

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF ACADEMIC AND JOURNALISTIC SPEECH
CRITICISM OF MACARTHUR'S ADDRESS TO CONGRESS

A Thesis
Presented to
the Faculty of the Department of Speech
University of Houston

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

by
William John Jordan
August 1966

381674

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF ACADEMIC AND JOURNALISTIC SPEECH
CRITICISM OF MACARTHUR'S ADDRESS TO CONGRESS

An Abstract of a Thesis
Presented to
the Faculty of the Department of Speech
University of Houston

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

by
William John Jordan
August 1966

ABSTRACT

This study compares the theory and practice of academic and journalistic speech criticism in an attempt to determine how journalistic criticism of a selected speech compares to academic criticism of the same speech. Scholars in rhetoric and journalism are studied for their theories of speech criticism. Critical studies of General Douglas MacArthur's address to Congress, April 19, 1951, by both academicians and journalists are studied for analysis of their critical practice.

The journalistic and academic theories of speech criticism of MacArthur's address to Congress illustrated noteworthy differences. Whereas the academic theorists have developed a critical theory based on rhetorical precepts, journalists have not developed a theoretical approach to speech criticism. In practicing criticism, the journalists presented criticism based on a single set of principles. The academicians presented criticism based on multiple sets of principles. Whereas journalists considered the speaker's accomplishment as the ultimate concern, academicians considered the speaker's method of accomplishment. Unlike the journalists who directed their criticism to a mass reading audience, the academicians directed their criticism to a

specialized audience. The journalists worked in the immediate context of the event. Academicians worked after the event. In addition to these differences, the journalists provided more depth in idea analysis. Academicians provided more depth in rhetorical technique analysis.

Working without a theory, journalists presented critical studies which illustrated an immediate "idea" approach to speech criticism. Academicians showed little concern for the ideas and their meaning. This comparison suggests that journalistic speech criticism emphasizes elements of rhetorical criticism which academic criticism does not. The value of the journalistic approach as another aspect of academic criticism suggests an area for further investigation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose of the Study	1
Design and Background of the Study	4
Organization of the Study	15
II. ACADEMIC APPROACHES TO SPEECH CRITICISM	17
The Critical Point of View	19
The Rationale of Criticism	22
The Method of Criticism	27
Application of Findings	36
III. ACADEMIC CRITICISM OF MACARTHUR'S ADDRESS TO CONGRESS	38
Criticism in <u>The Quarterly Journal</u> <u>of Speech</u>	38
Criticism in Speech Textbooks	47
Criticism in Graduate Theses	50
How Consistent Were the Critics?	55
Summary and Conclusions	62
IV. JOURNALISTIC APPROACH TO SPEECH CRITICISM	65
The Critical Point of View	66
The Rationale of Criticism	67
The Method of Criticism	72
Summary	75

CHAPTER	PAGE
V. JOURNALISTIC CRITICISM OF MACARTHUR'S	
ADDRESS TO CONGRESS	76
Speech Criticism in News Magazines	77
Speech Criticism in Newspapers	91
How Consistent Were the Journalists?	97
Summary and Conclusions	101
VI. COMPARISON OF ACADEMIC AND JOURNALISTIC SPEECH	
CRITICISM OF MACARTHUR'S ADDRESS TO CONGRESS . .	104
Theories of Speech Criticism	104
Practice of Speech Criticism	107
Conclusions	112
BIBLIOGRAPHY	114

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Purpose of the Study

Marie Hochmuth Nichols, in her discussion of recent rhetorical criticism,¹ reviews the arguments of Loren Reid² and Karl Wallace³ on the inadequacies and inconsistencies of modern academic speech criticism.⁴ She states:

We have sometimes argued that differences and variation are good for us . . . but I am not sure that differences stemming from wholly different conceptions of the nature of rhetoric can be good for us or for anyone else. If we are not sure what we are looking for, doubtless we are not going to find much that is significant. Underlying all Loren Reid's complaints is the problem of defining our intent.⁵

To illustrate her point, Nichols refers to Frederick Haberman's article "General MacArthur's Speech: A Symposium of Critical

¹"Theory and Practice of Rhetorical Criticism," Rhetoric and Criticism (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1963), pp. 65-78.

²"The Perils of Rhetorical Criticism," The Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXX (December, 1944), 416-22.

³"On Criticism of the MacArthur Speech," The Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXXIX (February, 1953), 68-72.

⁴For the purposes of this study, "academic speech criticism" means an evaluation of any or all aspects of a speech event made by teachers of public speaking or submitted to the teaching profession as exemplary scholarship.

⁵Nichols, p. 69.

Comment" which brings together speech criticism from within and without the Speech profession.⁶ Karl Wallace analyzes this same article and concludes that the professional critics of public address are ignoring or neglecting the fundamentals of rhetorical criticism.⁷ This leads the student of speech criticism to ask, along with Nichols, "What are we doing? What is our nature as critics of speeches? Does what we do have any validity or utility? Do we do well what we are doing?"⁸ There are no simple answers to these questions. They suggest a vast area of research and scholarly thought for the speech critic.

Haberman's "Symposium" suggests one area of initial research which may help to answer some of Nichols' questions. Haberman selected politicians, journalists, and speech teachers to comment on General MacArthur's Address to Congress. Nichols, commenting on the criticism, states, "It was peculiar indeed that, not the professional rhetorical critics, but the journalists examining MacArthur's speech concerned themselves seriously with the truth of MacArthur's assertions."¹⁰ How and why this was done was not within the scope of Nichols' lecture. However, this initial concern with academic and journalistic speech criticism suggests that there is merit

⁶The Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXXVII (October, 1951), 321-31.

⁷68-72. ⁸Pp. 67-8. ⁹321-31. ¹⁰P. 70.

in comparing, to a greater degree, academic speech criticism with journalistic speech criticism¹¹ in an attempt to discover meaningful approaches which may add to the entire concept of speech criticism.

Donald Bryant comments on the relationship which the news media has to the study of public address.

As we are readers of newspapers and magazines and all such information-giving and opinion-forming publications, and as we write for them, we are receiving or initiating rhetorical discourse, bad or good, effective or ineffective. The obligations of the journalist as investigator of the facts, as thinker about the facts, as discoverer of ideas and analyst and critic of ideas, are fundamental. They demand all the knowledge and skill that the political, scientific, and technical studies can provide. The journalist's distinctive job, however, is writing for his audience the highest grade of informative and suatory discourse that the conditions of his medium will permit. Whether editorial writer, commentator, or plain news-writer, reaching into his audience's mind is his problem. . . . Call it journalism if you choose, it is the rhetoric of the press.¹²

The material of this study concerns two sources of speech criticism--academic speech criticism and journalistic speech criticism. The purpose of this thesis is to answer the question: How does journalistic criticism of a selected speech compare to academic criticism of the same speech?

¹¹For purposes of this study, "journalistic speech criticism" means an evaluation of any or all aspects of a speech event, either analytical or impressionistic, as presented by professional news writers in the printed news media.

¹²"Rhetoric: Its Functions and Its Scope," The Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXXIX (December, 1953), 410-11.

Design and Background of the Study

Analysis of Academic Approaches
to Speech Criticism

A series of analyses establish a basis for answering the thesis question. First, the thesis surveys twentieth century speech criticism theory. The purpose of this survey is to discover the basic principles which have attempted to explain and guide current academic rhetorical criticism. The survey summarizes approaches to criticism found in the ideas of Lester Thonssen and A. Craig Baird,¹³ Loren Reid,¹⁴ Donald Bryant,¹⁵ Albert Croft,¹⁶ Marie Hochmuth Nichols,¹⁷ Wayland Parrish,¹⁸ Herbert Wichelns,¹⁹ Ernest Wrage,²⁰ and

¹³Speech Criticism (New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1948); and Baird, "The Study of Speeches," American Public Addresses, 1740-1952 (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1956), pp. 1-14.

¹⁴416-22. ¹⁵401-24.

¹⁶"The Functions of Rhetorical Criticism," The Quarterly Journal of Speech, XLII (October, 1956), 283-91.

¹⁷"The Criticism of Rhetoric," A History and Criticism of American Public Address (New York: Longmans, Green and Company, 1955), III, 1-23.

¹⁸"The Study of Speeches," American Speeches, Wayland M. Parrish and Marie K. Hochmuth, editors (New York: Longmans, Green and Company, 1954), pp. 1-20.

¹⁹"The Literary Criticism of Oratory," in The Rhetorical Idiom, Donald C. Bryant, editor (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1958), pp. 5-42.

²⁰"Public Address: A Study in Social and Intellectual History," The Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXXIII (December, 1947), 451-57.

L. H. Mouat.²¹ Although each critic has his own personal theory of criticism, a survey of these critical theorists presents fundamental approaches which provide insights into current speech criticism. This analysis attempts to describe the basic elements in the scholars' approaches to speech criticism by investigating the critical point of view, the rationale of criticism, and the method of criticism.

Analysis of Journalistic Approaches to Speech Criticism

A second analysis concerns the nature of journalistic speech criticism. Despite the fact that speech scholars have concentrated on various phases of speech reporting in the mass news media,²² they have not inquired into how journalists perceive speech criticism. This analysis concentrates primarily on the material presented to journalism students in college textbooks and educational journals, addresses delivered to journalism schools, and statements made by editors and publishers. Limited evidence for this survey exists because journalism scholars have devoted little attention to a theory

²¹"An Approach to Rhetorical Criticism," in The Rhetorical Idiom, Donald C. Bryant, editor (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1958), pp. 161-77.

²²H. Bruce Kendall, "The Reporting and Criticism of Speeches in Four Weekly Magazines" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Wisconsin, 1961); and E. Neal Clausen, "News Magazines as Sources of Rhetorical Criticism, 1948-1958" (unpublished Master's thesis, Southern Illinois University, 1959).

of speech criticism. This survey includes ideas presented by Thomas Berry,²³ Warren Breed,²⁴ Laurence R. Campbell and Roland E. Wolseley,²⁵ John Fisher,²⁶ John Hohenberg,²⁷ Hillier Krieghbaum,²⁸ Curtis MacDougall,²⁹ Orville Schaleben,³⁰ and Roland E. Wolseley.³¹ Other sources for this survey include personal correspondence with editors of news periodicals. This survey attempts to discover the critical point of view, the rationale of criticism, and the method of criticism. The analysis provides a basis for examining journalistic speech criticism.

²³Journalism Today: Its Development and Practical Applications (Philadelphia: Chilton Company, 1958).

²⁴"Analyzing News: Some Questions for Research," Journalism Quarterly, XXXIII (Fall, 1956), 467-77.

²⁵How to Report and Write the News (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Incorporated, 1961).

²⁶"Magazine and Newspaper Journalism: A Comparison," in The Press in Perspective, Ralph D. Casey, editor (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1963), pp. 198-205.

²⁷The Professional Journalist: A Guide to Modern Reporting Practice (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1960).

²⁸Facts in Perspective (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Incorporated, 1956).

²⁹Interpretative Reporting, fourth edition (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1963).

³⁰"The News and You," The Citizen and the News (Milwaukee: The Marquette University Press, 1962), pp. 77-95.

³¹Critical Writing for the Journalist (Philadelphia: Chilton Company, 1959).

Selection of the Speech

The evidence developed in the preceding two analyses provides a basis for examining the criticism of a specific speech. The following criteria determined selection of the speech: (1) to provide a common base for study, a single speech should be selected; (2) the speech should be of national interest; (3) the speech should be covered by both the journalistic publications and the speech academicians; (4) the speech should be recent enough to reflect the current principles of speech criticism; (5) the speech should be old enough for extensive criticism to have developed. A speech which meets these criteria is General Douglas MacArthur's Address to Congress, April 19, 1951.

In his analysis of the speech, Douglas Ehninger states: "It has been estimated that some forty-nine million Americans heard MacArthur's speech over radio and television. This was by all odds the largest audience ever assembled by the mass media up until that time."³² The news media responded to the national interest and published detailed descriptions of the speech event.³³ As the introductory paragraphs of this paper indicate, the academicians also developed

³²"MacArthur's Address to Congress," The Speaker's Resource Book, Carroll C. Arnold, Douglas Ehninger, and John C. Gerber, editors (Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1961), p. 274.

³³Ibid.

an interest in the speech.

MacArthur's Address to Congress

The occasion for MacArthur's address to Congress had its roots in a controversy between President Truman and MacArthur over the conduct of the Korean War. MacArthur, as chief of the United Nations forces in Korea, persisted in ignoring Truman's reprimands for openly criticizing the administration's foreign policy. Basically, Truman supported a limited war in Korea, in keeping with the policy of containment. MacArthur desired to extend the war into Red China. The conflict came to a head when Representative Joseph Martin (Republican, Massachusetts) published a letter from MacArthur advocating extension of the war. MacArthur's "Asia-first" policy was obvious in his remarks:

It seems strangely difficult for some to realize that here in Asia is where Communist conspirators have elected to make their play for global conquest, and that we have joined the issue thus raised on the battlefield; that here we fight Europe's war with arms while the diplomats there still fight it with words; that if we lose the war to Communism in Asia the fall of Europe is inevitable, win it and Europe most probably would avoid war and yet preserve freedom. As you point out, we must win. There is no substitute for victory.³⁴

MacArthur's stand was plain and open to public scrutiny.

Likewise, he stood in diametric opposition to the containment

³⁴Letter from General Douglas MacArthur to Representative Joseph Martin, March 20, 1951, cited by Oscar T. Barck, Jr., A History of the United States Since 1945 (New York: Dell Publishing Company, Incorporated, 1965), p. 173.

policies of the Truman administration. American History Professor Oscar T. Barck, Jr. comments, "Under the circumstances, there was nothing else for Truman to do but remove MacArthur."³⁵ On April 11, 1951, President Truman announced his dismissal of MacArthur:

With deep regret I have concluded that General of the Army Douglas MacArthur is unable to give his whole-hearted support to the policies of the United States government and the United Nations in matters pertaining to his official duties. In view of the specific responsibilities imposed upon me by the Constitution [and] the added responsibility which has been entrusted to me by the United Nations, I have decided that I must make a change of command in the Far East. . . . General MacArthur's place in history as one of our greatest commanders is fully established. The nation owes him a debt of gratitude.³⁶

The nation paid its debt of gratitude. Over 500,000 people greeted MacArthur in San Francisco. In New York, about 7,500,000 people honored the General with a record breaking ticker tape parade. Public opinion was strongly in favor of MacArthur. A Gallup poll reported that 69 per cent of all people interviewed favored MacArthur while only 29 per cent favored Truman. In the two days following MacArthur's dismissal, the American people sent more than 125,000 telegrams to Washington. For weeks editorial columns displayed newspaper readers' reactions both for and against the President's action. In Congress reaction was highly partisan. Democrats supported the President while Republicans rallied behind

³⁵Barck, p. 173. ³⁶In Ehniger, p. 273.

MacArthur. In the midst of the emotional turmoil, Republicans succeeded in obtaining an invitation for MacArthur to address a joint session of Congress. MacArthur accepted the invitation and an unprecedented speech occasion developed.

Ehninger describes the immediate setting:

Finally, at 12:31 as the blinding beams of a dozen floodlights were suddenly turned on, the seventy-one year old general, relaxed but erect, his "gladitorial features stony," strode into the Chamber escorted by a courtesy committee of Representatives and Senators and by House Doorkeeper William F. Miller. More than six feet tall, he was dressed in dark military slacks and a battle jacket bare of decorations. Only the insignia of his rank as a five-star general was visible on his shoulders. Following a two-minute ovation Speaker Sam Rayburn introduced him with these words: "Members of the Congress, I deem it a high privilege, and I take great pleasure in presenting to you General of the Army Douglas MacArthur."³⁷

Audience applause interrupted the forty minute address more than thirty times. This speech, its significance to speech scholars and journalists as an object of criticism, provides the initial material of this study.

Academic Criticism of the Speech

The next area of analysis is the academic criticism of MacArthur's speech. The first academic criticism to appear in the journals was Haberman's "Symposium."³⁸ In December of 1951, The Quarterly Journal of Speech published Philip Wylie's critical essay³⁹ followed by Paul Beall's

³⁷P. 274. ³⁸321-31.

³⁹"Medievalism and the MacArthurian Legend," XXXVII (December, 1951), 473-78.

critique in 1952.⁴⁰ Between 1952 and 1957, American graduate schools accepted five Masters theses analyzing MacArthur's address.⁴¹ Ehninger conducted the most recent analysis, published in 1961,⁴² while A. Craig Baird presented a brief commentary in 1952.⁴³ This investigation of academic criticism attempts to answer the question: How did selected academic critics treat MacArthur's speech?

Journalistic Criticism of the Speech

News sources studied in this thesis meet three requirements. The first consideration is that this study

⁴⁰ "Viper-Crusher Turns Dragon Slayer," XXXVIII (February, 1952), 51-6.

⁴¹ Joseph L. Lauber, "An Analysis and Evaluation of General MacArthur's Address to Congress, April 19, 1951" (unpublished Master's thesis, The State University of Iowa, 1952); John C. Swart, "A Critical Analysis of Douglas MacArthur's Speech Before Congress, April 19, 1951" (unpublished Master's thesis, Indiana University, 1955); Kenneth W. Shoemaker, "Analysis and Evaluation of Douglas MacArthur's Use of Emotional Appeal in His Speech 'Don't Scuttle the Pacific,' Given Before a Joint Session of Congress, April 19, 1951" (unpublished Master's thesis, Bowling Green University, 1955); Duane N. Diedrick, "A Study of General Douglas MacArthur as a Speaker" (unpublished Master's thesis, The University of Michigan, 1957); and Mrs. Bryant Moses, "Representative Speaking of Douglas MacArthur, General of the Army, During Various Phases of His Life" (unpublished Master's thesis, The University of Virginia, 1958). Only theses by Shoemaker and Moses are examined in this thesis. Theses by Swart, Lauber, and Diedrick were unavailable for examination.

⁴² Pp. 273-80.

⁴³ Representative American Speeches, 1951-52 (New York: H. W. Wilson Company, 1952), pp. 21-30.

concerns criticism of public speeches, not non-critical, non-evaluative speech reporting. This area is somewhat undefined and unlimited by any empirical data categorizing news media into critical and non-critical groups. Journalism scholars seem to agree that the weekly news and opinion magazines are primarily interpretive organs.⁴⁴ Only the "better," or "quality," or "prestige" newspapers concentrate on extensive news interpretation. In speaking of the news magazines and the few newspapers which analyze weekly news, Krieghbaum states, "All have more interest in putting the news into perspective than most daily papers. . . . They differ from day-to-day, spot reporting."⁴⁵ The first consideration then, is to select periodicals which fall into this general area.

Speech and journalism educators recognize that certain publications within the vast field of journalism consistently maintain a high standard of excellence. The second major consideration is that this study concerns speech criticism as it appears in those news publications which educators regard as superior journalistic models. Austin J. Freeley advises the speech student to explore quality periodicals

⁴⁴Fischer, p. 201; Hohenberg, p. 15; and Krieghbaum, p. 432.

⁴⁵p. 432.

and newspapers. He comments:

Daily reading should include the New York Times and at least one other metropolitan daily. . . . Weekly reading should include . . . Time, Newsweek, or U.S. News and World Report . . . also the Atlantic Monthly, Harper's, the Reporter, the Progressive, the New Republic, the Nation, and one or two other journals. . . . [Specialized publications include] the Wall Street Journal, Business Week, the AFL-CIO News, and the Monthly Labor Review. . . .⁴⁶

Wayne C. Minnick recommends the New York Times as the most reliable newspaper available to the student of speech.⁴⁷

Three studies surveying journalism educators, publishers, and editors, concur in ranking the New York Times as the "best" newspaper, illustrating the ideal principles of news journalism.⁴⁸ In the area of specialized newspapers, John C. Merrill notes that the "qualities that make the Wall Street Journal . . . 'qualitative' are not the ones that make the [general newspapers] qualitative."⁴⁹ Likewise, the qualities of Time as a news magazine are not the same as the qualities of The Nation as a more specialized "opinion" magazine.

The third major consideration in selecting publications

⁴⁶Argumentation and Debate: Rational Decision Making (Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1961), pp. 42-3.

⁴⁷The Art of Persuasion (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1957), p. 145.

⁴⁸Surveys cited by Erling H. Erlandson, "Correlation of Salaries with Newspaper 'Prestige' Rank," Journalism Quarterly, XL (Spring, 1963), 228.

⁴⁹"U.S. Panel Names World's Ten Leading 'Quality' Dailies," Journalism Quarterly, XLI (Autumn, 1964), 572.

is the publication's concern with General MacArthur's Address to Congress. Publications which do not attempt to evaluate MacArthur's speech offer no evidence on how journalists criticized that address.

To give the study both breadth and depth, and to satisfy the stated considerations, this thesis considers eight publications. Commonweal⁵⁰ represents the only national religious news magazine to offer evaluation. Life⁵¹ presents speech evaluation in the popular illustrated type of news periodical. The Nation⁵² and The New Republic⁵³ reflect evaluation as "opinion" magazines. Newsweek⁵⁴ and Time⁵⁵ present examples of speech criticism in weekly news magazines. The New York Times⁵⁶ represents journalism's most distinguished

⁵⁰Harold C. Hinton, "The MacArthur Argument," Commonweal, LIV (May 11, 1951), 111-12.

⁵¹"Challenge Is Heard Around the World," Life, XXX (April 30, 1951), 26-7; "An Old Soldier Fades Away Into New Glory," Life, XXX (April 30, 1951), 22-3; "The Response to MacArthur," Life, XXX (April 30, 1951), 34.

⁵²Willard Shelton, "MacArthur Joins the G.O.P.," The Nation, CLXXII (April 28, 1951), 389-90; "General Sows Confusion," The Nation, CLXXII (April 28, 1951), 388-89.

⁵³Editorial in The New Republic, CXXIV (April 30, 1951), 3.

⁵⁴"Emotion Wanes But the Issue Grows," Newsweek, XXXVII (April 30, 1951), 17-22.

⁵⁵"Old Soldier," Time, LVII (April 30, 1951), 21-6.

⁵⁶James Reston, "Profound Division in Capital Caused by General's Speech," New York Times, April 20, 1951, pp. 1, 7; "The Speech to Congress," New York Times, April 20, 1951, p.28.

contributor in the field of general newspapers; while the Wall Street Journal⁵⁷ represents the interests of business journalism. All of these sources evaluate news, are representative of journalistic excellence, and have attempted to evaluate MacArthur's address. The analysis attempts to discover how journalistic critics treated MacArthur's Address to Congress.

Comparison of the Criticism

The final analysis with which this thesis deals is a comparative study of the academic speech criticism and the journalistic speech criticism. The evidence developed in the preceding analyses provides the basis for this comparison. The question to answer is: How does journalistic rhetorical criticism of the MacArthur speech compare to academic rhetorical criticism of the same speech?

Organization of the Study

Chapter II of this study is an analysis of academic approaches to the study of speeches. Chapter III describes the academic criticism of MacArthur's address. These two chapters combine to form a unit on the academic approach to the theory and practice of speech criticism. Chapter IV surveys journalistic approaches to the critical handling of

⁵⁷"The Failure and the Challenge," Wall Street Journal, April 20, 1951, p. 4.

public speeches. Chapter V is a description of journalistic criticism of MacArthur's speech. These chapters form a unit on journalistic theory and practice of speech criticism. Chapter VI compares the two units, with major emphasis on the practice of criticism, and presents the conclusions of this study.

CHAPTER II

ACADEMIC APPROACHES TO SPEECH CRITICISM

Cornell University, in 1920, was the center of a seminar in classical rhetoric directed by Alexander M. Drummond. In this seminar, scholars of rhetoric focused their attention on the ancient rhetorical theorists--Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, Quintilian, Saint Augustine, and others. Participating in this seminar was Herbert A. Wichelns, who expressed his thinking on rhetoric in his essay, "The Literary Criticism of Oratory,"¹ Wichelns urged a return to the classical traditions of rhetorical scholarship. Ernest Bormann describes the influence of Wichelns' approach as the "central touchstone" of modern theories of speech criticism.² Donald Bryant comments:

This essay set the pattern and determined the direction of rhetorical criticism for more than a quarter of a century and has had a greater and more continuous influence upon the development of the scholarship of rhetoric and public address than any one other single work published in this century.³

¹In The Rhetorical Idiom, Donald C. Bryant, editor (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1958), pp. 5-42.

²Theory and Research in the Communicative Arts (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Incorporated, 1965), p. 231.

³p. 5.

The following discussion examines approaches to speech criticism suggested by scholars in rhetoric and public address since 1925. This limitation implies that a new movement in speech criticism developed out of Wichelns' approach to the study of speeches, which asserts that rhetorical criticism reflects the classical precepts of rhetorical theory rather than the precepts of literary criticism. The critical theorists in this examination reflect Wichelns' influence through either modification, expansion, or rejection of his theory. The selected theorists are Lester Thonssen and A. Craig Baird,⁴ Loren Reid,⁵ L. H. Mouat,⁶ Donald Bryant,⁷ Albert Croft,⁸ Marie Hochmuth Nichols,⁹

⁴Speech Criticism (New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1948); and Baird, "The Study of Speeches," American Public Addresses, 1740-1952 (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1956), pp. 1-14.

⁵"The Perils of Rhetorical Criticism," The Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXX (December, 1944), 416-22.

⁶"An Approach to Rhetorical Criticism," in The Rhetorical Idiom, Donald C. Bryant, editor (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1958), pp. 161-77.

⁷"Rhetoric: Its Functions and Its Scope," The Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXXIX (December, 1953), 401-24.

⁸"The Functions of Rhetorical Criticism," The Quarterly Journal of Speech, XLII (October, 1956), 283-91.

⁹"The Criticism of Rhetoric," A History and Criticism of American Public Address (New York: Longmans, Green and Company, 1955), III, 1-23.

Wayland Parrish,¹⁰ Herbert Wichelns,¹¹ and Ernest Wraga.¹²

While this study does not consider every scholar in speech criticism since 1925, additions to this survey would add little to the mainstream of thought on twentieth century approaches to speech criticism. The following discussion examines three aspects of the critical theory: (1) the critical point of view, (2) the rationale of criticism, and (3) the method of criticism.

The Critical Point of View

In describing the art of persuasion, Aristotle recognized three elements in the speaking situation--the speaker, the speech, and the audience.¹³ This three-part description of the speech act is basic to the academic approaches to speech criticism. However, the various academic theories depend upon the way scholars regard these parts as they influence the total act of communication.

¹⁰"The Study of Speeches," American Speeches, Wayland M. Parrish and Marie K. Hochmuth, editors (New York: Longmans, Green and Company, 1954), pp. 1-20.

¹¹In Bryant, The Rhetorical Idiom, pp. 5-42.

¹²"Public Address: A Study in Social and Intellectual History," The Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXXIII (December, 1947), 451-57.

¹³Rhetoric, W. Rhys Roberts, translator, in Aristotle's Rhetoric and Poetics, Frederick Solmsen, editor (New York: Random House, 1954), 1. 3. 1358^b.

Focus on the Public Man

The speaker is the central object of concern for Wichelns, Baird, and Mouat. Wichelns sees the speaker "as a public man whose function it is to exert his influence by speech."¹⁴ The speaker is an artist who attempts to influence "men in some concrete situation."¹⁵ Baird also perceives the speaker as the controlling element. He says:

Speech, as communication, originates with a speaker who uses his voice and other bodily aids to gain and hold the attention of one or more auditors. He aims to contribute something to their pleasure, knowledge, understanding, attitude, and conduct.¹⁶

Three elements of the public speaker determine the critic's focus in Mouat's description of the act. These are the method of the speaker, the purpose of the speaker, and the reaction of the audience to the method and purpose of the speaker.¹⁷

Focus on the Complete Organism

From the critical point of view of Nichols, Parrish, and Reid, the speech act is a complete organism, in which no one element supersedes the other elements in importance. Nichols comments, "If we do not press the analogy too far, we may compare the speech with a multi-celled organism, whose units consist of speaker, audience, place, purpose,

¹⁴In Bryant, The Rhetorical Idiom, p. 33.

¹⁵Ibid. ¹⁶P. 3.

¹⁷In Bryant, The Rhetorical Idiom, p. 166.

time, and form."¹⁸ The interrelationship of these elements in the complete organism is according to Reid a form of interaction whose "function is to seek to get others to react as the communicator wishes them to react."¹⁹ Parrish describes the complete organism as an incomplete entity within itself. The actual act is only one of many possible acts which could occur depending upon the composition of the elements.²⁰

Focus on Ideas

According to Croft and Wrage, the speech act is significant at the level of ideas.²¹ All other elements are only complementary. Croft submits that the ideas are the substance of the rhetorical act and form the links between the elements of the speaker and the audience.²² Wrage's perception of the speech act is limited. He states, "The basic ingredient of a speech is its content. . . . It is a vehicle for the conveyance of ideas."²³

¹⁸Hochmuth, III, 9.

¹⁹First Principles of Public Speaking, second edition (Columbia: Artcraft Press, 1962), p. 7.

²⁰p. 12.

²¹Croft, 283-91; and Wrage, 451-57.

²²289. ²³453.

The Rationale of Criticism

The critical points of view provide a basis for examining the rationale of speech criticism. The critical theorists' justifications for public address criticism compose the rationale of speech criticism. The following discussion considers this rationale as it suggests standards of evaluation, purposes of analysis, and goals of criticism.

Standards of Evaluation

Two major concepts emerge from the theorists' observations of why critics study speeches. These concepts are the critic's determination of rhetorical effect and rhetorical effectiveness.

Rhetorical effect. The logical object of criticism, according to Wichelns, is the result or effect of the public man's exertion of influence by speech, which the critic cannot discover through the criteria of literary criticism. Thus the speech critic considers effect, not beauty or permanence.²⁴ Effect, in these terms, is the literal result of the speech act. Mouat suggests that the effect of the speech unifies the many elements of the act.²⁵ The speech in these terms, is a stimulus which the critic evaluates by the response which follows.

²⁴In Bryant, The Rhetorical Idiom, p. 18.

²⁵Ibid., p. 166.

Rhetorical effectiveness. Parrish rejects the idea of evaluating speeches for effect and suggests that the critic consider the effectiveness, or quality, which "can be determined quite apart from its effect."²⁶ Inherent in this standard for evaluation is the idea that the critic evaluates the act in an effort to discover the best means of persuasion available to the speaker in order to determine the relative value of the act.

Combined standard. Baird submits that the speech critic's concern is "with the recognition of truth and the speaker's relation to attitudes and movements that support truth."²⁷ As a result, the critic studies speeches for their effect and effectiveness, both of which rest in the "highest moral and religious motives" of the speaker.²⁸

Purposes of Analysis

Whereas the standards of evaluation determine the critic's interpretation of his data, the purposes of analysis determine the critic's method and the content of his investigation. Bryant discerns four general areas of speech analysis which provide a comprehensive description of the analytic purposes. These purposes are social, pragmatic, literary, and philosophical.²⁹

²⁶P. 7. ²⁷P. 14. ²⁸Ibid.

²⁹"Rhetoric: Its Functions . . ." 424.

Social purpose. Bryant suggests that speech criticism as a social study concerns "the behavior of men in society."³⁰ In agreement, Nichols states, "The rhetorician is in effect, or ought to be, a critic of society."³¹ As a social critic, the speech scholar is a historian who, according to Nichols, concentrates on the raw data, "carefully selecting and editing speeches, and making them available to the historian."³² Wrage's concept of social criticism is to gain "additional knowledge about the growth of ideas, their currency and vitality, their modifications under the impress of social requirements, and their eclipse by other ideas with different values."³³

Pragmatic purpose. Bryant defines the pragmatic purpose of speech criticism as a concern "with the management of discourse in specific situations for practical purposes."³⁴ Croft's creative function of criticism which attempts "to re-examine, re-evaluate, and if possible to modify contemporary rhetorical theory through the examination of the adaptive processes in speeches," is one aspect of the pragmatic purpose of analysis.³⁵ Parrish presents another pragmatic aspect of

³⁰Ibid.

³¹Rhetoric and Criticism (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1963), p. 16.

³²Ibid., p. 33. ³³453-54.

³⁴"Rhetoric: Its Functions . . ." 424. ³⁵287.

criticism which provides "some lessons that . . . apply to the preparation of . . . speeches."³⁶ In addition, Reid comments, "Since it is difficult to know what in the contemporary speechmaking scene is worth preserving, the problem is to predict what will be of scholarly usefulness years hence."³⁷

Literary purpose. Bryant describes the literary purpose as one "involving linguistics, critical theory, and semantics as it touches the art of informing ideas, and the functioning of language."³⁸ Parrish amplifies the literary aspect of rhetorical analysis.

It is style, the choice and arrangement of words, that determines in the main the value of a speech as enduring literature. And it is style that more than any other factor gives a speaker the uniqueness by which he is distinguished from other speakers.³⁹

Philosophical purpose. Bryant notes that criticism "is a philosophical study so far as it is concerned with a method of investigation or inquiry."⁴⁰ Baird develops this approach when he suggests that "the critic . . . will become a logician--to examine the validity of the generalizations and the other elements of straight thinking."⁴¹

³⁶P. 1.

³⁷"The Perils of Rhetorical Criticism," 419.

³⁸"Rhetoric: Its Functions . . ." 424. ³⁹P. 17.

⁴⁰"Rhetoric: Its Functions . . ." 424. ⁴¹P. 11.

Goals of Criticism

The goals of criticism, as advanced by the critical theorists, determine the critic's application of the data which he analyzes and evaluates.

Historical goals. In viewing the many possible ways in which the speech critic can contribute to the study of history, Nichols makes the following suggestion. The speech critic, she says, contributes to the study of history by

doing well-balanced and expertly presented critical studies of orators, comparative studies, and studies which cope with the qualities and styles of speaking in various historical periods. By more modest tasks we may indeed make ourselves far more useful than we have sometimes been in the past.⁴²

The goal of historical speech criticism, according to Wichelns, is to provide a key to understanding the history of the "public man influencing the men of his own times by the power of his discourse."⁴³

Pedagogical goals. The pedagogical goals of speech criticism concern rhetorical theory and its application in the teaching of public speaking. Both Reid and Parrish suggest that the critic attempt to discover in examples of quality speaking principles applicable to speech making theory.⁴⁴

⁴²p. 33.

⁴³In Bryant, The Rhetorical Idiom, p. 39.

⁴⁴Reid, "The Perils of Rhetorical Criticism," 421; Parrish, p. 12.

From the effect of the speech, Mouat advises the critic to "promulgate rhetorical principles to be used by the practitioner."⁴⁵

Critical theory goals. Thonssen and Baird claim that one of the goals of the speech critic is to unify the divergent approaches which constitute the realm of inquiry of rhetorical criticism.⁴⁶ Mouat concurs with Thonssen and Baird when he urges "that there be a single set of principles."⁴⁷ Croft rejects the unified approach when he states, "There is no need for all research in rhetoric to follow a single pattern. Indeed, a pluralistic approach is the only intellectually defensible position."⁴⁸ Implicit in this controversy is the idea that the speech critic has as his goal not only the evaluation of speeches but also an evaluation of his art as an intellectual discipline.

The Method of Criticism

The critical theorist's perception of the speech act influences the method of criticism which he suggests more than his rationale of criticism. The following discussion

⁴⁵In Bryant, The Rhetorical Idiom, p. 166.

⁴⁶P. 465.

⁴⁷In Bryant, The Rhetorical Idiom, p. 165.

⁴⁸287.

surveys the suggested methods of Wichelns, Baird, and Mouat as they focus on the "public man" as the central figure in speech criticism. The methodologies of Parrish, Reid, and Nichols compose the "complete organism" approach. Croft and Wrage's rubrics describe the "idea-centered" method of criticism.

The Public Man Approach

Wichelns, Baird, and Mouat represent the proponents of the method of speech criticism which focuses on the speaker. Wichelns and Baird prescribe identical methods while Mouat adds to their method.

Focus on the public man. In approaching the speech as an object of critical evaluation, the critic focuses specifically on the speaker. Wichelns commented:

Where the critic divides his interest between the man and the work without allowing either interest to predominate, he is often compelled to consider the work in toto, and we get only observations so generalized as not to include the form of the work.⁴⁹

Failure to concentrate on the speaker at work throws the critic into the realm of evaluating the general qualities of the prose or the philosophic thought of the spoken essay. Thus, the material of the rhetorical process, the elements of the act, are "often lost from view, and criticism suffers in consequence."⁵⁰

⁴⁹In Bryant, The Rhetorical Idiom, pp. 15-16.

⁵⁰Ibid., p. 16.

Method of analysis. Following the classical rubrics, the critic examines the speaker's invention, arrangement, style, and delivery as they relate to the speech and the audience. The critic analyzes the elements of the speech situation. "The scheme of a rhetorical study includes the element of the speaker's personality as a conditioning factor; it includes also the public character of the man-- not what he was, but what he was thought to be."⁵¹ Regarding the hearers of the message, rhetorical criticism, according to Wichelns,

requires a description of the speaker's audience, and of the leading ideas with which he plied his hearers-- his topics, the motives to which he appealed, the nature of the proofs he offered. These will reveal his own judgement on the questions which he discussed.⁵²

In relation to the speech itself, Baird and Wichelns advise the critic to examine the textual authenticity of the address, the organization of the ideas, the process of preparation and delivery, and the style, insofar as it aids the hearer to understand the meaning of the communication.⁵³

Method of evaluation. Like Wichelns, Mouat suggests that "effect takes logical precedence over causal determinants."⁵⁴ Thus, the critic's study of the rhetorical act establishes the causal relation between that aspect and the

⁵¹Ibid., p. 38. ⁵²Ibid.

⁵³Ibid., pp. 38-9; and Baird, pp. 3-14.

⁵⁴In Bryant, The Rhetorical Idiom, p. 166.

effect of the speech. Baird adds the dimension of effectiveness and advises the critic to evaluate the quality of the act.⁵⁵

Identification and the public man. Mouat presents an additional aspect of rhetorical analysis. Paraphrasing Kenneth Burke, Mouat claims, "Identification is central to rhetorical effectiveness [success]."⁵⁶ He defines identification as "a process of becoming 'substantially one' with an audience."⁵⁷ By examining the speaker's invention the critic discovers the "material identification" of the speaker. By examining the speaker's use of arrangement, style, memory, and delivery, the critic discovers the elements of "formal identification."⁵⁸ Ultimately, the critic develops his evaluation of the effect of the speech by asking: How successful is the identification?"⁵⁹ The critic aims to discover the immediate actions and reactions and the ultimate results of the speaker's use of the classical arts of persuasion.

The Complete Organism Approach

Parrish, Reid, and Nichols represent the critical

⁵⁵p. 13.

⁵⁶In Bryant, The Rhetorical Idiom, p. 171.

⁵⁷Ibid., p. 172. ⁵⁸Ibid., p. 173.

⁵⁹Ibid., p. 177.

theorists who advocate a critical methodology which considers the complete speech act. These scholars are in basic agreement on the method which the critic should follow.

Focus on the complete organism. Nichols introduces volume three of A History and Criticism of American Public Address by stating:

The criticism of speeches, like the criticism of all art, includes both analysis and synthesis. It is concerned with naming and identifying its object, locating its connections with the culture of which it is a part, and seeing it in relation to other similar phenomena. It is discriminating among values.⁶⁰

Parrish's focus which concentrates on the actual act as one possible phenomena in a field of many alternative acts concurs with Nichols approach.

Method of analysis. The speaker's use of the Aristotelian three-fold division of proofs and the five-fold Roman division of speech preparation is central in the critic's analysis of the total act. Concerning the analysis of the speaker's method, Reid warns, "Rhetorical criticism is not simply a classification or tabulation of rhetorical devices."⁶¹ Parrish advises the critic to analyze the motives of the audience in order to measure the appropriateness of the speaker's appeals. In agreement, Nichols states that the critic cannot evaluate until he considers the audience, and

⁶⁰Hochmuth, 6.

⁶¹"The Perils of Rhetorical Criticism," 417.

he "must inevitably consider whether the speaker chose wisely or ill in relation to the audience."⁶² In analysis, the critic examines the speaker's premises, both stated and implied, and "the truth of those premises."⁶³ Although the critic describes what a speaker has said, he concentrates more on making a "critical judgement about the ideas of the speech."⁶⁴ Such a judgment the critic bases, not solely on the effect of the speaker's discovery of ideas, but on his process of discovering ideas, his intellectual background, and education. The critic also examines the speaker's ideas to discover if he chose the right things to say.⁶⁵

In analyzing the speech situation, Nichols advises the critic to examine not only the physical setting but also the metaphysical environment--the total conceptual situation in which the forces of time and thought operate upon the physical environment of the speech situation.⁶⁶ To discover the place of the speech situation in its relation to historical events, the critic acknowledges, from Reid's point of view, that "rhetorical criticism is not simply a narrative of the circumstances under which a speech is delivered."⁶⁷

⁶²Hochmuth, III, 10-11. ⁶³Ibid., 16.

⁶⁴Reid, "The Perils of Rhetorical Criticism," 417.

⁶⁵Parrish, pp. 13-14.

⁶⁶Hochmuth, III, 11.

⁶⁷"The Perils of Rhetorical Criticism," 417.

The historical facts which show the relationship of the speech to other historical events are not adequate substitutes for the critic's own evaluation of how the speech fits into historical perspective. Such an analysis depends upon an accurate recording of history plus a critical evaluation of the speech in its historical context.

Method of evaluation. According to Nichols, the critic should not evaluate a speech merely by measuring how well the speaker fulfills his purpose. "The critic who makes fulfillment of specific purpose the only test of eloquence is not merely misguided, he is attempting the impossible."⁶⁸ Parrish adds that "the critic's concern is not with the literal result of the speech, but with the speaker's use of a correct method; not with the speech's effect, but with its effectiveness."⁶⁹

In order to guide the critic in determining effectiveness, Reid offers the following ideas. "Eventually the critic makes a judgement about the effectiveness of a speech."⁷⁰ In conjunction with the previously described elements, the critic has three additional areas for supporting materials. From the testimony of hearers the critic gains evidence of the response to the act. From precepts, or accepted rhetorical

⁶⁸Hochmuth, III, 12. ⁶⁹P. 12.

⁷⁰"The Perils of Rhetorical Criticism," 420.

principles, the critic obtains criteria for evaluation. For the relative quality of the speech, the critic compares his critical object to other speeches. In comparing speeches, the critic obtains two types of observations. "First, it [the comparison] suggests that some ideas might have been presented more effectively; secondly, it reveals that some ideas, or some methods of treatment might have been overlooked altogether."⁷¹

In summary Reid states that the critic "must take to heart his primary and inescapable responsibility . . . to interpret, to appraise, to evaluate."⁷²

The Idea Approach

Both Wrage and Croft emphasize the ideas within a speech act as the central focal point of speech criticism. However, their methods differ significantly.

Croft's method of analysis. Croft divides the materials for critical study into three groups. First, the critic examines facts and opinions which deal with the audience and the occasion. From these materials, the critic attempts to discover the historical context of the speech and the "nature of the listening and reading audience."⁷³ The second area consists of the "speaker's propositions as they occur in representative speeches."⁷⁴ These two areas

⁷¹Ibid., 421. ⁷²Ibid., 422. ⁷³283. ⁷⁴Ibid.

provide data which points to the third area, how the speaker connects his propositions to his audience. The critic's materials consist of "illustrations of the speaker's use of Aristotle's three modes of proof and of various doctrines of style, arrangement, and delivery."⁷⁵ On the basis of these materials, the critic analyzes, reports, interprets, and evaluates the speeches he has chosen for study.⁷⁶

Croft's method of evaluation. In the evaluative process, the critic attempts to answer two questions about the forms or techniques of the art. First, "What are the various levels of meaning implied by the form-content units in a speech--that is, what is the larger implicative meaning of the speech?"⁷⁷ Second, "What are the unique and relatively artistic ways in which a particular speaker manipulates rhetorical forms in order to imply these meanings?"⁷⁸

Ultimately the critic attempts to discover four things:

- (1) the basic values on which the speaker rests his specific proposals;
- (2) the specific proposals themselves;
- (3) the manner in which the speaker attempts to connect values with proposals in the mind of his audience;
- (4) the extent to which these connections were appropriate to the audience being addressed.⁷⁹

Wrage's method of analysis and evaluation. Wrage, whose primary concern is with what happens to ideas in the

⁷⁵Ibid. ⁷⁶Ibid. ⁷⁷Ibid., 285-86. ⁷⁸Ibid.

⁷⁹Ibid., 289.

"interaction between the individual mind of the speaker and the collective mind of the audience," does not present clear cut rubrics for the critic to follow.⁸⁰ Wrage advises the critic to have an idea-centered approach. Since content is the basic ingredient of the speech, and ideas, put into language, compose the content, then only by discovering the ideas can the critic evaluate the speech.⁸¹ The critic's next responsibility, Wrage submits, is to examine the "essence" of the idea, to determine its meaning and implication.⁸² Finally, the critic examines the audience as an index to the popular mind.⁸³ By examining the audience, the critic gains a perspective by which he can relate the essence of the idea to the process of interaction between the speaker, the audience, and the times.

Application of Findings

The preceding approaches to speech criticism guide the examination of the criticism of MacArthur's Address to Congress. These approaches provide a basis for determining the critic's point of view, his rationale, and his method.

In examining how the critic perceives the speech act, the following discussion attempts to discover if the critic focused (1) on the public man attempting to exert influence through speech, (2) on the complete organism of the speech

⁸⁰453.

⁸¹Ibid.

⁸²Ibid.

⁸³Ibid.

act, or (3) on the ideas within the speech act.

Upon determining the critical point of view, the description inquires into the critic's rationale on the basis of the following questions. (1) What is the analytic purpose of the criticism as determined by the critic's concentration on the speech for social data, pragmatic knowledge, literary insights, or philosophical discoveries? (2) Does the critic evaluate the speech act for its rhetorical effect or its rhetorical effectiveness? (3) What is the critic's goal as revealed by his attempt to add to or modify speech pedagogy, to contribute to the study of history, or to concentrate on changing or improving the theory of speech criticism through criticism?

Finally, the analysis inquires into the methodology of the critic by asking if the critic used the method of (1) a public man approach, (2) a complete organism approach, (3) an idea approach, or (4) a new approach to criticism.

The answers to these questions describe not only the criticism of the address but also its relationship to the theory with which scholars influence the practice of speech criticism.

CHAPTER III

ACADEMIC CRITICISM OF MACARTHUR'S

ADDRESS TO CONGRESS

The following examination describes the academic criticism of General Douglas MacArthur's address to Congress. These critical studies appear in The Quarterly Journal of Speech, speech textbooks, and graduate theses. The description of the criticism focuses upon the critical point of view, the rationale of the criticism, and the method of the criticism. The material for this discussion is organized first by category of publication. Within each category, material is arranged according to the date of publication.

Criticism in The Quarterly Journal of Speech

Haberman's Symposium

Six months after MacArthur's speech, The Quarterly Journal of Speech published Frederick Haberman's collection of critical comment which surveyed Congressmen, journalists, and five academic critics.¹ Haberman made only one request

¹"General MacArthur's Speech: A Symposium of Critical Comment," XXXVII (October, 1951), 321-31.

from his critics--"that the commentary be brief."² This thesis considers only those critics which Haberman labelled academic.

Brigance. In his brief commentary on the speech, William Norwood Brigance selected three areas for comment. In considering the setting of the speech, Brigance found justification for analysis. In its setting the speech was a "demonstration of public address as a force in a free society."³ Brigance then analyzed MacArthur's audience. Basically four groups composed the audience: a non-critical mass of people to whom MacArthur was an abused war hero, the Republicans who could unite behind MacArthur, the Democrats who were on the defensive, and "a few thinking critical people."⁴ After describing the speech, Brigance discovered two major issues: MacArthur's dismissal, and his claim to have had the support of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. On both of the issues Brigance felt that MacArthur "was probably wrong."⁵ Going further, Brigance stated, "In the immediate aftermath of the speech neither of these important issues counted for much. By this speech MacArthur had seized the initiative even as he had done by the audacious landing at Inchon."⁶ How MacArthur had seized the initiative by speaking on issues which had little immediate effect Brigance

²Ibid., 321. ³Ibid., 327. ⁴Ibid. ⁵Ibid. ⁶Ibid.

did not explain. However, this comment illustrated Brigance's concern for the "effect" approach as it related to public speaking as a major force "in a free society."

Wichelns. In keeping with his critical theory, Wichelns concentrated on the effect of the speech and the rhetorical principles which caused the effect. He viewed the speech as a "call for a harder and more aggressive policy."⁷ MacArthur's problem was whether or not to debate the issues or to suggest the "heads for debate."⁸ Wichelns observed that MacArthur chose not to debate. His rhetorical method then was not found in the argumentative force of his support for a stronger policy. Wichelns stated, "The chief support for that policy is neither logical argument nor emotional appeal, but the self-portrait of the speaker as conveyed by the speech."⁹ Amplifying this theme, Wichelns observed that "most of these passages have no argumentative force. But all together they set up for us the image of a leader of global vision, comprehending in his gaze nations, races, continents."¹⁰ Wichelns appraised the effect of the speech.

The housewife who "understood every word" was mistaken; she missed on epicenter and recrudescence and some others. But having by the fanfare been jarred into full attention, she understood quite well both the main proposition of the speech . . . and the main support offered. . . .¹¹

⁷Ibid., 328. ⁸Ibid. ⁹Ibid. ¹⁰Ibid., 328-9.

¹¹Ibid., 329.

Howell. Wilbur S. Howell approached the speech in an attempt to appraise the effectiveness or lasting quality of MacArthur's address. The prominent element within the speech which perhaps justified it as worthy of study was its emotional appeal. Howell noted, "No prominent speech of the post-war era has contained so strong an appeal to emotion as MacArthur's did."¹² However, in his analysis, Howell found fault with MacArthur's structuring of appeals. The emotional images of "America's fighting sons in Korea" created feelings of anguish and anxiety which clashed with "those which he was bent upon creating towards himself."¹³ Howell's next idea considered the ethical appeal of MacArthur's arguments. "Ethical ambiguities in his speech tend also to weaken the effect he wanted to have."¹⁴ Although Howell had not stated what effect MacArthur wanted to have, he felt certain that MacArthur's position on defending Asia--"we can dominate with sea and air power every Asiatic port from Vladivostok to Singapore"--conflicted with his position that Asia should be free.¹⁵

Considering MacArthur's logic, Howell observed, "MacArthur's speech tends to expand into propositions that are easy to grasp and hard to defend."¹⁶ Howell rejected his discounting the risk of war as an illogical assertion.

¹²Ibid. ¹³Ibid. ¹⁴Ibid. ¹⁵Ibid.

¹⁶Ibid., 330.

On the basis of these considerations, Howell appraised the effectiveness of MacArthur's speech: "Thus it may happen that, with the applause now over and done with, the General's thesis will seem less and less attractive as time goes on."¹⁷

Ewbank. Henry Ewbank, like Howell, attempted to appraise the effectiveness of MacArthur's oratory. Ewbank saw the speech as part of a "great debate" on United States foreign policy. Summarizing the speech, he discovered that "in the main, MacArthur stuck to the issues, labelled his opinions as such, avoided ad hominem attacks, and presented his case with poise and dignity."¹⁸ For the basis of determining the quality of the address, Ewbank analyzed the speech according to Rudolf Flesch's criteria for readability and human interest.¹⁹ From this objective analysis, Ewbank discovered that "the style is uneven."²⁰ According to Ewbank, readability was difficult, and human interest bordered between mildly interesting and interesting on Flesch's scale. Ewbank's conclusion created some doubt as to the meaning of effectiveness. "In many ways this was, and is,

¹⁷Ibid. ¹⁸Ibid.

¹⁹Ibid. Ewbank explained Flesch's criteria: "He [Flesch] has devised two scales: one measuring 'ease of reading,' the other 'human interest.' The reading score is based on sentence length and the number of syllables per hundred words. . . . The human interest score is based on the percentage of 'personal words' and 'personal sentences.'"

²⁰Ibid.

a great speech. But it will not find an enduring place in our literature as a model of speech composition."²¹

Baird. Baird appraised MacArthur's speech as adequately fulfilling "the speaking demands of the situation, with its expectancy of powerful eloquence that should exist 'in the man, in the subject, and in the occasion.'"²² Considering the man, Baird observed that the speech "in spite of its logical texture, was primarily personal and ethical-- a vindication of . . . intellectual integrity, wisdom, and good will."²³ MacArthur's understanding of Asia, his sympathy for the Asiatic people, and his assertions about himself "strongly enforced his assumptions about his own character."²⁴ To project this character, Baird discovered that MacArthur relied upon his qualities of delivery. Baird described MacArthur's bearing, movements, and gestures as "heroic."²⁵ His voice was self-confident, convincing, stern, scornful, and righteous. The speech was not perfect, it had limitations. "His sonorous delivery, occasional volative phrasing, and calculated peroration were defects due to Asian rather than to Attic style."²⁶ Baird's evaluation concerning the relative quality of MacArthur as a speaker left the reader in some doubt as to the meaning of the statement that

²¹Ibid., 331. ²²Ibid. ²³Ibid. ²⁴Ibid.

²⁵Ibid. ²⁶Ibid.

"General Douglas MacArthur will be ranked as one of America's outstanding military orators."²⁷

Wylie

Philip Wylie's article, "Medievalism and the MacArthurian Legend," was the second critical commentary of MacArthur's speech presented by The Quarterly Journal of Speech.²⁸ Wylie's article was one of finding fault with MacArthur's oratory. He offered no justification for the study, and presented little criteria for making decisions. Wylie began, "MacArthur spoke--and a week later no one could accurately recall a paragraph."²⁹ Empirical data to support this assertion was lacking in Wylie's study. Wylie proceeded to examine the basic organization of MacArthur's arguments noting contradictions and asking for documentation. In Wylie's language, MacArthur

began with a homily on the psychology of Oriental peoples wherein he soon commenced to contradict himself. He next recommended a defensive system in the Pacific similar to the one which had calamitously failed when he was in command of it. He followed with a report on Japan which, in view of naked fact, sounded like quotations from Pollyanna.³⁰

Wylie expressed his disappointment in MacArthur's style in the following statement. "Nothing for school

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ XXXVII (December, 1951), 473-78.

²⁹ Ibid., 473. ³⁰ Ibid.

children to remember appeared in the speech."³¹ Wylie next condemned MacArthur for not living up to the expectations of his audience. "Millions," Wylie asserted, "expected MacArthur to show the way out of the 'Korean mess.'"³² For the solutions which MacArthur did suggest, Wylie attached the label of "hogwash."³³ Wylie then expanded his critical essay into an attack against MacArthur's specific ideas. He suggested that no one could, as MacArthur had attempted, project upon the future of Japan. From this argument he concluded, "In the longer range of time, Japan's plight seems hopeless."³⁴ Wylie attacked MacArthur for ignoring Europe and the Near East. Through his insight into the meaning of MacArthur's language, Wylie noted, "He called the crisis 'global' but the globe, ~~to~~ MacArthur, is limited to the area he knows [Asia]."³⁵ Wylie then expounded on his personal fears which he felt MacArthur had ignored.

If he were a man of imagination and insight--rather than to exploit the confused causes of distant Asia he might well have chosen to discuss the failures of Congressional leaders to prepare the American people for atomic bombardment.³⁶

As a speaker, according to Wylie, MacArthur failed to substantiate his ideas, used specious logic, ignored his audience, and failed to discover the central issue of the times, thus "sabotaging the best opportunity for a speech

³¹Ibid., 474. ³²Ibid. ³³Ibid. ³⁴Ibid.

³⁵Ibid., 475. ³⁶Ibid.

ever offered in history."³⁷ In the end, Wylie cooled his attack, and aligned himself with the critical ideas of Baird. "The only praise an honest man can give the address is that it was well-delivered."³⁸ Wylie then noted something which his criticism had failed to consider. "The important aspect is the impact of MacArthur himself upon so many of his fellow citizens."³⁹

Beall

In February, 1952, The Quarterly Journal of Speech presented, for scholarly examination, Paul Beall's rebuttal to Wylie's attack on MacArthur.⁴⁰ From the title of the essay, the student of rhetoric would have difficulty identifying the article as rhetorical criticism. Beall established the tone of his approach early in the essay. "I felt Wylie's piece to be an opinionated rout, hogwash (since he finds that euphemism a meaningful critical term) or even sheep dip."⁴¹

Beall stated his goal as an introduction to the evidence. "My rebuttal thesis is that the General's address will become an English language classic--even a world classic in oratory."⁴² Beall identified his motives as being based

³⁷ Ibid., 476. ³⁸ Ibid., 478. ³⁹ Ibid.

⁴⁰ "Viper-Crusher Turns Dragon-Slayer," XXXVIII, 51-6.

⁴¹ Ibid., 51-2. ⁴² Ibid., 52.

on "the fact that I sympathize with the General."⁴³ From this point Beall presented two critical observations. First he examined MacArthur's style. "I am nonetheless confident that MacArthur's high emotional periods meet Quintilian's ideal."⁴⁴ Beall presented no evidence. Second, Beall examined the logical construction of the speech. "A careful reading shows the whole argument of the speech to be logical."⁴⁵ Again, he presented no evidence. From this data Beall concluded with findings that were highly consistent with his introductory announcement. "A great man delivered a significant message on a memorable occasion. Surely the speech will not be forgotten in the years to come."⁴⁶

Criticism in Speech Textbooks

Baird

MacArthur's address has not received much critical attention in speech texts and speech anthologies. Baird included the speech and a brief introductory essay in his Representative American Speeches, 1951-1952.⁴⁷ In a prefatory note, Baird commented, "The brief ^{ro}introduction accompanying each speech aims to give the background and some suggestions of a critical examination of the speaker

⁴³Ibid. ⁴⁴Ibid., 53. ⁴⁵Ibid. ⁴⁶Ibid., 56.

⁴⁷(New York: H. W. Wilson Company, 1952).

and speech."⁴⁸ The basic approach which Baird took in this "suggestion of critical examination" was to direct his analysis toward the effect of the speech. Baird began by outlining the basic issues which influenced the speech.

- (1) Was General MacArthur guilty of insubordination?
 (2) Was the President in this case justified in using his constitutional authority over the military? (3) Should the military power be concentrated chiefly in Europe or in the Orient? (4) Should the limited Korean War be continued, or should a global war be risked?⁴⁹

Baird summarized the way in which he felt MacArthur dealt with these issues.

The analysis and arguments were carefully composed to give maximum logical and persuasive effect. The organizational pattern was well executed. . . . The speech moved to a striking climax of thought, language, and presentation.⁵⁰

Concerning the speaker and his actions within the situation, Baird repeated his previous discovery, that in movement and gesture, MacArthur was "heroic."⁵¹ As a result of these heroic techniques combined with MacArthur's mastery of the arts of persuasion, Baird noted the effect of the speech: "The nation was deeply stirred."⁵²

Ehninger

Douglas Ehninger's study of MacArthur's address was a detailed description of the speech act accompanied by a few

⁴⁸Ibid., p. 3. ⁴⁹Ibid., p. 21. ⁵⁰Ibid.

⁵¹Ibid. ⁵²Ibid.

selected critical comments.⁵³ He also provided an analysis of the speech text, noting units of organization, identifying transitional material, and labelling appeals. Ehninger began his analysis by describing President Truman's dismissal of MacArthur, world reaction, and Congressional reaction. He followed this with an account of MacArthur's triumphal return to the United States and a description of the speech setting in Congress and the immediate and national audience. Concerning MacArthur's ability to orally communicate to his audience, Ehninger noted, "As all reports agree, from his first words he was in complete control of the speaking situation."⁵⁴ Concerning the "heroic" manner of MacArthur's delivery, Ehninger observed, "Poised and alert, he read slowly and in a low voice. . . . Except when turning the pages of his manuscript, the General's hands were anchored firmly to the sides of the lecturn."⁵⁵

In discussing the speech, Ehninger pointed to MacArthur's initial moment of ethical contact with his listeners, "by referring to the historic place in which his address is being delivered."⁵⁶ In developing his arguments, MacArthur "relies almost exclusively upon his own ethical proof to

⁵³"MacArthur's Address to Congress," The Speaker's Resource Book, Carroll C. Arnold, Douglas Ehninger, and John C. Gerber, editors (Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1961), pp. 273-80.

⁵⁴Ibid., p. 274. ⁵⁵Ibid. ⁵⁶Ibid., p. 275.

establish the validity of his conclusions."⁵⁷ By examining the movement of ideas within the body of the speech, Ehninger discovered that "the overall plan of the body of the address is gradually to narrow the listener's focus of attention."⁵⁸ In so doing MacArthur moved from a general consideration of world events to a social survey of Asia, to the strategic Pacific area, and finally to the Korean War itself. Throughout, MacArthur amplified his discourse on the basis of his ethical appeal. Ehninger showed no concern for the effect of the speech. Instead, he concentrated on MacArthur's ability to construct and communicate ideas within the context of the complete speech event.

Criticism in Graduate Theses

Concerning the significance of speech criticism in the graduate school, Albert Croft commented, "As criticism in the graduate school goes, so goes rhetorical theory and teaching."⁵⁹

Shoemaker

In 1955, Kenneth Shoemaker presented his thesis, "Analysis and Evaluation of Douglas MacArthur's Use of Emotional Appeal in His Speech 'Don't Scuttle the Pacific,'"

⁵⁷Ibid. ⁵⁸Ibid.

⁵⁹"The Functions of Rhetorical Criticism," The Quarterly Journal of Speech, XLII (October, 1956), 291.

Given Before a Joint Session of Congress, April 19, 1951."⁶⁰

In investigating MacArthur's emotional proof, Shoemaker examined the speaker, the speech, and the occasion. In formulating standards of judgment, and establishing an objective evaluation, Shoemaker followed the process suggested by Thonssen and Baird.⁶¹ Shoemaker's ultimate goal was to determine the effect of the oratory, although he used the terms "effect" and "effectiveness" interchangeably. With effect as his goal, Shoemaker's critical function was "to focus attention on his [MacArthur's] use of 'pathos' in his attempt to reach his audience."⁶²

In examining the speaker's background, Shoemaker sketched a biography of MacArthur. Only twice did he imply relationships between MacArthur's background and his speaking. He noted that MacArthur obtained the qualities of "sentimentality, practicability, emotional control, and pride" from his mother.⁶³ Shoemaker later identified these same qualities as being present in MacArthur's ethical and emotional appeals. The second implication which Shoemaker made concerned MacArthur's homecoming success and his speaking success. Again the relationship was only implicit.

⁶⁰(unpublished Master's thesis, Bowling Green University, 1955).

⁶¹Lester Thonssen and A. Craig Baird, Speech Criticism (New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1948), p. 9.

⁶²p. 4. ⁶³Ibid., p. 13.

Shoemaker agreed with Brigance's classification of MacArthur's audience.⁶⁴ He then attempted to show how MacArthur used "pathos" to reach his audience. Before proceeding, he warned the reader:

It is not the function of the speech critic to judge as to the relative right or wrong of the actions or convictions involved, but rather to determine the effectiveness of the speaker in satisfying the purpose of the occasion.⁶⁵

In establishing the effect of MacArthur's pathos, Shoemaker identified MacArthur's ethical character as the vehicle for transmitting the emotional feelings. According to Shoemaker, MacArthur transmitted his appeals by "indicating to his listeners an attitude of deep humility and respect and attempting to remove barriers of suspicion and hostility. . . ." ⁶⁶ As a result the speaker "extremely impressed" the audience.⁶⁷ In another respect the transmission was not as effective. "He does, however, fail fundamentally to identify himself properly with his audience's problems in that they seem to be looking for a solution to peace which he does not offer."⁶⁸ Even though the vehicle was working, the content of the appeals was inadequate to fully meet what Shoemaker felt were the expectations of the audience.

Shoemaker, examining the content of the speech, noted that MacArthur devoted much time to the background material

⁶⁴See above, p. 49. ⁶⁵Pp. 35-6.

⁶⁶Ibid., p. 44. ⁶⁷Ibid., p. 43. ⁶⁸Ibid., p. 59.

on Asia.⁶⁹ This phenomena, Shoemaker did not explain. MacArthur's evidence consisted of "some eighty assertions which express his opinion" with little or no documentary support.⁷⁰ In discovering this evidence, Shoemaker explained, "It shall not be the function of this thesis to determine the truth of this evidence, but rather to point out its existence."⁷¹ Whether MacArthur's statements had the potency of truth behind them or not, Shoemaker concluded that "the speech would probably have been more convincing from a logical point of view, if he had referred to numerous well known authorities who shared his opinions."⁷²

Before appraising the effect of the speech, Shoemaker made two general observations. The first concerned the purpose of the speech in relation to the appeals used.

One observes that MacArthur's main purpose was to present an "apologia" strongly supported by "pathos". He successfully presented his self-portrait in defense of his actions and indeed carried the emotions of his audience in carrying out his task.⁷³

The second observation related to MacArthur's use of appeals in attempting persuasion. "We may say that he relied primarily on his ethical and emotional appeal rather than [sic.] factual support in attempting to convince his audience."⁷⁴ Since Shoemaker did not evaluate the truth of MacArthur's arguments, the meaning of this observation was vague. On the

⁶⁹Ibid., p. 72. ⁷⁰Ibid., p. 74. ⁷¹Ibid.

⁷²Ibid., p. 76. ⁷³Ibid., p. 61. ⁷⁴Ibid., p. 77.

basis of Shoemaker's previous data this observation implied only that MacArthur relied on ethical and emotional appeal rather than documentary support.

In appraising the effect of the speech, Shoemaker surveyed the findings in Newsweek, the New York Times, Time, and U.S. News, noting public approval and disapproval. In considering the long range effect, Shoemaker agreed with Karl Wallace's idea that the critic was too close to the object to assess long range effect.⁷⁵

Moses

In 1958, Mrs. Bryant Moses presented her thesis, "Representative Speaking of Douglas MacArthur, General of the Army, During Various Phases of His Life."⁷⁶ One of the "phases" included MacArthur's appearance before Congress. Moses' stated purpose was to make an objective analysis, including all of the elements of the speech situation-- the speaker, the speech, the audience, and the occasion.⁷⁷ A secondary purpose also guided Moses to study MacArthur.

⁷⁵"On Criticism of the MacArthur Speech," The Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXXIX (February, 1953), 70. Wallace states, ". . . a critic is unwise to assign to a contemporaneous product values which can best be assessed, if at all, by history. Let him [the critic] be content with recording such facts as he can about the immediate reaction to a speech and let the critic of tomorrow try to decide whether an oration or an orator has become classic."

⁷⁶(unpublished Master's thesis, The University of Virginia, 1958).

⁷⁷Ibid., p. 2.

"Did the alleged effectiveness of his speeches radiate from the vocal attributes of the man himself," she pondered, "or might there be, embodied within the cold texts of the speeches, some new rhetorical techniques that scholars should be aware of?"⁷⁸

After briefly describing the events in MacArthur's life leading up to his Congressional address and analyzing his techniques of delivery, the critic concluded, "The eminence of General Douglas MacArthur stems from two factors: unexcelled military prowess and masterful oratorical skill."⁷⁹ Moses asserted that MacArthur was a persuasive speaker because he fulfilled the requirements set up by Henry Ewbank and J. Jeffery Auer in Discussion and Debate: Tools of a Democracy.⁸⁰ By viewing MacArthur in the perspective of these criteria, Moses did not discover some new rhetorical techniques of which scholars should be aware. What Moses did discover was, (1) "General MacArthur is an orator of great weight," and (2) "he is worthy of further investigation."⁸¹

How Consistent Were the Critics?

Marie Hochmuth Nichols, in Rhetoric and Criticism, remarked, "It may well be that our critics have not settled

⁷⁸Ibid. ⁷⁹Ibid., p. 87.

⁸⁰(New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Incorporated, 1951), pp. 248-50.

⁸¹p. 88.

on a fundamental purpose for doing critical studies."⁸² The criticism of MacArthur's speech illustrated that no one fundamental purpose directed the criticism. The critics selected several ways of approaching the speech act.

The Critical Point of View

Focus on the public man. Brigance, Wichelns, Ewbank, Baird, Shoemaker, and Moses directed their attention specifically to MacArthur as a public man attempting to exert his influence through public speaking. This showed concern for the influential position of MacArthur as a man capable of directing public opinion..

Focus on the complete organism. Wylie, Beall, and Ehninger focused more on the complete organism of the speech act. Although Wylie and Beall both saw MacArthur as the central element of the act they expanded their analysis. Ehninger presented the broadest overview of the act. He viewed the elements of the act as equal entities within a complete process. His analysis of the speaker, audience, and occasion emphasized the events which occurred more than the effects which MacArthur caused. Ehninger's analysis of the speech concentrated more on a method of speaking for a particular occasion rather than upon MacArthur attempting to speak on specific issues for specific purposes.

⁸²(Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1963), p. 72.

Focus on ideas. Howell was the only critic to limit his focus specifically to the ideas of the speech. Although he concentrated on the public man, his attention was on the public man's ideas and how those ideas related to the audience and the problems at hand.

The Rationale of Criticism

Standards of evaluation. All of the critics, either directly or indirectly, presented standards of evaluation by appraising either the rhetorical effect, the rhetorical effectiveness, or both as they occurred in the speech act.

Brigance, Wichelns, Shoemaker, and Moses predicated their evaluations upon the rhetorical effect of MacArthur's speaking. In these studies the critics evaluated the response of the audience to MacArthur's appeals and the significance of that response.

Howell, Ewbank, Wylie, and Beall attempted to evaluate the rhetorical effectiveness of MacArthur's discourse. Their evaluations of the quality of the address reflected differences in critical taste. Wylie saw nothing of quality in the speech. Howell and Ewbank saw the speech as significant but not enduring eloquence. Beall accepted the speech as a world classic in oratory. These differences stemmed from the critic's application of the critical standards rather than from the standards themselves.

Baird and Ehninger considered both the effect and the effectiveness of MacArthur's oratory. The audience response

accounted for the effect of the speech. Ehninger concentrated on MacArthur's invention and arrangement of ideas to determine the speech's quality. Baird generalized from MacArthur's total performance to determine the value of the speech.

Purposes of analysis. All of the studies, regardless of their accuracy or detail, reflected a concern for preserving data which reflected the social purpose of criticism. Haberman's symposium and Baird's edition of the speech provide the historian with first-hand responses and a critical text edition of the speech. However, other purposes were influential in several of the analyses.

Haberman, Ehninger, and Baird revealed pragmatic purposes in their studies. Haberman provided studies which reflected various approaches to speech criticism. Ehninger's study concentrated on providing an exemplary model of speech criticism. Baird's critical edition of the speech provided a suggested approach to the study of the address.

Ewbank was the only academic critic to treat the literary aspect of the speech as a major element in his analysis. As a result his study provides more data on a method of criticism than on the object of the criticism.

The critics who considered aspects of MacArthur's logic or who looked upon their studies as systematized inquiries into truth, might have considered their work to have a philosophical purpose. However, these justifications

did not appear as a controlling purpose in any of the criticism and thus do not warrant further analysis.

Goals of criticism. In most of the studies, the nature of the content and conclusions pointed toward specific goals of the critic. The essays by Wylie and Beall do not reveal specific goals which fall into the categories of historical, pedagogical, or critical theory scholarship.

The studies by Brigance, Wichelns, Baird (in The Quarterly Journal of Speech), Howell, Shoemaker, and Moses implied an ultimate concern for discovering and adding to the history of public speaking.

Ehninger and Baird reflected pedagogical goals which were consistent with their pragmatic purposes of analysis. In editing the address for publication and providing critical analyses, both critics provided materials to direct an examination of the speech. Moses suggested that her study concerned discovering pedagogical principles, but no results appeared in her study.

Haberman and Ewbank presented studies which appeared to concentrate upon adding to the body of critical theory. Haberman's symposium provided the raw data for a comparative study of approaches to criticism. Ewbank's analysis of MacArthur's style demonstrated an empirical method of analysis applied to the object of criticism.

Results of the Critical Method

The public man approach. Did the critical point of view determine the method of the critic? Brigance, Wichelns, Baird, Ewbank, Shoemaker, and Moses focused on the public man, yet their method of criticism and their results differed significantly. Brigance saw the public man as being wrong, Wichelns saw MacArthur as a leader of global vision. Baird recognized in MacArthur an outstanding military orator. Ewbank perceived a poor speechwriter who spoke with poise and dignity. Moses stood in awe of the great orator, while Shoemaker looked upon MacArthur as being a deficient speaker.

Shoemaker was the only critic to analyze MacArthur's speech on the basis of the Roman canons of speech preparation and the Aristotelian modes of proof. Baird generalized on the quality of MacArthur's invention but concentrated primarily on his delivery, as did Moses. Ewbank, if the content of his critique indicated his choice of the major aspect of the speech, suggested that MacArthur's style was the key element of the critic's attention. Brigance analyzed the setting, the audience, and the major issues of the speech. Where Shoemaker found the emotional proof of the speech to be the major element, Wichelns discovered that MacArthur's ethical appeal was most significant.

The different analyses yielded different evaluations. The critics who had a favorable impression of the public man had a favorable evaluation of his speaking. Baird found the

speech to be "composed to give maximum logical" effect. Shoemaker evaluated the speech as logically inadequate. Baird appraised MacArthur's delivery as heroic and his style somewhat Asian. Ewbank, from his empirical data, evaluated the speech as mildly interesting. Shoemaker casually remarked on MacArthur's purpose; the other critics ignored it altogether. Unlike the critical theory, the critical point of view did not unify the critic's method with his perception of the act.

The complete organism approach. Wylie, Beall, and Ehninger focused on the speech as a complete organism. As in the public man approach, each critic saw the act in a different light and obtained conflicting results.

Each critic studied the speech on the basis of classical rhetoric as prescribed by the critical theorists. Ehninger presented the most extensive analysis of the major elements of the speech act, concentrating on the audience, occasion, and the speech. Wylie concentrated on discovering the means of persuasion which MacArthur did not use. Beall concentrated on labelling rhetorical elements in the speech.

Both Wylie and Beall based their evaluations of the speech upon their personal feelings toward the speaker and his ideas. Thus their evaluations were impressionistic and subjective. Ehninger, more cautiously, evaluated the speech on the basis of first-hand reports and the rhetorical structure of the speech. As a result, Ehninger drew fewer

conclusions than either Wylie or Beall but provided more insight into what occurred in the speech act. In contrast to Beall and Wylie, Ehninger followed a method of criticism based upon a critical point of view, reinforced by a rationale, and conducted according to principles of analysis and evaluation.

The idea approach. Howell was the only critic to focus upon the ideas of MacArthur's address. Howell's brief critique reflected the basic principles prescribed by Croft.

Howell attempted to discover the basic ideas and to identify the rhetorical method by which MacArthur related those ideas to his audience.

Howell attempted to show the relationship of the values of MacArthur's appeals to the values of his audience. Finding value-relevant contradictions in MacArthur's appeals, Howell rejected the ideas as being unsound.

Summary and Conclusions

The following similarities existed between the critical studies. All were concerned with the same speech. All were based on principles of classical rhetorical theory. None of the studies explicitly defined a predetermined method of criticism. All yielded noticeably different results.

The academic criticism of MacArthur's address to Congress illustrated the following principles. First, like approaches yielded unlike results. The critics working with

the public man approach and those working with the complete organism approach illustrated this point. Second, no two critics followed the same approach exactly. The differences between Baird's application and Wichelns' application of a commonly shared theory illustrated this principle. From these two generalizations, the criticism illustrated that the individual critic's unique application of his critical approach caused a difference in the results. Followed to its logical conclusion, this principle implies that unless two critics are identical, there can be no one approach to criticism. A unified approach to speech criticism would be of no value if it were not applied in a unified manner. Another principle which the criticism illustrated is that a critical method reinforces critical theory when the critic rigorously follows through the complete method. Howell and Ehninger provided through their studies examples of criticism which illustrated the theory of their methods. These two studies further indicated that there is no one method for the critic to follow.

The preceding criticism also implies that thorough criticism is goal-bound. Both Beall and Wylie presented no ostensible goals for their studies. As a result these studies provided little insight into the speech event.

A final aspect of the theory of criticism comes from the variance of opinions on the significant elements of the speech act. The critic's use of classical rubrics to guide his investigation was of reduced value in achieving

the goals of criticism if his analysis and evaluation of the speaker's application of the rubrics was subjective and impressionistic.

Scholars in speech criticism may question whether differences in criticism are good or bad. From the criticism of MacArthur's speech, differences in well-founded critical approaches appeared to have no adverse effect upon the validity of the criticism. Differences from poorly applied methods of criticism appeared to have added little to speech scholarship.

CHAPTER IV

JOURNALISTIC APPROACH TO SPEECH CRITICISM

As only a portion of the people labelled "speech teachers" actually work within the area of speech criticism, so only a portion of the people labelled "journalists" actually work within the area of reporting and evaluating public address. The next two chapters consider this group of journalists as they consider public speaking and as they criticize the art.

In the journalistic sense, "criticism" usually applies only to the literary and plastic arts.¹ Speech criticism is a term which has nebulous meaning for the journalist. Likewise, scholars in journalism have not formulated a theory of speech criticism. Journalism educators have recommended ways of reporting speech events, editors have advanced rationales for publishing analyses and evaluations of speeches, yet no attempt has yet produced a journalistic approach to speech criticism. The following chapter attempts to digest journalists' ideas about public speaking and to derive a journalistic approach to speech criticism. The materials include college

¹Roland E. Wolseley, Critical Writing for the Journalist (Philadelphia: Chilton Company, 1959), pp. 3-4.

texts on journalism, journalism school publications, journalism education journals, and statements made by editors of news publications. These materials provide data on the journalists' critical point of view, their rationale of criticism, and their method of criticism. The primary criterion for selection of material is: Does the journalist have something to say about public speaking and its relationship to journalism?

The Critical Point of View

In order to determine a journalistic critical point of view, the following analysis considers how journalists look at the speech act. Carey McWilliams, editor of The Nation, remarks, "We never evaluate speeches as speeches. . . . We will comment upon the content of the speech, but not on its form or matter."² Gilbert Harrison, editor and publisher of The New Republic, adds a similar point of view:

As individuals, we who write for The New Republic are probably as interested as anyone else in the mannerisms of a speaker. . . . But when it comes to writing about speeches in the magazine, I believe we are much more concerned with matter than manner.³

Journalism educator Warren Breed concurs with this critical point of view which focuses on speech content. He advises the reporter to discover why the speaker said what he said

²In E. Neal Clausen, "News Magazines as Sources of Rhetorical Criticism, 1948-1958" (unpublished Master's thesis, Southern Illinois University, 1959), p. 317.

³Ibid., p. 318.

and to note the reason for the speaker's arriving at his ideas.⁴ John Hohenberg, Professor of Journalism at Columbia University, also emphasizes the importance of the speaker's ideas as the central news element.⁵ Curtis MacDougall, in his text Interpretative Reporting, adds that the main emphasis in speech reporting should be upon what the speaker says.⁶

These concerns with message content illustrate a critical point of view which focuses on the ideas of the speech rather than upon the speaker and the other elements of the act. Differing points of view may exist, but they are not present in journalism literature.

The Rationale of Criticism

The following evidence provides insights into why journalists cover public speaking. Because the printed mass news media does not cover every public speech, the following discussion attempts to discover the journalistic standards for selection of speeches. On the basis of the standards for selection, the discussion inquires into the purpose of journalistic speech analysis and the goals of journalistic speech criticism.

⁴"Analyzing News: Some Questions for Research," Journalism Quarterly, XXXIII (Fall, 1956), 471.

⁵The Professional Journalist: A Guide to Modern Reporting Practice (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1960), p. 135.

⁶Fourth edition (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1963), p. 247.

Standards for Selection

In response to letters inquiring into the criteria for selecting speeches, news media editors and publishers provide relevant information. Joan Wharton, writing for the editors of Newsweek, notes, "We have no special policy regarding the coverage or selection of speeches. If we feel they are newsworthy, we report them, selecting the passages we feel are most significant."⁷ The editors of Time comment, "We cover those speeches which the editors consider newsworthy and of consequence to the course of world events."⁸ Edward K. Thompson, editor of Life, states that Life presents speech coverage when "the speech deals with important issues."⁹ McWilliams, speaking for The Nation, announces, "We comment on speeches only when we think they are of national significance."¹⁰

Two elements emerge from this survey. First, journalists handle speeches which, in the opinion of editors, are newsworthy. Second, journalists select speeches which editors judge to be of consequence, importance, or significance. From these two standards of selection, two questions arise.

⁷Letter dated February 2, 1966, in the files of William Jordan, Houston, Texas.

⁸Letter dated February 17, 1966, in the files of William Jordan, Houston, Texas.

⁹Letter dated January 12, 1965 [1966], in the files of William Jordan, Houston, Texas.

¹⁰Letter dated January 25, 1966, in the files of William Jordan, Houston, Texas.

First, what is a "newsworthy" speech? Second, from the journalists' point of view, what is the difference between "newsworthiness," "consequence," "importance," and "significance."

Journalists do not provide an explicit definition of a "newsworthy" speech. However, they provide extensive general definitions of "news" which are applicable to a definition of any newsworthy event. The following discussion which defines news also provides a basis for implying the journalistic purpose of analyzing public speaking.

Purposes of Analysis

Breed proposes a tentative definition of news. "News is the report of a recent event (or situation?) judged by newsmen to be worthy of publication for the interest and/or information of members of their audience."¹¹ The newsman makes his judgment on the basis of the following characteristics of the event: "recency, interestingness, accuracy, availability, saleability, superficiality, prudence, and significance."¹²

MacDougall concurs with Breed's concept when he writes, "Scholarly attempts to define news, for which the reporter is supposed to have a nose, correctly emphasize the fact that it is the account of an event, not the event itself."¹³

¹¹468. ¹²Ibid. ¹³13.

Other definitions of news add little to these general ideas. Following these definitions of news, a speech is newsworthy when the event has the qualities of recency, significance to the journalist's reading audience, and significance to the journalist's publication. Thus the national importance of a speech is a newsworthy element for a national publication; international consequence becomes newsworthy for an international publication. Newsworthiness of a speech then is the quality of the speech which corresponds to the purpose for which the publication exists.

Since the editors of news publications determine the selection of speeches, their purpose of analysis corresponds to their individual judgments. Arville Schaleben, managing editor of the Milwaukee Journal, amplifies this idea.

What you get in your daily newspaper is the product of hundreds and hundreds of judgements exercised by many, many men. Your newspaper is the product of the circumstances, the environment, the emotions, the education, the intellect and to some very large extent the physical stamina of reporters and editors.¹⁴

From such a field of uncontrollable variables, any purpose for journalistic speech analysis must be general enough to apply to the disparate purposes of the many publications. MacDougall suggests that there may be no absolute purpose which guides the journalist. "These news gatherers are men, not deities. They possess no absolute yardstick by which to

¹⁴"The News and You," in The Citizen and the News (Milwaukee: The Marquette University Press, 1962), p. 81.

judge what to report and what to ignore."¹⁵ If any yardstick does exist, as Schaleben suggests, it is far from absolute. He proposes that "the basic test of news is its usefulness to the reader."¹⁶ Here again the speech reporter must rely upon his own judgment, as MacDougall said, to analyze the speech event on the basis of his knowledge and experience.

Goals of Criticism

The goals of the journalistic speech critic are not explicitly stated in any theoretical form. They are implicit in the general principles of news reporting suggested by the journalists. This inference means that the goals of critical news coverage are also the goals of critical speech news coverage.

Hohenberg suggests that the goal of modern news coverage is to interpret the event. He describes interpretive reporting as including enough explanation and reasoning as is "necessary to public understanding."¹⁷ Breed comments, "The techniques of interpretive reporting are tantamount to those used by the trained scientific observer: historian, economist, sociologist, psychologist."¹⁸ Hohenberg feels that the trend is toward interpretive news reporting. "Most American editors today not only believe in interpreting the news but insist on it."¹⁹ According to journalism professor Hillier Krieghbaum, quality interpretive news coverage is

¹⁵P. 13. ¹⁶P. 82. ¹⁷P. 15. ¹⁸472. ¹⁹P. 15.

predominant only in the news magazines and the few newspapers which interpret weekly news. He concludes, "All have more interest in putting the news into perspective than most daily papers."²⁰ In a speech before the University of Minnesota Journalism School, newswriter John Fischer noted differences between the "better" newspapers and the news-magazines. He credited the newspapers with more complete coverage, the newsmagazine with more selective coverage. Illuminating the ultimate goal of quality journalism, Fischer suggested that "magazine journalism is only in part reporting the news. In part it also is recording and analyzing history as it is being made."²¹

The Method of Criticism

In describing the elements of the speech act worthy of the reporter's attention, journalism scholars provide the basic materials for a critical method. As noted previously, the journalists's primary concern is with the ideas which compose the speech. The following discussion outlines how journalism scholars suggest that the reporter analyze and evaluate the speech act.

²⁰Facts in Perspective (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Incorporated, 1956), p. 432.

²¹"Magazine and Newspaper Journalism: A Comparison," in The Press in Perspective, Ralph D. Casey, editor (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1963), p. 200.

Method of Analysis

Journalists recognize the basic elements of the speech act--speaker, speech, audience, and occasion. Concerning the speaker, Breed suggests that the reporter should identify the speaker, not only who he is but also who he was.²² MacDougall adds, "There is no substitute for adequate knowledge of both the speaker and his field of interest."²³ MacDougall also advises the reporter to examine "the speaker's attitude toward his subject as a whole."²⁴ Hohenberg is less precise. He states, "The speaker's name, the time and place of the meeting, the applause, the reason for the speaker's remarks, and similar details are scattered through the story where they logically belong."²⁵

Concerning the ideas in the speech, MacDougall feels that the main emphasis in speech reporting should be upon what the speaker says. "The reporter must follow the orthodox rule of important details first and must disregard the chronological order of a person's remarks. No good speaker ever makes his most important point in his introduction."²⁶ Breed says that the reporter should discover why the speaker said what he said. In so doing he should discover the reasons for the speaker's arriving at the ideas he presents.²⁷ Concerning the text of the speech, MacDougall warns the reporter who

²²471. ²³ P. 248. ²⁴Ibid., p. 247.

²⁵P. 135. ²⁶ P. 247. ²⁷471.

works with pre-released texts to note any deviations in order to safeguard against misquoting the speaker.²⁸

The audience and occasion claim little of the journalists' attention. Breed advises the reporter to examine the context of the situation, the forces at work, and the nature of the allegiances of the speaker and others involved with the speaker.²⁹

Method of Evaluation

Hohenberg presents a method of evaluation based upon selection and placement of details in the story. "In major speeches," he suggests, "a reporter has no alternative but to get the news at the top."³⁰ The reporter attempts to select the one most important element of the speech, develop that element into the "central news idea" and present that as his first sentence in the story.³¹ Here much is left to the reporter's own judgment to select and amplify what he considers to be the significant element of the speech event. MacDougall's approach, like Hohenberg's, provides no specific criteria for evaluation, but places the burden of evaluation upon the reporter.

Breed presents two general areas of evaluation. First he asks the reporter to base his evaluation on an explanation of why someone else did not say what the speaker said.

²⁸P. 248. ²⁹471. ³⁰P. 139. ³¹Ibid., p. 135.

³²471.

Second, he encourages evaluation on the basis of the discovery of "alternatives and the possible consequences of the speech and related acts."³²

Summary

For purposes of examining journalistic speech criticism, the preceding evidence indicates that the theoretical journalistic approach to criticism provides identifiable characteristics.

One factor determines the journalistic critical point of view. The speaker's ideas are the central element of attention. Other rhetorical elements--arrangement, delivery, and style--are only incidental in the critical focus.

Three principles determine the rationale of the criticism. The judgment of the editor determines the selection of speeches which journalists cover. Editors base their judgment on the value of the speech as it relates to the goals of the publication. The purpose of journalistic speech analysis is to provide the reading audience with useful information. The goal of journalistic speech criticism is to report, analyze, and record history as it is being made.

The critical method of handling speeches reflects a concern for the speaker and his significant ideas. The reporter relies on his own judgment in evaluating the speech.

³²471.

CHAPTER V

JOURNALISTIC CRITICISM OF MACARTHUR'S

ADDRESS TO CONGRESS

The purpose of this chapter is to describe how journalists, in selected news publications, criticized MacArthur's address to Congress.¹ Sources for this analysis are arranged into magazines and newspapers. Each source appears according to the alphabetical order of the title. This analysis attempts to describe how journalists criticized the speech. The major emphasis is on the elements of the speech which received evaluation. The journalists' non-evaluative reporting of the speech setting, description and identification of the speaker, and other related topics are noted but not analyzed.² The examination centers around three factors: the critical point of view, the rationale of the criticism, and the method of the criticism. By way of summary the study asks: How consistent were the journalists?

¹For justification of selection see Chapter I, pp. 12-15.

²For a description of speech reporting see H. Bruce Kendall, "The Reporting and Criticism of Speeches in Four Weekly Magazines" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Wisconsin, 1961).

Speech Criticism in News Magazines

Commonweal

Harold C. Hinton, writing for Commonweal, stated his reason for analyzing MacArthur's speech.³ "Quite apart from its merits as oratory, the speech was a clear summary of his views on some of the most important issues now confronting the United States, and it therefore deserves analysis."⁴ Regardless of what Hinton meant by "its merits as oratory," he saw the speech as a crucial statement of a point of view which was important to his audience. Hinton's basic concern was with MacArthur's development and support of ideas. He examined three areas of the speech upon which he drew a conclusion.

Hinton's first concern was with MacArthur's idea that Formosa was a crucial point for America's defense. Hinton saw the argument as a "straw man of his [MacArthur's] own invention. . . . General MacArthur overestimates the strategic importance of Formosa, . . . His concern for its safety is promoted mainly by his friendship for Chiang Kai-shek."⁵ Hinton next examined MacArthur's description of the passive Chinese. "I have spent the last five years studying modern Chinese history, but I cannot recognize in General MacArthur's

³"The MacArthur Argument," LIV (May 11, 1951), 111-12.

⁴Ibid., 111. ⁵Ibid.

self-contradictory description the country which I have been studying."⁶ For support Hinton suggested that the Taiping Rebellion which cost twenty million lives, and the countless wars of the Manchu Dynasty did not reflect a passive nation.

MacArthur's specific proposal for extending the war into China, Hinton viewed as a danger leading to world war. "Any such measures would give Mao-Tse-tung a pretext for invoking the Sino-Soviet mutual-defense alliance of February 14, 1950."⁷ MacArthur's proposal, he felt, overlooked the dangers of this alternative consequence. In conclusion Hinton stated, "General MacArthur's recommendations, it seems to me, must be rejected, on the ground that they are extremely dangerous and are founded on an inadequate understanding of Far Eastern political realities and popular psychology."⁸

Life

Life magazine presented three articles on MacArthur's speech. Two of the articles were interpretations of the speech event while an editorial presented a reaction to the ideas of the speech. Although Life did not formulate a justification for studying the speech in the articles, Editor Edward K.

Thompson provided the following explanation:

I don't think fiction could match the drama of a discharged general coming home to record-breaking acclaim, including an official appearance before a joint session of Congress. Any editor concerned at all with topical matters could

⁶Ibid. ⁷Ibid., 112. ⁸Ibid.

not fail to give this the full treatment. As to the speech, apart from the unprecedented circumstances under which it was delivered, it had everything--exposition of his views on the Far East generally and Korea in particular, what he considered wise advice and of course pathos. The prose was good and moving, the delivery effective.⁹

Critical news reports. The first article presented in Life gave an extensive description, complete with photographs, of MacArthur's return to the United States, his "record-breaking" receptions, and a brief interpretation of his delivery.¹⁰

Most Americans listened, and 30 million or more watched by television as he spoke, and they were magnetized by the vibrant voice, and the dramatic rhetoric and the Olympian personality of the most controversial military hero of our times.¹¹

The writer implied that he agreed with MacArthur's speech. His term "dramatic rhetoric" was somewhat ambiguous, but left a positive connotation.

In the article, "Challenge is Heard Around the World," the Life newswriter made note of the major idea of the speech, examined the intent of the speaker, and interpreted the intended effect of the speech.¹² After a survey of MacArthur's discussion of Asian history, Life commented, "He came directly

⁹Letter dated January 12, 1965 [1966], in the files of William Jordan, Houston, Texas.

¹⁰"An Old Soldier Fades Away into New Glory," XXX (April 30, 1951), 22-33.

¹¹Ibid., 23.

¹²XXX (April 30, 1951), 26-7.

to the major question--his recommendations for victory in Korea which had been rejected by the President."¹³ Victory in Korea, a worthy goal, replaced the "extremely dangerous" proposals suggested by Hinton and preceded an unworthy action, rejection "by the President." The writer was cautious in praise but precise in wording his favorable reaction to the proposal. Life took notice of MacArthur's intent. "His speech, as was plainly intended, had sharpened the division on strategy and initiated a new debate on foreign policy."¹⁴ The writer presented no evidence to show what MacArthur intended. Instead, he reasoned that the effect of the speech, "a new debate on foreign policy," was synonymous with the speaker's intent. In achieving his effect, MacArthur "had taken the arguments that concerned the very survival of the country out of the shadow of the secret files and forced them into public scrutiny."¹⁵ Again, the evaluation was subtle. MacArthur's actions corresponded with value-good ideas, national survival and public scrutiny, and overpowered the value-bad "shadow of the secret file."

Editorial. Life's editorial on MacArthur's address was less subtle than the news reports.¹⁶ The editorial writer began: "General MacArthur's task was to speak--'to tell us,' as Life said last week, 'what we ought to do, and why, and

¹³Ibid., 26. ¹⁴Ibid., 27. ¹⁵Ibid.

¹⁶"The Response to MacArthur," XXX (April 30, 1951), 34.

to challenge us to choose our course, now.' This he has done, in full and noble measure."¹⁷ Life predetermined MacArthur's purpose in speaking. MacArthur fulfilled that purpose; in so doing he presented a single idea of importance. "He defined the role--he told the country what it ought to do, what the course ought to be, and why--in a single sentence." General MacArthur said, "In war, . . . there is no substitute for victory."¹⁸ The conflict arose because of the Truman administration's denial of the necessity of victory. From this point of view Life saw MacArthur advocating the most desirable of two alternatives:

In the most skillful apology for President Truman's policies yet offered, Secretary Acheson stated the present conception very well last week when he said,

The great object of policy should be to prevent war. General MacArthur, had he been speaking of policy in the world struggle as Mr. Acheson was speaking of it, would undoubtedly have held that,

The great object of policy should be to insure victory. Victory without warfare, if possible. But victory--the defeat of an enemy dedicated to our defeat--however, whenever, and wherever it must be attained for the security of the U.S. and the peace of the world.¹⁹

Life saw MacArthur offering such a victory through his message to Congress. Life saw Truman rejecting such a victory through his dismissal of MacArthur--thus the cause for the speech. According to Life, MacArthur's speech was an expression of the value-good goal of victory. Without MacArthur's program Life saw the government allowing the

¹⁷ Ibid. ¹⁸ Ibid. ¹⁹ Ibid.

"enemy" to determine foreign policy.²⁰ Thus MacArthur's solution, as expressed in his speech, would prevent the enemy from determining United States policy and would ensure victory.

The Nation

The Nation presented two articles interpreting the significance of the ideas which MacArthur presented. The title of the first article described The Nation's interpretation of the effect of MacArthur's address. The article, "General Sows Confusion,"²¹ evaluated MacArthur's delivery, invention, and appraised the effect of his method. With some implied disdain for eloquence, the writer noted, "His speech was a highly polished performance [*italics mine*]."²² The writer observed MacArthur's use of language to further his persuasion. "Every sentence . . . appeared to have been carefully weighted. It skilfully ignored the constitutional issue" of subordination of the military to the civil government.²³ This last statement reflected The Nation's analysis of a central argument in the Truman-MacArthur debate. MacArthur, the writer implied, had the right to speak, but not the right to develop and present arguments for a proposal which could, constitutionally, come only from the civil

²⁰ Ibid. ²¹ CLXXII (April 28, 1951), 388-89.

²² Ibid., 388. ²³ Ibid.

authorities. Thus the result of MacArthur's invention was a skillful argument which ignored, without calling attention to itself, the political position of the speaker. Expanding upon MacArthur's discovery of ideas, the writer for The Nation noted, "The General's main thesis is that we are engaged in a war with Red China which must be fought to the limit, since 'in war there is no substitute for victory'-- a dictum with dubious moral and historical authority."²⁴ The journalist placed the burden of proof upon MacArthur to defend his position.

In commenting upon MacArthur's proposal for extending the war, The Nation observed that the General only implied that his measures would lead to a swift end of the war. Followed to their logical conclusions, The Nation felt that "his recommendations are based on several highly debatable assumptions," the least being Russian intervention into the war.²⁵ That MacArthur was effective, The Nation readily admitted. "The effect of his address has been to super-heat political passions . . . and . . . to divide 'Washington more profoundly than it has been divided at any time since the start of the cold war.'"²⁶

Willard Shelton, writing for The Nation, began his analysis by classifying MacArthur's address, then analyzing his delivery, and finally evaluating MacArthur's presentation

²⁴Ibid. ²⁵Ibid. ²⁶Ibid.

of ideas.²⁷ In classifying the speech, Shelton noted, "The speech before Congress, though purporting to be a statement on purely military matters by a professional military man, was a political address. It dealt with matters of high policy."²⁸ The policy, Shelton suggested, was parallel to Republican demands. Although in disagreement with MacArthur's ideas, Shelton admired MacArthur's delivery.

In a Congress where good oratory is rare, MacArthur's sonorous phrases were striking, and his resonant voice, magnificently controlled and sinking occasionally almost to a whisper, should have taught a few politicians the value of speaking softly as a means of getting attention.²⁹

Shelton did not directly clash with MacArthur's ideas. Instead he noted what MacArthur did not say.

The speech . . . was cunning. MacArthur did not specifically call for air attacks on Manchuria; he simply said he had asked permission to make "air reconnaissance." He did not dub our European allies knaves or cowards but confined himself to showing his resentment of criticism from "other countries."³⁰

Shelton did not specifically call for a rejection of MacArthur's proposal, he simply expanded upon MacArthur's ideas. Shelton summarized his views with a tone of national concern. "While the debate on which MacArthur has launched us will be prolonged and bitter, it will be an expression of our democracy."³¹

²⁷"MacArthur Joins the G.O.P.," CLXXII (April 28, 1951), 389-90.

²⁸Ibid., 388. ²⁹Ibid.

³⁰Ibid. ³¹Ibid., 390.

The New Republic

More than three months after MacArthur's Congressional address, The New Republic published an article, the title of which reflected that publication's attitude toward MacArthur-- "Newspapermen Say 'Fade Away.'"³² The New Republic gave little attention to MacArthur's speech. Their major concern with the speech concentrated on MacArthur's speaking and its effect upon Republican Congressmen.

You had to be there to feel and understand the intensification of partisan bitterness going on before your eyes. The emotionalism was such that Congressmen, particularly Republican House members, behaved like children, as they stamped and yelled. To them it must have seemed that at last they had a voice--sonorous, deep, flexible and dramatic.³³

For the writers in The New Republic, MacArthur's words counted for nothing. The speech event merely provided an occasion to air partisan differences, as their criticism stated, "it illustrated to us the profound truth that words that make one man weep merely give another man indigestion."³⁴ The New Republic's indigestion was only severe enough to evoke these two critical comments.

Newsweek

Newsweek provided comprehensive coverage of the speech in three articles. One article concentrated on the speech

³²Harold Ickes, CXXIV (July 30, 1951), 18.

³³"Washington Wire," CXXIV (April 30, 1951), 3.

³⁴Ibid.

in Congress, one on European response to the speech, and one presented an editorial analyzing the major area of controversy.

Critical news reports. In the article, "Emotion Wanes But the Issue Grows,"³⁵ Newsweek presented the Joint Chiefs of Staff viewpoint on MacArthur's proposals, background on the issues leading up to the speech, and background on MacArthur's reception. The major element of criticism in this article rested in the journalist's selection of significant portions of the speech for commentary. Noting the immediate action of the speech, Newsweek stated, "When he mentioned Formosa, Republicans clapped and shouted. The Democrats sat on their hands."³⁶ Commenting on the action of the speaker, Newsweek noted, "MacArthur stood erect, his left foot thrust a little forward. His voice was firm and resonant."³⁷ The writer for Newsweek discovered the major issue of the speech "past the midway point."³⁸ The major issue concerned the creation of a new war through United States military expansion. The most controversial issue of the speech, according to Newsweek, was MacArthur's implication that the Joint Chiefs of Staff were in agreement with his proposals. "The Democrats squirmed and looked at each other bewilderedly. Here was something they had not expected."³⁹ While the writer of this article made no attempt to evaluate the proposals, his

³⁵XXXVII (April 30, 1951), 17-22.

³⁶Ibid., 19. ³⁷Ibid. ³⁸Ibid. ³⁹Ibid., 20.

critical effort was primarily one of evaluating the speech to discover which ideas were most important and most controversial.

In the article, "MacArthur: Tribute Baffles Europe,"⁴⁰ Newsweek presented foreign reaction to the total speech event. In London,

the man on the street was clearly impressed by General MacArthur's magnificent delivery. . . . [But he] remained solidly convinced that bombardment of Manchuria, blockading of China, and especially the use of Chiang Kai-shek's troops were the surest means to racing headlong into a world war.⁴¹

In Paris there was little reaction to the speech, but according to officials, the people disagreed with MacArthur.⁴² The official source remained unidentified. In Germany the speech received negligible attention.⁴³ Although there was little direct evaluation of the speech in this article, the negative reaction of the Europeans corresponded with the critical attitude of Newsweek editorial writer Ernest K. Lindley.⁴⁴

Editorial. Lindley's editorial approached MacArthur's speech for a consideration of what the previous article had labelled "the most controversial" issue--whether MacArthur had the support of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Lindley made note of MacArthur's qualifying phrase and titled his editorial,

⁴⁰XXXVII (April 30, 1951), 35-6.

⁴¹Ibid., 35. ⁴²Ibid., 35-6. ⁴³Ibid., 36.

⁴⁴"The 'Military Standpoint,'" XXXVII (April 30, 1951), 26.

"The 'Military Standpoint.'" He proceeded by analyzing the speech as a reflection of MacArthur's "military standpoint."

Among the underlying questions raised by General MacArthur's address to Congress are these: In the making of great decisions in war or involving the risk of war, should only the "military standpoint" be considered? If so, where is the dividing line between military considerations and those of diplomacy and international politics?⁴⁵

In discussing the first question, Lindley referred to the Kaiser's fatal mistake in World War I, which was based on "military standpoint" and failed to allow for United States intervention.⁴⁶ Lindley adapted this argument to MacArthur's proposals.

A plan for defeating Red China which fails to take account of its probable effects on our Allies, on more or less friendly neutrals, and on our most powerful enemy cannot conceivably be regarded as sound from any viewpoint, military or otherwise.⁴⁷

Thus Lindley evaluated MacArthur's proposal as unfeasible.

Time

Time magazine's coverage of MacArthur's address was an attempt to reconstruct the total speech event.⁴⁸ Within this approach, Time developed one article which evaluated MacArthur's delivery, elements of organization, and elements of invention for the purpose of appraising the immediate effect of the speech. The unique factors of MacArthur's

⁴⁵Ibid. ⁴⁶Ibid. ⁴⁷Ibid.

⁴⁸"Old Soldier," LVII (April 30, 1951), 21-6.

delivery attracted the admiration of Time's writer.

Douglas MacArthur spoke with a native eloquence that the nation had not heard in years, without bombast or gesture [*italics mine*]. The resonant voice sometimes rasped, sometimes sank almost to a whisper, but never rose from a low, confident pitch.⁴⁹

Concerning MacArthur's organization, Time made two observations, one about the effectiveness of his introductory appeals and one concerning his conclusion. "In his first ten minutes, he disarmed critics who accused him of ignoring Europe, or of wanting to reimpose a discredited past upon Asia."⁵⁰ Although not labelling this device as such, the writer implied discovery of an effective common ground technique. MacArthur's conclusion, according to Time, "was a spine-tingling and theatrical climax, audaciously beyond the outer limits of ordinary present-day oratory."⁵¹ Whether this was good or bad, the writer did not say. Time's news-writer saw the speech as an appeal for Republican support. However, Time did not ascribe political intent to the speaker.

Since the war, said MacArthur, the U.S.'s strategic frontier has shifted to embrace the whole Pacific. . . . [Thus] "under no circumstances must Formosa fall under Communist control." Republicans applauded wildly. On the Democratic side, members were stolidly silent.⁵²

Outside of praising and appraising MacArthur's use of certain rhetorical devices, the writer for Time was slow

⁴⁹Ibid., 21. ⁵⁰Ibid. ⁵¹Ibid., 23. ⁵²Ibid., 21.

to reveal a position on the controversial issues. However, when the journalist discussed MacArthur's comments regarding the Joint Chiefs of Staff, he subtly disagreed with MacArthur. In his analysis of the "Joint Chiefs of Staff argument," the newswriter carefully pinpointed what MacArthur actually said and what he implied.

Strictly speaking, MacArthur was dead right. In fact, the four steps he urged had been lifted from a J.C.S. [Joint Chiefs of Staff] proposal which had been sent him in Tokyo for comment. But whereas the J.C.S. had used the term "air reconnaissance", MacArthur went on to urge the right to "destroy . . . enemy bases north of the Yalu" and in this he did not claim that the J.C.S. supported him, whatever the headlines, editorial writers or hasty orators said in the next 24 hours.⁵³

Time's article read like an apology for the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The writer continued his defense of the military advisory board with a direct suggestion. "But the qualifications in MacArthur's speech on which the J.C.S. is likely to base its explanations to Congress is the phrase 'from a military standpoint.' The J.C.S. like MacArthur saw no military end to the Korean war."⁵⁴ Thus the journalist, in reporting the speech, attempted not only to record what was said but also to clarify the meaning of the possible implications of what was not said. The effect of the speech, from Time's viewpoint, concerned partisan interests. "In the first heady aftermath of MacArthur's speech, many a Republican chorused praise ('magnificent,' 'tremendous') without apparently

⁵³Ibid., 26. ⁵⁴Ibid.

realizing all that MacArthur had said."⁵⁵ The writer recalled that the Republicans had not been in favor of the police actions they termed "Truman's War."⁵⁶

Speech Criticism in Newspapers

New York Times

On the day following MacArthur's Address to Congress, the New York Times printed two articles which critically evaluated MacArthur's speech. One was a front page news story, the other was an unsigned editorial. Both articles concentrated on the speech issues.

Critical news report. New York Times newswriter James Reston justified his discussion of the speech by noting the importance of the effect of the address.⁵⁷ He stated, "General of the Army Douglas MacArthur's address has divided Washington more profoundly than it has been divided at any time since the start of the 'cold war.'"⁵⁸ Reston's approach was to discover the issues upon which the division rested and to explain the meaning of those issues in MacArthur's address. Reston was careful not to disclose the source of his information. "The division now rests,

⁵⁵Ibid., p. 24. ⁵⁶Ibid.

⁵⁷"Profound Division in Capital Caused by General's Speech," April 20, 1951, pp. 1, 7.

⁵⁸Ibid., p. 1.

officials here believe, on these issues:" (1) Would bombing of Manchuria bring Russia into the war? (2) Would bombardment impede victory? (3) Should the United States send major re-enforcements to Korea and to blockade China? (4) Is Formosa essential? (5) Can the United States more effectively protect both Europe and Asia? (6) Can United States strategy be discussed without reference to NATO? and (7) Did the Joint Chiefs of Staff approve of MacArthur's strategy?⁵⁹ Reston felt that the first six issues relied on the probity of the seventh issue. On this basis he made note of two qualifications in the speech.

On careful examination of his text, two important qualifications were apparent.

First, he did not say that the Joint Chiefs approved his proposal to destroy the Communist bases above the Yalu River in Manchuria. And second, he did not attribute to the Joint Chiefs approval of all his views on Formosa.⁶⁰

Reston observed that MacArthur qualified his proposals, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff's approval of his proposals, "from a military standpoint."⁶¹ Reston then pointed to what he felt was the purposeful implication of the way in which MacArthur structured his argument.

This was said in such a way, however, that it gave the impression that the issues that led to the general's dismissal were not really between General MacArthur and the Government, but really between him and the Joint Chiefs on one hand and the President on the other.⁶²

⁵⁹Ibid., pp. 1, 7. ⁶⁰Ibid., p. 7. ⁶¹Ibid.

⁶²Ibid.

This then was the way in which MacArthur handled the arguments which he selected to present. Reston commented on MacArthur's failure to discover the best available arguments.

Therefore, to state the principle of global planning without taking into account the opposition to his strategy of the whole European coalition and most of the Asiatic free world seemed to officials here tonight to be an unfortunate oversight.⁶³

Reston also made note of the fact that MacArthur's arguments were not in accord with the arguments of his new-found supporters, the Republicans. Republicans who had been critical of the United States' foreign policy now rallied around a champion who favored extending the war. On one issue, Reston could find no argument. "On one point, there was almost unanimous agreement here, and that was that General MacArthur was putting forward an entirely sincere argument."⁶⁴ Reston clearly indicated that even though he disagreed with MacArthur's ideas, he admired the speaker's sincerity. In concluding his evaluation of the speech, Reston added perspective to his initial analysis of the effect of MacArthur's speech. Initially, MacArthur, through his address, had caused a marked division in Congress. By advancing the cause of war and receiving national support for that cause, Reston felt that "the MacArthur speech has now put it [the Truman Administration] in a position where any negotiation will be extremely difficult."⁶⁵

⁶³ Ibid.

⁶⁴ Ibid.

⁶⁵ Ibid.

Editorial. In the editorial "The Speech to Congress" the New York Times presented an interpretation of MacArthur's speech which contradicted the interpretation made by Reston.⁶⁶ The editorial writer commented, "In an eloquent and deeply moving speech . . . MacArthur yesterday clarified his views on the Far Eastern situation."⁶⁷ In evaluating MacArthur's views, the writer concentrated on the image which MacArthur attempted to project upon his audience. "He spoke . . . as an American who is trying to serve his country. The speech bore out that claim."⁶⁸ As an American, MacArthur attempted to identify himself and his proposals with the values of his audience. The editorial writer observed, through MacArthur's general appeals, how he achieved this identification. He noted that MacArthur, like "most Americans," saw the United States in a global struggle against Communism. Like most Americans, MacArthur felt that the United States must stop aggression. Like most Americans, the writer noticed, MacArthur was also against appeasement. These value-good qualities were combined finally in the speaker who dissociated himself from Left Wing appeasers and from Right Wing Europe-first Westerners.⁶⁹ Apparently, the writer did not believe everything he read in the newspaper, even his own newspaper, for he concluded, "By making this clear, General MacArthur has

⁶⁶ April 20, 1951, p. 28.

⁶⁷ Ibid. ⁶⁸ Ibid. ⁶⁹ Ibid.

performed a service which should help to unify this country and the rest of the free world."⁷⁰

Wall Street Journal

The Wall Street Journal, after presenting a non-interpretive news report on MacArthur's address, developed an editorial appraising the meaning and significance of the General's message.⁷¹ The editorial writer, speaking for the publication, did not support either Truman or MacArthur. Instead he attempted to show the failure of both, the failure being revealed in the words and character of MacArthur speaking to the nation. The writer stated his case at the beginning of the editorial.

The Administration, in the poverty of its own resources, could only discharge the one man courageous enough to propose, whether right or not, a policy and a course of action.

To this newspaper that disclosure of error and failure was the most important aspect of General MacArthur's speech yesterday.⁷²

Considering the events leading up to the speech, the writer interpreted the Administration's dismissal of MacArthur as leaving "a picture of inexperienced if well meaning men in Washington making military decisions of the greatest moment without proper consultation and without proper contemplation

⁷⁰ Ibid.

⁷¹ "The Failure and the Challenge," April 20, 1951, p. 44.

⁷² Ibid.

of all the possible consequences of their inspirations."⁷³

For the Wall Street Journal writer, MacArthur, through his public speaking, represented a unique phenomenon of his era. As a unique phenomenon, MacArthur was both an asset and a liability to his country.

No one else speaks forcefully for any policy. MacArthur does.

In this there is risk. It leaves the field to General MacArthur's views by default. Yet it does not follow from the greatness of MacArthur as a soldier that he is necessarily right in his proposals.

This newspaper does not think he is.⁷⁴

Recognizing the General's right and responsibility to speak, and the failure of other leaders to speak, the writer proceeded to evaluate the broad implications of MacArthur's message.

The evaluation concentrated on the major, yet unspoken, premise of the speech. "The unspoken premise of his policy is that the global conflict is already begun. . . . From this premise it is perhaps logical to advocate an immediate extension of this little war while we have the initiative."⁷⁵

The writer saw three fallacies in the unspoken premise.

First, "this is a premise without justification."⁷⁶ MacArthur offered no evidence to justify action to end the unproved "global conflict." Second, "it is also a dangerous premise. . . . The General offers us this course as a means of concluding war. Yet he himself offers no evidence that it will conclude the war."⁷⁷ The third fallacy of the major premise,

⁷³ Ibid. ⁷⁴ Ibid. ⁷⁵ Ibid. ⁷⁶ Ibid. ⁷⁷ Ibid.

according to the beliefs of the journalist, was that it asserted without providing a basis for believability. "For our part, we do not believe that World War III has begun or is inevitable. To assume either of these things is to be truly defeatist, and to assume them and act on them aggressively might be catastrophic."⁷⁸ Although the writer thoroughly disagreed with MacArthur's proposals, he was in full agreement with his actions. He attempted to dissociate the man from the meaning of the message in an effort to clarify the ramifications of MacArthur's proposal. Despite the fact that the writer rejected the proposals, he attempted to appraise the value of MacArthur's effort.

General MacArthur's real contribution is that he has the courage to challenge and the stature to make his challenge effective. It is possible now that out of this crisis a workable policy will emerge. And it is for that chance that General MacArthur deserves once again the unstinting gratitude of his country.⁷⁹

How Consistent Were the Journalists?

The preceding discussion describes the journalistic criticism of MacArthur's address to Congress. How the journalists differed and agreed in their criticism illustrated the critical point of view, the rationale, and the method of journalistic speech criticism. This summary describes these aspects of the criticism as they support or modify the

⁷⁸ Ibid. ⁷⁹ Ibid.

theoretical approach.

The Critical Point of View

As the journalism theorists suggested, all of the newswriters worked from a critical point of view which focused on the ideas of the speech. Three of the publications, in considering the ideas, expanded their central point of view to consider other elements. The editorial writer for the New York Times and the writers for The New Republic and the Wall Street Journal viewed the act as a composite of the public man attempting to exert influence through speech and the ideas of the public man.

The Rationale of Criticism

In most of the journalistic studies, the rationale was only implied. The nature of the critical content identified the standards for selection, the purposes for analysis, and the goals of the criticism.

Standards for selection. Only Hinton, writing for Commonweal, explicitly justified his analysis of the address. Hinton based his argument on the national importance of the speech issues. The national and international significance of MacArthur's message permeated all of the critiques except The New Republic's. Life, Newsweek, Time, the New York Times, and the Wall Street Journal identified the speech with the interests of the national audience by describing MacArthur's reception and the response to the address. The New Republic

limited the interest element to partisan responses. The significance and importance of the speech as described by the newswriters corresponded to the journalistic theorists' explanation of newsworthiness. Thus, the rationales for selecting the speech rested in the newsworthiness of the speech as it related to the interests and concerns of the reading audience.

Purposes of analysis. The recency of the accounts and the content of the accounts described the purposes of analysis. All of the publications, except the bi-weekly Commonweal, treated the speech in the first issue immediately following the event. Commonweal's article omitted much of the description of the national emotion and attempted to establish an evaluation of the speech apart from its immediate context. The other news sources emphasized the elements of the event which reflected the immediate interests of the speaker and the audience. None of the publications attempted to present their coverage as the event. Instead they clearly presented their commentaries as accounts of the event. The journalists' concern with describing the event and clarifying the issues pointed to Schaleben's suggested purpose of journalistic speech analysis--to provide useful information to the reader.

Goals of criticism. The journalists' concern with describing the event and clarifying the issues also pointed

to the goals of the criticism. In varying degrees, all of the studies illustrated a concern for interpreting the event and for recording and analyzing history as it was being made.

In keeping with the principles of interpretive reporting, all of the publications presented speech analyses which attempted to illuminate the reader's understanding of the journalists' critical viewpoints. For example, a goal of The New Republic was to intensify partisan reaction to the speech. The Wall Street Journal attempted to show the fallacies of accepting either Truman's or MacArthur's position. In all of the journalistic studies, the critical point of view determined goals of the criticism.

The journalists' concern for recording and analyzing history was a goal which could only be implied from the actual criticism. No explicit evidence within the criticism identified ostensible historical goals. However, the studies recorded the event, analyzed significant elements of the act, and evaluated the immediate meaning of the act. In so doing, all the journalists provided historical data in the form of eye witness reports.

Results of the Critical Method

The journalists' recognition of significant speech elements showed little variation. The greatest differences occurred in the journalists' evaluative statements about those elements.

Results of analysis. Since the major focus of the journalistic criticism was on the ideas of the speech, the results of the analyses attempted to explain the meaning of the ideas. The analyses in Commonweal, The Nation, Time, the New York Times, and the Wall Street Journal concentrated on discovering the logical validity of MacArthur's statements. These analyses consisted of discovering the significant arguments, identifying the assumptions which supported the arguments, and comparing the underlying assumptions with ideas which the journalists held to be true. The consistency of MacArthur's implications with the beliefs of the journalists determined their evaluations of the ideas.

Life and Newsweek did not attempt to analyze the logical structure of the ideas. Instead, they concentrated on identifying the significant statements. From these statements they conducted their evaluations on the basis of their agreement or disagreement with the explicit meaning.

The New Republic did not examine the specific ideas of the speech. Instead, the writer concentrated on the total event as representative of a single idea--that MacArthur was aligning himself with the Republican Party in an attempt to gain support for his policies.

Life, The Nation, Newsweek, and Time also described how MacArthur delivered his ideas through his use of voice and gesture. Other elements of the act received attention from the editorial writers for the New York Times, The New

Republic, and the Wall Street Journal. These journalists analyzed MacArthur's character as it related to his identification with the audience. Through this method of analysis they illustrated how MacArthur connected his proposals with the values of the audience.

Results of evaluation. In formulating statements about what MacArthur did, Life and the New York Times' editorial writer agreed with the speaker's ideas. Newsweek and Time did not take an open stand but implied disfavor for MacArthur's suggestions. Commonweal, The Nation, The New Republic, the Wall Street Journal, and Reston in the New York Times openly opposed MacArthur's suggestions.

The effect of the address concerned all of the journalists. Life and the New York Times' editorial writer saw the speech unifying the nation. The Nation, Commonweal, Time, Newsweek, the Wall Street Journal, and Reston evaluated the results as dividing the nation rather than unifying it. Time and The New Republic appraised the speech's effect as unifying the Republican Party.

Summary and Conclusions

Although the journalists did not have a formulated critical theory on which to base their speech criticism, their critical studies supported general principles of speech criticism advanced by journalism educators and editors. From the journalistic criticism of MacArthur's address to Congress

six conclusions emerge. First, journalists showed a greater concern for the ideas of the speech than any other element of the speech act. Second, the significance of the speech to the readers of the publication determined its selection as an object of criticism. Third, the journalists considered the speech in its immediate time setting in an attempt to provide useful information to the reading audience. Fourth, the journalists attempted to interpret the speech in its immediate historical context. Fifth, the journalists' methods of analysis and evaluation emerged from a critical judgment of the significant elements of the event and the relationship of those significant elements to their own system of values. Sixth, all of the journalistic criticism reflected an attempt by the journalist to influence the way his reader evaluated the act. By attempting to persuade their audiences, the journalists became rhetoricians, as Bryant suggested, working in the specialized media of printed news publications.⁸⁰

⁸⁰See above, p. 3.

CHAPTER VI

COMPARISON OF ACADEMIC AND JOURNALISTIC SPEECH CRITICISM OF MACARTHUR'S ADDRESS TO CONGRESS

The preceding analyses provide data on the theory and practice of academic and journalistic speech criticism. This data supplies the answer to the original question: How does journalistic criticism of a selected speech compare to academic criticism of the same speech? With the criticism of MacArthur's address to Congress as the basic material, the following comparison considers the differences and similarities in the critical studies.

Theories of Speech Criticism

The theories of speech criticism are relevant to this comparison insofar as they attempt to explain, guide, and justify the practice of criticism. As such, the theory is an integral part of the art.

As noted in Chapter II, speech scholars have developed an extensive body of critical theory. The primary aspect of the academic theories is a concern for evaluating the speaker's rhetorical method of accomplishment. Journalism scholars have not developed a specific theory. However, journalism educators

and editors have expressed concern for evaluating the speaker's accomplishment. Evaluation of the speaker's rhetorical method implies evaluation of his accomplishment. Evaluation of accomplishment alone does not necessarily include evaluation of the speaker's rhetorical method. This difference reveals two unlike concepts of speech criticism. The extent of this difference finds expression in the journalistic and academic theorists' points of view, rationales of criticism, and methods of criticism.

Critical Points of View

The academic critical points of view focus upon what the theorists consider to be the significant rhetorical element of the act. The journalists' point of view closely parallels Ernest Wrage's focus on ideas. In comparison to the several academic points of view, the journalists have a limited field of critical attention.

Rationales of Criticism

In determining a rationale of criticism, speech scholars concentrate on establishing specific standards for evaluating the speech. Journalists, rather than establishing standards particularly applicable to speeches, emphasize individual judgment as the one standard for selecting speeches. By his standards, the speech scholar evaluates public speaking for its rhetorical effect or its rhetorical effectiveness. The journalist selects speeches for study on the basis of his

appraisal of the newsworthiness of the message content. Newsworthiness, while a quality of the speech act, is an element which speech scholars have not considered.

In developing specific purposes for analyzing speeches, academicians have concentrated on various fields of knowledge in which speechmaking is a part. Thus the academic theory emphasizes the analysis of public speaking as it relates to the areas of pragmatic, literary, and social knowledge. The journalists, working with immediate acts, advance one purpose, to provide useful knowledge to the reading audience. Whereas the selected area of knowledge directs the academician's investigation, the reading audience determines the journalist's examination.

A major distinction appears between the academic and journalistic goals of criticism. The academicians suggest that rhetorical criticism contributes to the study of rhetoric, history, and rhetorical criticism. Journalists suggest studying speeches in order to record history, to provide an immediate analysis and evaluation of the historical event. Journalists put a temporal limitation upon their goals; the speech historians have no temporal limitation. Thus the journalist becomes a specialized type of speech historian, working with history as it occurs.

No evidence appears to indicate that journalists consider their studies of public speaking as pertaining to the general areas of speech pedagogy or speech criticism.

Likewise, speech scholars have not considered journalistic theory as an aspect of the goals of academic speech criticism.

Methods of Criticism

Whereas the academic theorists have developed methods of criticism based on rhetorical principles, the journalists have overlooked rhetorical precepts. Elements of rhetorical theory do appear in the journalistic method. However, no systematized principles of rhetoric are discernable in the journalistic approach. In the evaluative process, one standard is common to journalists and academicians. Theorists from both fields advise the critic to exercise his individual judgment in appraising speeches. On this basis then, the ultimate value of either school of critical theory rests not in the theory itself but in the knowledge, experience, and wisdom of the critic who practices the theory.

Practice of Speech Criticism

The comparison of academic and journalistic theories of speech criticism provides an indicator of the differences and similarities between the academic and the journalistic practice of speech criticism. The comparison of the criticism of MacArthur's address to Congress considers the points of view, the rationales, and the methods of the two groups of critics.

Critical Points of View

The academicians provided critical studies which focused on the public man, the complete organism, and the ideas in the speech. The journalists gave primary attention to the speaker's ideas. The New Republic, New York Times, and the Wall Street Journal gave secondary attention to the speaker as a major element of consideration. None of the journalists focused on the act as a complete organism.

In the academic criticism no consistent relationship appeared between the critical point of view and the speech elements which the critic considered significant. In the journalistic criticism, based on essentially one point of view, the critical focus on ideas preceded a method of idea analysis and evaluation. Howell, the only academician to focus on ideas, also conducted an analysis and evaluation of MacArthur's ideas. This suggests that the journalists, in general, were more consistent in following a critical point of view than were the academic critics.

Rationales of Criticism

All of the academicians illustrated a concern for appraising the rhetorical effect or rhetorical effectiveness of the speech act. The journalists concentrated on the effect of the speech as it related to their reading audiences.

The academic critics conducted analyses which contributed to social, pragmatic, and literary fields of study.

The journalists concentrated on the social field by providing immediate studies of the address. Only incidentally did one journalist, Willard Shelton, analyze the speech as a pedagogical model.

The goals of the academic criticism concerned history, speech pedagogy, and speech criticism theory. All of the journalistic criticism reflected a dual social goal. First, by the nature of its content, the criticism provided a record of the act. Second, the criticism revealed a desire by the writer to influence his reader's perception of the speaker's ideas. Beall and Wylie were the only two academicians who appeared to be using speech criticism primarily as a vehicle for partisan persuasive discourse.

These differences in the rationale of the criticism illustrated that the academic speech critic studied public speaking for a variety of purposes. The journalist had one primary purpose--to evaluate public speaking for a public reading audience. For whom did the academician write? Presumably, academic speech critics, through the media of scholarly journals, textbooks, and graduate theses, directed their studies to other scholars of public address. Thus a major difference between academic and journalistic rationales of speech criticism was that the journalists presented their knowledge of public speaking to the mass public audience and the academicians reserved their knowledge of public speaking for the humanities scholars.

Evidence from publication dates indicated that the journalists terminated their interest in the speech shortly after its occurrence. Academic interest has continued. This difference illustrates the temporal limitations of the journalistic approach and the unlimited approach for the academic critic. To the extent that the academic approach is unlimited in time, academic criticism provides a re-evaluative function which the journalistic approach does not offer. Conversely, the journalists who specialized in making immediate evaluations of the act provided criticism of MacArthur's speech which predated any of the academic studies. Thus both approaches provided data on the history of criticism of the speech. From the evidence, journalists appeared to evaluate the speech when it was of most consequence to most people; academicians waited until the speech was of consequence to fewer people.

Methods of Criticism

The primary difference between the academic and journalistic methods of criticism was that the academicians analyzed the speech from bases of formulated critical theory. The journalists' analyses revealed no evidence of such theory. However, elements of logic were present in all of the journalistic analyses.

The primary object of the journalists' critical attention was the meaning and immediate effect of the words of the speech. Within this general realm of criticism, the

journalists concentrated on such elements as classifying the speech as a type, identifying the speaker's purpose, examining the forms of support used, and examining the implied premises of the speaker. For support, the journalists attempted to relate what they found to other known evidence in an effort to build a basis for accepting or rejecting the ideas of the speaker.

The academicians took varied approaches to the speech. Most of the scholars attempted to classify and evaluate the types of proofs used by the speaker. Little attention was given to the proofs as they related to the total message of the speech. The journalists showed little concern for labels. The journalists who disagreed with the proposals of the speech based their opinions primarily upon the logical structure and development of the arguments. Only one academician went into any detail in examining the logical adequacy of the speech and then rejected the arguments for a lack of documentation. Other academicians asserted logical adequacy without a thorough exposition on the arguments.

In examining the speaker's discovery of arguments only one academician found fault with any arguments being omitted. Three of the journalists were critical of arguments which they felt the speaker had overlooked.

In appraising the effect of the speech, the journalists, although in disagreement, made no attempt to label the speech or to classify it in relation to other speeches. They did

not view the speech as a "world classic" nor as one which could find "an enduring place" in speech scholarship. The academicians, however, were generally eager to make sweeping value judgments about the speech and to rank it accordingly. Whereas the journalists attempted to show the relation of the speech to its immediate environment, the academicians made little effort to preserve the immediate impact of the speech which could become a tool for later speech historians.

One common element existed in both approaches. The critics formulated their evaluations on the basis of how the speech corresponded to their expressed beliefs. In general, the academicians attempted to evaluate the speech on its alignment with the critics' interpretation of rhetorical precepts. The journalists based their evaluation on how the ideas of the speech corresponded with their interpretation of other known data. The journalists demonstrated more concern for the meaningful validity of MacArthur's statements. The academic critics showed more concern for MacArthur's use of a proper rhetorical method.

Conclusions

The journalistic and academic theories of speech criticism and the practice of speech criticism of MacArthur's address to Congress illustrated significant differences.

(1) The journalists presented criticism based on a single set of principles. The academicians presented criticism

based on multiple sets of principles. (2) Journalists considered the speaker's accomplishment as the ultimate concern. Academicians considered the speaker's method of accomplishment as the ultimate concern. (3) Journalists directed their criticism to a mass reading audience. Academicians directed their criticism to a specialized audience. (4) Journalists worked in the immediate context of the event. Academicians worked after the event. (5) Journalists provided more depth in idea analysis. Academicians provided more breadth in rhetorical analysis.

These differences suggest questions for further research. The speech critic might well ask at this point, along with Marie Hochmuth Nichols, "Do we do well what we are doing?"¹ Does the journalist do better what we should be doing? Should the speech critic concern himself with recording and analyzing speech history in its immediate context, or is the journalist adequately fulfilling this task? Should the speech critic attempt to communicate to the mass reading audience concerning contemporary speaking; or is the journalist's message sufficient? These questions imply that differences which stem from different concepts of the nature of speech criticism can be of value when they provide new ways of evaluating the usefulness of speech criticism.

¹Rhetoric and Criticism (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1963), p. 68.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Aristotle, Rhetoric. W. Rhys Roberts, translator. The Rhetoric and the Poetics of Aristotle. Friedrich Solmsen, editor. New York: Random House, 1954.
- Arnold, Carroll C., Ehninger, Douglas, and Gerber, John C., editors. The Speaker's Resource Book. Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1961.
- Baird, A. Craig. Representative American Speeches, 1951-1952. New York: H. W. Wilson Company, 1952.
- Barck, Oscar T., Jr. A History of the United States Since 1945. New York: Dell Publishing Company, Incorporated, 1965.
- Berry, Thomas Eliot. Journalism Today: Its Development and Practical Applications. Philadelphia: Chilton Company, 1958.
- Bormann, Ernest G. Theory and Research in the Communicative Arts. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Incorporated, 1965.
- Campbell, Laurence R., and Wolseley, Roland E. How to Report and Write the News. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Incorporated, 1961.
- Ewbank, Henry, and Auer, J. Jeffery. Discussion and Debate: Tools of a Democracy. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Incorporated, 1951.
- Freeley, Austin J. Argumentation and Debate: Rationale Decision Making. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1961.
- A History and Criticism of American Public Address. 3 vols. Vols. I and II, William Morwood Briggance, editor. New York: Longmans, Green, and Company, 1943; Vol. III, Marie Hochmuth, editor. New York: Longmans, Green, and Company, 1955.

- Hohenberg, John. The Professional Journalist: A Guide to Modern Reporting Practice. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1960.
- Krieghbaum, Hillier. Facts in Perspective. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Incorporated, 1956.
- MacDougall, Curtis D. Interpretative Reporting. Fourth edition. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1963.
- Minnick, Wayne C. The Art of Persuasion. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1957.
- Nichols, Marie Hochmuth. Rhetoric and Criticism. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1963.
- Peterson, Theodore. Magazines in the Twentieth Century. Second edition. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1964.
- Reid, Loren. First Principles of Public Speaking. Second edition. Columbia: Artcraft Press, 1962.
- Thonssen, Lester, and Baird, A. Craig. Speech Criticism. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1948.
- Wolseley, Roland E. Critical Writing for the Journalist. Philadelphia: Chilton Company, 1959.

Periodicals

- "An Old Soldier Fades Away into New Glory," Life, XXX (April 30, 1951), 22-3.
- Beall, Paul R. "Viper-Crusher Turns Dragon-Slayer," The Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXXVIII (February, 1952), 51-6.
- Breed, Warren. "Analyzing News: Some Questions for Research," Journalism Quarterly, XXXIII (Fall, 1956), 467-77.
- Bryant, Donald C. "Rhetoric: Its Functions and Its Scope," The Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXXIX (December, 1953), 401-24.
- "Challenge Is Heard Around the World," Life, XXX (April 30, 1951), 26-7.

- Croft, Albert J. "The Functions of Rhetorical Criticism," The Quarterly Journal of Speech, XLII (October, 1956), 283-91.
- "Emotion Wanes But the Issue Grows," Newsweek, XXXVII (April 30, 1951), 17-22.
- Erlandson, Erling H. "Correlation of Salaries with Newspaper 'Prestige' Rank," Journalism Quarterly, XL (Spring, 1963), 228-30.
- "General Sows Confusion," The Nation, CLXXII (April 28, 1951), 388-89.
- Haberman, Frederick W. "General MacArthur's Speech: A Symposium of Critical Comment," The Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXXVII (October, 1951), 321-31.
- Hinton, Harold C. "The MacArthur Argument," Commonweal, LIV (May 11, 1951), 111-12.
- Ickes, Harold. "Newspapermen Say 'Fade Away,'" The New Republic, CXXV (July 30, 1951), 18.
- Lindley, Ernest K. "The 'Military Standpoint,'" Newsweek, XXXVII (April 30, 1951), 26.
- Merrill, John C. "U.S. Panel Names World's Ten Leading 'Quality' Dailies," Journalism Quarterly, XLI (Autumn, 1964), 568-72.
- "Old Soldier," Time, LVII (April 30, 1951), 21-6.
- Reid, Loren D. "The Perils of Rhetorical Criticism," The Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXX (December, 1944), 416-22.
- "The Response to MacArthur," Life, XXX (April 30, 1951), 34.
- Shelton, Willard. "MacArthur Joins the G.O.P.," The Nation, CLXXII (April 28, 1951), 389-90.
- Wallace, Karl R. "On Criticism of the MacArthur Speech," The Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXXIX (February, 1953), 68-72.
- "Washington Wire," The New Republic, CXXIV (April 30, 1951), 3.
- Wrage, Ernest. "Public Address: A Study in Social and Intellectual History," The Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXXIII (December, 1947), 451-57.

Wylie, Philip. "Medievalism and the MacArthurian Legend," The Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXXVII (December, 1951), 473-78.

Essays and Articles in Collections

Baird, A. Craig. "The Study of Speeches." American Public Addresses, 1740-1952. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1956. Pp. 1-14.

Fischer, John. "Magazine and Newspaper Journalism: A Comparison." The Press in Perspective. Ralph D. Casey, editor. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1963. Pp. 198-205.

Hochmuth, Marie K. "The Criticism of Rhetoric." A History and Criticism of American Public Address. New York: Longmans, Green, and Company, 1955. III, 1-23.

Mouat, L. H. "An Approach to Rhetorical Criticism." The Rhetorical Idiom. Donald C. Bryant, editor. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1958. Pp. 161-77.

Parrish, Wayland M. "The Study of Speeches." American Speeches. Wayland M. Parrish and Marie K. Hochmuth, editors. New York: Longmans, Green, and Company, 1954. Pp. 1-20.

Schaleben, Arville. "The News and You." The Citizen and the News. Milwaukee: The Marquette University Press, 1962. Pp. 77-95.

Wichelns, Herbert. "The Literary Criticism of Oratory." The Rhetorical Idiom. Donald C. Bryant, editor. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1958. Pp. 5-42.

Unpublished Materials

Clausen, E. Neal. "News Magazines as Sources of Rhetorical Criticism, 1948-1958." Unpublished Master's thesis, Southern Illinois University, 1959.

Kendall, H. Bruce. "The Reporting and Criticism of Speeches in Four Weekly Magazines." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Wisconsin, 1961.

Moses, Mrs. Bryant. "Representative Speaking of Douglas MacArthur, General of the Army, During Various Phases of His Life." Unpublished Master's thesis, The University of Virginia, 1958.

Letter from Edward K. Thompson to William Jordan, Houston, Texas, January 12, 1965 [1966].

Letter from Carey McWilliams to William Jordan, Houston, Texas, January 25, 1966.

Letter from Joan Wharton to William Jordan, Houston, Texas, February 2, 1966.

Letter from Susan Sommers to William Jordan, Houston, Texas, February 17, 1966.

Shoemaker, Kenneth W. "Analysis and Evaluation of Douglas MacArthur's Use of Emotional Appeal in His Speech 'Don't Scuttle the Pacific', Given Before a Joint Session of Congress, April 19, 1951." Unpublished Master's thesis, Bowling Green University, 1955.

Newspapers

"The Failure and the Challenge." Wall Street Journal.
April 20, 1951.

Reston, James. "Profound Division in Capital Caused by General's Speech." New York Times. April 20, 1951.

"The Speech to Congress." New York Times. April 20, 1951.