

A COMPARISON OF ETHOS IN SELECTED CONGRESSIONAL  
SPEECHES OF THADDEUS STEVENS AND JOE McCARTHY

---

A Thesis

Presented to

the Faculty of the Speech Department  
Kansas State Teachers College of Emporia

---

In Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
Master of Arts

---

by

Raymond S. Menendez

December 1970

Thesis  
1710  
M

*David L. Mitchell*

Approved for the Major Department

*James L. Byrle*

Approved for the Graduate Council

8

305827

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
1. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
PURPOSE OF THE STUDY . . . . .	3
PREVIOUS RESEARCH . . . . .	3
SOURCES OF MATERIAL . . . . .	4
METHOD OF ORGANIZATION . . . . .	5
2. ETHOS . . . . .	7
ETHOS BEFORE ARISTOTLE . . . . .	8
Tisias . . . . .	8
<u>Rhetorica Ad Alexandrum</u> . . . . .	9
Plato . . . . .	10
Summary . . . . .	10
ETHOS IN ARISTOTLE'S <u>RHETORIC</u> . . . . .	11
Choices . . . . .	12
Invention . . . . .	13
Arrangement . . . . .	14
Style and Delivery . . . . .	16
Summary . . . . .	17
ROMAN CONCEPTS OF ETHOS . . . . .	18
Cicero . . . . .	20
Quintilian . . . . .	22
Second Sophistic . . . . .	23

Chapter	Page
MEDIEVAL RHETORIC . . . . .	25
MORE RECENT CONCEPTS OF ETHOS . . . . .	26
Campbell . . . . .	27
Blair . . . . .	28
Whately . . . . .	29
American Rhetoricians . . . . .	30
TWENTIETH CENTURY CONCEPTS OF ETHOS . . . . .	31
SUMMARY OF THE HISTORY OF ETHOS . . . . .	33
ETHICAL PROOF IN THIS STUDY . . . . .	35
3. THE LIVES OF THE SPEAKERS . . . . .	37
THADDEUS STEVENS . . . . .	37
JOSEPH RAYMOND McCARTHY . . . . .	44
SPEECH TRAINING . . . . .	53
STEVENS' TRAINING AND BACKGROUND . . . . .	54
Stevens' Speech Training . . . . .	54
Stevens the Lawyer . . . . .	55
Stevens in the Legislature . . . . .	56
McCarthy's Speech Training . . . . .	57
McCarthy's Legal Speaking . . . . .	58
McCarthy on the Bench . . . . .	60
SUMMARY . . . . .	61
4. TWO EARLY SPEECHES . . . . .	64
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	64
The Political Environment of 1850 . . . . .	65
Stevens' Maiden Speech in Congress . . . . .	67
STEVENS' USE OF ETHOS ON FEBRUARY 20, 1850 . . . . .	71

Chapter	Page
Probity . . . . .	71
Sagacity . . . . .	72
Good Will . . . . .	75
Summary of Stevens' Ethos . . . . .	77
The Political Environment of 1950 . . . . .	77
McCarthy's First Speech on Communists in Government . . . . .	80
Ethos in McCarthy's Speech of February 20, 1950 . . . . .	84
Probity . . . . .	85
Sagacity . . . . .	89
Good Will . . . . .	90
SUMMARY . . . . .	93
Stevens . . . . .	93
McCarthy . . . . .	94
Summary . . . . .	95
5. TWO MIDDLE SPEECHES . . . . .	97
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	97
POLITICS IN THE HOUSE IN 1868 . . . . .	97
SUMMARY OF STEVENS' SPEECH ON THE FIFTEENTH AMENDMENT . . . . .	100
STEVENS' USE OF ETHOS IN HIS SPEECH ON THE FIFTEENTH AMENDMENT . . . . .	104
Probity . . . . .	105
Sagacity . . . . .	108
Good Will . . . . .	110

Chapter	Page
Summary . . . . .	112
McCARTHY IN 1951--AFTER THE BEGINNING . . . . .	113
SUMMARY OF THE SPEECH . . . . .	115
ETHOS IN THE SPEECH OF MARCH 14TH . . . . .	121
Probity . . . . .	122
Sagacity . . . . .	124
Good Will . . . . .	127
Summary . . . . .	128
SUMMARY . . . . .	129
6. TWO PERSONAL ATTACKS . . . . .	132
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	132
STEVENS' CHARGES IN THE TRIAL OF JOHNSON . . . . .	132
The Political Environment . . . . .	132
SUMMARY OF THE SPEECH . . . . .	134
THE USE OF ETHOS IN THE IMPEACHMENT	
TRIAL SPEECH . . . . .	138
Probity . . . . .	139
Sagacity . . . . .	142
Good Will . . . . .	145
McCARTHY AND THE RETREAT FROM VICTORY . . . . .	148
THE POLITICAL SITUATION IN JUNE, 1951 . . . . .	148
SUMMARY OF "THE RETREAT FROM VICTORY" . . . . .	150
USE OF ETHOS IN THE "RETREAT FROM	
VICTORY" SPEECH . . . . .	152
Probity . . . . .	153
Sagacity . . . . .	157

Chapter	Page
Good Will . . . . .	159
Summary . . . . .	161
THE TWO SPEECHES COMPARED . . . . .	162
7. CONCLUSION . . . . .	164
ETHOS . . . . .	164
Good Sense, Good Will, and	
Good Character . . . . .	164
Sources of Ethos Within the Speech . . . . .	165
The Parts of Each Aspect of Ethos . . . . .	166
THE USE OF ETHOS BY THE TWO SPEAKERS . . . . .	168
Stevens' Use of Ethos . . . . .	168
McCarthy's Use of Ethos . . . . .	170
The Use of Ethos by the Two Men	
Compared . . . . .	172
CONCLUSION . . . . .	173
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	175

## Chapter 1

### INTRODUCTION

Alarmed foreigners often mistake Our Joe McCarthy for a budding Hitler; if they were less ignorant of American history they would have realized long ago that he is merely another Thaddeus Stevens. In his day this spiteful little man was even more of a terror than McCarthy: he actually managed to deprive President Johnson of his command of the Army, and of his power to fire federal employees.<sup>1</sup>

History indicates that at least twice in America's past a figure has emerged from Congress and tried to impose his will and the will of the Legislative branch on the Executive branch of the United States Government. Thaddeus Stevens, Congressional "Radical" and hard-line reconstructionist of the 1860's may be seen as occupying a role similar to that of Senator McCarthy, self-proclaimed anti-Communist of the 1950's.

Similarities in the two cases are striking. Both men made an effort to impose the will of Congress on the Executive. Both men imposed their own will upon Congress. Both attacked the President and the Executive branch through charges of softness toward an enemy. Both were men with substantial political and intellectual followings. Both were finally deposed in the Senate.

---

<sup>1</sup>John Fischer, The Stupidity Problem and Other Harassments (New York: Harper and Row, 1964), p. 206.



The men's similarity in goals was also implicitly stated by Time Magazine. In June, 1954, a year which opened with only one senator willing to go on record as opposed to Senator McCarthy,<sup>2</sup> Time pointed out that the central issue between then-President Eisenhower and Senator McCarthy was "Who was going to control the Executive branch of the U. S. Government?"<sup>3</sup> The same question of control was crucial in 1868.<sup>4</sup>

The apparent similarities in the Congressional roles of the two men is reflected in their use of the speaking situation. Each man relied on oratory to perform certain tasks. Both also used rhetoric to bolster their popularity outside of their respective Houses and to serve as vital weapons in their political arsenals. Each filled the role of leader of legislative forces as much as that of lawmaker, and each used the spoken word as a vehicle for instructions to their legislative allies as well as for advocacy.

---

<sup>2</sup>Richard H. Rovere, Senator Joe McCarthy (New York: Meridian Books, 1960), pp. 34-35.

<sup>3</sup>"McCarthy," Time Magazine, LXIII (June 7, 1954), 18.

<sup>4</sup>See, for example, Richard Hofstadter and others, The American Republic (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1959), II, 20.

## PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

This study examines three selected representative speeches of each of the two men, delivered in Congress, to determine similarities and differences in each speaker's rhetoric, especially in their use of ethical appeals. In doing this the study must consider the similarities in the Congressional environments of the speakers, and in the use of ethical appeals as a reason for the effectiveness of the rhetoric of each speaker. More specifically, a comparison of McCarthy's Senatorial rhetoric will be made to already extant descriptions of Steven's Congressional rhetoric.

To make the comparison more accurate, care was taken in choosing speeches of McCarthy that are at least similar in some respects to speeches of Stevens previously examined by other scholars.

## PREVIOUS RESEARCH

Examination was made of Knower's "Index of Graduate Work in Speech" and Auer's "Doctoral Dissertations, Work In Progress," both of which are published annually in the August issue of Speech Monographs; and in University Microfilms, Inc., Dissertation Abstracts for the period from 1950 to the present, under the assumption that McCarthy's activities up to that time would not have attracted the attention of a student of speech interested

in comparing his rhetoric with that of Thaddeus Stevens. No such studies were found.

Scholarship dealing with the individuals and their rhetoric included "A Comparative Study of the Spoken Words of Andrew Johnson and Thaddeus Stevens," a thesis for the Ph. M. degree from the University of Wisconsin, written in 1939 by Mary Grace Walsh; "Thaddeus Stevens: Spokesman for the Vindictives and Creator of the Solid South," a dissertation for the Ph. D. degree from the University of Wisconsin, written in 1949 by William B. Whitaker; and "The Congressional Speaking of Thaddeus Stevens," a dissertation for the Ph. D. degree from Purdue University written in 1961 by Raymond Tyson. As the list indicates, all relevant degree-oriented scholarship found thus far was concerned with Stevens.

#### SOURCES OF MATERIAL

Material for the study primarily concerns itself with either Thaddeus Stevens or Joe McCarthy, although there must necessarily be background information on the times in which each man functioned and the governmental stresses and alliances within which each man functioned.

The main source of information on Stevens, his life and his Congressional speaking, was Dr. Tyson's dissertation.

Information on McCarthy to be compared with Tyson's work on Stevens was found in magazines of the early 1950's,

and biographies of McCarthy including Senator Joe McCarthy by Richard Rovere; McCarthy: The Man, The Senator, the "Ism" by Jack Anderson and Ronald W. May; and McCarthy and the Communists by James Rorty and Moshe Decter.

Speech texts for comparison were found in appropriate volumes of Congressional Record and Congressional Globe.

The lack of verbatim accuracy in speeches reported in either source was no problem since the record was corrected by the individual member before publication and thus represents what each man wanted to be recorded as saying. Thus, although offering an inaccurate record of what actually was said the Record provided a good view of what McCarthy was willing to have circulated in his name.

#### METHOD OF ORGANIZATION

The following method of organization offers the most functional structure for this study:

##### 2. Ethos

Chapter II briefly examines current literature on the nature of ethical appeals, and states a working definition for the word.

##### 3. The Lives of the Speakers

Chapter III offers brief biographies of the two speakers, examines their public careers, and underscores biographical similarities which proved helpful in a study of the two men as rhetoricians, with particular attention to factors which influenced their development as speakers.

#### 4. Two Early Speeches

Chapter IV compares Steven's maiden speech in Congress, February 20, 1850, with McCarthy's first speech in the Senate on Communists in government ironically enough delivered exactly a century later.

#### 5. Two Middle Speeches

Chapter V compares Steven's speech on the Fifteenth Amendment to the Constitution, March 18, 1868, with McCarthy's speech on American Foreign Policy, March 14, 1951.

#### 6. Two Personal Attacks

Chapter VI compares Steven's indictment of President Andrew Johnson, April 22, 1868, with McCarthy's indictment of Gen. George Marshall, Secretary of State, June 14, 1951.

#### 7. Conclusion

Chapter VII summarizes the similarities and differences discovered in the prior four chapters and draws conclusions relevant to the purpose of the study.

## Chapter 2

### ETHOS

Quintilian, in his classic definition of rhetoric as "a good man speaking well" indicates one of the key facets of rhetoric: the value of the speaker, or what may be called in more contemporary terms, source credibility. The things used to evaluate the credibility of the speaker are usually called ethical appeals and sometimes personal proof.

To examine the use of ethical appeals by the two subjects of this study, the nature of the proof under consideration needs examination. Using as a preliminary definition "the signs by which the worth of the speaker is displayed and measured" this chapter examines the definitions of ethical proof offered by the literature of rhetoric. Since the subject has long interested rhetoricians, the most useful arrangement is examination on a historical framework. Beginning with scholars prior to Aristotle various meanings applied to the word ethos are examined, and a working definition of our own appropriate to the nature of this study is formulated. Appeals used by a speaker and labeled ethical appeals are also examined.

## ETHOS BEFORE ARISTOTLE

Pre-Aristotelian rhetoricians were aware of the concept of proof generated by the fact that the speaker was a good and honorable man, and evidence exists that there was reliance on the use of this form of proof before it was described. Homer used arguments which would be labeled ethical with frequency, as in Book IX of the Iliad when the embassy to sulking Achilles attempted to persuade him to accept Agamemnon's offer of gifts and surrender Briseis to the Achaian king.<sup>1</sup>

Tisias

The first attempt to teach a system of rhetorical thinking reflecting a concern for the opinion of the speaker held by the audience may have been that taught by Tisias near the middle of the fifth century B.C. One scholar of the period conjectures that Tisias taught such concern in the four-part division of judicial oratory connected with his name.<sup>2</sup> Although the practice was, as early as Antiphon (ca. 430 B.C.), to present the character of the speaker in a favorable light,<sup>3</sup> and although

---

<sup>1</sup>Homer, The Iliad, translated by Andrew Lang et al. (New York: The Modern Library, 1950), p. 147, and see Phoenix's lengthy ethical appeal beginning on p. 159.

<sup>2</sup>George Kennedy, The Art of Persuasion in Greece (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963), p. 61.

<sup>3</sup>Kennedy, p. 91.

Lysias is credited with a systematic effort at conveying the character of the speaker in the orations he wrote for others,<sup>4</sup> no systematization of the nature of ethical proof seems to have been attempted prior to Aristotle's. Kennedy points out that Aristotle's friend Theodectes, who apparently had a strong degree of influence on Aristotle's works, had taken some steps toward systematically discussing the nature of ethical proof with his assignment of various ends to various parts of the speech. While some of the ends are "ethically oriented,"<sup>5</sup> no claim is made that Theodectes tried to organize a systematic study of ethos. Common practice of the time, however, usually put ethical proof in the introduction, although no "rules" survive.

#### Rhetorica Ad Alexandrum

English points out that an attempt to relate the character of the speaker as displayed in the speech to the character of the audience is present in the Rhetorica Ad Alexandrum, which however neither used the term ethos nor implied an exhaustive analysis of the area.<sup>6</sup> The Rhetorica Ad Alexandrum stated that the character of

---

<sup>4</sup>Kennedy, p. 135.

<sup>5</sup>Kennedy, p. 81.

<sup>6</sup>William Baker English, "Robert S. Kerr--A Study in Ethos" (unpublished Doctor's dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1966), p. 17.



the speaker should be of high quality<sup>7</sup> and that the use of evidence on the authority of the speaker is an addition to the persuasive force of the speech. It also conformed to the tendency to put ethical appeals in the introduction.

### Plato

Finally, as the last major writer on rhetoric prior to the systematic description of ethos by Aristotle, Plato discussed ethical appeals in the Phaedrus. Plato attacked the Sophistic notion of "probability" and outlined a "noble rhetoric" laden with considerations of an ethical nature.<sup>8</sup> He also demanded a new doctrine, one with greater "resemblance to the truth" as a substitute for the doctrine of probability because the probability construct is not ethical.

### Summary

Thus, rhetorical thinkers prior to Aristotle were seeking an outline offered by him under the concept of ethos. The work of the pre-Aristotelians drew some parallel points which may be worth analysis and summary.

First, the character of the orator is irreversibly tied to his use of the truth. If he uses the truth,

---

<sup>7</sup>English, p. 18.

<sup>8</sup>Plato, Phaedrus, in Plato, translated by Lane Cooper (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1955), p. 273.

then his character is good, and if his character is good he will use the truth.

Second, the introduction of the speech is the primary locus of efforts to establish an image which will be favorably evaluated by the audience.<sup>9</sup>

#### ETHOS IN ARISTOTLE'S RHETORIC

Ethos was first systematically examined by Aristotle. Plato's pupil considered the role of this form of proof in the speech, described its nature and component parts, and advanced suggestions on the way in which it should be used.

In the Rhetoric Aristotle first mentioned the concerns of ethos in Chapter 2 of Book I, when he identified the first of the modes of persuasion furnished by the spoken word as that which "depends on the personal character of the speaker."<sup>10</sup> A few lines later Aristotle indicated that "persuasion is achieved by the speaker's character when the speech is so spoken as to make us think him credible."<sup>11</sup> Thus Aristotle defined ethos first in terms of its function. Ethos is the part of rhetoric that permits persuasion because it makes the speaker believable. For as Aristotle pointed out, "We believe good men more fully and more readily than others:

---

<sup>9</sup>English, p. 19.

<sup>10</sup>Rhetoric, 1356a2.

<sup>11</sup>Rhetoric, 1356a4.

this is true generally whatever the question is and absolutely true where exact certainty is impossible and opinions are divided."<sup>12</sup> Aristotle lamented the tendency of assessing the speaker's character before he spoke, and the point was made clear that there are things inherent in the speech which will make an audience believe one man and not another.

Aristotle considered three things inspiring confidence in the orator's own character. They were good sense, good moral character, and good will.<sup>13</sup> These three elements, used properly, aid the speaker to "make his own character look right and put his hearers, who are to decide, into the right frame of mind."<sup>14</sup>

Aristotle thus described the role of ethos and offered some insight into the things which comprise this particular form of artistic proof.

### Choices

Aristotle, continuing his discussion of ethos and the appeals based on this form of proof, first pointed out that the key factor in this area of consideration is the making of choices by a speaker in preparing and delivering a speech. Aristotle's comments on ethos can be divided into those made concerning invention, those

---

<sup>12</sup>Rhetoric, 1356a6.

<sup>13</sup>Rhetoric, 1378a6.

<sup>14</sup>Rhetoric, 1377b23.

concerning arrangement, and those concerning style and delivery.

Aristotle considered the process of making a choice the key to the concept of ethos, for as he wrote in a different context, "We shall learn the qualities of . . . individuals, since they are revealed in their deliberate acts of choice, and these are determined by the end that inspired them."<sup>15</sup> Thus, some of the decisions concerning the value of the character of the speaker are made, not from what he says, but from the type of thing he says, and the type of topic the speaker selects. In Aristotle's view the choices made by the speaker provided a body of evidence implicitly stated upon which a judgement of the speaker's character could be based.

Aristotle stated that the choice to which he referred could be exercised in one of the four areas mentioned earlier: invention, arrangement, style, and delivery.

### Invention

Aristotle discussed ethos as a factor in invention in the Rhetoric. As English points out, the proper frame of mind suitable for persuasion is achieved by selecting arguments which conform to the aims of the three kinds of speaking. In the case of deliberative speaking, the

---

<sup>15</sup>Rhetoric, 1366a14.

orator is to choose that which is most expedient in achieving happiness. English goes on to credit ethos with its greatest potential effect in the realm of deliberative speaking, for it is here that the orator has the greatest number of choices. In the case of forensic speaking, the aim is justice, as obtained through arguments in conformity with this principle. In epideictic oratory the aim is to establish honor with the choice of arguments found through a study of virtues.<sup>16</sup>

Aristotle also concerned himself with the use of the maxim, particularly relevant to the character, because it deals with "questions of practical conduct, courses of action to be chosen or avoided."<sup>17</sup>

Aristotle also suggested, late in the Rhetoric, that ethical proof, or "moral discourse", may serve as a base for argument in the absence of logical reasoning, because "it is more fitting for a good man to display himself as an honest fellow than as a subtle reasoner."<sup>18</sup> Thus the character of the speaker, his ethos, may be more important than the soundness of his logic.

### Arrangement

Aristotle discussed ethos and arrangement through the device of indicating where in the various parts of

---

<sup>16</sup>English, p. 26.

<sup>17</sup>English, p. 26.

<sup>18</sup>Rhetoric, 1418b1.

a speech appeals based on the character of the speaker should be included, and what types of appeals were appropriate for each point. He indicated that in the proem, the beginning, of the speech:

You may use any means you choose to make your hearer receptive; among others, giving him a good impression of your character, which always helps to secure his attention. He will be ready to attend to anything that touches himself . . . and you should accordingly convey to him the impression that what you have to say is of this nature.<sup>19</sup>

Thus Aristotle clearly was seeking, at least in the introduction, the use of the character of the speaker as a snare for the attention of the audience.

In narration, the midpart of the speech, the speaker is enjoined to, in contemporary idiom, "throw in" anything that makes him look good:

You may also narrate as you go anything that does credit to yourself, e. g. I kept telling him to do his duty and not abandon his children . . . .  
The narration should depict character; to which end you must know what makes it do so. One such indication is the indication of moral purpose; the quality of purpose indicated determines the quality of character depicted and is itself determined by the end pursued.<sup>20</sup>

According to Aristotle, then, at any time in the speech that the orator is able to include favorable reference to his character he should seize the opportunity.

Finally, in the epilogue, or closing, Aristotle said that the speaker should make an effort to keep the

---

<sup>19</sup>Rhetoric, 1415a37-b3.

<sup>20</sup>Rhetoric, 1417a16.

audience well-disposed to himself and ill-disposed toward the opponents:

Having shown your own truthfulness and the untruthfulness of your opponent, the natural thing is to commend yourself, censure him, and hammer in your points. You must aim at one of two objects--you must make yourself out a good man and him a bad one either in yourselves or in relation to your hearers.<sup>21</sup>

Thus, Aristotle's concern with the ethos of the speaker as it applies to arrangement is primarily one of locus. The right appeal at the right time will aid the rhetorical process.

### Style and Delivery

Considerations of ethical applications relative to style and delivery occupy less space in the Rhetoric. Concerning style Aristotle wrote, "Your language will be appropriate if it expresses emotion and character and if it corresponds to its subject."<sup>22</sup> Expanding this point, Aristotle explained the role of appropriate language in expressing the speaker's character:

The aptness of language is one thing that makes people believe in the truth of your story: their minds draw the false conclusion that you are to be trusted from the fact that others behave as you do when things are as you describe them; and therefore they take your story to be true, whether it is or not. . . .

Furthermore, this way of proving your story by displaying these signs of its genuineness expresses your personal character. Each class of men, each type of disposition, will have its own appropriate way of letting the truth appear. . . . If then a speaker uses the very words which are in keeping with a particular disposition, he will reproduce

---

<sup>21</sup>Rhetoric, 1419b12.

<sup>22</sup>Rhetoric, 1408a10.

the corresponding character; for a rustic and an educated man will<sup>23</sup> not say the same things nor speak in the same way.

Thus Aristotle's contention was that the speaker's character was revealed by his style.

Aristotle recommended that form of delivery called naturalness as the most effective. He said, "a writer must disguise his art and give the impression of speaking naturally and not artificially."<sup>24</sup>

### Summary

English points out that Aristotle was concerned with the value of good character as a rhetorical device rather than a moral code, and that he did not believe that the speaker actually had to possess good character in order to be held in high esteem by his audience. Admitting that Aristotle did feel that justice would naturally prevail over injustice and the speaker who offered worthy proposals built on moral purpose would more likely succeed than one who did not, English was supported by Clark in his contention that the Rhetoric was more descriptive than prescriptive.<sup>25</sup>

English concludes his consideration of Aristotle's views of ethos by underlining the fact that the speaker's ethos is not properly a function of what has been done

---

<sup>23</sup>Rhetoric, 1408a20.

<sup>24</sup>Rhetoric, 1408b18.

<sup>25</sup>English, p. 30.



before by the speaker. The Rhetoric says that persuasion derived from the audience's opinion of the character of the speaker "should be achieved by what the speaker says, not by what people think of this character before he begins to speak."<sup>26</sup> Thus, in addition to being an artistic endeavor, involving choices made in areas of invention, arrangement, style, and delivery, ethos is a function of the specific rhetorical occasion under consideration, and not properly concerned, in Aristotle's view, with the prior reputation of the speaker.

#### ROMAN CONCEPTS OF ETHOS

Following Aristotle and a small group of rhetorical thinkers who bear the mark of strong Aristotelian influence, the next significant group of oratorical theorists are the Romans, especially Cicero and Quintilian.<sup>27</sup> Although there were other Romans concerned with the process of rhetoric and oratory, Cicero, the great orator, and Quintilian, the outstanding teacher, provide the most useful insights into the Roman theories of Rhetoric.

The earlier writings of the Roman period dealt with ethos in much the same manner as that of the Greeks. This category of early extant Roman works included Cicero's

---

<sup>26</sup>Rhetoric, 1356a8.

<sup>27</sup>See, for example, Lester Thonssen and A. Craig Baird, Speech Criticism (New York: The Ronald Press, 1948), p. 77. Later cited as Thonssen and Baird.

De Inventione and Rhetorica Ad Herenium, and ethical proof was considered primarily as a factor in the introduction of a speech.

The two leading Roman rhetoricians varied from the opinion of Aristotle and the Aristotelian school of rhetorical theory in their view of the importance of ethos. Cicero held ethos to be as important as logos, or logical proof, while Aristotle is usually not considered to have held it to be equal.<sup>28</sup> Cicero is also accused of being somewhat unclear on the differences between ethical and emotional proof, a charge substantiated by Irving J. Lee who, in support of this theory, states:

The concepts are differentiated on a functional basis. Ethos becomes a way of winning the favor of the audience. When the speech shows the speaker to be generous, merciful, just, and upright, the hearers will be positively disposed and conciliatory.<sup>29</sup>

If Cicero is accused, with some justice, of being unclear about the differences between ethical and emotional appeals, Quintilian may be accused of apathy in the same area. Quintilian held that the primary difference between ethical and emotional appeal was one of degree,

---

<sup>28</sup>English, p. 31.

<sup>29</sup>Irving J. Lee, "Some Conceptions of Emotional Appeal in Rhetorical Theory," Speech Monographs, VI (December, 1939), 70.

with, to cite his example, love being an emotion of pathos, and affection one of ethos.<sup>30</sup>

Despite what they thought of its nature, both Cicero and Quintilian agreed that ethos was an important part of persuasion, and that training which enhanced the moral quality of the speaker was of the greatest benefit.

### Cicero

Cicero has been described as the practical orator speaking on his art, as opposed to Quintilian, the teacher discoursing on methods of instruction.<sup>31</sup> He stated in his essay De Oratore that the proper training:

. . . contributes much to success in speaking, that the morals, principles, conduct, and lives of those who plead causes, and of those for whom they plead, should be such as to merit esteem; and that those of their adversaries should be such as to deserve censure; and also that the minds of those before whom the cause is pleaded should be moved as much as possible to a favorable feeling, as well towards the speaker as towards him for whom he speaks. The feelings of the hearers are conciliated by a person's dignity, by his actions, by the character of his life; particulars which can more easily be adorned with eloquence if they really exist, than be invented, if they have no existence. . . .

Cicero was almost modern in his concern for the speaker's "image" when he wrote:

---

<sup>30</sup>Quintilian, Institutes of Oratory, translated by H. E. Butler (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1921), VI. II. 12.

<sup>31</sup>Thonssen and Baird, p. 77.

It is of particular advantage that indications of good nature, of liberality, of gentleness, of piety, of grateful feelings, free from selfishness and avarice, should appear in him; and everything that characterizes men of probity and humility. . . . The contrary qualities to these, therefore, are to be imputed to your opponents. . . . To describe the character of your clients in your speeches, therefore, as just, full of integrity, religious, unassuming, and patient of injuries, has an extraordinary effect; . . . that it often prevails more than the merits of the cause.

Cicero, in addition to his concern for appearances, knew that the maintenance of appearance took skill, writing:

Such influence, indeed, is produced by a certain feeling and art in speaking, that the speech seems to represent, as it were, the character of the speaker; for by adopting a peculiar mode of thought and expression, united with action that is gentle and indicative of amiableness, such an effect is produced, that the speaker seems to be a man of probity, integrity, and virtue.<sup>32</sup>

Although there is little argument concerning Cicero's views on the value of ethos, some disagree with the view of Cicero's ideas of the nature of ethos as stated in De Oratore. Sattler, for example, disagrees with this interpretation of Cicero and insists that "a more basic concept emerges, for ethos comprehends morals, principles, and conduct."<sup>33</sup> Sattler also contends that Cicero, although fully aware of the value of ethos, is more

---

<sup>32</sup>Cicero, De Oratore, in Cicero on Oratory and Orators, translated by J. S. Watson (London: Geo. Bell and Sons, 1909), II. XLIII. Later cited as Cicero.

<sup>33</sup>William M. Sattler, "Conceptions of Ethos in Rhetoric," (unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Department of Speech, Northwestern University, 1941), p. 202. Later cited as Sattler.

interested in pathos, and he therefore does not choose to treat ethos in a systematic manner.<sup>34</sup>

### Quintilian

Quintilian based his differentiation between ethos and pathos on the fact that, although ethos is not directly translatable from Greek into Latin, the word is closely allied with "mildness." This translation permitted him a view of the two concepts which gave him opportunity, in the Institutes of Oratory, to state:

Pathos and ethos are sometimes of the same nature, differing only in degree; love for instance, comes under the head of pathos, affection of ethos; sometimes however they differ, a distinction which is important for the peroration, since ethos is generally employed to calm the story aroused by pathos.<sup>35</sup>

Quintilian was not entirely entrenched in his holding of his position, a point made clear a few lines later when he wrote:

The ethos which I have in my mind and which I desiderate in an orator is commended to our approval by goodness more than aught else and is not merely calm and mild, but in most cases ingratiating and courteous and such as to excite pleasure and affection in our hearers.<sup>36</sup>

The importance for Quintilian of the personal qualities of the orator was evident in his definition of rhetoric as "a good man speaking well." Again,

---

<sup>34</sup>Sattler, p. 202.

<sup>35</sup>Quintilian, VI. II. 12.

<sup>36</sup>Quintilian, VI. II. 13.

Quintilian underscored his views on the importance of ethos:

Finally ethos in all its forms requires the speaker to be a man of good character and courtesy. For it is most important that he should himself possess . . . those virtues for the possession of which it is his duty, if possible, to commend his client as well, while the excellence of his own character will make his pleading all the more convincing and will be of the utmost service to the case which he undertakes. For the orator who gives the impression of being a bad man while he is speaking, is actually speaking badly, since his words seem to be insincere owing to the absence of ethos which would have otherwise revealed itself.<sup>37</sup>

Although there was a difference of opinion between Cicero and Quintilian concerning the nature of ethos, with Cicero holding it different in nature from pathos and Quintilian believing the difference one of degree, their agreement on the importance of ethos as an aid to persuasion is clear.

### Second Sophistic

Following the end of the Roman Republic, oratory, persuasion, and rhetoric went into an eclipse. The downward trend began because persuasion was less important in what Tacitus was pleased to call a state "as well ordered as one could wish."<sup>38</sup> For, as he pointed out, in considering the great orators of the past in Greece and Rome:

---

<sup>37</sup>Quintilian, VI. II. 18.

<sup>38</sup>Tacitus, Dialogue on Orators, translated by Herbert W. Benario (Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1967), p. 41.

We are not speaking about a calm and peaceful state, . . . but that great and renowned eloquence is the offspring of license, which fools call liberty, the companion of seditions, the instigator of an unbridled people, without dignity, violent, rash, arrogant, which does not appear in well-governed states. . . . We do not even know of eloquence among the Macedonians and Persians or any people who were satisfied with stable government. Certain orators appeared in Rhodes and very many in Athens, where the commons, the inexperienced, all men, so to speak, had all power. Our state too, as long as it wandered aimlessly, as long as it weakened itself by means of partisan politics and dissensions and discords, as long as there was no peace in the forum, no common policy in the Senate, no self-restraint in the law courts, no respect for authority, no restrictions imposed by the magistrates, undoubtedly produced a more vigorous eloquence, just as an uncultivated field produces certain more luxuriant plants.<sup>39</sup>

Contemporary scholars have pointed out that in such a period as this, in which the content of the persuasive effort was no longer as important as the form in which it was delivered, the oratorical form tended toward excess and affectation.<sup>40</sup> Thus, the rise in popularity of the form of oratory known as the "declamation," a form in which speeches were recited as an exercise, rather than as an actual persuasive device. Since this was a rule-oriented form, ethos was one of the areas of rules which played an important part in the recital of declamations, but no new concepts were advanced, and little of that which was learned in declamation was carried over into the use of the little day-to-day rhetoric.

---

<sup>39</sup>Tacitus, p. 40.

<sup>40</sup>Thonssen and Baird, p. 96.

## MEDIEVAL RHETORIC

Rhetorical writers during the early medieval period substituted terms such as "ethical," "character," "propriety," "the becoming," and "decorum" for the concept of ethos discussed by Aristotle.<sup>41</sup> Writers such as Capella, Julius Victor, Cassiodorus, and Alcuin, although they discussed ethos, gave it no attention as a mode of proof.<sup>42</sup> Instead, audience approval of the speaker's ethical qualities was to be provided by the canons of style and delivery.<sup>43</sup> The late medieval period gave rise to the rhetoric of dictamen which stressed some traditional aspects of ethos.<sup>44</sup> In the rhetoric of dictamen the exordium and adaptation of the reader's style to the audience were given attention.

Considerations closest to those which we now call ethical appeared during the medieval period in treatises on preaching.<sup>45</sup> They recommended nobility of character and recognized the importance of ethical persuasion, especially in invention through the use of the scriptures.<sup>46</sup>

Rhetorical considerations changed later. As English writes:

---

<sup>41</sup>Sattler, p. 234.

<sup>42</sup>English, p. 35.

<sup>43</sup>Sattler, p. 234.

<sup>44</sup>English, p. 35.

<sup>45</sup>English, p. 35.

<sup>46</sup>Sattler, p. 233.



In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries rhetorical treatises followed either the classical tradition or the stylistic approach which emphasized tropes and figures. Erasmus, Melanchthon, Bacon, Fenelon, and Lamy treated ethos as an Aristotelian mode of proof.<sup>47</sup>

English lists Sherry, Peachem, Fraunce, and Hoskins as among those supporting a rhetoric of tropes and figures, with ethos being derived from the nature of the choices made by the speaker, in a return to the letter if not the spirit of Aristotle's concept of ethos as choice.<sup>48</sup>

#### MORE RECENT CONCEPTS OF ETHOS

More recently, theoreticians in the area of rhetoric have further developed Aristotle's concept of ethos, especially in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Treatises on rhetoric in both England and America gave thought to the component parts of ethical proof, and described its nature. Some--Mason, Sheridan, Burgh, Scott, Knox, and Austin--treated ethos only as a function of delivery.<sup>49</sup> Others--notably Ward, Campbell, Blair, and Whately in England and Adams and Witherspoon in America--relied on the systematic and complete treatment of the Aristotelian concept.<sup>50</sup> Sattler points out "The entire doctrine of Aristotle appears: ethos as a mode of proof, ethos as adaptation to the audience, and ethos

---

<sup>47</sup>English, p. 35.

<sup>49</sup>English, p. 36.

<sup>48</sup>Rhetoric, 1366all4.

<sup>50</sup>English, p. 36.

evinced in style and delivery. In fact, the threefold basis of ethos in the Rhetoric is fully explained."<sup>51</sup>

Most important among writers of the period are probably Britons Campbell, Blair, and Whately and Americans Witherspoon and Adams.

### Campbell

George Campbell initiated a return to the classical view of rhetoric which held as its primary aim persuasion. He showed a preference for the Roman treatment of qualities needed for the "ideal" orator.<sup>52</sup> He used the term "sympathy" to describe ethos, writing:

Sympathy in the hearers to the speaker may be lessened several ways, chiefly by these two: a low opinion of his intellectual abilities, and a bad opinion of his morals. The latter is the more prejudicial of the two. Men generally will think of themselves in less danger of being seduced by a man of weak understanding, but of distinguished probity, than by a man of the best understanding who is of a profligate life. So much more powerfully do the qualities of the heart attach us than those of the head. . . . hence it hath become a common topic with theoreticians, that in order to be a successful orator, one must be a good man; for to be good is the only sure way of being esteemed necessary to one's being heard with due attention and regard. Consequently, the topic hath a foundation in human nature. There are, indeed, other things in the character of the speaker, which in a less degree will hurt his influence; youth; inexperience of affairs, former want of success, and the like.<sup>53</sup>

---

<sup>51</sup>Sattler, p. 338.

<sup>52</sup>English, p. 37.

<sup>53</sup>George Campbell, The Philosophy of Rhetoric, in James L. Golden and Edward P. J. Corbett, The Rhetoric of Blair, Campbell, and Whately (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968), p. 224. Later cited as Campbell.

Campbell, like Aristotle, evaluated ethos in terms of a study of virtues, writing that although:

One reduceth all the virtues to 'prudence,' and is ready to make it clear as sunshine . . . another is equally confident that all the virtues are but different modifications of disinterested 'benevolence:' a third will demonstrate to you that 'veracity' is the whole duty of man: a fourth [Campbell] with more ingenuity, and much greater appearance of reason, assures you that the true system of ethics is comprised in one word, 'sympathy.'<sup>54</sup>

Campbell believed that ethos was a factor for consideration in adapting to the audience and speech occasion,<sup>55</sup> and that it was also displayed in style, when "Authority . . . tempered with moderation, candour, and benevolence . . ." enhance the audience's opinion of the speaker.<sup>56</sup>

### Blair

Hugh Blair, like Campbell, held ethos to be of great importance, writing that it stood "highest in the order of means" in persuasion.<sup>57</sup> Blair, like Campbell, also believed that in order to be truly eloquent or persuasive, a speaker need be a virtuous man.<sup>58</sup> Blair, however, did not agree with the writer with "a much

---

<sup>54</sup>Campbell, p. 248.

<sup>55</sup>Campbell, p. 223.

<sup>56</sup>Campbell, p. 227.

<sup>57</sup>Hugh Blair, Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres, XXXIV, in Golden and Corbett, p. 129. Later cited as Blair.

<sup>58</sup>Blair, XXXIV, p. 130.

greater appearance of reason" who summed up the system of ethics as "sympathy." Blair wrote:

Nothing . . . is more necessary for those who would excel in any of the higher kinds of oratory, than to cultivate habits of the several virtues, and to refine and improve all their moral feelings. The sentiments and dispositions, particularly requisite for them to cultivate, are the following: the love of justice and order, and indignation at insolence and oppression; the love of honesty and truth, and detestation of fraud, meanness, and corruption; magnanimity of spirit; the love of liberty, of their country and the public; zeal for all great and noble designs, and reverence for all worthy and heroic characters. . . . Every public speaker should be able to rest somewhat on himself; and assume the air, not of self-complacency but of firmness, which bespeaks a consciousness of his being thoroughly persuaded of the truth, or justice, of what he delivers. . . . Next to moral qualifications, what, in the second place is most necessary to an orator, is a fund of knowledge. . . . There is no art that can teach one to be eloquent, in any sphere, without a sufficient acquaintance with what belongs to that sphere.<sup>59</sup>

Thus it may be seen that Blair rejected the concept of one main virtue and suggests that a combination of all the virtues was necessary.

### Whately

Richard Whately approached the question of ethos with his eye firmly on Aristotle. He wrote:

Under the head of affections may be included the sentiments of Esteem, Regard, Admiration. Aristotle has considered this as a distinct head; separating the consideration of the Speaker's Character from that of the disposition of the hearers. . . .

He remarks, justly, that the Character to be established is that of, first, Good Principle,

---

<sup>59</sup>Blair, XXXIV, p. 131.

secondly Good Sense, and thirdly Goodwill and friendly disposition towards the audience addressed.<sup>60</sup>

In completing his consideration of ethical proof, Whately pointed out that ethical considerations might be the strongest, saying: "If the Orator can completely succeed in this, he will persuade more powerfully than by the strongest arguments."<sup>61</sup>

### American Rhetoricians

Two Americans deserve inclusion in the consideration of historical treatments of ethos. Both John Witherspoon and John Quincy Adams treated ethos in the Aristotelian tradition. Adams singled out integrity as the most important facet of ethos and asserted that unless a speaker possessed this quality, his audience would lose all confidence in him.<sup>62</sup> Witherspoon, like Adams, held integrity to be the primary indicator of ethos. He wrote: "There can be no doubt that integrity is the first and most important character of a man, be his profession what it will."<sup>63</sup> The two Americans were, thus, in essential agreement with the views of Blair, Campbell, and Whately.

---

<sup>60</sup>Richard Whately, Elements of Rhetoric (New York: Sheldon and Co., 1872), p. 223.

<sup>61</sup>Whately, p. 223.

<sup>62</sup>John Quincy Adams, Lectures on Rhetoric and Oratory, I (Cambridge: Hilliard and Metcalf, 1810), p. 345.

<sup>63</sup>John Witherspoon, "Lectures in Eloquence," in The Works of the Reverend John Witherspoon (Philadelphia: William W. Woodward, 1802), III, 570.

TWENTIETH CENTURY CONCEPTS OF ETHOS

The twentieth century has seen a significant change in the nature of ethos as viewed by speech scholars. The importance of this form of proof is universally recognized by contemporary rhetoricians. Few would disagree with Thonssen and Baird that ". . . the force of the speaker's personality or character is instrumental in facilitating the acceptance of belief."<sup>64</sup> Since Thonssen and Baird did not define ethos in terms of what is, although discussing what it does and the things that constitute ethos,<sup>65</sup> a broader examination of current rhetoric is necessary to determine a useful contemporary definition.

Monroe and Ehninger defined ethos as the "persuasive force which resides in the character or reputation of the speaker."<sup>66</sup> They labelled it the "strongest and most permanent"<sup>67</sup> and state that "in order to be listened to and believed in, then you [the speaker] must have a deserved reputation for integrity."<sup>68</sup>

---

<sup>64</sup>Thonssen and Baird, p. 383.

<sup>65</sup>They follow Aristotle's division into the three "goods".

<sup>66</sup>Alan H. Monroe and Douglas Ehninger, Principles and Types of Speech (6th ed., Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1967), p. 4.

<sup>67</sup>Monroe and Ehninger, p. 4.

<sup>68</sup>Monroe and Ehninger, p. 5.

Lionel Crocker, following the lead of Thonssen and Baird, defined ethos by quoting Aristotle,<sup>69</sup> as did Buehler and Linkugel.<sup>70</sup> Hance, Ralph, and Wiksell, however, defined it simply as "the kind of proof--or the element that lends credibility to the message--that arises from the person of the speaker."<sup>71</sup>

In their discussion of ethos Hance, Ralph, and Wiksell touched on a concept closely allied with ethos, but seeming to offer usefulness in areas other than the speech situation. That concept, "source credibility," is an aspect of the concept of ethos which is becoming increasingly popular in the considerations of rhetoricians, especially those quantitatively oriented. Work done by Hovland and others in this area pointed to some interesting objective conclusions which may be reached through experimentation in this field.<sup>72</sup>

Work done by these researchers in the area of source credibility is important to rhetoricians who are behavior-oriented, or who deal with the theories of

---

<sup>69</sup>Lionel Crocker, Public Speaking for College Students (3rd ed., New York: American Book Company, 1956), p. 219.

<sup>70</sup>E. C. Buehler and Wil [sic] Linkugel, Speech: A First Course (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1962), p. 50.

<sup>71</sup>Kenneth G. Hance, David C. Ralph, and Milton J. Wiksell, Principles of Speaking (2nd ed., Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1969), p. 80.

<sup>72</sup>Carl I. Hovland and others, Communications and Persuasion (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953), p. 27.

communication rather than public speaking. Writers such as Wiseman and Barker, for example, used the work of these men as a basis for their work. Interestingly enough, when defining the concept of ethos before examining it in a quantitative framework, Wiseman and Barker followed traditional form closely. They wrote: "Proof by ethos or ethical proof is that which lies with the speaker either because of his past reputation, or because of elements within the communication which add to his credibility."<sup>73</sup>

Some less traditional thinkers in the field of rhetoric alter the label for the concept, but the idea of the importance of the audience's perception of the character of the speaker remains important. Burke, in his "New Rhetoric" made it a key point in his concepts of consubstantiation and identification.<sup>74</sup>

#### SUMMARY OF THE HISTORY OF ETHOS

Clearly, there are a number of aspects to the concept of ethos, but its importance throughout the history of the study of rhetoric has seldom been denied. Some considered it the most important form of proof open to

---

<sup>73</sup>Gordon Wiseman and Larry Barker, Speech--Interpersonal Communications (San Francisco: Chandler, 1967), p. 168.

<sup>74</sup>Kenneth Burke, A Grammar of Motives and A Rhetoric of Motives (Cleveland: The World Publishing Co., 1962), p. 545.



use by the speaker, and all admitted that it was an important aid in persuasion.

Areas in which some disagreement over the nature of ethos occurred include the relationship of ethos to pathos, with some scholars joining with Quintilian and agreeing that ethos was different from pathos in degree while others held it to be different in nature. Disagreements also occurred in the role of the reputation of the speaker in determining the audience's opinion of the speaker. Aristotle held that ethos should be an artistic endeavor, and not predicated on the previous reputation of the speaker.<sup>75</sup> Thonssen and Baird agree that this division of ethos is defensible in some instances, "if we conceive of ethical proof as an artistic creation brought about by the speaker's skill in asserting his intelligence, revealing his probity, and accommodating himself to his hearers."<sup>76</sup> However, they questioned the value and utility of this restriction, labeling it "artificial" and pointing out that the attitudes of the audience toward the speaker based on 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."<sup>77</sup>

---

<sup>75</sup>Rhetoric, 1356a8.

<sup>76</sup>Thonssen and Baird, p. 384.

<sup>77</sup>Thonssen and Baird, p. 385.

## ETHICAL PROOF IN THIS STUDY

Although the division of ethos into considerations of artistic creation, explicit within the speech, and prior reputation, implicit in the audience's knowledge of the speaker, has been attacked, in determining the two speakers' use of ethos the distinction will be made for the purposes of this study. Thus, the term ethos when used within this thesis will refer to those explicit instances in which the speaker's art has led him to include overt references to his character in the texts of the speeches to be considered. Since only the overt, explicit bids for belief stated in a speech are within the speaker's control at the time of the speech, only they will be considered.

The consideration of overt expressions of ethos will be divided into three areas, based on Aristotle's division of ethos into three areas, the three goods of "good sense," "good will," and "good moral character."<sup>78</sup> Thonssen and Baird offer a useful system for recognizing this form of ethos. A speaker emphasizing his good character:

(1) associates either himself or his message with what is virtuous and elevated; (2) bestows, with propriety, tempered praise upon himself, his client, and his cause; (3) links the opponent or the opponent's cause with what is not virtuous; (4) removes or minimizes unfavorable impressions of himself or his

---

<sup>78</sup>Rhetoric, 1378a6.

cause previously established by his opponent; (5) relies upon authority derived from his personal experience; and (6) creates the impression of being completely sincere in his undertaking. . . .

A speaker who is supporting his claim to good sense:

(1) uses what is popularly called common sense; (2) acts with tact and moderation; (3) displays a sense of good taste; (4) reveals a broad familiarity with the interests of the day; and (5) shows through the way in which he handles speech materials that he is possessed of intellectual integrity and wisdom.

Of the third source of ethos they say:

Finally, a speaker's good will generally is revealed through his ability (1) to capture the proper balance between too much and too little praise of his audience; (2) to identify himself properly with the hearers and their problems; (3) to proceed with candor and straightforwardness; (4) to offer necessary rebukes with tact and consideration; (5) to offset any personal reasons he may have for giving the speech; and (6) to reveal, without guile or exhibitionism, his personal qualities as a messenger of the truth.<sup>79</sup>

It is within the above framework that we shall examine the speeches of Thaddeus Stevens and Joe McCarthy to seek the similarities in their explicit use of ethos.

---

<sup>79</sup>Thonssen and Baird, p. 387.

## Chapter 3

### THE LIVES OF THE SPEAKERS

In the study of the use of ethos by the men under consideration the lives of each will be examined and compared. This chapter outlines brief biographies of Stevens and McCarthy, compares for existing similarities and contrasts for differences the speaking of the two men. The legal speaking and public record of each man is also briefly examined.

#### Thaddeus Stevens

Stevens, born before the ratification of the Constitution, was by birth a New Englander, by adoption a Pennsylvanian, and an outstanding member of the Bar of his adopted state.<sup>1</sup> He was also reckoned by many the most effective debater in Congress during his tenure in one of Pennsylvania's House seats. A physically afflicted man, he had a delicate and perhaps sheltered childhood.

Thaddeus Stevens was born on April 4, 1792, in Danville, Vermont. He was one of four sons of Joshua

---

<sup>1</sup>Biographical material on Stevens, unless otherwise noted, is from Tyson.

and Sarah Stevens. His father was not a good provider; consequently the family suffered great poverty.

Little is known about Stevens' father, other than that he was by turns a shoemaker and a surveyor. A few years after the family settled in Danville, the older Stevens disappeared.

Tyson describes Sarah Stevens as a woman of strong character and great strength of mind, and her success in rearing four sons lends support to the description. Stevens held his mother in high esteem, provided for her maintenance, and visited her at least annually until her death. Because Thaddeus was clubfooted and sickly as a youngster, he was closer to his mother than his other brothers were, and the evidence is that she reciprocated in her feeling.

Stevens' mother moved the family to nearby Peacham, Vermont, the home of Caledonia Academy, because of her conviction that her family needed an education. Stevens entered Dartmouth College as a sophomore in the fall of 1811.

Stevens attended Dartmouth in 1811 and 1812 and the University of Vermont in 1812-13. In 1813, when the Federal Government took over the buildings of the University to use as barracks in the War of 1812, Stevens returned to Dartmouth, graduating from there in August 1814. He was undistinguished as a student.

Following graduation at twenty-two, Stevens returned to Caledonia Academy as a teacher. During this period he began reading for the law under a Judge Mattocks. After a year of teaching and reading in Peacham, a friend and former teacher secured a position for him in York, Pennsylvania, teaching in an academy. Stevens continued to read the law.

At the end of the summer of 1816, Stevens was admitted to the practice of law in Pennsylvania. He settled in Gettysburg, where he was admitted to practice before the Adams County Court in September, 1816. His practice as a lawyer was prosperous.

Six years later, Stevens was elected to the Gettysburg town council and was unanimously elected its president. He served on the council irregularly for the next ten years.

By 1825 Stevens had become the largest individual holder of real estate in Gettysburg with a total valuation of \$11,420. His interests included a number of farms throughout the county and partnership in a charcoal-iron business at Maria Furnace near Gettysburg. Current describes his holdings:

In his haste to attain this local wealth and eminence, he had, as one might expect, shown a more than becoming avidity, a certain propensity to overreach. He had not hesitated to take advantage of his position as a lawyer to further his quest for real estate. Much of it he had got at sheriff's sales.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup>Current, p. 11.

During this time, Stevens continued a prosperous law practice, appearing in every case in the Pennsylvania Supreme Court from Adams County. He won nine of his first ten appearances before the Supreme Court, six times winning the reversal of a lower court, which helps account for the fact that he was growing both wealthy and eminent. He was yet involved in no political activity more significant than the Gettysburg Borough Council.

In 1829 the appearance of the Anti-Masonic party opened the door to Stevens for wider political activity. In that year he founded, with George Himes, the Gettysburg Star, which was an Anti-Masonic organ. Before the appearance of the Anti-Masonic party Stevens had been a Federalist, but the waning of that party left him homeless politically. With the move from the Federalist party to the Anti-Masonic party he began a political migration which would lead him to pass through the ranks of three political alliances before finally finding a home as a Republican.

Stevens was active in the Anti-Masonic party, working at the national convention of the group in Baltimore in 1831 for the nomination of Judge John McLean of the Supreme Court. However, when the party nominated William Wirt, Stevens stumped Pennsylvania for the candidate.

As a member of this party, Stevens was elected to the Pennsylvania House of Representatives in 1833

where he served, excepting 1836, until his withdrawal from that body in 1841.

One year after his retirement from the Pennsylvania Legislature Stevens left Gettysburg for Lancaster, which "promised a more lucrative legal practice, and perhaps, a more promising political future."<sup>3</sup>

Lancaster, a thriving city of about 17,000 people, was a former capital of the state and had served during the Revolution as a meeting place for the Continental Congress. An important center for agricultural products, it was soon to become a manufacturing center.

Stevens quickly assumed a substantial law practice and became politically active again. In 1844, with the waning of the Anti-Masonic party, Stevens worked for the Whig nomination of Winfield Scott for the Presidency. However, Henry Clay was nominated, and Stevens, smarting from some political slightings by Clay and William Henry Harrison, gave the Whig nominee minimal support. He planned to support Scott again in 1848, but campaigned for Zachary Taylor when he gained the Whig nomination.

By 1848 Stevens was a power in the Whig party, and a leader in the growing anti-slavery movement in the Lancaster area. Stevens' credentials as an opponent of slavery were sound, dating back to his tenure in the State Legislature. Although Stevens was regarded as

---

<sup>3</sup>Tyson, p. 43.



somewhat radical in his opinions when he first espoused the cause of anti-slavery and abolition, by 1848 the Lancaster area was beginning to agree generally with his views.

In 1849 Stevens ran for Congress. He was nominated by the Whig party and defeated his foe in the general election by more than 4,000 votes. He took his seat at the opening of the Thirty-First Congress on December 3, 1849.

The Thirty-First Congress took three weeks to select a speaker, due primarily to the sectional controversy over the question of slavery. Stevens apparently entered the contest eagerly. He received four votes on the forty-first ballot, and his support grew to twenty-seven votes, remaining at that figure until the fifty-fifth ballot, when his support eroded. During the balloting, Stevens' support came from Free-Soilers and anti-slavery Northern Whigs.

Stevens' maiden speech in Congress on February 20, was a singeing attack on slavery. He followed this with another denunciation on June 10th. During his term in the Thirty-First Congress Stevens made clear his position of uncompromising opposition to slavery and bitterly attacked both the Compromise of 1850 and the Fugitive Slave Act. After reelection to the Thirty-Second Congress in 1851, he refused to run again in 1853. He returned

to his law practice, with no expectation of ever returning to elected national office.

In 1851, Stevens joined with several other men in an effort to start another newspaper, the Independent Whig, a weekly political paper with strong anti-slavery sentiments. The paper, which supported Winfield Scott in the election of 1852, lasted about four years.

In 1855 Stevens was instrumental in the formation of the Republican Party in Lancaster County, and the following year he was selected as a delegate to its national convention. Stevens had found a party which had his complete approval, and eventually he was to become one of the dominant voices in the affairs of that party. At the 1856 Philadelphia convention he supported Justice John McLean, twenty-five years after first supporting the jurist at the Baltimore convention of the Anti-Mason party. However, despite his private fears that Pennsylvania would be lost because of the nomination of John C. Fremont, Stevens was an active campaigner.

Two years later, incensed over the policies of James Buchanan, Stevens again ran for Congress, securing the Republican nomination and winning handily, with 75 per cent of the county's votes.

Returning to Congress at the age of sixty-seven, Stevens began a program of self-assertion that made him the acknowledged leader of Republicans in the House. Re-elected continually until his death in 1868, Stevens

controlled the majority party throughout this portion of his Congressional career.

Stevens was a strong partisan fighter, and a firm believer in some ideals which were held generally to be radical at that time. He supported abolition and a hard war and led legislative fights for Constitutional amendments to abolish slavery, secure a hard-line reconstruction, and provide for universal manhood suffrage.

### Joseph Raymond McCarthy

Joseph Raymond McCarthy, who would later purge himself of all his given names but Joe, was born on November 14, 1908, in Grand Chute Township, Outagamie County, Wisconsin, the fifth of nine children.<sup>4</sup> His father Timothy was half Irish, half German, and a native of the region. His Irish mother was an immigrant. Both were pious Roman Catholics. The family was poor, but had improved financially enough to move, just before Joseph's birth, from a log cabin to a clapboard house.

McCarthy was an unattractive child. He was described as barrel-chested, with short arms, large eyebrows, and a certain grossness of features. Reportedly a hard and willing worker on the family farm, he was protected excessively by his mother.

---

<sup>4</sup>Biographical material on McCarthy, unless otherwise noted, is from Rovere.

Eric Goldman relates what he believed to be the basis of McCarthy's drive to national attention:

The Irish settlement in northern Wisconsin where he grew up respected money and looks; the McCarthys were a struggling brood of nine and Joe was the ugly duckling, barrel-chested and short-armed with thick eyebrows and heavy lips. Mother Bridget McCarthy threw a special protective wing around the shy, sulky boy and when the rough teasing came, he sought out her big, warm apron. 'Don't you mind,' she would console, 'You be somebody. You get ahead.'

Joe took heed. He would get back; he would show everybody. The shy sulkiness turned into a no-holds-barred ambition. . . .

There are difficulties in discerning the true story of McCarthy's boyhood. McCarthy never, according to Richard Rovere, said or wrote anything about his family, despite the political gains which could have been made from the large family that started in a log cabin, and the working of his way not only through college, but through high school.<sup>6</sup>

The young McCarthy attended the one-room Underhill Country School and, despite reports of an inability to recite, did well enough to skip a grade, finishing grammar school at age 14. Instead of continuing his education he became a full-time chicken farmer. Using money earned at odd jobs, he purchased a flock of fifty chickens, which he raised on land rented from his father. It took little time for him to accumulate a flock of ten thousand,

---

<sup>5</sup>Eric Goldman, The Crucial Decade--And After (New York: Vintage Books, 1960), p. 138.

<sup>6</sup>Rovere, p. 83.

a new chicken house, and a truck for carrying the birds to the Chicago market.

Five years later, McCarthy fell ill and while in the hospital hired some boys to care for his chickens. However the boys were careless, disease infected the flock, and the birds died. Faced with the option of beginning again or quitting, McCarthy quit.

McCarthy left Grand Chute for Manawa, twenty miles away, a town of about 5,000 people. He became manager of a Cashway grocery store and apparently made a good impression on the leaders of Manawa for they encouraged him to further his education. He entered Little Wolf High School shortly before his twentieth birthday and in one year completed four years academic work.

Following graduation, he enrolled in engineering at Marquette University in Milwaukee. He worked his way through Marquette by washing dishes, baking pies, pumping gas, and digging ditches. He abandoned his engineering plans for law, became a debater, president of his class, and a college boxer. While a law student he served as the college boxing coach.

Following graduation from law school, McCarthy set up practice in Wappaca, the county seat west of his native Outagamie. He shared offices with a dentist, but apparently the dentist did the most business. In nine months records show he had four cases, and he

reported earnings of \$777.81 for 1935. He made additional money because of his poker winnings.<sup>7</sup>

He worked at fifty dollars a week for an attorney named Michael Eberlein, in Shawano County north of Outagamie. McCarthy was, at that time, a Democrat, while Eberlein was a Republican. McCarthy became chairman of a Young Democrat Club and in 1936 ran for District Attorney on the Democratic ticket, running second in a three-way race. He returned to work with Eberlein and, in 1939, emerged from obscurity by running for Circuit Judge of Wisconsin's Tenth Judicial District as a Republican.

During this campaign McCarthy falsified the age of his opponent by adding seven years to it and, at the same time, subtracted two from his own age, making age an issue. The fact was that his opponent, already sixty-six, was open enough to the age question from the thirty-year old McCarthy. McCarthy won the seat.

His tenure on the bench was distinguished by "that emancipation from convention which characterized him in his 1939 campaign and in his behavior as a United States Senator."<sup>8</sup>

When the United States entered World War II, McCarthy was thirty-three years old and exempt from the

---

<sup>7</sup> Jack Anderson and Ronald May, McCarthy: The Man, The Senator, The "Ism" (Boston: Beacon, 1952), p. 41.

<sup>8</sup> Rovere, p. 89.

draft because of his judicial position, but in June 1942, he wrote the Marine recruiter in Milwaukee stating his qualifications and applying for a direct commission. He then told reporters that he was willing and eager to enlist as a "buck private," and "more interested in getting a gun than a commission." He got them in reverse order.

After training, he became an intelligence officer for a Marine Aviation unit, Scout Bombing Squadron 235. He did not resign from the bench, but asked his fellow circuit judges to take over his duties.

In 1944, McCarthy secured a furlough to return home and campaign in the Republican primary against Senator Alexander Wiley of Wisconsin. He violated a military ruling forbidding men on active duty to speak on political issues, and a section of the Wisconsin Constitution forbidding judges to enter political contests and declaring all votes cast for such a man to be forfeit. However he ran, made a respectable showing, and then returned to the Pacific.

Once there, McCarthy applied for a three month leave of absence to secure his reelection as Circuit Judge, and when this was denied, he resigned his commission in October, 1944. His resignation was accepted in the following February, and he returned to Wisconsin. He was reelected in 1945 to the circuit judgeship, and in 1946 he defeated Robert M. LaFollette, Jr. in his bid

for the Republican Senate nomination. McCarthy's margin of victory was about 5,400 votes out of a total of 410,000 votes cast, and a great deal of credit for McCarthy's victory was given to anti-LaFollette Communist labor union leaders. McCarthy won the general election and took his Senate seat in 1947 as part of the first Republican congress since the Great Depression.

Despite a promising start<sup>9</sup> McCarthy soon revealed an aggressive ability to be placed in compromising positions. He became a spokesman for Pepsi-Cola, Inc., and had some sugar quotas suspended to permit Pepsi to return to full production. He became involved with a firm called Lustron, manufacturers of pre-fabricated houses, which benefited by some changes which he introduced into housing legislation. In return, he was paid \$10,000 to write an essay for inclusion in their advertising literature. He also defended some Nazi soldiers who were to be executed for murdering 150 American soldiers and 100 Belgian civilians at Malmedy in 1944.

No financial gain was hinted for McCarthy in the defense of the Germans, but the Senator realized more than \$20,000 from Pepsi-Cola and well over the \$10,000 fee from Lustron and, by implication, there were other similar arrangements which were personally lucrative

---

<sup>9</sup>Life Magazine selected him for the center of a feature on the 1946 crop of freshman senators and followed him around all day with cameras.



to the Senator. McCarthy had already become moderately rich after saving \$50,000 from 1935 to 1943 on a gross income which totalled \$24,867.05. McCarthy invested the \$50,000 in the stock market, later switching to soy bean futures. He made a profit in 1943 from the stock market which totalled \$42,353.92. His salary as a judge was \$8,000, which was thrice his highest earning as a lawyer.

McCarthy's first exposure to the problem of Communist infiltration in the government came on January 7, 1950, at supper at the Colony Restaurant in Washington. Here, McCarthy was dining with three men, two educators from Georgetown University and a prominent Washington attorney, and he reportedly admitted that he was seeking an issue for his reelection bid in 1952. His reelection was doubtful, for:

. . . word of his malpractices and of his chiseling was beginning to circulate in Wisconsin. The Milwaukee Journal and the Madison Capital-Times dug up the stories of divorce scandals in his court. He filed no returns with the State Department of Taxation on his stock-market killings in 1943. The Department called this to his attention, and he claimed that he had not been a resident of Wisconsin but a tail gunner in the South Pacific that year; the Department ruled that this was nonsense and forced him to pony up \$2,677. In 1949, the Board of Bar Commissioners censured him for violating the state Constitution and its own code of ethics by running for the Senate while holding a judgeship. An examination of the reports of his 1946 campaign committee showed contributions amounting to \$18,000 reported as coming from his father, his brother, and his brother-in-law, none of whom, according to their own tax returns, had ever had that kind of money. (And none of whom, for that matter, had ever shown any interest in Joseph McCarthy's political career.) In general, he did

not add luster to the Wisconsin tradition of public service.<sup>10</sup>

Therefore, McCarthy was meeting with Father Edmund A. Walsh, Regent of the School of Foreign Service at the University; Charles H. Kraus, Professor of Political Science at Georgetown, and William A. Roberts, a Washington attorney and businessman. The purpose of the meeting, according to one of the three, was to expose a young Roman Catholic Senator to the ideas of some of the intellectual leaders of his faith to better his mark in Congress.

Following discussion of the St. Lawrence Seaway and a modification of the Townsend plan for universal pensions as keys to McCarthy's success, Father Walsh suggested the question of Communism and its immense power for evil both at home and abroad. McCarthy immediately began to plot the theme for a campaign. Shortly thereafter he requested speaking engagements for the Lincoln's Birthday weekend, with the announced topic "Communists in Government."

On February 9th, in Wheeling, West Virginia, McCarthy allegedly said that there were a certain number of communists in the employ of the State Department, but the question of just how many he said there were is lost beyond retrieval in a welter of charges, claims, and conflicting affidavits. His Wheeling speech was

---

<sup>10</sup>Rovere, p. 121.

followed by similar ones in Reno, Nevada, and Salt Lake City, Utah, that same weekend.

Eleven days later he made his first major speech in the Senate on what was to become his only theme. He delivered later speeches on the presence of "Reds" in the State and other Departments of the government, on the lack of a concerted effort to root out these men, on the sly attempts by a traitorous press to eliminate himself, and on the stupidity or treason of the men directing America's foreign policy.<sup>11</sup> He continued in this vein, attacking seemingly at random, from the time of his Wheeling speech through summer, 1954. His charges were always taken seriously by some people. Then, in 1954, following the drafting of G. David Schine and after several disputes between members of his staff and key people in the Department of the Army, McCarthy became entangled in hearings which were to determine whether or not McCarthy or his staff had misused the power of McCarthy's Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

A poor showing on national television in the now-famous Army-McCarthy hearings caused McCarthy's legislative power to wane. He was brought before a Select Committee of the United States Senate, his

---

<sup>11</sup>Joe McCarthy, Major Speeches and Debates of Senator Joe McCarthy Delivered in the United States Senate 1950-1951 (Washington: n.p. (Government Printing Office, number 251894) n.d.), p. 5.

activities were investigated, and he was "condemned" by the United States Senate. The Senatorial defeat seemed to be total defeat. Despite the very real possibility that McCarthy could have recouped his fortunes,<sup>12</sup> he apparently began drinking excessively and died within three years of liver failure. He was accorded, at the request of his wife, a Senate funeral and was buried in Appleton, Wisconsin, on May 7, 1957.

#### SPEECH TRAINING.

Both Thaddeus Stevens and Joe McCarthy had some formal training as speakers. Stevens, at Dartmouth and the University of Vermont, studied rhetoric and read some rhetoricians. McCarthy was a college debater. Both men were probably aware of some technical points of persuasion, and neither can accurately be characterized as unexposed to rhetorical principles, although little evidence exists of McCarthy's rhetorical education.

Both men were lawyers, and both practiced their profession. Although there are few statements available about McCarthy's early career, and a number available about that of Stevens, a number of comparisons may be made.

---

<sup>12</sup>Rovere, pp. 233 ff; 237-39.

Since Stevens and McCarthy are to be examined as speakers at a time when they served as public servants, their records as men holding public office ought to be examined.

#### STEVENS' TRAINING AND BACKGROUND

##### Stevens' Speech Training

Stevens was doubtless familiar with the rhetorical theories of Hugh Blair, since scholars have identified that work as being in common usage at most New England colleges by the time Stevens enrolled at Dartmouth. It is also probable that Stevens had read George Campbell, but since Richard Whately's Elements of Logic did not appear until 1826, with his Elements of Rhetoric being introduced two years later, it seems unlikely that Stevens read those works. There is a great likelihood that Stevens had read Systems of Oratory by John Ward, and a personal regard for the author may have led Stevens to read John Quincy Adams' Lectures on Rhetoric and Oratory, published in 1810.<sup>13</sup>

It is difficult to see how Stevens could not have read Adams. Stevens was to become a great admirer of the former president, he was to earn his living as an advocate in a period when rhetoric was important to the legal profession, and he was throughout his life an

---

<sup>13</sup>Tyson, p. 68.

idealist who would avidly read every word by someone he admired. Actually, rather than require evidence that Stevens read Adams, it is logical to assume that he did in the absence of contrary evidence.

### Stevens the Lawyer

Stevens practiced law for more than thirty years before he entered Congress for the first time, and his legal career was both successful and lucrative. Tyson, in his examination of the legal career of Stevens, refers to it as "eminently successful," calling Stevens "one of the most effective trial lawyers in the state."<sup>14</sup>

Stevens had a legal skill which led several experts to pronounce his abilities "unequaled," "near perfection" and "one of the first lawyers of Pennsylvania"; high praise indeed from the former Attorney General of the United States, an eminent journalist, and an opposing member of the House of Representatives.<sup>15</sup>

Stevens amassed a large sum of money, primarily from his skill at the law, with no hint of any illegal or shady practices attached to his fortune, although there is widespread agreement that his practices were "sharp," with frequent purchases at sheriff's sales.

Stevens also displayed signs which can be interpreted as indications of competence. He was prepared

---

<sup>14</sup>Tyson, p. 78.

<sup>15</sup>Tyson, p. 80.

to face the competition of his fellow lawyers, sometimes suggesting things which would make their tasks easier. He was also prepared to assist the young budding lawyers in their reading of the law, the most common way to earn entrance to the bar in that time.

Further, his clientele were generally, although not always, the bankers and businessmen of Gettysburg and Lancaster, men usually discriminating when it comes to the selection of legal counsel. Finally, Stevens frequently achieved a degree of eminence when called upon to handle the cases of Negroes detained under the Fugitive Slave Act, and was successful in several unorthodox cases, including a plea for the "right of the Seventh Day Baptists to engage in worldly employment on Sunday, in accordance with their conscientious belief that the seventh day of the week is the true Sabbath of the Lord."

Seemingly Stevens was an eminent success in his chosen profession. Indeed, even his political and legal foes are united in agreeing that his was one of the best legal minds in the state, if not the nation.

#### Stevens in the Legislature

Stevens was elected to the Pennsylvania Legislature on the Anti-Masonic Party ticket in 1833 and with the exception of the 1836 election served in that body until 1841. He amassed a record which was characterized as "impressive," and "bold and enlightened." He was a leader

of legislative forces, becoming Canal Commissioner and the dispenser of patronage while in the Pennsylvania legislature. With the exception of a complicated and sordid incident called the "Buckshot War" which arose, as so much Pennsylvania political turmoil arises, from charges of corruption in Philadelphia's election, Stevens had an enviable record in the legislature. On the occasion of a bill to provide for the free education of the poor, Stevens so eloquently advocated free education for all that not only did his proposal persuade the House, but enough Senators were present that they returned to the upper chamber and reversed an earlier decision, voting instead to support Stevens' proposal.

Celebrations of Stevens' eloquence on the occasion of the education reform debate came from his friends, his enemies, and men writing after the passage of several years.<sup>16</sup>

Stevens was a power in the legislature until his retirement from that body in 1841. During that time, he dominated his fellow representatives, and also perfected the oratorical skills which were to stand him in good stead in Congress.

#### McCarthy's Speech Training

Although less is known about McCarthy's speech training than of Stevens, several things may be surmised.

---

<sup>16</sup>Tyson, pp. 108-9.



First, since McCarthy was a member of Marquette University's debate squad and participated in the debate activities at that school, it is improbable that he was completely unaware of theories of rhetoric including the nature, use, and sources of the three modes of proof. Probably, considering the nature of their work, McCarthy's views of ethos would not differ greatly from those views stated by Thonssen and Baird.

Leslie Fiedler, writing in an essay intended originally for Encounter Magazine, pointed to at least one trait which labeled McCarthy a debate veteran. Fiedler says:

He practices in addition the college debater's device (I can dimly remember my own debate coach recommending it to me with a wink) of waving about irrelevant papers, as he makes some especially undocumented statement.<sup>17</sup>

### McCarthy's Legal Speaking

No such testimony indicates that Joe McCarthy was of legal skill equal to Stevens: indeed, quite the contrary seems to apply. He earned only \$777.81 in legal fees for 1935, augmenting his earnings with winnings at the poker table. Ending his private practice, he took a job at \$50 per week in the law office of Michael Eberlein. At a time when Judges of the Circuit Court were earning

---

<sup>17</sup>Leslie A. Fiedler, An End to Innocence (Boston: The Beacon Press, 1955), p. 64.

more than \$200 per week, apparently McCarthy's legal position was not the most rewarding one in the area.

Specific achievements of McCarthy's legal practice prior to his seeking the judgeship are not mentioned in the works of any of his biographers. Although not prima facie evidence of a lack of legal skill, it serves, when combined with other evidence, to outline a picture of, at best, modest talent.

McCarthy's record, upon his subsequent elevation to the bench, is one not distinguished by positive criticism. In reversing one of his decisions involving the Quaker Dairy Company of Appleton, the state Supreme Court referred to his action dismissing a suit against the firm as "an abuse of judicial power . . . highly improper . . . and open to the inference that the evidence destroyed contained statements of fact contrary to the position taken by the person destroying the evidence." McCarthy had personally ordered the evidence destroyed on the grounds that "they weren't material."<sup>18</sup> McCarthy's tenure on the bench caused the Milwaukee Journal to comment:

Judge McCarthy, whose burning ambition for political advancement is accompanied by an astonishing disregard for things ethical and traditional, is doing serious injury to the judiciary in this state.<sup>19</sup>

One other fact must be pointed out concerning the legal career of Joe McCarthy. The inference is clear

<sup>18</sup>Rovere, p. 90.

<sup>19</sup>Cited in Rovere, p. 93.

that before his return from the South Pacific, Joe McCarthy had managed to amass a substantial fortune, through extra-legal or illegal means. McCarthy's financial holdings exceeded his total salary and reported income, and the evidence indicates that he was not immune to bribery while a Senator. Senator McCarthy, while seeking financial security, sometimes circumvented law to achieve it. Perhaps his skill was not equal to the financial demands he made on it, so his position served as a substitute source of income.

#### McCarthy on the Bench

Joseph R. McCarthy worked as a public servant in the courts for seven years, from election in 1939 until election to the Senate in 1946. His performance of duty must have been imperfect at best.

McCarthy managed to invest more than double his salary as judge in the stock market at a time when his only legal source of income was his judicial salary. He also avoided paying taxes on some portions of the income from his investments.

His judicial record included several reversals from the state supreme court as scathing as the one in the Quaker Dairy Company case.

In a state which prided itself on machinery for marriage counseling tied to its divorce laws, McCarthy managed to obviate the system. He first had his campaign

manager, a lawyer and taxicab owner, appointed as marriage counselor for his court. Then, with this man drawing a regular salary for the work, McCarthy proceeded to ignore him, granting divorces without benefit of either the mandatory counseling or the legal cooling-off period.

He ignored the rules for political conduct of members of the armed forces and members of the Wisconsin Judiciary. Prior to his intrusion onto the national scene, he violated several ethical standards and turned in an unenviable record as a United States Senator.

McCarthy apparently benefited by acting as a spokesman for the Pepsi-Cola Corporation and was financially rewarded for helping write federal housing legislation so that it would no longer be harmful to prefabricated house manufacturers. Apparently other favors were given. McCarthy also befriended fur farmers and some "shoddy" lobbyists.

McCarthy was selected by a poll of journalists and political scientists as the "worst" Senator of the Eighty-First Congress.

#### SUMMARY

Thus, neither McCarthy nor Stevens were unaware of the nature of rhetoric, nor untrained in some of its finer points. It seems reasonable to assume, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, that both men were aware of the nature of ethical proof or ethos and that

both men were conscious of their "image" in the eyes of their audience. Although differences exist between the theories concerning the nature of ethos in the two periods of time in which the men lived, it seems clear that each man would understand the definition as used by his more educated contemporaries.

Clearly a comparison of the legal speaking of McCarthy with Stevens reveals the lack of a basis for comparison. McCarthy seems to have been a generally ineffective lawyer while Stevens seems to have been a leading light of his state's bar.

The disparity between the public career of the two men is obvious. Stevens, although ascribed base motives by some of his enemies, was excellently qualified, and most critics agree that he had high motivation. McCarthy, most critics agreed, was ill qualified, and this fact, his motivation notwithstanding, contrasted strongly with Stevens.

Although the two speakers possessed an almost opposite record of public service, there was a fairly close relationship between their lives. Both were physically unattractive children, Stevens with his clubfoot, and McCarthy with his physical grossness. Histories of the youth of both men indicate that the mother was, in each case, the strong figure. Sarah Stevens functioned effectively in the absence of a father; Bridget McCarthy seemed to dominate the father.

## Chapter 4

### TWO EARLY SPEECHES

#### INTRODUCTION

The point at which the rhetoric of the two men will first be compared is the speech which each delivered on February 20th. Stevens, delivering his maiden speech in the House of Representatives, spoke against slavery in 1850; McCarthy, after nearly four years in office, spoke against Communists in government in 1950.

To understand adequately the nature of the two speeches, especially their use of ethos, the speaking occasion will be examined. Attention will be given to the political environment to aid the speech evaluations.

For consistency, the following chapters comparing the rhetoric of the two men have the same general organization. Each chapter first discusses the general political environment prevailing at the time the speech was delivered. Next, the chapter summarizes the content of the speech. Where applicable, a thumbnail sketch of events leading to the delivery of the speech, such as proposed legislation, or opposing speeches calling for response, are presented. Third, ethical appeals present in the speeches are identified, and finally each chapter compares those

ethical appeals used by the two speakers. Hopefully, two general conclusions are offered: First, the nature of the ethical appeals used by the two men should be apparent, second, the interrelationship and repetition of the appeals used by the two speakers should be discovered to determine whether or not McCarthy and Stevens had any ethical appeals in common.

These two speeches, given precisely a century apart, were each part of a national political movement. Each speech served in some measure to label its speaker as an emerging figure of importance in the coming events, and each caused excitement in the political context of the day.

The speeches were also similar in that they were accurate indications of future speeches from each man and accurate indications of the main theme which each speaker was to repeat on many occasions.

### The Political Environment of 1850

Ten years before the beginning of the American Civil War conflict was already visible.<sup>1</sup> Sectional strife was emerging throughout the nation, with roots as early as the War of 1812. Dissent over slavery and the tariff were a major part of the national domestic political problem.

---

<sup>1</sup>See, for example, Harry Hansen, The Civil War (New York: Mentor Books, 1961), pp. 9-25.

When Stevens took his seat in the Thirty-First Congress, tension was rising because of question of permitting slavery to extend into territory acquired in the Mexican War. Some legislators believed that slavery, even in the Southern States, should be abolished; some held that a policy of containment forbidding slavery from extension was adequate; and most of the Southern legislators held that abolition was unthinkable.

The Congressional opening was a stormy session with sixty-three ballots required for the selection of a Speaker. Dissent among sectional factions kept the search for a Speaker hopelessly deadlocked.<sup>2</sup>

The House was already unruly, even when operating with its proper officers. Horace Mann, while a member of the Thirtieth Congress, made a journal entry for March 4, 1849, which captured the climate of that deliberative body:

There were two regular fist-fights in the House, in one of which the blood flowed freely; and one in the Senate. Some of the members were fiercely exasperated; and had the North been as ferocious as the South, or the Whigs as violent as the Democrats, it is probable there would have been a general melee.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup>The Thirty-First Congress contained, in the House of Representatives, 112 Democrats, 109 Whigs, and 9 others, most of whom were the remnants of the Anti-Masonic Party.

<sup>3</sup>Mary Peabody Mann, Life of Horace Mann, Centennial Edition in Facsimilie (Washington: National Education Association of the United States, 1937), p. 277. The original was published in 1865.



Stevens entered this body, described by historian Allan Nevins as "a mob, and an inflammable one," and within two months delivered his maiden speech. He had already offended the South by delivering taunting impromptu responses to remarks made by Southerners on several occasions, beginning as early as the second day of the session when his reply to Keitt of South Carolina resulted in his being attacked by a bowie knife-wielding William Barksdale of Mississippi. Timely and concerted action by Whigs, including Roscoe Conkling of New York and Elihu Washburne of Illinois, prevented bloodshed, but the incident offers an interesting insight into both the political and the rhetorical problems faced by Stevens as a member of the Thirty-First Congress.

#### Stevens' Maiden Speech in Congress

On February 20th Stevens replied to several threats by Southern Representatives, specifically Representative Clingman of North Carolina. For approximately one hour he delivered an attack on slavery and the slave society ranked by Tyson as among the most vigorous and eloquent denunciations of slavery ever uttered on the floor of the House.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup>All excerpts from this speech are from the Congressional Globe, Thirty-first Congress, 1st session, appendix, pp. 141-3.

After apologizing for consuming the time of the House, Stevens based his remarks on a simple chain of reasoning. The representatives of the South, he said, were united in combination to prevent the passage of legislation through fear that legislation would be harmful to their sectional interests. This, Stevens reasoned, was a formidable combination and needed an important reason to justify itself. Stevens reasoned that the men were motivated by sectional ends, and this placing of section above nation became sedition or treason. Stevens digressed by discussing the penalties of such conduct in other nations. But in the United States, he said, "where two-thirds of the people are free" men can act freely. Stevens held that the Southern combination was formed to prevent a move to limit the spread of slavery into the territories. He indicated his belief that this cause was, on the surface, preposterous. He pointed out that his position on slavery held it a "great evil" and one to be opposed by Congressmen "as statesmen, as philanthropists, and as moralists," despite the contentions of some Southern representatives that Congress should defend slavery.

Stevens then shifted from defense to offense.

He first attacked the institution economically, contending that the system held large tracts of land for the profit of small numbers of men, and this system prevented the establishing of a middle class of free men holding their

own farms and supporting government and society. He contended that the few free men seeking to establish themselves in the South were unable to compete with the slave holdings and were degraded by performing the same labor as slaves, even though they worked for their own profit.

Stevens cited Virginia's economy as a horrible example of the potential of a slave state:

Her ancient villages wear the appearance of mournful decay. Her minerals and timber are unwrought. Her noble water power is but partially occupied. Her fine harbors are without ships, except from other ports, and her seaport towns are without commerce and falling into decay. Ask yourself the cause, sir, and I will abide the answer.

Having offended the Virginia representatives, Stevens attacked slavery as an inhibitor of education, since the presence of the slave population kept the white population from achieving the density to afford public schools. The children of the rich, he conceded, were able to travel for their education, but the children of the poorer people would be uneducated and disadvantaged. (Remember that Stevens was recognized as the savior of the Pennsylvania public school system.)

Stevens then dug his spurs into the flank of the South by claiming that rich planters would never permit their sons to mingle socially with children of the poor white. Stevens continued goading and taunting the South by charging that her military strength would be enfeebled by the necessity of maintaining troops at

home to guard against a slave rising. He also attacked the South's military record, agreeing that while many army officers were Southern the North provided the bulk of the troops, with the vainglorious South offering only officers and leaders to the nation, while sending her younger sons to monopolize the posts of clerks in the government and letting the northern men carry the rifles in battle.

Stevens attacked claims advanced by Meade of Virginia that his state's economy was based on the demand for and supply of slaves produced for shipment further south by claiming that "Virginia is now only fit to be the breeder, not the employer, of slaves."

Stevens concluded by first predicting that the prevention of the spread of slavery would lead to its demise within twenty-five years, painting a rosy picture of the nation beginning "the true principles of government-- freedom."

Stevens then described the slave states and a "General government" which recognized and abided slavery as a "despotism," sketched a history of the nature of slavery calling American slavery "the most absolute and grinding despotism the world ever saw," and concluded with powerful appeals to the religious background of House members, calling slaveowners to the judgement of the same God that judged the slaves, being shown "their chains, their stripes, their wounds to their Father,

and to his [the slaveholder's] Father; to their God, and to his Judge."

#### STEVENS' USE OF ETHOS ON FEBRUARY 20, 1850

From an Aristotelian view of ethos, Stevens apparently enhanced his credibility in the speech of February 20th. First, Stevens, by topic choice, conformed with most of the criteria for the presence of ethical appeals. By speaking on slavery and its termination, Stevens demonstrated his probity, associated himself with the virtuous, linked his opponents with the vicious, and created an impression of sincerity. By such a choice he demonstrated sagacity, revealing a familiarity with the issues of the day, despite the partisan nature of judgments on his "common sense" and taste. Similarly, his choice demonstrated his good will by providing an opportunity to proceed with candor and straightforwardness.

#### Probity

Stevens demonstrated his good moral character repeatedly, conforming closely to the guidelines set forth by Thonssen and Baird. Virtues associated with Stevens' views on slavery included self-reliance, prosperity, patience, industriousness, charity, and mercy. Praise of the North and its advocates, as well as the friends of containment of slavery, was gentle and subtle;

usually covert and unstated, sometimes clear as, comparing Virginia with her neighbors, he said:

Travel through the adjoining States of Ohio and Pennsylvania, and you will see that the land produces more than double as much as the same kind of land in Virginia. In the free States new towns are everywhere springing up and thriving; the land is becoming more productive, smiling habitations are within hail of each other; the whole country is dotted with school-houses and churches almost within sight of one another; and, except under peculiar circumstances, their manufactures and mechanical arts furnishing lucrative employment to all their people; and their population steadily and rapidly increasing.

Turn again to Virginia. There is scarcely a new town, except at one or two points, within her whole borders. Her ancient villages wear the appearance of mournful decay. . . .

Thus, Stevens accomplished several ends, each useful in building ethos. He associated his Northern allies with virtue and productivity, while associating the South with opposing vices, and by reciting Northern virtues Stevens bestowed praise upon them. Although his reliance on personal observation was implicit in questioning the facts advanced by an earlier speaker, it is specious, because there is no record of Stevens ever having been to Virginia. Stevens did not visibly minimize unfavorable impressions and, from the distance of history, the impression of sincerity created by the speaker is difficult to judge. Still, clearly, Stevens made an effort in the speech to establish good moral character.

### Sagacity

Stevens made less appeal to the audience to accept his good sense than he did in his efforts to demonstrate

good moral character. The most obvious area in which his sagacity was visible was his attention to the issues of the day, especially those confronting the Congress. His speech is a reply to previous statements in Congressional debate, and his introduction reflects the immediate Congressional situation, for he says:

I do not know that I should have troubled the committee at this time, could I see any reasonable prospect that the House would devote its time to practical legislation. But for a considerable time after our meeting the organization of the House was obstructed; and since organized, a large portion of its time has been occupied by speeches on the subject of slavery . . . when no practical question, to which they could apply, was before the committee. There was no doubt a well-defined object . . . so that no legislation could be matured obnoxious to southern gentlemen. . . . The learned gentleman . . . distinctly notified us that unless Congress, as a condition precedent, submitted to settle the slavery question, according to Southern demands, there should be no legislation. . . .<sup>5</sup>

Thus, in relating immediately to the questions before Congress at the time, Stevens showed familiarity with the issues of the day.

Stevens first exhibited his "common sense" by defining the nature of the Southern conspiracy threatening the North, and demonstrated that the combination of representatives was a conspiracy based upon fear. The speech was a logical one, based heavily on visible reasoning, and the use of the logical format helped to

---

<sup>5</sup>The Congressional Globe records Congress, on that date, "In Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, on the reference of the President's Annual Message."

demonstrate his "common sense." Thus, in Stevens' attack on the obstructive tactics of the Southern representatives, his pointing out that the men of the South were working in conjunction with each other in a seditious conspiracy was one of the instances in which his logic aided the appearance of his common sense.

Stevens displayed little tact, and his maintenance of the dictates of good taste was questionable. Thus, when he described Virginia as "only fit to be the breeder, not the employer of slaves" and pointed out "the sons of that great State must devote their time to selecting and grooming the most lusty sires and the most fruitful wenches to supply the slave barracoons of the South," he excited many representatives of the South to incomprehensible sputtering. Millson of Virginia, Stanley of North Carolina, Marshall of Kentucky, Williams of Tennessee, Meade of Virginia, and Ross of Pennsylvania each called the description of Virginia breeding slaves as unfit for civilized society, and contrary to the dictates of good taste.<sup>6</sup>

However, in displaying his intelligence, intellectual integrity, and wisdom, Stevens clearly displayed sagacity, and the efforts made by his foes to deny his charges only lend credence to the claim that his thinking was sound.

---

<sup>6</sup>Tyson, pp. 158-162.



Perhaps the best testimonial to the soundness of Stevens' logic was given by John A. Logan, Representative of Illinois, who said it had "a sledge-hammer pungency, and characteristic brevity" and who praised its logic highly.<sup>7</sup>

### Good Will

Few of Stevens' contemporaries and few later commentators have indicated that Stevens was a man of good will toward his enemies.

Good will may exist in the balanced praise of the audience, but Stevens never offered much balanced praise for his audience. Occasionally, he praised some Northern allies in the House, but he never gave any similar praise to Southern enemies or Democrats. Similarly, his identification with his hearers was based on partisan, sectional considerations.

Positively, Stevens always proceeded with candor and straightforwardness in his Congressional rhetoric. On numerous occasions his opponents probably wished that he would be less candid.

Stevens' weakest area was probably in offering rebukes with tact and consideration. Stevens offered rebukes with as much scorn as he could summon. Words like "vilification" and "vituperation", "calumny" and

---

<sup>7</sup>Reported in Tyson, p. 163.

"Phillipic" are repeated throughout accounts of his Congressional speaking.

Although Stevens delivered no personal rebukes in his first speech on the floor of Congress, his denunciation of the group of Congressmen known as "dough-faces" gives some indication of the flavor of his rebuke:

But I hope, with some fears, that the race of dough-faces is extinct; I do not see how it could be otherwise. They were an unmanly, an unvirile race, incapable, according to the laws of nature, of reproduction. I hope they left no descendants. The old ones are deep in political graves. For them I am sure there is no resurrection, for they were soulless.

Apparently, Stevens' integrity was well known and not questioned. His rhetoric led some to suggest that he was greatly motivated by his dislike for class distinction.

For example, when discussing the nature of the South's contribution to the nation's history, Stevens conceded that the South has produced many men of renown, but he added:

For it is only the officers and commanders of armies who live in song and story. The stout hearts and strong arms of the common soldiers that fight the battles and win the victories are unknown to fame. . . . And the South has always furnished officers for our armies; Presidents for the Republic; most of our foreign ambassadors; heads of departments; chiefs of bureaus; and sometimes, in her proud humility, has consented that the younger sons of her dilapidated houses should monopolize the places of clerks and messengers to the government.

In the revelation of his personal qualities as a messenger of the truth Stevens perhaps earned his lowest

marks. In the February 20th speech he referred to the government of the United States as a "despotism," calling the sixteen million Americans the despots, causes of "the most grinding despotism that the world has ever seen." Such hyperbole, although defended logically, was not the type of support used by one attempting to earn a reputation as a messenger of the truth.

### Summary of Stevens' Ethos

Stevens' use of ethos was generous. His choice of topic and use of much of the evidence first offered by his adversaries enhanced his ethical stature. He was generous in demonstrating his own probity and the good moral character of his argument, displaying each of the component efforts of probity described by Thonssen and Baird.

He was not as concerned with proving sagacity, although he was probably not weak in this area. There is some indication of an effort to support this aspect of his ethos.

Stevens was apparently prepared, consciously or unconsciously, to be labeled as a man of ill will, because little effort was made to support this facet of his ethos.

### The Political Environment of 1950

The political environment of 1950 was, in many respects, similar to that of 1850. Although the major split in the nation was one based on ideology rather

than geography, the nation was again deeply divided by questions and problems which were not easily dispelled. The profound trauma of a Great Depression and a World War, combined with changes occasioned by the New Deal, divided the nation into factions as far apart as the factions a century earlier.

Conservatism-isolationism battled with liberal-internationalism in a nation uncertain of its future world role.<sup>8</sup> A recession had shaken the economy, and a Democratic administration led a recalcitrant nation in directions unclear to contemporary observers. The mood of the Eighty-First Congress, elected in the elections of 1948, was peculiarly vacillating. The Congress made few important steps forward, but did not follow the lead of the Eightieth Congress in retreating. New Deal legislation, threatened with erasure by the Eightieth Congress, was safe from tampering in 1948.

However, world events did not permit Congress' leisurely pace to permeate the entire Government. The Chinese Communist armies began to sweep south in January, 1949, and in August the U. S. State Department published a White Paper officially announcing that China had fallen

---

<sup>8</sup>The essential division between conservative-isolation and liberal-international wings of the nation, although somewhat simplistic, seems useful as an indicator of the nature of the national division or polarization. It is based on Goldman, especially Chapters III and V.

to Communist armies. Prefacing the announcement was a defense of American Asiatic policy by the Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, blaming Chiang's "corrupt, inefficient, blind" government for an inability to utilize American aid and its own resources.

In September, 1949, the White House announced that the Soviet Union had exploded an atomic bomb. The Russian achievement was far earlier than the world expected.

Trials of American Communist leaders continued throughout 1949, with America's top party leaders on trial in Foley Square in New York; Judith Coplon was being tried for delivering Justice Department secrets to the Soviet embassy; and the perjury trial of Alger Hiss revealed that an American Undersecretary of State could be an agent for the Communist conspiracy. His conviction, on perjury charges January 21, 1950, held that Hiss had lied when he said he was not a Communist, and did not spy for the Soviet Union.

In the crowded weeks of 1950 prior to the first Communist-seeking speech of Senator McCarthy came the news that President Truman was ordering the construction of a hydrogen bomb and the confession in England of Dr. Klaus Fuchs, who admitted stealing atomic secrets during the war and passing them on to Russia.

On February 9th, a hitherto obscure Senator McCarthy first charged that there were Communists in high places, specifically the State Department, there

with the acquiescence, if not actual overt cooperation, of the nation's leaders. In a speech before the Ohio County Republican Women's Club of Wheeling, West Virginia, McCarthy charged that Communists were in the State Department, that the Department's leaders knew they were there, and that, despite several warnings, they were permitted to remain although branded as security risks. The Senate speech of February 20th was a defense of the Wheeling speech, which had been given in slightly altered form on February 10th in Salt Lake City, Utah, and on February 11th in Reno, Nevada.

#### McCarthy's First Speech on Communists in Government

Senator McCarthy first spoke about State Department Communists in Wheeling, Salt Lake City, and Reno on Lincoln's Birthday weekend, 1950. His charges became the cause of much concern in government, and occasioned demands for further information, amplification, and, most importantly, names.

Senator McCarthy responded in a long and rambling speech of February 20th during an evening session of Senate.

Unlike Stevens' speech, McCarthy's effort was neither as connected, or as cogent. McCarthy spoke during "one of the maddest spectacles in the history of

representative government"<sup>9</sup> for almost six hours. In an attempt to substantiate his assertion that there were Communists in the State Department, whether 205, as he allegedly said in Wheeling, or 57, which he claimed to have said in Wheeling, or 81, which he undertook to prove on the Senate floor.

McCarthy began by announcing that he was speaking on a matter which "concerns me more than any other subject I have ever discussed before this body, and perhaps more than any subject I shall ever have the good fortune to discuss in the future."<sup>10</sup>

He outlined the weekend events of the 9th of February, reading the text of a wire sent to President Truman offering him the names of the alleged Communists. The wire, according to the speech, included the statement "I have in my possession the names of 57 Communists who are in the State Department at present," and offered their names to the President. The wire included several other figures, including "300 certified to the secretary for discharge because of Communism, but only approximately 80 were actually discharged."

---

<sup>9</sup>All excerpts from this speech are from Major Speeches and Debates of Senator Joe McCarthy--1950-1951 (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, n.d. [number 251894] ), pp. 5-60.

<sup>10</sup>Rovere, p. 133.

Following the reading of the wire, and a statement that no official White House answer had been received, McCarthy refuted President Truman's reaction that there was no truth to the McCarthy charges. This occasioned a flurry of questions from Senator Scott Lucas, Democratic Majority Leader. The exchange subsided as McCarthy read the supposed text of his Wheeling and Reno speeches, claiming "it was the same speech."

McCarthy's recital of the Wheeling speech was interrupted for exchanges with Senator Lodge. Lodge indicated that his position on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee enabled him to promise that, McCarthy willing, the committee would fully investigate his charges. McCarthy continued reading.

At the conclusion of the alleged Wheeling text, and following further exchanges with Lucas and Herbert Lehman of New York, McCarthy substantiated his contentions by reading what he said were 81 "cases" of Communism in the State Department. McCarthy fenced with Lucas, with Lehman, with Senator McMahon of Connecticut, and even with Senator Knowland of California, the Minority Leader of the Senate and McCarthy's party superior. He tiresomely read 77 case histories, with no apparent information in any one. An example of one, Case 38, is typical:

Case No. 38. This individual is employed in a very responsible position in the Broadcasting Division of the Voice of America. As early as December 10,



1946, investigation by the State Department's security agency showed that this man was a fanatical Communist, that he was anti-capitalistic, and definitely followed the Communist Party line. In this case there were reports from two different Government investigative agencies. Another government investigative agency advised that a well-known Communist in Newark, N.J., gave him the unqualified information that this individual was a paid-up party member. While acting as a newspaper reporter prior to his present employment with the Voice of America broadcast he was reported by his superiors to have colored the news reports with Communist theory, and did not give complete and unbiased coverage to such reports. This is important because it is this individual who is handing out news reports on the Voice of America program. A very close friend of this individual and his brother stated that both are definitely Communist.

The entire process of reading the cases occupied more than six hours, from late afternoon to almost midnight. Interspersed with the charges made against each of the 77 were battles with various senators who either wanted information or wished to get alleged facts straight in their minds.

Senator Lehman asked how McCarthy could identify these people as Communists. Senator Lucas wanted the names made public. Senator McMahon wanted to examine the charges made by McCarthy on the basis of the standards of reason and evidence.

McCarthy also argued with Senators Brewster of Maine, Donnel of Mississippi, Mundt of South Dakota, Wherry of Nebraska, Langer of North Dakota, Ferguson of Michigan, Dworshak of Idaho, Capehart of Indiana, Withers of Kentucky, Neely of West Virginia, and Magnuson of Washington. Several offered aid and assistance, but

he scorned attempts at aid. Throughout the debate McCarthy recited case after case.

### Ethos in McCarthy's Speech of February 20, 1950

The use of ethos by Senator McCarthy in his maiden speech on Communists in government was of a different nature than that of Stevens'. Several differences between the positions of the two men seem important and need to be identified before the real relationships between the two speeches can be observed.

McCarthy delivered the speech to support the shaky credibility of his discovery of Communists in government. Thus, he began with negative ethos in that his believability was already being questioned.

In this case, McCarthy devoted a large portion of the speech to supporting his original charge with logical proof; the files pertaining to some State Department Communists.

However, McCarthy's decisions in preparing to make the speech indicate some choices which, prior to an examination of the speech, aid in assessing his use of ethos.

McCarthy's choice of topic displayed his character by its concern with the issues of the day, its association with virtue, its identity with his hearers, and supported his probity, his sagacity, and his good will.

Secondly, McCarthy's decision to support his charges gave credibility to his speech, and his use of evidence was perhaps intended to support an impression of intellectual integrity and wisdom, as well as create an impression of sincerity and reveal personal qualities as a messenger of the truth.

### Probity

In addition to adding support to his claim of probity evidenced through his choices of topic and arrangement, McCarthy hoped to substantiate his claim to good moral character in several ways.

In two ways McCarthy associated himself and his cause with virtuous action. He used examples of the propriety of his conduct as a support for his own virtue, and used patriotic platitudes to support the virtues of the rather nebulous "cause." McCarthy, in fact, utilized a technique of the classical classes of support for probity, but with a change.

He attributed virtue to himself and his cause, and attributed vice to the cause of his opponents. He then outlined the specific points opposed by his opponents and ascribed virtue to those points implying that those opposed to such manifestly "good" points must, of necessity, be bad.

An example of this system was given in the alleged Wheeling speech of February 9th. That speech, part of the February 20th speech, went, in part:

The great difference between our western Christian world and the atheistic Communist world is not political, ladies and gentlemen. It is moral. There are other differences, of course, but those could be reconciled. . . . The real basic difference, however, lies in the religion of immoralism--invented by Marx, preached feverishly by Lenin, and carried to unimaginable extremes by Stalin. This religion of immoralism, if the Red half of the world wins--and well it may--this religion of immoralism will more deeply wound and damage mankind than any conceivable economic or political system.

Karl Marx dismissed God as a hoax, and Lenin and Stalin have added in clear-cut, unmistakable language their resolve that no nation, no people who believe in a God, can exist side by side with their communistic state.

The implication was that McCarthy's enemies were enemies of God, and that some of the virtues ascribed to God could be ascribed to McCarthy's arguments.

McCarthy bestowed tempered praise on his cause frequently, although there was a tendency to intemperate praise which, while not immediately identifiable, seemed to diminish the effectiveness of the appeal.

In the linking of the opponent and the opponent's cause with that which was not virtuous, McCarthy first seemed to make progress as an innovator. This form of ad hominem argument was especially complex as McCarthy developed and molded his arguments.

Thus, when Dean Acheson offered, for the sake of friendship, to vouch for Alger Hiss, or when Acheson stated that he would not "turn his back" on Hiss, McCarthy

permitted the inference to be drawn that Acheson was as much a Communist as Hiss. Then the allusions to atheistic Communism apply to Acheson as well as Hiss.

McCarthy usually dealt with three sets of opponents: the Communists, especially those hidden in government, and those who aid them; the Democratic national administration, particularly Harry Truman and Dean Acheson; and Congressional Democrats willing to let McCarthy's charges die because of the political danger.

McCarthy's creative use of rhetoric ascribed certain qualities to some of his enemies, e. g. "Godless Communists," then discussed other enemies as though they possessed the same attributes as the Communists. Thus, for example, several of the "cases" which McCarthy read on the floor of the Senate were not instances of Communists as much as they were cases in which a man was "soft" on Communism, or had retained a subordinate because of other considerations. Case 62, for example, although "not important as far as Communistic activities are concerned" and apparently a homosexual, was also "typed" as an atheist, psychoneurotic, disloyal, and guilty of such violations as black marketeering, graft, and job apathy.

To minimize his previously unfavorable impression McCarthy indulged in a bit of theatricalism. He surrounded himself with the implements of logical discourse. Rovere described his appearance:

It was a flabbergasting performance . . . McCarthy, growing hoarser, redder, and less coherent, shuffled about the idiotic "dossiers" that were spread untidily over two desks and that were plainly as foreign to him as they were to the other Senators.

This display of signs of truthfulness, coupled with repeated refusals to "answer silly questions," "play number games," and repeated admonitions to various Senators that "this is not a game," "I am not playing games with the Senator," and "I may say, if the Senator is going to make a farce of this, I will not yield to him," all were designed to underscore the seriousness of the speech and minimize previous impressions.

In the speech of February 20th, McCarthy made few points which relied on his personal experience, although he sometimes referred to his conversations with members of the FBI, loyal employees of State and other departments, and other "experts" in an attempt to enhance his expertise.

However, upon reading the speech record, the sincerity and the intelligence of Senator McCarthy must be doubted. On several occasions simple questions were given complex and misleading answers. When Senator Lucas, trying to support his contention that McCarthy was bluffing, repeatedly sought answers to such simple-seeming questions as: "Mr. President, did the Senator say at Wheeling, West Virginia, last Thursday night that 205 persons working for the State Department were known by the Secretary of State to be members of the Communist Party, or words to that effect. . . ?" McCarthy sought unanimous consent

to insert a copy of his Wheeling speech into the record, and, upon denial of permission, proceeded to read the speech, despite several repetitions by Senator Lucas of his question.

However, McCarthy seemed to attempt to support his probity.

### Sagacity

McCarthy attempted to comply with those areas headed as good sense. He attempted to display common sense, tact and good taste, and as demonstrated earlier he sought to identify himself to his hearers as familiar with the issues of the day and possessed of intellectual integrity and wisdom.

Many of McCarthy's appeals toward common sense were oriented toward a belief that common sense is the opposite of, or at least different and distinctly separated from, "book learning." Thus, when McCarthy attacked college-trained people, as he did in the February 20th speech:

It has not been the less fortunate or members of minority groups who have been selling this Nation out, but rather those who have had all the benefits that the wealthiest nation on earth has had to offer-- the finest homes, the finest college education, and the finest jobs in Government we can give them.

This is glaringly true in the State Department. There the bright young men who are born with silver spoons in their mouths are the ones who have been the worst.

Again, when McCarthy was asked for further information on some of his files and he would not reveal the source

of his information it seemed sensible, as it did when he said that he "tried, and I hope successfully, to red-pencil anything that might be embarrassing to any investigating agency." These prudent actions were indicative of apparent tact and seeming moderation, as well as evidence of his good taste.

Signs of tact, moderation and good taste are found in McCarthy's repeated refusal to name specific names on the floor of the Senate. In his reply to a request from Senator Withers of Kentucky, McCarthy repeatedly answered in a reasonable vein, as:

. . . we should not attempt to try to convict a man, that should be done by a committee. I am submitting the evidence without giving the names. I have avoided that in every way possible.

By not revealing the names of those whom he identified impersonally as Communists, McCarthy displayed an aura which contributed to his sagacity.

### Good Will

McCarthy showed evidence of his good will, although no good will was ever intended to be displayed toward Communists, especially those in government.

McCarthy made little attempt to praise his hearers, the Senators of the United States. Except for a few ritual descriptive adjectives such as "the distinguished Senator" or "my able colleague," and a few remarks about "able Senators on the Democratic side of the aisle," Senator McCarthy made no apparent attempt to praise.



However, on several occasions McCarthy praised the American electorate, implying that once they became aware of the nature of the problems of governmental Communist infiltration they would react correctly.

Identifying with his hearers, not in but out of the Senate, indicated that this was a deliberately planned tactic designed to win McCarthy a reputation of good will with the public. McCarthy made no reference in the February 20th speech to identification or empathy with fellow senators, but made several references to the fact that Americans would understand and applaud his approach.

In his first speech, for example, McCarthy addressed comments to the bulk of America's registered Democrats on several instances, saying early in the speech ". . . a group of twisted-thinking intellectuals have taken over the Democratic Party." He later said:

The subject now under discussion is one in which the Democrats should be especially interested. As the Senator from Illinois knows, unless something is done to clean up the State Department, the Democratic Party is going to be identified with that group. I think that is wrong. I think there are too many fine Democrats in this country and too many fine Democrats in the Senate, on the Democratic side of the aisle, to permit the Democratic Party to be identified with the group I have been discussing.

McCarthy repeatedly emphasized his intention to proceed in his indictment of Communist influence in the State Department. He usually referred to this intention

following an interruption of his speech. Early he referred to his intention to proceed as an excuse not to yield to interruptions, especially with Senator Lucas. He also used this device to overlook the answering of questions, exemplified in this exchange with Senator Lehman:

MR. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the senator yield for another question?

MR. McCARTHY. I am glad to yield.

MR. LEHMAN. Does not the Senator believe that, interested as he is in combatting Communism, and we are all interested in combatting Communism, that it is his duty both as a Senator of the United States and as an American to submit those names to the State Department or to the Senate, in executive session?

MR. McCARTHY. If the Senator will but sit down and let me make my report, to the Senate, he will have all the information he wants. . . .

The exchange also demonstrates McCarthy administering a rebuke with tact and consideration, with the closing of McCarthy's statement as "The Senator from Wisconsin does not need any advice on his duty as a Senator, in this respect." McCarthy rebuked fairly calmly, at least in the speech of February 20th.

McCarthy made no attempts to nullify his personal reasons, if any, for speaking, and revealed few qualities which personally qualified him as a messenger of the truth.

McCarthy was a speaker who made an effort to provide for a reputation for good will.

## SUMMARY

Although McCarthy's speech was much longer than the comparable one of Stevens, running for more than six hours rather than the hour occupied by the elder speaker, it is still useful to compare the two speakers on a point-by-point basis. Let us thus review the efforts of each speaker for a brief overview and then compare the two speakers.

Stevens

Stevens offered primarily emotional proof, heavily mixed with appeals to the ethical background of the audience. He offered himself as a source of proof on a limited but adequate basis.

His choices of topic, arguments, and support, indicated some ethical considerations. He demonstrated good moral character repeatedly, conforming closely to the guidelines offered by Thonssen and Baird. He did not make any detectable attempt to minimize any unfavorable impressions, but otherwise complied with each of the categories for this type of ethical support.

He made less appeal to the audience to accept his good sense than he did to support his moral character. He showed familiarity with the issues of the day, and demonstrated his common sense in several ways. He did not, however, display evidence of tact nor good taste. Perhaps, he relied on his ability to display intelligence,

intellectual integrity, and wisdom, each of which was clearly visible in the speech.

Stevens was concerned least with demonstrating his good will, and there are few instances of praise, tactful rebukes, or showing his personal qualities as a messenger of truth. He did not identify with his hearers to any great extent, and did not make any attempt to demonstrate any of the signals of good will except that he proceeded with candor and straightforwardness. Since he made no attempt to support his integrity or to nullify any personal reasons which he may have had for speaking, it is possible that this area was not one under question in the House.

### McCarthy

McCarthy offered proof which was essentially logical in nature, composed primarily of the documents of government. He also used proof derived from himself as a source sparingly. His choice of topic, arguments, and especially support reveal him to be as aware of his ethos as was Stevens.

McCarthy concentrated fairly heavily on supporting his probity. He displayed the connection between his arguments and the virtuous, and also demonstrated the connection between his opponents and the vicious. McCarthy also took overt steps to minimize his previous impression,

a tactic which was required by the amount of uproar generated by the earlier impression, the Wheeling speech.

He generally made few points dependent on his personal experience, and did not convey an attitude convincing of his sincerity and intelligence.

McCarthy did attempt to display indices of good sense. He displayed a familiarity with the issues of the day, and made a substantial appeal to common sense. He attempted to display tact, good taste, moderation, and intellectual integrity by not making public the names of the people he identified as members of the Communist Party.

McCarthy showed some examples of good will, although fewer than the other two categories. He bestowed some praise on his hearers, identified with the nation rather than those immediately present, and underscored his intention to proceed without undue delay.

### Summary

Both speakers demonstrated ethos in their opening speeches primarily by their choice of topic, and to a lesser extent by their exhibiting the signs of ethos. Both men seemed most concerned that they be seen as men of good character, and to a lesser extent men of good sense. Neither man ignored supporting his good will entirely, but both men devoted less effort to this aspect of their ethos than any other.

It seems clear that the role of each man in the events of the era was to some extent clear to him, for both men in their use of ethos were to conform to images of them current in their day.

## Chapter 5

### TWO MIDDLE SPEECHES

#### INTRODUCTION

Stevens spoke in favor of the granting of universal male suffrage on March 18, 1868, and McCarthy spoke in favor of altering America's foreign policy on March 14, 1951. The two speeches have much in common.

For Stevens, the domestic political environment had changed markedly; the Civil War had been fought and won.

McCarthy, however, addressed the Senate in an atmosphere in which foreign affairs had changed significantly. In this chapter, the nature and impact of environmental changes will be briefly discussed, the men's speeches will be summarized, and their use of ethos will be examined.

#### POLITICS IN THE HOUSE IN 1868

Lincoln was dead. The strong leader who guided the nation through the Civil War and who might have matched the strength of his character against the Radical wing of the Republican Party in the reconstruction battle had been shot, and the lead in the remaking of the nation

became an object of dispute between Andrew Johnson and Congress, especially the House, and specifically Thaddeus Stevens. The political polarity of the House lay between War Democrat and Republican on the one hand and Radical Republican on the other. Stevens was a leader of the Radical Republicans.

Reconstruction of the Union had caused several sharp clashes between the Executive and Legislative branches of the federal government. Feeling that the President was usurping the Constitutional duty of the legislature by imposing rules for reconstruction, Stevens and his allies rejected Executive plans through the simple expedient of refusing to seat Representatives and Senators from disputed states. The House's composition of 143 Republicans and 49 Democrats gave that party an overwhelming parliamentary edge, one which they used firmly and sometimes ruthlessly.

The key issues facing the Fortieth Congress concerned decisions to be made regarding the shape of the rebuilt nation and the nature of the relationship between states loyal to the Union and those which had formed the Confederacy.

One of the major causes of friction was the liberated slave. The emancipated Negro, his role in the political climate of both the defeated Confederacy and the victorious Union, and the relationship of the federal and state governments to the freedman were



questions at the center of the struggle over Reconstruction. In these battles Stevens was a leader.

A second major phase of the Reconstruction battle centered on the political constitution of the re-admitted states.

Stevens, a zealous champion of the Republican Party, and an unashamed partisan, sternly opposed any measure that might break the Republican hegemony in the reconstructed South. He repeatedly advocated a Reconstruction frankly slanted toward the Republican Party, or as he repeatedly referred to it, the "union party." Any program permitting the Democratic Party to resume power, according to Stevens, would have grave consequences. Stevens said in December, 1865, that restoration of the union on the old basis would lead to:

assumption of the rebel debt or repudiation of the Federal debt . . . The oppression of the freedmen; the reamendment of their State constitutions; and the reestablishment of slavery would be the inevitable result. . . .<sup>1</sup>

This strong partisanship feeling and the equally strong feeling that the Executive was unable to direct the course of Reconstruction for the federal government were the main political factors when Stevens rose to speak on the Fifteenth Amendment. The impeachment of Johnson for High Crimes and Misdemeanors was only one

---

<sup>1</sup>Congressional Globe, Thirty-ninth Congress, First Session, pp. 73-75.

month in the past, with acquittal to follow in another eight weeks. Stevens, engineering the majority of the impeachment proceedings, was accounted by many the leader of the House and by some the most powerful man in the nation.<sup>2</sup>

SUMMARY OF STEVENS' SPEECH ON THE  
FIFTEENTH AMENDMENT

Stevens' speech, March 18, 1868, was one of his last formal presentations in the House.<sup>3</sup> He had less than five months to live.

The speech, partly delivered by Stevens and partly read by the clerk, was preparatory to his announcement, at the end of the speech, that when the bill before the House became open for amendment, he would submit a change extending the right to vote to every male citizen, excepting felons, over the age of twenty-one.

Stevens announced the importance of the question, pointing out "it is not a question for demagogues." He then claimed that the nature of advances in the science of government, the science which "is to make man happy or to make him miserable," compelled the nation to advance or to retreat into barbarism.

---

<sup>2</sup>Tyson, p. 19.

<sup>3</sup>All excerpts from this speech are from the Congressional Globe, Fortieth Congress, Second Session, pp. 1966-68.

He claimed that the nation, originally, was based on the equality of man, and that the proposal before the House simply implemented that belief, because for the first time such implementation was possible. He described universal suffrage as:

one of those doctrines planted deep as the foundations upon which our fathers laid the immortal work of universal liberty, which work of theirs will last just so long as that immortal doctrine shall last, and no longer.

Then followed a brief discussion of the legal aspects of a Congressional measure awarding the right to vote to citizens, a move which Stevens held legal in light of the precedent of the Fourteenth Amendment.

Stevens then discussed the intention of the framers of the Declaration of Independence to provide equal liberty and justice to all, saying:

The laws, the principle, which were to apply to the dwellers on the Penobscot were to apply to those on the Savannah and the Susquehanna; else the Declaration would have proclaimed that the one--the people on the Penobscot or Susquehanna--were born free and equal, and those on the Savannah with a modified equality. . . .

But, claimed Stevens, such an interpretation was not part of the original design of the men writing the document.

Stevens then discussed the relation of the ballot to rights specifically declared inalienable by the Declaration: life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. He demonstrated that the preservation of liberty was only available through the use of the ballot, and claimed

that this meant that every man had recourse to the elective franchise.<sup>4</sup>

Stevens declared that the nature of the guaranties of freedom in the amended Constitution compelled supporters of that Constitution to support the awarding of the vote to the freed Negro. This argument was important because readmission to the Union was based on an oath, by a percentage of a state's population, as well as by the state's leaders, to uphold and defend the Constitution. Thus, he argued, persons not supporting the concept of universal male suffrage were committing a perjury more significant than that committed under the old Constitution by those who "refused aid to their fellow-men," and seceded in an effort to perpetuate slavery.

Stevens invoked the immediate presence of death and "the dread tribunal occupied by a Judge who cannot be deceived" and threatened his enemies with the wrath of God's justice for those who opposed his will.

Stevens then praised the nation. Calling for an attempt to establish perfect liberty, Stevens said:

If ever there was a spot on earth where it could be tried with perfect success, and bestow perfect happiness upon all those who are their own rulers

---

<sup>4</sup>Stevens was not only concerned with male suffrage. The Journal of the Joint Committee of Fifteen on Reconstruction of the Thirty-Ninth Congress reveals that on more than one occasion Stevens proposed measures which enfranchised women. Their usual fate was amendment by the addition of the word "male."

and their own subjects, that spot is the continent of North America.

Stevens then compared this continent, from the Isthmus of Darien "up to where the Esquimaux roam" to Great Britain, water-girt and safe, and said "That would be a tall and bold admiral who hereafter with hostile intent should venture this side of the Pillars of Hercules."

Fully one-fourth of Stevens' speech described the free nations of the Western Hemisphere, including several independent nations of the Carribean, and predicted that the islands of Cuba and Porto Rica [sic] would soon join in liberty Hayti [sic], St. Domingo, and Jamaica. Stevens concluded this portion of the speech claiming that, "if we do the justice which the Declaration of Independence proposes, and we now propose," the United States would contain a greater abundance of riches than Europe, Asia, or Africa.

In an abrupt transition, from the almost lyric description of North America's potential, Stevens lapsed into the jargon of the legislative hall: "I now desire to indicate an amendment which I propose to offer when in order. I understand that this bill is not now in a condition to be amended." The Speaker agreed that the bill was not open to amendment, and Stevens concluded by saying:

At the proper time I shall move to amend the bill by adding the following:  
And be it further enacted, That every male citizen of the United States above the age of twenty-one

years, who was born or naturalized in the United States, or who has declared his intention to become naturalized, shall be entitled to vote on all national questions which may arise in any State in the Union where he shall have resided for the term of thirty days; and no distinction shall be made between any such citizens on any account, except for treason, felony, or other infamous crimes, not below the grade of felony at common law.

The bid to grant every man the vote was the culmination of Stevens' life-long battle against privilege, and marked one of the peaks of his legislative career.

#### STEVENS' USE OF ETHOS IN HIS SPEECH ON THE FIFTEENTH AMENDMENT

Again Stevens spoke on a topic with which he was familiar, which was important to the nation, and with which he probably had come to be identified. No longer was he a novice in the legislative chambers of the nation. He had become one of the most important men in the House and in the entire government.

Stevens again exhibited, through his choices of topic and approach, his ethos. He spoke for universal freedom and the destruction of barriers to the freedmen, an always favorite topic. He also used, once again, logical proofs bearing great weight with both his friends and his enemies, and supported his assertions with evidence available to everyone.

His use of ethos had evolved, however. He was still primarily concerned with demonstrating his probity,

less concerned with displaying his sagacity, and least concerned with his good will. However, he used more tact and moderation, and generally mellowed.

### Probity

Stevens displayed examples of all six techniques to substantiate his probity. He associated his argument with the virtuous, and opponents' arguments with the vicious. He bestowed tempered praise on the framers of the Constitution and the members of the House. He used the authority of his personal experience, and took several steps which created an impression of sincerity.

Probably Stevens was most given to argument aligning him with virtue. In his speech on the Fifteenth Amendment, Stevens took several approaches to achieve this specific end. He demonstrated that Negro discrimination, which lay at the root of much of his opposition, was immoral, he demonstrated that universal suffrage was the only road to justice and humanity and the virtue of liberty, and he demonstrated that the virtue of the nation would be enhanced through the measure.

First, in connecting the measure with the godly and opponents with the forces opposed to God, Stevens criticized an old Pennsylvania political rival. Stevens said:

The black man who brushes the boots of my respected friend from the Luzerne district Mr. Woodward is, according to that doctrine, as much entitled to every right and every privilege of a free man and a citizen

as that gentleman or myself. And whenever he or I or any one else undertakes to make a distinction between the black race and our own because of the color of the skin or the formation of the body, he forgets his God, and his God will forget him.

Thus, Stevens associated the attack on racial intolerance with the pious and the defenders of bigotry with the impious.

He said, a few minutes later:

There is no other way than by universal suffrage that you and I and every man can protect himself against the injustice and inhumanity and wrongs that would otherwise be inflicted upon us.

With this, Stevens appealed, additionally, to the natural desire of men to secure the listed virtues, both for themselves and for others.

Finally, Stevens discussed the nation's virtues, and their enhancement by passage of the measure. He said:

The ingenious artist of the gods, when procured by the mother of Achilles to engrave coast surveys and geographical delineations upon his invincible shield never depicted a land so glorious and so variegated with gold and silver and every precious metal, and so bewitching to the senses with the odors of God's happiest creations. Its enchanting products grow in abundance on every inch of her variegated soil; and since the curse of slavery is removed, if we do the justice which the Declaration of Independence proposes, and we now propose, will soon contain a greater abundance of riches than either Europe, Asia, or Africa.

Attaching the virtues of the nation and its people to the measure under consideration revealed Stevens as a subtle advocate.

Stevens bestowed praise in a manner which makes it not immediately evident. For example, in the previous



passage the praise bestowed upon the nation may not be temperate, but it was present. Congress was praised in allusions pointing out that Congress planned to augment the justice proposed in the Declaration of Independence. The writers of the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence were praised, called "immortal men," who "had been inspired with such a light from on high as never man was inspired with before." By thus praising the founders of the nation, Stevens also praised the men in high positions in the government.

Stevens made an effort to overcome reluctance he had shown in the past to a federal legislature acting on voting requirements. He said:

Before the Constitution was amended, I could not agree with some of my learned friends that Congress could intermeddle with State laws . . . in the United States. The circumstance of slavery seemed, while it was submitted to, to prevent it. After the amendment abolishing slavery I still doubted, and proposed a constitutional remedy on the 5th of December 1865 . . . Since the adoption of the Fourteenth Amendment, however, I have no doubt of our full power to regulate the elective franchise. . . .

Stevens thus justified a contradiction in previously recorded opinions. At the same time he partially indicated his sincerity by admitting that his opinion had changed, and he used the authority of his personal experience.

Another use of personal experience occurred midway through the speech when Stevens pointed out: "You grant a lot or easement in the midst of your estate; you thereby grant a right-of-way to it by ingress and egress." These

terms, drawn from Stevens' experience of the law, and doubtless familiar to the many lawyers in Congress, were created at the opening of the speech, when Stevens said: "Mr. Speaker, this is a grave question of argument, it is not a question for demagogues." Sincerity is heightened later in the speech, when Stevens discussed his previous doubts, when he referred to the imminence of death, (at age 77 he was one of the closest to death in the House) and again when he referred to the future importance of the nation.

### Sagacity

Stevens again based less of his ethical support on his wisdom, perhaps realizing that the partisan nature of his past decisions had made impartial judgements beyond the realm of possibility.

Previously Stevens revealed his use of common sense by using the example of the easement. Similarly, his discussion of the applicability of the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence to the residents of the areas of the Penobscot and the Susquehanna as well as the Savannah showed his common sense. No interpretation other than his seemed tenable when the argument was phrased like that. So too did his discussion of the vote as a weapon of defense offer the only interpretation.

Perhaps the most significant and visible change in the rhetoric of Stevens from the 1850 speech occurred

in his use of tact and moderation. Stevens had little patience with his foes in 1850, and seemed ready to classify as foes all who opposed him, and all who contributed to the presence of slavery in the United States. In 1868 he revealed no such universal condemnation.

Where, in 1850, he referred to the government, to the alarm of some observers, as a despotism, now he described the government as it was in terms of the founders of the Constitution:

I know that when they came to frame the Constitution, slavery having increased, they were obliged to postpone some of those universal principles, and allow individuals and municipalities to violate them for a while.

This mellowness may have been caused by the fact that the war was over and won, or it may have been caused by the mellowing of age, but at any rate Stevens became more moderate and tactful, at least in certain areas.

Stevens' mellowing may have continued into the area of good taste. Although visible only in the negative, it seemed to improve, since no portions of the speech seem as questionable as the passages cited earlier on the breeding of slaves in Virginia. Although the absence of poor taste does not confirm its opposite, a mellowing was indicated.

Stevens was on most solid ground when revealing a familiarity with the issues of the day. To some extent he chose the issues of the day, and thus his opinion of the importance of issues helped form the standard

for this area of consideration. His speeches were always on timely topics, and his speech on the Fifteenth Amendment was no exception.

Finally, Stevens revealed his intellectual integrity, his wisdom, and his education and culture frequently throughout the course of the speech. Wisely, he called the question before the House "a grave question of argument, . . . not a question for demagogues." Wisely he revealed the doubts he entertained concerning the action before the House, and described the manner of resolution. He also showed his intellectual integrity.

His broad education was revealed in several places. He said that the American legislature is as free to act "as Sampson when the fire had touched the flax"<sup>5</sup> and once referred to the shield made for Achilles by Hephastion for the siege of Troy.<sup>6</sup>

Thus, while Stevens supported his sagacity less than his probity, he assured himself the image of a man of wisdom.

### Good Will

Perhaps in the area of good will Stevens showed the greatest effects of aging and the winning of the war, for he demonstrated more than before his willingness to be a man of good will.

---

<sup>5</sup>Judges, XV, 4.

<sup>6</sup>Iliad, XVIII, 460.

His praise of the audience again was subtle, and while not visible at first glance, was present. For example, his comparison of the tasks facing the House with those faced by the members of the Constitutional Convention was praise, and his suggestion that the House might succeed where the Constitutional Convention had failed was almost flattery.

He tried to identify with his hearers. In the early portion of his speech, he said, "We are not now merely expounding a government, we are building one. We are making a nation." The use of the word "we" indicated that Stevens was willing or at least wished to appear willing to share the burden and the blame for the events under way in Congress.

Stevens, as usual, proceeded with candor and straightforwardness. In the first place, the speech was brief, terse, and pithy, lasting less than one hour. Thus, it was straightforward.

The speech was also candid. He said, for example:

Henceforth let us understand that universal suffrage, operating in favor of every man who is to be governed by the votes cast, is one of those doctrines planted deep as the foundations upon which our fathers laid the immortal work of universal liberty, which work of theirs will last just so long as that immortal doctrine, and no longer.

There was to be, if Stevens had his way, no misunderstanding of the magnitude of the step contemplated.

While Stevens rebuked the representative of the Luzerne district, Mr. Woodward, this rebuke was not

comparable to the stinging attack on the doughfaces in his speech of 1850.

In one area Stevens made no attempt to enhance his ethos. He made no effort to offset any personal reasons for speaking, nor any attempt to justify his presence in the debate since he and the Congress knew why he was speaking.

However, he did take a number of steps to reveal his personal qualities as a messenger of the truth. By showing his doubts, and explaining what had dispelled them, he made more evident the amount of concern he had devoted to the question. By pointing out the nature of the Constitutional amendment which he had proposed, he was also pointing out the kind of man he was, or had been, three years earlier. He was, to some extent, displaying his credentials as a member in good standing of the group of men entitled to participate in the debate then before the House.

### Summary

Thus, Stevens seemed to have mellowed a bit.

His ethos was still substantial, and supports were generously scattered throughout his speech, but there were some areas in the speech of 1868 in which he placed additional emphasis on portions of his ethos. He was more willing to seek identification with his hearers, and more willing to display tact, taste, and moderation.

He was still the strong supporter of universal liberty and individual freedom.

### MCCARTHY IN 1951--AFTER THE BEGINNING

The political climate had changed somewhat less between February 20, 1950 and March 14, 1951, than it had between February 20, 1850 and March 18, 1868. The differences were in the same major areas of foreign politics and war, and domestic policy.

Little more than four months after McCarthy spoke on Communists in government for the first time, the Republic of Korea was invaded by forces of the Communist-dominated People's Republic of Korea. The war at first went badly against the South Koreans and their United Nation allies, but the tide turned in early fall, 1950 and by late November the U.N. troops had pushed the North Koreans almost to the Yalu River border between Korea and Manchuria. Then, Chinese Communist forces entered the war and counterattacked, and after terrible winter retreats across the frozen wastes of North Korea, and some see-saw fighting around the 38th Parallel, the war became a grinding war of attrition and patience. When McCarthy spoke in late March the allies were moving north from the low point of their second retreat, and were pressing again toward the 38th Parallel. They would cross it on Easter Sunday, March 25th.

The major domestic development was probably the rise in importance of Joe McCarthy. Plaudits poured into the Senator's office, despite the negative findings of the Tydings Committee, which was appointed to investigate the charges advanced by McCarthy. Much of America seemingly accepted the idea that no Senator of the United States would issue such charges without some proof, and many thinking Americans recognized the Tydings Committee as a governmental whitewash, just as the Senator described it.

Meanwhile the nation endured a period of frustration. Organized crime existed in every city in the nation, with the Kefauver Committee of the Senate appearing on television to show the nation links between criminals and the city governments of New York City, Chicago, and others. Scandals were attached to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, with mink coats and deep freezers used as bribes. The basketball team of City College of New York was revealed as tools of gamblers as well as teams from Long Island University, New York University, Bradley, Kentucky, Toledo, and others. The U. S. Military Academy revealed a wholesale dismissal: ninety cadets, including the son of football coach Earl Blaik, were expelled for violating the honor code. Teenagers were increasingly making headlines for their activities, including "house parties" which were being revealed in small towns across the nation.



The nation seemed unable to cope with the problems of the day. In this atmosphere Senator McCarthy released his charges, supporting a "conspiracy" theory which laid the blame for all of the nation's ills at the door of foreign enemies who seduced Americans into acting contrarily to the interests and traditions of the nation.

Against this background frustration in Korea, in the Crime Committee investigations, in the positive steps to insure no more basketball scandals, the March 14th speech on foreign policy must be viewed.

#### SUMMARY OF THE SPEECH

In a relatively brief speech, McCarthy recorded his opinions concerning the current debate on the nature of the American military commitment to Europe.<sup>7</sup> The question debated the number of divisions America should send to that continent to aid in defense against the Soviet Union, with suggestions ranging from two or three to twenty divisions.

McCarthy's thesis was that we should use all of Europe's manpower and we should be certain that American planning was taken out of the hands of the men who had bungled her post-war foreign policy before we committed any men to Europe.

---

<sup>7</sup>All excerpts from this speech are from Major Speeches and Debates of Senator Joe McCarthy, pp. 187-215.

However, like most McCarthy speeches, this was a rambling and discursive one, obscure in many points, and difficult to follow in the printed record.

McCarthy began his speech praising the men who founded America's traditional Far Eastern policy of a neutral and friendly China. He referred to his experiences in the Pacific theatre of operations during World War II as an intelligence officer, and indicated that this experience helped him draw these conclusions.

McCarthy then claimed that the foreign policy of the nation had undergone a policy of complete change without the approval of the American people. There had been some who had opposed this trend, he said, naming Senators Knowland, and Bridges, and Representative Walter Judd, but most of their efforts gained scant attention from either the State Department or the American public.

At this point, he said, he joined the "hopeless task" of helping those fighting against the betrayal of the nation.

Senator Wherry of Nebraska interrupted for a brief statement to the effect that there had been other men in the Senate fighting the anti-Communist fight. McCarthy replied that he did not mean that the men named were the only ones in the fight.

McCarthy then continued, after congratulating the Senator from Nebraska for recognizing that Dean Acheson was a dangerous man, by examining the motives of those

working to bring about the downfall of the nation. He asked "Was their action the result of treachery or incompetence? I decided then it was a combination of the two plus, in some cases, opportunism."

McCarthy claimed that, in searching out traitors in the government, he had uncovered an estimate by J. Edgar Hoover that there were 55,000 Communists in the nation, a figure McCarthy identified as "three divisions." McCarthy said that each one of these people sought a position in the upper echelons of the government, with many successful. He indicated that Alger Hiss, for example, was one of those successful in seeking a high government post, and suggested that the "phony planning" going on for American deployment in Europe indicated that others still were active. He referred in passing to attacks he had experienced while first exposing Communists in government.

McCarthy then continued to "deal briefly with the broad picture of what I feel should be our foreign policy if America is to live." However, saying "We cannot intelligently chart the future without keeping an eye on the past" McCarthy returned to his basic theme of Communists in government.

He reiterated that Communism was dedicated to the conquest of the world, "including America" and said that any man seeking to guide the destinies of the nation must be aware of the theory of Communism. Then he read,

from the record of committee hearings chaired by Styles Bridges, Secretary of State Dean Acheson's statement that he never read two supposedly key Communist documents.

McCarthy accused Dean Acheson of negotiating a \$90,000,000 loan to Communist Poland at a time when the battle between Communist and democratic government was most doubtful, this assuring the Communist victory in that nation. He connected Alger Hiss with this episode, and then reminded the Senate of Hiss' role at the Yalta Conference.

He read testimony of Earl Browder, head of the Communist Party in the United States, that "What we had advocated was substantially incorporated into the policies of the United States government" and claimed this to be a surrender to Communism.

McCarthy attacked the United States role in China, hinting at his coming assault on George Marshall by describing the general's activities in the events leading to the fall of the Nationalist government of Chiang Kai-shek. His charges accused Marshall of acting on State Department orders to the detriment of the Nationalist government, damaging its military effectiveness and harming its political future.

McCarthy, at this point, refused to answer a question from Senator Wayne Morse of Oregon concerning Marshall's possible Communist sympathies, saying "I am not concerned with the workings of General Marshall's mind."

McCarthy, after detailing what he claimed to be some of the detrimental effects of Marshall's 1946 mission to China, answered Senator Morse's question affirmatively that Marshall had been of help to the Chinese Communists. McCarthy linked Marshall with John Carter Vincent, a man repeatedly accused of Communist sympathies, and Dean Acheson, who was, in McCarthy's view, a Communist sympathizer.

McCarthy, in a brief debate with Senator Morse, refused to discuss General Marshall's motivations. He then detailed several more specific points of the charges against the State Department, exchanging comments with Senator Welker of Idaho and Senator Wherry.

McCarthy continued his indictment of the leaders of the State Department, quoting Dean Acheson as saying, apropos of the Communist victory in China, "A new day has dawned in Asia" and Owen Lattimore as saying, in the same context, "it represents the opening of limitless horizons of hope."

Senator Wherry interrupted to point out that the leaders of the State Department could not have been ignorant of their actions. McCarthy agreed. Then Senator Ferguson of Michigan obtained permission to make a statement charging that the State Department had cabled the Nationalist Chinese government that this nation would not help them in their battle against the Communists. He also charged that the United States was seeking to

force a coalition government on the Nationalist regime, despite a "bitter experience in Eastern Europe. . . ." which indicated that the course was not helpful to the survival of the Nationalist Chinese government.

McCarthy agreed with Ferguson, and then the Michigan Senator added that similar attempts were made in Korea, but President Rhee refused to cooperate.

McCarthy called these charges confirmation of the "long-established, insidious official policy of the State Department, if you please--namely to allow our friends to fall but not let the American people know we shoved them." Pleased with the phrase, McCarthy used it several times in the next few minutes and repeatedly throughout the speech.

After another statement by Knowland, McCarthy returned to his examination of the Communist plot.

McCarthy indicated some of the problems faced by Americans fighting in the Far East. For example, he showed how Americans fighting in Korea were hindered by other Americans, on duty with the Seventh Fleet, whose mission was to keep Nationalist forces from invading the mainland. McCarthy detailed offers of help received from Chiang Kai-shek's government, including the offer of half a million men in Korea and one million guerillas on the mainland. All Chiang needed, according to McCarthy, was "light automatic weapons to equip them," although

the source for one million light automatic weapons, and ammunition for them, was not discussed by the Senator.

McCarthy moved the center of his attention from Asia to Europe, and reiterated the idea that Spain, and the 48,000,000 people of West Germany, should be included in the planning for the European defense community. McCarthy conceded that the Spanish government was "not the kind of government of which we would or should approve." However, he repeated his idea that American planning should include the forces of that government as well as West Germany. During this portion of the speech, McCarthy debated with Senator Butler of Maryland, who suggested that West Germany might not be willing to aid in the defense of Europe; and with Senator Malone of Nevada who said that the American involvement of ground troops in Europe would not be necessary if the Spanish and West German forces were involved. Malone suggested that American support of repressive governments only led to American problems.

McCarthy summarized by calling for the use of all available European troops, and the establishment of real plans for a real defense.

#### ETHOS IN THE SPEECH OF MARCH 14TH

McCarthy had, once again, worked to establish his ethos in some areas, and not been concerned with others. The concept of ethos revealed through choices

revealed him as a speaker concerned with the events of the day, concerned with his credibility, and acting for the best interests of the nation and the people.

He seemed concerned with establishing his probity and his sagacity and less concerned with establishing his good will, as he was in the speech of February 20, 1950. His argument in the speech of March 14, as in the earlier speech, was couched in the language of reasonable debate, although seemingly as logically weak as his previous speech.

### Probity

McCarthy was concerned with establishing the strength of his moral character, and to accomplish that he displayed most of the signs of good character, failing only to attempt to overcome the unfavorable impression of his previous speaking.

McCarthy frequently managed to associate his argument, and the point of view which he represented, with the virtuous. For example, he offered as his motive for undertaking his attack on Communists a promise he had made his constituents:

One of the promises which I made to the people of Wisconsin during my campaign for the United States Senate was to try to do something about this Washington spearheaded propaganda which threatened the life of America.

No record of such a promise appears in any books about the life of the Senator, but his investigation became



one prompted by a promise. He also used the successful formula, first encountered in the February 20th speech, of saying or implying that Communists are atheists and the fight against them is a religious crusade.

McCarthy praised several segments of the nation, both among his hearers and readers. He first praised the "wisdom and farseeing intelligence of those great statesmen who long ago disappeared into the caverns of history. . ." who founded the policy seeking a friendly and neutral China. Shortly he praised "some of our very able Senators and Congressmen who were attempting to focus attention upon our disastrous foreign policy . . ." and shortly later praised Karl Mundt and Dick Nixon "and others who dug out Alger Hiss. . . . Those men were doing the Nation a great service."

McCarthy made no major effort to minimize any unfavorable impression created either by his previous speeches on the anti-Communist theme or any other topic. He did, however, rely on personal authority, pointing out in the first lines of the speech that he was familiar with "a Pacific which I came to know better than my own back yard. . ." and later indicating that he had been "accused of smearing innocent people" and otherwise vilified. His dismissal of these charges and his use of experiences gained in the Pacific lent the authority of his own personal experiences.

Finally McCarthy created the impression of sincerity in a number of instances. For example, on more than one occasion he declared his intention to turn his back on the past and look to the future, a program not in keeping with his best interests. McCarthy had, after all, earned his reputation by exposing the records of Communists in government, and a concern for the future would diminish the importance of the things which he had discovered.

### Sagacity

McCarthy was concerned with the presentation of the appearance of good sense. He frequently appealed to "common sense" for support. He displayed more tact, taste, and moderation than usual. He revealed familiarity with the issues of the day, and displayed his intellectual integrity and wisdom.

McCarthy appealed to the self-evident superiority of common sense on a number of occasions. At one point in the speech, for instance, he ridiculed the thought that some Americans were fighting in Korea at the same time that other Americans were on duty with the Seventh Fleet. The Americans in Korea were fighting the Chinese Communists and yet the Seventh Fleet was deployed in the Straits of Formosa to prevent the forces of Chiang Kai-shek from invading the mainland and fighting with the same Chinese Communists. Similarly, McCarthy later

pointed out that an American reliance on manned bombers would be a waste of money in the event that the Soviets perfected the ground-to-air guided missile.

McCarthy displayed more tact in the speech of March 14th than he had in the speech of February 20th. As an example, he refused to accuse General Marshall of Communist sympathies at this time, despite the fact that he was to do so less than four months later. He said, when asked if he thought General Marshall was a Communist sympathizer, "I am not concerned with the workings of General Marshall's mind. I am concerned with his acts. I am concerned with the fact that Marshall went to China under State Department orders." Thus, McCarthy revealed a hesitancy to attack one of the nation's foremost military heroes. This episode revealed a degree of good taste, since the reputation of the General was above reproach.

McCarthy was almost always able to reveal a familiarity with the issues of the day, if, for no other reason, than he created many of them. However, his ethos began suffering somewhat following the outbreak of the Korean War, since the center of concern for most Americans shifted from the enemy within to an aggressor overseas. Several sources confirmed this view of the situation. Thus, in the foreign policy speech, McCarthy referred to a recently-concluded vote on the draft, declared his intention to amend a bill for troops for Europe to permit McArthur to fight a freer war in Asia, and to several

other events in domestic and international politics. As common in the speeches of the period, references to the Korean War, then entering its bloodiest and least productive phase, were rife. Numerous allusions were made to world events, in the United Nations, and in national politics.

McCarthy on several occasions revealed things detrimental to him but leading to the conclusion that he had intellectual integrity or that he was wise. As an example, in an early exchange with Senator Wherry, longtime foe of Dean Acheson, McCarthy said:

I certainly want to compliment the Senator from Nebraska for having recognized, in Dean Acheson, long before some of the rest of us, the dangerous man that he is. I shall forever be ashamed of the fact that I voted for the confirmation of Dean Acheson.

By admitting an error, McCarthy enhanced his integrity and added to his ethos. McCarthy also revealed his intellectual integrity in the conclusion when, following a summary of the two common views of the options for Western Europe, he said:

I wholeheartedly and completely disagree with both schools of thought. I feel that regardless of which school of thought prevails, if we continue to refuse the great sources of manpower in Western Europe and in Asia as we have refused to use the great source of manpower in Asia, namely the anti-Communist Chinese, then we are doomed to defeat at the hands of the Communist half of the world as certainly as that the sun will rise in the east tomorrow.

Thus it may be seen that McCarthy was at least partly interested in demonstrating his wisdom, or good sense.

Good Will

McCarthy was again concerned little with projecting an aura of good will. Although he bestowed some praise on his audience, and revealed some qualities of a messenger of the truth, although he usually said he was proceeding with candor and straightforwardness, several other signals indicating the presence of good will were never displayed.

McCarthy praised two segments of his audience: the American people and his fellow Senators. The March 14th speech happened to contain praise of both kinds.

McCarthy praised the American people almost immediately in the speech. He said that America's foreign policy was being changed with neither the consent of the people nor the leadership of one of the nation's political parties. He referred to the American people who "discovered a traitorous and insidiously clever campaign of propaganda," implying that the average American was too clever for such a tactic. In the same passage he praised several Senators, Knowland, Bridges, Congressman Judd, and others for "calling attention to the situation in a most clear-cut and intelligent fashion." Thus, McCarthy praised two major segments of his hearers for their ability to recognize the key problem facing the nation.

McCarthy used some examples of the consequences of his charges to support his role as messenger of the truth. He related that he "was accused of smearing

innocent people because I could not swear that I saw them attend Communist meetings or that I had attended such meetings with them." McCarthy also explained that while others sought to call attention to blunders in foreign policy, "I was attempting to focus attention upon the individuals in the three Communist divisions who were responsible for this foreign policy." Thus, McCarthy claimed that he was attacking the source of the problem, a wise move making him all the more believable.

McCarthy frequently followed interruptions, and requests for him to yield, with repeated assurances of his intention to proceed with a minimum of delay, although he seemed particularly open to diversion. However, he usually made little or no effort to conceal his candor.

McCarthy made no evident attempt to identify himself with his hearers, no attempt to offset any personal reasons for his speaking and offered rebukes without any visible signs of tact.

### Summary

Thus, the use of good will in the March 14th speech of Joe McCarthy was probably his least supported area of ethical proof.

McCarthy, then, supported each area of ethos, although seemingly least concerned with establishing his good will.

McCarthy had, in fact, made an apparent effort to once again make his probity the cornerstone of his ethical appeal. He had taken some pains, it seems, to present a picture of a man of wisdom.

He had also taken some extensive steps to reinforce his good sense, although evidence indicates that less attention was devoted to this area than to his probity.

He seemed least concerned with supporting his good will. His speech contains some steps in support of this aspect of his ethos, but does not devote as much time to this area as either of the other two.

#### SUMMARY

The second set of speeches considered offers another fair parallel in the speaking of the two speakers, and seems to offer again a parallel use of ethos.

Stevens was speaking on what seemed to be his favorite subject, the offering of an equal opportunity for all Americans. He spoke against the background of the Civil War, which had been successfully completed; he also spoke against the impending storm of the impeachment of the President of the United States.

His speech contained some support for his ethos in terms of his good will, but more in terms of his good sense and the greatest amount of all for his good character. He had, perhaps, mellowed a bit, but essentially he was the same speaker that made the February 20th speech.

He was still an effective speaker, brief according to the standards of the day, and a powerful man in the intellect of the nation. He was a formidable debater, and the speech on the Fifteenth Amendment was renewed evidence of that fact.

McCarthy, likewise, had returned to the theme with which he was most closely connected, although he, too, had abandoned the center of the area for the edge. He had abandoned the search for Communists in government temporarily and directed his attention on European slackers rather than American fellow-travellers.

He, too, seemed once again to be most concerned with the appearance of probity in his speech, somewhat less concerned with the appearance of good sense, and least worried about the good will which his hearers attributed to him.

He reflected almost every indicator of good character, apparently taking pains to see to it that there were no sources of ethical appeal relating to good character that were unused. However, some indicators of good sense were not emphasized as strongly as those of good character, and several sources of good will remained virtually untapped.

Like Stevens, McCarthy used ethos in the second speech examined about the way he did in the first. Unlike Stevens, there was no visible "mellowing," although also



unlike Stevens he was neither victorious nor eighteen years older, both strong reasons for "mellowing."

It seems clear, then, that the pattern of usage of ethos was, consciously or unconsciously, similar in the two speeches of each. Both men seem to have the same sorts of concerns and the same sort of solution to the problem of their credibility.

## Chapter 6

### TWO PERSONAL ATTACKS

#### INTRODUCTION

The Congressional speaking of the "vindictive" Thaddeus Stevens and Joe McCarthy, "politician of revenge," perhaps reached their respective peaks in attacks launched and aimed at major symbols of American life and government. McCarthy's verbal assault on General George Marshall was matched by Stevens' argument for the conviction of Andrew Johnson on April 27, 1868. Several parallels exist within and without the speeches.

#### STEVENS' CHARGES IN THE TRIAL OF JOHNSON

##### The Political Environment

In 1868, Andrew Johnson was accused of various crimes and misdemeanors while President and stood before the Senate for judgement. Stevens was one of the men responsible for the accusations, and was the man who carried notice of the charges to the Senate. The charges had been filed with the Senate in February, and the trial, with the Supreme Court presiding and the Senate sitting as a jury, began on March 5, 1868.

Division over the method of the Reconstruction of the Union was general. The impeachment trial was to decide the course of government operations, especially in the South, during the next few years, and the nation waited for the result.

Specifically, Johnson was trapped into overt violations of laws so that his impeachment and removal would be facilitated. He was, for example, accused of violation of the Tenure of Office Act, a measure forbidding him to remove members of his cabinet and one of the few measures in American history seemingly designed to be useful only when broken.

Basically the problem was a difference in views of the relationship of the former states of the Confederacy to the Union. Several times during the war the point clearly had been made by Lincoln: the Confederacy was not a nation, the Union was not broken, and the Civil War was an action by Federal troops acting under their police function, restoring order in a portion of the one nation. Johnson, in essence, was operating on the Lincoln theory.

Stevens on the other hand, held that the Union had been broken and the states of the Confederacy must be readmitted. Thus, the restoration of the Union was a Legislative function, the seceded states were legally of the same status as territories. Were the Union unbroken, the decisions concerning the resumption of

normal roles by the seceding states would be a concern of the President.

Johnson was charged on eleven counts, any one of which sufficient to cause his removal. All articles but one were related to Johnson's violations of the Tenure of Office Act; the exception referred to his "inflammatory and scandalous harangues."

Johnson's trial lasted from March 5th, when the Senate first was formally organized as a jury, to late May, when seven Republicans indicated their intention to acquit the President of the charges. Stevens delivered his most important address of the trial on April 27th, eighteen days before signs that the Republican ranks would yield enough to fail of removal.

#### SUMMARY OF THE SPEECH

Stevens delivered his charges against the President less than four months before his death; he was so feeble that the Globe reported:

Mr. Manager Stevens read a portion of his argument standing at the Secretary's desk; but after proceeding a few minutes, being too feeble to stand, obtained permission to take a seat, and having read nearly half an hour from a chair until his voice became almost too weak to be heard, handed over his manuscript to Mr. Manager Butler, who concluded the reading.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>All excerpts from this speech are from the Congressional Globe, Fortieth Congress, Supplement, pp. 320-324.

Stevens delivered a speech which was, in its nature, legalistic. Following a brief preamble, he set forth the law violated. He discussed the specifications of the charge detailing the circumstances surrounding the alleged violations. He attacked the offered defense, answering arguments one by one. He briefly praised the wronged party, and then summarized and concluded by requesting a guilty verdict. It was very like a plea at the bar.

Stevens began his speech promising to be brief, and disclaiming any degree of preparedness. He said that he would limit his discussion to the single article he had proposed and said that he acted in no spirit of meanness. He also commented on the spectacle unfolding before the Senate, and cautioned that the questions facing the body "should be discussed with a calm determination, which nothing can divert and nothing can reduce to mockery."

He discussed briefly the differences between impeachment in the United States and in England, pointing out that British impeachment was used for all types of high crimes, with all manner of punishment; he then showed that American impeachment was only to be applied in cases of public servants, and that dismissal was the only punishment open under the proceedings.

He claimed that the only question to be determined was whether Andrew Johnson violated the law, and he accused the President of that.

Stevens rehearsed the specifics of the case which applied to his charge, showing that Johnson tried to replace Secretary of War Edwin M. Stanton on two occasions.

Stevens showed that Johnson had taken an oath of office to uphold the law, and recited the law. He then considered and attacked six of the defenses offered by Johnson for his action.

Stevens concentrated on the defense which held that the law did not cover Stanton, since Lincoln had appointed him. Stevens argued that the term of the President was the key question, and that Johnson operated in the term of Lincoln. He indicated that the wording of the law made such considerations meaningless in any case.

Stevens attacked as irrelevant Johnson's claim that other men holding the Presidency had removed their Cabinet officers since the law was not passed in the term of other men. The violation of the law was the wrong in question.

Johnson claimed that he had removed Stanton to test the legality of the law, a claim refuted by Stevens as not a function of the Presidency.

Johnson claimed that Stanton was not removed under the terms of the law, a claim refuted by Stevens reading a message sent to the Secretary of the Treasury which announced "In compliance with the act entitled

'An act to regulate the tenure of certain civil offices'  
. . ." he had removed Stanton and stopped his pay.

Stevens attacked Johnson's claim to be able to violate an unconstitutional law with an excellent anecdote showing the flaw in this argument. Stevens described the scene as it would have been if, upon taking the oath of office Johnson had said:

Stop; I have a further oath. I do solemnly swear that I will not allow the act entitled "An act regulating the tenure of certain civil offices" just passed by Congress over the Presidential veto to be executed; but I will prevent its execution by virtue of my own constitutional power.

Stevens digressed to present a clear outline of the "Conquered Province" doctrine of reconstruction. He ridiculed Johnson's efforts to rebuild the Union by use of Executive power, saying "He directed the defunct States to come forth and live by virtue of his breathing into their nostrils the breath of life."

Stevens discussed the spectacle of the trial of "the chief of traitors" being conducted without "turmoil, tumult, or bloodshed" and predicted that the nation would return to the enjoyment of its accustomed freedoms.

Stevens praised Stanton, asking "Where could a better man be found?" and called him the "organizer of victory."

Stevens brought his sarcasm to bear on the final defense considered, the claim that, since Stanton had never relinquished his office, no removal took place

and Johnson had done nothing wrong. Stevens appealed to the popular notion that "when the brains were out the man was dead" and claimed that Johnson's plea was similar to expecting the brains to be out, and the head cut off, and the mortal remains "shovelled out and hauled into the muck-yard."

Finally Stevens reviewed the key elements of the case against Johnson and, invoking the spirit of the Roman Senate, indicated that their example would be an excellent one for the American Senate to emulate.

#### THE USE OF ETHOS IN THE IMPEACHMENT TRIAL SPEECH

Stevens, as usual, relied on his ethos in his speech against Johnson. Once again, ethical proof was not as frequent a mode of proof as the logical, although the courtroom atmosphere of the Senate was one reason for this fact, and the legal factors inherent in the charges added to the preponderance of logical proofs.

The fact that Stevens claimed that the efforts of Johnson were aimed at the preservation of slavery indicated that his choice of side, and his energy in leading the fight, as well as his speaking against Johnson, indicated his ethos. His use of logical proofs lent credence to his approach, and his point-by-point refutation of the defenses of the respondent aided in an impression of wisdom. Finally, his decision to speak in a dry and



logical manner rather than deliver invective added to an aura of good will and disinterest at the level of personality.

Stevens displayed most of the indicators of ethos within the speech.

### Probity

Stevens reflected each of the six indices of moral character, although one was present primarily in circumstances outside the speech text.

Few references were present to the virtue of the actions of the leaders of the movement for impeachment. Stevens referred to the fact that the forces arrayed against Johnson were working in the "public welfare" and for "the laws and interests of his country" and referred to the Senate as a "virtuous and patriotic audience."

Stevens also carefully referred to the virtue of General Grant, whose testimony was important to the prosecution, calling him a "gallant soldier" and lauding him for refusing to aid in the obstruction of the law. Similarly, he described Stanton as loyal, faithful, above corruption, efficient, and peaceful. This was an effort to enhance the credibility of these men, who served as witnesses to the specific charge alleged by Stevens.

Stevens sparingly praised the Senate. He did not praise individual members of that House except on two occasions, both near the end of the speech.

On the first occasion, he said:

I know that Senators would venture to do any necessary act if endorsed by an honest conscience of an enlightened public opinion; but neither for the sake of the President nor of any one else would one of them suffer himself to be tortured on the gibbet of everlasting obloquy.

Thus, Stevens obliquely referred to the desire of the Senators to take the right course of action.

Shortly, Stevens praised both Houses, saying

"That sovereign power in this Republic is the Congress of the United States" and later indicated that the danger inherent in Johnson's usurpation of the powers of Congress was past, since Congress was a reasonable and responsible body.

Stevens concentrated his effort in the impeachment speech to attributing vice or wrongdoing to his opponent. This was reasonable since the thesis of the speech was "Andrew Johnson is a wrongdoer and should be punished."

Stevens claimed that Johnson followed a program of self-aggrandizement, and power-grabbing. He claimed that Johnson was impudent and brazen in his design, seeking to restore slavery to the South. Stevens called him a "pettifogging political trickster," and claimed he uttered "A direct contradiction of his solemn answer." The entire

speech demonstrated that Johnson was a malefactor, a purjurer, a dunce, as well as disloyal.

Stevens opened his address with a disclaimer trying to reduce the blame for a poor presentation:

I trust to be able to be brief in my remarks, unless I should find myself less master of the subject which I propose to discuss than I hope. Experience has taught that nothing is so prolix as ignorance. I fear I may prove thus ignorant, as I had not expected to take part in this debate until very lately.

Stevens made no reference to his conduct or the conduct of any of the leaders of the impeachment movement during the course of the speech. He did not refer to the speeches of allies or aides. Apparently, he felt no need to discuss previous impressions made during the course of the trial, either feeling that the impressions were favorable or that it was not his duty to justify them.

Early, Stevens cites the need for argument "in a manner worthy of the high tribunal" before which he spoke, but perhaps the chief evidence of his sincerity was external to the speech.

The aged man, eighty-six years old, standing briefly and then obtaining permission to seat himself, and, still unable to deliver his speech, giving his manuscript to Ben Butler to finish, was close to death, and it is probable that many Senators knew it. The sight of Stevens tottering about, being borne in a chair to and from the sessions by two large Negroes who carried

him up and down the steps of the Capitol must have been an important testimony to the sincerity of the speaker.

### Sagacity

Stevens defended his sagacity less than his probity in the April speech. He again showed concern with each area of support for his claim to good sense, but the examples are more infrequent in this area than they were in the first.

The most striking example of Stevens' use of common sense occurred in his refutation to the claim raised by Johnson that since Stanton did not leave his office he was not ever removed, and thus the law had not been violated. Stevens ridiculed this argument using neither law nor legal arguments but appealing instead on the basis of "the old saying that . . . 'when the brains were out the man was dead'." No law is invoked here, but rather the familiar, the old saying, the keystone of common sense.

Other examples were present. In several instances Stevens attacked some minute points of defense, based on law, with refutation based on common sense, such as Johnson's claim that he was empowered to refuse to obey laws not in accordance with the Constitution. A legal argument would not have used the illustration of the taking of the oath, but it was one with a good deal of merit based on common sense.

Stevens was in the midst of impeachment proceedings which constituted his greatest victory. Perhaps, for this reason, his references to the President were more reasonable, moderate, and even tactful than other, earlier statements.

Early in the speech, he said, in reference to Andrew Johnson:

Whatever may be thought of his character or condition, he has been made respectable and his condition has been dignified by the action of his fellow-citizens. Railing accusation, therefore, would ill become this occasion, this tribunal, or a proper sense of position of those who discuss this question on the one side or the other.

Similarly, Stevens' claim that all he need prove was the actual violation of the law, with no concern to judge motive at all, was both moderate and tactful: moderate since it was easy to demonstrate, less vindictive but more effective than personal attacks; and tactful since the course of action relieved him of the duty of demonstrating an inherent defect in the character of the President of the United States.

Stevens displayed good taste on one occasion, alluding to the view, commonly held in 1868, that Andrew Johnson was drunk when inaugurated as Vice President. Following his illustration of the reserve oath, Stevens said:

How shocked Congress would have been--what would the country have said to a scene equalled only by the unparalleled action of this same official, when sworn into office on that fatal 5th day of March which made him the successor of Abraham Lincoln.

Although ample opportunity for tasteless vilification was present, Stevens contented himself with a somewhat subtle reminder of the incident.

By his presence at the impeachment trial of the President of the United States Stevens revealed his familiarity with the issues of the day. In fact, like other leaders, he chose the issues of the day and was aware of them before they were issues. Surely, the topic of the speech indicated that Stevens reflected the issues of the day. Also, Stevens' refutation of Johnson's defense was the best indicator that he was aware of "current events."

Stevens revealed his broad education on several occasions throughout the course of the speech, closing with a discussion of the reaction to some of the arguments advanced in defense if the arguments had been offered to the Roman Senate:

Had he [Mr. Groesbeck] been pleading for innocence his great powers would have been well exerted. Had he been arguing with equal eloquence before a Roman Senate for such a delinquent and Cato, the Censor, had been one of the judges, his client would have soon found himself in the stocks in the middle of the forum instead of receiving the sympathy of a virtuous and patriotic audience.

He revealed his integrity in the admonition to avoid "railing accusation" and in the determination to keep the argument on as high a plane as possible, a determination repeated several times throughout the early portion of the speech.

Good Will

Stevens, more in this speech than in the two examined previously, revealed support for his claim to good will, but still to a lesser extent than either of the other two areas of ethos. He inovertly indicated five of the six areas of support for the claim of good will.

Stevens was aware of the dual nature of the audience, since he addressed some remarks and aimed some praise over the heads of the Senators toward the general public. For example, he indicated his hope that "the good people" of the nation would remember the wise doctrine that virtue will be done only by the virtuous when they return to the polls. Stevens also alluded several times to the wisdom of the American people, calling them "powerful" and residents of "a land of freedom."

Stevens praised the Senate generally, but briefly made a point which was important because it was aimed at a single Senator.

Stevens described the action of the Senate following the first defiance of the order to restore Stanton as "calm manliness." He praised the Senate for the high calling of each member, claiming that none were motivated by any but the highest motives.

Stevens also, in three words, made a gesture to heal a breach between himself and one specific Senator. At the conclusion of Stevens' remarks of praise for

Stanton he said, "None ever organized an army of a million of men and provided for its subsistence and efficient action more rapidly than Mr. Stanton and his predecessor." [italics added].

Stanton was preceded in office at the War Department by Simon Cameron, long-time leader of Pennsylvania Republicans, and a bitter enemy of Stevens. Stevens, who thought that the Cabinet post given Cameron in 1860 should have been his, was also a bitter enemy of Cameron. Yet the reason for the praise was clear: Cameron was now a member of the Senate and his vote might be in doubt if he saw a way to harm Stevens. Thus the three-word accolade.

Stevens identified himself with his hearers on two occasions. Both times he indicated the fact that he was a member of Congress and that Congress, each branch acting in concert, had taken action. The first instance occurred when, talking about the Congressional passage of the Tenure of Office Bill, over the veto of the President, he mentioned the actions of the House at the time of the measure. The second instance occurred when, discussing the constitutionality of the act, he stated that "every member of this tribunal has more than once--twice, perhaps even three times--declared that law constitutional and valid." In both instances he seemed to be taking part of the responsibility for the passage



of the legislation, legislation usually attributed to him and to Senator Charles Sumner for its origin.

Stevens frequently repeated his intention to be brief, mentioning his intention at the beginning of his remarks and on two or three other instances and using the intention to provide a transition into his concluding remarks. He was straightforward, with only a few brief statements before beginning his discussion of the defense offered by Johnson. He indulged in few oratorical flights, remained businesslike and considered the questions before the court without unnecessary delay.

The entire speech was, in one respect, a rebuke toward Andrew Johnson, and as such, was reasonably tactful and considerate. However, within the speech there were few, if any, rebukes to other than the President.

Stevens frequently made reference to the magnitude of the question before the Senate. He pointedly repeated a call for elevated thought rather than a "mean spirit of malignity." However, no attempt other than this general call for higher motivation was made to offset the personal reasons which helped bring Thaddeus to his unsteady feet before the Senate.

Stevens never referred to any previous statements he made concerning the President or the Cabinet nor concerning any of the major questions on which his opinion had been recorded. Despite a good past record of pointing out the problems of the day, Stevens did

not refer to this aspect of his record at all. Thus, he made no attempt to indicate his qualities as a messenger of the truth.

#### McCARTHY AND THE RETREAT FROM VICTORY

On June 14th, 1951, Senator McCarthy delivered a Senate address, "America's Retreat from Victory," which was a thoroughgoing denunciation of General George Catlett Marshall, former chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and President Truman's former Secretary of State. The speech, a 60,000 word effort, was partly read and, for the most part, inserted into the Record. Although the speech followed McCarthy's statement on American foreign policy by only three months, the political environment had changed and the Flag Day speech aimed directly at a topic carefully avoided in the March speech, the motives and mind of George Marshall.

#### THE POLITICAL SITUATION IN JUNE, 1951

The situation in June, 1951, was similar to March, 1951, with one major exception: President Truman had relieved General Douglas MacArthur of his Korean command. The nation's biggest or second-biggest military hero, depending on the half of World War II toward which the speaker felt identified, was replaced by a jumped-up militia captain with the Missouri State Field Artillery. The nation reeled from the shock.

The announcement came from the White House April 11th at one in the morning to coincide with Asian announcements, and before noon Senators caucused, Congress planned a joint session to hear MacArthur, and 69 per cent of Americans polled opposed the removal.

Joe McCarthy said of Truman, "The son-of-a-bitch ought to be impeached," and crowds greeted MacArthur on his trip across America following his return.

The core of the controversy was, in essence, the view of the Korean War held by each man. MacArthur believed that China should be invaded and the war settled, with nuclear weapons if necessary. The President felt such a program to be foolishly dangerous. MacArthur was fired.

MacArthur stumped the nation while the Senate investigated his release. Administration spokesmen, especially the Joint Chiefs of Staff, attacked MacArthur's position in two areas. First, he was termed a bad strategist: because his called-for war would have been an Asiatic land war, bugaboo of so many of his World War II planning sessions; because it would alienate our allies; and because the nation was not ready for a war with China, especially one from which Russia could remain aloof. Second, he subtly was called a bad soldier: he was insubordinate; he was obstructive; he was advocating a position for himself superior to the President.

The hearings had an effect on American public opinion. Movements boosting MacArthur for President soon died. He drew smaller crowds at his speaking engagements, and commanded less respect at public events.

McCarthy, meanwhile, was increasing his popularity, confirming the support or at least the acquiescence of his party, and capturing headlines. His was a politically rising star.

#### SUMMARY OF "THE RETREAT FROM VICTORY"

Despite the fact that "America's Retreat from Victory; The Story of General George C. Marshall" was 60,000 words long, it was not a difficult speech to summarize.<sup>2</sup> To a great extent this was because the speech was written by McCarthy's staff, and only partly read into the Record. The thesis of the speech was that General Marshall was part of a conspiracy aimed at the destruction of America's institutions. McCarthy claimed that the conspiracy was Communist, and that it was directed in the State and Defense departments by Marshall himself. McCarthy divided the bulk of his speech into three areas, or statements, which, when linked, offered a reasonable summary of the speech.

---

<sup>2</sup>All excerpts from this speech are from Major Speeches and Debates, pp. 215-311.

First, McCarthy claimed that the MacArthur investigation brought to light a body of facts casting doubt on the nation's power.

Second, Marshall was aware of and instrumental in most of the planning that permitted the situation to develop. The planning originated in Marshall's office, under his direction.

Finally, Marshall operated essentially without aid in doing this, and was at all times a disloyal American and an agent of an international conspiracy.

McCarthy claimed, in support of the first contention, that MacArthur was removed at Marshall's behest, and that the choice faced by the Joint Committee on Foreign Relations and Armed Services was to believe MacArthur or Marshall.

McCarthy detailed Marshall's wartime activities, emphasizing the incidents in which he aided our wartime Russian allies or hindered the British. He examined Marshall's postwar service as an emissary of the American government to China during the period leading to the Communist takeover. McCarthy then discussed several incidents which occurred during Marshall's tenure in the State Department.

McCarthy then discussed Marshall's role as a planner and maker of cold war strategy. He accused the general of subverting the will of Congress, and said that his loyalties were not to America. Marshall was

accused of appointing fellow-travellers and Communist sympathizers to important posts, and of squandering the nation's power so painfully built up during World War II.

McCarthy detailed some achievements of the great international conspiracy, and accused Marshall of being a member of that conspiracy, since this could be the only explanation for Marshall's unusual actions.

Finally, McCarthy closed by appealing for a reassertion of Congressional prerogative in the operation of war, and urged Senators to take steps to bring control of the nation's foreign policy back to the Senate.

McCarthy did not write the speech; none of it was in his style. He did not entirely deliver the speech, causing much of it to be inserted in the Record. He may have organized the speech, although the plan is more cogent than most of his works. However, he did lend his name to the speech, and wished it to be considered as his statement.

#### USE OF ETHOS IN THE "RETREAT FROM VICTORY" SPEECH

Despite its length, "Retreat from Victory" does not display a greater use of ethos than the earlier speeches. Its orientation was primarily logical, and the amount of extra-logical support was very small. Still, McCarthy aided his ethos in a number of ways with this speech.

First, of course the topic was important. The choice of Marshall was unpopular, and the attack on the American old soldier was not helpful to building McCarthy an image of good will. However, the extensive use of evidence, especially from sources friendly to the general, partially made up for the feelings of ill will initially generated by the choice of Marshall. His use of extensive evidence, and the generally restrained tone of the indictment, added to McCarthy's image of good sense as well as good will, and the careful documentation of each use of material added to an impression of good moral character. Of course, concern for the nation and loathing of "godless Communism" added to the positive effects of McCarthy's ethos.

McCarthy referred to each one of the signs which are displayed to enhance ethos.

### Probity

McCarthy exhibited each signal of probity. Expectedly, the specific references to the elements of ethos occurred prior to the bulk of the logical support.

Early McCarthy referred to the virtues of the nation: bravery, valor, a will to resist the encroachment of an unjust enemy, and strength. He also referred in passing to one of his common themes, the thought that Communists are atheist, godless enemies of civilization. Through this statement he applied the same formula which

he ascribed to his enemies: he "turned the batteries of his anger, not on his enemies, but the enemies of the enemies of those enemies."

By identifying his allies as patriots and men of high principles, he associated his arguments with the virtuous.

Finally, operating on the premise that only he and his allies worked for the good of the nation, he said:

. . . this vast and teeming land, this hopeful society where the poor share the table of the rich as never before in history, where men of all colors, of all faiths, are brothers as never before in history, where great deeds have been done and great deeds are yet to do, that America deserves to be led not to humiliation or defeat but to victory.

Thus McCarthy suggested that his arguments are virtuous, that his allies are virtuous, and that the prize in the conflict is virtuous.

In addition to the praise implicit in the concept of association with the virtuous, McCarthy praised several small segments of society. He praised newsmen, for example. He said, following derogatory statements concerning a few newsmen:

I hope the press will understand that I am only referring to the left-wing, bleeding-heart elements of the press, because, thank God, we do have essentially a good press in this Nation.

Senator McCarthy may, of course, have been praising the newsmen present because of the fact that he would rely on their help in disseminating the substance of his remarks.



McCarthy bestowed a similar bit of praise when, following a lengthy discussion of General Albert Wedemeyer's report from China and General Mark Clark's report on his experiences in Europe, he said:

In passing I should note that it is refreshing to come across evidence that the United States commands the loyalty of such soldiers as Mark Clark, Lucius Clay, Albert Wedemeyer, and Douglas MacArthur.

To a great extent, the entire speech linked the operation to the vicious, or more specifically linked Marshall with those who are linked with the vicious. Of course, McCarthy operated best in this area, pointing out connections between Marshall and others and then indicating how the others had violated the law or standards of conduct.

McCarthy openly charged some opponents with conduct which was immoral, illegal, or unpatriotic:

This is the administration which has sheltered the friends and puppets of the Russian Empire high in its own councils and, when challenged, has turned the batteries of its anger and its camp-following propaganda agents, not upon the enemies of our country in its ranks, but turned them upon the enemies of those enemies.

The speech abounded with comments such as "the maddening ambiguity of the administration's policy" and charged that the President was craven, Secretary of State Dean Acheson was "perfidious," and described as the "Red Dean," the Secretary of Defense, former Secretary of State and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Marshall was "preaching a gospel of defeat" and was "phony and

fraudulent" while the President of the United States was pursuing an "empty, defeatist strategy" because of "infatuated and cloudy vision" and had "never wavered in support of the forces that were intent upon delivering China to the Kremlin."

Treason, ineptitude, cowardice, and mendacity were vices which McCarthy associated with his opponents.

The primary way in which the unfavorable impressions of his past were minimized by McCarthy was his extensive use of evidence from public sources. However, he made a statement or two which aided him in this effort.

Early in the speech, as a sort of apologia for attacking Marshall, he said:

I realize full well how unpopular it is to lay hands on the laurels of a man who has been built into a great hero. I very much dislike this unpleasant task, but I feel that it must be done if we are to intelligently make the proper decisions in the issues of life and death before us.

Both before and following this statement McCarthy emphasized the fact that the sources used in his speech were those friendly to Marshall, a statement which added to his general credibility and minimized the unfavorable impression of a controversial junior Senator with a tarnished image attacking a national hero.

McCarthy referred repeatedly to events within the memory of Senators, using his own views and reactions to them to add weight to the argument, reminding the members of the upper house that "one of the Administration's

two principal spokesmen . . . seeks to frighten us with the admonition that . . . 'This very Capital Building, this very Senate Chamber may be blown to smithereens. . . .'"

However, McCarthy also alluded to his boyhood in Wisconsin, pointing out "we had a deep pride in our country" and saying "We were simple, uncomplicated Americans, not above dying, if need be, for the land we love." McCarthy continued in this vein for several minutes to lend credence to his assertion that the actions of the Administration were un-American.

McCarthy used several devices to add to the impression of his sincerity. He relied almost exclusively on the writings of Marshall's friends. He called himself "a little handicapped in this examination" of the events of World War II on a strategic basis, "because during the events of those days I was segregated in a small area of the Pacific Ocean." He also mentioned the problems inherent in his plan "to lay hands on the laurels of a man who has been built into a great hero." However, he used a large amount of evidence and managed to convey, at least in writing, a substantial degree of sincerity.

### Sagacity

McCarthy was, as usual, less concerned with demonstrating his sagacity than he was his good character. Naturally, in a speech of this length, sagacity was demonstrated on each of the ninety-six pages. However,

in general less support was used for a claim of McCarthy's good sense than was used to show his good moral character.

McCarthy made some efforts to demonstrate his common sense. For the most part he displayed sound reasoning and made few hasty conclusions. He also said some things which were sound in themselves, calling them at one point "immaterial" and at another saying "I shall leave that subject to a subtler analysis of human personality."

McCarthy showed a great deal of tact, moderation, and restraint during the speech. With several opportunities to attack Roosevelt he passed each one, calling him only misguided. He showed moderation in soundly supporting each argument, and in carefully choosing his sources. Of course, there is a question of how tactful an egregious assault on a national figure can be. However, suspending judgement on that question, McCarthy showed, in reading "Retreat from Victory," a major degree of restraint. In fact, he seemed to have followed Stevens' injunction in an earlier speech to avoid "shrill recriminations."

While the degree of wisdom McCarthy displayed in attacking Marshall was a partisan decision, he made efforts to bolster this aspect of his ethos. He used documentation to a greater degree than in any other major address in this portion of his career. He repeatedly pointed out that the needs of the nation compelled him to undertake the examination of Marshall, saying "unless

we understand the record of Marshall it will be impossible to even remotely grasp the planned steady retreat from victory which commenced long before World War II ended."

### Good Will

As usual, good will was the aspect of his ethos which McCarthy supported least. However, the quantity is greater in the Marshall speech than in the two previously examined. Only when the quantity of support given his good will is compared with the quantity of support given the other two aspects of ethos does it become clear that McCarthy was less concerned with this portion of his ethos than with the others.

McCarthy was aware of at least two audiences for the speech on Marshall. One audience was the Senate, mostly absent during the speech. He had, after all, informed the Senators that the speech was 60,000 words long, and that he would distribute copies to all who asked. However another audience, of which he was equally aware, was the public, represented by newsmen. Thus two kinds of praise were offered.

McCarthy described Congress as "the people's last hope" and praised it as free and open, urging it to take up its traditional prerogatives, and "declare that this body must have the final word on the disposition of Formosa and Korea." He also praised various Senators as "very able," in situations where the epithets were

not ritual forms. He called Congresswoman Edith Rogers "extremely able and vigilant" and said "we probably owe it to her and the grace of God that American boys are not being killed today by American-trained Reds."

McCarthy also praised the common American, referring to his bravery, his patriotism, and his wisdom. "He is nobody's fool," he said, "He has never failed to fight for his liberties . . . he is fighting tonight, fighting gloriously in a war on a distant American frontier. . . ." Clearly McCarthy was counting on reports of the speech being read by many Americans.

Because of the dual nature of the audience, McCarthy took two routes to identify with his hearers. He referred several times to the nature of his vision of the nation, in addition to the account of the patriotism prevalent in his boyhood.

In identifying with Senators, he offered copies of his speech to any interested Senator, and announced his intention to read some of the speech and insert the rest in the Record. About one-sixth of the way through the speech, he yielded, first to Senator William Langer, than Senator Robert Hendrickson, and finally Senator Kenneth Wherry. During the colloquies in which each senator merely signified agreement with McCarthy, he said:

I pause to say to my colleagues on the floor of the Senate that it is certainly not necessary for them to stay in the Chamber to listen to a

documentation [sic] which is bound to be very lengthy. Frankly, Mr. President, I do not expect my colleagues to remain in the chamber, . . .

I may say that I have notified many of my colleagues that I will supply them with a copy of my address. Certainly I do not want them to miss the ball game this evening.

Thus, McCarthy sought to avoid the possibility of Senators becoming annoyed at him and his 60,000 words.

McCarthy documented his entire speech, to the best of his ability, and the time consumed in delivery prevented him from being called brief. He spoke with directness, however, and his careful documentation, to the page number, added to the candor of the occasion. Similarly, few circumlocutions were evident.

With the exception of the speech subject and his immediate allies, McCarthy rebuked no one during the course of the speech. Marshall, Dean Acheson, and President Truman were rebuked in the speech, and although the use of tact in those rebukes was questionable, McCarthy was not as crude as he had been in the past in rebuking these men.

### Summary

McCarthy revealed his ethos in his usual manner. He was primarily concerned with the image of good character, and secondarily as a man of good sense. He used good will least. He displayed Aristotelian traits of character by his choice of topics. He also supported the three

facets of ethos, although not equally. Finally, he generally conformed to the pattern of his use of ethos.

#### THE TWO SPEECHES COMPARED

Similarities in the two speeches seem clear.

Both speeches were attacks on single men for obstructing the will of the people or taking steps which would harm the nation. Stevens was basing his charges on the idea that Johnson wished to restore the Union in a different form than Stevens and the American people wished. McCarthy indicated that the Administration was being helpful to an agent of the Communist conspiracy in defiance of the wishes of McCarthy and the American people. In addition, changes in the political environment had helped each speaker by making the issue of the speech more vivid; for Stevens, the end of the Civil War was as illuminating to his topic as the Korean war was for McCarthy.

Both speakers did essentially the same thing with their use of ethos.

Stevens displayed concern with the rights of the people with his choice of topic, since he held that Johnson had broken the law in an attempt to deprive Americans of their rights. He displayed all of the indicators of probity and took pains to support his good character. He also displayed support for his good sense, although to a lesser degree than his good character. Finally, Stevens spent less effort supporting his good will than



either of the other two areas of ethos, although this speech revealed greater concern for this area than either of the other two speeches.

McCarthy also showed concern for his ethos during the course of the speech. He supported his credibility through his choice of topic, and through the nature of the support for his arguments. He also showed each sign of probity and sagacity and spent some time supporting his good will.

McCarthy too, spent most effort supporting his claim to good character. He seemed to deliberately display each of the indicators of this area of ethos.

He spent somewhat less effort in supporting his good sense. The speech was thoroughly documented, and in a somewhat different style than his usual one.

Finally, McCarthy spent least effort on his good will, taking few pains when compared to the other two areas. However, every one of the indicators of good will were displayed, due to the magnitude of the speech.

It seems clear that both speakers were aware of their ethos, and concerned with supporting their claims to credibility. Each man was more concerned with his character than with his wisdom, and more concerned with his wisdom than with his good will.

## Chapter 7

### CONCLUSION

This chapter first recapitulates the theories of ethos, then examines the speeches of each man. Then, the similar ways in which ethos was used by the two men will be determined.

### ETHOS

Essentially, the aspects of ethos in this study were based on the writings of Aristotle. The consideration of those appeals based on the personal proof of the speaker clearly spoken in the speech is based on the writings of several other speech scholars, and the division of each of the aspects of ethos into its several parts is derived from Thonssen and Baird.

#### Good Sense, Good Will, and Good Character

Aristotle, who first systematized the study of rhetoric and who first articulated the theory permitting ethical considerations to become important to both the speaker and the critic, divided the sources of ethos into "good sense, good will, and good character."

Most of Aristotle's considerations of ethos were intended to be functional, and end-oriented. Thus, when

he first discussed the concept, he pointed out that "persuasion is effected by the speaker's character when the speech is so spoken as to make us think him credible." Thus, the definition of ethos first offered by Aristotle appears to be one of function and seems to point out what should concern the speaker.

Aristotle later pointed out that any support bolstering the character of the speaker added to an audience's impression of good sense, good will, or good character.

The final Aristotelian consideration important for this study deals with his reluctance to accept the validity of ethical proof based on the reputation of the speaker prior to the time he speaks. Ethical proof, according to Aristotle, should be based only on the things said, rather than on a consideration such as the reputation which he holds within the community.

#### Sources of Ethos Within the Speech

The nature of ethical appeals first defined by Aristotle was the one reflected within this study. The ethical appeals which were overt and present in the body of the speech were the ones examined.

There were two reasons for this analysis. First, these were the only appeals which could be altered by the speaker at the time he spoke, were the only ones immediately under his control and the only ones over

which he had any influence of a deliberate nature. Second, the speakers studied and the speeches examined did not lend themselves to a detailed consideration of the past reputation of the speakers.

A speaker is, admittedly, responsible for his reputation. Stevens, who enjoyed a reputation for high ideals, was in essence the only source of that reputation, just as McCarthy was the only source for the views of himself which were common in the Senate. Yet, seemingly at the time that any speech was delivered the bulk of that reputation was not open to alteration by the speaker. No one phrase was intended to overcome this reputation, but rather the entire message of the speech. The whole effort was thus aimed, in part, at improving the speaker's reputation.

On the other hand, statements embodied within the speeches had as apparent goals the supporting of very specific portions of the speaker's ethos in areas of good sense, good will, or good character.

In keeping with Aristotle's expression of distaste for including reputation within the consideration of ethos, the material contained within the speech has been the only source of ethos in this study.

#### The Parts of Each Aspect of Ethos

In order to handle conveniently the various forms of ethical appeals, this study adopted a division of

the subject into the methods by which a speaker emphasizes each portion of his ethos. The division, first articulated by Thonssen and Baird, lists the various overt appeals which a speaker might make to enhance the three aspects of his ethos. Thus, a speaker emphasizing his good character:

(1) associates either himself or his message with what is virtuous and elevated; (2) bestows, with propriety, tempered praise upon himself, his client, and his cause; (3) links the opponent or the opponent's cause with what is not virtuous; (4) removes or minimizes unfavorable impressions of himself or his cause previously established by his opponent; (5) relies upon authority derived from his personal experience and (6) creates the impression of being completely sincere in his undertaking. . . .

A speaker who is supporting his claim to good sense:

(1) uses what is popularly called common sense; (2) acts with tact and moderation; (3) displays a sense of good taste; (4) reveals a broad familiarity with the interests of the day; and (5) shows through the way in which he handles speech materials that he is possessed of intellectual integrity and wisdom.

Of the third source of ethos they say:

Finally, a speaker's good will generally is revealed through his ability (1) to capture the proper balance between too much and too little praise of his audience; (2) to identify himself properly with the hearers and their problems; (3) to proceed with candor and straightforwardness; (4) to offer necessary rebukes with tact and consideration; (5) to offset any personal reasons he may have for giving the speech; and (6) to reveal, without guile or exhibitionism, his personal qualities as a messenger of the truth.

Against this framework of ethical appeals, the speeches of the two men were measured to learn the nature of their ethical appeals.

## THE USE OF ETHOS BY THE TWO SPEAKERS

Stevens' Use of Ethos

Stevens seemed to use personal proof in the same way in each of his speeches. His choices of topic and support reveal strong concern with the justice of possible courses of action and with the potential for equality which underlay the choices facing Congress at the middle of the Nineteenth Century.

The concern with justice and opportunity for equality which dictated Stevens' stance on so many of the issues of the day was an important part of his ethos and one of the key factors in the approach which he repeatedly took in an effort to persuade Congress of the essential rectitude of the course which he advocated.

Within the speech, there were several specific areas in which the use of ethos was characteristic. He usually ascribed the same amount of importance to each of the three main areas of support for his character in each of the speeches examined.

Probity. Stevens seemed to attach the greatest amount of importance to defending his character. Evidence from the three speeches seems to indicate that he felt his character was the area for which the most support was essential, because he spent more time bolstering that aspect of his ethos than either of the other two areas. He repeatedly associated his views with the

virtuous or the views of his opponents with the vicious and bestowed tempered praise on those coming to agree with his point of view, as well as those holding his opinion from the beginning of the dispute.

Sagacity. Stevens seemed less concerned with supporting his good sense, although several attempts were made in each speech to lend weight to his thinking processes. He was strongest in the use of "common sense," frequently phrasing arguments in such terms that the least sophisticated of his hearers or readers could understand, and drawing conclusions which seemed inescapable. He also displayed intellectual integrity and wisdom, and revealed a thoroughgoing familiarity with the issues of the day. He was perhaps weakest in his use of tact and moderation, although study of the latest speeches indicates that age and victory had mellowed him somewhat.

Good will. Stevens spent least time, space, and effort in supporting his good will. He delivered rebukes in an essentially bitter manner, sacrificing tact for pungency, although the process of aging seemed to temper his venom so that the later rebukes were less bitter than those delivered during his first term in Congress.

### McCarthy's Use of Ethos

McCarthy, too, reflected his character in his choices of topic and support, and although he reflected concern for each of the three areas of ethos, he seemed to ascribe differing amounts of importance to each.

McCarthy, despite an early reputation as a somewhat venal political operator, came to be identified with the topic of the international spread of Communism and the domestic threat presented to America through infiltration and subversion. He chose this topic as the center of his activity early in 1950, and devoted most of his efforts to this area during the time he was an important member of the Senate.

His choice of topic, as well as the subject choices for his specific speeches led hearers and observers to draw certain conclusions concerning his character. For example, his concern with Communism, which was seen as an atheistic force, indicated that he was essentially a Godly man. Similarly, his determination to protect the United States from international domination reflected his patriotism.

Probity. McCarthy was most concerned with supporting his character and adding substance to his tacit claim to truthfulness. He frequently linked his opponents with the virtueless or the vicious, while associating himself and his cause with the virtuous. He frequently



referred to personal experience, and was careful to bestow praise on those in agreement. He made reference in each of his speeches to his sincerity.

Sagacity. McCarthy was less concerned with his hearer's opinion of his wisdom than he was with their opinion of his character, since he seemed to devote less attention to displaying his sagacity than he did in supporting his character. He most frequently supported his sagacity by displaying "common sense" in both his reasoning and as an example of the sort of thinking which ought to be followed. He added to his stature as a wise man by revealing a familiarity with the issues of the day, especially by taking a stance early in his Communist-hunting career. Thus, he had a ground-floor claim to familiarity with the anti-Communist issue based on the fact that he did a great deal to create the issue in the minds of Americans.

Good will. McCarthy seemed least concerned with the impression of good will which he created in the minds of his hearers. He was careful to bestow praise on his audience, or at least the portion that agreed with his views. He made great efforts to identify with this portion of his hearers. For example, he carefully dropped all use of the precise names with which he was baptized, shifting from Joseph Raymond to the somewhat more proletariat "Joe."

The Use of Ethos by the Two Men Compared

What are the similarities in the use of ethos by the two men? The two men used most of the ethical appeals in their speeches to add magnitude to their character; to a lesser degree to enhance their appearance of wisdom; and with even less attention paid to the good will which they seemed to have.

Stevens started his Congressional rhetorical career with a speech which heavily bolstered his character. He apparently tried to display each sign of good character to his hearers, and seemed to give extra stress to the virtue of the course he espoused, as if he respected the character of his hearers and depended upon them to act rightly as soon as the way was shown to them.

McCarthy, too, devoted more attention to support of his good character than to either of the two other aspects of ethos. Instead of linking his course with the virtuous, he seemed to spend more time linking the opposition with the virtuousless.

Both speakers devoted less attention to displaying their wisdom than they did to enhancing their character, although once again they seemed careful to touch each of the points at which their wisdom could be displayed.

Both Stevens and McCarthy adopted a course of "common sense" when displaying their wisdom, although Stevens seems to have used this device less than McCarthy. Both men displayed their ability to think, and both

offered evidence of their intellectual integrity and their wisdom. Naturally, since each was a leader of his House, each was familiar with the broad issues of the day.

The two men were little concerned with the area of supporting their wisdom with tact and taste since each could become vicious and bitter and since neither was especially noted for his attention to the rules of decorous debate.

Finally, each man seemed least interested in enhancing his reputation for good will. Both men were acknowledged to be fierce partisans, and neither was noted for his charity toward an enemy. An examination of their rhetoric suggests that each man enjoyed that reputation, since neither seemed to pay more than passing attention to adding to the appearance of good will. The closest that either came to that reputation seems to be a careful identification with that portion of his hearers that agreed with his views, although clearly McCarthy made a deliberate effort to become identified with the common American.

#### CONCLUSION

Neither Thaddeus Stevens nor Joe McCarthy are currently considered to be among the most important historical Americans. Yet Stevens' life work has had repercussions which are felt more than a century after

his death and similar evidence points to a path of events which are at least influenced by Joe McCarthy. If future historians determine that the two men were similar in more than superficial ways, then the fact that their use of ethical appeals was similar may become more important.

However, even now, the similarities offer some useful lessons. First, if these two men, separated by more than a century and by a host of historical events, chose the same types of ethical appeals to support their contentions and defeat their foes, then perhaps there is a type of legislator that can use the same appeals for the same end in any era. With the nation more aware of that type of legislator the people can more wisely deal with him and his plans.

Finally, when a leader of the government or of forces within the government supports his ethical appeals primarily through support of his character, with little attention paid to his wisdom and even less to his good will, then perhaps the informed observer can guard against certain events to follow. This study indicates that on at least two occasions leaders have emerged from Congress and offered to impose their will on the Executive branch of government and on the nation.

## SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

### BOOKS

- Adams, John Quincy. Lectures on Rhetoric and Oratory.  
2 vols. Cambridge, Mass.: Hilliard and Metcalf,  
1810.
- Anderson, Jack, and Ronald May. McCarthy: The Man, The  
Senator, The "Ism". Boston: Beacon, 1952.
- Aristotle. Rhetoric. W. Rhys Roberts, trans. New York:  
The Modern Library, 1954.
- Buehler, E. C. and Wil [sic] Linkugel. Speech: A First  
Course. New York: Harper & Bros., 1962.
- Burke, Kenneth. A Grammar of Motives and A Rhetoric of  
Motives. Cleveland: The World Publishing Co., 1962.
- Cicero. Cicero on Oratory and Orators. J. D. Watson,  
ed. and trans. London: Geo. Bell & Sons, 1909.
- Crocker, Lionel. Public Speaking for College Students.  
3d ed. New York: American Book Co., 1956.
- Feidler, Leslie A. An End to Innocence. Boston: The  
Beacon Press, 1955.
- Fischer, John. The Stupidity Problem and Other Harassments.  
New York: Harper and Row, 1964.
- Golden, James L. and Edward P. J. Corbett (eds.). The  
Rhetoric of Blair, Campbell, and Whately. New York:  
Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1968.
- Goldman, Eric F. The Crucial Decade and After: America  
1945-60. New York: Vintage Books, 1960.
- Hance, Kenneth G., David C. Ralph, and Milton J. Wiksell.  
Principles of Speaking. 2d ed. Belmont, Cal.:  
Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1969.
- Hovland, Carl I. and others. Communication and Persuasion.  
New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953.

- Kennedy, George. The Art of Persuasion in Greece. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963.
- Mann, Mary Peabody. The Life of Horace Mann. Centennial Edition in Facsimile. Washington: National Education Association of the United States, 1937.
- McCarthy, Joe. Major Speeches and Debates of Senator Joe McCarthy Delivered in the Senate 1950-51. Washington: n.p. (Government Printing Office number 251894) n.d.
- Monroe, Alan H. and Douglas Ehninger. Principles and Types of Speech. 6th ed. Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman & Co., 1967.
- Plato: Phaedrus. Lane Cooper, ed. and trans. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1963.
- Quintilian. Institutes of Oratory. H. E. Butler, trans. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1921.
- Rovere, Richard H. Senator Joe McCarthy. New York: Meridian Books, 1960.
- Tacitus. Dialogue on Orators. H. W. Benario, trans. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1967.
- Thonssen, Lester and A. Craig Baird. Speech Criticism. New York: The Ronald Press, 1948.
- United States. Congressional Globe. Thirty-first, Thirty-ninth and Fortieth Congresses.
- Whately, Richard. Elements of Rhetoric. New York: Sheldon & Co., 1872.
- Wiseman, Gordon and Larry Barker. Speech--Interpersonal Communication. San Francisco: Chandler, 1967.
- Witherspoon, Rev. John. Works. Philadelphia: William Woodward, 1802.

#### DISSERTATIONS

- English, William Baker. "Robert S. Kerr--A Study in Ethos." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1966.

Sattler, William M. "Conceptions of Ethos in Rhetoric."  
Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Northwestern  
University, 1941.

## PERIODICALS

Lee, Irving J. "Some Conceptions of Emotional Appeal in  
Rhetorical Theory," Speech Monographs, December, 1939,  
pp. 67-86.