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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Sam Rayburn, Mr. Sam, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Democrat—
for over half a century this man was one of the strongest political forces on the Texas or Washington scene. Indeed, his influence extended across the entire nation and around the world. Rayburn served as Speaker of the House from 1941 to 1947, from 1949 until 1952, and from 1955 until 1961—a total of seventeen years—and during that time he brought unprecedented power and respect to that position.

"A bald, stocky, rugged farmer-lawyer from Texas, his rough-hewn manner and appearance suggested latent force."¹ That he was a forceful man was evident not only in his personal appearance, but in his manner of speaking, and in his record as a political leader. He once said, "I've always wanted responsibility because I want the power responsibility brings. I hate like hell to be licked. It almost kills me."²

During his fifty-five years as a public servant, he never lost an election as Representative from his fourth


district in Texas, he never failed, after his initial election in 1941, to fill the Speaker's chair when his Party was in power, and he saw most of the legislation he backed through to victory. Under his influence, significant bills relevant to rural electrification, farm to market roads, soil conservation, and the extension of the Selective Service Act prior to World War II become reality. Another significant action on his part was the expansion of the Rules Committee during the early days of the Kennedy Administration. Rayburn was the key figure in all of this action. He knew "how to command the house's respect and affection, even when things were not going his way."\(^3\) His shrewdness, dogmatism, and unusual capacity for business were evident in the way he ran the House.

Sam Rayburn was a middle of the roader who exerted a calming effect on the House as a whole and he kept his Party unified in perilous times.\(^4\) "Because he was square and patient, he managed to pass a vast mass of legislation without losing the affection and good opinion of either the President or the House."\(^5\)

When he could not persuade the lawmakers to what he felt was the right position, he often resorted to talking

\(^3\)Ibid.

\(^4\) *Newsweek*, XXXV (January 10, 1955), 18.

\(^5\)*Alsop and Kinter, p. 22.*
privately and earnestly to convince a Congressman to change his vote. One prime case of this method of persuasion was evidenced in his maneuvers on the Selective Service Bill in 1941. Enough Congressmen changed their votes to block suspension of that act, and they did it "for Sam." In 1951 he argued for one whole day with members individually on an extension of the Economic Controls Law. As a cattleman, he knew that the ten percent roll-back on beef prices should be retained because prices were too high. The bill passed.

This power of personal persuasion was evident from the chair of the House of Representatives, to private conversations in offices all over Washington, to public speaking platforms in a multitude of situations. When he spoke, people listened. As a public speaker, he was heard from the floor of Congress, at a considerable number of ceremonious occasions, and innumerable times from the campaign stump in Fannin County.

A study of the speaking of one who was a familiar figure as a public speaker and who was of such significance in our nation's history is seemingly a worthwhile one. Several unpublished theses have been written on Rayburn as a politician, but it seems that no study of his activities

6 David Cohn, "Mr. Speaker," *Atlantic*, LXX (October, 1942), 73.

7 Paul F. Healy, "They're Just Crazy about Sam," *Saturday Evening Post*, CCXIV (November 24, 1951), 23.
as a public speaker has been made. Three biographies have been written about the man, but these also focus primarily on his political involvement. This thesis will not attempt to analyze every aspect of the man's speaking. Such a broad topic would be far too lengthy and general. Therefore, primary attention will be given to an analysis of invention in selected congressional, campaign, and ceremonial speeches of Sam Rayburn. Such an analysis should reveal the most common modes of persuasion used by the man.

Selection of Speeches

Ceremonial, congressional, and campaign speeches by Sam Rayburn were chosen to observe his use of invention in all types of speaking in which he was involved. All copies of the speeches were taken from Rayburn's personal files in the Sam Rayburn Memorial Library in Bonham, Texas. These specific speeches were chosen over a multitude of others because they seem to reflect the man's overall attitudes and ideals. They are speeches on topics which were of vital concern to "Mr. Sam." Three speeches from each type were chosen to give a sample not encumbered too much with text material. On the basis of these criteria, the following speeches were chosen:

1. Ceremonial speech delivered in Princeton, Texas, on Labor Day, September 13, 1950. This speech is typical of those given by Rayburn on similar occasions in Texas towns.
2. Ceremonial speech delivered on the occasion of the twentieth anniversary of the Rural Electrification Act, in Atlanta, Georgia, in 1957. As the author and chief supporter of the R.E.A. in the House, Rayburn was a significant part of this celebration.

3. Ceremonial speech delivered on April 16, 1960, at a testimonial dinner given in his honor in Washington, D.C. This banquet was a gesture of gratitude by lawmakers across the land to Rayburn for the fruits of his life in the House.

4. Campaign speech nominating Lyndon B. Johnson for President of the United States at the 1960 Democratic Convention in Los Angeles, California. The historical significance of such a speech is evidenced in Johnson's later occupancy of the White House.

5. Campaign speech delivered on national television during the 1954 congressional elections. The speech is a good example of his political speeches.

6. Campaign speech delivered in Baltimore, Maryland, during the 1956 campaign.

(No copy of a campaign speech given by Rayburn on his own behalf in the fourth district is available because these speeches were given "off the cuff." Therefore, the type of campaign speeches given in behalf of his Party are being analyzed.)

8 Interview with H.D. Dulaney at the Sam Rayburn Memorial Library in Bonham, Texas, on March 22, 1969. Dulaney is the librarian there.
7. Congressional speech delivered before the House of Representatives on December 9, 1943, entitled, "We Must Have Unity." Many copies of this speech were requested by people across America, pointing out its acceptance and the response of the people to it. Given during World War II, the speech voices Rayburn's faith in America, in democracy, and in God—common themes in much of his speaking.

8. Congressional speech entitled "Our Farm Problem," delivered before the House of Representatives on May 25, 1947. Rayburn's philosophy of support for those on the nation's farms and his desire to help them is voiced clearly here.

9. Congressional speech entitled, "We Must Save Our Soil," delivered before the House of Representatives on May 1, 1952. Given in support of a soil conservation bill, the speech voices Rayburn's knowledge of and love and concern for the soil.

Method of Analysis

Logos, pathos, and ethos, or logical, emotional, and ethical appeals, from Rayburn's speeches were analyzed. Chapters 11, 12, and 13 of Speech Criticism by Lester Thonssen and A. Craig Baird provided the primary criteria for analysis. These chapters deal in good detail with the above mentioned appeals.

In this thesis, rhetorical invention is defined as being the search for and the analysis and development of arguments suitable to the enforcement of ideas and the establishment of belief in hearers.
Organization, style, and delivery are, of course, also contributors to the effectiveness of a speech, but these were not dealt with in this thesis except as they were a part of his logical, ethical, and emotional appeals. An analysis of invention only was of primary concern here.

The following questions served as the guidelines for the study.

1. Who was Sam Rayburn, and what was his role in the times during which and for which he spoke?

2. What was the primary mode of persuasion utilized by Rayburn? Logical, ethical, or emotional?

3. What persuasive techniques were common to all his speeches?

4. What conclusions can be drawn about Rayburn's speaking which would be beneficial to students of public address?

Procedure in Discussion

Six chapters are included in this thesis. Following the introductory portion is a section providing additional background on Sam Rayburn with special attention given to those factors which contributed to his success. Chapters III, IV, and V deal respectively with logical, emotional, and ethical appeals. An evaluatory chapter concludes the study.

A speech by speech analysis has not been made, but rather data gathered from a total study of the speeches were used as supporting material in the chapters which define and analyze his use of the three appeals. Background material on each
speaking situation was inserted where it seemed necessary. In the final chapter, judgments drawn from the study were recapitulated and values of the study expressed.
CHAPTER II

SAM RAYBURN, THE MAN AND HIS TIMES

Driving northeast from Dallas, Texas, and taking a short-cut through the country to pass Merit, Frogknot, and Leonard, Texas, one sees some of the richest farm land in the Lone Star State. The soil is rich, black, and fertile. The cotton, corn, and wheat grow thick and abundantly there, and the Hereford and Angus cattle grow fat on the abundant coastal bermuda grass. Bois d'arc and hackberry trees line the fence rows and the shallow creek banks. This is farmland. This is where generations of Texans have made their livings through the sweat of their brows and faith in God. This is the land which is forever home to one who is born there. This is a land which is tilled with consistency and faith in years of drought and crop failure as well as in years of abundance. This is northeast Texas. This is Sam Rayburn country.

Driving farther, one comes to Bonham, the county seat for Fannin County. A farm town complete with every characteristic which the term brings to mind, Bonham, was the home of Rayburn. People window shopping at the town square smile with fondness and familiarity when his name is mentioned. They point with pride to the lovely white marble Memorial Library which was built to honor him in 1957, and they drive past his immaculate
white frame house, feeling proud that this singular American was their own.

Samuel Taliaferro Rayburn was a United States Representative who consistently exhibited a sincere love and concern for those he represented. He distinguished himself as one of the outstanding legislators of our history, and as Speaker without equal in the House of Representatives. His life was a life which can be studied with respect. His are contributions to our country which reflect political prudence and keen sensitivity toward people. No biography on Sam Rayburn could fully reveal the complete story of this man's significance in more than fifty years of public service. But though he had influence in world affairs and could persuade presidents, whenever he came home to Bonham he was "just plain Sam," and no one had to have an appointment to see him. Whether it was to discuss politics, to speculate on the year's crops, or to ask advice on rearing an unruly boy, a person could come to either the front or back door and receive a hearing from "Mr. Sam." He never traveled outside the United States. His free time was spent where he felt he was needed—with his constituents.¹

This love affair with the people of Fannin County began when, as a boy of four, Sam moved with his family from a poor farm in Tennessee. There in northeast Texas, the Rayburns took up crude tools and set to the task of eking a living from the soil. William Marian, the father, was of sturdy pioneer

¹Dwight Dorough, Mr. Sam (New York, 1962), p. 54.
stock, and he gave to Sam a disposition to hard work and
dogmatic determination. A quiet man, he told the boy many
stories of the Civil War, and his impressions formed the roots
of Sam's patriotism and his faith in divine guidance. However,
the mother, Martha, was the more predominant influence of the
two parents. An avid reader, she instilled a love of the
written word in her children. In his later life, Sam "felt
guilty to have a book in his library he had not read."

Sam's mother was part of his strength. For many years a
packet of letters she had written to him went wherever he went.
There are recognizable traits of both mother and father in Sam.
As he said,

It's true that Mother was the stronger of the team. Father was a quiet and modest man who never talked loudly.
We used to call Father "Easy-Boss" and we were completely relaxed with him. With Mother, it was different. She
was very energetic and highly intelligent....My sister Lou once said, "Mother had good judgment about everything.
There was no subject remote to her, because she read everything printed."

It is important to be familiar with these aspects of Rayburn's background in order to best understand the portrait of the man
as a national figure. His love for the earth, his compassion
for his fellowman, his devotion to America, his steadfastness
to truth and honesty, and his dogged determination all spring
from the pattern set by his family and environment in those

2 Ibid., p. 54.
3 W.B. Ragsdale, "An Old Friend Writes of Sam Rayburn,"
U.S. News and World Report, LI (October 23, 1961), 70.
4 Dorough, p. 43
5 Ibid., p. 61.
early days. The schooling of this man followed a pattern which was familiar to many farm boys of his time. Farm work demanded much of his time, but the desire to learn more than how to raise cotton or cows ingrained itself in Sam's mind. He finished what limited schooling was offered in his community. An incident which undoubtedly influenced his aspirations occurred when, as a lad of thirteen, Sam walked to Bonham and stood outside in the rain to hear Congressman Joe Weldon Bailey address his constituents. Rayburn reported of that day in this way:

My first impulse for public affairs came when Joseph Weldon Bailey, my Texas predecessor in Congress, was speaking to a gathering of his constituents in Bonham, Texas. I remember it was a rainy day and I made my way... over a gummy mud road to hear Bailey's magnificent speech, which he delivered in a covered 'tabernacle' of the Evangelical Church. The place was jammed. It was raining and when I saw all those rich townfolk in storebought clothes, I decided to stay outside. I found an open flap and listened attentively for two hours. I can still feel the water dripping down my neck. I slipped around to the entrance when he was through, saw him come out, and followed him for five or six blocks until he got a streetcar. Then I left, wondering whether I'd ever be as big a man as Joe Bailey. It must have been under the spell of Bailey's oratory that I decided to become some day a Speaker.

The boy, from that day, directed his life toward Washington. His family exhibited faith in Sam to do what he must do. Often he would practice his oratory to the cows in the barn or to the corn in the field. The eloquent phrases he hurled must have delighted his brothers and sisters as they listened from hiding places in the barn. As he grew older, his time at the farm

---

6Ibid., p. 64.
chores was spent more reflectively as he envisioned a better world for his family and friends.

Here in the North Texas cottonfield was born the concept of rural electrification, farm-to-market roads, and securities legislation in the mind of a boy still clothed in homespun. Here also, was conceived his dreams for better social security coverage and medical assistance for the aged.  

In due time, after the cotton was picked in the fall of 1900, he announced a desire to enroll at Mayo College in nearby Commerce, Texas. No attempt was made to stand in his way. Packing his belongings into a tight bundle and saying good-bye to mother, sisters, and brothers, Sam drove with his father to the train station at Ladonia. Father and son stood quietly on the steps of the depot waiting for the train. When the time came to depart, Marian Rayburn handed his son twenty-five dollars in crumpled bills. Sam knew this was all the money his father had. But, more meaningful to him was his father's accompanying advice. "Sam," he said, "be a man." As Sam left, neither of the two men could have imagined how magnificently the son would follow that advice.

At Mayo College, students were challenged by the motto: "Ceaseless Industry, Fearless Investigation, and Unfettered Thought." Those words were doubtlessly a beacon to Rayburn then and in his later political involvement. That they became

---

a part of his total-self is substantiated by a tribute paid to him by a colleague, Representative Vinson of Georgia, when he said, "...I think of him as being indestructible, imperishable, and indomitable. To these characteristics must also be added the qualities of integrity, wisdom, loyalty, friendliness, fairness, and leadership."

During his final years at Mayo, Sam began to build a reputation as a public speaker. He led the Oratorical Association with ten members on his team. "Of course, it pleased Sam a great deal when several of his friends in Commerce even suggested that he should go into politics."

Those days at Mayo College were happy ones. Jobs as bell ringer, janitor, and dairy assistant helped to defray expenses and provide extra money to buy books for his growing library. Such volumes as Gilbert Hamerton's *Intellectual Life*, and *Outlines of English History*, and Ralph Waldo Emerson's *Representative Man* were read hungrily by the student, as well as were the books on American history which he so loved.

When his money ran far too low, Rayburn taught for a term in the Greenwood school. Here he saved enough money to make graduation from Mayo a reality in 1903.

---


11 *Allen*, p. 20.


Two years later, Sam Rayburn ran for and was elected to his first term in the Texas State Legislature. During the hot summer months of 1905, the twenty-four year old political aspirant, mounted on a brown pony, campaigned his way from farm to farm across the fourth district. Having discussed general farm problems with these Texans, and convincing them that he was one of them, Rayburn would ask the man with whom he had been talking for the name of his neighbor. "In this way, Rayburn could always greet the next man by name. It is this sort of touch that wins votes."¹⁴ Years later, Rayburn proved that making friends with his constituents in such a personal way was not merely a gimmick to get votes. During the campaigning of the 1948 election, President Harry Truman came through Bonham to visit his friend Sam's home. As word spread through the community that Truman was there, thousands of Bonham folk lined up outside the Rayburn home to shake hands with the President. In spite of much protestation from the secret service men, Sam insisted that these were his friends, and he met and greeted each one by name at the door.¹⁵ A rapport like this with his constituents makes it easy to believe that from 1905 until 1960—over half a century—Sam Rayburn never lost an election in Fannin County or the fourth district.

From that victory in 1905, Rayburn served in the Austin legislature for six years. In 1912, at the age of thirty, he

¹⁴Ibid., p. 21.
¹⁵Ibid., p. 137.
ran for the position of his dreams—Representative from the fourth district to the United States House of Representatives. A speech delivered in Bonham during that campaign verbalized a Rayburn philosophy which was to be echoed many times from speaker's platforms in years to come.

I am a Democrat. I believe that the principles advocated and adhered to by the Party since its birth are the same fundamental principles upon which our Republic was founded: a government of the people, by the people and for the people, where every man, rich or poor, should stand equal before the law and Government.

That speech lasted for over two hours, but the capacity audience did not seem to mind. They continued to support him by giving him a significant margin of votes over the other six candidates in the race. To those who had put their trust in him he said that he would sincerely try to be worthy of their confidence. To his opponents he said:

...I have nothing but the highest feelings, and the only pang that comes to me in the hour of my triumph is that so many good men must suffer defeat. To those who supported my opponents I have no word of censure but shall strive to so discharge my duties of the position that they will be led to believe that the people made no mistake in electing me.

In Washington, Representative Rayburn was keenly observant in learning the ropes. Under the protective wing of Jack Garner, a Texas veteran in politics, he moved perceptively through that first year. His maiden speech from the floor of Congress was given on May 6, 1913. Although tradition held that a freshman

16 Ibid., p. 140.
17 Allen, p. 33.
Congressman not seek recognition, Rayburn felt too strongly about the tariff question before the House to let his opportunity to voice an opinion slip by. After presenting his views on the specific disadvantages of the tariff bill, he closed his speech on a note which encompassed his concern and love for his country.

I have always dreamed of a country which I believe this should be...one in which the citizenship is an educated and patriotic people, not swayed by passion and prejudice, and a country that shall know no East, no West, no North, no South, but inhabited by a people liberty loving, patriotic, happy and prosperous...

Rayburn saw his dream of being Speaker of the House realized in 1940. Then House majority leader, "Mr. Sam" filled the Speaker's chair which had been vacated by the ailing Speaker, William Bankhead. After twenty-seven years in Congress, Sam Rayburn sat in the chair where his eye had been fastened since the age of thirteen. With the exception of the eightieth and eighty-third Congresses, he maintained that rank until his death in 1961. He became so much a fixture in the House of Representatives that it is probably hard for even seasoned Congressmen to remember a time when his saturnine face, shining bald head, and piercing brown eyes did not oversee House proceedings. The Hon. John McCormack said of this Speaker, "One fact of greatness of Sam Rayburn is that neither opportunity
nor invitation by circumstances to the abuse of an immense power ever tempted him on a single day, in a single hour of his unprecedented tenure in the Speakership."\(^{19}\)

He was Speaker of the House under Franklin Roosevelt, Harry Truman, Dwight Eisenhower, and John Kennedy. To all, even to the Republican, he was an important aid in getting legislation through the House. In times of political stress, he prevented disastrous party division and helped to preserve the two-party system by being ever fair with the minority.\(^{20}\) All those in Congress "knew him as a friend whose reputation for old-fashioned promise keeping was unmarred. He knew the ins and outs of every major bill; the disputes that surrounded it, the compromises that might have to be made..."\(^{21}\) The confidence he had of all factions of Congress was undoubtedly due to his personal integrity. Not all men in Congress agreed with him in all things, but all respected his word. He often said, "You'll never get mixed up if you simply tell the truth. Then you don't have to remember what you have said, and you never forget what you have said."\(^{22}\)

In a conversation with his good friend Jack Garner, Rayburn once said, "I think someday a man will be elected who'll bring

\(^{19}\) *House Document No. 247*, p. viii.


\(^{22}\) Ragsdale, p. 72.
the Speakership into respectability again. He'll be the real leader of the House. He'll be master around here and everyone will know it."^23

Rayburn's fifty years in Congress were characterized by a steady increase in prestige and influence. Always he had a definite and serious aim in every action. On the floor or in a committee, he never budged but preferred to out fight and out argue the other fellow. He pushed legislation through the House without gag-rules limiting debate and amendments.\(^24\)

The marks of a leader in the House or Senate have been generally agreed upon as the following:

1) A good fellow; sociable; fond of masculine society.

2) Astute in handling other men; clever in perceiving motives; good observer of habits and appearances of his colleagues.

3) Essentially somewhat conservative; rarely grows emotional over political issues.

4) Interested in practical aspects of party management.

5) Becomes a leader in the end because he regards politics as a game he loves to play.\(^25\)

In all of these, Sam Rayburn was a qualifier because he was a master politician.


\(^{25}\) Alsop and Kinter, p. 22.
In the course of his service in Congress, Rayburn was often called "The Great Compromiser," but he disliked that description since he felt that it implied a sacrifice of principles for expediency. "I am not a compromiser," he denied emphatically.

I'd rather be a persuader. I try to compromise by getting people to think my way. Of course, there are times when you haven't got the votes. Then you have to make concessions. But, in the main, you can get what you want by sticking to your guns.\footnote{Ibid.}

Even in this quotation, Sam Rayburn defined his own philosophy of public speaking. He would rather be a "persuader," and he seems to have been just that. Congress passed revolutionary statutes in the areas of soil conservation, rural electrification, production credit, production marketing, commodity credit, and farm-to-market roads under his legislative leadership. This man devoted his life to the people of his own Congressional district and the people of the whole nation. Any attempt to completely elaborate on those contributions would prove too massive for this type of paper. It will suffice to say that he rose to power and influence because he was a "good fellow, a thorough organization man, and an inordinately hard worker."\footnote{Alsop and Kinter, p. 22.}

"Rayburn had a theory that a member of Congress deserved a certain amount of respect as the chosen spokesman of his constituency, and he made it a point never to leave a man angry."\footnote{Jesse Laventhal, "Mr. Sam," San Antonio News and Express, November 21, 1961.}
As he pointed out, "If you are square with them, they will always understand your reasons when you're patient enough."\textsuperscript{29} Rayburn's theory about speaking from the floor of Congress also seems to express the kind of man he was. He said, "Don't take the floor until you know you're ready--never just to hear the sound of your own voice."\textsuperscript{30} Rayburn followed his own advice. He seldom made speeches in Congress. When he did, "no silver-tongued oratory flowed from him, nor any cracker-barrel opinions dressed up to attract attention."\textsuperscript{31} He didn't believe in using oratory to gloss over a situation or unduly sway a person to a way of thinking.

Rayburn was fair to everyone but orators. He was not an orator and believed in the American maxim, "The steam that blows the whistle will never turn a wheel." He ruled that talk in Congress be limited to the business at hand; when that was disposed of, the gates to the cave of the winds could be opened.\textsuperscript{32}

He allowed any member of Congress to speak for one minute on any topic before the beginning of each session. Thus, Rayburn believed that speaking should serve a specific purpose.

On the rare occasions when Rayburn did address Congress (usually less than a dozen times a year), the chambers would fill and a hushed silence would prevail as all listened. "Speaking in a low, conversational tone, he talked briefly, pointedly, in short hard sentences, and in the stripped-down vocabulary of a Texas cow hand, sincerity ringing in every

\textsuperscript{29}Ibid. \textsuperscript{30}Ibid. \textsuperscript{31}David Cohn, "Mr. Speaker," \textit{Atlantic}, CLXXX (October, 1941), 73. \textsuperscript{32}Ibid.
One of the Speaker's philosophies in dealing with people was, "You can persuade men and lead them much easier than you can drive them." This philosophy he followed both in his speaking from the floor of Congress and in the more than one hundred private conferences he held daily with fellow Congressmen. He was "brief without being curt; blunt without being brutal." That he preferred to use the power of personal persuasion rather than force in his verbal dealing with people is exemplified by Representative Leslie Arends of Illinois, who said, "He does not arbitrarily use the power that is his as Speaker. He uses, and has used on me, the power of personal persuasion."

Sam Rayburn the public speaker was much like Sam Rayburn in any confrontation with people. Even in his delivery, his serious, unchanging facial expression, piercing and penetrating eye-contact, and a slightly ministerial voice tone and inflection pattern were in keeping with the kind of man he was. He had a good, strong, flexible voice which he used to its best advantage.

Although he seldom used gestures, but preferred to underline points by a quick nod of the head, he occasionally did slowly

33 Paul F. Healy, "They're Just Crazy About Sam," Saturday Evening Post, CCIV (November 24, 1951), 66.
34 Ragsdale, p. 68.  
35 Healy, p. 22.
37 Interview with H.D. Dulaney, Librarian, Sam Rayburn Library, Bonham, Texas, March 22, 1969.
raise his right hand from the elbow and, with index finger extended, bring the hand down in one sharp movement, much as though he were using the Speaker's gavel. For special emphasis, he used noticeably soft and loud volume variety. Key words were surrounded by a significant pause or were given an extra "punch" to demand attention. At times, he would lean forward over his right arm which was extended to the front of the podium, or he would purse his lips and peer over the top of his glasses to let a point find its mark in the listener's mind.38

The librarian of the Memorial Library in Bonham, Texas, H.D. Dulaney, verifies that Rayburn was the sole author of his speeches. Probably his pioneer stock which encouraged honesty and individuality contributed to this. Often the speeches were dictated to Dulaney who accompanied him to Washington as a stenographer on his staff. There were those who wanted to influence what the Speaker said in his public speeches, but seldom did they succeed. During the 1956 Democratic Convention there were those who exerted considerable pressure on "Mr. Sam" to include certain things in his key-note address. Rayburn listened kindly to each suggestion, but when he delivered the speech, the written and revised text was ignored, and the Speaker spoke on that which he had intended to say in the beginning.39

38Ibid.
39Ibid.
His language was as unpretentious as the man and was the same whether he spoke in Congress or to a friend in a Bonham feed store. His plain, simple language was colored by some Texas colloquialisms. "Figger" was usually substituted for figure, and "ever" for every. If an idea was out of date it was "old-fogey" and "no body woulda hadta" get a dictionary to understand what he was saying.

He advised his fellow Congressmen to practice an economy of words. They were told to "make short speeches and avoid all the multi-syllable and tongue-twisting words."\(^\text{40}\)

"If a Republican calls the President a Communist," he advised, "this may be mean vicious propaganda, but the people will never know it if you call it that. Instead, tell them it's a hell-born lie."\(^\text{41}\)

Reading a cross-section of Rayburn speeches, one notices certain phrases and ideas appearing over and over again. Faith in youth, love of country, and concern for the problems of rural America seem to be voiced in many of his speeches. Dulaney pointed out that most of Rayburn's speeches were built from a mental storehouse of key phrases and ideas. Since the things "Mr. Sam" felt were most important in life were very fundamental, it is not difficult to see how he could and would relate any other matter to these basics. In several speeches

\(^\text{40}\)Dorough, p. 301.

\(^\text{41}\)Ibid.
he said, for example, "I believe that ninety-eight and one-half of the American people are good folks, and when properly motivated they will respond," and, "I have absolute faith in the American people."

Rayburn was "not gabby nor a back-slapper." Rather distant and secretive with most people, he relaxed with his own circle and "shaped his existence to suit his tastes as an old dog shapes his bed to his carcass." But, even with this reserve, his audiences seemed to warm to his speaking. The total personality of the man was always evident.

Speaker Rayburn presided during the passage of some of the most formative and historic legislation of our nation's history. Beginning as an active supporter of the Roosevelt "New Deal," he became the leading spokesman for rural electrification and all improvements for rural America. His dreams for farm folk were expressed in these remarks to a friend:

The rural homes must have an opportunity to become more attractive and have more conveniences. Drudgery, darkness, and muddy roads are not conducive to anything that is good. They are not profitable in a democracy. Conveniences will eliminate the feeling of drudgery in the necessary rural tasks that must be done each day. We have enough low-cost power now going to waste in our muddy streams, out best engineers say, to light all the rural homes in America. I simply hate to think of the social and economic and moral loss to about one-third of the people of my State who live

\(^{42}\) Ibid.
\(^{43}\) Ragsdale, p. 60.
\(^{44}\) Alsop and Kinter, p. 22.
on roads that will not permit travel so much of the time to market, to school, to church, and to obtain a doctor for the sick. All-weather roads and rural electrification will drive mud and darkness away in more ways than one. Rayburn was influential in the passage of this legislation as well as in opening doors for "New Deal" and "New Frontier" bills to receive maximum consideration during the F.D.R. and J.F.K. Administrations.

Sam Rayburn died of cancer on November 16, 1961, in his home town. He had often said, "Home looks better to me than any place in the world," and it had been his desire to spend his last days there. Dignitaries, Congressmen, farm hands, barbers, grocers, and housewives poured into Bonham to pay their last respects to "Mr. Sam." Indeed, some of them thought that "Mr. Sam" and "Uncle Sam" were one and the same. Not all of them had always voted for Rayburn, and not all of them had agreed with his views, but most had listened with respect to what he had to say. He spoke for Fannin County, for the Democratic Party, and for the nation as a whole. What this man said and how he said it are certainly worthy of examination.

\[45\] Allen, p. 89.
CHAPTER III

LOGICAL APPEAL

When a person sets his mind toward motivating another person to a specific course of action, he should realize that he must appeal to that person on three levels. For one thing, the action he is proposing must appeal to that person's mind. The action must appear to be a logical and rational thing to do. Also, he must appeal to this person's heart. For, if the person has no desire or emotional compulsion to respond, the chances are slim that he will act merely because his head says to act. Finally, the person is more prone to take the suggested action if he respects the person who is advocating the action. Or, as Aristotle, one of the first teachers of public address, would say, he must utilize logos, pathos, and ethos, or logical, emotional, and ethical appeal. These three appeals, then, are the components of invention.

Making a subjective judgment about whether or not a speaker "makes sense" is easy to do. However, there are certain criteria as set forth by Thonssen and Baird which provide for a more scientific and thorough appraisal of logical adeptness.

One of the first considerations should be the intellectual stock of the speaker. Through the text of a speech it is possible to tell if the speaker's judgment is sound by seeing
if he discriminates between essential and non-essential data, and if significant items are held constantly in view. His personal intelligence can also be determined through his recognition of the pressing problems of the day and through the amount of reflective thought which seems apparent.\(^1\)

A very excellent standard for judging a speaker's intellectual stock is Dewey's formula for recognizing logic in the light of

1. his recognition of the problems which are disturbing the status quo,
2. his analysis of the nature and bearing of the problem upon the social setting,
3. his fertility of mind in suggesting ideas relevant to the solution of the difficulty,
4. his acuteness in examining, through reasoning, the implications of his suggestions, and
5. the verification of his judgment following the acceptance of the most feasible solution.\(^2\)

A major part of sound judgment and arguments is sound evidence. Whether the evidence used is fact or testimony, it should have a certain integrity.

Factual evidence can be tested for validity and acceptability by asking of it:

1. Are the instances numerous enough?
2. Are the units included in the investigation properly and carefully defined?

---


\(^2\) Ibid., p. 336.
3. Is there comparability between the things compared?
4. Are the instances typical of the field as a whole?
5. Are the facts reported and classified accurately?
6. Do the facts furnish an index to the information desired?

Testimony can be found to support almost any proposal a speaker might advocate. Therefore, personal quotations should be tested to be sure they are not statements of mere whim or prejudice. Any testimonial evidence should appeal to the truth of the case at hand and should meet the following tests:

1. Is the testimony consistent with itself and with the laws of logical argument?
2. Is the authority reliable?
3. Has the authority examined the data from which he speaks?
4. Is he prejudiced?
5. Is he generally recognized as capable and competent in his field?
6. Are the facts of the testimony causally related to each other?
7. Is the source citation or the authority recognized?
8. Does other evidence corroborate what is introduced?
9. Is the evidence recent?
10. Does the evidence satisfy the reader?\(^3\)

If the evidence used by a speaker meets these standards, it should be considered fairly reliable. To be more specific,

\(^3\)Ibid., p. 343.
\(^4\)Ibid., p. 345.
if the evidence used by Sam Rayburn in these selected congressional, ceremonial, and campaign speeches meets these standards, it can be concluded that at least this segment of his logical appeal is firmly based.

The actual arguments advanced in speech are also important. These arguments are lines of reasoning which are supported by evidence, which has been previously discussed. There are two types of reasoning at a speaker's disposal. One type is deductive and the other type is inductive reasoning.

In reasoning deductively, one begins with a statement which is universally considered to be true, and concludes that the same thing can be said of an individual case which is comparable to the whole. In so reasoning he constructs a syllogism. The syllogism must contain a major premise, a minor premise, and a conclusion. It must contain three terms: major, middle, and minor. If any part of the syllogism is missing or falsely represented, the reasoning is fallacious. "The middle term of the syllogism must be distributed—i.e., used in a universal sense, meaning all or every—in at least one of the premises."\(^5\) For this term to be included in the conclusion, it must be distributed in one of the premises. Also, it is impossible to draw a valid conclusion from two negative premises, and if one negative premise is given, the conclusion must likewise be negative. Naturally, the facts alleged in the premises should be true.\(^6\)

\(^5\)Ibid., p. 346. 
\(^6\)Ibid., pp. 346-347.
Besides the correct structure of the syllogism, validity in reasoning deductively rests upon the truth of the major premise, and being able to prove the minor premise.

Another type of reasoning is inductive reasoning. When reasoning inductively, one says that a thing which is true in a particular case is true in all cases which are similar. This is reasoning from the specific to the general.

To reason inductively, a credible relationship must exist between the particular point being proved, and the conclusion being drawn. Causal relationships, analogies, specific instances, and authorities which give a truthful representation of the cause propounded serve to establish this relationship.

The primary thing to be concerned with in inductive reasoning is whether or not there is comparability between the particular and the general. Unless this basic "likeness" exists, no valid conclusions can be drawn.

Involved in the credibility of all the foregoing is the speaker's use of language. It should be clear, free from contradiction, complete in drawing conclusions only when there are adequate facts, and consecutive. Since words carry both emotive and referential value, use of "loaded" words should be taken into consideration. In all, a speaker's logical appeal can be best assessed by an observation of the vision and judgment and truth shown throughout. Then, of course, a final test is: Did the speech change anything?

\[7\text{Ibid., p. 351.}\]
The intellectual stock of the man Sam Rayburn has already been mentioned generally in Chapter II and will be discussed in more detail in Chapter V. Much has been said by his contemporaries and historians concerning the sound judgment of the man. He was able to cut through the murk which so often clouds an issue and get to the heart of the matter. In all nine speeches analyzed, he devoted at least 98% of the text to a discussion of the problem at hand and not to any fringe issues. The material he presented was essential and directly related to the point he wanted to make, and the significant item was held ever in view.

In both of his speeches on the farm problems, he talked about those problems and nothing else. Every piece of evidence, every statistic or example, in some way served to amplify the need for more concern of those problems.

His speech delivered before the House of Representatives during the tense days of the second World War discussed why unity was needed and why the American people were hurting themselves through their unjustified grumblings and dissatisfaction. There was nothing in the speech which did not speak of how the people at home could, through unity of spirit and effort, help to win the war.

One outstanding trait of the congressional speeches studied is their stress on importance and urgency. No non-essential or extraneous wording is attached, and each speech is on an issue of national concern. Rayburn pointed out in each speech
the importance of that of which he speaks. In one case he brings out the importance by saying:

And, I say to you deliberately that I think our greatest domestic problem—I do not care what anybody else thinks—is what we are going to do for the preservation of what fertility is left in our soil and what we are going to do to reestablish the fertility that has already left our land.

In another instance, he said:

...the major domestic problem we have in America today is what we are going to do with this soil. Are we going to preserve it? Are we going to transmit it to generations that are to come?

In the speech delivered before the House to inspire the nation toward overall unity during the days of the second World War, the importance of such a message is more obvious, but he still pointed this importance out by saying, "The very fate of civilization depends not only on how our Army and our Navy act, but how you and I act and how you and I respond to the necessity of this hour."  

8 From the text of speech delivered before the House of Representatives on May 28, 1947. A copy of the speech was obtained from the personal files of Sam Rayburn in the Sam Rayburn Library in Bonham, Texas. This speech will be referred to throughout the remainder of the text as the farm speech.

9 From the text of speech delivered before the House of Representatives on May 1, 1952. A copy of the speech was obtained from the personal files of Rayburn in the Sam Rayburn Library in Bonham, Texas. This speech will be referred to throughout the remainder of the text as the soil conservation speech.

10 From the text of speech delivered before the House of Representatives on December 9, 1943. Copy of the speech was obtained from the personal files of Rayburn in the Sam Rayburn Library in Bonham, Texas. This speech will be referred to throughout the remainder of the text as the unity speech.
Even in the ceremonial speeches studied, this note of urgency is heard. Although he was always quick to praise his Party, and the efforts of free people, Rayburn also was equally sure to point out the ever present dangers in the world. For example, in his speech delivered at a testimonial dinner given in his honor in Washington, D.C., after many verbal tributes had been paid to him by those present, he said:

But now we have come upon times whose like is not in the annals of mankind. For today it is possible to enshroud all men in a seamless, cloudborne garment of poison, and make our planet as lifeless as the moon. I would, therefore, beseech Democrats and Republicans alike to conduct themselves with a becoming restraint in all those things that pertain to war and peace, since they pertain also to life and death of all men.

In a Labor Day speech delivered in Princeton, Texas, in 1950, several pressing topics of the time were discussed. The first was soil conservation, another was rural electrification, and others were the national economy and moral support of the Truman Administration.

In October of 1954, one of the most pressing political problems was concerned with the Congressional elections slated for the following month. Dissatisfaction with the Eisenhower Administration made it very likely that a Democratic legislature would serve with him during the next term. It was of such a situation that Sam Rayburn spoke as he pointed out the urgency of the choices made by the voters.

\[\text{From the text of speech delivered at the National Guard Armory in Washington, D.C., at a testimonial banquet given in his honor on April 16, 1960. This speech will be hereafter referred to as the testimonial speech.}\]
The situation is such between the President, who has embraced much of the Democratic legislative program, and the Republican Congress, who have resisted it, that the country will be better off if it returns a Democratic Senate and House in the November elections. ... I ask you, the American people, this question, and especially the farmer—the small businessman—what is your financial condition in 1954 compared to what it was in 1951 and 1952? Do you have more money or as many people working? Is the average businessman as prosperous as he was? Have you been benefitted by and are you proud of the change?¹²

A similar voicing of pressing issues is evidenced in the other speeches studied. Coupled with this seems to be the characteristic of truly reflective thought. A good standard by which to evaluate Rayburn's reflective thinking is the formula devised by John Dewey. That formula will be followed.

As has been stated earlier, Sam Rayburn did seem to recognize and speak on issues which were affecting, or threatened to affect the status quo. Each of the speeches studied discussed areas of national and international concern. Not only did he point out the specific problem, and in most cases its cause, but he also broadened the scope of ultimate effects to include all of society. Whenever he discussed his Party, he discussed it in the light of benefits to all Americans. This is evidenced in the campaign speeches studied, and also in the ceremonial speeches, which were, in actuality, political. Sam Rayburn could not divorce himself from Party affiliation, nor could be bypass an opportunity to expound upon its glory.

¹²From text of speech delivered over nationwide television on September 10, 1954. A copy of the speech was obtained from the Sam Rayburn Library in Bonham, Texas. This speech will be referred to throughout the remainder of the text as the television speech.
In addition to the foregoing, Dewey suggests that reflective thought shows itself in the solution the speaker proposes. Each of the Rayburn speeches studied offered a specific solution to the specific problem presented. In the congressional speeches the solutions were quite specific: vote for the expansion of the soil conservation bill; stop complaining about the war; and get behind our boys in unified support. However, in the two other types of speeches, the solutions were more general. For example, in the testimonial speech, he devoted the body of the speech to a historical survey of the place of the Democratic Party in helping the country. He then shifted in a few sentences to remind those present of the dangers of the age, and gave a solution to the meeting of those dangers as he said, "...let us in this desperate hour nobly conceive and nobly act in the greatness that is our heritage and our light and our life. So doing, within the eye of God, we shall triumph over evil..."

Such a statement of solution seems typical for the ceremonial and campaign speeches of this man. Indeed, at times it seems that the Speaker believed the panacea to all the nation's needs to be support of the Democratic Party and becoming concerned Americans.

The implications of following his suggestions are not directly brought forward in any of the speeches studied, but the assumption of favorable results is evident. There seems to be no room for alternatives. To the Speaker, doing the right thing, the basic thing, was the only alternative, so why discuss what might accrue under other action?
Having thus discussed the intellectual stock of Rayburn, and finding it to be acceptable in almost every area which the criteria set forth, the argumentative development of the man should be analyzed. What shall be ascertained is "that measure of assent which indicates a reasonable degree of truth. Fundamentally, the constituents of logical proof are evidence and argument or reasoning."¹³ The procedure which will be followed in discussing the arguments developed by Rayburn will be to first evaluate, in a general way, Rayburn's use of supporting material in the light of criteria set forth by Thonssen and Baird. Following will be a discussion of specific arguments used in each speech studied. The validity of his supporting material will rest upon the tests previously administered, and no additional test of evidence will be discussed unless there are significant deviations from the established norm.

Rayburn seemed to have a ready knowledge of facts and statistics necessary for the support of his arguments. Especially in the congressional speeches, there is liberal use of statistics. These facts were sufficiently numerous, but there is a lack of documentation of those facts. There was a tendency in these speeches toward reducing a fact to its most easily assimilated portion. This is exemplified in the following two quotations from his farm speech: "In other words, let me repeat, if many millions of dollars more are not put in this bill than the amount proposed by the committee, soil conservation is dead."

¹³Baird and Thonssen, p. 341.
The only clue as to the "amount" alluded to comes much earlier in the speech when he says, "In the appropriation bill last year...we made a solemn pledge to the American farmer that we would appropriate this year $300,000,000 for soil conservation."

The other example of simplifying facts in this speech came when he said, "...they produced more in 1943 than they had ever produced before. They produced more in 1944 than they had ever produced before. They produced more in 1945 than they had ever produced before." But how much is more?

However, whereas generalizations were made in some instances, detailed consideration to specifics was noted in the latter part of this speech where he made reference to the growth in rural electrification. Here, a year by year account of the number of farms serviced by rural electrification in the counties he represented was given. The same type of consideration for exactness was given when he discussed road construction.

A similar balancing of specifics with generalities is noted in the other speeches, but, it is difficult to read these speeches without feeling a great respect for the ability of this man to back so many assertions with statistical proof which is relevant and reliable. It can be noted that Rayburn's use of statistical proof revolved around only his arguments concerning economic growth. This is true in all the speeches studied. The following quotation from his rural electrification speech illustrates his use of statistics.
At what price have the farmers and ranchers been able to receive this most valuable of all services? Today, electricity marketed by rural cooperatives and public utility companies cost the average farmer approximately 1/3 less per kilowatt hour than it did in 1940. By contrast, during this same period, feed prices advanced 225%, farm wages 400%, and farm machinery prices 100%. The rural market today is the largest user of electrical energy per average consumer by about fifty percent.

Comparison is also shown in the preceding excerpt. Such a specific comparison could have been used to better support this quotation from his speech delivered during the 1956 congressional campaign:

Millions were unemployed when we came into power in 1933, and before our Administration closed, 621 million men and women were gainfully employed at reasonable wages and decent working conditions. After twelve years under Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover, the national income of the United States had sunk to 39 billions of dollars. We were accused of spending the country into bankruptcy, but in the twenty years we were in power, the national income rose to more than 280 billions of dollars.

Rayburn's factual evidence, as far as research can indicate, was accurate. When comparisons were made, they were valid, and all facts used in these nine speeches were relevant. Most factual evidence was used in the soil and farm speeches, the R.E.A. speech, and the television speech. Very little use of statistics was made in the unity speech and the nomination speech.

14 From text of speech delivered in Atlanta, Georgia, on May 11, 1955, before banquet celebrating the twentieth anniversary of the Rural Electrification Act. Copy of speech was obtained from Sam Rayburn Library in Bonham, Texas. This speech will be referred to hereafter as the R.E.A. speech.

15 From text of speech delivered in Baltimore, Maryland, in 1956. Copy of speech was obtained from Sam Rayburn Library in Bonham, Texas. This speech will be referred to hereafter as the Baltimore speech.
Testimony as a type of supporting material was not common in Rayburn speeches, except the personal testimony of Rayburn himself. In the nine speeches, only three quotations from other persons are used. One is from his testimonial speech where he quoted President Truman's first message to Congress: "Let me assure the forward looking people of America that there will be no relaxation in our efforts to improve the lot of the common people." Another is from the Baltimore speech where he quoted John McCormack, Democratic Leader of the House at that time, as saying, "The Democratic Party is the Party with a heart." Neither of these could really be classified as significant testimonial proof for they are little more than accent marks on what Rayburn is himself advancing.

Using the criteria for evaluating testimony in regard to the personal testimony of Rayburn, one can see that this testimony was very consistent with itself and was logically sound. That Rayburn as an authority was reliable has been established, as has the fact of his awareness of data surrounding that about which he spoke.

Saying that Rayburn was an unprejudiced speaker would not be entirely accurate. That he was conscious of all sides of a controversy is true. That he was free from social prejudice seems true. That he was completely objective and unprejudiced

---

16 From the text of speech delivered in Princeton, Texas, on September 13, 1950, at a Labor Day celebration. Copy of speech was obtained from personal files in Sam Rayburn Memorial Library in Bonham, Texas. This speech will be referred to hereafter as the Princeton speech.
in issues involving a confrontation of Democratic ideas versus Republican, is probably not true.

Surely, he was recognized as a competent advocate of that for which he spoke in each of the speeches studied. Rayburn did not believe it right to speak publicly on a subject with which he was not completely familiar. When he spoke, he spoke with authority.

Although the same phrases and references are evidenced in several of the speeches, and although frequent historical allusions are made, nevertheless, his opinions were recent, up-to-date, and relevant.

The supporting material used by Sam Rayburn shows responsibility and integrity, and sound judgment.

The next area which should be discussed is the Speaker's actual lines of argument. How did he use this supporting material? For only through proper application of evidence can desired conclusions be derived. Thonssen and Baird point out:

The principal forms of discourse used by a speaker in the logical development of his ideas are exposition and argument....Since all argument regardless of type, must make certain ideas clear before it can lead to the fixation of belief or attitude, it follows that expositional detail is prerequisite to argumentative development. 17

Definition and example play important parts in setting the proper stage for an argument. In this respect, the examples used by Rayburn are clear and descriptive. Although not given to a heavy reliance on examples he did use them with propriety.

17Baird and Thonssen, pp. 344-345.
The example given in his unity speech of a mother who has given six sons in service for the war effort was quite illustrative as well as emotionally arousing.

The television speech was filled with examples. In fact, the speech covered a multitude of topics relevant to the Republican Administration. An indictment was made and immediately supported by an example. The following quotations exemplify this.

On agriculture, the Republicans made bit promises in the 1952 campaign. In Minnesota, when he was a candidate, Mr. Eisenhower stated that he not only favored ninety percent of parity on farm commodity prices, but he favored 100 percent parity on the market for 1954.

After the election, President Eisenhower changed his mind. He went all out for Secretary of Agriculture Benson's proposal for flexible price supports from 75 to 90 percent. Whenever a minimum is set on price supports, it automatically becomes the maximum.

Another such example came in his discussion of federal tax revision. After pointing out the statistical inequity of the bill, he said:

To show unfairness of this Tax Bill, the man with a wife and two children who makes his living with his brain and brawn and earns $4,000 a year will pay $20 a year income tax. The man who has an income of $4,000 a year with dividends pays only $184.

Use of personal example is made when he said:

The farm prices for his products, on the average, have declined 20% in the last two years and many farm products have declined more than that. I can give you a personal example as a cattleman. In 1951 I sold my calves off the cow for an average of $150 a head. In 1953, I sold them for less than $50. There is a lot of talk about depressions and recessions. A great many people say there has been none, but as a cattleman, I want to say that I am in a depression.
To cite an example from another speech, note the support in the Princeton speech of Rayburn's description of the national economy under Republican leadership.

What did we find then?--14,000,000 unemployed people. If the bread winner in that family had a wife and only one child, that made 42,000,000 Americans that had no buying power at all. Add to that the 33,000,000 people on the farms of the country...and you have 75,000,000 of the 133,000,000 people who had no buying power or who had practically none.

From these citations it can be deduced that the illustrations used by Rayburn were illustrative of the point the Speaker was making. He did not tell unrelated stories. They were not elaborated on to any large degree, but were conveyed with enough detail to give a complete picture. They sensibly fitted into the context of the speech and were not just tangent remarks. In regard to number, they were heavily distributed in the television speech and the Baltimore speech. In the other studied texts, only a few examples were used in campaign speeches, and fewer in other speaking situations.

Thomssen and Baird say that examples should illustrate what is being discussed and not something else; they should be described in sufficient detail, should fit sensibly into the context of the speech, and should be sufficient in number to avoid generalizations from a few isolated instances. In these respects, Rayburn met the criteria.

\[18\textbf{Ibid.}, p. 345.\]
In appraising the argumentative design of this man, the question to first be answered is what is the conclusion toward which each speech was aimed? After this is answered, it should be determined how he arrived at that conclusion. What lines of reasoning did he use, and what are the actual arguments? After doing this, a judgment should be made as to how well his arguments were chosen and developed. For a thorough analysis, the above procedure will be applied to each speech under study.

The end purpose of the farm speech was to move Congress to increase appropriations for farm problems in the areas of soil conservation, rural electrification, vocational agricultural schools, farm-to-market roads, and home purchasing. Rayburn used primarily inductive reasoning in this speech and established a causal relationship between improved farm conditions and good for the entire country.

He first showed how a failure to appropriate more money would result in the eventual death of farm bills which were operating under a limited budget already. Then he showed how the death of these bills would result in the eventual total waste of the soil which would cut down production making exports lessen and importation of raw materials increase. The death of the bills would also result in many veterans not returning to the farms, hence increasing the problem through a lack of man power.
A statement of the causal relationship which is evident in the speech is, "...if many millions of dollars more are not put in this bill than the amount proposed by the committee, soil conservation is dead." Another is, "They [the veterans] are not going to the farm and stay there unless they have two things—one is rural electrification and the other is an all weather road." The same directly stated result came when he said, "...if the bill passes the House and the Senate in present form, the farm tenant purchase program is also dead."

These examples show the more obvious causal relationships. A less obvious one came when he pointed out that Congress had promised more money for the farmers. The implied result here is that failure to provide more money would result in a lessening of trust in Congress by the farmers.

Deductive reasoning is also observed in an overriding argument which stated that what helps the farmer helps America. More money in the areas discussed would help the farmer, and thus, more money for those bills would help all of America.

The supporting material for both lines of argument was primarily personal experience and factual.

The desired result of the soil speech was similar, but was concerned specifically with Congress voting against amendments which would cut down appropriations. Again, inductive reasoning resting upon causal relationships was the main line of reasoning. To Rayburn, the result of cutting appropriations would be 1) harm to the nation's economy and 2) weakening the position.
of the United States in the world. Using personal testimony
and factual evidence, Rayburn supported each relationship well.

A harm to the nation's economy would come when the soil
lost its fertility due to negligence in conservation, he said,
because the farmer's buying power would decrease, resulting in
less demand for products from industry, resulting in production
cuts in factories, resulting in city workers being put out of
work: a cycle which would upset the entire national economy.
This entire chain of causal relationship was based upon personal
opinion and upon the establishment of a statistical relationship
which showed how the increase in farm income corresponded with
an increase in production, national income, bank deposits,
corporate profits, and wages and salaries between 1933 and 1951.
The statistics of the increase in all these areas were presented,
but the relationship was only implied and not clearly stated.

In arguing the second point that failing to increase soil
conservation would result in weakening the position of the
United States in the world, personal testimony was the main
form of supporting material used. He said:

Soil waste and soil erosion is the reason why governments
throughout the length and breadth of the earth are not
stable because their people do not have enough to eat,

The implication is that the United States could fall into that
pattern. The relationship was further strengthened as he said:

One of the greatest defense measures that we can have is
to have a sufficient supply of raw materials at hand so
that we will not be dependent if submarines sweep the
ships from the seas and we have to draw from within ourselves as far as the seas are concerned.

Thus, inductive reasoning, using a causal relationship substantiated by personal testimony and facts, comprise the argumentative pattern of the soil conservation speech.

The purpose of the unity speech was to say as a nation we should stop complaining about the inconveniences imposed upon us by the war, and we should unify in spirit and support of the war effort. In reaching this conclusion, Rayburn reasoned inductively again, proving "we are not unified," by pointing out specific cases of a lack of this unified character. The instances he pointed out concerned complaining about inconveniences, a lack of willingness to sacrifice, and a preoccupation with what we will do after the war rather than how to obtain victory now.

Supporting these generalizations are examples, both actual and hypothetical, as well as personal testimony. Hypothetical examples came in the form of questions as Rayburn said:

Every day or every week, somebody somewhere asks: "What are we going to do with Russia after the war is over?"..."What is Russia going to take from us?"..."Are we going to be able to feed the world after this thing is over?"

About the unjustified complaints, he used himself as an example and said:

I am wondering what sacrifice I have made, and I cannot think of a single one....We in this country would not know that a war was on if we did not read the newspapers, hear the radio, and see the vacant chairs in the homes of the country....When I think of these people [soldiers]
I would despise myself if I complained about my little inconveniences, and that is the best or the worst of the greatest sacrifice I have made.

In concluding the speech, he used one other type of inductive reasoning when he drew a causal relationship stating that a unified support of those on the home front could result in a unified effort in victory on the front lines.

Personal opinion and examples dominated the supporting material for the inductive reasoning used in this speech.

Whereas inductive reasoning was the primary mode of reasoning in the three congressional speeches, two of the three ceremonial speeches have strong deductive lines of argument.

In the testimonial speech, the following syllogism was set up:

A Party of responsibility is best for the good of the United States.

The Democratic Party is a Party of responsibility.

The Democratic Party is best for the good of the United States.

Establishing his Party as the Party of responsibility was the desired conclusion of the speech. Examples, authority, and causal relationships were used for supporting material in doing this.

Through example, Rayburn pointed out areas where the Party had acted responsibly by 1) supporting the common man, 2) leading the nation through a great depression and two great world wars, 3) fortifying the country against communism, 4) bringing the United States out of isolation and into world leadership, and 5) co-operating with an opposition President (Eisenhower).
By quoting some famous and generally revered men such as Thomas Jefferson, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, and Andrew Jackson, who were all Democrats, Rayburn further supported the respect for his Party as one of responsibility. Using more modern quotations from President Harry Truman, he compared the consistency of the goals of the Party—past and present.

Even now the name Andrew Jackson rings sharp on American ears. It means a man who would fight for the ordinary man. It means a man who could not be deterred by the devil himself when he was fighting for the people's interest.

This quotation from Truman's first message to Congress offered a good comparison: "Let me assure the forward looking people of America that there will be no relaxation in our efforts to improve the lot of the common people."

A causal relationship was established to show the responsibility of the Democratic Party as reflected by 1) the growth and prosperity of the nation under their leadership and 2) the American people's acceptance of the Party as their own. As Rayburn saw it, "Today the American people are so deeply devoted to the Democratic reforms of this generation that no Republican Administration would dare tamper with them; certainly not in open daylight."

In the Princeton speech, Rayburn aimed at the unified support of the country during dangerous peacetimes. But instead of the inductive reasoning used in his previous speech with a similar goal of motivating unity, this one reasoned deductively.
Our form of government depends upon the support of the people to survive.

Under existing conditions, our government does not have the full support of its people.

Under existing conditions, our form of government cannot survive.

In support of the minor premise, causation and generalization provided the chief support.

In regard to the knock-and-smear tactics in practice against the government and its policies, Rayburn said that such practices would result in harm to 1) every American, 2) those in younger countries who were looking to us for leadership, and 3) the entire cause of freedom. This line of causal reasoning was exemplified when he said:

We are in the testing period as to whether or not the civilization that we have known and loved will continue or perish from the earth.

The time, my countrymen, has come that these campaigns of knock-and-smear must cease if we are to perform our function and fulfill our destiny....free people, languishing near dictatorships and iron curtains, are looking to this mighty Republic to see whether or not we will lead; whether we have the capacity.

Some generalizations were made to prove that these criticisms were unjustified and should therefore cease. Among those generalizations were 1) we are more prosperous as a nation than ever before, 2) conditions continue to improve, 3) we are better prepared militarily than ever before (referring to the conflict then in progress over Korea), 4) our leadership is highly qualified (specifically President Truman and Secretary of State Dean Acheson), and 5) the Truman policies are aimed at and can meet the perils of the times.
The reasoning in the speech is easy to follow and especially well backed by necessary proof. The first third of this speech was a statement on farm problems which parallels his earlier speech on the same subject.

The R.E.A. speech was well supported in its statement for the progress in rural America during twenty years of R.E.A. activity. Making good use of statistics, Rayburn supported the causal relationship that because of R.E.A. the country had benefited through 1) better living conditions for farmers, 2) a national economic upsurge, 3) an expansion of industry to produce more electrical farm equipment, 4) benefits to the private electrical companies, and 5) an opportunity to share these advances with less privileged underdeveloped countries.

In all three campaign speeches, deductive reasoning was used. An interesting comparison of syllogistic design can be made between the television speech and the Baltimore speech. The first had a negative purpose in persuading the viewers not to vote Republican in the upcoming election. The second was positive in purpose as it encouraged the listener to vote for the Democratic candidates. Stated in syllogistic fashion, the argumentative design of the two speeches appear as follows:

**Television speech**

You should not vote for a Party which has not fulfilled its responsibilities to the American people.

The Republican Party has not fulfilled its responsibilities to the American people.

You should not vote for the Republican Party.
Baltimore speech

You should vote for the Party which can best benefit you and the nation.

The Democratic Party can best benefit you and the nation. You should vote for the Democratic Party.

To prove the minor premise in the television speech, Rayburn established a cause-effect relationship between Republican leadership and abuse of the common man and a setback in the progress of the nation. He showed how the Republicans had not fulfilled their platform promises in the areas of foreign policy, budget and tax reform, unemployment and agriculture. Personal testimony supported these indictments. Because the Republican Administration had not proven to be responsible, said Rayburn, candidates under that banner should not be elected.

To prove his minor premise relative to the benefits derived under Democratic leadership, Rayburn enumerated and supported by personal testimony and statistics the past evidences of national advancement during Democratic administrations. He proved that his Party was a "Party with a heart" because of the fruits of Democratic efforts, which included old age assistance, improved national income, highway improvement, extended Social Security, strengthened national defense measures, and minimum wage law.

Personal testimony was the major support for the nomination speech for Lyndon Johnson in 1960. Arguing deductively,
Rayburn established that America needed a strong, proven leader as its next President. He then asserted that Lyndon Johnson met those necessary qualifications, and logically concluded that he should be the Party's nominee for the next President of the United States as he said, "With great confidence in your judgment, I give you the name of the proven leader which these anxious times demand...Lyndon B. Johnson of Texas."\(^{19}\)

Thus, in five of the speeches studied, deductive reasoning is the most obvious argumentative style used by Rayburn. In the remaining four, inductive reasoning is clearly dominant. Of the four which argue inductively, three are congressional and one is ceremonial. All three campaign speeches, and two ceremonial speeches argue deductively. That Rayburn deliberately chose the way he would argue is evident. When speaking before fellow Democrats in a partisan environment, he used deductive reasoning, and used as his major premise a strongly "Democratic truth." Both of the ceremonial speeches which have deductive reasoning were given before audiences which were largely Democratic (fellow Democrats at the testimonial banquet, and the principality of Princeton, Texas, which is strongly Democratic). He probably knew that he need not go into such detail in establishing strong causal relationships with those who thought as he did.

\(^{19}\)From text of speech delivered at the Democratic National Convention in Los Angeles, California, on July 13, 1960, to nominate Lyndon B. Johnson as the Party's Presidential candidate. Copy of speech obtained from Sam Rayburn Library, Bonham, Texas. The speech will be refered to hereafter as the nomination speech.
On the other hand, when he spoke before Congress, he consistently argued inductively. He knew that before this group a line of argument based on an assume truth would not be as likely to stand. Therefore, he carefully established sound causal relationships to prove a truth from which the validity of the whole could be drawn. This maneuver in adjusting his lines of reasoning to the audience at hand shows a shrewdness on Rayburn's part.

Also characteristic of the logical appeal in these speeches is the clear wording and the lack of significant contradictions in arguments. He submitted his arguments in good consecutive order. Perhaps the most striking characteristic of the logical development of his speeches is the strictness with which all parts are held together to advance a central proposition. In only one case does this not hold true. The Princeton speech could easily be classified as two complete speeches. One is a statement of his views on farm problems, and the other is on national unity. But even here, there is no overlapping of the two postulates. Tangent thoughts and irrelevant material have no part in Rayburn speeches.

In all the speeches, much reliance is placed upon personal Rayburn testimony. Liberal use of statistics is made in the congressional speeches, and examples are most common in his campaign and ceremonial speaking. Rayburn left some figures standing alone without necessary correlations being drawn between them and the desired conclusions of the argument being
advanced. This has been pointed out from the farm speech and the soil conservation speech.

The last thing to be discussed in regard to logical appeal is the accuracy of the speaker's vision in advancing certain arguments. It should be determined whether or not history has proven Rayburn's advocations to be significant.

The first thing to be observed is that each of the Rayburn speeches pertained to an immediate problem of the time during which he spoke, but there was a timeless quality about them. Testing the vision of Rayburn's speeches which were campaign and ceremonial does not apply since such speeches were not designed to be primarily argumentative. The lasting impact of these speeches was secondary to the purpose of bringing about an immediate response.

Looking at those speeches which did aim at changing a policy, however, one can see that Rayburn's vision was correct. History tells us that additional funds to supplement the progress of rural America were appropriated, and the results can be measured today in greater farming efficiency. If Rayburn's belief that a direct correlation exists between farm productivity and national prosperity is true, further proof of his vision can be seen in the growing national prosperity of our day, calculated from the time of the passage of his bills.

On the whole, Rayburn's logical appeal was strong when it needed to be strong. It is obvious from these speeches that he knew how to use both inductive and deductive reasoning, and he knew when it was best to use each.
EMOTIONAL APPEAL

Men have long realized that the emotions play a large part in how we act and react. To be influenced toward a certain belief or action, we must appeal to the head and to the heart of the one we wish to influence. The poet who said, "The heart is master of the mind and master of the man but it masters not itself," realized that emotions control many of our motivations and responses. Thonssen and Baird point out that this is also true in the area of public speaking, for "two forms of expression operate in rhetoric: the one appeals to the intellect while the other addresses the emotions."¹

Since logical proof has been discussed, emotional, or pathetic proof, can now be defined as that proof which "includes all those materials and devices calculated to put the audience in a frame of mind suitable for the reception of the speaker's ideas."²

A speech, then, receives its energy from its emotional appeal. Naturally, not all emotional appeals will affect all audiences similarly, so it is necessary for a sensitive speaker to adapt his particular speech to the particular

²Ibid., p. 358.
audience he is addressing. This adjustment is made both prior to the speech and during the presentation of it. As Thonssen and Baird state, "The basic consideration, then, is adaptation, or adjustment to the variables of human behavior as found in a specific group of hearers."\(^3\)

In this adaptation, a speaker should consider these things:

1) age level; 2) sex; 3) intellectual and informational status with regard to the subject; 4) the political, social, religious, and other affiliations; 5) the economic status; 6) known or anticipated attitude of audience toward subject; 7) known or anticipated prejudices and predispositions; 8) occupational status; 9) known interest in the subject; 10) considerations of self-interest in the subject; and 11) temper and tone of the occasion.\(^4\)

One of Rayburn's strongest advantages in adaptation was the fact that he so often spoke before groups which he knew. He was generally more than casually involved with the people personally, or with the reason for their being there. In none of the nine speeches studied did he speak before total strangers. The television speech would come closest to being before an unknown audience, but to Sam Rayburn, any gathering of American people was a gathering of friends. He was seemingly the type of man who made it a point to know people. This is the reason hundreds of people all over northeastern Texas will say that Sam Rayburn was their friend. Establishing relationships that were not political, but were sincere and

\(^3\)Ibid., p. 360.
\(^4\)Ibid., pp. 361-362.
and deep, was his habit. This is important to realize in discussing his audience adaptation. His adapting a particular speech to a particular audience must have come naturally, for he seemed to know his audiences naturally. Even the way he addressed an audience through the text of his speeches seems to be as in a conversation rather than before multitudes.

In his unity speech this method of adaptation and of setting a mood of comradeship was established in the opening paragraph when he said:

I do not know whether it is possible for me by saying what I have in my heart today to say to be helpful to all of us or not. I read a great deal, I hear a lot of conversation, I hear things and I see things on the printed page that I feel are very hurtful to the unity of your country and mine...

When he further stated, "I know that everyone in this House loves his country," he stated an opinion upon which the entire tone of the speech rested. He adapted the speech to what he already knew personally to be true about his audience—they loved their country—because of that love they wanted to do what was best for it.

When he spoke for the anniversary of the R.E.A., the same adaptation to the particular audience was early evident. By saying, "As author and sponsor of the Rural Electrification Act in the Congress of the United States, I would be less than frank if I did not tell you that I have a deep and abiding interest in your program and welfare," Rayburn identified with the people there as their friend in that he was a part of
leading them to a better way of life through rural electrification, and he set a favorable emotional state in so doing.

Speaking before the people of Princeton, Texas, Rayburn very obviously adapted his entire approach to that group. He used the common method of establishing a common ground by saying, "I come to you tonight to talk to you about some things that we must do in peacetimes..." Soon after this, he made personal reference to a model conservation farm in the community which he had hoped to visit. From this reference to something near and familiar to those assembled, he moved quickly into his more detailed discussion of soil conservation.

His adaptation to the audiences of the campaign speeches studied was even more obvious because of his immediate reference to the common bond they all shared as Democrats. In nominating Lyndon B. Johnson for the Presidential candidacy, he opened by saying, "I come to you tonight as an old friend who for nearly half a century has wanted nothing except to make your burdens a little lighter and your path a little smoother." This emotional appeal recognized the status of "Mr. Sam" in the Democratic Party at that time, and immediately beckoned those who loved and respected him to take heed.

In the television speech, Rayburn adapted to his widely varied audience by referring to what seems to have been the common attitude and "talk" among the people at large toward that administration. For example, he said, "Most of the people
of the United States and many peoples in free and enslaved lands over the world held high hopes for the success of the Republican Administration when it assumed the solemn responsibility of guiding this great and powerful nation..." After admitting a commonly known fact, Rayburn went on to enumerate the things the American people were promised and hoped for under the new leadership, and how these promises had not been met. This technique of verbalizing what was on the lips of many Americans in everyday conversation at the time, was an effective way of gaining their emotional support. The general attitude must have been, "See, even Sam agrees with us."

His frequent use of the personal pronouns "we" and "us" also contributed to gathering the listeners into his stream of thought.

In regard to audience adaptation as a facet of emotional appeal, then, it appears that his efforts were not so much deliberate as they were natural responses of the man toward his audiences. There doesn't seem to be an obvious attempt to adapt to a particular age or sex, nor does any real attempt to adjust to a particular intellectual level appear. The same unaffected vocabulary and sentence structure appears in the speech before the farmers in Princeton, Texas, and in his speeches before Congress. As can be expected, there is a strongly Democratic flavor in all of his speeches. He seemed to deliver all of his remarks under an assumption that those listening were either Democrats or should be.
Religious overtones by way of phraseology and biblical references were common in many Rayburn speeches, but whether this was an attempt to adapt to his Bible-belt constituency or merely a sincere expression of his own faith is hard to discern. Rayburn always made direct reference in some way to the particular audience he was addressing. An acknowledgment of who he was speaking to is a common factor in all the speeches.

In adapting to the economic status of the audience, Rayburn was quicker to mention the poor than those who were well supplied. Much of the legislation which he backed was directed toward helping the condition of the poor, and he was not hesitant in taking an opportunity to put a people's needs before the public. This is not to say he slanted his speeches toward the underprivileged, but he rather verbalized their needs.

Rayburn seemed to have been aware of the attitude of his audiences toward his topics in all the speeches analyzed. Just as he advised young Congressmen to never take the floor until they were thoroughly prepared, so did he seem to be aware of the known attitudes and prejudices and predispositions of his audiences toward what he was advocating. One interesting thing is the optimistic approach taken by the man. His speeches all seem to assume that there is a certain amount of support and respect for the topic under discussion. His adaptation to the temper and tone of the occasion appears very slight. The pace and fervor vary little from speech to speech.

In regard to audience adaptation during the delivery of a speech, there is no obvious indication from the speeches
studied that Rayburn did this, or really had need to. This man spoke from manuscript on most formal speaking occasions. From observing Rayburn speak on film and from following a printed copy of the speech he delivered (i.e. Atlanta R.E.A. speech), it was noted that he adhered strictly to the printed word with the exception of some opening remarks pertaining to some of the people who were at the meeting, and to the program which had preceded his speech. As an accustomed political speaker, he showed good adaptation to applause which interrupted his speaking. His experience as Speaker of the House probably strengthened his ability to keep his composure in the face of audience reaction which was less than favorable.

In the practical application of emotional appeal in directly aiming at the audience's pathetic spirit, "the speaker should conceal the attempt to play upon the feelings, for emotion should be perceived only by its effect."\(^5\) The speaker with integrity never uses emotion to replace reason, but uses it as an additional underscoring of that reason. Thonssen and Baird wisely point out that any emotional appeal should be short and should be concentrated in certain parts of the speech. The introduction and conclusion are preferable.

Such a technique of introducing a speech with an emotional tone was used by Rayburn. All of the speeches studied began with an appeal to one of the emotions. Those emotions most

\(^{5}\text{Ibid.}, \text{ p. 363.}\)
familiar to us are anger, calmness, friendship, enmity, hatred, fear, confidence, shame, shamelessness, kindness, unkindness, pity, indignation, envy, emulation, patriotism, social responsibility, fair play, expediency, personal honor, family life, self-assertion, social recognition, and social approval.  

Speaking at his testimonial dinner, the Speaker opened by an appeal to the friendship which existed between himself and the group when he said:

I want to thank you from the bottom of a grateful heart, everyone who has had anything to do with bringing about this occasion....I want you to know that I shall never cease to hold in grateful memory this evidence of your partial friendship, and above all, to feel that I have your respect.

He concluded with an appeal to their patriotism and social responsibility with these remarks:

Today darkness broods over the face of the earth. Evil stalks the hills. No man knows what devouring monsters tomorrow may bring. May I say, then, to my countrymen, let us in this desperate hour nobly conceive and nobly act in the greatness that is our heritage and our life. So doing, within the eye of God, we shall triumph over evil as did the founders of this great Republic.

Early in his farm speech, "Mr. Sam" utilized the appeal of shaming the Congress for having not acted to save the precious top soil in the country. He did this by saying:

When I drive along the road or look out of the train window and see the fertile soil of the country washed down to rock bottom and gutted with ditches, It hurts
me almost like the stick of a knife....If we are the same vandals for the next twenty-five years, even that we have been in the past fifty years in the destruction of the fertility of our soil, we will not have any amount of surpluses to sell abroad, but we will be using every acre of this worn and torn land to raise the things that we have got to consume inside the United States of America.

In concluding this speech, he appealed to friendship, kindness, fair play, expediency, and family life, when he said:

Let me again say to you, that when these farmers and their families have been called upon at any time in our country's history to produce more and give their sons and daughters to the service of their country, they have never failed to respond. We should today, as their Representatives, respond to their wants and their great needs.

Stating, "...I desire to speak on some dangerous trends," Rayburn began his unity speech. He concluded by saying:

When I think of the millions of men and women who are making the supreme sacrifice in sons in this war, when I think of the bravery of the best equipped soldiers that ever went to battle in the history of mankind, how our production has put into their hands the greatest instruments of defense and for attack of any soldiers ever called to battle in all the history of mankind! If we do our job on this front in unity, not only here, but with those who fight with us, God knows, and you know, that the boys who wear the uniform will do their part.

The same type of technique of appealing to fear was utilized when he spoke in Princeton, Texas, and said, "I come to you tonight to talk to you about some things that we must do in peacetimes, and then it will be my purpose to talk to you about the serious and dangerous world in which we live."

Concluding, he made another seemingly typical religious reference as he said:
As long as this world is in the condition it is in, let me repeat, we must keep a lot of powder, and keep that powder mighty dry, and pray and hope that men will not be desperate enough to inflame this whole earth in a war that is bound to be the most destructive that civilization has ever known, and pray that one day, under God and in His providence, that the teachings of His Son, the lowly man of Galilee, may pierce the hearts and appeal to the mind of leaders throughout the earth and that one day we may again look toward a peace that will be lasting.

The R.E.A. speech was somewhat more objective, but did make an appeal to their sense of pride and accomplishment when he said:

...please believe me when I say to you that it is a source of profound satisfaction to me that I was permitted to take part in the creation of a movement and a program which has contributed so magnificently to the economic and cultural life of all Americans.

This emotional tone is extended a little further in the speech when he stated:

Therefore, to you who have labored along the dusty roads, in the rich farmlands, and on the steep hillsides to sign up members by the light of a wood fire or a kerosene lamp goes the everlasting credit for the impetus given an agricultural movement which in two decades has contributed more to the agricultural industry than that industry has had contributed to it from all other sources since the founding of this nation.

Just as in the preceding speech, he concluded this one with a challenge to their social responsibility that they "...express divine gratitude that you live in a land of hope and promise of eternal life as preached by the humble man who walked the shores of Galilee."

There is an obvious appeal to patriotism and Party loyalty in all three campaign speeches studied. An acknowledgement of the apprehension perpetuated by the times is also expressed.
This combined appeal to patriotism and fear is evidenced in these remarks in the nomination speech:

I come to you tonight as an old friend who for nearly half a century has wanted nothing except to make your burdens a little lighter and your path a little smoother. I am talking to you today in one of the fateful hours in the history of human freedom.

A little further in the speech he pointed out:

Everything that brave, far-visioned men and women have struggled for throughout human history is at stake today. I am a realist, and I must tell you frankly that I believe the civilization we all know and love stands in greater danger today than at any time in the twenty centuries since the Lowly Galilian preached peace across His world.

Several paragraphs which follow built up this tone of fear and needed concern on the part of the American people. Of course, his answer to the problem came in his final nomination of Johnson for the Presidency, stating, "The destiny of mankind hangs in the balance. Assembled here in this convention all of us are freedom's soldiers. Our assignment is to give our country and the world our very best."

A more positive emotional appeal, one toward friendship and pride, was used in the Baltimore speech. Here he said, "We demonstrated to the people of America that we were their friend and had their interests at heart." Calling the Democratic Party the "Party with a heart" also contributed to this emotional tone. By way of contrast, he called the Republican Party the "Party of preferred privileged."

Thus, almost without exception, Rayburn conformed to the suggestion of Thonssen and Baird that primary emotional
interest be placed in the introduction and/or the conclusion. It is also recognized by these authors that emotional appeal should never be used as a substitute for logical reason. As has been pointed out in the preceding chapter, Rayburn generally used sound logical foundations for his arguments. However, it appears that in some cases he tended to generalize somewhat in his emotional appeal and failed to give that appeal substantial undergirding. This is not as true in the deliberative speeches studied as in the ceremonial and campaign. For example, the statement is made in the television speech that "...they [the Republican Party] have so administered it [the Truman-Acheson policy] that the sad and tragic fact is that we have fewer friends in the world today than we have had in the history of the United States," but it is never supported by any documented proof of specific cases of bad administration of the policy, nor is any evidence of the United States actually losing prestige and favor with her sister countries due to this administration made. On the whole, his appeal was subtle enough that he did not actually tell an audience to be moved, but rather moved them. But, as is evidenced by previously quoted concluding statements, he often did tell them bluntly what action they should take whether it was a changing of attitudes, or a greater outward show of support for the country, or the Party, or a movement.

His emotional appeal was not long nor prolonged, nor did he continually refer to it throughout a speech. Those
emotional passages in the speech studied are as quick and concise of statement as the man's speech itself. Rayburn did not extend his emotional pleas past the point of good taste.

Another important factor to consider when discussing Rayburn's speaking and the emotional tone of those speeches, is the language he used. Thonssen and Baird have well pointed out that words have much to do with the way an audience responds to what is being said. They say that "...language is capable of performing a dual function of appealing both to the rational and the emotional nature of man." The words spoken have much to do with the emotional impact of the total presentation. Something has already been said of Rayburn's general use of language in Chapter II. It was pointed out that his choice of words was simple, concise, and without verbosity.

He often used phrases which denoted religious reference, such as "the humble man of Galilee," or "within the eye of God." Every speech studied has at least one religiously oriented phrase.

Rayburn also used words which had a "folksey" flavor. In the television speech he referred to the "ballyhooing" amidst which the Republican's Randall Commission was created. In his testimonial speech he said, "Therefore, while you may find a few amiable idiots among us, you won't find any old fogies or those who are worse than old fogies—new fogies."

---

7Ibid., p. 368.
Pick almost any page from any of the speeches studied, and on it will be evidence of the straightforwardness with which the man spoke. In the Princeton speech he reassured the audience about their leadership in Washington when he said simply, "...every man and woman in Washington in any position of responsibility are doing everything we can do to try to avoid a major war." In the television speech he described the Republican Party as being "...as dynamic as a dodo."

The single fact that Rayburn used words which are simple and familiar to those listening is a contributor to the emotional impact of what he said. Listeners responded favorably because they could respond to something they recognized and about which they felt comfortable. The book *Speech Criticism* talks of the relationship which exists between logical and emotional appeal as it correlates to word choices and how the audience responds to certain words. We see there that "the logical-affective dichotomy thus results from the way hearers respond to certain words or combinations of words..." Thus, responding to Rayburn's speeches was easy for many people because they could find an easy and simple identity there. This type of familiar, easily comprehended speech was Rayburn's forte, and with it came a certain emotional flair: not the emotion of the majestic oratory of Daniel Webster, but the emotion of familiarity and friendship.

---

This word "friend" is often seen in Rayburn speeches. This word was often used in discussion of the relation of the United States to other countries, in discussing the work of the Congress for the people of the country, and particularly in describing the relationship between the Democratic Party and the people of the land. "We demonstrated to the people of America that we were their friend and had their interests at heart" is from the Baltimore speech. In nominating Johnson he began with "I come to you tonight as an old friend..." Saying "...we have fewer friends in the world today than we have had at any time in the history of the United States," in the television speech, cast an unfavorable light on the Republican Administration.

It should not be assumed that just because Rayburn usually spoke the language of the common man he did not have the ability to speak in a loftier and grander style. The evidence indicates quite the contrary. These are some particularly striking emotional phrases in the television speech, and they illustrate his ability to speak grandly. 1) "The tempests of communism blow but not a leaf of our tree is disturbed." 2) "Between the brief bright day of Woodrow Wilson and the warming sun of Franklin Roosevelt, there came a long Republican eclipse. In its murk and gloom this nation almost lost its way." 3) "Today darkness broods over the face of the earth. Evil stalks the hills. No man knows what devouring monster tomorrow may bring."
In the nomination speech are also passages which rise above the ordinary. In describing the ingenuity of modern man, he said:

By his own thoughts and deeds man has lifted himself from the savagery of the forest primeval to a high plateau of personal comfort, individual freedom, and control of his physical world which our forefathers could not have dreamed of, much less predict.

But the same hand and mind of man—when devoted to creating agencies of destruction—are just as efficient. By use of the same scientific genius which has improved man's life upon this earth, we have created terrible, unspeakable agencies of destruction which can literally wipe out the world—and these unearthly weapons are in the hands of, and subject to the control of, and the whim of, mortal men such as you and I.

Later in the speech he defined true leadership in this way:

Leadership is that intangible quality in an individual which makes men do better than themselves. which makes men dream greater dreams and do braver deeds. Leadership is that spirit which inspires men to work together in the name of a great ideal without thought of self. Leadership unites a whole people in a great common cause.

In this anxious hour all eyes turn to America. Downtrodden, distraught, enslaved, ragged and hungry people all across the earth are crying out to this fair land to lead them, to save them from the iron grip of merciless tyranny.

Since these more grandiose passages seem to be more abundant in the television and nomination speeches (both of which received nationwide coverage) it might be concluded that when speaking before audiences which were less familiar than constituents or colleagues Rayburn could, and did, utilize a more formal and carefully planned word usage.

The abundance of adjectives, pictorial effects, and imagery also contributed to the emotional appeal of his speeches, but
there is relatively little reliance upon this colorful language in these speeches. If all the adjectives were stripped from them, the essence would remain the same. Even the vivid word pictures which he painted tended to use simple words instead of flamboyance. One such example comes from the soil conservation speech.

My brothers and I own some acres of pasture land and farm land. We feel that we are only tenants for a short time on that dirt, that we owe it to this generation and those who come after us to leave that soil as fertile as we found it, not to deny the people of the next generation or generations for a hundred years in the future the right to have soil that will feed and clothe the millions of people that will inhabit this country in those years to come.

Again, in the unity speech, another word picture was painted when he said:

I think of the mother of six sons, a widow, in the district I represent. Every one of her sons is in the Army or in the Navy. She is not complaining, but is meeting her sacrifice as a great American and has gone out to get herself a war job....When I think of her son who has been in command of a submarine in the Pacific Ocean ever since Pearl Harbor; when I think of millions of other mothers' sons who are in the Southwest Pacific, and all other theaters of war, wading in the mud and muck and mire of vermin infested islands where if disease does not attack them the murderous Jap or a murderous German is behind every stone, every stump, and every tree; when I think of the sacrifice of these people, I would despise myself if I complained about my little inconveniences...

Before the Princeton, Texas, crowd, another visual picture was presented to the listener:

In many countries American blood was spilled, and Americans buried. Crippled and maimed live in this land. I want us to become so strong—and let me repeat, stay so strong—that none of these international desperadoes or bandits will have the courage or the desperation to attack us.
The emotional appeals of the speeches studied are fairly obvious and easy to detect, but, it seems, as in everything the man Sam Rayburn did, the full impact of the emotional play was a product of the man. Thonssen and Baird state that "all men are not completely prepared, intellectually and emotionally to receive the truth in its boldest and least adorned guise; it must be articulated or identified with feelings..."9 This Sam Rayburn seemed to do as he used simple language and a keen sensitivity to his audiences, along with a sensible rationing of logical and emotional appeal. The emotional overtones are not always overly subtle, but are never handled with undue garishness. This appeal is used with taste in appropriate places, not as a divergent to real issues, but usually as an adjunct to logical reasoning.

9Ibid., p. 381.
In the fourth century B.C., Aristotle outlined the three types of proof a speaker could use in persuasion as logical, emotional, and ethical. Placed above logical and emotional appeal was ethos, or the moral character of the speaker. He explained that a speaker persuades by moral character "when he speaks in a manner as to render him worthy of confidence," and that "his character is the most potent of all the means of persuasion."¹

Aristotle said that a speaker displays ethos through character, intelligence, and good will. A speaker may build his ethical appeal with an audience by displaying his merits in one or all three of these areas. If the audience believes the speaker to be worthy, or ethical, they will more easily trust the logical thrust of his arguments and will be more susceptible to the emotional impact of his presentation. The speaker, however, must choose in which of these three areas he can best build his ethical appeal. It is even in the choices he makes that he further reveals himself. "The choices are conditioned by the particular end in view in the case of deliberative, forensic, and epideictic speaking: likewise,

they are tempered by the nature of the audience being addressed.\(^2\)

In regard to intelligence, the speaker may, by reference to his liberality, justice, courage, temperance, and magnanimity, reveal himself to the audience as being endowed with a degree of intelligence which demands their attention. Aristotle further enumerates virtues by stating that the speaker's character can be manifested through a display of his magnificence, prudence, gentleness, and wisdom. Good will can be established with the audience through a genuine show of friendship. Aristotle states that this atmosphere can be created through a genuine interest in the welfare of the listeners and through a general respect between speaker and listener. Being aware of the above, the speaker must make his own choices in regard to how he will establish himself with the audience. Invention, arrangement, style, and delivery are the tools at hand for such adaptation. "Aristotle appears to be saying that the power of custom and tradition is strong; and that the speaker who conforms to the ethos of the class—who likes what we like—will be highly regarded."\(^3\)

Naturally, the speaker who is known to possess these qualities of intelligence, character, and good will has already cleared the first hurdle in making himself ethically appealing to his audience. His job is simply to reinforce their belief in him.


\(^3\)Ibid., p. 59.
However, for the unknown man, reputation is of little value in establishing him favorably with an audience. He must make use of the speech itself and his immediate delivery to quickly gain rapport. It is with this man that proper use of invention, arrangement, style, and delivery are most important. Obviously, "since the subjects with which he deals reflect purpose, the judgments given in a speech may be said to have moral import."^4 It is here that the speaker must be more discerning in the choices he makes. His decisions, says Aristotle, are dictated by 1) what he believes to be expedient, just, and honorable; 2) his adaptation to his audience's ages, fortune, wealth, power, and political standing; and 3) conformity to the traits of the depicted characters. These traits include their ages, sex, nationality, moral character, education, and pursuits. After an analysis of these areas, the speaker must make necessary adjustments.

With respect to invention, stress should be placed upon a judicious selection of arguments. "All such premises and reasons necessarily reflect the speaker's choices, and in turn affect the opinion of the listener in regard to the speaker's intelligence, character, and good will."^5

Ethos is principally a function of invention. However, style and delivery also help in establishing ethos in that the speaker must be sure to speak in a manner and on a level with

^4Ibid.
^5Ibid., p. 60.
which the audience is comfortable and familiar. This, in
fact, seems to be Aristotle's overriding advice: adapt to
the particular audience and the particular occasion. Magnify
your intelligence, character, and good will toward the audience
by adjusting to their ideals, age, sex, nationality, and
education. Chapter 13 of Thonssen and Baird's *Speech Criticism*
echoes this Aristotlian theory of ethos. Being more specific,
they list the following criteria as guidelines for evaluating
a speaker's ethical appeal.

In general, a speaker focuses attention upon
the probity of his character if he 1) associates either
himself or his message with what is virtuous and elevated;
2) bestows, with propriety, tempered praise upon himself,
his client, and his cause; 3) links the opponent or the
opponent's cause with what is not virtuous; 4) removes or
minimizes unfavorable impressions of himself or his
cause previously established by his opponent; 5) relies
upon authority derived from his personal experience; and
6) creates the impression of being completely sincere in
his undertaking.

With certain qualifications varying with the
circumstances, it may be said that a speaker helps to
establish the impression of sagacity if he 1) uses what
is popularly called common sense; 2) acts with tact and
moderation; 3) displays a sense of good taste; 4) reveals
a broad familiarity with the interests of the day; and
5) shows through the way in which he handles speech
materials that he is possessed of intellectual integrity
and wisdom.

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

---

6 A. Craig Baird and Lester Thonssen, *Speech Criticism*
All of the above is concerned with subjective ethos. Aristotle also had something to say about objective ethos. "Objective ethos is often considered as an end in itself, but it is nevertheless important to understand that the delineation of the character of others may have a bearing upon the ethos of the speaker." In other words, what a speaker says about other people, in his speech, reflects on him also.

One obvious way to analyze the subjective ethos of Sam Rayburn is by observing the comments of some of his contemporaries in regard to his intelligence, character, and good will. Following that, an analysis of the evidence of ethical appeal in the actual speeches will be made.

That Sam Rayburn was considered to be a man of intelligence and one whose counsel was sought and respected has been somewhat brought out in preceding chapters. Senator Wright Patman of Texas recognized the good sense and leadership of the man when he said, "His work is not yet done and because the years of fulfillment that belong to the past, and the years of counsel and leadership that lie ahead, will to generations yet unborn serve as a symbol and a guide and a model of the long qualities..." Representative Paul Kilday, also of Texas, said, "He is possessed of a knowledge and appreciation of history not excelled by any man in public life."  

---

7 Ibid.
9 Ibid., p. 3
His justice and liberality were observed by Representative Chet Holifield of California, who said, "He knows that the minority must be heard, but that the majority must prevail."\textsuperscript{10} This opinion was further expressed by Representative Barratt O'Hara of Illinois, who said, "Everything he does is fair....He takes no advantage of power, ability, and experience to advance his own position."\textsuperscript{11}

His constituents also trusted his judgment as is shown in the following letter.

Bonham, Texas
Jan 1st 1960

To the Speaker:

Thru, all these changes that you have witnessed, which come with such rapidity as to be almost confusing to the human eye, and mind, you have maintained that calm spirit and vigorous body which have readily adapted themselves to conditions, making use of the best and rejecting that which was worthless.

We congratulate you and extend to you our good wishes. May the world still have in store for you many thrills and much happiness. [sic]

Charlie and Willie\textsuperscript{12}

Rayburn was blest with good sense and also a real thirst for "book knowledge." He read much and started early to build an excellent library. During his college days "he studied hard, continuing his interest in history and biography. From time

\textsuperscript{10}\textit{Ibid.}
\textsuperscript{11}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 6.
\textsuperscript{12}Dwight Dorough, \textit{Mr. Sam} (New York, 1962), p. 51.
to time he bought a book—not without some sacrifice—by skipping a meal or doing his own laundry."\(^13\) When he had the time, he read voraciously. He said of his childhood, "By the time I was nine or ten, I had read every history book I could find... and all I could about the men then in public life."\(^14\) So, Sam Rayburn's good judgment was based on book learning as well as common sense.

That he was a man of character and good will will hardly be necessary to reiterate. Representative Carl Vinson of Georgia capsuled the attitude of many of those who knew him when he said, "...I think of him as being indestructible, imperishable, and indomitable. To those characteristics must also be added the qualities of integrity, wisdom, loyalty, friendliness, fairness, and leadership."\(^15\)

What were Rayburn's uses of his ethical portrait in these specific speeches as determined by the criteria set forth by Thonsen and Baird? Character, sagacity, and good will shall be discussed.

To extend a favorable character image to an audience, one should associate himself or his message with what is virtuous and elevated. Sam Rayburn chose to bring out, in every speech studied, a reference to God, country, and/or the good of the American people. He was quick to inform his audience of any

\(^{13}\) Ibid., p. 70.


\(^{15}\) Ibid., p. 2.
measures he and the Democratic Party had been instrumental in passing to the betterment of the country. Speaking before Congress on soil conservation, he went into much detail in showing the benefits which had come from the Rural Electrification Act of a few years before. He also identified himself with a concern for ex-servicemen and making life easier for them as they returned home by building farm-to-market roads. This favorable light was thrown on "Mr. Sam" as he said, "I, and others who worked with me, saw to it that $150,000,000 each year was allotted to the States to be allotted and spent by the highway commissioners of the States and the county commissioners court for building farm-to-market roads."

A similar method was used in the soil conservation speech. Here he associated conserving the soil with benefits for the whole nation when he said:

When you deny to the thirty-odd-million people in the United States of America the right to farm fertile dirt and make an income, you deny prosperity to all sections of the people of the United States of America....If it were not for this dirt there would be no Washington City, there would be no Boston, or Chicago, there would be no great factories with smoke rising from their chimney's, factories employing at good wages millions of American citizens; we would not have a national income of more than $276,000,000,000 a year.

Such an association put the soil conservation measure into a category with those things the American people feel are virtuous and stable: a stable economy, prosperity, industrious work, and growth.
The virtues of patriotism, loyalty, democracy, and self-sacrifice were brought out in his speech on unity. Considering that this speech was delivered during the Second World War as an attempt to lift the nation to a new zeal and support of the war effort, it is not surprising that Rayburn would identify himself with his comments, with those virtues. Several of these ideas are mentioned in the second paragraph of the speech where he said:

I know that every man and woman in this House loves this country. I do not doubt the patriotism of a single one of you. I do not doubt the patriotism of those numberless millions of men and women out there. I do know that there are complaints about sacrifice. I think I know, however, that the people of this country who are making the greatest sacrifice are complaining least.

He established himself with these same persons when he said, "I am an average American citizen, no better, I know, no worse, I hope than the average...I am wondering what sacrifice I have made, and I cannot think of a single one." He then made a plea for unity on the home-front and stated that this was very necessary because "the very fate of civilization depends not only on how our Army and our Navy act, but how you and I act and how you and I respond to the necessity of this hour."

Speaking at his testimonial dinner, Rayburn associated himself and his Party with "...the vision of Thomas Jefferson and the dauntless courage of Andrew Jackson." He also made references to the advance of America under President Wilson and Truman. This association became obvious when he said:
The Democratic Party, therefore, has constantly produced great leaders; men who performed a twofold task. They sought, first, to redeem the nation from its follies and its crimes of indifference toward a large part of the population; and, second, they sought to bring the nation to dedicate itself to the life of democracy. Their achievements have made the greatest of all nations.

By using the pronouns "our" and "we" frequently in referring to specific accomplishments, he incorporated himself into those virtues.

Further lauding of the virtues of the Democratic Party was made in his speech before the Princeton, Texas, populus. Here he tried to put President Truman in a favorable light by showing him to be a true proponent of those same virtues. Of him he said, "...I never have had more confidence in the honor—the patriotism—of any of them [other presidents] than I do in Harry S. Truman." He went on to further associate himself and the goals of the Truman Administration with that which was revered by the audience when he concluded:

We must...pray that one day under God and in His providence that the teachings of His Son, the lowly man of Galilee, may pierce the hearts and appeal to the mind of leaders throughout the earth and that one day we may again look toward a peace that will be lasting.

Before the R.E.A. celebrators in Atlanta, a similar statement was made in conclusion:

...express your divine gratitude that you live in a land of hope and promise—a land where you might hope that your earthly span will be more bountiful through your own character, and a land where you might fulfill the promise of eternal life as preached by the humble man who walked the shores of Galilee.
In his campaign speeches, it is very easy to pick out Rayburn's attempts to identify with that which was virtuous and elevated. The praise which he bestowed upon his Party was not watered-down nor meek. It was his honest, sincere belief. His campaign speeches were positive, devoting more time to constructive observations of the good done by the Party or candidate than to mercilessly degrading his opposition. The criticism of the other side was not merely personal opinion, but was usually backed with enough logical evidence and handled with such simple sincerity that it served more to cast a favorable light upon the Democratic Party than to indict the Republicans. That he intentionally refrained from such tactics is evident from these remarks in his television speech:

Now, I am here to tell you the other side of the story. I shall engage in no personalities; I shall call no one names; nor shall I do what it seems to have become the fashion to do, and that is to call somebody a subversive or a communist just because I do not agree with them.

Then, he very thoroughly, but concisely, enumerated the areas where he felt the greatest failures of the Republican Party had occurred: international influence diminished, economic difficulties at home, rise in power of Communist countries, disregard for the nation's poor and catering to the nation's rich.

Before switching to the case for the Democrats, he said a word for himself:

I have now served longer in the Congress of the United States than any member presently sitting in the
House of Representatives. I do not contend that this endows me with any special wisdom. Out of that long experience of more than forty years, however, has grown the deep conviction that the continued existence of our free political institutions rests upon two bulwarks: first, the two-party system; second, party responsibility.

Thonssen and Baird point out that among the criteria for evaluating ethical appeal is the reliance upon authority derived from personal experience. Sam Rayburn underscored many of his jibes against the Republican Administration with personal observation and opinion. For example, he said, "It is with a grave sense of sorrow that I have seen those foundations shaken and weakened, and the future of our nation threatened." And, speaking of the Rural Electrification Act, "The income of the farmers was so increased during the Democratic Administrations that I have heard of no farmer that has had the comforts and conveniences of rural electrification who has not continued the use of it." Again, in discussing the Tennessee Valley Authority under Eisenhower, he used personal experience to give vividness to fact when he said, "Not in my memory has a chief executive taken such a drastic step, particularly when an established government function was involved."

But, even though Sam Rayburn frequently did use personal experience to carry the burden of proof in his arguments, it seems always to have been done in good taste and gives the impression of being completely sincere.

Those things mentioned in regard to the television speech also hold true in the other two campaign speeches studied.
They seem to culminate in his nomination speech for Johnson. In the following excerpts, the character of Sam Rayburn as well as the character of Lyndon B. Johnson is illuminated through associating them with that which is virtuous and elevated, by bestowing tempered praise upon both, by relying upon authority derived from Rayburn’s personal experience, and by creating an impression of sincerity.

I come to you tonight as an old friend who for nearly half a century wanted nothing except to make your burdens a little lighter and your path a little smoother.

...I know the gravity of the situation we are in today. I have been in the service of the American people for more than half a century. I have thrilled to see the upward march of our people and free peoples everywhere during my lifetime, and I know what a wonderland of liberty and comfort and brotherhood the future can be if the forces of freedom retain control of the destiny of mankind.

...I have been a member of Congress of the United States for nearly half a century. I have worked beside more than 3,000 members of Congress from every nook and cranny of America. Every giant of the past half century in this country I have known personally. I think I have had a chance to learn what leadership is, and I think I know a great leader when I see him in action.

...This man Johnson belongs to no class, no section, no faction. This is a man for all Americans—a leader matured by long experience, a soldier seasoned in many battles, a tall, sun-crowned man who stands ready now to lead America and lovers of freedom everywhere through our most fateful hours.

Having now discussed character and finding that Rayburn did indeed meet the standards set forth by the guide, let us now turn to the sagacity of the man and evaluate this as revealed through these nine speeches. Thonssen and Baird say that to exhibit sagacity a man should use what is popularly
called common sense, act with tact and moderation, display a sense of good taste, reveal a broad familiarity with the interests of the day, and show, through the way he handles speech materials, that he is possessed of intellectual integrity and wisdom.

It appears from the studied speeches that Rayburn was indeed a sensible man in that he never advocated anything which was of a tangent nature, or which he could not prove was in the best interest of many Americans—not just a minority. That he was respected as a man of sound judgment has already been established through previous quotations. The things he wanted to see Congress do, and the American people do, were sensible things. He wanted more attention given to soil conservation and bettering of farm conditions because he could see that the future of the country lay there. It made sense to the man to preserve and make better today that which would be feeding, clothing, and housing the nation tomorrow. To Sam Rayburn, it was a matter of common sense that a nation couldn't hope to win a war on foreign soil if the people were divided and restless and doubting of the victory at home. Thus, he spoke on "We Must Have Unity." When speaking in a ceremonious or campaign setting, he did not mince words on trivialities, but pointedly said what he considered to be the sensible thing to say. Thus, he spoke of the glories of the Democratic Party because he firmly believed that his party was the hope of the country. He attempted to rally the people of Princeton, Texas,
around their President, Harry Truman, because he felt the man was doing a good job and deserved their support and that they should be giving him more than they were giving. Speaking of the accomplishments of the Rural Electrification Act, he aimed his praise at the practical aspects of the action and not at the fringe benefits. He spoke in figures of the amount of money saved and invested and of the ultimate profit to the people of the entire country. In giving his rebuttal to President Eisenhower in the television speech, Rayburn exhibited common sense and did not give an emotional tirade against the Republican Administration, but matter of factly stated what the Administration had promised and what it had actually done. The entire speech was aimed at saying: "Why put your trust in a Party which makes promises it does not keep? That just doesn't make sense!" Finally, in the nomination speech, he carefully outlined the common sense approach to choosing a leader and then showed, point by point, how Lyndon Johnson met each qualification.

Good taste was displayed in all the speeches studied. There was no degrading language, no unpleasant imagery, nor anything which would be called bad taste. Representative Springer, of Illinois, said of the man in this regard, "He was always a hard and courageous fighter for the causes he espoused, but he never has been a mean or petty fighter."16

As was pointed out earlier, good tact and moderation were exhibited by this speaker. This should not imply that an "all pleasing" and weak stand was taken. He called a thing as he saw it, but he was moderate in not continuing to pound a point once it had been made. This underscored his faith in his fellow Congressmen and in Americans to understand his point of view the first time, and it also demonstrated a security in his own ability to understand a problem well enough to explain his views in as few words as possible and still make the point.

He was tactful in that he did not resort to finger-pointing or name calling tactics. Especially in his congressional and ceremonial speeches, he was careful to use "we" and "us" in a non-partisan discussion of a problem. In the unity speech, the citizen he used as the prime example in showing how little Americans at home were sacrificing for the war was himself. This was a tactful way of defining the problem clearly and graphically without pointing a finger at any one person.

In his campaign speaking, however, Rayburn called the Republicans by name when he told of their blunders and shortcomings. Of course, it would hardly be expected that such a devoted Democrat would use the soft pedal in talking about his opposition. He bluntly stated in the television speech that the Republican Party "...was not conceived for the benefit of the best interests of all the people, but for big business." But, later in the speech he added, with tactful sarcasm, "It could be that since the Republicans labored so long and
so faithfully in the fields of the minority—hurling stones at constructive Democratic measures—their power to function as a responsible majority has dangerously diminished."

The ethical appeal in these speeches indicates a calm moderation and tact in handling all subjects. The considerate manner in which he spoke is another indication of the kind of man Rayburn was.

Even though there are specific ideas which are common from the earliest speech studied up to the latest, there also appears to be a keen sense of currency. Even until his death in 1961, Rayburn was never behind the times when it came to knowing the needs of his country. Representative Libonati, of Illinois, once said to him, "You have always been alert to the needs of the people in legislation."

Another Representative, Basil L. Whitener, of North Carolina, similarly said, "...he has remained youthful in his outlook and has retained a capacity to understand the problems, as well as the hopes and ideals, of people of all ages..." He often made historic references in his speeches, but these related to modern awarenesses.

Through his handling of speech materials, he showed his intellectual integrity and wisdom. There was a completeness in his coverage and a wholeness in his approach. Extremely good judgment was evident through his picking arguments on which he was well acquainted and interested. The topics

\(^{17}\)Ibid., p. 7. \(^{18}\)Ibid., p. 8.
discussed in these speeches were not "splinter" issues but were basics. His intellectual integrity and wisdom were probably best revealed by the way he broadened specific problems so that their long-range and universal results could be seen. This wholeness of approach can be noted in the soil conservation and farm speeches where he showed the harmful results of vandalizing the soil as it would affect future generations of Americans and other nations. In the Princeton and unity speeches he told the audiences to unify in spirit—not just for themselves but for the ultimate good of the whole world and for the future of freedom. Very obviously, the nomination speech expanded the need for Johnson’s being President outside the nation’s boundaries and into the future. This kind of broad perception is a good indication of the man’s wisdom in being able to get outside of himself and view an issue in its entirety.

Therefore, in regard to sagacity, Sam Rayburn did use common sense and did act with tact and moderation when it was needed. Good taste seems to have been displayed at all times, as well as interest in and awareness of the issues of the day. Intellectual integrity and wisdom were expressed, and his comments seem to be rational and well thought-through.

To evaluate a speaker’s display of good will, it is helpful to determine if he captures the proper balance between too much and too little praise of his audience, if he identifies himself properly with the hearers and their problems, if he proceeds with candor and straightforwardness, if he offers
necessary rebukes with tact and consideration, and if he foregoes any personal biases in the search for truth.¹⁹

Sam Rayburn did not make it a practice to overly praise his audiences—at least not in the speeches studied. In the unity speech he said, "I know that every man and woman in this House loves his country." From that statement, however, he went on to show these same people they were not doing their best to display that love.

Before the testimonial dinner in his honor, he said to his audience, "I want you to know that I shall never cease to hold in grateful memory this evidence of your partial friendship, and above all, to feel that I have your respect." However, these two short sentences are the only obvious attempts to praise his audience in any of the nine speeches. His primary attention was not aimed at past glory and recognition, but in looking ahead to what should continue to be done. This portion of his speech before the Rural Electrification group is more in keeping with the type of praise administered by the man.

On this 20th Anniversary of the creation of your program, it is well to reflect upon your achievements, but it behooves us even more to pause and consider that relatively few people in all the lands of the world have reason to hope that their lot will ever approach that which we now enjoy.

Saying that he did not commonly bestow praise upon his audiences should not imply that he was not able to identify

¹⁹Baird and Thonssen, p. 387.
with them and their problems. Quite the contrary, he preferred
to get right to the heart of a problem rather than to discuss
what had been. This reflects a concern for his listeners and
their future. It is easier to see such adaptation in his
deliberative speeches before Congress, in which he seemed to
be more concerned with identifying himself with the problems
of his constituents rather than with currying the favor of
the Representatives. The link was made as he connected the
problems of these constituents with the entire nation.
Such a connection was made in the farm speech as he spoke in
favor of increased funds for farm improvements. To his audience
he said:

You proclaim your friendship for the farm-ownership
program of the Farmers Home Administration—but you
recommend no funds...when these farmers and their
families have been called upon at any time in our
country's history to produce more and give their sons
and daughters to the service of their country, they
have never failed to respond. We should today, as their
Representatives, respond to their wants and their great
needs.

A similar statement was made in his soil conservation
speech when he said, "When you deny to the thirty-odd-million
people in the United States of America the right to farm fertile
dirt and make an income, you deny prosperity to all sections
of the people of the United States of America."

That he proceeded with candor and straightforwardness was
perhaps his most obvious and significant display of good will.
He did not try to be devious or secretive in his motives for
speaking. Rather, in all the speeches studied, the introductory
remarks always related directly to the theme of the talk. In each of these speeches he stated the theme in either the first or second paragraph, and he stated that theme straightforwardly and without pretense. An example of such a sentence is, "I think I have given more time to the study of the conservation of soil in my section of the country than to any one thing." This is the opening sentence of the farm speech. A similar sentence opened his speech on soil conservation: "If I know anything I know the land." From such statements, he then proceeded to outline exactly what he felt needed to be done and how.

In the first paragraph of his speech on unity is this statement: "...if I were going to say what would be the subject of my remarks today I would say that I desire to speak on some dangerous trends."

The sixth sentence of his testimonial speech is, "I belong to a Party that has been, is, and will be, the Party of responsibility." He went on to say, "We have demonstrated this time and time again, it matters not whether the Administration in power be Democratic or Republican." From that point, he spent the remainder of the speech outlining the accomplishments of the Party under both administrative rules.

Again, in the Princeton speech he said, in the second paragraph, "I come to you tonight to talk to you about some things that we must do in peacetimes, and then I will talk to you about the serious and dangerous world in which we live."
In the R.E.A. speech he said, "A fair appraisal of these accomplishments during the past 20 years is convincing proof that your efforts and the work of your Cooperatives is responsible for the greatest economic upsurge in the history of rural America." From that statement, he proceeded to give that fair appraisal of their accomplishments and to show the effects of them.

Speaking on national television in rebuttal to President Eisenhower, he again used the second paragraph to straightly tell the purpose of his speaking.

President Eisenhower went on the nationwide television...and extolled the accomplishments of the 83rd Congress. Now, I am here to tell you the other side of the story. I shall engage in no personalities; I shall call no one names; nor shall I do what it seems to have become the fashion to do, and that is to call somebody a subversive or a communist, just because I do not agree with them.

Speaking in Baltimore during the campaign of 1956, he opened his speech by saying:

We Democrats demonstrated for twenty years we could have a program, and we knew how to put it into effect. In twenty years, under Roosevelt and Truman, we made a record of legislative accomplishments unequalled by any twenty years in American history. We demonstrated to the people of America that we were their friend and had their interests at heart.

The remainder of the speech exhibited the various ways in which the Democratic Party had worked for the good of the American people and did establish itself as a "Party with a heart."
His nomination of Lyndon Johnson was not so straightforward in the beginning in stating the exact purpose. This could perhaps be that all assembled at the Convention knew the nature and purpose of his speech before he began, and is customary in nomination speeches to withhold the person's name until the end of the speech. He began this speech by building a case for the fateful hours in which they were living. After outlining the needs of the day, he showed how his candidate possessed the qualities which could meet those needs.

Rayburn was, as has been seen, candid and honest in making sure his audience knew early in his speeches his intent and purpose in speaking.

Some discussion of Rayburn's tact and consideration in making rebukes has already been presented. That he had the gift of being blunt and pointed in his remarks without being insensitive should be understood. There is an overriding air of concern and sincerity about his remarks in these speeches which takes the sting from those remarks. Such remarks are made indirectly and in a general way as in this statement from the Princeton speech:

So, let me repeat—this campaign of knock and smear and trying to create a lack of confidence of the people of the United States in the only leader that we have is doing a disservice to every man, woman, and child in America and every freedom-loving man, woman, and child throughout the length and breadth of this round earth.

This statement is very potent and does not single out any special group as being guilty of not supporting the President, but his reprimand is nevertheless clear.
Even in the speech which was intended to rouse the American people to an awareness of their lack of involvement and support of the war, the remarks were again indirect. The following excerpt is a good example:

Some people are complaining who have improved their position during this war. I hate to think it, but as I do think it, I must say it, I think some groups in this country, at the expense of our unity in the war effort, are thinking more of their position after the war than they are of winning the war now. It is a sad commentary upon some human beings.

Thus, it was one of Rayburn's more obvious traits as a public speaker to handle subjects with tact and consideration, and without unduly laying blame.

Rayburn used personal references and displayed personal concern for all the subjects about which he spoke in these nine speeches. Several examples have already been cited which show this to be true. Most common are his references to his years of service in the House and his love and devotion to the people of the country. The impression that he was giving any speech for any type of personal gain is not evident. He never proposed that Congress pass a bill, or people respond in a certain way, for his sake, but for the sake of the nation. He is also revealed as a messenger of truth in all the foregoing.

In summary, then, Sam Rayburn was first of all considered to be a man of ethical stature by those who heard him, whether they were Congressmen or farmers. Therefore, the ethical appeal he brought with him to a speaker's platform was substantial. Secondly, he met most of the criteria set
forth by Thonnissen and Baird in reflecting character, sagacity, and good will through the text of his speeches. Some common characteristics of his display of these traits are much use of personal pronouns which attributes to a unity between speaker and audience, a tact and consideration in handling rebukes and reprimands, a moderate but consistent use of patriotic and reverent references, personally linking himself with the problems at hand through reference to his experiences as a legislator, and his direct involvement with the problem. Underscoring all this was an overriding attitude of concern and absolute sincerity.

Evidently, these strong ethical appeals were obvious to those who heard "Mr. Sam" speak. Edward Rackley, of Greenville, Texas, is one who heard Rayburn speak many times. He heard him speak on a variety of occasions—at a local labor banquet, at National Democratic Conventions, at political rallies in the fourth district, and before Congress; and his reaction to each occasion was the same:

Sam Rayburn always spoke the truth and he always spoke from the heart. He told the truth today so he wouldn't have to dodge them tomorrow. He didn't run anybody down and spoke as though he wanted to be their friend. Mr. Sam was always sure of a statement before he said it, but once he said it he wouldn't budge from it.20

Here are observed those traits of intelligence, character, and good will which Aristotle said were the sources of our trust in a speaker.

20 Interview with Edward Rackley, Greenville, Texas, July 15, 1969. Rackley was Hunt County Democratic Advisor for Sam Rayburn.
CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

During the 1960 Presidential campaign, Sam Rayburn joined forces with young John Kennedy and long-time friend Lyndon Johnson to tour the state of Texas and to speak out for a Democratic victory. A telegram sent to Rayburn a few days after that tour gives a small clue as to the impact of this man's speaking ability. The telegram was sent by John Kennedy and is now proudly displayed in the Sam Rayburn Memorial Library in Bonham, Texas. It says, "In the past two days you made the most effective speeches delivered in this campaign. I am deeply indebted to you."

What was it about the speaking of "Mr. Sam" which would prompt such praise from one who was himself a master orator? What was it that made people listen no matter where the man spoke--and listen with respect? Perhaps this paper has clarified some of the Rayburn magic.

Three questions remain to be answered in order to bring the scope of this research into focus. What does the study reveal about the public speaking of Sam Rayburn? What general revelations about public address does this study make known? Of what value is this study?
Several things from Rayburn's background carry over into characteristics of his public speaking. The conservative and frugal upbringing he received as a lad undoubtedly was instrumental in his developing an economy of words and conciseness of expression which so mark his speaking. The discipline of his parents probably helped to instill in him the habit of confining his remarks strictly to the issues at hand.

From his intelligent mother, Sam inherited the love of history and of studying, which served as the backbone of so much of what he said. From his father's pioneer spirit, he inherited the respect for democracy and the love for America, which were sounded in almost every public speech the man gave. From his rural boyhood environment he inherited an understanding of farm people, and a love for the soil, and a concern for the grass roots of the country, which prompted his involvement in bills which led to their betterment and which led to many speaking opportunities for him. His integrity, hard work and determination undoubtedly sprang from this background which put a premium on faith, diligence, and steadfastness. These characteristics marked him as the man of integrity who was possessed of a strong ethical appeal as a public speaker.

There were strengths and weaknesses in the logical, emotional, and ethical appeals of this man. One weakness in the area of logical appeal is the dependence of many of his arguments on personal testimony. It is true that all types of evidence and arguments are to be found in the nine speeches
studied, but when weighed proportionately, personal testimony carries much more than its share of the burden. This is not to say that Rayburn did not have sufficient background and knowledge to speak with authority. His intelligence and thorough study of the bills put before the House gave him more than ample background as a spokesman. As was mentioned earlier, he refused to speak on a subject with which he was not thoroughly familiar. The observation is that a better balance of types of proof could have been utilized, for those who were not familiar with the man's reputation—historians and future speech critics included—might not be inclined to straightway accept his word.

On those subjects with which Rayburn worked closely and for which he felt a deep concern, he maintained an impressive first-hand knowledge of facts and statistics. Figures relative to national economy and trends in that field were familiar ones in the speeches studied. Yet, there were occasions where more correlation of those facts and the basic point being made was needed. It was often left to the listener to complete the connection.

Closely associated with this was a lack of documentation of facts, and some mass generalizations of facts.

Strength in his logical appeal lay in his ability to adapt his lines of reasoning to a particular speaking situation. It was noted that Rayburn used inductive reasoning when the situation required a more methodical and thorough presentation
of arguments, such as before Congress. However, when speaking before groups which were sympathetic to his ideas, he relied mainly on deductive reasoning. No significant contradictions were observed in the speeches as all the arguments presented in a given speech were directed toward a single conclusion. Good consecutive, logical order was used in presenting these arguments. This was especially true as Rayburn did a masterful job in drawing sound and valid causal relationships in an orderly fashion. There was a strict adherence to the issues at hand, and no tangent comments were presented in these speeches. Rayburn displayed a working knowledge of logical appeal as determined by the guidelines used.

His emotional appeal also possessed certain strong points. His emotional appeals were easily detected, but were never overly done nor flamboyant. He adapted the emotional aspect of his language to the particular audience, using straight, simple language when speaking with familiar audiences, and using a grander, loftier style on more formal occasions. Good taste was always exercised in the use of emotional appeal, and he did not allow the bulk of an argument to rest on this appeal.

By far, Rayburn's greatest strength as a persuader lay in his ethical appeal. Time and again it was obvious that all the man said was a reflection of what the man was. He was considered to be a man of intelligence, character, and good will by those who knew and worked with him. Coming to a speaker's platform, then, he came with a strong ethical appeal
already established. But, he further exhibited this ethical portrait through speaking with tact and consideration, through a display of sincerity and concern toward his audience and his subject, through linking himself personally with the problems about which he spoke, through a moderate but consistent use of references which the people considered virtuous, and through a demeanor which instilled trust.

Several characteristics can be noted through the study of these sample speeches. One of the most obvious is that Rayburn had a storehouse of stock phrases and arguments which recurred in speech after speech. A tendency toward religious references can be noted as can a strong patriotic tone. Faith in the American people to be able to meet the challenges of dangerous times is coupled with an ever-optimistic outlook for America.

Another common characteristic is the practice of using emotional appeal at the beginning and ending of speeches. In each of the speeches studied this was true. One last characteristic involves his use of supporting material. It can be observed that personal testimony is most common in the ceremonial and campaign speeches, while factual evidence is more common in the congressional speeches. The need for more substantiation in speaking before Congress is obvious, and it is a credit to Rayburn's judgment that he knew when this type of proof was needed most.

The study also revealed that a thing said simply but with authority can be as effective as a thing said grandly. True,
there was a time when it was thought that the greatest heed should be paid the orator with the biggest vocabulary, the most impressive gesticulation, and the most elocutionary air. Rayburn as a speaker illustrates that this need not be so. He proves that sincerity can be as much of an audience motivator as eloquence.

Although this simplicity of language is certainly the norm for Rayburn speaking, it can be observed that on certain occasions he could elevate his speech toward the grand style. The television speech and the nomination speech are most representative of this ability. Since these speeches were given on more formal occasions and before audiences comprised of more than his constituents or colleagues, it can be assumed that although Rayburn had the ability to speak with the near grandeur of the Websterian orator, he chose not to. Perhaps through expediency, perhaps through a desire to avoid aloofness, Rayburn remained casual and down-to-earth with the audiences with whom he felt a close kinship.

The values of such a study as this are several. Especially in an age when honor, integrity, and patriotism are often scoffed at, the study of a true American patriot and what he had to say is enlightening and refreshing.

It is valuable for a student of public address to observe through historical record that speaking which is a true reflection of the person speaking is respected. For those who might attempt to copy the speaking of another, it is
helpful to observe that a speaker should start with who he is. Sam Rayburn was an example of the consistency which should exist between a man as an orator and a man as a person.

Finally, there was value in this student's being able to see the principles of logical, emotional, and ethical appeals in practice. Reading rhetorical principles from a textbook can only go a certain distance in clarifying the qualities of public speaking at its best. Theory and principles took on real meaning as they came alive in the actual experiences of a real man. As this student of public address observed the reality of the theories and principles, she came closer to a more thorough understanding of them, and she came closer to making those principles her own.

In the beginning chapter of this study, several questions were presented as guidelines for the study. The preceding pages have attempted to answer the question of who Sam Rayburn was and what his role was in the times during which and for which he spoke. The persuasive techniques used by this man in public speaking were analyzed, and it was found that although Rayburn had a working knowledge of all the aspects of invention, the source of his main strength as a speaker lay in his reputation and his skill in portraying that reputation with consistency from the speaker's platform. Conclusions as to the benefit of such a study were also drawn.
Perhaps the most valuable revelation about public address which this study offers is the verification of the fact that one who lives with integrity also speaks with integrity. In all of the research conducted, there was found no derogatory remarks about the character, honor, and sincerity of the man Sam Rayburn. The same consistency can be found in his attitude toward the things for which he spoke. There is truthfulness in his arguments and integrity in his presentation. Such a man verifies what Aristotle spoke of so long ago when he said that what a man is cannot be divorced from what he says.
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