A BURKEIAN ANALYSIS OF THE RHETORIC OF MALCOLM X
DURING THE LAST PHASE OF HIS LIFE,
JUNE 1964--FEBRUARY 1965

APPROVED:

Vicki O. Stupp
Major Professor

Donald K. Pickens
Minor Professor

R. V. Holland
Chairman, Department of Speech and Drama

Robert B. Toulouse
Dean of the Graduate School

Cadenhead, Evelyn, A Burkeian Analysis of the Rhetoric of Malcolm X During the Last Phase of His Life, June 1964--February 1965. Master of Arts (Speech and Drama), May, 1972, 202 pp., bibliography, 72 titles.

The purpose of the study has been to analyze the rhetoric of Malcolm X with Kenneth Burke's dramatistic pentad in order to gain a better understanding of Malcolm X's rhetorical strategies in providing answers to given situations. One speech, determined to be typical of Malcolm X during the last phase of his life, was chosen for the analysis. It was the speech delivered on December 20, 1964, during the visit of Mrs. Fannie Lou Hamer, Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party candidate for the Senate.

This study is divided into six chapters. Chapter I includes a brief introduction to Malcolm X, the first contemporary black revolutionary orator. It, too, establishes the justification for selecting one speech for analysis because it embodied the four philosophies Malcolm X advocated during his last year. Chapter I also introduces Kenneth Burke and his dramatistic pentad, with a separate explanation of the five terms of the pentad, act, scene, agent, agency, and purpose. A glossary of Burkeian terms to be used throughout the study concludes Chapter I. Chapter II is divided into two parts. Part I is a Burkeian scene analysis; scene being

the background out of which the speech arose. It analyzes African independence, the M.F.D.P. and its leader, Mrs. Fannie Hamer, and the overall Civil Rights picture in 1964. Part II contains a separate consideration of act, or the speech itself. Chapter III discusses Malcolm X, the agent, on December 20, 1964. Passages from the speech are cited; then, an explanation of the elements in Malcolm X's background that motivated him to choose the symbols he chose, is given. Chapter IV offers an analysis of agency and purpose respectively. In the Burkeian sense, Chapter IV is the most important one in the thesis; for, Burke himself contended that the emphasis in a pentadic study should be vested in agency. Chapter V discusses seven relevant Burkeian ratios: scene-act, scene-agent, scene-agency, agent-purpose, agent-agency, agent-act, and purpose-agency. Chapter VI offers a summary and some conclusions about Malcolm X and his rhetoric during his last phase.

This study has revealed Malcolm X to be, during the last year of his life, a dynamic force speaking for immediate freedom. No longer anti-white, Malcolm X shunned the capitalist system and saw socialism as the answer for freedom. He saw himself as the symbol of idealistic emancipation for all people. A measured public speaker, Malcolm X chose his symbols carefully for audience identification.

Because of the charismatic aura which surrounded Malcolm X, the agent-agency ratio was the most important one that dominated on December 20, 1964.

Realizing that his death was imminent, Malcolm X, nevertheless, continued his public speaking during his last phase. He used his speeches as attempts at "image-clarification." The purpose of his speeches and his life had become to unify blacks and whites concerned for immediate and unqualified freedom for all people. In order for whites to accept his change of philosophy, Malcolm X realized they would have to first understand the difference in his old "hate-whitey" doctrine and his new philosophy. Hence, Malcolm X utilized every opportunity during that last phase to clarify public misunderstanding of his views.

Judging from this study, there can be little doubt that Malcolm X would have become a more positive and dynamic force in the Civil Rights scene had he not been assassinated on February 21, 1965.

A BURKEIAN ANALYSIS OF THE RHETORIC OF MALCOLM X DURING THE LAST PHASE OF HIS LIFE, JUNE 1964--FEBRUARY 1965

THESIS

Presented to the Graduate Council of the
North Texas State University in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

By

Evelyn Cadenhead
Denton, Texas

May, 1972

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION 1

Purpose
Speech to be Analyzed
Method of Analysis
Burke's Dramatistic Pentad
Act
Scene
Agent
Agency
Purpose
Ratios

A Survey of the Literature
Summary of Design
Kenneth Burke, A Glossary of Terms

II. SCENE AND ACT ANALYSIS 35

Part I--Scene Analysis
Part II--Analysis of Act

III. MALCOLM X, THE AGENT 81

IV. AGENCY AND PURPOSE ANALYSIS 118

Part I--Agency Analysis
Part II--Purpose

V. RATIOS 149

VI. CONCLUSIONS 173

APPENDIX 184

BIBLIOGRAPHY 198

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

"A spellbinding orator of bitter wit, power and impressive intellect. He had 'charisma.' His style was nurtured in the ghettos of Boston and New York where he met the people and gained authenticity."[1] This description of Malcolm X, the first revolutionary black orator to gain prominence in contemporary America, emphasizes his rhetorical powers. Irving J. Rein, a speech teacher, reiterated Malcolm X's ability to charm an audience: "He was a dynamic speaker who gave the black pride in himself and his ancestors."[2]

In February, 1964, The New York Times, according to a poll conducted on college and university campuses, reported that Malcolm X was the "second most sought-after speaker at colleges and universities."[3] Louis Lomax, in his book When the Word is Given, substantiated Malcolm X's popularity as an orator even further when he said, "Whether people believe Malcolm X is one thing, but there can be no doubt that they come in droves--particularly white people--to hear him. And they always linger to ask questions."[4] According to both black and white observers, Malcolm X was an effective leader. Because blacks today regard him as a "martyr in the cause of

brotherhood and even a kind of saint and whites regard him as radical and dangerous,"[5] a study of his rhetoric will furnish some insight into his methods of identifying with his audiences.

Malcolm X, born Malcolm Little on May 19, 1925 in Omaha, Nebraska, called himself "the angriest black man in America." His life exemplified the fact that his anger may have been justified. Malcolm Little was exposed early in life to the animosity existing between blacks and whites. The Ku Klux Klan destroyed the Little home in Lansing, Michigan and later lynched Malcolm X's father for his activities in the Black Nationalist movement. After the Little family was ripped apart by poverty, Malcolm X was sent to an institution for boys. Despite excellent grades and outstanding athletic ability, Malcolm X, who aspired to be a lawyer, was told by his mathematics teacher: "You've got to be realistic about being a nigger. A lawyer--that's no realistic goal for a nigger."[6] This was a turning point in Malcolm X's attitude toward white people.

Malcolm Little went to New York, and, because of his affiliation with the underworld, was imprisoned at the age of twenty-one. In 1947, in a maximum security prison in Concord, Massachusetts, Malcolm X was converted to the Black Muslim religion. Due to the influence of the works of Elijah Muhammad, the Black Muslim leader, Malcolm X underwent an extensive self-education program. After leaving

prison, Malcolm Little changed his name to Malcolm X. The next twelve years of his life were devoted to increasing the following of the Black Muslims. Because of jealousy that arose between him and Elijah Muhammad, Malcolm X was asked to leave the Black Muslim sect, which he did on March 8, 1964. A journey to Mecca, the pilgrimage which all Muslims are encouraged to take, restored Malcolm X's faith in the Muslim religion.

His creation of the first Muslim Mosque, Inc., as well as the non-religious Organization of Afro-American Unity, re-established him as a Negro spokesman. Throughout 1964, rumors persisted that Black Muslims were going to silence Malcolm X permanently because his existence "threatened to split the black militant movement."[7] On February 21, 1965, sixteen revolver slugs ended Malcolm X's life during the opening moments of a speech at the Audubon Ballroom in New York.

Purpose

Jack Daniel in his "Study of Black Rhetoric" contended that black rhetors deserve special and intensive study at the present time.[8] There can be little doubt that Daniel's contention is a valid one. The lack of understanding in black-white relationships, especially with regard to Malcolm X, is exemplified by the essays in Myths about Malcolm X. Included in the essays are the following views about Malcolm X:

(1) Malcolm X was a Marxist and a member of the Socialist Workers Party.
(2) Malcolm X believed that all white men were enemies and to be hated.
(3) Malcolm X believed that racism could never be eliminated.[9]

Research indicates, however, that these views present a distorted picture of Malcolm X and the ideas which he expressed in his speeches.

The method chosen to analyze Malcolm X, a complex man in complex times, is Kenneth Burke's dramatistic pentad. Burke has been called the modern man's critic. As L. Virginia Holland wrote in her article, "Kenneth Burke's Dramatistic Approach in Speech Criticism":

> Such an approach might educate us to become better analysts of the social scene, more cognizant of what the problems of society are thought to be, and more critical of the solutions given to those problems by the social critics operating as speakers and writers.[10]

Hence, Burke allows the rhetorical critic to become a social critic.

Malcolm X's speeches apparently were answers to questions posed by the situations in which they arose. The purpose of this study is to do a Burkeian analysis of Malcolm X's rhetoric during the last phase of his life in the hope of gaining a better understanding of Malcolm X's rhetorical strategies in answers to given situations.

Speech to be Analyzed

Because of the complexity of the Burkeian method, only one speech has been selected for analysis.[11] Malcolm X's life can be divided into three phases. George Breitman, in his book, The Last Year of Malcolm X, The Evolution of a Revolutionary, explained these stages. The first of these encompassed Malcolm X's life from birth through March 8, 1964. As stated in Time magazine, "Many Americans recall Malcolm X as a 'bad' guy, known mainly for preaching racism."[12] Malcolm X's philosophies were well-known during this period.

The second phase, Malcolm X's re-evaluation and transition, lasted only three months. Since his philosophies toward life were changing, Malcolm X contradicted himself publicly during this period. It would be difficult to analyze a speech delivered at this point. Phase three seems to be the most desirable one for selecting a speech for analytical purposes; for few people realize what Malcolm X had become, and thus many writers confuse the Malcolm X of the third phase with the Malcolm X of the first stage.

Malcolm X himself considered this last phase to be the most important part of his life. As George Breitman wrote:

> He could have lived by keeping quiet. But he had things to say in his last year that he considered vital; things that it was dangerous to say--and still he put his life on the line for the right opportunity to say them. To discard what Malcolm himself considered the most important part of his legacy, and for which he gave his life--that is indeed a sad mistake.[13]

In selecting a speech, it was important to find one typical of Malcolm X during his last phase. All of the available speeches delivered by Malcolm X from June, 1964, to February, 1965, were read. The speech chosen for analysis was the speech delivered in Harlem at a rally for the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party on December 20, 1964. It was felt that his speech was typical of Malcolm X, for the following reasons.

After he announced his split with the Black Muslims on March 8, 1964, Malcolm X began to change his philosophies. George Breitman in his book, The Last Year of Malcolm X, The Evolution of a Revolutionary, "went over tapes of almost twenty full speeches from that last period." As he stated further about the last phase of Malcolm X's life, "I realized, with growing excitement, that these patterns were indisputable. . . My book is an effort to clarify ambiguities, and thus, give the reader a balanced judgement of Malcolm X."[14] Other resources were exhausted in an attempt to discover Malcolm X's changing philosophies. Malcolm X Speaks, edited by George Breitman, was one of these. The aim of the book was "to present in Malcolm X's own words the ideas he defended during his last year."[15] The companion volume to Malcolm X Speaks--Malcolm X, By Any Means Necessary, also edited by George Breitman, was checked for further information. The Autobiography of Malcolm X, edited by Alex Haley, was explored in an effort to uncover

the philosophies which Malcolm X defended from June, 1964, to February, 1965. Louis Lomax's book, When the Word is Given, written about Malcolm X, was read to discover his principles before and after the Black Muslim split.

Several pamphlets, containing Malcolm X's speeches during this last period, were also checked.

> Malcolm X on Afro-American History, a speech delivered at an Organization for Afro-American Unity meeting on January 24, 1965.
>
> Malcolm X, the Man and His Ideas, a brief synopsis of Malcolm X's ideas, written by George Breitman.
>
> Speech at Militant Labor Forum, a speech delivered on January 7, 1965 entitled, "Prospects for Freedom in 1965."
>
> Two Speeches by Malcolm X, two speeches delivered by Malcolm X immediately after his split with the Nation of Islam.
>
> Myths about Malcolm X, a collection of essays by the Reverend Albert Cleage and George Breitman, written in an attempt to dispel the most misunderstood myths surrounding Malcolm X.

All of these resources indicated that Malcolm X's philosophy from June, 1964 to February, 1965 embodied four basic creeds.

(1) He was not anti-white. He condemned the white man collectively for what he had done to the black man collectively.
(2) The black man needed to be concerned for the struggle for human rights. It was not an American struggle but an international struggle. Thus the black Americans should identify with the African culture.
(3) The black man should fight for freedom. The white power structure would not hand him freedom on a platter.

(4) He felt racism was a result of the capitalist society. Hence, he was pro-socialist and anti-capitalist.

A better understanding of the four basic creeds proposed by Malcolm X during his last phase can be reached by examining each one separately.

The first belief, "Malcolm X was not anti-white; he condemned the white man collectively for what he had done to the black man collectively," was a new concept for Malcolm X. Heretofore, he had been, in word and deed, anti-white. However, when Malcolm X visited the Middle East and Africa after the Black Muslim split, he began to alter his views toward the white man. In Arabia, Dr. Abd ir-Rahman Assam, a Moslem who would have been considered white in America, treated Malcolm X as a brother. As Malcolm X stated in his Autobiography, "That morning was the start of radical alteration in my whole outlook about the white man."[16] As Breitman contended in Malcolm X Speaks, "While Malcolm X's thinking about alliances began with non-Americans. . . it also turned, in his last year, to the possibility of alliances with American whites."[17] Malcolm X himself spoke of the young white people,

> When I was in the Black Muslim movement, I spoke on many white and black campuses. I knew back in 1961 and 1962 that the younger generation was much different from the older and that many students, black and white, were more sincere in their analysis of the problem and their desire to see the problem solved.[18]

Although he condemned the white man collectively for what he had done to the black man collectively, he welcomed the white man's help to undo these wrongs. On May 29, 1964, Malcolm X stated:

> We will work with anyone, with any group, no matter what their color is, as long as they are genuinely interested in taking the type of steps necessary to bring an end to the injustices that black people in this country are inflicted by no matter what their color is, no matter what their political, economic, or social philosophy is, as long as their aims and objectives are in the direction of destroying the vulturous system that has been sucking the blood of the people in this country, they're all right with us.[19]

Alex Haley in Malcolm X's Autobiography contended that Malcolm X no longer "inveighed against the United States but against a segment of the United States represented by overt white supremacies in the South and covert white supremacies in the North."[20] Malcolm X further clarified his relationship to white people: He felt that blacks and whites working together could condemn the white collectively for their mistreatment of the black people. After his second trip to Africa, he discussed the relationship between militant whites and militant blacks at an Organization of Afro-American Unity meeting on January 7, 1965.

> So when the day comes when the whites who are really fed up--I don't mean those jive whites, who pose as liberals and who are not, but those who are fed up with what is going on--when they learn how to establish the proper type of communication with those uptown who are fed up and they get some coordinated action going, you'll

> get some changes. And it will take both, it will take everything that you've got, it will take that.[21]

During the last weeks of his life, in an interview with Marlene Nadler, Malcolm X concluded with the statement,

> I'm not going to be in anybody's straitjacket. I don't care fot what a person looks like or where they come from. My mind is wide open to anybody who will help get the ape off our back.[22]

Hence, one can conclude, in his last phase, Malcolm X was not anti-white. He was becoming conciliatory toward white people. He still condemned white people to a degree, but his condemnation was directed toward whites collectively. This was indeed a change in philosophy for the previous Black Muslim spokesman who had often spoken of the "hated blue-eyed devil."

The second belief supported by Malcolm X, "concern for human rights and the necessity for black Americans to identify with the African culture," was also a new philosophy for Malcolm X. Prior to this time, the Black Muslim spokesman had been concerned solely for Black Muslim Americans. The black unity Malcolm X sought after his split with the Black Muslims was a "unity of all negroes--whatever their religion, whatever their philosophy, so long as they were ready to fight for freedom. His movement was switched from a religious sectarianism toward non-sectarian mass action."[23]

Malcolm X felt the best allies for the American Negroes were to be found abroad. This, according to George Breitman in The Last Year of Malcolm X, Evolution of a Revolutionary, was

> where he placed his primary emphasis in his last year. . . . He set out to convince black people in this country and Africans, Arabs, Asians and Latin Americans that they have common interests and a common enemy--'the international power structure.'[24]

As Malcolm X stated,

> The OAAU [Organization of Afro-American Unity] hopefully will unite not only black people in the United States but would be a nucleus for bringing about common action by non-whites throughout the Western Hemisphere.[25]

Malcolm X felt the Afro-Americans should seek help internationally. As he stated,

> But when we realize how large the earth is, and how many different people there are on it and how closely they resemble us, then when we turn to them for some sort of aid, or to form alliances, then we'll make a little faster progress.[26]

Malcolm X felt there was a distinct difference in Afro-Americans whose scope was limited to the United States and the Afro-Americans with the international outlook.

> The Afro-American whose scope is limited to the United States feels he is the underdog and he always uses an approach that is a begging, hat-in-hand, compromising approach. The Afro-American, with the international outlook uses a different approach in trying to struggle for his rights. He doesn't beg. He doesn't thank you for what you give him, because you are only giving him what he should

> have had a hundred years ago. He doesn't think you are doing him any favors.[27]

The concept of Black Nationalism was interwoven with the third belief Malcolm X sponsored during the last year of his life. He believed "the black man should fight for freedom. The white power structure would not hand him freedom on a platter." In the statement Malcolm X delivered on March 12, 1964 announcing his break from the Nation of Islam, he explained his concept of Black Nationalism.

> Black Nationalism is designed to correct or eliminate immediately evils that our people have suffered here for four hundred years. So today when the black man starts reaching out for what Americans say are his rights--the black man feels that he is within his right--to do whatever is necessary to protect himself.[28]

Malcolm X felt Black Nationalism answered an urgent need for the black people.

> The most urgent need of the Negro people is still the mobilization and unification of the Negro masses into an independent movement to fight for their freedom. Black Nationalism is still highly progressive because it contributes to that process and to the creation of that kind of movement.[29]

As George Breitman explained, Malcolm X did not propose violence. However, he believed the black man should defend himself and his freedom. The white power structure would not hand the black man freedom; he had to fight for it.

> Those of you who heard Malcolm know that he did not advocate violence. He advocated that negroes defend themselves and their freedom when attacked. He said it a hundred times;

> he said it a thousand times. He said he was opposed to violence and wanted to stop it. He felt Negroes contributed to stopping it by letting the attackers know they would defend themselves.[30]

In his Autobiography, Malcolm X himself explained that his non-religious Organization of Afro-American Unity had at its basic core the belief that Negroes should fight for their freedom. He stated, "The OAAU seeks to convert blacks from non-violence to active self-defense against white supremacies across America."[31] He told a rally of the OAAU in the fall of 1964 after a long stay in Africa and the Middle East, "Any time I have a religion that won't fight for my people, I say to Hell with that religion."[32]

Malcolm X's last year saw a change in his political philosophy as well. As he gradually became anti-capitalist, he simultaneously became pro-socialist.

Breitman explained that "Malcolm was not at all hesitant about exposing his anti-capitalist position. I do not say he was a Marxist--he wasn't."[33] In a January 18, 1965 interview with the Young Socialist, Malcolm X said,

> It is impossible for the capitalist system to survive, primarily because the system of capitalism needs some blood to suck. Capitalism used to be like an eagle, but now it's more like a vulture. . . It's only a matter of time in my opinion before it will collapse completely.[34]

Malcolm X believed the rejection of capitalism would leave a vacuum that should be replaced by socialism. As he told an audience on May 29, 1964:

of Motives, Rhetoric of Motives, and Philosophy of Literary Form constituted the core of the "most important job of criticism being done among us."[38] Burke has also been deemed "a dazzling virtuoso of ideas,"[39] one of the truly "speculative thinkers of our time."[40]

Burke has sought for more than thirty years to find a rapprochement of rhetoric. Between 1924 and 1941, he moved from writing poetry into a philosophy of living.[41] To purify Burke to the extent of being able to apprehend his whole coherent system of rhetorical criticism is a difficult task but one worth undertaking. Understanding Burke means comprehending a "systematic view of man and the drama of human relations, and a methodology for its application of great power, beauty and persuasiveness."[42] To attain the necessary comprehension of Burkeian criticism, one must understand the aim of his methodology--"using all there is to use" in an attempt to rechart human experience out of its "wasteland to a better life through symbolic action."[43]

Burke contended that language is a stylized symbol employed by man in answer to situations in which he is placed. He defined man as a symbol-using animal. His methodology for rhetorical criticism evolved primarily through A Philosophy of Literary Form, published in 1941; A Grammar of Motives, published in 1945; and A Rhetoric of Motives, published in 1950. In his Rhetoric of Motives, he discussed

man's use of symbols, "The use of language is a symbolic means of urging cooperation in beings that by nature respond to symbols."[44] Burke further explained that language is a method for encompassing situations. Burke suggested that naming a thing as "friend" or "foe" not only serves as a nomenclature, it also suggests appropriate courses of action. Hence, where there is meaning, persuasion is evident, and where there is persuasion, there is rhetoric.

In the Grammar of Motives, Burke employed the metaphor of man as an actor acting out (through human conduct and actions) his life with a purpose in view. He discussed his dramatism:

> The titular word of our method is dramatism. It invites one to consider the matter of motives in a perspective that, being developed from the analysis of drama, treats language and thought primarily as modes of action.[45]

The Philosophy of Literary Form also established man as an actor and introduced an important concept, identification. "Men enact roles. They change roles. They develop modes of social behavior. They establish identification by relating to groups."[46]

An understanding of identification is an essential aspect of comprehending Burkeian criticism. He remarked,

> If I had to sum up in one word the difference between the 'old' and 'new' rhetoric, I would reduce it to this: 'The key term for the old rhetoric was persuasion and its stress upon

> deliberate design. The key term for the new rhetoric would be identification which can include a partially unconscious factor in appeal.'[47]

Burke felt that a speaker persuades an audience by the use of stylistic identification. The speaker might cause the audience to identify themselves with his interests in an attempt to establish rapport between himself and his audience. However, one must not stop here, for Burke would have the critic "use all there is to use." Identification can range from the politician saying, "I was a farm boy myself" to the mystic's devout identification with the sources of all being.[48] If for example, instead of analyzing the times, the events, and the occasion, one asked, "What were the symbols of the time? Did the speaker reject or accept these symbols of authority?" It would be much easier for the rhetorical critic to determine the attitudes held in common by the speaker and the audience that make identification conceivable.

Essential to identification is Burke's concept of properties. Properties can include both material or physical properties and intellectual properties. All people have properties which are shared as well as properties which are different. Though people differ, they find commonalities for identification purposes. Physical properties may encompass such things as a need for food. This is a property which men share. Yet, men may differ in the

methods for subsisting. One man may be a vegetarian while yet another may be a meat-eater. Intellectual properties embody such things as education, status, and citizenship. Intellectual properties represent man's rational or symbolizing capacity; for example, speech majors all belong to the field of speech, yet their specialties may differ. One may be a speech therapist; another may be in the field of public address-communication.

Thus, identification goes beyond common ground or rapport established between speaker and audience. By calling upon the physical and intellectual properties which his audience may share in common, the speaker also phychologically analyzes his audience. He is appealing to his audience's values, their socio-economic status, their citizenship, their political beliefs; the list is endless. Hence, men are united in properties through rhetoric. The rhetorical function of language is to bridge the conditions of estrangement natural to society.

Related to the concept of identification and properties is consubstantiality and substance. Identification brings consubstantiality. Identification refers to the process by which a speaker attempts to achieve togetherness or consubstantiality. Consubstantiality implies a state of being united in one common substance. Burke explained this in his Rhetoric of Motives. "For substance was an act and a

way of life, an acting together. In acting together, men have common sensations, concepts, images, ideas that make them consubstantial."[49] To identify with a person is to be consubstantial with a person other than oneself. Etymologically, the word substance means to stand under; thus, it involves a paradox of thinking in terms of what a thing is in itself and what a thing is extrinsically. For example, a child both is and is not one with its parents.[50] The Holy Trinity is yet another example of consubstantiality. The Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit all have substance. Each one is unique; yet each is consubstantial with the other parts. Hence, persuasion involves communication by signs of consubstantiality. As Burke said, "You persuade a man only in as far as you can talk his language by speech, gesture, tonality, order, image, attitude, idea, identifying your ways with his."[51]

This analysis does not imply that Malcolm X understood rhetoric or was conscious of Burkeian rhetorical strategies in the scholarly sense. Rather, the author is applying Burkeian methodology to Malcolm X as a means of revealing rhetorical strategies he used during his last year.

Burke's Dramatistic Pentad

The method of Burke's rhetorical criticism can be discovered in his "dramatistic pentad." In his Grammar of Motives, Burke explained:

> Human motivation can be explained fully in dramatistic terms. Man is an actor who purposively acts through certain means (symbolic or linguistic methods as well as physical) and carries out his action against the background of the historical scene (time and place in which he lives).[52]

Kenneth Burke's concept of dramatism is not a new one, for Shakespeare himself said, "All the world's a stage and the men and women merely players."

L. Virginia Holland, in "Kenneth Burke's Dramatistic Approach in Speech Criticism," explained the component parts of Kenneth Burke's dramatistic pentad:

> The strategy of the pentad considers man's actions from all of the perspectives which anything can have--from five interrelated motivational or causal points of view. The pentad considers the Act (that is, it names what took place in thought or deed), the Scene (the background of the Act, the situation in which it occurred), the Agent (the actor, or kind of person who performed the act), the Agency (what means or instruments he used), and the Purpose (motive or cause which lay behind a given act).[53]

Act

In Philosophy of Literary Form, Burke explained the concept of act: "Any verbal act is to be considered symbolic action. Words are symbolic of something, representative of a social trend."[54] Therefore, the act may be the speech itself; for example, what took place in thought or deed? What did the speaker say?

Scene

The scene can encompass many aspects. Among these are the occasion, what has happened to the speaker, and the events surrounding the speech itself prior to the event. Therefore, the scene is the background out of which the act grows--the situation in which it occurred. Burke contended that "the scene should be a fit container for the act."[55]

Agent

In rhetorical criticism, the agent to be considered is usually the speaker himself. What type of person was he? What motivated him to speak as he did? In the Grammar of Motives, Burke explained, "Under agent, one could place any personal properties that are assigned a motivational value, such as 'ideas, the will, and fear.'"[56]

Agency

Agency is the means by which the speaker accomplishes his purpose. It is the means through which the act is performed. Burke himself stated that the primary emphasis of rhetorical analysis should be vested in agency.[57]

The term "strategy" is much akin to Burke's agency, for strategy is the plan or method the speaker (actor) follows to achieve his ends. "It is a 'naming of the associative grouping of ideas which the speaker makes in his language.'"[58]

As man sees similar situations (or dramas) occurring, he develops strategies to explain what is happening. When man uses language, he indicates his strategies for dealing with situation. Strategies are man's attempts to cope with given situations.

Although agency usually encompasses the agent's strategies and is thus dominated by the agent, sometimes another part of the pentad dominates the agency. A good example of this may be found in David Ling's analysis of Edward Kennedy's July 18, 1969 speech after the drowning of Mary Jo Kopechne.[59] Ling said that Kennedy (the agent) described the elements in such a way that the events surrounding Mary Jo Kopechne's death (the scene) became controlling. Kennedy's statements concerning the "unlit road," the "narrow bridge which had no guard rails," and the "deep pond" placed him in the position of an agent caught in a situation not of his own making. It suggested the scene as the controlling element. Furthermore, Kennedy's suggestion that his survival was more a result of fate than of his own actions and that he was the victim of "some awful curse" assumed that "as an agent he was not in control of the scene, but rather its helpless victim."[60]

Purpose

It is explained in the Philosophy of Literary Form that as a poem is designed to "do something" for the poet and his

readers, so it is with rhetoric. The purpose of the speech asks the questions, "What is the speech designed to do?" "Why was it given?" "What was the speaker trying to accomplish?" Burke stated that purpose is the motive or cause behind the act.

Ratios

In doing a Burkeian analysis, one must not stop with a definition of the five component parts of the pentad; for the analysis would be incomplete. Burke continually reminded the reader of the interrelationship between the various parts of the pentad:

> Philosophy of Literary Form:
> So we watch in structure analysis. . . not only a matter of what, but also a matter of 'from what to what.'[61]
> Grammar of Motives:
> Certain formal interrelationships prevail among these terms, by reason of their role of . . . common ground or substance.[62]
> Counter-Statement:
> A work has form . . . insofar as one part of it leads the reader to anticipate another part, to be gratified by its sequence.[63]

Each of the parts is related to the other four parts. In naming his ratios, Burke stated that all ratios are essentially analogies. By "scene-act-ratio" one implies that the nature of the act was implicit or analogously present in the nature of the scene. Conversely, the act-scene-ration indicated that the act had a bearing upon the scene.

Rueckert wrote that the inter-action between agent and scene is a ratio of man and his environment.[64] The Grammar of Motives furnished us with an excellent example of the scene-agent-ratio:

> The (Communist) Manifesto uses the scene-agent-ratio materialistically when asserting that 'every change in the conditions of man's material existence is accompanied by a change in man's ideas, views, conceptions,' in one word, man's consciousness.[65]

The ratios existing between scene, agent, and agency can be understood when one considers that agency is a method or medium that serves as an element common to both scene and agent.

This is by no means an exhaustive list of ratios that could be learned and studied from the pentad. One must always remember that Burke "uses all there is to use." For the pentad, it is possible to have the following ratios:

(1) Scene-act
(2) Scene-agent
(3) Scene-agency
(4) Agent-purpose
(5) Agent-agency
(6) Agent-act
(7) Act-purpose
(8) Act-agency
(9) Act-agent
(10) Purpose-scene
(11) Purpose-agency

It was impossible to decide the significance of the various ratios until an in-depth study was made. In certain instances, some ratios were not important; one or more of the

ratios dominated. Through research, the more significant ratios were determined and dealt with accordingly.

A Survey of the Literature

There was ample material on Malcolm X. The Autobiography of Malcolm X, edited by Alex Haley, was an excellent source. George Breitman, a black journalist, wrote three books which were invaluable. Malcolm X Speaks explained Malcolm X's position as a Black Muslim leader. The Last Year of Malcolm X, the Evolution of a Revolutionary and Malcolm X, By Any Means Necessary, gave a detailed explanation of Malcolm X's changing philosophies during his last year.

Louis Lomax, author of When the Word is Given, wrote from a thorough knowledge of Black Muslim groups. He examined the entire movement, with special exphasis on Malcolm X. Eric Lincoln wrote Black Muslims in America. It, too, furnished insight into Malcolm X as a Black Muslim leader.

Many pamphlets about Malcolm X have been written. Among those used were the following:

(1) Myths about Malcolm X, The Reverend Albert Cleage and George Breitman
(2) Malcolm X, the Man and His Ideas, George Breitman
(3) Malcolm X on Afro-American History, Malcolm X
(5) Malcolm X Talks to Young People, Malcolm X.

To examine the possibility of a Burkeian analysis of Malcolm X, other Burkeian rhetorical analyses were consulted.

Burke himself applied his method to Hitler's Mein Kampf. He explained why Hitler spoke as he did to the German people. Virginia Holland's discussion of Wendell Phillip's "Murder of Lovejoy" address also utilized a Burkeian approach. In addition, many master's theses and Ph.D. dissertations had employed Kenneth Burke's criteria. Several were noteworthy of mention. Mark S. Kyle's thesis on "Webster on the Seventh of March: A Study in the Theory and Practice of Rhetorical Criticism" was essentially Burkeian. It was an effort to isolate and define the factors that shaped Webster's strategy. Thomas F. Mader's "Coriolanus and God: A Burkeian View of William Buckley" interpreted Burke's dramatistic pentad and approach to criticism in the first part. Section two applied the dramatistic theory to a single Buckley speech, "True Meaning of Right Wing." "The Rhetoric of Isolation: A Burkeian Analysis," by Donald W. Parson also appropriated some of Kenneth Burke's insights that help the critic discuss rhetorical patterns peculiar to a historical movement.

George Robert Skorkorsky, Jr. has written a thesis entitled "The Rhetoric of Malcolm X: A Burkeian Analysis." He analyzed Malcolm X's "Ballot or the Bullet" speech delivered on April 3, 1964, during Malcolm X's transition period. This study is an analysis of a speech delivered after Malcolm X had entered the third phase of his life.

This is an important difference because Malcolm X actually contradicted himself publicly during his transition period. Further, the purpose of this study was to reveal, through his rhetoric, the beliefs, motives, and actions surrounding Malcolm X during the last phase of his life.

In Skorkorsky's scenic analysis he did not use specific incidents in the "Ballot or the Bullet" speech to emphasize exactly what elements in the scene prompted Malcolm X to speak as he did. This study uses specific instances in the speech delivered on December 20, 1964 in its scenic analysis. In his analysis of the broad scene, Skorkorsky mentioned only Malcolm X's involvement in the Black Muslims. This study analyzes not only the Black Muslim influence on Malcolm X, but other existing factors in the December 20, 1964 world that prompted Malcolm X to speak as he did.

Skorkorsky's Chapter III, "Agent Analysis," was not a complete analysis of the agent in the Burkeian sense, but rather a biographical sketch of Malcolm X. Chapter III of this study, which analyzes the agent in the Burkeian sense, quotes passages from the December 20, 1964 speech and explains what elements in the agent's background prompted him to react as he did on December 20, 1964.

Lastly, Skorkorsky did not treat ratios at all. Chapter V of this thesis is reserved solely for the

treatment of Burke's ratios. Since Burke advocates using "all there is to use," Skorkorsky did not appear to go far enough.

Judging from the past, a study such as this one, utilizing a Burkeian analysis of Malcolm X's rhetoric, is both workable and worthwhile.

Summary of Design

Chapter I includes a statement of purpose, an introduction to the method of Kenneth Burke and the terms to be used throughout the study, and a justification for selecting the speech to be examined.

Chapter II includes an analysis of the scene in which Malcolm X's December 20, 1964 speech was delivered. It includes a separate discussion of the act itself.

Chapter III examines Malcolm X, the agent.

Chapter IV is an analysis of the agencies and purpose of the December 20, 1964 speech.

Chapter V is a discussion of the relevant ratios of the pentad.

Chapter VI contains a summary and conclusions.

Kenneth Burke

A Glossary of Terms

1. Properties--physical properties representing the animal nature of man; intellectual properties representing man's rational or symbolizing capacity.
2. Language--its essential function is a symbolic means of inducing cooperation in beings that by nature respond to symbols; as long as man uses language symbols, he is rhetorical, for the vocabulary he uses is a weighted vocabulary.
3. Speech--one kind of strategic answer to a situation.
4. Man--an actor acting out (through human conduct and actions) his life with a purpose in view.
5. Old rhetoric--persuasion with stress upon deliberate design.
6. New rhetoric--identification which includes a partially unconscious factor in appeal.
7. Identification--process of overcoming those things that divide men by providing them with concepts, images, ideas, and attitudes that allow them to become substantially one (consubstantial is Burke's term): to identify with someone or something is to become consubstantial with it.

8. Consubstantiality--implies a state of being united in one common substance; identification may take place in principle or through a whole range of associated properties and interests.
9. Dramatistic Pentad--man's attempt to act through certain means (symbolic or linguistic methods as well as physical) and his ability to carry out his action against the background of the historical scene (time and place in which he lives).
10. Act--what took place in thought or deed (often, the speech).
11. Scene--setting or background.
12. Agent--usually the actor who performs the act.
13. Agency--means by which the act is performed.
14. Purpose--motive behind the act.
15. Strategies--naming of the associative grouping of ideas which the speaker makes in his language; man's attempts to cope with given situations.

FOOTNOTES

[1]"Angry Spokesman Malcolm X Tells Off Whites," Life, 24 (1963), 30.

[2]Irving J. Rein, The Relevant Rhetoric: Principles of Public Speaking Through Case Studies (London: Collier-Macmillan Lmtd., 1969), p. 76.

[3]Alex Haley, ed., The Autobiography of Malcolm X (New York: Grove Press, Inc., 1966), p. 285.

[4]Louis Lomax, When the Word is Given (New York: The New American Library, 1963), p. 147.

[5]Haley, The Autobiography of Malcolm X, p. 37.

[6]Ibid.

[7]Rein, The Relevant Rhetoric: Principles of Public Speaking Through Case Studies, p. 45.

[8]Jack Daniel, "Study of Black Rhetoric," Black Lines, 1, (1970), 7-14.

[9]Myths about Malcolm X (New York: Merit Publishers, 1968), p. 27.

[10]L. Virginia Holland, "Kenneth Burke's Dramatistic Approach in Speech Criticism," The Quarterly Journal of Speech, 41 (1955), 356.

[11]Resources used in search of speech texts:

a. Album, Message to the Grass Roots.
b. George Breitman, Last Year of Malcolm X, the Evolution of a Revolutionary.
c. George Breitman, Malcolm X Speaks.
d. Contemporary American Speeches.
e. Archie Epps, ed., Speeches of Malcolm X at Harvard.
f. Louis Lomax, When the Word is Given.
g. Daniel J. O'Neill, ed., Speeches by Black Americans.
h. August Meier and Elliot Rudwick, ed., Black Protest in the Sixties.
i. Arthur L. Smith, Rhetoric of Black Revolution.
j. Vital Speeches, vol. 30, 31.

[12]Haley, The Autobiography of Malcolm X, p. 155.

[13]Myths about Malcolm X, p. 24.

[14]George Breitman, The Last Year of Malcolm X, the Evolution of a Revolutionary (New York: Pathfinder Press, 1967), p. 2.

[15]George Breitman, ed., Malcolm X Speaks (New York: Grove Press, Inc., 1966), p. vii.

[16]Haley, The Autobiography of Malcolm X, p. 334.

[17]Breitman, Malcolm X Speaks, pp. 236-237.

[18]Ibid.

[19]Ibid., p. 70.

[20]Haley, The Autobiography of Malcolm X, p. 372.

[21]Breitman, Malcolm X Speaks, pp. 223-224.

[22]Breitman, The Last Year of Malcolm X, the Evolution of a Revolutionary, p. 49.

[23]George Breitman, Malcolm X, the Man and His Ideas (New York: Pathfinder Press, 1965), p. 10.

[24]Breitman, The Last Year of Malcolm X, the Evolution of a Revolutionary, p. 42.

[25]Ibid., p. 44.

[26]Breitman, Malcolm X Speaks, p. 49.

[27]Ibid., p. 52.

[28]Malcolm X, Two Speeches by Malcolm X (New York: Merit Publishers, 1969), p. 7.

[29]Breitman, Malcolm X, the Man and His Ideas, p. 13.

[30]Ibid., p. 11.

[31]Haley, The Autobiography of Malcolm X, p. 416.

[32]Breitman, The Last Year of Malcolm X, the Evolution of a Revolutionary, pp. 2-4.

[33]Breitman, Malcolm X Speaks, p. 205.

[34]Ibid., p. 215.

[35]William Worthy, "Malcolm X Says Group Will Stress Politics," National Guardian, 27 (1964), 20.

[36]Breitman, Malcolm X Speaks, p. 69.

[37]Marie Hochmuth, "Kenneth Burke and the 'New Rhetoric,'" Quarterly Journal of Speech, 39 (1952), 133.

[38]William Howe Rueckert, Critical Responses to Kenneth Burke, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1969), p. 163.

[39]William Howe Rueckert, Kenneth Burke and the Drama of Human Relations, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1963), p. 6.

[40]Hochmuth, "Kenneth Burke and the 'New Rhetoric,'" 133.

[41]Rueckert, Kenneth Burke and the Drama of Human Relations, p. 51.

[42]Ibid., p. 5.

[43]Ibid., p. 43.

[44]Kenneth Burke, A Rhetoric of Motives, (Berkley: University of California Press, 1969), p. 22.

[45]Kenneth Burke, A Grammar of Motives, (Berkley: University of California Press, 1969), p. xxii.

[46]Kenneth Burke, The Philosophy of Literary Form, Studies in Symbolic Action, (Louisiana: Louisiana State University Press, 1941), p. 227.

[47]Holland, "Kenneth Burke's Dramatistic Approach," 300-5.

[48]Burke, A Rhetoric of Motives, cover.

[49]Ibid., p. 21.

[50]Marie Hochmuth Nichols, Rhetoric and Criticism, (Baton Rouge, Louisiana: Louisiana State University Press, 1963), p. 85.

[51]Burke, A Rhetoric of Motives, p. 21.

[52]Burke, A Grammar of Motives, p. x.

[53]Ibid., pp. xv, xxii.

[54]Burke, The Philosophy of Literary Form, p. 8.

[55]Burke, A Grammar of Motives, p. xix.

[56]Ibid.

[57]Ibid., p. 275.

[58]Nichols, Rhetoric and Criticism, p. 286.

[59]David A. Ling, "A Pentadic Analysis of Senator Edward Kennedy's Address to the People of Massachusetts," Central States Speech Journal, 21 (1970), 81-86.

[60]Ibid., p. 84.

[61]Burke, The Philosophy of Literary Form, p. 33.

[62]Burke, A Grammar of Motives, p. xix.

[63]Kenneth Burke, Counter-Statement, Los Altos, California: Hermes Publications, 1953), p. 124.

[64]Rueckert, Kenneth Burke and the Drama of Human Relations, p. 11.

[65]Burke, A Grammar of Motives, p. 205.

CHAPTER II

SCENE AND ACT ANALYSIS

Part I--Scene Analysis

Kenneth Burke contended that the scene is the background out of which the act or speech grows as well as the situation in which it occurred. Furthermore, he stated that "the scene should be a fit container for the act."[1] Malcolm X's December 20, 1964 speech or act was a by-product of the twentieth century world, the scene out of which it grew.

To consider the scenic influences affecting Malcolm X on December 20, 1964, one must consider the larger circumference of the scene, African independence. Malcolm X was impressed with Africa and its quest for freedom; therefore, this would be an integral part of Malcolm X's overall scene.

The second important scenic element that influenced Malcolm X's speech can be narrowed to the activities of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party. The rally itself was being held for MFDP members who were touring the United States in a fund-raising effort.

The third element to be considered is an MFDP leader, Mrs. Fannie Lou Hamer. Mrs. Hamer spoke directly before Malcolm X on December 20, 1964; and therefore, her speech was a part of the scene.

Since Mrs. Hamer alluded directly to the overall Civil Rights' picture in her speech, the next element of scenic value to be considered is the Civil Rights picture in 1964, with particular emphasis on Black Nationalism and the Black Muslims.

Malcolm X believed the Civil Rights struggle was interlocked with the Congressional struggle confronting the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party. Since Congress in 1964 was controlled by the Democrats, both Congress and the Democratic Party in 1964 are important to an analysis of the scene. Both influenced Malcolm X to choose the symbols in his speech on December 20, 1964.

The last element to be considered in the analysis is the speech Malcolm X delivered later that night at the Audubon Ballroom. It is important to a scenic analysis, for it was a by-product and an extension of his earlier speech on December 20, 1964.

The first element to be considered in a scenic analysis is Malcolm X's evolving respect for the African nations and their quests for independence. As explained in Chapter I, Malcolm X, during his last year, became convinced that the

black man's struggle for independence should be deemed an international struggle. Hence, the black Americans should identify with the African culture.

Numerous references were made in Malcolm X's December 20 speech to the Africans' fight for freedom:

> Oginga Odinga is one of the foremost freedom fighters on the African continent. . . But since Kenya became a republic last week, and Jomo Kenyatta ceased being Prime Minister and became the President, the same person you are singing about, Oginga Odinga is now Kenyatta's Vice President. He's the number-two man in the Kenya government. . . Oginga Odinga is not meek and humble and forgiving. He's not nonviolent. But he's free. . . When I was in Africa, I noticed some of the Africans got their freedom faster than others. Some areas of the African continent became independent faster than other areas. . . let some people hear you singing about Oginga Odinga and Kenyatta and Lumumba.[2]

To examine Malcolm X's reasons for mentioning Kenya freedom fighters, Kenyatta, Oginga Odinga, and Lumumba, one must first examine the scene in African culture in 1964. Kenya was the thirty-fifth nation to gain its independence and the thirty-first since World War II. In a relatively short span of years, newly-declared nations were testing their capacities for self-government.

The newly independent African nations had to overcome barriers such as tribal loyalties and lack of public education. The week before Kenya had declared its independence, the Sudan government admitted that it had guerilla warfare on its hands among the tribes of the South. Sixty-four

people had lost their lives, and the revolt was growing. The Congo, too, was bubbling and simmering. "Togo's President Nicholas Grunitsky was in power by the grace of a bunch of disgruntled army veterans who grunted down President Sylvanus Olympio."[3] In Nigeria, Chiefs Obafemi Awolowo and Anthony Enahoro were in prison for plotting to overthrow the state. The Ghana government was in no better shape. An amended Preventive Detention Act empowered President Nkrumah to keep his political opponents in jail without trial for ten years. The Ivory Coast's President Felix Houphouet Boigney spoke sadly of the "wind of madness that swept the continent. No nation has ever escaped the sort of crisis we are now going through."[4] Africa of 1964 was a continent of instability and dictatorship.

As previously stated, Malcolm X made specific reference to Kenya. The Kenya of 1964 was a "mosaic of contrasts and conflicts, not quite as large as Texas, 3/5 desert or semi-desert. The largest of its tribes was Kikuyu. The African language, Swahili, developed through trading, was spoken there."[5]

The road to Kenya's independence was a slow one.

> Seconds before the stroke of midnight on December 11, eighty blazing floodlights flicked off. Britain's Union Jack flag was hurled down and the black, red and green flag of independent Kenya was raised. Shouts of 'uhuru' of freedom were heard; and the opening bars of 'El Mungu Nguvu Yeta' [O God Of All Creation], Kenya's national anthem filled the air.[6]

Kenya's journey to independence was treacherous and bloody at times. Three overlapping phases were evident in the struggle. The first of these existed between the two world wars. It was a British settlers' struggle led by pioneer fighters like Lord Delamere, a British Colonial Officer. The struggle was an effort to achieve an elite white government in Kenya like those existing in South Africa.

The second phase was a conflict involving the largest tribe, the Kikuyus and the settlers. An offspring of the upheavals was the formation of the Young Kikuyu Association. The central issue of the struggle was land. The clash was partially responsible for the violence of the Mau Mau Rebellion from 1952-1959.

The Mau Mau freedom fighters ushered in the third and last phase of Kenya's independence struggle. The Mau Mau rebellion itself struck a "decisive blow at the political domination of the settlers." The third phase also saw a "political awakening of all Kenya tribes."[7] The third phase was actually a struggle between Kenya's two political parties, the K.A.N.U. (Kenya African National Union) and the K.A.D.U. (Kenya African Democratic Union). K.A.N.U. won a smashing victory in a nine-day election. Out of 112 seats in the House of Representatives, K.A.N.U. delegates won sixty-four outright and gained the allegiance of six independent candidates. With its independence won, the

K.A.N.U. party, too, was responsible for changing the country's slogan from "uhuru" (freedom) to "Karambee" (Let us work together; get up and go).

Malcolm X also alluded to Jomo Kenyatta as the President of the newly independent nation. Kenyatta has been described as a "bearded, leonine man armed with an ebony walking stick, Africa's symbol of authority."[8] The seventy-three-year-old President of Kenya was born Kamau Ngengi, the son of a poor farmer near Ft. Hall, where his tribe, the Kikuyu, worshipped the snowcapped Mount Kenya as a dwelling place of Ngai (God). At ten, he ran away from home. He adopted the name Kenyatta. Later, in Nairobi, he became a public works department clerk. In 1922, he joined the Kikuyu Central Association, and, in 1929 was sent to England to plead the Kikuyu cause. While he was in England, he married Edna Grace Clarke, an English governess and withdrew temporarily from politics. In September, 1946, he deserted his wife and his twenty-one year old son, who was then a student at King's College in Cambridge, to return to Africa. In 1951-52, he became the leader of the Mau Maus. As he told his followers at Thika in 1951, "The land was ours when the Europeans came; they kept us back and took our land. We want self-government. . .Don't be afraid to spill your blood to get the land."[9]

There was much speculation following Kenyatta's election. One Kenya parliament member explained the views of the pro-Kenyatta camp, "The effect of his [Kenyatta's] voice and personality were immediate and magnetic. Even the smallest child became still and quiet as Kenyatta talked to us."[10] There were Africans who were somewhat alarmed at his election. As one of them stated, "He is inclined to drift into rambling incoherence in private conversation, especially when his interest is not fully engaged." Despite these opposing reports, it can be concluded that Kenyatta was in definite command of Kenya in 1964.[11]

Because Malcolm X considered international alliance of great importance to the black Americans' struggle, he spoke of two other Kenya leaders, Oginga Odinga and Lumumba. Hence, both African leaders are important to an overall scenic analysis. The first of these, Oginga Odinga was one of two presidential contenders in Kenya in 1964. Thirty-two-year-old Tom Mboya, who was later appointed Minister of Justice, was the other presidential hopeful. Mzee (as Kenyatta was often called) "played West-oriented Tom Mboya against emotional and extreme left-winger Oginga Odinga, who freely admits he gets money from Moscow and Peking. Hence, Mzee became President of the new Kenya government."[12]

Malcolm X's reference to Lumumba was a reference to Patrice Emergy Lumumba. Shortly before his death in 1960, Lumumba stated, "I am the Congo; the Congo has me. I am making the Congo."[13] In the Communist bloc and much of Africa in 1964, Lumumba was regarded as a martyr. Malcolm X's reference to him was related to the fact that he was the "first Congolese politician to think beyond tribal boundaries. His, too, was the first real Pan-African nationalism."[14] However, Patrice Lumumba was also a convicted embezzler, a monumental drunk, a compulsive liar, and an addicted hemp smoker. Lumumba was a "disaster as Prime Minister since he refused to make the compromise necessary to form a working coalition government, alienating almost every power base in the Congo."[15]

The Mau Mau freedom fighters were also an important component of the overall scene. According to The New York Times, Malcolm X stated "He [Malcolm X] hailed the Mau Mau, the antiwhite terrorists active in Kenya before that country gained independence as 'the greatest African freedom fighters who would hold an important place in history.'"[16] Some of Malcolm X's references on the Mau Mau included the following:

> They'll go down as the greatest African patriots and freedom fighters that the continent ever knew, and they will be given credit for bringing about the independence of many of the existing independent states on that continent right now. There was a time when their image was negative, but today they're looked upon with respect and

> their chief is the president and their next chief is the vice-president. . . and the excellent job that was done by the Mau Mau freedom fighters. In fact, that's what we need in Mississippi. In Mississippi we need a Mau Mau. In Alabama we need a Mau Mau. In Georgia, we need a Mau Mau. Right here in Harlem, in New York City, we need a Mau Mau.[17]

Malcolm X was right in saying that the Mau Mau were partially responsible for Kenya independence. "The Mau Mau bloodbath spurred the pace of Kenya independence." S. A. Ayodo, a member of the Kenya legislature, also spoke highly of the Mau Mau terrorists, "When the Mau Mau movement is properly appraised, it will rank in history with the French Revolution or the American war of independence."[18]

Jomo Kenyatta was, as Malcolm X stated, "the leader of the Mau Maus." It was through Kenyatta that the world first heard reports of the fearful oath-taking ceremonies in the forests of Kikuyuland. African and European farms went up in flames. "Lonely white settlers were hacked to death with broad-bladed pangos." There were savage rituals using entrails, excrement, and blood. The Mau Mau attacks were launched primarily against Kikuyus and whites who wouldn't take the oaths.

> In some cases, pregnant women were split open and foetuses were stuffed in their mouths. The men, too, avowed to eat human brains. Suspected traitors were strangled . . . The Mau Mau leaders reduced their victims to the state where men who took the Mau Mau oaths sealed the oaths by digging up corpses and eating putrefied flesh or copulating with sheep. A Mau Mau freedom fighter assigned to kill an enemy of the

> movement was pledged to remove the eyeballs of the victim and drink the liquid from them.[19]

According to the Corfield Report, the British survey compiled on the Mau Mau revolution,

> After seven years of terror beginning in August of 1952, the death toll had reached ninety-five Europeans, twenty-nine Asians and 12,423 Africans. It cost the British government one-hundred-fifty million dollars to crush the Rebellion.

The report further explained that Jomo Kenyatta, "Burning Spear," whose work showed a "passing acquaintance with European witchcraft," was personally responsible for the uprising. Kenyatta was sentenced to seven years hard labor for managing the Mau Mau. The judge charged that Kenyatta had "let loose a flood of misery and unhappiness affecting the lives of all the races. . . including his own people."[20]

To narrow the circumference, the second major segment to be considered in the scene analysis is the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party. That the events of the twentieth century spawned a political party of this nature lends credence to Burke's philosophy that the scene is a fit container for the act. The speech would never have been delivered had there not been sufficient reason to warrant such a rally. George Breitman, in his foreword to Malcolm X's speech, explained the significance of the party on the occasion:

> In December, 1964, representatives of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party toured

> Northern cities seeking support for their campaign to block the seating of Mississippi's five segregationist United States representatives when Congress convened on January 4, 1965.[21]

Malcolm X referred to the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party or the M.F.D.P. with the words, "We need a Mau Mau. If they don't want to deal with the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party, then we'll give them something else to deal with."[22]

One is led to examine the core of the M.F.D.P. The M.F.D.P. became the catalyst for a significant realignment in national politics. Its delegates were not seated (in the Democratic convention, 1964), but only granted the status of honored guests with two named delegates at large. They refused it and walked out of the Convention.

The Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party had to prove "the systematic and substantial character of the denial of Negro voting rights."[23] That task should not have proven too difficult. In 1900, 189,884 Negroes were registered to vote in Mississippi. Because of a series of discriminatory practices, the figure was reduced to 23,801 by 1961 despite the fact that sixty percent of Mississippi population was black. Proponents of the M.F.D.P. supported the thesis that "the wide range of Negro participation in Southern politics will show that the problem in Mississippi was not Negro apathy, but discrimination and fear of physical and economic reprisals for attempting to register."[24]

> The Commission [the one assigned to investigate the Mississippi racial situation because of the M.F.D.P.'s challenge regarding the seating of five Mississippi congressmen] has stated repeatedly and persuasively how brutal Mississippi sheriffs were to Negroes. Those sheriffs had been laws unto themselves; their tyranny was protected not merely by their governor, but by an actively sympathetic legislature.[25]

Hence, as one can gather, the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party was created because of discriminatory practices. Indeed, the "established state party [in Mississippi] was as explicitly committed to segregation as the national party was committed to integration."[26] As the 1960 platform of the state party (of Mississippi) admitted, "We believe in the segregation of the races. We condemn integration."[27]

Fannie Lou Hamer, a leader of the M.F.D.P. who spoke directly before Malcolm X, succinctly explained why the party was created, "It was organized because we [the blacks] couldn't get in the Democratic Party otherwise."[28] The idea itself was spawned by militant students who were members of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee. SNCC was founded in 1960. It began as a "religious band of middle-class rather square reformers."[29] By 1962 and 1963, SNCC workers had moved into rural communities of the South. These SNCC members were spending their summers in the South attempting to break down segregation in several fields. The actual organizing of the M.F.D.P. took place on April

26, 1964, at the Masonic Temple in Jackson, Mississippi. As Bob Moses, summer project director, told Andrew Kopkind, "The whole purpose of M.F.D.P. is to teach the lowest sharecropper that he knows better than the biggest leader exactly what is required to make a decent life for himself."[30]

After its inception, the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party's first activities included holding meetings on every possible level within the state in an attempt to organize and educate the blacks in Mississippi. During its first year, in the Mississippi gubernatorial election of 1963, an unofficial "freedom ballot" was conducted for the "edification and solidification of the state's Negroes."[31]

National attention had been directed toward the Freedom Party on a large scale twice by December 20, 1964. The first of these was the Democratic Convention of 1964. George Breitman said of the convention,

> The chief speaker was Mrs. Fannie Lou Hamer, M.F.D.P. candidate for Congress, whose personal testimony about racist brutality had attracted wide attention at the Democratic Party national convention in August, 1964.[32]

An integrated delegation of sixty-four Negroes and four whites appeared as M.F.D.P. spokesmen at the 1964 Democratic convention. The purpose of the protest, reported Andrew Kopkind, "was to chip away at the political monolith back home."[33] Mrs. Hamer was very skeptical about the outcome of the Freedom Party's appearance at the convention, "They [other

political parties at the convention] wanted to give me what should've been mine 100 years ago. They offered us two seats at large with no voting power."[34] Mrs. Hamer did admit, however, they passed a resolution that no delegation that excluded minority groups could come to another convention.

The second occasion on which the Freedom Party attracted national attention was the catalyst for Malcolm X's speech on December 20, 1964, the attempt to unseat Mississippi's five segregationist representatives. The campaign itself became known simply as "Mississippi's Challenge" or "The Challenge." James Monroe Houston challenged the seating of Robert Bell Williams, Democrat, third congressional district. The Reverend John E. Cameron faced William Meyers Colmer, Democrat, fifth congressional district. Mrs. Victoria Gray campaigned for the senate seat held by John Stennis, Democrat, first congressional district. "The incomparable Fannie Lou Hamer of Ruleville, Mississippi,"[35] ran against incumbent congressman, James L. Whitten, Democrat of the second congressional district. The only Republican congressman whose seating was challenged was senator-elect from the fourth congressional district, Prentiss Walker; Mrs. Annie Devine vied for his congressional seat. Extra-legal elections were held by M.F.D.P. four days prior to November third.[36]

According to The Nation magazine, the national press attempted to de-emphasize the political significance of "The Challenge." Drew Pearson, however, stated, "The challenge to Mississippi's congressmen is causing such worry (in the state of Mississippi) that Governor Paul Johnson called off a special session of the state legislature originally planned to denounce the Civil Rights act."[37]

The basis of the challenge, which was filed the first day of Congress, January 4, 1965, was the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution passed to assure freed Negroes' rights of citizenship and the fifteenth amendment outlawing abridgment of voting rights on account of race. The leaders of the Freedom Party alleged that the five segregationist congressmen were "simply not what they claimed to be--representatives of the people of Mississippi since a substantial portion of Mississippians were denied the right to vote."[38]

On opening day of the session, New York's William Ryan introduced a "fairness resolution" to postpone the seating of the five regular congressmen. The House Admissions Committee had six months to hear the challenge. Lawyers William Kunstler and Arthur Kinoy of New York, Mortimer Stavis of Newark, New Jersey, and Ben Smith and Bruce Waltzer of New Orleans, organized the defense of the Challenge. Ninety-six lawyers flew into Mississippi at their own expense, examined 500-600 witnesses in thirty counties and

assembled over 15,000 pages of testimony in an attempt to "smother all objections with proof that Negroes are discriminated against in the state's [Mississippi's] voting system."

Theoretically, the House Committee was to report on July 5. Finally, after nine months of deliberation, the committee voted 228 to 143 against the Freedom Party of Mississippi. As the committee reported, "The weakest link in the M.F.D.P.'s defense was that the petitioners themselves were not certified candidates."[39] How could they be? The Challenge was initiated because they were denied a place on the ballot.

Indeed, the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party was a by-product of twentieth century prejudice and discrimination. The world of 1964 was ripe for such a movement or it would never have gained the momentum and force it did.

In the Burkeian sense, the scene is the background out of which the act grows. Malcolm X spoke as he did because of the scenic element in his environment on December 20, 1964. Mrs. Fannie Lou Hamer's speech preceded Malcolm X's. Hence, Mrs. Hamer's speech was very much a part of the scene which triggered Malcolm X's act. In Breitman's words, "Malcolm X spoke, too, after Mrs. Hamer's moving address."[40] Lubasch stated,

> Mrs. Fannie Lou Hamer, a leader of the Mississippi Democratic Party, called on

> the audience to provide moral, political, and financial support for the efforts to block the seating of Mississippi's five United States Representatives on January 4.[41]

Malcolm X alluded to her speech directly and indirectly numerous times.

(1) In fact that's what we need in Mississippi. In Mississippi, we need a Mau Mau. (This was an indirect allusion to Mrs. Hamer's speech since she was a delegate from that state.)

(2) When I listen to Mrs. Hamer, a black woman . . . describe what they had done to her in Mississippi, I ask myself how in the world can we ever expect to be respected as men when we will allow something like that to be done to our women and we do nothing about it?

(3) The language that they were speaking to Mrs. Hamer was the language of brutality. Beasts, they were, beating her. The two Negroes, they weren't at fault. They were just puppets.

(4) I might say, secondly, some people wonder, well, what has Mississippi got to do with Harlem? It isn't actually Mississippi; it's America. (Note: Malcolm X himself was broadening his scene to include not just Mississippi, but America.)

(5) The senator from Mississippi is over the Judiciary Committee.

(6) So what happens in Mississippi and the South has a direct bearing on what happens to you and me here in Harlem.

(7) It's [Mississippi] controlled right up here from the North. Mississippi is controlled from the North.

(8) Find out in advance where does he [Robert Wagner, mayor of New York City] stand on these Mississippi congressmen who are illegally coming up from the South to represent the Democrats.

(9) So, I say, in my conclusion, as Mrs. Hamer pointed out, the brothers and sisters in Mississippi are being beaten and killed for no reason other than they want to be treated as first-class citizens.

(10) We have to let the people in Mississippi as well as in Mississippi, New York, and elsewhere know that freedom comes to us either by ballots or by bullets.

(11) And let that Klan know that we can do it tit for tat, tit for tat. What's good for the goose is good for the gander. (Indirect allusion to Mrs. Hamer's statement about discrimination she had suffered at the hands of the Klan.)
(12) So, Mrs. Hamer, we have another rally up at the Audubon tonight, at 8:00, where there'll be alot of black people.[42]

The first question that comes to mind is the identity of Mrs. Hamer. Mrs. Fannie Lou Hamer lived in Ruleville in Sunflower County, one of the twenty-four counties in the Northwestern quarter of Mississippi known as the Delta. Sixty-eight percent of the 2,000 people living in Ruleville were blacks, yet only 4.14 percent of the voting age blacks were registered to vote in 1964. Mrs. Hamer was born October 6, 1917, in Montgomery County, the twentieth child. "She's large and heavy, but eager and heavy with a power to back up her determination."[43] She attended grammar school, but dropped out of school at fourteen to help support her family. Later she married Perry Hamer. They had two daughters; both were adopted. She and her family had been openly discriminated against since August 31, 1962, when she attempted to register to vote in Indianola. As Mrs. Hamer told Jerry DeMuth of Nation magazine, "According to Mississippi laws, the names of persons who take the registration test appear in the local papers for two weeks."[44]

A word-for-word manuscript of Mrs. Hamer's speech on December 20, 1964, was unattainable since by her own admission, "I never speak from a manuscript."[45] However, a

reasonable account of the speech can be gathered from three sources, Malcolm X's speech, The New York Times, and the telephone interview with Mrs. Fannie Lou Hamer on September 30, 1971.

Malcolm X's references to Mrs. Hamer's speech (see p. 51) provide several clues. "When I listen to Mrs. Hamer, a black woman . . . describe what they had done to her in Mississippi . . . Beasts, they were, beating her. The two Negroes they weren't at fault." (Obviously, she had included the account of being beaten or Malcolm X would not have referred to it in this manner.)

Still another clue can be found in Malcolm X's words:

> The senator from Mississippi is over the Judiciary Committee. He's in Washington, D.C., as Mrs. Hamer has pointed out, illegally . . . So, I say, in my conclusion, as Mrs. Hamer has pointed out, . . . The brothers and sisters in Mississippi are being beaten and killed for no other reason than they want to be treated as first class citizens.[46]

The New York Times of December 21, 1964, also furnished clues as to the content of Fannie Lou Hamer's speech of December 20:

> In a voice rising with emotion, Mrs. Hamer said she did not understand why the Federal Government could not protect Negroes in Mississippi but could send forces to protect the whites in the Congo. She also described brutal beatings and economic intimidation used to deter Negroes from registering to vote in Mississippi, adding she might be killed when she returned to the state . . . She concluded with the words, 'We don't only need a change in Mississippi, we need a change in the nation. The whole world is looking at the American society.'[47]

The best source for clues to her speech was the speaker herself, Fannie Hamer. In a telephone interview with Mrs. Hamer on September 30, 1971, she told what she included in her December 20 speech. (Note, Mrs. Fannie Lou Hamer will be referred to as "F.H."; the interviewer, Evelyn Cadenhead, will be referred to as "E.C." Relevant portions to an analysis of her December 20 speech are underlined.)

E.C.: Mrs. Hamer, exactly how did you become involved in the Civil Rights struggle?

F.H.: I've been involved since August 31, 1962. I wouldn't 'ave been involved 'cept I was fired from the job that I'd had since eighteen years back.

E.C.: What was the reason for firing you?

F.H.: I worked in the office of a plantation keepin' time. You know, I kept a record of time that people work'd. Anyway, I was fired the day I went to register to vote. The landowner tol' me to withdraw or I'd be fired. You know, they're jist not ready for Negroes to vote in Mississippi.

E.C.: Did you leave your job?

F.H.: I lef my job that same day--after workin' there for eighteen years. Ten days later, someone shot into the house of the people I was livin' with. That same night, they shot into three houses, all total, that night.

E.C.: What is the identity of "they" you have been referring to?

F.H.: You know, the Night Riders, the KKK, and the White Citizens' Councils--you never see 'em. They go right along. That same night they shot two little black girls.

E.C.: Was any legal action taken?

F.H.: The deaths was reported to the FBI. Everyone knew who did it. No one's been arrested . . . Can you hear that? My phone is tapped today. It has been tapped ever since I was involved in the Civil Rights business.

E.C.: Did you include the above facts in your speech of December 20, 1964?

F.H.: Well, I never speak from a manuscript, but I probably did. I travels all over the United States, and I tol'

'em these things. You know, I don't know who you are 'cept what you've tol' me. I don't know what color you are. But you need to tell whoever reads this interview that no one realizes what goes on with black people down in Mississippi--today. No one cares what happens to us as people.

E.C.: In George Breitman's introduction to Malcolm X's speech of December 20, 1964, he mentioned that your testimony at the Democratic Convention of 1964 caused much comment. What did you include in that speech that you also included on December 20?

F.H.: I remembers that Convention well. I tol' 'em what happened on September 9, 1963.

E.C.: Excuse me for interrupting, but did you also include the happenings of September 9, in your December 20, 1964 speech?

F.H.: I sure did. I figur'd it was time someone realized what was happin'. I had been to Charleston, South Carolina, to visit some friends. I was ridin' the bus home. We stopped in Winona, Mississippi.

E.C.: Exactly where is Winona, Mississippi, located?

F.H.: It's about seventy miles from my home in Ruleville. It's in Montgomery County. I was arrest'd after the ICC rulin' that we could go any place and eat any place. Anyway, I was on this bus. I stayed in the bus after the others went in the bus station to get somethin' to eat.

E.C.: Could you be more specific about "the others?"

F.H.: Well, there was Miss Annell Ponder, James West, and Miss June Johnson and Miss Evester Simpson. There was about five people in all. I can't rememb'r the rest of their names.

E.C.: Were they young people?

F.H.: Yes, I was the only older person . . . the people who had gone into the bus terminal to get somethin' to eat rushed out. Miss Ponder rushed out real excitedly, "There's police in there. He beat us with billy clubs." She was real shock-up like. You see, Miss Ponder's not from Mississippi. I tol' her. "Miss Ponder, this here is Mississippi."

E.C.: By this time, were you still in the bus?

F.H.: I had stepped out of the bus to see what was goin' on. I saw the state highway patrol put five people in the patrol car. I was about to step back on the bus when one of them police said, "Get that -----." I can't tell you what he called me. It would make your ears burn. The police came over and grabbed me by the arm and tol' me to get into the car.

E.C.: By this time, were you still in the bus?

F.H.: I had stepped out of the bus to see what was going on. I saw the state highway patrol put five people in the patrol car. I was about to step back on the bus when one of the

E.C.: You were arrested for just watching what was going on. Was that correct?

F.H.: Yes'm.

E.C.: And these young people were arrested for trying to get something to eat?

F.H.: Yes'm. When I was gettin' into the police car, one of 'em police kicked me. On the way to the jail, one of them white police kept askin' me questions. If I tried to answer 'em, he would curse me. They carried me on to jail and put me and the rest of 'em in the bookin' room. I was put in jail with Miss Simpson. I mean, I was put in the same cell.

E.C.: And you included all this in your December, 1964 speech?

F.H.: I'm sure I did. I've tol' everyone I could since all this happened. We sat there in the cell listenin' to the yells, "Can't you say yes sir, Nigger?" We learnt later this was Miss Ponder they was talking to 'cause she said she wouldn't say yes sir to anyone she didn't know. Then she said later they called her, "Bitch." We heard the screams of "Bitch." The next thing we could hear (we couldn't see anythin') was a thud hittin' the floor. Sounded like a body hittin' the floor. They passed my cell. They had June Johnson, who is fifteen years old. They was draggin' her back to her cell. Blood was runnin' from her head to her blouse that was ripped off to her bosom. They threw her back into her cell and yelled at her, "Wash the blood off, bitch!"

E.C.: What happened next, and what thoughts were going through your head?

F.H.: Well, I wasn't sure what was goin' to happen. For all I knowed, they was goin' to kill me. Miss Ponder passed my cell. My God, when she passed my cell, her eyes looked like blood. Her dress was torn down to her waist. Then three white men came to my cell. They was highway patrolmen.

E.C.: How can you be sure they were highway patrolmen, and what were their names?

F.H.: They was highway patrolmen, all right, 'cause they had highway patrol uniforms on. I could identify one of 'em 'cause I seed the name tag all highway patrol has to wear. His name was John L. Bassinger.

E.C.: Is he still a highway patrolman?

F.H.: He's still a highway patrolman in Mississippi--even today. Bassinger spoke up, "Where you from?" I tol'

him from Ruleville, and they left my cell. They come back shortly and tol' me I wasn't lying. Then one of 'em called me a bitch and said after they got through with me, I would wish I was dead. They led me out where they had two young black prisoners. They forced 'em to hit me.

E.C.: Who were the black prisoners and how did they force them to hit you?

F.H.: Roosevelt Knox and Pore. Those patrolmen had some homemade booze they was forcin' Knox and Pore to drink. Bassinger said, "If you don't hit her, you know what will happen." They made me stretch out on a cot and they started beatin' me. The first prisoner beat me till he fell back exhausted. The second prisoner then started beatin' me.

E.C.: How did you react during this time?

F.H.: I put my hands behind me to protect mys'f the very best I could. Then I started screamin' and I couldn't stop. My dress worked up high. My hands was navy blue after they finished beatin' me up. I couldn't bend my fingers.

E.C.: Did you tell the audience all this on December 20?

F.H.: Yes'm, I'm sure I did. While the second prisoner was beatin' me, the first one sat on my feet so that I couldn't move.

E.C.: How long did they beat you?

F.H.: Well, I lost all meain' of time. But I'll tell you the honest truth, and it kills me to say this, but after they finished with me, one of 'em white men tried to feel of my front under my clothes. One of 'em white men was the County Deputy, Earl Wayne Patrick.

E.C.: Was anyone outside the jail aware of what was going on?

F.H.: Oh yes, our friends and relatives was curious after we didn't show when we was upposed to. We got national publicity. We learnt later that various people called the jail askin' for our release--particularly young students, both black and white. I was in jail when Medger Evers was killed, too.

E.C.: Had you heard any plans about what they planned to do with the six of you?

F.H.: I heared 'em discussin' one night. One of 'em wanted to kill us and put us in the Big Black River.

E.C.: Is the Black River near where you were imprisoned?

F.H.: Yes'm. It's real close. And the one talkin' said it would be years before anyone found us. One of 'em said he wouldn't 'ave anythin' to do with murder. "The purpose," he said, "was to keep 'em from eatin' in our places."

E.C.: Exactly when was it you were in jail? I mean, how long?

F.H.: I was in jail from September 9--September 12. I lost all meain' of time. Our backs and buttocks was as hard as metal when they finished beatin' us up.

E.C.: How did you get back to your cell?

F.H.: They helped me back to the cell.

E.C.: What did you have to eat and drink?

F.H.: One day, the jailer's wife and daughter gives us some ice water. A little taste of it anyway.

E.C.: Were you supposed to stay in jail indefinitely?

F.H.: No, our trials was scheduled in Winona. I couldn't walk to my own trial. I was so beat up.

E.C.: What kind of trial was it?

F.H.: Some of 'em same white men who captured us and beat us up was on the jury seat.

E.C.: What were the charges leveled against you?

F.H.: We was charged with disorderly conduct and resistin' arrest. I'll tell you, as Fannie Lou Hamer is my name, I never thought I'd face up with a man who'd tell that big a lie. Earl Wayne Patrick stood up and testified that he couldn't handle us. That we was resistin' arrest and we was disorderly in jail. We was then asked to testify. They tried to get us to say we had done things. I tol' them to my dyin' day, I'd not say I done 'em things. Miss, let me go down on your record as sayin' I hate violence. I try not to hate anyone. The Bible teaches us that's wrong. I hate nobody. Black or white. After chargin' us, they carried us back to jail. My body was sore and hard from them beatins. When I lay down, I couldn't lay on my back.

E.C.: They obviously didn't release you then?

F.H.: No. They wasn't through with us. They would get us up at night. Force us to say they was good to us.

E.C.: How did they do that?

F.H.: They'd tell us they'd beat us if we didn't sign statements sayin' they'd treated us fair.

E.C.: How did they act toward you then?

F.H.: They was actin' sneaky-friendly . . . Miss, what is your name?

E.C.: Cadenhead.

F.H.: Miss Cadenhead, no one is free till all men are free. No man is an island to hisself. Till the shackles are loosed from my neck, you're not free where you are. My fight is for all mankind. That's about what happened.

E.C.: <u>And you told the audience of December 20, 1964, all of this</u>?

F.H.: Yes, I tol' 'em my only crime was to register to vote and to step off the bus.
E.C.: What was the outcome of your trial?
F.H.: I was charged with $200 like everyone else. S.C.L.C. bailed us out. Mrs. Dorothy Cotton, who I'll remember till my dyin' day, brought me some clothes and paid my fare to Washington.
E.C.: What was the purpose of going to Washington?
F.H.: To tell the FBI what had happened. They took lots of pictures. I remember one of 'em white secretaries sayin', "I'm sorry I'm a white woman if whites can be this dehumanizin' to another human." You know, we'll send a black woman's son to die for what we don't have yet. To this day, I can still remember young blacks who've died for our cause . . .

*E.C.: What was your relationship with Malcolm X?
F.H.: I thought he was one of the greatest men who ever lived. People thought he hated whites, but that's wrong. In my November election, I'm goin' to fight for all mankind.
E.C.: Are you the M.F.D.P.'s candidate for Senator?
F.H.: Yes'm.
E.C.: There were some SNCC Freedom Singers at the rally on December 20, 1964. Would it be possible for me to get copies of the songs they sang that night?
F.H.: I'm afraid no. We're gettin' 'em together now. We don't want anybody else to have 'em. They might get lost.
E.C.: What was the situation in Ruleville after you got out of jail?
F.H.: Constant harrassment. My husband was arrested . . . Even today from 1963-1965, we had to turn our lights out at 6:00. Otherwise, shots would be fired at us. We've lived through what the men in Viet Nam have gone through. We call it Viet Mississippi.
E.C.: Did you include the statement about Viet Mississippi in your speech with Malcolm X?
F.H.: No, in speeches since then.
E.C.: On the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party, does the Democratic Party in Mississippi recognize your party?
F.H.: They offered us two seats at large with no voting power. They wanted to be nice and give me what should have been mine 100 years ago.

---

*From this point, facts in the interview were not included in Fannie Hamer's speech of December 20, but do pertain to the overall scene.

E.C.: When was the M.F.D.P. organized?
F.H.: April 26, 1964, in the Masonic Temple of Jackson, Mississippi. We organized it because we couldn't get in the Democratic Party otherwise. At the Democratic National Convention of 1964 they passed a resolution that no delegation that excluded minority groups could come. It's not been changed yet. This new President is worse. Nixon's government is for big people.
E.C.: Then, did the M.F.D.P. go to the National Convention in 1964?
F.H.: Yes. '64 and '68. People wept through what I tol' 'em. But there was fishy things happenin' there.
E.C.: Exactly what "fishy things?"
F.H.: Well, I'd rather not say right now.
E.C.: Who are the M.F.D.P. leaders?
F.H.: I can't remember all. There's Dr. Ahren Henry, Mrs. Victoria Gray, Mrs. Annie Devine, Miss Suzie Ruffin . . . It's gettin' late. I think this interview has been long enough.
E.C.: Thank you, Mrs. Hamer. You've been an invaluable aid with my thesis. I do apologize for taking so much of your time. I was so eager, I didn't realize how lengthy this interview had become.

Hence, from Malcolm X's speech, from The New York Times, and the preceding interview, one can deduce the approximate content of Mrs. Hamer's speech preceding Malcolm X's on December 20, 1964. There were three general areas she covered.

(1) Intimidation under which the Mississippi Negroes suffered. She told of the discrimination directed toward her when her only crime was to "register to vote and step off the bus." She related beatings dealt to her and her friends by two black prisoners who were forced to drink by white law officers in Mississippi. She held the Klan responsible for much of the discriminatory practices. As The New York Times reported, she concluded by stating she "might be killed when she returned to the state."
(2) She launched an attack against the federal government. She charged they would protect whites in the Congo, but would not protect blacks in Mississippi. Too, she contended

that Mississippi representatives were in Washington illegally since blacks composed sixty-eight percent of Mississippi and yet were not allowed to vote for congressional representation.

(3) She contended freedom must be a privilege enjoyed by all and not just whites. She felt strongly the necessity for nation-wide change.

Malcolm X, the agent, was influenced by this element, Mrs. Fannie Lou Hamer, in the overall scene. His statements alluding directly to her and discrimination she had suffered evidenced the degree to which she had influenced him. He also devoted a considerable section of his speech to the legality of the Mississippi delegation being in Washington. This, too, was undoubtedly a result of Mrs. Hamer's apparently moving speech.

Even further substantiation of her influence can be found in Malcolm's speech. Like Mrs. Hamer, he contended that the change must be nationwide. He urged that if discrimination existed anywhere in the United States, it should be abolished. "America is Mississippi. There's no such thing as a Mason-Dixon Line. It's America. There's no such thing as the South, it's America. If one room of your house is dirty, you've got a dirty house."[48]

The next scenic element that influenced Malcolm X on December 20, 1964, was the overall Civil Rights picture with particular emphasis on Black Nationalism and the Black Muslims. He alluded directly to the overall Civil Rights

struggle with the words, "The language you and I have been speaking in the past hasn't reached him . . . But when they [black people] get angry they bring about a change."

His speech was a product of twentieth century America for "Black America of 1964 was awakening." Andrea Rich and Arthur L. Smith, in the Rhetoric of Revolution, described black America as the "long dormant giant beginning to define its potential, lashing out against forces which have held it constrained and rendered it impotent."[49]

C. Eric Lincoln and Essien-Udom were antecedents of the Black Nationalism movement to which Malcolm X referred to on December 20, 1964. Essien-Udom defined Black Nationalism as

> the belief of a group that it possesses, or ought to possess a country; that it shares, or ought to share, the common heritage of language, culture, and religion. The heritage, way of life, and ethnic identity are distinct from any other group.[50]

C. Eric Lincoln, with his book, Black Muslims in America, was the first author to focus national attention on the Black Muslim Sect. Rich and Smith, in Rhetoric of Revolution, stated the Black Nationalism groups overall tended to have three elements in common:

> (1) the acceptance of racial redemption
> (2) the quest for racial identity and power
> (3) faith in Messianic leadership.[51]

Malcolm X was aware that the world, the scene of 1964, was one in which Black Nationalism was becoming an overwhelming force. His sharp denunciation of the status quo on December 20, 1964 evidenced this.

The largest and best-organized of the Black Nationalism forces in the 1960's was the Black Muslims. Malcolm X, former Black Muslim leader and spokesman, could not help but be influenced by his prior Black Muslim beginning. He referred to the Christian Church and to Jesus Christ's life twice on December 20: "Jesus himself was ready to turn the synagogue inside out . . . As Jesus said, 'Little children, go thee where I send thee.'"[52] His references to Christ's life were a result of his former Muslim training and education. His knowledge of American history also evidenced his former Muslim training, for Black Muslims advocated educating the black masses. Malcolm X was a self-educated man as a result of his conversion to the Black Muslims.

A scenic analysis, therefore, should also include a sketch of the Black Muslim movement. The beginning of the movement was midsummer, 1930. An amiable, but mysterious peddler appeared in the Negro community of Detroit. He told them [Detroit Negroes] the silks and materials he had were woven in their homeland. They were eager to hear about their own country. "The Prophet," as W. D. Fard became known, held meetings house-to-house throughout the community. He used the Bible to teach them the true religion was not Christianity but the religion of the Black Muslims in Asia and Africa. He offered a harsh denunciation of the white man, which his poor, down-trodden listeners were more than ready to accept.

The house-to-house meetings became inadequate. He rented a hall and named it the Temple of Islam. The movement known as the Black Muslims was born.[53] W. D. disappeared in June, 1934. There was much speculation as to the cause of his disappearance. Nothing substantial was ever produced. Elijah Muhammad took over as the "Messenger of Allah."

The membership of the Black Muslim sect was predominately male youth. Eighty percent of its following was from seventeen to thirty-five. The majority of its membership, particularly in its beginning days, was extremely lower class, mainly domestic, factory workers and common laborers. By 1964, however, there seemed to be a shift in its membership to the middle-class Negro who was becoming more conscious of his racial identity. The Black Muslims, too, were ex-Christian American Negroes. Hence, Muslim leaders had to appeal to potential converts on the basis of Christianity, much like the first Black Muslim leader, W. D. Fard, in the 1930's. Therefore, one can understand Malcolm's knowledge of Christ and his reference to Christ's life on December 20.

The ultimate goal of Black Muslims, according to one of its ministers, is "To get the white man off my neck and his hand out of my pocket. Our ultimate goal is a passion for group solidarity."[54] A synthesis of the major beliefs of the Black Muslims in 1964 included

(1) The one true God was Allah.
(2) A separate black economy, totally independent of white America.
(3) Racial separation was mandatory. Five or six states should be set aside for a Black United States.
(4) An overall policy of non-violence should be instituted. However, as Malcolm X stated in a Boston address to a Black Muslim audience: 'Never be the agressor; never look for trouble. But if any man molests you, may Allah bless you!'[55]
(5) A strict moral code was essential. Black Muslims were commanded to pray five times a day facing the East and the Holy City of Mecca. They, too, had to attend two temple meetings a week and contribute regularly to the temple's upkeep. They were prohibited from eating pork and venison. Tobacco and drugs were forbidden. The sexual morality imposed upon Black Muslims was very strict.[56]

As a former Black Muslim spokesman, Malcolm X was cognizant of the force and momentum that Black Nationalism sects had upon the world of 1964. He, too, spoke as he felt the world and his own conscience dictated.

Another extremely important element to a scenic analysis of December 20, 1964, was Malcolm's repeated references to the Democratic Party:

> The senator from Mississippi is over the Judiciary Committee (James Eastland). He's in Washington, D.C., illegally . . . This country is a country run by committees--House and Senate committees. The committee chairman occupies that position by dint of his seniority. Eastland is over the Judiciary Committee because he has more seniority than any other senator after the same post or on that committee; he's the chairman. Fulbright, another cracker from Arkansas, is over the Foreign Relations Committee. Ellender, of

> Louisiana, is over the Agriculture and Forestry Committee. Russell, of Georgia is over the Armed Services Committee. And it goes right down the line. Out of sixteen committees, ten are in the hands of Southern racists.[57]

Malcolm X was aware of the scene surrounding his speech. "During the eighty-eighth Congress [in 1964], the Democrats were in substantial control of both chambers. They had been the majority party since 1955." The President pro tempore of the Senate was Carl Hayden, Democrat of Arizona; the Speaker of the House was John McCormack, Democrat of Massachusetts.[58] On the opening day of the session, there were sixty-nine Democrats and thirty-three Republicans in the Senate. In the House, there were two hundred fifty-six Democrats, as opposed to one hundred seventy-seven Republicans.

Malcolm X condemned the Democratic party in general. He realized there had been a very strong Southern block opposing passage of the Civil Rights Bill of 1964. "In the Senate, the Judiciary Committee, under the effective control of anti-Civil Rights Senator James O. Eastland, Democrat, Mississippi, its chairman, held hearings but took no further action."[59] Eastland, a "committed resistant segregationist,"[60] was sixth in Senatorial senority and had been serving since January 3, 1943. There can be no doubt why Malcolm X mentioned this aspect of the scene, for the Judiciary Committee dealt with, "federal courts and judges, civil rights and civil liberties, constitutional amendments, and interstate compacts."[61]

Malcolm X also referred to Senator Fulbright. J. W. Fulbright, ninth in Senority, had been serving since January 3, 1945. Fulbright chaired the Foreign Relations Committee, a committee that dealt with the "relations of the U.S. with foreign nations generally; treaties, Red Cross, diplomatic services, the United Nations, and foreign loans."[62]

Senator Ellender was mentioned also: "Ellender of Louisiana is over the Agriculture and Forestry Committee." Allen J. Ellender chaired a committee of eleven Democrats and six Republicans. He was fourth in senatorial seniority having served since January 3, 1937. He was the leader of one of the three major Southern forces attempting to block the passage of the Civil Rights Act in 1964. In his final speech of June 18, 1964, he stated, "I hope I am in error when I say that its [Civil Rights Bill] passage will bring on more strife than anyone can contemplate . . . What is not recognized is that in many parts of the nation, and especially in the South, integration is considered immoral."[63]

Senator Richard B. Russell of Georgia was the last senator Malcolm X mentioned by name. He was, as Malcolm X stated, chairman of the Armed Services Committee. His committee was composed of twelve Democrats and five Republicans. Richard Russell was often termed the acknowledged leader of the Senate Southern block. "The Southerners, led by Senator

Richard B. Russell, were expected to wage a lengthy filibuster on the bill."[64] In his last stand on the floor, June 19, 1964, he stated,

> There were many ministers who, having failed completely in their efforts to establish good will and brotherhood from the pulpit, turned from the pulpit to the powers of the Federal Government to coerce people into accepting their views under threat of dire punishment.[65]

Malcolm X referred to the number of Senatorial committees. He stated that out of sixteen committees, ten were in the hands of Southern racists. The following is a list of Senatorial committees at the time of Malcolm's speech:

1. Aernautical & Space Science; D10--R5--Clifton P. Anderson (D--N.M.)
2. Agriculture & Forestry; D11--R6--Allen J. Ellender (D--La.)
3. Appropriations; D18--R9--Carl Hayde (D--Ariz.)
4. Armed Services; D12--R5--Richard Russell (D--Ga.)
5. Banking & Currency; D10--R5--A. Willis Robertson (D--Va.)
6. Commerce; D12--R5--Warren G. Magnuson (D--Wash.)
7. Dist. of Columbia; D4--R3--Alan Bible (D--Nev.)
8. Finance; D11--R6--Harry Flood Byrd (D--Va.)
9. Foreign Relations; D12--R5--J. W. Fulbright (D--Ark.)
10. Gov't Operations; D10--R5--John L. McClellan (D--Ark.)
11. Interior & Insular Affairs; D11--R6--Henry M. Jackson (D--Wash.)
12. Judiciary; D10--R5--Eastland (D--Miss.)
13. Labor & Public Welfare; D10--R5--Lister Hill (D--Ala.)
14. P.O. & Civil Service; D6--R3--Olin D. Johnston (D--S.C.)
15. Public Works; D12--R5--Pat McNamara (D--Mich.)

16. Rules and Administration; D6--R3--B. Everett Jorden (D--N.C.)
17. Select Small Bus.; D11--R6--John J. Sparkman (D--Ala.)
18. Spec. Comm. on Aging; D14--R7--George A. Smathers (D--Fla.)

Out of eighteen committees listed, the Democrats had control of all of them by virtue of the fact that the Democrats controlled Congress. As one can tell from those marked, twelve of the eighteen senatorial committees were chaired by Southern Democrats.

Further references were made to the Democratic party in Malcolm X's speech.

> The head of the Democratic Party is in the White House. He could have gotten Mrs. Hamer into Atlantic City. Hubert Humphrey could have opened his mouth and had her seated. Wagner, the mayor right here, could have opened his mouth and had her seated. . . LBJ is head of the Cracker Party. . . Wagner is a Democrat. He belongs to the same party as Eastland. Johnson's Democrat. He belongs to the same party as Eastland. Wagner was in Atlantic City. Ray Jones was in Atlantic City--the crackers that you voted for were in Atlantic City.[66]

Malcolm X launched his first attack against Lyndon Johnson, President in 1964. Part of the reason for this attack may have been grounded in the fact that LBJ was muted on the Civil Rights Bill. He was seeking re-election and thought he needed Southern support.

Hubert Humphrey, Vice-President from 1965-1969, was also mentioned in Malcolm X's attack. Humphrey was primarily responsible for the legislative strategy employed in the passage of the Civil Rights Bill.

> He kept a tight check on Senators' speaking dates and essential trips out of Washington. . . . All of this contact gave backbone to the Civil Rights effort . . . . Humphrey was anxious that the debate not become bitter or contentious. . . . He went out of his way never to question the motives of the Southerners and to accommodate them when he could.[67]

Roy F. Wagner, Jr., and Rayford Jones were also mentioned because of their affiliation with the Democratic Party. Roy F. Wagner, Jr., was mayor of New York City from 1954-1965. Rayford Jones, Malcolm X stated, "was one of the most powerful blacks in the city." Ray Jones was county attorney.

Hence, Malcolm X condemned the Democratic Party and its members. Part of the scene influencing Malcolm X to speak on December 20, 1964, was the Congressional situation in 1964, since the Congressional refusal to seat the M.F.D.P. members prompted the M.F.D.P. to tour the United States.

The last important element to examine in an overall scenic analysis was Malcolm X's speech delivered later that night. It was a by-product of the earlier speech on December 20, 1964. He referred to his later speech in his conclusion,

> So, Mrs. Hamer, we have another rally up at the Audubon tonight, at 8:00, where there'll be a lot of black people. I myself would like to have you tell them what you told us here this afternoon, so you are welcome to be my guest tonight if you will, at the Audubon.[68]

The rally Malcolm X referred to was a rally of the organization he formed in his last year, the Organization of Afro-American Unity.

> Before they [Mrs. Hamer and the M.F.D.P. Freedom singers] took the floor, Malcolm X carried out what was one of his major assignments in the organization--teaching, educating, patiently explaining things to his people in language and style they understood.[69]

He began with the words, "Salaam Alaikum." He then explained to his people that it was an expression that meant, "Peace." He further taught that if they replied, "Alaikum Salaam," they would be returning, "Peace."

In his speech that night, Malcolm X included his four basic philosophies he defended during his last year.

1. He was not anti-white. He condemned the white man collectively for what he had done to the black man collectively. 'I'm sincere about this. I think there are many whites who are sincere, especially at the student level. They just don't know how to show their sincerity.'
2. The black Americans should be concerned for the Human rights struggle. Hence, they should identify with the African culture. 'It's impossible for you and me to know where we stand until we look around on this entire earth. . . . You can't understand what is going on in Mississippi if you're not also interested in what's going on in the Congo. . . . Today, real power is international.'
3. The black man should fight for freedom. 'And automatically. Your intelligence makes you want freedom so badly that you'll do anything, by any means necessary to get that freedom.'
4. Racism was a result of the capitalist society. He was pro-socialist and anti-capitalist. 'Almost everyone of the

> countries that has gotten independence has devised some kind of socialistic system. . . . What they are using to solve their problems in Africa is not capitalism. So what you and I should do is find out what they are using to get rid of poverty and all the other characteristics of a rundown society.[70]

As has been discussed in the preceding pages, Malcolm X was a product of the times in which he lived. Kenneth Burke contended, "words are symbols of something representative of a social trend."[71] Malcolm X's December 20, 1964, speech was one of the products of the racial struggle in twentieth century America.

The Burkeian scene is the background out of which the speech grows and the situation in which it occurred. There were six major scenic elements triggering Malcolm X's choice of words on December 20, 1964.

The larger circumference of scenic influence considered has been Malcolm X's concern for African independence. Malcolm X praised Kenya and its leaders, Kenyatta, Oginga Odinga, and Lumumba. Malcolm X drew a parallel between Africa's treacherous and bloody path to freedom and the blacks' plight in the United States. Hence, the African situation in 1964 was essential to a Burkeian scenic analysis, for it furnished background and material for Malcolm X's speech or act.

To narrow the circumference of the scenic analysis to the United States, the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party

was discussed. The M.F.D.P. was a product of the world of 1964. The M.F.D.P.'s challenge to unseat Mississippi's five segregationist representatives was a catalyst for Malcolm X's speech; and hence, was important to a scenic analysis.

Mrs. Fannie Lou Hamer's speech was another important scenic element prompting Malcolm X to speak as he did on December 20, 1964. Her speech included three major portions.

1. She described the intimidation under which she and other Mississippi blacks suffered daily (Note: Malcolm X broadened Mrs. Hamer's scene to include discrimination all American blacks had faced).
2. She launched an attack against the federal government.
3. She advocated freedom for all people regardless of color.

Mrs. Hamer's speech was also an important scenic influence, for Malcolm X's words reflected Mrs. Hamer's concern for intimidation. His words, too, included a sharp denouncement of the federal government; and, he also advocated international freedom for all.

The fourth element of the background in 1964 that Malcolm X spoke of was the overall Civil Rights picture. Emphasis has been centered on both Black Nationalism and the Black Muslim movement. Both Mrs. Hamer and Malcolm X were by-products of the twentieth century Civil Rights struggle; and, therefore, their words were influenced by it.

The Congress of 1964 and its controlling body, the Democratic Party, were also analyzed. Malcolm X directly condemned both of them and it was the congressional refusal to seat the M.F.D.P. candidates that spawned the rally on December 20, 1964.

The last scenic element considered was Malcolm X's speech delivered later that night. It was a by-product and extension of the speech currently being analyzed. Mrs. Hamer and the M.F.D.P. Freedom singers were present. Mrs. Hamer spoke and the M.F.D.P. singers sang freedom songs about Kenyatta, Oginga Odinga, and Lumumba.

Part II--Analysis of Act

Burke's concept of act may be the speech itself; for example, what took place in thought or deed? What did the speaker say? An analysis of act and agency are closely intertwined, for agency (to be discussed in Chapter IV) is the method used by an actor (speaker) in his act (speech).

The body of Malcolm X's speech or act was concerned with clarifying his philosophy for his audience. He proposed four basic philosophies during his last year.[72] Each of them was expressed on December 20, 1964.

His belief that the black man should be concerned for the struggle for human rights and that black Americans should identify with the African culture was discussed in his numerous references to Africa. "But since Kenya became

a republic last week. . . . When the nations of Africa are truly independent. . . the historians will give Prime Minister, or rather, President Kenyatta and the Mau Mau, their rightful role in African history."

Another philosophy Malcolm X defended during his last year that was evidenced by his speech was his attitude toward whites. He was not anti-white, but he condemned the white man collectively for what he had done to the black man collectively: "I believe there are some white people who might be sincere. But I think they should prove it."

Malcolm X further believed that the black man should fight for his freedom. "The law of justice is 'he who kills by the sword shall be killed by the sword' . . . I say that a black man's freedom is as valuable as a white man's freedom. And I say that a black man has the right to do whatever is necessary to get his freedom."

The fourth contention Malcolm X supported during his last year was indirectly expressed on December 20. He felt racism was a result of the capitalist society. Hence, he was pro-socialist and anti-capitalist. Though he did not directly allude to his anti-capitalist sentiments, Malcolm did so indirectly by condemning the Democratic "crackers." This was a condemnation of the capitalist society which could produce such a political party. Hence, the body of Malcolm X's speech was a statement of his basic philosophy during his last year.

The conclusion of his speech was a summation of all he had said that night; the philosophy he advocated, and an invitation to come to the rally being held later that night:

> So, I say in my conclusion, as Mrs. Hamer pointed out, the brothers and sisters in Mississippi are being beaten and killed for no other reason than they want to be treated as first class citizens. . . . Nobody can give you freedom. Nobody can give you independence . . . freedom comes by ballots or bullets. . . . They've always said I'm anti-white. I'm for anybody who's for freedom. . . . And I say that if the government of the United States cannot bring to justice people who murder Negroes. . . . So, Mrs. Hamer, we have another rally up at the Audubon tonight, at 8:00, where there'll be a lot of black people. . . so you are welcome to be my guest tonight at the Audubon. . . and let some people hear you singing about Oginga Odinga and Kenyatta and Lumumba.[73]

Malcolm X's speech or act of December 20 was his attempt at image-clarification. He wanted his audience to understand, through his act, that he was no longer anti-white, that he believed racism to be the result of the capitalist society, that he urged identification with the African culture, and that he was ready to fight for immediate freedom.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Kenneth Burke, A Grammar of Motives, (Berkley: University of California Press, 1969), p. xix.

[2]George Breitman, ed., Malcolm X Speaks (New York: Grove Press, Inc., 1966), pp. 105-114. All references to the speech hereafter refer to the speech of Dec. 20, 1964.

[3]"Independence for Kenya: And Not to Build a Nation," Newsweek, 62 (December 16, 1963), pp. 36-38.

[4]Ibid.

[5]"Kenya," Senior Scholastic, 83 (December 6, 1963), pp. 10-13.

[6]"Independence for Kenya: And Now to Build a Nation," pp. 36-38.

[7]"Harambee in Kenya," Current History, 46 (March, 1964), p. 146.

[8]"Independence for Kenya: And Now to Build a Nation," pp. 36-38.

[9]Ibid.

[10]Ibid.

[11]"Kenyatta: From Mau Mau to Prime Minister," Newsweek, 61 (June 10, 1963), p. 59.

[12]"Independence for Kenya: And Now to Build a Nation," pp. 36-38.

[13]"The Congo, Lumumba Jumbo," Time, 84 (December 25, 1964), p. 21.

[14]Ibid.

[15]Ibid.

[16]Arnold H. Lubasch, "Malcolm Favors a Mau Mau in the U.S.," The New York Times, 21 December, 1964, p. 21, cols. 3-5.

[17]Breitman, Malcolm X Speaks, pp. 105-114.

[18]"Kenya, the Oath-Takers," Time, 75 (June 13, 1960), p. 31.

[19]Ian Henderson, Man Hunt in Kenya (New York: Doubleday, 1965), pp. 15-58.

[20]"Kenya, the Oath-Takers," p. 31.

[21]Breitman, Malcolm X Speaks, pp. 105-114.

[22]Ibid.

[23]"Congressional Challenge," Commonweal, 81 (January 22, 1965), p. 532.

[24]Jerry DeMuth, "Sick and Tired of Being Sick and Tired," The Nation, 198 (June 1, 1964), pp. 548-551.

[25]Andrew Kopkind, "Seat Belts for Mississippi's Five," New Republic, 153 (July 24, 1965), p. 17.

[26]"Mississippi Challenge," New Yorker, 41 (October 16, 1965), pp. 223-234.

[27]Ibid.

[28]Telephone interview of Fannie Lou Hamer, conducted by Evelyn Cadenhead, on September 30, 1971.

[29]Jack Newfield, A Prophetic Minority (New York: New American Library, 1966), p. 71.

[30]Kopkind, "Seat Belts for Mississippi's Five," p. 17.

[31]Ibid.

[32]Breitman, Malcolm X Speaks, p. 105.

[33]Kopkind, "Seat Belts for Mississippi's Five," p. 17.

[34]Telephone interview of Fannie Lou Hamer, conducted by Evelyn Cadenhead, on September 30, 1971.

[35]"End of the Beginning," The Nation, 199 (September 7, 1964), pp. 82-83.

[36]"Mississippi Challenge," pp. 233-234.

[37]"Five Seats in Congress: Mississippi Challenge," The Nation, 200 (May 17, 1965), pp. 526-529.

[38]"Congressional Challenge," p. 532.

[39]"Mississippi Challengers," New Republic, 153 (October 2, 1965), p. 8.

[40]Breitman, Malcolm X Speaks, p. 105.

[41]Lubasch, "Malcolm Favors a Mau Mau in the U.S.," p. 21, cols. 3-5.

[42]Breitman, Malcolm X Speaks, pp. 105-114.

[43]DeMuth, "Sick and Tired of Being Sick and Tired," pp. 548-551.

[44]Ibid.

[45]Telephone interview of Fannie Lou Hamer, conducted by Evelyn Cadenhead, on September 30, 1971.

[46]Breitman, Malcolm X Speaks, p. 111.

[47]Lubasch, "Malcolm Favors a Mau Mau in the U.S.," p. 21, cols. 3-5.

[48]Breitman, Malcolm X Speaks, pp. 105-114.

[49]Andrea Rich and Arthur L. Smith, Rhetoric of Revolution (Durham, N.C.: Moore Publishing Co., 1968), p. 146.

[50]C. Eric Lincoln, Black Muslims in America (Boston: Beacon Press, 1961), p. 17.

[51]Rich and Smith, Rhetoric of Revolution, p. 146.

[52]Breitman, Malcolm X Speaks, pp. 112-113.

[53]Lincoln, Black Muslims in America, p. 17.

[54]Ibid., p. 27.

[55]Ibid., p. 4.

[56]Ibid., pp. 25-35.

[57]Breitman, Malcolm X Speaks, pp. 110-113.

[58]Congressional Quarterly Almanac, vol. 20 (Washington D.C.: Congressional Quarterly Service, 1965), p. 24.

[59]"Congressional Challenge," p. 532.

[60]"The Sight of Reality Drove Them to Immoderation," New Republic, 148 (April 27, 1963), pp. 3-4.

[61]Congressional Quarterly Almanac, p. 24.

[62]Ibid., p. 42.

[63]Ibid., p. 357.

[64]Ibid., p. 354.

[65]Ibid., p. 357.

[66]Breitman, Malcolm X Speaks, p. 109.

[67]Congressional Quarterly Almanac, p. 355.

[68]Breitman, Malcolm X Speaks, p. 114.

[69]Ibid., p. 115.

[70]Ibid., pp. 115-136.

[71]Burke, The Philosophy of Literary Form, p. 8.

[72]See Chapter I, pp. 7-14.

[73]Breitman, Malcolm X Speaks, p. 114.

CHAPTER III

MALCOLM X, THE AGENT

The question, "Who was Malcolm X?" has plagued journalists, newspaper columnists, and critics since his death. There are various views on Malcolm X's significance. Raymond A. Schroth, a journalist, stated in The Catholic World, "Malcolm X experienced grace and evil so intensely and publicly as a human and efficacious significance to all men, his life took on a cosmic significance."[1] C. Eric Lincoln, an authority on the Black Muslim movement, saw Malcolm X as a "symbol of the uninvolved leaderless black masses whose hatred for the white man has often been expressed as self-hatred."[2] Lincoln's point was reinforced by Schroth who said,

> He [Malcolm X] was a remarkably gifted and charismatic leader whose hatreds and resentments symbolized the dreadful stamp of the black ghetto. . . he is worthy to be remembered because the perpetuation of the ghetto which spawned him will not let us forget.[3]

Insights into the enigma surrounding Malcolm X's significance and personality can be gained by an in-depth analysis of Malcolm X as a rhetorical agent, for he often used public speaking as an instrument for building his

movements. To understand why Malcolm X spoke as he did, all the forces that ultimately gave shape to his personality must be investigated.

In Burkeian rhetorical criticism, the agent to be considered is usually the speaker himself. What type of person was he? What motivated him to speak as he did? In the Grammar of Motives, Kenneth Burke explained, "Under agent, one could place any personal properties that are assigned a motivational value such as 'ideas, the will and fear.'"[4] Hence, a Burkeian analysis of Malcolm X includes an analysis of the values, fears, and ideas motivating the agent to speak as he did on December 20, 1964.

In his introductory remarks, Malcolm X addressed his audience, "Reverend [Joseph] Coles, Mrs. Hamer, honored guests, brothers and sisters, friends and enemies; also ABC and CBS and FBI and CIA:"[5] His address to "Reverend Coles, Mrs. Hamer, honored guests"[6] was a note of courtesy observed by Malcolm X. It is indicative of his Muslim background and morality.

His involvement in the Black Muslim sect began in a maximum security prison in Concord, New Hampshire in 1948. Malcolm Little was converted to the "Nation of Islam," a black religious sect with a very strict moral code. The first contact he had with the Black Muslims was from his brother Philbert. Philbert wrote to Malcolm X telling him

that he should "pray to Allah, the Muslim God, for deliverance." Malcolm X reacted negatively, for he did not appreciate being prayed for by his brother's "holiness" church. But Malcolm X's other brother, Reginald, who was also a Muslim, sent the instructions, "Malcolm, don't eat any more pork and don't smoke any more cigarettes. I'll show you how to get out of prison."[8]

Through his lack of obedience and respect for prison authority, Malcolm X, who had earned the nickname, "Satan," in prison, thought that Reginald had a fantastic scheme to "work a hype on the penal authorities."[9] When his brother, Reginald, immaculately dressed, visited "Satan" in prison, he told Malcolm X of the devil, the white man. He further explained to Malcolm X that God had come to America and had made himself known to a man named Elijah Muhammad, the Black Muslim leader.

After constant urging from his family, Malcolm Little wrote to Elijah Muhammad explaining his circumstances and conversion. Elijah Muhammad welcomed Malcolm Little to the "true knowledge." As Malcolm himself stated, "I've never been one for inaction. Everything I've ever felt strongly about, I've done something about."[10] Upon realizing the inadequacy of his eighth-grade education when writing his daily letters to Elijah Muhammad, he began an intensive self-education program.

He began to copy the dictionary page-by-page. Alex Haley contended that, "Malcolm developed an affinity for the aardvark since he copied it first." Reading virtually everything he could get his hands on concerning black history, Malcolm X began to store knowledge to be later utilized in identifying with his audiences. In prison debates, he first experienced the sensation of speaking before an audience and utilized every chance he was given to condemn the hated "white devils."

Simultaneously, Malcolm Little embraced Black Muslim morality with its prohibition of smoking, drinking, narcotics, and pork. He completely embraced the belief that only through "clean living" and courtesy could the black man overcome white persecution.

After his release from prison in the spring of 1952, he visited Elijah Muhammad, and with Elijah Muhammad's urging, changed his name to Malcolm X to indicate first, how the white man had robbed him of his true identity by forcing him to adopt a white name like Little, and, second, to denote a mysterious and exclusive Muslim knowledge that no white man could ever attain.[11]

Hence, it is understandable that Malcolm X courteously addressed the pastor as "Reverend Coles" since the rally was being held in the Williams Institutional Christian Methodist Church in Harlem. He, too, personally addressed Fannie

Hamer, who along with other representatives of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party, "was touring Northern cities seeking moral, political, and financial support for their campaign to block the seating of Mississippi's five segregationist U.S. representatives when Congress convened on January 4, 1965."[12]

Malcolm X, politeness embedded in his very nature through his Black Muslim background, was never one to slight his guests. He felt as if he were acting host since the rally was being held in his territory, Harlem. The "honored guests" Malcolm X courteously addressed in his opening remarks were the other Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party members present and the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee's Freedom Singers.

The next group of people whom Malcolm X, the agent, addressed in his remarks, "brothers and sisters" is significant. In his conclusion he also alluded to "the brothers and sisters in Mississippi [who] are being beaten and killed."[13]

Burke contends man is a symbol-using animal who chooses his words carefully. On December 20, Malcolm X's choice of the words, "brothers and sisters" was a deliberate identification appeal to the entire audience, both black and white members. Malcolm X, the agent, was much more conciliatory toward whites than he had been previously; hence, it

would have been appropriate for him to address the white members of his audience who constituted one-third of the total audience.

Malcolm X was cognizant of his influence over his black brothers and sisters. The very use of the fifty-five "I's" and the thirty-three "we's" in the speech is indicative of the mass appeal and sway. As Minister of the big mosques in New York and Washington, Malcolm experienced vocal expressions of approval to his words, "Yes, that's right," and "You tell 'em like it is, Mr. Minister."[14]

In the concluding chapters of his Autobiography, Malcolm X explained his appeal,

> I am also blessed with faithful followers who are, I believe, as dedicated to me as I once was to Elijah Muhammad. . . . Each day, I learned in one way or another of more support from non-Muslim Negroes, including a surprising lot of the middle and upper-class black bourgeoisie, sick of the status-symbol charade.

One can tell from Malcolm X's own words that he perceived himslf, the agent on December 20, 1964, as a liberator, one who could dispose of the "status-symbol charade."[15]

Malcolm X was wise in appealing to the brothers and sisters on December 20, 1964, for the "blacks thought Malcolm was a man who could pick the conscience of the white man and make him look at, and perhaps fear the blacks."[16] Raymond A. Schroth contended that

> Malcolm X made an impact on the minds of the black masses. To the various black nationalist fronts in Harlem and elsewhere, Malcolm X was a liberator, a man on a Black Horse who would someday lead them in a revolutionary struggle against the hated blue-eyed devils.[17]

The address to the "friends and enemies. . . FBI and CIA" was a barbed one, an intentional stab. It is probable that Thomas Mader, who wrote "Coriolanus and God: A Burkeian View of William Buckley," would consider Malcolm X a good speaker. He stated,

> A good speaker is selective in exposing personal traits to an audience and is consistent in this exposition. . . . He comes before the audience as an antagonist whose sole raison d'etre in that given situation is to disturb, to unsettle, to disorient. He seeks, in short, to create tension in his audience.[18]

Malcolm X was aware that his reference to "enemies" would create tension and possible hostility in the December 20 speech, for one-third of his audience was white. The address to enemies was undoubtedly not limited to whites. The speech was delivered almost nine months to the day after the announcement of his split with the Black Muslims on March 8, 1964. He knew he was being watched carefully by the Muslim element in Harlem, and, hence, the barbed address to the "FBI and CIA." It was even rumored that his very presence in Harlem "threatened to tear the black militant movement apart."[19]

The second passage which sheds light on Malcolm X, the agent, was his discussion of the Mau Mau freedom fighters.

> In Mississippi we need a Mau Mau. . . . I say it with no anger; I say it with very careful forethought. The language that you and I have been speaking to this man in the past hasn't reached him. And you can never really get your point across to a person until you learn how to communicate with him. If he speaks French, you can't speak German. You have to know what language he speaks and then speak to him in that language.[20]

What prompted Malcolm X, the agent, to urge his audience to "speak the language he [the white man] speaks?"

As an eighth-grade student in Lansing, Michigan, Malcolm Little made excellent grades. He was elected class president. When asked by his math teacher, Mr. Ostrowoski, what he aspired to be, Malcolm X replied, "A lawyer." Mr. Ostrowoski's reply became etched in Malcolm's mind, "A lawyer. . . . That's no realistic goal for a nigger."[21] Malcolm Little recalled, "Heretofore, the word 'nigger' had rolled off my back when people [whites] would talk about 'niggers' in front of me as if I didn't have ears. Now the word itself became a scathing denouncement."[22] He left school for the slums of Boston. Ghetto areas in Boston and New York became his home and school until he reached the age of twenty-one. He "conked" his red hair, donned a sky-blue zoot suit, and orange knob-toed shoes. Gradually he evolved as "Big Red," the hustler, gangster, pimp, narcotics addict and peddler,

petty thief and armed robber."[23] Here he learned the first rule of society about hustling: "Never trust anyone outside your own close-mouthed circle and select with time and care your words and intimates even among these."[24]

Herein, Malcolm X's background in the Harlem ghettos made him become, as Time magazine reported, "a measured speaker who chose his words very carefully."[25]

Malcolm X's next choice of words on December 20 was a direct allusion to his own rearing and background. It, too, was an identification technique. For in recalling his own past, Malcolm X forced his audience to recall their pasts, comparing its similarities and differences, with the words,

> When I listen to Mrs. Hamer, a black woman--could be my mother, my sister, my daughter--describe what they had done to her in Mississippi, I ask myself how in the world can we ever expect to be respected as men when we allow something like that to be done to our women and we do nothing about it?[26]

Malcolm Little was born May 19, 1925, to Louise and the Reverend Earl Little. In the opening paragraph of his Autobiography, he recalled:

> When my mother was pregnant with me, she told me later, a party of hooded Ku Klux Klan riders galloped up to our home in Omaha, Nebraska, one night. Surrounding the house, brandishing their shotguns and rifles, they shouted for my father to come out. . . .Standing where they could see her pregnant condition, she told them she was alone with her three small children, and that my father was away, preaching, in Milwaukee. The Klansmen shouted threats and warnings at her that we had better get

> out of town because the good Christian white people 'were not going to stand for my father's spreading trouble among the good Negroes of Omaha with the back to Africa teachings of Marcus Garvey.'[27]

Malcolm Little's father was black, very strong, a gun-carrying Baptist minister and a Marcus Garvey organizer. Marcus Garvey was the leader of the Universal Negro Improvement Association, which reached its peak in the twenties. The Garveyites advocated the blacks returning to Africa.[28] Malcolm recalled his six-foot-four father with the words, "He had only one eye. . . . He was from Reynolds, Georgia, where he had left school after the third or maybe the fourth grade."[29]

Malcolm was seventh of his father's eleven children. Three children, Ella, Earl, and Mary were his father's by a previous marriage. After Reverend Little met and married Malcolm's mother in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, Wilfred, Hilda, and Philbert were born. Malcolm X was next in line. The eighth child, Reginald, was born in Milwaukee. The three youngest were born in Lansing. Malcolm X described his mother:

> Louise Little, my mother, who was born in Grenada in the British West Indies, looked like a white woman. Her father was white. She was born as the result of her mother's having been raped by her father. Of this white father of hers, I know nothing except her shame about it. I remember her saying she was glad she had never seen him. It was, of course, because of him that I got my reddish-brown 'mariny' color of skin, and my hair

> of the same color. I was the lightest child of the family.[30]

Shortly after Malcolm X was born, the family moved from Omaha to Milwaukee. They stayed only briefly, for Reverend Little could not find a place where they could raise food and perhaps build a business.

Lansing, Michigan was Malcolm Little's next home. Here his father bought a house, was doing some free-lance Christian preaching in local Negro Baptist churches, and during the week, was spreading the word of Marcus Garvey.

Malcolm X recalled the "Get-out-of-town" threats he had become so accustomed to in his young life:

> A local hate society called the Black Legion wore black robes instead of white. Soon, nearly everywhere my father went, Black Legionnaires were reviling him as an 'uppity nigger' for living outside the Lansing negro district, for spreading unrest and dissension among the 'good niggers.'[31]

The hatred was not to stop with words, because at the age of six, he recalled a very vivid memory of his house being burned.

> I remember being suddenly snatched awake into a frightening confusion of pistol shots and shouting and smoke and flames. My father shouted and shot at the two white men who had set the fire and were running away. Our home was burning down around us. I remember we were outside in the night in our underwear, crying and yelling our heads off. The white police and firemen came and just watched our house burn down without making any effort to put one drop of water on the fire. . . .

> The same fire that burned my father's home still burns in my soul.[32]

Hence, Malcolm X's choice of the words, "could have been my mother, my sister. . ." were intentional ones. He chose the words because he knew what it was like to be black and to face discrimination. His house had been burned, taken away from him.

Yet this was not the end of discriminatory factors to confront the Little family. Reverend Little did not heed the less than subtle reminder to "keep quiet about Marcus Garvey." Shortly thereafter, his father was found with his head bashed in and laid on a railroad track to be cut in half. The insurance company called it "suicide."[33] Violence was not an element unknown to the Little family for five of Reverend Little's six brothers had died by violence, including one who was lynched and another who was killed by white policemen.

Violence of this nature struck its toll on Mrs. Louise Little and her eleven children. Alex Haley, Malcolm X's biographer, recalled how Malcolm reacted to the situation, "In moving terms, clenching his fists, and at times, breaking into tears, Malcolm described how his mother cooked dandelions to keep the eleven children from starving. He stayed dizzy and sick because of hunger."[34]

The Little family struggled to stay together. The older boys picked up odd jobs where they could find them and

Mrs. Little worked when she could. Work was not plentiful in the 1930's, particularly for Reverend Little's widow. Poverty ripped them apart. Malcolm blamed the social agencies for the split. "Our home didn't have to be destroyed. But the welfare, the courts and this [white] doctor gave us the one, two, three. . . ."[35] Louise Little was hospitalized in a mental institution and the children were separated. No one would accept responsibility for eleven children. Malcolm Little was sent to an institution for boys in Lansing.

With the words, "When I listen to Mrs. Hamer, a black woman. . . could be. . . my daughter," Malcolm X was referring directly to his own family. In 1956, in the New York City Black Muslim Temple, where he was Minister, Malcolm X met Sister Betty X. A very dedicated Muslim, Sister Betty X was also in her final semester at one of the big New York hosptials' school of nursing. Malcolm X called Sister Betty X from Detroit, and in the middle of the conversation, asked, "Look, do you want to get married?" Sister Betty X flew to Detroit. They were married shortly thereafter. They had six daughters: twins, Malikah Saban and Mallak Saban born seven months after their father's assassination on February 21, 1965; Quibilah, Ilyasah, Gamilah Lamunban, and Attallah.

Though never having as much time as he would have liked to have had with his family, Malcolm X was a very dedicated

family man. His role as a family man was undoubtedly strengthened by his background as a Black Muslim since the Muslim sect advocated strong family ties. In all likelihood, it was also a carryover from his own childhood when his father was killed when Malcolm X was very young. Listening to Mrs. Hamer's testimony, Malcolm must have imagined what it would have been like to have one of his daughters victimized in the manner which Mrs. Hamer had described in her speech prior to his.

Another passage which reveals more about Malcolm X, the agent, is found where he subtly referred to Martin Luther King and the non-violent advocates.

> No, we don't deserve to be recognized and respected as men as long as our women can be brutalized in the manner that this woman [Fannie Lou Hamer] described, and nothing being done about it, but we sit around singing, 'We Shall Overcome.'[36]

Malcolm X felt strongly that the time of peaceful co-existence was gone since violence had been dealt to black people. A more direct allusion was made to Martin Luther King later in the speech, "You want to reach back in the bag and grab somebody who's non-violent and peaceful and forgiving and long-suffering, I don't go for that--No, I say that a black man's freedom is as valuable as a white man's freedom."[37]

In the Burkeian sense, one must ask himself, "What motivated Malcolm X to refer to Martin Luther King and other passive resisters?" One must analyze his relationship with

King to examine the why of these passages. Malcolm X labeled King as "the other cheek man; a chump, not a champ." The non-violent civil rights movement was not a movement Malcolm X could accept. He thought that acceptance of passive neutrality meant acceptance of the status quo. The status quo, to Malcolm X, was intolerable.

In speaking and writing, the men were opposites. For Malcolm X frequently said, "We are never the aggressor. However, we do not teach you to turn the other cheek. We will not attack anyone, but teach our people if anyone attacks you, lay down your life."[38] There were even further differences in the two men. King was a staunch believer in non-violence; he preached love and fellowship. Malcolm X professed a belief in violence, "an eye for an eye, tooth for tooth" philosophy, which asked no quarter and gave none. King was a Christian; Malcolm X was a Muslim.

Their followers, too, differed in nature.

> King had won almost universal support among both the white and black communities--at least vocally--everywhere except in the Deep South. Malcolm X was rejected almost unanimously by white America. Whites deplored his willingness to trade violence for violence, voicing the fear that such a philosophy could bring forth widespread and bloody race riots.[39]

It is little wonder that Malcolm X referred to King's opposite non-violent philosophy. One must remember, in the Burkeian sense, that the speaker should "use all there is to use." Malcolm X had just heard a stirring speech by Mrs.

Hamer about the violence she had suffered at the hands of white police officials in Winona, Mississippi on September 9, 1963. It is not surprising that, in an attempt for audience identification, he would remind his audience that the peaceful co-existence advocated by another civil rights leader at the time, was not a desirable philosophy.

The passage in which Malcolm X made direct reference to choices and alternatives is significant in analyzing the agent.

> If they don't want to deal with the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party, then, we'll give them something else to deal with. If they don't want to deal with the Student Nonviolent Committee, then, we have to give them an alternative. Never stick someone out there without an alternative. [Or] we waste our time. Give them this or give them that. Give them the choice between this or that.[40]

The above passage indicates how Malcolm X perceived himself as an agent. He felt that, as a national black leader, he could tell his audience "they" should give the world a choice between alternatives. Burke contended that life itself is a choice--man's speech arises from choices he makes. Malcolm X, too, contended that one should be allowed to choose. His life exemplified choices. He was not given the choice of going to the detention home when he was only twelve. However, once he got to the home, he chose to attend the junior high school in Lansing. He chose to make top grades. Later, his teacher's racist statement,[41]

prompted Malcolm X to become the Boston and Harlem hustler, "Big Red." In prison, he chose to become a Black Muslim and undergo a strenuous self-education program.

When leaving prison in 1952, Malcolm X (as he was now called) began to give other blacks the choice to become a Black Muslim. He firmly believed that one must choose for himself; that one must evaluate the situation and determine what is right. "So know yourself and be yourself. We are of the black nation, and we must choose to recapture our rightful culture."[42] Hence, it is altogether fitting that Malcolm X said that the blacks should give the whites an alternative, a choice.

The next passage in the December 20, 1964 speech was an important one. It referred to Malcolm X's trip to Africa, "When I was in Africa, I noticed some of the Africans got their freedom faster than others. Some areas of the African continent became independent faster than other areas."[43] This passage was not Malcolm's first reference to Africa. In his introductory remarks, he stated:

> I couldn't help but be very impressed at the outstart when the Freedom Singers were singing the song, "Oginga Odinga" because Oginga Odinga is one of the foremost freedom fighters on the African continent. . . . When the nations of Africa are truly independent--and they WILL be truly independent because they're going about it in the right way--the historians will give Prime Minister, or rather, President Kenyatta and the Mau Mau their rightful role in African history . . . . In Mississippi we need a Mau Mau.

> In Alabama we need a Mau Mau. In Georgia we need a Mau Mau. In Harlem, in New York City, we need a Mau Mau.[44]

The African reference is significant, for Malcolm X, the agent, was prompted to tell of his African visit for multiple reasons. To fully understand Malcolm X's African visit, one must firstly understand the reasons for his split with the Black Muslims. Malcolm X, in his Autobiography, said of the split, "Mr. Muhammad and I are not together today only because of envy and jealousy. I had more faith in Elijah Muhammad than I could ever have in any other man upon this earth."[45]

Malcolm further explained his loyalty to the Muslims and Elijah Muhammad with the words,

> In every radio or television appearance, in every newspaper interview I always made it crystal clear that I was Mr. Muhammad's representative. . . . When to my joy, Mr. Muhammad agreed to grant interviews to white writers, I rarely spoke to a white writer, or a black one either, whom I didn't urge to visit Mr. Muhammad in person in Chicago--'Get the truth from the Messenger [Mr. Muhammad] in person. . .'[46]

In 1962, Malcolm noticed that less and less about him appeared in the Islam Nation's paper, Muhammad Speaks. Malcolm explained, "Herbert, Muhammad's son, now the paper's publisher, had instructed that as little as possible be printed about me."[47] The last public appearance Malcolm X and Elijah Muhammad made together was at a late 1963 rally in Philadelphia.

There is much speculation as to the actual reasons for the Muslim split. Raymond A. Schroth, in The Catholic World magazine, accounted for the split in this manner, "The underlying cause of the breach between Malcolm X and Muhammad was not so much a contest of power within the movement as a conflict of ideology."[48] Truman Nelson, in The Nation, attributed the cause of the split to "outside pressure upon the Muslim movement, mixed adulation and horror."[49]

Malcolm X's account is somewhat different. He explained.

> I will quote from one wire service story as it appeared in newspapers, and was reported over radio and TV, across the US: 'Los Angeles, July 3 (UPI)--Elijah Muhammad, 67-year-old leader of the Black Muslim movement, today faced paternity suits from two secretaries who charged he fathered their four children. . . . So one night I wrote to Mr. Muhammad about the poison being spread about him. He said that when he saw me, he would discuss it.[50]

Malcolm told of his expectation of headlines regarding Muhammad's conduct. The headlines which appeared announced John F. Kennedy's assassination on November 22, 1963. "Within hours," Malcolm X reported, "every Muslim minister received. . . two directives. Every minister was ordered to make no remarks at all concerning the assassination. Mr. Muhammad instructed that if pressed for comment, we should say, 'No comment.'"[51] Malcolm X explained how he disobeyed

the directive when asked about John Kennedy's death. He told newspaper reporters he thought it was a case of "the chickens coming home to roost."[52]

Elijah Muhammad told Malcolm X,

> That was a very bad statement. The country loved this man. . . . A statement like that can make it hard on Muslims in general. I'll have to silence you for the next ninety days--so that Muslims everywhere can be disassociated from the blunder.[53]

According to Malcolm X, he submitted completely to the punishment. However, Muslims were given the impression he had rebelled. The realization came to Malcolm X at this time that the split was a permanent one. The newspaper headlines, "Malcolm X Silenced" and "Malcolm X Suspended by Organization Head, Elijah Muhammad, for Remarks about Assassination," became permanent signs of truth.

On March 12, 1964, Malcolm X announced his split with the Black Muslims, and the simultaneous formation of the Muslim Mosque, Inc.

> I am going to organize and head a new Mosque in New York City known as the Muslim Mosque, Inc. . . . It will be the working base for an action program designed to eliminate the political oppression, the economic exploitation, and the social degradation suffered daily by twenty-two Afro-Americans.[54]

This was the beginning of the agent, Malcolm X's, ties with the African nation. As he later told Alex Haley, his biographer, "I'm glad I've been the first to establish official ties between Afro-Americans and our blood brothers in Africa."[55]

Malcolm X had been abroad before only briefly to conduct business for Elijah Muhammad. Now, however, in March of 1964, Malcolm X made his first of two pilgrimages to Mecca, the journey which all followers of the Islamic religion are encouraged to take. He traveled to Africa and the Middle East. He spent half of his remaining life discussing, learning, seeking help, and giving it. His conversion to the Orthodox Islamic beliefs prompted him to change his name legally to El-Hajj Malik El Shabazz.*

In Mecca, Malcolm X saw the oneness of all races. He saw Muslims of all races unite as if with one purpose--to worship Allah. Malcolm X, in his Autobiography, told of Dr. Omar Azzam, the brother-in-law of the son of the ruler of Arabia, who in America would have been called a white man, yet who extended hospitality to him. As Malcolm X stated, "That morning was when I first began to reappraise the 'white man. . .' Why the man acted as if he were a brother of mine."[56]

Through his Muslim Mosque, Inc., and his non-religious organization, Organization of Afro-American Unity, Malcolm X once again began to rely on public speaking as his primary building tool. As one can see in his December 20,

---

*Though Malcolm X had changed both his and his family's names and used his new legal name for the rest of his life (it, too, appeared on his tombstone), the press still referred to him as Malcolm X.

1964, speech, Malcolm's concern for freedom became an international concern. He turned his attention to a crusade on behalf of oppressed peoples all over the world with Afro-Americans ranking first in concern. Hence, one is led to understand why Malcolm X spoke of the African struggle for independence. His beliefs were shattered by his split with the Black Muslims, but reaffirmed solidly by his conversion to the Orthodox Islamic religion.

The next passage that sheds light on Malcolm X, the agent, is the stress he placed on "anger" in his speech.

> But when they [black people] get angry, they bring about a change. When they get angry, they aren't interested in consequences. When they get angry, they realize the condition that they're in--that their suffering is unjust, immoral, illegal, and that anything they do to correct it or eliminate it, they're justified.[57]

The agent felt justified in saying that anger preceded change because, as he stated in The New York Times of March 15, 1964, "I feel that all the efforts on the part of the Negro groups through 1963 have met with failure. The Negroes are angry. I should say they're angrier and I'm the angriest."[58]

In the next few paragraphs of his speech the agent talked "common sense" to the people.

> Let's learn his [the white man's] language. If his language is with a shotgun, get a shotgun. Yes, I said if he only understands the language of a rifle, get a rifle. If he only understands the language of a rope, get a rope. But don't waste time talking the wrong language to a man if you want to really communicate with him. Speak his language. There's nothing wrong with that.[59]

In the Burkeian sense, Malcolm X was identifying with his audience in the above passage. He realized the blacks in his audience had suffered injustices because of discrimination. Malcolm X was forcing his audience to recall instances of violence they may have been subjected to; these recollections of violence would, hence, enable his audience to justify violence directed toward the aggressors.

The agent on December 20, 1964, was cognizant of the sway he held over his Harlem audience. He was well aware of his charm. Malcolm X cited no authorities for his audience; he seemed to expect them to agree because he was Malcolm X. He felt he knew the racial situation. He was a self-educated, self-made man, and he expected his audience to know and appreciate that fact.

Another passage exemplified the fact that Malcolm X was an educated man. He referred to American history with the words, "You were struggling for your freedom in the Revolutionary War. Your own Patrick Henry said, 'Liberty or death,' and George Washington got the cannons out."[60] One is led to ask the question, "How educated was the agent?" His public education ended abruptly when, at the age of fourteen, he was told to think of carpentry and relinquish his lawyer ambitions. Experience then became his teacher for the next seven years in the Boston and Harlem slums.

Malcolm X's education was not to be continued until the late 1940's when he began to consider the Muslim religion. He realized how pitifully inadequate his writing and reading abilities were. The self-education program he undertook involved copying the dictionary word-by-word. In the prison library, Malcolm read the rare collection of anti-slavery tracts stored there. He began to fashion his thoughts after the abrasive rhetoric of the great abolitionists, William L. Garrison and Wendell Phillips.[61]

Information about the agent can also be gleaned by understanding that numerous references were made to Harlem throughout the speech as an identity technique linking the agent's background to that of his audience.

(1) Right here in Harlem, in New York City, we need a Mau Mau. . .
(2) I might say, secondly, some people wonder, well, what has Mississippi got to do with Harlem?
(3) So what happens in Mississippi and the South has a direct bearing on what happens to you and me here in Harlem.
(4) All of our people in Harlem should have heard her [Mrs. Hamer] describe what they did to her down there. Because I think the people in Harlem are more capable of evening the score than people are elsewhere in the country.
(5) I say in my conclusion that if you and I here in Harlem, who form the habit oftimes of fighting each other, who sneak around trying to wait for an opportunity to throw some acid or lye on each other, or sprinkle dust on each other's doorsteps--if you and I were really and truly for the freedom of our people, we wouldn't waste all that energy thinking how to do harm to each other. Since you have that ingenuity, if you know how to do it, let me know; I'll give you some money and I'll show you where to go, and show you who to do it to.

(6) . . . and the next time you come to Harlem, you'll have a crowd out there.[62]

References made to Harlem were made for one reason only--to make his fellow blacks realize he, too, was a product of the ghettos of Harlem. Thus, identification with the Harlem blacks would be possible, for they shared common ground. There can be no doubt that Malcolm drew on his own background and experience when speaking in the above passages. "If anything his past seemed to give him a unique insight into the nature of the problems with which he sought to deal."[63] "His style was nurtured in the ghettos of Boston and New York where he met the people and gained authenticity."[64]

As an eighth-grade student in Lansing who was told to be realistic about being a "nigger," Malcolm X decided to go to Boston to live with his half-sister, Ella. As he stated,

> Like hundreds of thousands of country-bred Negroes who had come to the black ghetto before me, and have come since, I'd also acquired all the other fashionable ghetto adornments--the zoot suit, liquor, cigarettes, then reefers--all to erase my embarrassing background.

He, too, related how he conked his hair. "When I endured all that pain, literally burning my flesh with lye, in order to conk my natural hair until it was limp, to have it look like a white man's hair, I was on my way to becoming a degraded Negro."[65]

He got a job in Boston shining shoes and selling contraceptives on the side to the white patrons of Roseland Ballroom. For the first time in his life, he saw some of the so-called "pillars" of white society engaging in all kinds of illicit sexual relations with black prostitutes. It was a rude awakening for the young boy.

After Malcolm Little had seen the ghettos of Harlem, he transferred his operation there. At first he worked as a waiter at Small's Restaurant, but decided there was neither money nor future in the job.

He began to handle narcotics. By the age of sixteen, he was admitted to the underworld fringes as "Big Red." He absorbed all he heard and saw. Building a reputation for honesty by turning over every dollar due his boss, his fame spread. Malcolm had also acquired status among the ghettos of Harlem. He had a white girl friend, Sophia. He recalled in his Autobiography, "Even among Harlem Negroes, her looks gave me status."[66] By the age of eighteen, Malcolm hired from four to six men variously plying dope, numbers, bootleg whiskey, and diverse forms of hustling. He personally squired well-heeled white thrill-seekers to Harlem sin dens. As he was to later recall, "My best customers were preachers, social leaders, police, and all kinds of big shots in the business of controlling other people's lives."[67] As Lomax stated in When the Word is

Given, "Malcolm Little's income had reached $2,000 a month. And I have heard Malcolm talk of paying off cops with a thousand-dollar bankroll pulled from his pocket."[68]

By February, 1946, because of his leadership of a burglary ring, Malcolm Little was arrested and sentenced to jail. As he himself stated, "I wasn't quite twenty-one. I had not even started shaving."[69]

Malcolm X could and did identify with the Harlem blacks. When he said, "The people in Harlem are more capable of evening the score" he knew what he was saying. He clarified the statement even further in his Autobiography with the words, "The hustler out there in the ghetto jungle has less respect for the white power structure than any other black in America. He is internally restrained by nothing."[70]

Malcolm X, the agent, could thus empathize with the Harlem audience. He explained the Harlem blacks' plight succintly,

> Many times I have thought about it and what it really meant. In one sense, we were huddled in there, bonded together in seeking security and warmth and comfort from each other and we didn't know it. All of us who might have probed space, or cured cancer, or built industries, were, instead, black victims of the white man's American social system.[71]

Another belief the agent harbored was that the time was right for blacks to take freedom where they could get it. Three direct passages illustrate the point.

(1) There's only one way to be a first class citizen. There's only one way to be independent. . . . It's not something that you take. Nobody can give you independence. Nobody can give you freedom. . . . If you're a man, you take it.
(2) And I say that a black man has the right to do whatever is necessary to get his freedom that other human beings have done to get their freedom.
(3) We will never get it [freedom] until we let the world know that as other human beings have laid down their lives for freedom--and also taken life for freedom--that you and I are ready and willing and equipped and qualified to do the same thing.

What component parts of Malcolm X's philosophy and personality compelled him to make the above statements? As Time magazine reported, "Malcolm X was an extremist in many ways. He was most extreme in sheer impatience."[72] He was impatient for his goals of freedom and complete equality to be realized. As he stated on March 15, shortly after his break with Black Muslims, "Negroes should defend themselves even if it means carrying rifles and shotguns. . . driving from our doors the people who are brutalizing the Negroes."[73]

Fannie Lou Hamer had just explained how she and five other victims had suffered physically at the hands of white racists in Mississippi. It is understandable that the agent would talk of freedom for all blacks, meeting violence with violence.

Malcolm X practiced what he preached. As his wife, Mrs. Betty Shabazz, stated, "Malcolm . . . felt that blacks have the right and responsibility to stop the oppression

by any means necessary."[74] His wife further commented, "Malcolm always said it was just as noble for black people to fight for their human rights as it is for Irishmen, a Jew, a Russian, an Arab, or a Chinese."[75]

Malcolm X was willing to sacrifice his life for the cause. As Truman Nelson stated in The Nation, March 8, 1965, "His cause, however mistaken, meant more to him than length of days."[76] The agent knew his life was being threatened. His house had been bombed. He even applied for a permit to carry a pistol shortly before his death. None was issued. He told his biographer, Alex Haley, it was dubious that he would live to see his Autobiography published, yet he would not relinquish his cause. He felt he was to become a victim of society.

> I know that societies often have killed the people who have helped to change those societies. And if I die having brought any light, having exposed any meaningful truths that will help to destroy the racist cancer that is malignant in the body of America, then all the credit is due in Allah--only the mistakes have been mine.[77]

Malcolm X's prophecy proved true. On February 21, 1965, at Audubon Ballroom, Malcolm X was assassinated. Sixteen revolver slugs hit him. On March 10, Talmadge Hayer, along with Norman 3X Butler and Thomas 15X Johnson, alleged Black Muslims, were indicted for Malcolm X's murder.

There are yet other passages that enable one to learn about Malcolm X, the agent on December 20, 1964. Malcolm X

referred to a previous speech, "The Ballot or the Bullet." Noted for his public speaking ability, Malcolm X was considered by blacks to be "The" Black Muslim leader. Truman Nelson reported that "Malcolm X changed a store-front cult into a powerful religion with more than a hundred places to worship spread over fifty states."[78] There has been speculation that Malcolm X did not reach his zenith as a black leader until after the split on March 24, 1964. "It is evident that Malcolm X as a revolutionary rhetorician did not reach or achieve his maximum effectiveness until he disassociated himself from the Muslims."[79] The next three months became known as Malcolm X's transition period. He evolved in June, 1964, as a strong black leader with a definite following. Paramount among his views at this time was the belief in Black Nationalism. The most often quoted speech on Black Nationalism is one called, "The Ballot or the Bullet" delivered April 3, 1964. Malcolm X, the agent, alluded to his previous and oft-quoted speech.

> We have to let the people in Mississippi, as well as in New York, Mississippi, and elsewhere know that freedom comes from ballots or bullets. These are the only two methods, the only two means--either ballots or bullets.[80]

Malcolm X's attitude toward white people is important to an analysis of the agent. He directly referred to his change in philosophy regarding white people.

> They've always said I'm anti-white. I'm for anybody who's for freedom. I'm for anybody who's for justice. I'm for anybody who's for equality. . . . I believe there are some white people who might be sincere.[81]

The two statements above were true concessions for the "St. Paul of the Muslim Movement"[82] who had uttered his first public curses against "whitey" in prison debates as early as 1948. Malcolm X dedicated the ensuing twelve years of his life to increasing the following of the anti-white religion, the Black Muslims. He had no use for the "blue-eyed devil." Whites, he had contended, had stripped the blacks of their dignity and their true heritage. He believed, as a Black Muslim, it was necessary to form a separate black United States.

Malcolm X's philosophy underwent a radical change. One can understand the essential differences between Malcolm X's philosophy and the one proposed by the Black Muslims by reading George Breitman's Malcolm X, The Man and His Ideas. He explained the differences.

> (1) The Black Muslims built everything around a mystique of leadership. Malcolm X, however, called for help in the form of ideas and suggestions from all quarters, especially from students, white or black.
> (2) The Black Muslims practiced a 'close-mouthed' policy of leadership. Malcolm X discussed his ideas much more openly with the other leaders. His was a far more democratic organization with far more collective leadership.
> (3) The Black Muslim sect was a secular one; Malcolm X sought to build a non-secular movement uniting all blacks regardless of religion.

(4) Though the Black Muslims urged self-defense, with Malcolm X, the right became concrete, specific, and practical.
(5) Black Muslims judged people on the basis of color. Malcolm X strove to judge men on the basis of their deeds, not color.
(6) Black Muslims advocated concern for American negroes. Malcolm X's concern became an international concern for all men's freedom.[83]

The last important passages which furnish clues to Malcolm X, the man and agent, can be found in his religious references.

> Jesus himself was ready to turn the synagogue inside out and upside down when things weren't going right. In fact, in the Book of Revelations, they've got Jesus sitting on a horse with a sword in his hand, getting ready to go into action. But they don't tell you or me about that Jesus. . . . No, go and read the whole book and when you get to Revelations, you'll find that even Jesus's patience ran out. . . . He picked up the sword.[84]

Malcolm X knew the Christian Bible well. His father was a Baptist minister. Malcolm's contact with the Christian church through his father was a very negative one. In his Autobiography he recalled his religious father's beating his mother and the rest of the family. He, too, recalled the constant quarrels his mother and father had before his father was killed.

A very practical and sensible man, Malcolm X used the Christian religious reference to possibly tell his audience he was no longer a secular Black Muslim leader. He was for all blacks who were willing to seek freedom by any means necessary.

The December 20, 1964 speech was an explanation of Malcolm X's philosophy two months prior to his death. In the Burkeian sense, Malcolm X chose his symbols carefully. A Burkeian analysis has allowed an in-depth study of the values, fears, and ideas that motivated Malcolm X's choice of words on December 20, 1964. Malcolm X's courteous introductory remarks reflected his background as a Black Muslim. A Burkeian analysis, too, has revealed the reasons behind Malcolm X's strong condemnation of the white power structure. He blamed the white power structure for his lack of formal education and strong family ties. One, too, can understand why Malcolm X chose to shun passive resistors on December 20, 1964. He felt a keen urgency for immediate action. Further, Malcolm X's lack of evidence has revealed his self-perception as a knowledgeable and educated self-made man.

By analyzing the many facets that ultimately shaped Malcolm X's personality, one can "use all there is to use" as Kenneth Burke advocated. One can understand what prompted Malcolm X to choose the words of his speech on December 20, 1964.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Raymond A. Schroth, "The Redemption of Malcolm X," The Catholic World, 205 (September, 1967), 346-353.

[2]C. Eric Lincoln, "The Meaning of Malcolm X," The Christian Century, 82 (1965), 433.

[3]Schroth, "The Redemption of Malcolm X," 346.

[4]Kenneth Burke, A Grammar of Motives, (Berkley: University of California Press, 1969), p. xix.

[5]George Breitman, ed., Malcolm X Speaks (New York: Grove Press, Inc., 1966), pp. 105.

[6]Ibid.

[7]Alex Haley, ed., The Autobiography of Malcolm X (New York: Grove Press, Inc., 1966), p. 285.

[8]Ibid.

[9]Ibid.

[10]Ibid., p. 170.

[11]Ibid., p. 172.

[12]Breitman, Malcolm X Speaks, p. 105.

[13]Ibid., p. 111.

[14]"Angry Spokesman Malcolm X Tells Off Whites," Life, (24 May, 1963), p. 30.

[15]Haley, The Autobiography of Malcolm X, p. 315.

[16]Lincoln, "The Meaning of Malcolm X," 432.

[17]Schroth, "The Redemption of Malcolm X," 348.

[18]T. F. Mader, "Coriolanus and God: A Burkeian View of William Buckley," Dissertation, Northwestern University, Chicago, 1966, p. 293.

> They say travel broadens your scope, and recently, I've had a lot of it in the Middle East and Africa. While I was traveling, I noticed that most of the countries have recently emerged into independence and turned away from the so-called capitalistic system in the direction of socialism.[35]

Malcolm X believed that capitalism and racism went hand-in-hand.

> It's impossible for a white person to believe in capitalism and not believe in racism. You can't have capitalism without racism. And if you find one [a capitalist]. . . who has a philosophy that makes you sure they don't have racism in their outlook, usually they're socialists or their political philosophy is socialism.[36]

The four basic beliefs discussed were the paramount beliefs proposed by Malcolm X in the last phase of his life, extending from June, 1964 until his assassination on February 21, 1965. The speech chosen for analysis, the speech Malcolm X delivered in Harlem for the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party Rally on December 20, 1964, embodied, directly or indirectly, each of the four philosophies. Therefore, one can conclude that Malcolm X's Freedom Democratic Party Speech typified these four principles; and, thus, would be representative of the real Malcolm X at that time.

Method of Analysis

Kenneth Burke is "unquestionably the most brilliant and suggestive critic now writing in America."[37] William Rueckert reported that Burke's trilogy of works, Grammar

[19]Louis E. Lomax, When the Word is Given (New York: The New American Library, 1964), p. 43

[20]Breitman, Malcolm X Speaks, pp. 106-107.

[21]Haley, The Autobiography of Malcolm X, p. 102.

[22]Ibid., p. 103.

[23]Truman Nelson, "Delinquent's Progress," The Nation, 201 (August, 1965), 336.

[24]Haley, The Autobiography of Malcolm X, p. 91.

[25]"Malcolm X," Time, 125 (March 8, 1964), 36.

[26]Breitman, Malcolm X Speaks, p. 107.

[27]Haley, The Autobiography of Malcolm X, p. 1.

[28]Irving J. Rein, The Relevant Rhetoric: Principles of Public Speaking Through Case Studies (London: Collier-Macmillan Lmtd., 1969), p. 46.

[29]Haley, The Autobiography of Malcolm X, p. 2.

[30]Ibid.

[31]Ibid., p. 3.

[32]Ibid.

[33]Ibid., p. 11.

[34]Ibid., p. 15.

[35]Ibid., p. 17.

[36]Breitman, Malcolm X Speaks, p. 106.

[37]Ibid., p. 113.

[38]Marcus H. Boulware, "Minister Malcolm Orator Profundo," Negro History Bulletin, 30 (November, 1967), 13.

[39]"Violence Versus Non-Violence," Ebony, 20 (April, 1965), 168.

[40]Breitman, Malcolm X Speaks, p. 107.

[41]See Chapter III, p. 88.

[42]"Angry Spokesman Malcolm X Tells Off Whites," p. 30.

[43]Breitman, Malcolm X Speaks, p. 107.

[44]Ibid., pp. 105-106.

[45]Haley, The Autobiography of Malcolm X, p. 198.

[46]Ibid., p. 291.

[47]Ibid., p. 292.

[48]Schroth, "The Redemption of Malcolm X," 347.

[49]Nelson, "Delinquent's Progress," 332.

[50]Haley, The Autobiography of Malcolm X, pp. 299-300.

[51]Ibid., p. 300.

[52]Ibid., p. 301.

[53]Ibid., p. 302.

[54]Ibid., p. 316.

[55]Ibid., p. 431.

[56]Ibid., pp. 335-336.

[57]Breitman, Malcolm X Speaks, p. 107.

[58]"Malcolm X," 36.

[59]Breitman, Malcolm X Speaks, p. 108.

[60]Ibid., p. 112.

[61]Nelson, "Delinquent's Progress," 336.

[62]Breitman, Malcolm X Speaks, pp. 105-114.

[63]Lincoln, "The Meaning of Malcolm X," 432.

[64]Rein, The Relevant Rhetoric: Principles of Public Speaking Through Case Studies, p. 69.

[65]Haley, The Autobiography of Malcolm X, p. 56.

[66]Ibid., p. 67.

[67]Ibid., p. 79.

[68]Lomax, When the Word is Given, p. 50.

[69]Haley, The Autobiography of Malcolm X, p. 151.

[70]Ibid., p. 81.

[71]Schroth, "The Redemption of Malcolm X," 350.

[72]"Malcolm X," 88-89.

[73]Haley, The Autobiography of Malcolm X, p. 262.

[74]Betty Shabazz, "The Legacy of My Husband Malcolm X," Ebony, 24 (June, 1969), 173.

[75]Ibid.

[76]Nelson, "Delinquent's Progress," 336.

[77]Haley, The Autobiography of Malcolm X, p. 424.

[78]Nelson, "Delinquent's Progress," 336.

[79]Andrea Rich and Arthur L. Smith, Rhetoric of Revolution (Durham, N.C.: Moore Publishing Co., 1968), p. 188.

[80]Breitman, Malcolm X Speaks, pp. 111-112.

[81]Ibid., p. 112.

[82]"Malcolm X," 88-89.

[83]George Breitman, Malcolm X, the Man and His Ideas (New York: Pathfinder Press, 1965), p. 10.

[84]Breitman, Malcolm X Speaks, p. 111.

CHAPTER IV

AGENCY AND PURPOSE ANALYSIS

Part I--Agency Analysis

Kenneth Burke stated, "The Primary emphasis of rhetorical criticism should be vested in agency."[1] Agency is the means through which the act is performed.

Burke's term "strategy" is much akin to agency, for strategy is the method the actor chooses to achieve his ends. "It is a naming of the associative grouping of ideas which the speaker makes in his language."[2] A speaker (actor) chooses his strategies in an attempt to establish identification with his audience. The speaker might cause the audience to identify themselves with his interests to establish rapport, however, the critic must not stop here. If, for example, instead of analyzing the times, the events, and the occasion, the critic asked, "What were the symbols of authority? Did the speaker reject or accept these symbols of authority?" it would be much easier for the rhetorical critic to determine the attitudes held in common by the speaker and the audience that make identification possible.

The concept of properties is inherently related to Burkeian identification. Although people differ, they find common properties for identification purposes. The speaker (actor) appeals to his audience's values. Hence, men are united in properties through rhetoric. Identification, too, is linked with consubstantiality. Burke explained consubstantiality in his Rhetoric of Motives. "For substance was an act and a way of life, an acting together. In acting together, men have common sensations, concepts, images, ideas that make them consubstantial."[3]

Malcolm X apparently was aware of identification techniques. He realized that to persuade and communicate with an audience he had to speak the audience's language. Archie Epps, in his book, Malcolm X at Harvard, said of Malcolm X's style, "One of the most remarkable things about Malcolm X was his ability to change his style for his audience. He could speak in the emotional language of Harlem streets, shift gears en route to the studio, and carry on a cool, logical debate before TV cameras."[4] George Breitman further described Malcolm X's identification strategies. "He [Malcolm X] always adapted his speaking style to the particular audience he faced using the vocabulary and rhythm best suited for communication."[5] His extemporaneous rhetoric during the last months of his life became "stronger, more colorful, more direct, just as the New Black Nationalism movement was more hard-hitting and generalized than the

Black Muslim movement."[6] His diction and vocabulary were "superb. . . . His graceful voice inflections amplified the meaning of what he said. He had good voice control and talked with a narrow bend of natural pitch range in order to have a great reserve whenever he needed it."[7]

Cognizant of his sway over audiences, Malcolm X accounted for it in this manner,

> I've talked with other public speakers, they agree that the ability to communicate is native to any person who has the 'mass appeal' gift, who can get through to move people. It's a psychic radar. . . . When I am up there speaking I can feel the reaction to what I am saying.[8]

Martin Luther King, too, spoke of Malcolm X's ability to communicate and identify with an audience, "I just saw Malcolm X on TV, I can't deny it. When he starts talking about all that's been done to us, I get a twinge of hate or identification with him."[9]

In an agency analysis, the audience becomes an extremely important factor. In order for identification to be achieved, there must be receivers of the message. "Inasmuch as rhetoric must have an audience because communication is a reciprocal process, the black revolutionaries needed receivers for their message."[10]

The membership of the audience can be described, for Malcolm X alluded specifically to persons in his audience on December 20, 1964, in three different parts of his speech.

> Reverend (Joseph) Coles (Jr.),
> Mrs. Hamer, honored guests,
> friends and enemies, also
> ABC and CBS and FBI and
> CIA. . .
> The Freedom Singers were
> singing. . .
> It's a shame that Mrs.
> Hamer came out here this
> afternoon where there
> are so few people.[11]

Furthermore, Arnold H. Lubasch, reporting on the rally in The New York Times, said of the audience, "Three hundred persons, one third of them white, attended the rally in the Williams Institutional Church, at 2225 Seventh Avenue, near 131st Street. . . ."[12]

Hence, one can gather that the minister of the Williams Institutional Church, Reverend Joseph Coles, Jr., was present; Fannie Lou Hamer, too, was there. Malcolm X's reference to "ABC and CBS, was an address to the newspaper and television reporters who were present. His address to "FBI and CIA" was an intentional stab at possible persons present who had him under surveillance.[13]

The New York Times stated the rally attendance was around three hundred. Malcolm X believed this to be "few people." This could possibly be explained by the fact that Malcolm X was accustomed to speaking before large TV audiences and on university campuses.

The next element of concern in an agency analysis is the method Malcolm X employed in identifying with his two-thirds black, one-third white audience.

The first major strategy to be discussed is the strategy of unification. There were five "sub-strategies" under the unification strategy. The first sub-strategy was the strategy of "national oneness." Malcolm X attempted to convince his audience that America was one big nation and family. There were no boundary lines. Hence, they were consubstantial one with another.

> I might say, secondly, some people wonder, well what has Mississippi got to do with Harlem? It isn't actually Mississippi; it's America. America is Mississippi. There's no such thing as the Mason-Dixon line--it's America. There's no such thing as the South--it's America. . . . So what happens in Mississippi and the South has a direct bearing on what happens to you and me here in Harlem. . . . So all I say is this. . . when you start talking about one, talk about the others. When you start worrying about the part or the piece, worry about the whole.[14]

Malcolm X's audience had just heard a stirring oration from Fannie Lou Hamer. Malcolm X was suggesting to his audience they, too, should be concerned about the plight of the blacks in Mississippi; that Mississippi's problem was Harlem's problem. He was attempting to achieve unification through his strategy of national oneness. Note, too, this is to all members of his audience, not just blacks.

"International oneness" was Malcolm X's second sub-strategy of unification. He urged his audience to identify with the African culture by telling of his own experience.

He had visited Africa and had become concerned about the international struggle for independence. Numerous African references were made throughout his speech.

> When the nations of Africa are truly independent--and they will be truly independent because they're going about it in the right way--the historians will give Prime Minister, or rather President Kenyatta and Mau Mau, their rightful role in African history. . . . In Alabama we need a Mau Mau. In Georgia we need a Mau Mau. Right here in Harlem, in New York City, we need a Mau Mau. . . .When I was in Africa, I noticed some of the Africans got their freedom faster than others.[15]

Kenneth Burke contended that "in acting together, men have common sensations and concepts. . . that make them consubstantial."[16] Malcolm X was telling his audience that black Americans were not the only segment of the world population concerned for independence and freedom. Their African neighbors were experiencing the same "freedom pangs." Therefore, consubstantiality and oneness should be achieved by both black Americans and Africans.

Malcolm X next used "racial pride" as a strategy by employing the term "black" throughout his speech. James Baldwin stated Malcolm X's strategy at this point in the words, "Malcolm X has a great authority over his audiences. He corroborates their reality; he tells them they really exist."[17] The sub-strategy of racial pride was directed primarily toward the two-thirds black portion of his audience. He was telling them to be proud of their color. It

was a mark of dignity and pride. Yet indirectly, by his frequent use of the word "black" and not colored or Negro, he was aiming at the white people in the audience. He was telling them that blacks no longer desired to be white.

> When I listen to Mrs. Hamer, a black woman . . . . How can you and I be looked upon as men with black women being beaten and nothing being done about it, black children and black babies being beaten and nothing being done about it?. . . the black man is deprived of his right to vote. . . . There'd be some black faces there. . . . Find out where Ray Jones, who is one of the most powerful black Democrats in this city. . . . I'm not for anybody who tells black people to be nonviolent. . . and I say that a black man has the right to do whatever is necessary to get his freedom.[18]

The Burkeian concept of properties was inherent in Malcolm X's strategy of racial pride. Malcolm X was psychologically analyzing his audience. He was calling upon the black segment of his audience's physical property of race and uniting them in this respect. By reminding his audience of its shared property of race, he also forced them to recall experiences they had encountered because of their race. His use of the word black was a strategy utilized definitely in an attempt to unify his black audience.

Another unification sub-strategy was love of family. Malcolm X capitalized on his audience's strong family ties. He wanted his audience to experience a sense of oneness or of consubstantiality by identifying with Mrs. Hamer and her suffering: "When I listen to Mrs. Hamer, a black woman--

could be my mother, my sister, my daughter. . . ."[19] Malcolm X, too, wanted his audience to establish identity with the "brothers and sisters in Mississippi (who) are being beaten and killed for no other reason than they want to be treated as first-class citizens."[20]

The last unification sub-strategy to be analyzed was the strategy of masculine self-respect. Malcolm X appealed to the male members of his audience. He tried to unify the black men with the words:

> No, we don't deserve to be recognized and respected as men as long as our women can be brutalized in the manner that this man described. . . . When you and I develop that type of anger and speak in that voice, then we'll get some kind of respect and recognition. . . . Nobody can give you independence. Nobody can give you freedom. . . . If you're a man, you take it. If you can't take it, you don't deserve it. . . . So if you and I want freedom. . . if we want respect. . . we obey the law, we are peaceful--but at the same time, at any moment that you and I are in accord with our civil rights. . .--when all these things are on our side, and we still can't get it, it's because we aren't on our own side.[21]

Malcolm X was goading the male members of the audience into identification with him and the other black males. By attacking their dignity as males, he challenged the roles they had been accepting. Malcolm X believed, through unification of the black males, action could be taken against discriminatory practices and self-respect could be achieved.

Linked closely with the unification strategy was Malcolm X's strategy of chastisement. He was chiding his audience's policy toward civil rights. As Archie Epps poignantly stated, "He [Malcolm X] could not support the strategy of passive neutrality, for in accepting neutrality, he felt the Negroes accepted the status quo."[22]

Malcolm X rejected the status quo and its symbols of authority. He contended that neutrality was no longer acceptable nor practical. He wanted his audience to also reject the symbols of authority in 1964. He chastised their acceptance of the status quo with the words:

> Two or three years ago our people would choose to sing about someone who was, you know, passive and meek and humble and forgiving. Oginga Odinga is not passive. He's not meek. He's not humble. He's not nonviolent. But he's free. . . .
> No, we don't deserve to be recognized and respected as men as long as our women can be brutalized in this manner that this woman described, and nothing being done about it; we all sit around singing, 'We Shall Overcome'. . . . When you and I develop that kind of anger and speak in that voice, then we'll get some kind of respect and recognition, and some changes from these people, who have been promising us falsely already for far too long. . . .
> He's talking the language of violence while you and I are running around with this little chicken-picking type of language. . . . But now when the time comes for our freedom, you want to reach back in the bag and grab somebody who's nonviolent and peaceful and forgiving and long-suffering. I don't go for that--No.[23]

Malcolm X's strategy of chastisement was at first subtle. He was testing his audience's reaction and identification with

him on this point. He began by alluding to Oginga Odinga's lack of passive neutrality. He gradually became very outspoken and critical of "We Shall Overcome" advocates. Finally, toward the end of his speech, he openly stated, "Now you want to grab somebody who's non-violent. . . . I don't go for that--No." He was indeed seeking identification with his audience, yet he clearly worded his speech so that his audience "cheered" to his ballot or the bullet reference."[24]

Incorporated in the strategy of chastisement is also a strategy of dis-unity or breaking away from the non-violent philosophy of King. It, too, was an identification appeal on Malcolm X's part to attempt to have his audience establish consubstantiality or oneness with the militant Africans.

After chastising his audience, Malcolm X chose his next strategy carefully; he tried to provoke his audience into anger, hence, the strategy of provocation. He told them anger was a necessary element to change.

> And in the areas where independence had been gotten, someone got angry. And in the areas where independence had not been achieved yet, no one was angry. . . . But when they get angry, they bring about a change. . . . When they get angry, they realize the condition that they're in--that their suffering is unjust, immoral, illegal, and that anything they do to correct it or eliminate it, they're justified. . . . Freedom is gotten by ballots or bullets. These are the only two roads, the only two methods, the only two means--either ballots or bullets. . . . I watch you, those of you who are singing--are you also willing to do some swinging?[25]

The next strategy Malcolm X employed on December 20, 1964, was the strategy of justification directed toward both the blacks and the whites in the audience. He justified violence for his audience on two levels. He justified violence on the basis of their middle-class morality; and secondly, he justified violence with his belittling strategy. He belittled the white man so that violence directed toward him would seem more acceptable to his audience. As Archie Epps stated in Malcolm X at Harvard, "Kenneth Burke suggested by naming things, Malcolm X showed the Negroes whom to be against and how to be against him. He seemed to express the real feeling of the Negroes about their violent state of existence."[26]

Malcolm X was cognizant of his audience's middle-class concern for values of right and wrong. He attempted to justify violence on this level for them; and hence, appeal to their values and identify with them.

> The fact that you would be singing about him [Oginga Odinga] to me is quite significant. Two or three years ago, this wouldn't have been done. Two or three years ago, most of our people would choose to sing about someone who was, you know, passive and meek and humble and forgiving. Oginga Odinga is not passive. He's not meek. He's not humble. He's not nonviolent. But he's free.[27]

Hence, the black members of Malcolm X's audience on December 20, 1964, were supposed to infer that because the SNCC Freedom Singers were singing about Oginga Odinga, they, too,

adopted his political philosophy. Malcolm X was utilizing the strategy of mass appeal. His black audience was to conclude that violence could be justified on the basis of numbers. Therefore, Malcolm X wanted his audience to identify with Oginga Odinga's policy of violent rebellion.

Kenneth Burke contended, "You persuade a man only in as far as you can talk his language by speech, gesture, tonality, order, image, attitude, idea, identifying your ways of life."[28] Malcolm X also attempted to justify violence to his audience by explaining that it was the only avenue open. Malcolm X supported Burke's contention with the words,

> The language that you and I have been speaking to this man in the past hasn't reached him. And you can never really get your point across to a person until you learn to communicate with him. . . . So, you have to speak their language. The language they were speaking to Mrs. Hamer was the language of brutality. Beasts, they were, beating her . . . and when you and I begin to look at him and see the language he speaks, the language of a brute, the language of someone who has no sense of morality, who absolutely ignores law--when you and I learn how to speak his language, then we communicate. . . . He's talking the language of violence. . . and let the Klan know that we can do it tit for tat, tit for tat.[29]

Malcolm X's reference to the "Klan" here indicates a strategy of threat to whites who were racists.

The second level on which Malcolm X explained his strategy of justification for violence was his strategy of belittling. He attempted to achieve identification with the

black members of his audience by belittling the white man in their eyes. Hence, when violence was initiated toward the white man, it would not seem unjustified and cruel.

Malcolm X belittled the white man first by recalling the violence the white man had directed toward the blacks in Mississippi "for no other reason than they wanted to be treated as first-class citizens."[30] He secondly belittled the white man by his repeated use of the word "cracker."

> If something was wrong with that language, the federal government would have stopped the cracker from speaking it to you and me . . . and the mistake you and I make is letting these northern crackers shift the weight to the southern crackers. . . . Fulbright, another cracker, from Arkansas is over the Foreign Relations Committee. . . . There'd be some faces other than those cracker faces that are there right now. . . . All of these crackers--and that's what they are--crackers--they belong to the Democratic Party. . . . Lyndon B. Johnson is head of the Cracker Party. . . . These northern crackers are in cahoots with the southern crackers. . . .[31]

The next strategy Malcolm X employed was the scapegoat strategy. He launched a harsh indictment against the federal government, bureaucracy, and the democratic party. The federal government to Malcolm X became the scapegoat responsible for the suffering of the blacks. The democratic party also was a symbol of authority Malcolm X vociferously rejected. Kenneth Burke defined symbol of authority in his book, Attitudes Toward History: "Admittedly it is a vague

term. It puts together in the lump our attitudes toward rulers, courts, parliaments, laws, educators, constabulary and moral slogans linked with such."[32] By naming the federal government as his scapegoat, he "suggested how he was against the federal government. As Burke contended, "If you call a man (or thing) a villain, you have the choice of either attacking or cringing."[32] Malcolm X wanted the black members of his audience to attack.

With his scapegoat strategy, Malcolm X was also creating in his white audience a sense of collective guilt. He wanted the white members of the audience to identify with his words to the extent that they felt guilty because of the treatment blacks had received from the federal government.

His indictment of the status quo and the federal government was evident in these words:

> Speak his language--there's nothing wrong with that. If something was wrong with that language, the federal government would have stopped the cracker from speaking it to you and me. . . . The senator from Mississippi is over the Judiciary Committee. He's in Washington, D.C., as Mrs. Hamer pointed out, illegally. Every senator from a state where our people are deprived of the right to vote--they're in Washington, D.C., illegally. . . . If we had the ballot in that area, those racists would not be in Washington, D.C.[33]

Hence, the audience was thereby asked to reject the federal government because it was not representative of the black population.

Malcolm X also launched a severe attack against another element of the status quo of 1964, the Democratic party. This was indirectly another attack against his scapegoat, the federal government; for he contended that the federal government allowed the Democratic party to exist. He strove for audience identification with the words:

> All of these crackers--and that's what they are, crackers--they belong to the Democratic Party. That's the party they belong to--the same one you belong to, the same one you support, the same one you say is going to get you this and get you that. . . . Wagner is a Democrat. He belongs to the same party as Eastland. Johnson is a Democrat. He belongs to the same party as Eastland. . . . What did they [the Democrats] do for you when you wanted to sit down? They were quiet. They were silent. They said, 'Don't rock the boat, you might get Goldwater elected. . . .'[34]

These words, too, were an identification strategy. If both black and white members of his audience identified with Lyndon Johnson, thenMalcolm X was stating they, too, would have to identify with Eastland.

In his concluding remarks, Malcolm X also denounced and blamed the federal government for the plight of the black people: "And I say that if the government of the United States cannot bring to justice people, who murder Negroes . . . then it's time for you and me to retire quietly to our closets."[35]

Another strategy Malcolm X utilized was exoneration. He attempted to clarify his image toward whites for his audience.

As a Black Muslim, Malcolm X had been openly anti-white. As Smith and Rich contended in Rhetoric of Revolution, "The image of the Black Muslims was a rhetorical problem which Malcolm X had to overcome to sway his audience to his position."[36] Malcolm X was exonerating himself for both the black and white members of his audience. Since he used little or no supporting material, his sway and identification with an audience depended heavily on his audience's acceptance or rejection of him as a credible source. His image clarification was illustrated with the words: "They've always said that I'm anti-white. I'm for anybody who's for freedom. I'm for anybody who's for equality. . . . I believe there are some white people who might be sincere. But I think they should prove it."[37] Thus, Malcolm X identified with whites through the properties of freedom and equality and fighting for freedom and equality.

Another strategy Malcolm X used was an appeal to religion. Kenneth Burke contended in Rhetoric of Religion, "Religion is the center from which all other forms of human motivation gradually diverged."[38] He appealed to his audience's emotions in order to establish identification and to elicit a response from them. Rich and Smith spoke of the responsiveness black adult audiences render an emotional speaker, "The responsiveness tends to become highly emotional and dramatic."[39]

Malcolm X knew his audience. No doubt his religious appeals were included for identification purposes. He was appealing to his audience's intellectual property, a belief in God, with the words: "I know I'm in this church and probably shouldn't be talking like this--but Jesus himself was ready to turn the synagogue inside out and upside down when things weren't going right." Malcolm X carried the religious reference even further. He used Jesus to justify violence for his audience; linking Jesus and militancy:

> In fact, in the book of Revelations, they've got Jesus sitting on a horse with a sword in his hand, getting ready to go into action. But they don't tell you or me about that Jesus they never let us get down to the end of the book. They keep you up there where everything is, you know nonviolent. . . . And when his [Jesus's] patience ran out, he picked up the sword.[40]

Malcolm X pointed his right forefinger vigorously and accusingly and said "Justice demands he who kills by the sword shall be killed by the sword."[41] Malcolm X, in his concluding remarks, quoted again from the Bible, "As Jesus said, 'Little children, go thee where I send thee.' We have brothers who can do that, and who will do that."[42]

The last strategy analyzed here is Malcolm X's strategy of patriotism. This strategy was aimed directly toward the white people of the audience. He was searching for consubstantiality with his white audience by appealing

to their intellectual property, a knowledge of American history and of a feeling of patriotism.

> You were struggling for your freedom in the Revolutionary War. Your own Patrick Henry said, 'Liberty or death,' and George Washington got the cannons out, and all the rest of them that you taught to worship as my heroes, they were fighters, they were warriors.[43]

With these words, the white people in the audience could identify. A knowledge of American history would substantiate part of Malcolm X's words. They could agree that the Revolutionary War was fought for independence and Patrick Henry did say "liberty or death." He did overstate the point by implying that George Washington immediately got the cannons out. Though his white audience was isolated in parts of his speech, they could establish identification here. They could sense what it was like to love one's country and to fight for it. Malcolm X continued:

> But now when the time comes for our [the blacks] freedom, you want to reach back in the bag and grab somebody who's nonviolent and peaceful and forgiving and long-suffering. I don't go for that--No. I say that a black man's freedom is as valuable as a white man's freedom.[44]

Needless to say, the last passage quoted was an emotionally-keyed identification appeal to both black and white members of his audience; both races could share and understand a man's plight for freedom.

A strategic analysis is not complete with a study naming only the specific strategies the speaker utilized. An analysis must also include a study of the various types of forms an agent (speaker) used. In the Rhetoric of Motives, Kenneth Burke explained the significance of forms:

> Forms satisfy man's desire for order and the agent, thus, is able to persuade an audience to accept his course of action, since the explanation of a proposition in one or another of these rhetorical forms would involve identification, first by inducing the audience to participate in the form as a universal locus of appeal and next by trying to include a partisan statement within the pale of assent.[45]

There are five types of form, each of which Malcolm X used on December 20, 1964.

1. Syllogistic Progression--This type plots the points of communication so that the total development seems reasonable. Given 'a' and 'b,' 'c' follows. There would be no such thing as a cause unless there was an effect; the reverse would also be true.

2. Qualitative Progression--This element of form deals with tone. It would pertain to creating a mood whereby another can follow smoothly. For example, if a speaker (agent) began with a humorous story, he would not want to progress to a very serious talk without a transitional element linking the two. He needs to develop a state of mind in the audience whereby the humor and seriousness fit in.

3. Repetitive Form--'Repetitive form is the restatement of the same thing in various ways.' Variety is the keynote in repetitive form. 'It emphasizes the speaker's subject so that the audience comes to appreciate the significance of what he is saying.'

4. Conventional Form--This element stresses form as form. It satisfies the audience that a speech will have an introduction, a body, and a conclusion.

5. Minor or Incidental Form--This includes rhetorical elements such as metaphor, parallelisms, simile, and apostrophe.[46]

Each of the five elements will be considered separately, with particular emphasis to Malcolm X's use of them on December 20, 1964. The first of these, syllogistic progression, Malcolm X used extensively. An example of syllogistic progression can be seen in the following words: "Oginga Odinga is not passive. He's not meek. He's not humble. He's not nonviolent. But he's free." The audience was supposed to follow the thought pattern below.

A. Oginga Odinga is not passive, meek, humble, or nonviolent.

B. Oginda Odinga is free.

Universal truth the audience was to supply--violence will bring freedom. Therefore, since A + B = C, the audience should conclude:

C. If we are violent, we, too, will be free since violence begets freedom.

Another example of syllogistic "cause to effect" progressionism can be noted in Malcolm X's words, "But when they [people in general] get angry, they bring about a change." The audience was to supply the following:

A. People get angry.

B. People bring about a change.

The universal truth the audience was to supply--anger will bring a change. Therefore, since A + B = C, the audience should conclude:

C. If we, too, get angry, we will bring about a change.

There is a definite fallacy in both of Malcolm X's progressive syllogisms. He used no authority whatsoever for his statements. His audience accepted his word because he was Malcolm X or because they wanted to believe him. In the first syllogism, Malcolm X asked his audience to supply the questionable truth "violence brings freedom." Whether Malcolm X believed the statement is dubious. However, during his last year, he advocated the black man fighting for freedom. He was using the syllogism as a rhetorical strategy for unification.

The second syllogism was equally fallacious. One must accept both "A" and "B" with no authoritative evidence. Malcolm X asked his audience to accept the universal truth that anger is a necessary and vital element to change. Malcolm X could not accept passive neutrality. He was utilizing the syllogism as a rhetorical strategy to goad his audience, both blacks and whites, into anger.

The second element of form to be analyzed is qualitative progression, which deals with tone. Malcolm X's overall tone was one of conviction. He had a very sincere message to impart to his audience. He began with a slight note

of humor when he referred to the presence of friends and enemies, FBI and CIA. Malcolm X realized he was probably being watched. He knew that his life was in danger. Therefore, these words were used in his introduction partly in jest to put his audience at ease; and secondly, they were used to let his audience know he realized he had enemies in the crowd.

His qualitative progression was evident in his next paragraph. "I couldn't help but be impressed at the outset when the Freedom Singers were singing the song 'Oginga Odinga' because Oginga Odinga is one of the foremost freedom fighters on the African continent."[47] He flowed smoothly from his introduction to his first major point, that the American Negro needed to identify with the African culture. His overall tone was very smooth. He flowed from one point to the other. Summarizing for his audience, he stated, "So all I say is this, this is all I say." He, too, told his audience, "So I say, in my conclusion. . . ." and also "I say in my conclusion." It was as if he were being very careful that his audience understand all of his major points.

The third element of form, repetitive form, was one at which Malcolm X was a master. He used variety in restating his major ideas for his audience. Archie Epps stated,

> Malcolm X used a halting style of delivery in his speeches, heightening the dramatic impact of his repetitions. . . . The frequent repetitions in Malcolm X's rhetoric . . . are communications of the passion that is not satisfied by single statement, but that beats through the pulses.[48]

Malcolm X repeatedly referred to the necessity for American Negroes to identify with the African culture in his references to Kenyatta, Kenya's freedom, and the necessity for Mau Mau Freedom Fighters in the United States.

Malcolm X also repeatedly referred to the language the white man had been using, the language of violence:

> The language that you and I have been speaking to this man in the past hasn't reached him. . . . So you have to speak their language. The language they were speaking to Mrs. Hamer was the language of brutality. . . . He's talking the language of violence while you and I are running around with this chicken-picking type of language. Let's learn his language. . . .[49]

Conventional form is the fourth element of form to be analyzed. It satisfied the audience's expectation of introduction, body, and conclusion in a speech. The elements were obvious on December 20, 1964. He began his remarks with the customary address to his audience. His conclusion, too, was evident for he told his audience he was definitely ending the speech.

The last Burkeian form to be examined is minor or incidental form. I. F. Stone said of Malcolm X's style, "In simple imagery, he drove home the real truth about the

Negroes' position in America."[50] George Breitman stated, "His speaking style was direct, plain, direct like an arrow, devoid of flowery trim. He used metaphors and figures of speech that were lean and simple."[51]

Malcolm X used parallelism in the words, "In Mississippi we need a Mau Mau. In Georgia we need a Mau Mau." A very simple metaphor can be found in his passage about Mrs. Hamer, "When I listen to Mrs. Hamer, a black woman--could be my mother, my sister, my daughter." Two other descriptive metaphors can be seen in his report of the men who beat Mrs. Hamer, "Beasts they were, beating her--the two Negroes, they weren't at fault. They were just puppets. You don't blame the puppet, you blame the puppeteer."

He also used slang words, descriptive words, to emphasize his points:

> He's talking the language of violence while you and I are running around with this chicken-picking type of language--and think he's going to understand. . . and the mistake that you and I make is letting these northern crackers shift the weight to the southern crackers.[52]

Part II--Purpose

Kenneth Burke views the purpose of all rhetoric to be the salvation of mankind. In this sense, he explains that salvation both generates and justifies the actor's strategies aimed at achieving it.[53] Poetry, too, according to

Burke, is designed to do something, so it is with rhetoric. The purpose of the speech asks, "Why was the speech given? What was the speaker trying to accomplish?"

The element of purpose will receive the least attention in the entire analysis because it was inherent in the act, agent, and agency analyses. The agent's act reflects his purpose through his agency since his rhetorical choices reveal his purpose.

Keeping in mind Burke's overall rhetorical purpose, salvation, one can conclude Malcolm X's goal on December 20, 1964, was his attempt to "save" the members of his audience based on his own experience.

Malcolm X's overall purpose was to unify the members of his audience, both blacks and whites, who were willing to seek complete freedom and equality for all. He strove for unification on several levels.

1. He sought unity on the basis of the American ideals of patriotism, freedom, equality, love of family, and religion.
2. Malcolm X sought unification by chastising the acceptance of the status quo. He deemed salvation of the nation's blacks would be feasible only through the rejection of passive neutrality. He provoked the members of his audience into anger and

justified violence for both black and white segments of his audience.

3. He sought unification of his audience by furnishing them a common enemy or scapegoat, the federal government. Malcolm X wanted the black members of his audience to attack the federal government; he wanted the white members to feel guilty because of the treatment the blacks had received.

Related to his overall purpose of unification were two sub-purposes aimed toward the extreme groups in his audience on December 20, 1964, the black militants and the white racists.

The sub-purpose aimed toward the black militants was group solidarity. Malcolm X realized this diverse segment of his audience might act as a catalyst to activate the other blacks in the audience; hence, he chose not to ignore them. He strove to unite them in two ways.

1. He urged them to identify with militant Africans who had won their independence, such as, the Mau Mau Freedom Fighters, Oginga Odinga, and Kenyatta.
2. His repeated use of the word "black" was aimed at unity of the black militants, subtly telling them to forget their differences and unite for freedom.

Malcolm X's second sub-purpose was directed toward the white racists in his audience in an attempt to isolate them and frighten them. His continual references to "blacks" was aimed directly toward white racists, telling them blacks no longer desired to be white. His use of the word "cracker," too, was intentionally derisive. Malcolm X's references to the Klan, also, were threats to the white racists, letting them know the blacks could return it "tit for tat, tit for tat."

Strategy or agency and purpose are interlocked. The overall strategy Malcolm X utilized was "suggestive unification;" the overall purpose was "unification of both black and white members of his audience." If the blacks identified with the African culture, with other American blacks, and with whites willing to fight the American capitalistic power structure, Malcolm X felt "freedom now" would be a realistic goal. If united, the blacks could combat the federal government to insure their freedom. Hence, Malcolm X chose the strategy and purpose of "unification" in the hopes of achieving his goals. "Suggestive unification" could be deemed the overall strategy and purpose since Malcolm X often subtly suggested the audience draw their own conclusions by his subtle suggestive remarks.

Hence, one should remember Kenneth Burke's overall purpose of rhetoric, salvation. Malcolm X contended on

December 20, 1964, that black salvation could only be achieved through unification for immediate freedom.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Kenneth Burke, A Grammar of Motives, (Berkley: University of California Press, 1969), p. 275.

[2]Marie Hochmuth Nichols, Rhetoric and Criticism, (Baton Rouge, Louisiana: Louisiana State University Press, 1963), p. 286.

[3]Kenneth Burke, A Rhetoric of Motives, (Berkley: University of California Press, 1969), p. 21.

[4]Archie Epps, The Speeches of Malcolm X at Harvard, New York: William Morrow Co., Inc., 1968, p. 206.

[5]George Breitman, Malcolm X on Afro-American History (New York: Merit Publishers, 1967), p. 1.

[6]Andrea Rich and Arthur L. Smith, Rhetoric of Revolution (Durham, N.C.: Moore Publishing Co., 1968), p. 206.

[7]Breitman, Malcolm X on Afro-American History, p. 1.

[8]Alex Haley, ed., The Autobiography of Malcolm X (New York: Grove Press, Inc., 1966), p. 286.

[9]Rich and Smith, Rhetoric of Revolution, p. 165.

[10]Ibid., p. 166.

[11]George Breitman, ed., Malcolm X Speaks (New York: Grove Press, Inc., 1966), pp. 105-114.

[12]Arnold H. Lubasch, "Malcolm Favors a Mau Mau in the U.S.," New York Times, 21 December, 1964, cols. 3-5, p. 21.

[13]See Chapter III, p. 87.

[14]Breitman, Malcolm X Speaks, pp. 105-114.

[15]Ibid.

[16]Burke, A Rhetoric of Motives, p. 21.

[17]James Baldwin in Rich and Smith, Rhetoric of Revolution, p. 165.

[18]Breitman, Malcolm X Speaks, pp. 105-114.

[19]Ibid., p. 111.

[20]Ibid., pp. 105-114.

[21]Ibid.

[22]Epps, The Speeches of Malcolm X at Harvard, p. 48.

[23]Breitman, Malcolm X Speaks, pp. 105-114.

[24]Lubasch, "Malcolm Favors a Mau Mau in the U.S.," p. 21.

[25]Breitman, Malcolm X Speaks, pp. 105-114.

[26]Epps, The Speeches of Malcolm X at Harvard, pp. 48, 63.

[27]Breitman, Malcolm X Speaks, pp. 105-114.

[28]Burke, A Rhetoric of Motives, p. 21.

[29]Breitman, Malcolm X Speaks, pp. 105-114.

[30]Ibid., p. 111.

[31]Ibid., pp. 105-114.

[32]Burke, Attitudes Toward History, p. 329.

[33]Breitman, Malcolm X Speaks, pp. 105-109.

[34]Ibid., pp. 105-113.

[35]Ibid., pp. 113-114.

[36]Rich and Smith, Rhetoric of Revolution, p. 168.

[37]Breitman, Malcolm X Speaks, p. 112.

[38]Kenneth Burke, Rhetoric of Religion: Studies in Logology (Boston: Beacon Press, 1961), p. v.

[39]Rich and Smith, Rhetoric of Revolution, p. 63.

[40]Breitman, Malcolm X Speaks, pp. 105-114.

[41]Lubasch, "Malcolm Favors a Mau Mau in the U.S.," p. 21.

[42]Breitman, Malcolm X Speaks, p. 112.

[43]Ibid., pp. 112-113.

[44]Ibid., pp. 105-114.

[45]Burke, A Rhetoric of Motives, p. 590.

[46]Kenneth Burke, Counter-Statement, Los Altos, California: Hermes Publications, 1953), pp. 120-126.

[47]Breitman, Malcolm X Speaks, p. 105.

[48]Epps, The Speeches of Malcolm X at Harvard, pp. 59-60.

[49]Breitman, Malcolm X Speaks, pp. 105-114.

[50]I. F. Stone in Breitman, Malcolm X Speaks, p. i.

[51]George Breitman, Malcolm X, the Man and His Ideas (New York: Pathfinder Press, 1965), p. 6.

[52]Breitman, Malcolm X Speaks, pp. 105-114.

[53]William Howe Rueckert, Kenneth Burke and the Drama of Human Relations, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1963), p. 71.

CHAPTER V

RATIOS

The five parts of Kenneth Burke's dramatistic pentad, scene, act, agent, agency, and purpose have been analyzed in Chapters II, III, and IV, but the rhetorical critic must not stop here. Burke continually reminded the reader of the inter-relationship between the various parts of the pentad. In Counter-Statement he explained, "a work has form. . . insofar as one part of it leads the reader to anticipate another part, to be gratified by its sequence."[1]

There are eleven possible ratios for the dramatistic pentad.

(1) Scene-act
(2) Scene-agent
(3) Scene-agency
(4) Agent-purpose
(5) Agent-agency
(6) Agent-act
(7) Act-purpose
(8) Act-agency
(9) Act-agent
(10) Purpose-scene
(11) Purpose-agency

Each ratio includes two terms and each asserts a causal relation between them. For example, to analyze the scene-act ratio, the rhetorical critic must determine the influence the scene had upon the act or speech which was presented.

Seven ratios have been deemed to be relevant ratios and will be discussed respectively. The scene-act, scene-agent, and scene-agency ratios have been analyzed, for each of them explains the influence the scene had upon the act or speech, the agent, or Malcolm X, and the agency or methodology.

Malcolm X, the agent, had a strong influence over his purpose, agency, and act; for in order to accomplish his purpose on December 20, 1964, he utilized various strategies in his act. Therefore, the agent-purpose, agent-agency, and agent-act ratios will be discussed. Purpose-agency is the last ratio to be considered. In order to explain his overall purpose, Malcolm X used certain methodology; hence, the purpose-agency ratio will also be discussed.

Kenneth Burke explained the scene-act ratio succintly with the words: "The nature of the act should be analogously present in the scene. There is no act without a scene, and no analysis of a speech is complete until one has shown how the act functioned in the scene."[2] Shakespeare's play, Hamlet, furnishes an excellent example of the scene-act ratio. Horatio warned Hamlet not to follow the ghost with the words: "The very place puts toys of desperation without more motive, into every brain that looks so many fathoms to every sea, and hears its roar beneath." Horatio implied that the scene could prompt a man to commit a certain act,

suicide. In the Burkeian sense, he implied that the natural scene was sufficient motivation for such an act.[3]

A scene produces an act. It can be a certain climate, which triggers a rhetorical response. The ratio is reflected in the way the scene is reflected in the act. There are causal relationships between scene and act. The scene provides a particular orientation--it tends to generate problems because it can limit the range of acts by approving of some and disapproving of others. Thus an act can be an acceptance or rejection of the values of that scene. In Burkeian logic, the act contains ingredients of all the scenes in which it was enacted. Thus the scene not only controls the act to a certain extent, but often generates the problem for which the act is a solution. Thus we ask, "Is the scene a fit container for the act?"

The nature of Malcolm X's words on December 20, 1964 (his speech or act), was consistent with the scene, and very much a product of the scenic environment out of which it arose. There were concrete instances when the scene-act ratio became the dominating force of Malcolm X's rhetoric.

The first instance of the ratio to be described will be the influence the international scene had upon the act. Malcolm X's speech or act contained an international flavor throughout.

> But since Kenya became a republic last week, and Jomo Kenyatta ceased being the prime minister and became the president. . . .
> When the nations of Africa are truly independent and they will be truly independent because they're going about it in the right way. . .
> When I was in Africa, I noticed some of the Africans got their freedom faster than others.[4]

Malcolm X, during his last year, advocated thinking on an international scale. Hence, a scenic analysis of his speech included an examination of the African nations in their quest for freedom.[5] Malcolm X saw Africans gaining their independence faster than black Americans. Therefore, the international scene had a definite effect upon his act. It prompted him to encourage black Americans to become pro-African and anti-American, to reject the American system of values and adopt the African system, which might offer more opportunities for advancement, freedom, and equality.

To narrow the circumference of the scene to a national outlook, the rhetorical critic can examine the influence Civil Rights in the United States had upon Malcolm X's act. The ineffectiveness of passive resistors in the status quo of 1964, was an example of where the scene-act ratio became the dominating force. Malcolm X believed neutrality was no longer possible. He felt the black man should fight for his freedom, just as other white Americans had fought for theirs. The existence of inequality in the national scene specifically prompted Malcolm X to state:

> The language that you and I have been speaking to this man in the past hasn't reached him. . . .
> No, we don't deserve to be recognized as men as long as our women can be brutalized in the manner this woman described. . . .
> As long as you think we are going to sing up on some [freedom], you come in and sing. I was watching you, those of you who are singing--are you also willing to do some swinging?[6]

Another example of the scene-act ratio dominance on a national scale was the scenic element of racial descrimination in 1964. Had the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party candidates been seated in the democratic convention and the national congress, possibly Malcolm X would never have launched his verbal assault on the federal government and the democratic party. His assaults on the federal government and the democratic party were both symbolic, in the Burkeian sense, of Malcolm X's rejection of the status quo and its value system.

> Out of sixteen committees. . . ten are in the hands of Southern racists. . . and the reason they're in the hands of Southern racists is because in the areas from which they come, the black man is deprived of the right to vote. . . .
> All of these crackers--and that's what they are, crackers--they belong to the Democratic Party. . . . Why the base of the Democratic Party is in the South. . . Lyndon B. Johnson is the head of the Cracker Party.[7]

Narrowing the scene to specific instances of discrimination dealt to Mrs. Fannie Lou Hamer, one can understand

another instance where the scene-act ratio had an overwhelming influence. As explained in Chapter II, Mrs. Hamer, Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party leader, spoke before Malcolm X. Malcolm X referred time and again to Mrs. Hamer's address: "When I listen to Mrs. Hamer, a black woman--could be my mother, my sister, my daughter--describe what they had done to her in Mississippi. . . . The language they were speaking to Mrs. Hamer was the language of brutality." Her speech also motivated Malcolm X to say, "In Mississippi. . . we need a Mau Mau. In Alabama we need a Mau Mau."[8] Fannie Hamer's account of the suffering she had undergone, too, prompted Malcolm X to point out specifically the relationship between Mississippi and Harlem, "What happens in Mississippi and the South has a direct bearing on what happens to you and me in Harlem."[9] Mrs Hamer, as an element of the scene, had become for Malcolm X a symbol of the suffering the blacks had undergone in the United States, from the 1800's to the twentieth century. He referred to her many times, explaining to his people, that all she had asked for was to be treated as a "first-class citizen." Yet, as an American citizen, she was denied that right. By identifying with Mrs. Hamer, his audience would, therefore, reject the American system and its values because the system itself denied blacks the right to be equal.

Malcolm X narrowed the scenic influence even further when he alluded particularly to the place in which the M.F.D.P. rally was being held, the CME Church in Harlem, "I know I'm in this church, I probably shouldn't be talking like this." The next segment of Malcolm X's speech or act was influenced by its scene, the CME Church, with the words: "Jesus himself was ready to turn the synagogue inside out and upside down when things weren't going right." Malcolm X was again rejecting the values of the status quo with the words, "In the Book of Revelations, they've got Jesus sitting on a horse with a sword in his hand, getting ready to go into action. But they don't tell you and me about that Jesus."[10]

Another example of the scene-act ratio was Malcolm X's actual appearance in Harlem that night. Why was he in Harlem speaking on December 20, 1964? Malcolm X and his family were residing in a home owned by the Black Muslims on Long Island, New York. He was in Harlem constantly during the last months of his life. As his biographer, Alex Haley, stated:

> He [Malcolm X] could scarcely eat at his favorite Twenty Two Club or elsewhere in Harlem for the people who came up asking for appointments to discuss with him topics ranging from personal problems to his opinions on international issues. It seemed not in him to say 'No' to such requests.[11]

Therefore, it is not surprising that Malcolm X would have appeared at the CME Church in Harlem to deliver his act or speech on December 20, 1964.

The last instance of the scene-act ratio to be considered was Malcolm X's justification of the act within the scene. He explained to his audience why he chose his symbols:

> I might say secondly, some people wonder, well what has Mississippi got to do with Harlem? It isn't actually Mississippi, it's America. America is Mississippi. . . so what happens in Mississippi and the South has a direct bearing on what happens to you and me here in Harlem.[12]

Hence, one can see that the scene-act ratio was an important one. The words Malcolm X spoke, his act, grew out of the scene in which it was presented.

Kenneth Burke's scene-agent ratio was an integral part of Malcolm X's December 20, 1964 speech. Rueckert stated that the relationship between scene and agent is the relationship between man and his environment. Carlyle's Heroes and Hero Worship offers an excellent example of the scene-agent ratio: "These Arabs Mohammed was born among are certainly a notable people. Their country itself is notable; the fit container for such a race."[13]

Malcolm X, the agent, was a definite product of twentieth century America. Raymond Schroth explained the importance of Malcolm X's environment on his life, "Malcolm

X's hatred and resentments symbolized the dreadful stamp of the black ghetto. . . he is worthy to be remembered because the perpetuation of the ghetto which spawned him will not let us forget."[14]

Malcolm X's status as "the first black revolutionary"[15] indicates that scenic elements were present to allow a revolutionary to flourish and become, as explained in Chapter I, "the second most sought-after speaker on university and college campuses."

The very fact, too, that Malcolm X was a Black Muslim indicated that the Black Muslim sect was a growing populace in the United States.[16] Had the scene not been ripe in the Detroit ghettos for a man such a W. D. Fard, in the 1930's, the Black Muslim sect would never have gained momentum. Malcolm X, the agent, would never have joined the sect and possibly would not have attained national prominence and fame. Hence, the Burkeian scene-agent ratio can again be seen.

Another specific instance of the scene which influenced Malcolm X, the agent, was his split with the Muslims. When first silenced by Elijah Muhammed in November of 1963, Malcolm X did not know where to turn. His pilgrimage to Mecca, and his later trips to the Middle East and North Africa, were motivated by his split with the Black Muslims.[17] In all likelihood, the trips would never have been taken had Malcolm

X remained a member of the Black Muslims. The trips themselves and his simultaneous conversion to the Orthodox Islamic religion accounted, in part, for his radical change in philosophy.

His new philosophy, as explained in Chapter I, was centered around four basic creeds:

(1) He was not anti-white. He condemned the white man collectively for what he had done to the black man collectively.
(2) The black man needed to be concerned for the struggle for human rights. It was an international struggle. Thus, the black Americans should identify with the African culture.
(3) The black man should fight for freedom. The white power structure would not hand him freedom on a platter.
(4) He felt racism was a result of the capitalist society. Hence, he was pro-socialist and anti-capitalist.

The new philosophy itself was an essential extension of Burke's scene-agent ratio. The agent, Malcolm X, told of how important the scene was to him and the influence it had on his attitude toward white people. Before his trip to the Holy City of Mecca, Malcolm X often spoke of the hated "blue-eyed devil." In his Autobiography, Malcolm X said in the Holy Land he saw Muslims of all races unite as if with one purpose--to worship Allah. As he stated, "That morning while in the Holy City, I first began to reappraise the 'white man.'"[18]

Malcolm X's African travels, prompted by the scenic element, his split with the Black Muslims, also accounted for

changes in the agent, Malcolm X. His concern for independence became an international concern,

The third belief, that the black man should fight for freedom, has already been discussed in this chapter and was more a result of the scene-act ratio than the scene-agent ratio.

However, the fourth belief, was a definite extension of the scene-agent ratio. He became anti-capitalist as a result of his international travels. As explained in Chapter I, Malcolm X believed the rejection of capitalism would leave a vacuum that should be replaced by socialism. Malcolm X spoke of the importance of the scenic influence, his travels abroad:

> They say travel broadens your scope, and recently, I've had a lot of it in the Middle East and Africa. While I was traveling, I noticed that most of the countries have emerged into independence and turned away from the so-called capitalist system in the direction of socialism.[19]

There is further evidence of the significance of the scene-agent ratio to be discussed. Malcolm X's environment heavily influenced him to become the versatile hustler, "Big Red." His father's death, and Malcolm X's placement in a detention home and attendance at a junior high in Lansing, Michigan brought him into contact with his math teacher, Mr. Ostrowoski. Mr. Ostrowoski, an element of the scene surrounding Malcolm X at the time, was quizzing Malcolm X

as to what he aspired to be. Malcolm X's reply, "A lawyer," was answered with the words, "A lawyer. . . that's no realistic goal for a nigger." Malcolm X himself called this one of the major turning points in his life. Again, one can see the importance of the scene-agent ratio.

The third ratio of importance was the scene-agency ratio. Scene-agency indicates the dominance of the environment over Malcolm X's methodology. Malcolm X's overall strategy was one of suggestive unification in an attempt to achieve international unification so that freedom and equality could become realistic goals for American blacks.[20]

Malcolm X's desire for international unification was a definite instance of the scene-agency ratio. The situation or scene in Africa influenced Malcolm X to choose the words he selected. Had Malcolm X never yearned for international unification, he would never have linked Africa and America. He would never have sought identification of the American blacks with the African nations. ". . . but right here in New York City, you and I can best learn how to get real freedom by studying how Kenyatta brought it to his people in Kenya, and how Odinga helped him, and the excellent job done by the Mau Mau freedom fighters. In fact, that's what we need in Mississippi. . . ."[21]

Time and again, Malcolm X, as a result of the scene in Africa in 1964, strove to have the blacks and the whites

in his audience truly concerned for black freedom, unify with Africa; hence, the strategy of international oneness. "When I was in Africa, I noticed some of the Africans got their freedom faster than others. Some areas of the African continent became independent faster than other areas."[22]

Because of the scenic influences of discrimination and prejudice prevalent in the 1964 world, Malcolm X urgently felt the necessity for racial pride in the blacks. He believed racial unity to combat the scenic influence of discrimination would be the blacks' salvation. Hence, the scene dominated the agency again. Malcolm X chose the strategy of racial pride. His continual use of the word "black" instead of "negro" was aimed at group identification of the blacks and at isolation of the white racists.

Malcolm X also strove to identify with the black males' element of masculine self-respect. He believed scenic elements in the Civil Rights picture in 1964 had robbed them of this. Therefore, he selected the strategy of self respect and appealed to them in this manner: "No, we don't deserve to be recognized and respected as men as long as our women can be brutalized in this manner."[23]

Linked closely to his strategy of unification were his strategies of chastisement and provocation. Malcolm X spoke chidingly of those who sat around singing "We Shall Overcome." The scene-agency ratio dominated in this instance also.

Malcolm X also capitalized on the scenic element, Mrs. Hamer's speech. He referred to it many times in an attempt to chastise and provoke his audience into anger so that they would bring about a change. "No, we don't deserve to be recognized and respected as men as long as our women can be brutalized in this manner that has been described, and nothing being done about it, but we sit around singing, 'We Shall Overcome.'"[24] Malcolm X was rejecting the value system of the "We Shall Overcomers." He was chastising his audience for accepting passive resistors, telling them they had not overcome in the world of 1964 and were not about to do so. He then sought to provoke his audience into anger, for he contended that only through anger could the blacks replace the value system of the "We Shall Overcomers" with a value system that would furnish blacks unqualified freedom. Therefore, Malcolm X chose the strategies of chastisement and provocation to overcome the scenic elements of discrimination in 1964.

In order to accomplish his goals in the scene of 1964, Malcolm X chose his strategies or instruments of agency carefully in order to identify with the blacks and whites in his audience who were concerned about immediate freedom.

Agent-purpose is the next ratio of importance. Purpose was dominated by the agent on December 20, 1964, for the purpose of a speech designates what the speech is supposed to do. As explained earlier in this chapter, Malcolm X's

philosophy had undergone a drastic change prior to his last year. Therefore, his rhetorical purposes, too, would reflect the changes. Since he used rhetoric as a tool with which to build his movement, he utilized the chances given to him to speak before an audience and explain his philosophies.

Malcolm X's overall purpose of unification of blacks and whites was one which reflected the agent-purpose ratio. Heretofore, Malcolm X would never have appealed to the white segment of his audience in anything but a derogatory sense. However, as he stated, "They've always said I'm anti-white. I'm for anybody who's for freedom. I'm for anybody who's for justice. I'm for anybody who's for equality."[25]

Malcolm X, the agent, attempted to unify the blacks and whites on several levels. He appealed to both races on levels which were sub-purposes of his overall purpose of unification.

The first sub-purpose that reflected the agent's concern for black-white unification was an appeal to the American ideals of patriotism, equality, love of family, and religion.

The second sub-purpose, chastising acceptance of the status quo and provoking to anger, reflected the agent's belief during his last year that freedom was something the

black men would have to fight for in order to receive. Therefore, Malcolm X, the agent, chose to chastise his audience for accepting the passive neutrality of the status quo, ". . . and nothing being done about it [Mrs. Hamer's beating], but we sit around singing 'We Shall Overcome.'"[26]

Malcolm X's third sub-purpose of unification, furnishing blacks and whites with a common enemy, the federal government, also reflected the dominance of the agent-purpose ratio. Malcolm X, during his last year, had become very discontented with the federal government and blamed it for the blacks' plight. Hence, it would be appropriate that he would utilize the federal government as his scapegoat. The black man could agree with Malcolm X's words, "If we [the blacks] had the ballot in that area, those racists would not be in Washington, D.C."[27] The agent, Malcolm X thought the white man should feel guilty because of the dominance of the federal government over the blacks.

The next ratio that dominated on December 20, 1964, was agent-agency. As Rueckert explained, "The choice of symbols utilized depends solely on the agent. All the symbols glow with the secret identifications of the self [agent] which used them." Rueckert even went so far as to say, "The poet [speaker or actor] uses symbols as a rhetorical address to himself. It is a means through which the self persuades itself."[28]

Malcolm X, the agent, had a definite influence on his methodology. From his first speaking experiences in prison debates in 1948, when he patterned his speaking after the abrasive rhetoric of abolitionists such as Garrison, Malcolm X's speaking style began to evolve. In his Autobiography, Malcolm X spoke of his first public speaking attempts, "whichever side of the selected subject was assigned to me, I'd track down and study everything I could find on it. I'd put myself in my opponent's place and decide how I'd try to win if I had the other side; and then I'd figure a way to knock down those points."[29] With more experience, Malcolm X's rhetoric became more polished, smoother; it seemed to flow with more ease. However, he never abandoned his analytical debating approach to a speaking situation. He analyzed his audience and sought identification on their level, always conscious of using correct grammar if the occasion dictated it. He often adapted his style, grammar, and strategies for the aduience to which he was speaking. He used the vocabulary and rhythm best suited for communication.

The agent, Malcolm X, believed that international unification was of paramount importance. During his last year, he contended that black Americans should view their fight for freedom as an international struggle; and, therefore, the black men would not be the minority race. In order to

emphasize the importance of international unification, Malcolm X selected the overall strategy of suggestive unification.

Two of the suggestive unification sub-strategies that were extensions and outgrowths of the agent-agency ratio were the sub-strategies of "love of family" and "self-respect." Malcolm X had a poor family background. As discussed in Chapter III, his father was killed by white racists when Malcolm X was very young. The family was ripped apart and Malcolm X was sent to a home for young boys. As a result of his own background, Malcolm X became a devoted family man. Therefore, it is understandable that Malcolm X would utilize the strategy of love of family in an attempt for audience identification, "When I listen to Mrs. Hamer, a black woman--could be my mother, my sister, my daughter."[30]

The agent-agency ratio dominated in Malcolm X's use of the strategy of self-respect. Malcolm X was s self-made man, a former Muslim. As discussed earlier, the Muslims contended the black man's salvation lay in his ability to develop self-respect and restraint.[31] Therefore, it is understandable that the agent, Malcolm X, would have chosen the strategy of self-respect to appeal to his audience.

Malcolm X's use of the strategies of chastising the audience's acceptance of the status quo, provoking the

audience to anger, and justifying violence for the audience were all three instances of the agent-agency ratio dominance. One of the four basic creeds Malcolm X advocated during his last year was immediate and complete freedom for the blacks. He was eager for his goals to be realized. It is fitting that Malcolm X, the agent, would choose the three strategies trying to provoke them into immediate action. He realized his time was running out. He often told his biographer, Alex Haley, he would never live to see his Autobiography published. Time magazine characterized Malcolm X with the words, "He was most extreme in sheer impatience."[32]

An extension, too, of the agent-agency ratio was Malcolm X's strategic appeal to the extremist group, the black militants, in his audience. He felt, by identifying with their African heritage, the black militants could possibly serve as activists to spur the other blacks to immediate action. Hence, he chose such strategies as "international oneness" and "racial pride."

In order to accomplish his goals, the agent chose his strategies accordingly. His words were a product of the agent on December 20, 1964.

The agent-act ratio was significant. Rueckert contends that the "[act] springs from the very sources of the actor's being. All acts are related to the actor and are therefore charged with his being. . . [act] is 'charismatic.' It

glows with the secrets of the self which the. . . [actor] inevitably infuses into it."[33]

Rueckert further contends that a single representative act could be considered equal to the man himself. For example, if a man had a physical disease, one would see signs of it in the imagery and structure of the work. So it is with Malcolm X. His speech on December 20, 1964, was a biography of him, thus, the agent influenced the act.

For instance, Malcolm X's courteous introduction to his guests gives the rhetorical critic insight into Malcolm X's background and training in courtesy and self-respect as a Black Muslim. His multiple references to the African nations and their status as free states leads the rhetorical critic to investigate why Malcolm X made the pilgrimages to the Middle East and Africa. His simultaneous split with the Black Muslims leads the rhetorical critic to discover Malcolm X was discarding the values advocated by the Black Muslims and embracing another value system, which he advocated during his last year. The agent's reference to Mrs. Hamer "could be my mother, my sister, my daughter," is yet another instance of the agent-act ratio. The statement prompts the critic to discover what elements in Malcolm X's family background made him act or speak as he did.

The agent-act ratio is prominent also in Malcolm X's references to the federal government and the democratic

party. One discovers that Malcolm X blamed the federal government for much of the discrimination the blacks faced.

Malcolm X's references to Harlem throughout his speech, too, "so what happens in Mississippi and the South has a direct bearing on what happens to you and me here in Harlem,"[34] emphasize the significance of the agent-act ratio. The agent's background as a hustler in the Boston and New York ghettos furnished him with an avenue of audience identification Malcolm X constantly used. He continually reminded the audience that he, too, was familar with the vices of the Harlem streets.

The last ratio of importance was purpose-agency. Burke stated, "We cannot understand a poem's structure without understanding the function of that structure. To understand its function, we must understand its purpose."[35] Purpose and agency go hand-in-hand. Malcolm X's overall purpose was unification of both blacks and whites in his audience to achieve immediate freedom; his overall strategy was suggestive unification. Malcolm X's purpose of unification dominated his choice of strategies.

The dominance of the purpose-agency ratio can again be seen in Malcolm X's choice of the strategies of chastising, provocation, and justifying violence. He used all three strategies in an attempt to accomplish his purpose or goal of immediate freedom.

As illustrated in this chapter, seven ratios dominated on December 20, 1964, scene-act, scene-agent, scene-agency, agent-purpose, agent-agency, agent-act, and purpose-agency. One of the ratios, agent-agency, overshadowed the other six. This can be explained by the fact that Malcolm X, as a public speaker, was a drawing card. People often came to see him simply because of the charismatic quality he possessed when speaking before an audience. The charismatic aura surrounding the agent flavored his choice of strategies or the agency which he utilized on December 20, 1964. In the true Burkeian sense, the ratios overlapped. One part of the speech lead the reader to anticipate another part. The scene had a direct bearing on the act, agent, and agency. The agent influenced the purpose, agency, and act; and the purpose dominated the agency.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Kenneth Burke, Counter-Statement, Los Altos, California: Hermes Publications, 1953), p. 124.

[2]Kenneth Burke, A Grammar of Motives, (Berkley: University of California Press, 1969), pp. 3-7.

[3]William Howe Rueckert, Kenneth Burke and the Drama of Human Relations, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1963), p. 65.

[4]George Breitman, ed., Malcolm X Speaks (New York: Grove Press, Inc., 1966), pp. 105-114.

[5]See Chapter II, pp. 36-44.

[6]Breitman, Malcolm X Speaks, pp. 105-114.

[7]Ibid.

[8]Ibid.

[9]Ibid.

[10]Ibid.

[11]Alex Haley, ed., The Autobiography of Malcolm X (New York: Grove Press, Inc., 1966), p. 421.

[12]Breitman, Malcolm X Speaks, pp. 105-114.

[13]Burke, Grammar of Motives, p. 7.

[14]Raymond Schroth, "The Redemption of Malcolm X," The Catholic World, 205 (September, 1967), 346-353.

[15]Andrea Rich and Arthur L. Smith, Rhetoric of Revolution (Durham, N.C.: Moore Purlishing Co., 1968), p. 313.

[16]See Chapter II, pp. 61-65.

[17]Ibid.

[18]Haley, The Autobiography of Malcolm X, p. 335.

[19]William Worthy, "Malcolm X Says Group Will Stress Politics," National Guardian, 27 (1964), p. 20.

[20]See Chapter IV, pp. 142-143.

[21]Breitman, Malcolm X Speaks, pp. 105-114.

[22]Ibid.

[23]Ibid., p. 110.

[24]Ibid., p. 112.

[25]Ibid.

[26]Ibid.

[27]Ibid., p. 111.

[28]Rueckert, Kenneth Burke and the Drama of Human Relations, p. 70.

[29]Haley, The Autobiography of Malcolm X, p. 184.

[30]Breitman, Malcolm X Speaks, p. 108.

[31]See Chapter II, pp. 61-65.

[32]"Malcolm X," Time, 125 (March 8, 1964), 36.

[33]Rueckert, Kenneth Burke and the Drama of Human Relations, p. 69.

[34]Breitman, Malcolm X Speaks, p. 107.

[35]Kenneth Burke, The Philosophy of Literary Form, Studies in Symbolic Action, (Louisiana: Louisiana State University Press, 1941), p. 286.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS

The aim of Burkeian criticism is to "rechart human experience out of its wasteland to a better way of life."[1] Burkeian criticism sees man as an actor acting out (through human conduct and actions) his life with a purpose in view. Burke's mode for rhetorical criticism has become known as the dramatistic pentad. An analysis of the five parts of the pentad, act, scene, agent, agency, and purpose, has been made to obtain a better picture of Malcolm X.

This analysis does not imply that Malcolm X understood Kenneth Burke's dramatistic pentad. Rather, the author of the current study has applied Burkeian methodology to Malcolm X's December 20, 1964 speech.

When Malcolm X was assassinated on February 21, 1965, the world and the press remembered, and to an extent, still remembers him, as the "hate-whitey Black Muslim." Yet the agent, Malcolm X, was not a Black Muslim and had not been since March 8, 1964. After his expulsion from the sect, the agent began to re-evaluate his basic beliefs. Refusing to completely denounce his faith in the Nation of Islam, he journeyed to the Holy Land to investigate the differences

in the Black Muslims and the Moslems. What he saw was, for him, an almost incredible bond of brotherhood between Moslems of all creeds and colors. He was treated as an equal by all the races which he encountered. His inner turmoil was quieted. He replaced his "hate-whitey" doctrine, advocated by the Black Muslims, with a more humanitarian belief in the equality of all people.

Known heretofore as being anti-white, Malcolm X, the agent, shifted his emphasis from a "black-white clash" to an emphasis on equality for all. The shift in emphasis was significant for Malcolm X because, prior to his final year, his attitude had isolated many whites from anything he had to say. Instead of viewing the world as black or white, he began to strive toward a constructive goal, equality; a goal which blacks, and even whites, could identify with and fight for. He was no longer an element to be feared by whites, particularly young students, but a symbol of idealistic emancipation for all people.

Malcolm X, during the last phase, became concerned for international freedom. While traveling abroad to the Holy Land, Malcolm X also visited Africa. Here he saw the black man in power; the black man ruled his own people. Malcolm X began to re-evaluate his former beliefs as a Black Muslim again. The Black Muslims were concerned only with the United States with its bigotry and prejudice running rampant.

He began to consider any man who was not white as a member of one huge race, whether the man was black, Mexican, Chinese, or a member of any other ethnic minority. Therefore, Malcolm X saw the black man in the United States as a member of the majority race, with the white man in the minority. International freedom, hence, became his goal instead of national freedom. Thus, Malcolm X stressed an identity with the African nations. He used the black men in Africa who had obtained their freedom as examples which the black men in America could strive to emulate. Time and again, he stressed Kenya's success in winning their freedom in his speech on December 20, 1964.

Closely linked to his belief that freedom should be an international concern were his beliefs that the black man should fight for freedom and that racism was a by-product of the capitalist society. As a Black Muslim, he had advocated a very vague philosophy of "violence should be met with violence." However, during his last year, the right to fight for freedom became more concrete, more specific. He became impatient for action.

After the split with the Black Muslims, an element of the broad scene, Malcolm X also became "anti-capitalist." The Black Muslims were seeking freedom within the framework of democracy; Malcolm X was turning away from democracy and toward socialism.

Chosen because it was typical of the speeches delivered by Malcolm X during his last phase, the speech on December 20, 1964, embodied his shift in beliefs. Malcolm X utilized every speaking opportunity offered to him during his last year to explain to blacks and interested whites his radical change of philosophy. He used language as a symbolic means of reacting to the situation or scene in 1964 as a means of solving the racial problems in America. This is important because, although Malcolm X is often associated with violence by the public, everything he did was rhetorical.

Hence, the language strategies or agencies Malcolm X chose on December 20, 1964, were extremely significant since it was his reaction to the scene of 1964. Burke himself would view Chapter IV of the current study as the most important; for by selecting certain rhetorical strategies, Malcolm X was seeking identification with his audience through shared ideas and attitudes, which made him consubstantial or "one" with his audience. He urged his audience, both blacks and whites, to identify with the African culture. Of all his strategies, he placed most emphasis on this one. Time and again he alluded to Jomo Kenyatta, Lumumba, and Oginga Odinga as a means of explaining to his audience, "These are black men who've been successful in attaining complete unqualified freedom. They are Africans.

Therefore, we, by following their examples, may also become free." He wanted his audience to reject the value system in the United States. It offered them nothing. He told them repeatedly, "Look toward Africa. Be like her. Therein lies your key to freedom."

Malcolm X used the scenic element of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party to prove his point. He often used this particular strategy during his last phase. He would point toward a flaw in the capitalist system, examine it, and destroy it before his audience's eyes. Yet he did it so subtly that his audience never quite realized what he was doing. His strategies of chastisement, provocation, justification, and scapegoat exemplify this.

There was definite racial strife in the scene of 1964. Malcolm X did not have to search long to describe and explain this for his audience. He chastised them for allowing the Democratic Party to deny them the right to vote and for not seating the M.F.D.P. members at the Democratic Convention in 1964. He provoked them into anger by recalling incidents of discrimination dealt to blacks. He justified violence directed toward the white power structure by belittling the power structure in his audience's eyes on the basis of their middle-class morality and his continuous use of the word "cracker." He, too, used the racial strife in the scene of 1964 to justify any anger

directed toward the scapegoat which he furnished them, the federal government. All of these Malcolm X used as identifying strategies, seeking consubstantiality with his audience, by symbolically expressing the audience's rage and anger for them.

Malcolm X was a measured public speaker. Using Burkeian terminology to describe him, he "chose his words carefully." He was impatient, yet realized through experience, that patience had to be utilized in a mass appeal. He carried his audience step-by-step to his seemingly logical conclusion. Often, however, his reasoning was not necessarily logical. The most outstanding example of his failure to employ logic was his parallel between Africans and black Americans. He seemed to believe they had the same goals, feelings, and aspirations. The fallacy here is that, although both faced discrimination, it was on an entirely different plane. Many Africans had never been free, whereas black and white Americans were, theoretically, free at birth. Furthermore, Africans faced divided loyalties such as to family, tribe, and government. American blacks, on the other hand, were socialized differently. They were born into a nation with relative governmental stability. The list of differences in Burkeian properties, both physical and intellectual, between the black Americans and Africans is endless. Yet Malcolm X never once mentioned any

of this to his audience. It is doubtful that Malcolm X was actually advocating a full-fledged Mau Mau rebellion in the United States. His words, "What we need is a Mau Mau," were symbolically expressing the need for a change in the United States.

Another characteristic the agent, Malcolm X, possessed was courage. He was not afraid to die. He had a message to convey to the world and he felt it far outweighed the possibility of injuries he might suffer because of it. He was still very bitter about racism. He could not forget the prejudice he had been subjected to as a small child. Malcolm X perceived himself as a liberator of his people, the shining knight on a black horse ready to combat any forces that might stand between his people and freedom. Being very knowledgeable, practical, and sensible, Malcolm X expected his audience to accept his word as fact. He felt he knew the racial situation as well as any man could.

The overall purpose of Malcolm X's rhetoric, and the overall purpose of his life, during the last phase, was to unify all blacks and whites who were willing to seek immediate, unqualified freedom for all.

The ratio analyses revealed that the agent was the most important and influencing part of the dramatistic pentad. A product of twentieth century America, Malcolm X, the agent, felt he could change the scene. He used his purpose and

agencies within his acts or speeches to influence and attempt to change the scene in which he had been placed.

Since rhetoric reveals a man's motives and way of viewing the scene and his audience, a rhetorical study such as the one that has been conducted, has revealed that Malcolm X, during his last phase, had an entirely different role in the world of 1964 compared to his role in previous years as the "trouble shooter of the Black Muslims." As a Black Muslim, there had been no doubt about his convictions; for twelve years he voiced them loud and long. However, during the last year of his life, Malcolm X emerged on the Civil Rights scene as a dynamic force speaking for immediate freedom. No longer anti-white, he urged all blacks to unite regardless of religion, to turn their eyes toward their brothers, the Africans. Simultaneously, Malcolm X shunned the capitalist system and embraced socialism.

His speech on December 20, 1964, also revealed Malcolm X to be unsure of the exact number of followers he had among blacks or whites. Before his expulsion from the Black Muslims, he believed himself to be "the only man in America capable of starting or stopping a race riot."[2] Now, however, his newly-formed Organization for Afro-American Unity had yet to gain the momentum and force the Black Muslims had experienced under Malcolm X's guidance. His speech was an effort to solidify his black following. It, too, embodied

an appeal to vindicate himself toward the white man, explaining that he was no longer anti-white. Malcolm X was concerned about the image the whites in his audience had of him.

The speech also revealed the almost paranoid attitude Malcolm X had toward other Civil Rights leaders and their methodologies. He rejected this passiveness conclusively, not willing to admit they, too, might be doing some good. Coupled with this is the fact that Malcolm X was intolerant, to an extent, of other religions, particularly the Christian religion, that pictured peaceful co-existence between the blacks and whites as a reality.

Indeed Malcolm X's image was changing in 1964. All of his speeches delivered during that last phase embodied his newly-formed philosophy toward Civil Rights. His speeches were attempts toward "image-clarification." There can be little doubt that Malcolm X would have been an even more positive and dynamic force in the Civil Rights scene had he not been assassinated on February 21, 1965.

FOOTNOTES

[1]William Howe Rueckert, Kenneth Burke and the Drama of Human Relations, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1963), p. 43.

[2]Alex Haley, ed., The Autobiography of Malcolm X (New York: Grove Press, Inc., 1966), p. 312.

APPENDIX

Text of Malcolm X's Speech
Delivered December 20, 1964

Reverend [Joseph] Coles [Jr.], Mrs. Hamer, honored guests, brothers and sisters, friends and enemies; also ABC and CBS and FBI and CIA:

I couldn't help but be very impressed at the outstart when the Freedom Singers were singing the song "Oginga Odinga" because Oginga Odinga is one of the foremost freedom fighters on the African continent. At the time he visited in Atlanta, Georgia, I think he was then the minister of home affairs in Kenya. But since Kenya became a republic last week, and Jomo Kenyatta ceased being the prime minister and became the president, the same person you are singing about, Oginga Odinga, is now Kenyatta's vice president. He's the number-two man in the Kenya government.

The fact that you would be singing about him, to me is quite significant. Two or three years ago, this wouldn't have been done. Two or three years ago, most of our people would choose to sing about someone who was, you know, passive and meek and humble and forgiving. Oginga Odinga is not passive. He's not meek. He's not humble. He's not nonviolent. But he's free.

Oginga Odinga is vice president under Jomo Kenyatta, and Jomo Kenyatta was considered to be the organizer of the Mau Mau; I think you mentioned the Mau Mau in that song.

And if you analyze closely those words, I think you'll have the key to how to straighten the situation out in Mississippi. When the nations of Africa are truly independent--and they will be truly independent because they're going about it in the right way--the historians will give Prime Minister, or rather, President Kenyatta and the Mau Mau their rightful role in African history. They'll go down as the greatest African patriots and freedom fighters that that continent ever knew, and they will be given credit for bringing about the independence of many of the existing independent states on that continent right now. There was a time when their image was negative, but today they're looked upon with respect and their chief is the president and their next chief is the vice president.

I have to take time to mention that because, in my opinion, not only in Mississippi and Alabama, but right here in New York City, you and I can best learn how to get real freedom by studying how Kenyatta brought it to his people in Kenya, and how Odinga helped him, and the excellent job that was done by the Mau Mua freedom fighters. In fact, that's what we need in Mississippi. In Mississippi we need a Mau Mau. In Alabama we need a Mau Mau. In Georgia we need a Mau Mau. Right here in Harlem, in New York City, we need a Mau Mau.

I say it with no anger; I say it with very careful forethought. The language that you and I have been speaking

to this man in the past hasn't reached him. And you can never really get your point across to a person until you learn how to communicate with him. If he speaks French, you can't speak German. You have to know what language he speaks and then speak to him in that language.

When I listen to Mrs. Hamer, a black woman--could be my mother, my sister, my daughter--describe what they had done to her in Mississippi, I ask myself how in the world can we ever expect to be respected as men when we will allow something like that to be done to our women, and we do nothing about it? How can you and I be looked upon as men with black women being beaten and nothing being done about it, black children and black babies being beaten and nothing being done about it, but we sit around singing "We Shall Overcome."

We need a Mau Mau. If they don't want to deal with the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party, then we'll give them something else to deal with. If they don't want to deal with the Student Nonviolent Committee, then we have to give them an alternative. Never stick someone out there without an alternative. [Or] we waste our time. Give them this or give them that. Give them the choice between this or that.

When I was in Africa, I noticed some of the Africans got their freedom faster than others. Some areas of the

African continent became independent faster than other areas. I noticed that in the areas where independence had been gotten, someone got angry. And in the areas where independence had not been achieved yet, no one was angry. They were sad--they'd sit around and talk about their plight, but they weren't mad. And usually, when people are sad, they don't do anything. They just cry over their condition.

But when they get angry, they bring about a change. When they get angry, they aren't interested in logic, they aren't interested in odds, they aren't interested in consequences. When they get angry, they realize the condition that they're in--that their suffering is unjust, immoral, illegal, and that anything they do is to correct it or eliminate it, they're justified. When you and I develop that type of anger and speak in that voice, then we'll get some kind of respect and recognition and some changes from these people who have been promising us falsely already for far too long.

So you have to speak their language. The language that they were speaking to Mrs. Hamer was the language of brutality. Beasts, they were, beating her--the two Negroes, they weren't at fault. They were just puppets. You don't blame the puppet, you blame the puppeteer. They were just carrying out someone else's orders. They were under someone else's jurisdiction. They weren't at fault; in a way

they were, but I still won't blame them. I put the blame on that man who gave the orders. And when you and I begin to look at him and see the language he speaks, the language of a brute, the language of someone who has no sense of morality, who absolutely ignores law--when you and I learn how to speak his language, then we can communicate. But we will never communicate talking one language while he's talking another language. He's talking the language of violence while you and I are running around with this little chicken-picking type of language--and think that he's going to understand.

Let's learn his language. If his language is with a shotgun, get a shotgun. Yes, I said if he only understands the language of a rifle, get a rifle. If he only understands the language of a rope, get a rope. But don't waste time talking the wrong language to a man if you want to really communicate with him. Speak his language--there's nothing wrong with that. If something was wrong with that language, the federal government would have stopped the cracker from speaking it to you and me.

I might say, secondly, some people wonder, well, what has Mississippi got to do with Harlem? It isn't actually Mississippi; it's America. America is Mississippi. There's no such thing as a Mason-Dixon line--it's America. There's no such thing as the South--it's America. If one room in

your home is dirty, you've got a dirty house. If the closet is dirty, you've got a dirty house. Don't say that that room is dirty but the rest of my house is clean. You're over the whole house. You have authority over the whole house; the entire house is under your jurisdiction. And the mistake that you and I make is letting these Northern crackers shift the weight to the Southern crackers.

The senator from Mississippi is over the Judiciary Committee. He's in Washington, D.C., as Mrs. Hamer has pointed out, illegally. Every senator from a state where our people are deprived of the right to vote--they're in Washington, D.C., illegally. This country is a country whose governmental system is run by committees--House committees and Senate committees. The committee chairman occupies that position by dint of his seniority. Eastland is over the Judiciary Committee because he has more seniority than any other senator after the same post or on that committee; he's the chairman. Fulbright, another cracker, from Arakansas, is over the Foreign Relations Committee. Ellender, of Louisiana, is over the Agriculture and Forestry Committee. Russell, of Georgia, is over the Armed Services Committee.

And it goes right on down the line. Out of sixteen committees, ten of them are in the hands of Southern racists. Out of twenty congressional committees, thirteen are in the hands, or at least they were before the recent elections, in

the hands of Southern racists. Out of forty-six committees that govern the foreign and domestic direction of this country, twenty-three are in the hands of Southern racists. And the reason they're in the hands of Southern racists is because in the areas from which they come, the black man is deprived of his right to vote. If we had the ballot in that area, those racists would not be in Washington, D.C. There'd be some black faces there, there'd be some brown and some yellow and some red faces there. There'd be some faces other than those cracker faces that are there right now.

So what happens in Mississippi and the South has a direct bearing on what happens to you and me here in Harlem. Likewise, the Democratic Party, which black people supported recently, I think, something like 97 percent. All of these crackers--and that's what they are, crackers--they belong to the Democratic Party. That's the party they belong to--the same one you belong to, the same one you support, the same one you say is going to get you this and get you that. Why, the base of the Democratic Party is in the South. The foundation of its authority is in the South. The head of the Democratic Party is sitting in the White House. He could have gotten Mrs. Hamer into Atlantic City. He could have opened up his mouth and had her seated. Hubert Humphrey could have opened his mouth and had her seated. Wagner, the mayor right here, could have opened up his mouth

and used his weight and had her seated. Don't be talking about some crackers down in Mississippi and Alabama and Georgia--all of them are playing the same game. Lyndon B. Johnson is the head of the Cracker Party.

Now, I don't want to be stepping on toes or saying things that you didn't think I was going to say, but don't ever, ever call me up here to talk about Mississippi. It's controlled from the North. Alabama is controlled from the North. These Northern crackers are in cahoots with the Southern crackers, only these Northern crackers smile in your face and show you their teeth and they stick the knife in your back when you turn around. You at least know what that man down there is doing and you know how to deal with him.

So all I say is this, this is all I say: when you start talking about one, talk about the others. When you start worrying about the part or the piece, worry about the whole. And if this piece is no good, the entire pie is no good, because it all comes out of the same plate. It's made up out of the same ingredients. Wagner is a Democrat. He belongs to the same party as Eastland. Johnson is a Democrat. He belongs to the same party as Eastland. Wagner was in Atlantic City, Ray Jones was in Atlantic City, Lyndon B. Johnson was in Atlantic City, Hubert Humphrey was in Atlantic City--the crackers that you voted for were in Atlantic City.

What did they do for you when you wanted to sit down? They were quiet. They were silent. They said, "Don't rock the boat, you might get Goldwater elected. . . ."

I have this bit of suggestion. Find out what Wagner is going to do in behalf of this resolution, that you're trying to get through, before January 4. Find out in advance where does he stand on these Mississippi congressmen who are illegally coming up from the South to represent Democrats. Find out where the mayor of this city stands and make him come out on the record without dilly-dallying and without compromise. Find out where his friends stand on seating the Mississippians who are coming forth illegally. Find out where Ray Jones, who is one of the most powerful black Democrats in this city--find out where he stands. Before January 4. You can't talk about Rockefeller because he's Republican. Although he's in the same boat right along with the rest of them.

So I say, in my conclusion, as Mrs. Hamer pointed out, the brothers and sisters in Mississippi are being beaten and killed for no reason other than they want to be treated as first-class citizens. There's only one way to be a first-class citizen. There's only one way to be independent. There's only one way to be free. It's not something that someone gives to you. It's something that you take. Nobody can give you independence. Nobody can give you freedom.

Nobody can give you equality or justice or anything. If you're a man, you take it. If you can't take it, you don't deserve it. Nobody can give it to you. So if you and I want freedom, if we want independence, if we want respect, if we want recognition, we obey the law, we are peaceful but at the same time, at any moment that you and I are involved in any kind of action that is legal, that is in accord with our civil rights, in accord with the courts of this land, in accord with the Constitution--when all of these things are on our side, and we still can't get it, it's because we aren't on our own side.

We don't yet realize the real price necessary to pay to see that these things are enforced where we're concerned. And until we realize this, they won't be enforced where we're concerned. We have to let the people in Mississippi as well as in Mississippi, New York, and elsewhere know that freedom comes to us either by ballots or by bullets. That's the only way freedom is gotten. Freedom is gotten by ballots or bullets. These are the only two avenues, the only two roads, the only two methods, the only two means--either ballots or bullets. And when you know that, then you are careful how you use the word <u>freedom</u>. As long as you think we are going to sing up on some, you come in and sing. I watch you, those of you who are singing--are you also willing to do some swinging?

They've always said that I'm anti-white. I'm for anybody who's for freedom. I'm for anybody who's for justice. I'm for anybody who's for equality. I'm not for anybody who tells me to sit around and wait for mine. I'm not for anybody who tells me to turn the other cheek when a cracker is busting my jaw. I'm not for anybody who tells black people to be nonviolent while nobody is telling white people to be nonviolent. I know I'm in this church, I probably shouldn't be talking like this--but Jesus himself was ready to turn the synagogue inside out and upside down when things weren't going right. In fact, in the Book of Revelations, they've got Jesus sitting on a horse with a sword in his hand, getting ready to go into action. But they don't tell you or me about that Jesus. They only tell you and me about that peaceful Jesus. They never let you get down to the end of the book. They keep you up there where everything is, you know, nonviolent. No, go and read the whole book, and when you get to Revelations, you'll find that even Jesus' patience ran out. And when his patience ran out, he got the whole situation straightened out. He picked up the sword.

I believe that there are some white people who might be sincere. But I think they should prove it. And you can't prove it to me by singing with me. You can't prove it to me by being nonviolent. No, you can prove it by recognizing

the law of justice. And the law of justice is "he who kills by the sword shall be killed by the sword." This is justice. Now if you are with us, all I say is, make the same kind of contribution with us in our struggle for freedom that all white people have always made when they were struggling for their own freedom. You were struggling for your freedom in the Revolutionary War. Your own Patrick Henry said "liberty or death," and George Washington got the cannons out, and all the rest of them that you taught me to worship as my heroes, they were fighters, they were warriors.

But now when the time comes for our freedom you want to reach back in the bag and grab somebody who's nonviolent and peaceful and forgiving and long-suffering. I don't go for that--no, I say that a black man's freedom is as valuable as a white man's freedom. And I say that a black man has the right to do whatever is necessary to get his freedom that other human beings have done to get their freedom. I say that you and I will never get our freedom nonviolently and patiently and lovingly. We will never get it until we let the world know that as other human beings have laid down their lives for freedom--and also taken life for freedom--that you and I are ready and willing and equipped and qualified to do the same thing.

It's a shame that Mrs. Hamer came out here this afternoon where there are so few people. It's a shame. All of

our people in Harlem should have heard her describe what they did to her down there. Because I think the people in Harlem are more capable of evening the score than people are anywhere else in this country. Yes, they are, and they need to hear her story. They need to know more, first hand, about what's happening down there, especially to our women. And then they need some lessons in tactics and strategy on how to get even. I, for one, will make the first contribution to any fund that's raised for the purpose of evening the score. Whenever someone commits murder, what do you do? You put out a "reward, wanted--dead or alive" for the murderer. Yes, learn how to do it. We've had three people murdered. No reward has been put on the head of the murderer. Don't just put a reward--put "dead or alive," and let that Klan know that we can do it tit for tat, tit for tat. What's good for the goose is good for the gander.

And if you all don't want to do it, we'll do it. We'll do it. We have brothers who are equipped, and who are qualified, and who are willing to--As Jesus said, "Little children, go thee where I send thee." We have brothers who can do that, and who will do that, and who are ready to do that. And I say that if the government of the United States cannot bring to justice people who murder Negroes, or people who murder those who are at the forefront fighting in behalf

of the Negroes, then it's time for you and me to retire quietly to our closets and devise means and methods of seeing that justice is executed against murderers where justice has not been forthcoming in the past.

I say in my conclusion that if you and I here in Harlem, who form the habit oftimes of fighting each other, who sneak around trying to wait for an opportunity to throw some acid or some lye on each other, or sprinkle dust on each other's doorsteps--if you and I were really and truly for the freedom of our people, we wouldn't waste all of that energy thinking how to do harm to each other. Since you have that ingenuity, if you know how to do it, let me know; I'll give you some money and show you where to go, and show you who to do it to. And then, you'll go down in history as having done an honorable thing.

So, Mrs. Hamer, we have another rally up at the Audubon tonight, at eight o'clock, where there'll be a lot of black people. I myself would like to have you tell them what you told us here this afternoon, so you are welcome to be my guest tonight if you will, at the Audubon. And those singers who sing about Oginga Odinga, if you haven't got anything else to do, you need to come up in Harlem and let some people hear you singing about Oginga Odinga and Kenyatta and Lumumba, and the next time you come to Harlem, you'll have a crowd out here. Thank you.