxes—you even pay a tax on the air in the tires of your car.
These are the facts that the party of Abraham Lincoln—the most human, the greatest representative of the common man ever to be President—must bring home to the American people if our free way of life is to be recaptured and preserved, if we are to remain loyal to the principles of Lincoln.

The Republican Party now has the fighting spirit of the underdog. It has the most admirable of causes to fight for. It has the ammunition to fight with—a past record of positive accomplishments—and the stumbling, fumbling errors and deliberate deceptions of the Democratic administrations for the past 18 years.

We can and we will win with our undeniable cause and record, if we just keep fighting to tell the people the facts of life that the Democratic administration is trying to keep from them. Let's lift the iron curtain set up here in America by the Democratic administration between the people and the Government. In that way, we can return the American people to the most basic of all freedoms—the freedom to be let alone.
President Creese, trustees and officers of Drexel, members of the faculty, distinguished guests, men and women of Drexel, and friends of Drexel, I have looked forward to coming to Drexel for some time now. I have because of the very great esteem that is held for your institution. And I always like to return to Philadelphia--the City of Brotherly Love.

In a way, Philadelphia seems like another home to me. For Philadelphia was the very first place I came and made my first speech after winning the Senatorial nomination for the first time. That was back at the 1948 Republican National Convention.

And my column that was carried by the Bulletin here for 5 years brought such a kindly response from Philadelphia readers that I came to think of them as I would next-door neighbors. If I am ever tempted to return to the heavy chores of writing a column again it will be because of such inspirational experiences as I received from Philadelphia on daily publication of my views.

There are many other things about my experiences with Philadelphia that make me feel as though I am one of you. But

---
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there is none that makes me prouder than the honor that Drexel Institute of Technology grants me today.

Drexel Institute is truly an integral part of the traditions of your great metropolis that cradled the Declaration of Independence. That historic Declaration emphasized that our Creator had endowed in us the inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Drexel has kept the faith of the Declaration in that the object of Drexel training has been to open for its students the way of happiness through usefulness.

In faithful adherence to its illustrious founder and to its many dedicated philanthropists, Drexel has always been sensitive and adaptable to social and economic change. In keeping that faith with the eminently successful men and women who have made this great institution, Drexel has thus met the needs of thousands of students.

Two basic ingredients in happiness are freedom and security. To those of you who graduate today to go forth to make your place in the sun, to stand on your own two feet, Drexel has given you excellent tools with which to pursue and capture happiness.

It has cultivated your value of freedom. It has shown you the way to be free and remain free—and how to protect not only your freedom but the freedom of your fellow man and of those less fortunate than you.
It has trained you in the ways of achieving security—security for yourselves and your families, whether they be present or future. It has trained you in productivity of various kinds. It has shown you how you can use your talents to contribute to the security of your fellow men and the security of your country.

Freedom is everybody's responsibility. It's something so taken for granted in our American way of life that we are rarely aware of it. Freedoms only come to seem important to many of us when we have lost them. They are intangibles that elusively escape our normal five senses of sight, hearing, smell, taste, and touch.

We can't see freedoms, we can't hear freedoms, we can't smell freedoms, we can't grab freedoms in our hands. Because we can't, we are always in danger of losing the intangible freedoms gradually and without realizing it—to put it another way, without sensing it.

In a world of increasing materialism, this danger of loss of freedom is all the greater. As we become more materialistic and place greater emphasis upon the tangible things of life—the things we can see, hear, smell, taste, and touch—the greater grows the conflict between security and freedom. Security has a great advantage in that it can be reduced to tangibles.

Security can be translated into physical terms, while freedom is measured more in terms of the mind and the spirit.
Important parts of security are food and shelter. They are materialistic tangibles, necessities of life. You can see, smell, taste, and touch them. To use a graphic phrase, food is something you can sink your teeth in. Freedom isn't.

You and your Government control the freedom that is enjoyed in this country. The less you exercise and jealously guard that freedom the more you surrender the authority and responsibility for freedom to your Government—and the more the Government controls and regulates your daily life and your destiny, the more the Government becomes a dispenser of promised security and the less it remains a guardian of freedom.

Shirking of individual responsibility is outright surrender of individual authority. Freedom is bartered for security. That does not mean to say that freedom and security can go hand in hand. But when they get out of balance the conflict starts.

Where should our Government stand on freedom and security? How have these concepts been developed? From where do they spring? What type of social system has maintained the best balance of freedom and security? Answers are indicated in past history.

The first formally recorded guide of freedom was relayed to the world by Moses when he brought the Ten Commandments down from Mount Sinai. Their common basis was the ordained freedom of everyone from arbitrary and unlawful interference with his life and his property.
This freedom from which all freedoms spring was formally revived and recorded by the Magna Carta in 1215. It was reasserted in our Declaration of Independence. It was refined and delineated in our Bill of Rights, the first 10 amendments to our Constitution. From the Ten Commandments to the 10 amendments freedom has been defined.

Yet there is a limitation to man's basic freedom—the freedom to be let alone. That limitation is that in the exercise of that freedom we cannot so use our freedom as to invade the right of others to be let alone. One man's freedom stops where another man's freedom begins.

Because individual selfishness either can't or won't recognize where that line of separation is, we have to have what we call government. That government operates on laws that draw the lines of individual freedom—that punish the crimes of murder, robbery and other acts that invade the freedom of the individual to be let alone.

Where the line of freedom is drawn between the individual and his government varies and determines the kind of government. On the one extreme, it is the state of society where there is no government at all, no law and no order. That is anarchy—no government control at all. On the other extreme is the state of society where the government controls everything. That has been called "statism."

Somewhere between the extremes of anarchy and the so-called "statism," there is a happy medium—an ideal balance
between freedom and security that establishes order and eradicates injustice and poverty.

Man has tried a myriad of systems—monarchies, dictatorships, oligarchies, autocracies, democracies, republics. I think, and I believe achievement records of history show, that the nearest to the perfect, happy medium has been our Federal Republic with its system of checks and balances through the separation of authority into the legislative, executive, and judicial.

This, together with the individual immunity provided by the Bill of Rights, has established history's greatest safeguard of individual freedom and order. Government our American way has been government the best way.

Just as man has tinkered with various types of political government so has he experimented with various types of economic systems in the pursuit of prosperity. He has run the gamut of the "isms"—capitalism, socialism, communism, fascism, and statism—and the greatest of these has been capitalism—not unrestrained and unlimited capitalism, but capitalism the American way, limited by laws restraining monopoly.

It has given us the highest standard of living man has ever known—and the highest standard of freedom man has ever enjoyed. Under it the ownership of land and natural wealth, the production, distribution, and exchange of goods, and the operation of the system itself, are effected by private enterprise and control under competitive conditions.
Freedom the American way is twofold. There is the positive freedom to do something. Sometimes we call this liberty. There is the negative freedom from something. Sometimes we call this immunity.

Woodrow Wilson had something to say about liberty that I think is worth repeating when we start thinking about government and freedom. He said:

"Liberty has never come from the government. Liberty has always come from the subjects of it. The history of liberty is a history of limitations of governmental powers, not the increase of it." On the score of the basic freedom of the right to be let alone, Abraham Lincoln superbly but simply stated the thought with:

"I believe each individual is naturally entitled to do as he pleases with himself and the fruits of his labor, so far as it in no wise interferes with any other man's rights."

This was the observation of a great humanitarian who could never be accused of prejudice against the acceptance of welfare responsibility by the government.

Perhaps Thomas Jefferson stated the proper balance of freedom and government most tersely when he said: "That government is best that governs least."

When we recall this statement of his we may also recall that he was our representative to France when that country was governed completely by statism. It cannot be said that Jefferson never saw statism in action.
The preservation of individual freedom requires a reasonable minimum of social security so that the shirkers can compare what is attainable to thrifty workers with what a benevolent government provides for those who take only the advantages and shirk all of the disadvantages of daily earning their way.

No government can devise a system of security that will completely eliminate the struggle in life. The test-proven way of successfully meeting the struggle of life is self-development. The best thing that our Government can give to you and me is not a State-controlled security or special advantage but rather the opportunity for self-development.

You and I cannot escape the fact that the ultimate responsibility for freedom is personal. Our freedoms today are not so much in danger because people are consciously trying to take them away from us as they are in danger because we forget to use them.

Freedom may be an intangible but like most everything else it can die because of lack of use. Freedom unexercised may be freedom forfeited.
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