

REPRESENTATIVE BARBARA JORDAN
AN ANALYSIS OF HER PERSUASIVE SPEAKING SKILLS IN
SELECTED DELIBERATIVE AND EPIDEICTIC SPEECHES

by

OLIVE REED SCHAFER

B. S., Fort Hays State College, 1936

A MASTER'S REPORT

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Speech

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1976

Approved by:

Norman D. Buntan

LD
2665
R4
1976
533
6.2
Document

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
LETTER FROM BARBARA JORDAN	iv
LETTER FROM KEITH SEBELIUS	v
Chapter	
I. STATEMENT OF THE PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT	1
II. BIOGRAPHY OF BARBARA CHARLINE JORDAN	4
III. BARBARA JORDAN COMMENTS UPON HERSELF — OTHERS COMMENT ON HER — REFLECTIONS OF JORDAN'S ETHOS	9
IV. RHETORICAL ANALYSIS OF TWO OF JORDAN'S DELIBERATIVE SPEECHES .	16
V. ANALYSIS OF SELECTED EPIDEICTIC SPEECHES	35
VI. CONCLUSION	41
APPENDIX	43
A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	60

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer gratefully acknowledges the untiring assistance and very helpful ideas of Dr. Norma D. Bunton who, despite an automobile accident in which she suffered serious injuries, has given unstintingly of her time and energy in the fulfillment of her academic duties.

Gratitude is also expressed to the other members of my committee:
Dr. William Burke, Dr. Wallace Dace, Dr. Norman Fedder and Dr. Harold Nichols.

BARBARA JORDAN
18th District, Texas

1534 Longworth
House Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20515
Telephone: (202)225-3816

COMMITTEES:

JUDICIARY
GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS
DEMOCRATIC STEERING
AND POLICY

Federal Building
515 Rusk
Houston, Texas 77002
Telephone: (713)226-5724

5303 Lyons, 2D Floor
Houston, Texas 77020
Telephone: (713)674-8465

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Washington, D.C. 20515

February 26, 1976

Mrs. Olive Schafer
409 North Hersey
Beloit, Kansas 67420

Dear Mrs. Schafer:

This will acknowledge and thank you for your recent letter regarding your graduate studies.

Enclosed please find a brief biographical sketch and a list of articles where additional information can be found concerning my life and career. Also enclosed are copies of remarks I made on various issues. I hope this information proves helpful.

With every good wish, I am

Sincerely,

BARBARA JORDAN
Member of Congress

BJ/ect

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Washington, D.C. 20515

February 12, 1976

Olive Schafer
409 N. Hersey
Beloit, Kansas 67420

Dear Mrs. Schafer:

Just a note to enclose the information you
requested regarding Congresswoman Jordan and
Judiciary Committee Report on Impeachment.

If I can be of service in the future,
please let me know.

With every best wish,

Sincerely yours,

Keith G. Sebelius

KGS:nr

CHAPTER I

STATEMENT OF THE PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT

For many years there has been a dearth of analytical and critical consideration of non-fictional prose, particularly that of the persuasive type. Spoken rhetoric has worked its powerful ways with very little methodological analysis. Criticism of speeches is very old in that Plato, Cicero, Quintilian and other scholars practiced it. It is young in that little recent systematic effort has been made to formulate a working doctrine for careful evaluation.

In the last decades a group of scholars in speech have produced a mere handful of substantial contributions. Among these contributions is Carroll C. Arnold's book Criticism of Oral Rhetoric, published by Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, in which texts and analyses of speeches by John Kennedy and Spiro Agnew among others are printed. A. Craig Baird's book, American Public Address was published by McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., in 1956.

It is true that criticisms of editors or columnists are available in newspapers or popular weekly magazines, but seldom is the entire speech evaluated in an unbiased and meaningful manner. Now is a time to know what a speech did or continues to do. We have passed from the time that printed material has set the standards for general communication to one in which aural and visual dimensions of rhetoric have become more important than at any time since the Greco-Roman period. Arnold stresses that now there is a growing need for careful and painstaking oratory. Lawrence W. Rosenfield in his The Anatomy of Critical Discourse defends this position also. This change is the

result of the new media and the complex changes in the social pattern of modern living. The ease of transportation has played an important part in the development. Face to face communication has become more common in academic, scientific, diplomatic, business and other phases of life.

The world of practical affairs is a fertile field in which rhetorical criticism could prosper. Criticism bridges the gap between external stimulus and internal compulsion to belief and action.

In an effort to bring together the age-old principles of rhetoric with modern practices, the author chose Barbara Jordan, United States Representative of the 18th District of Texas as a representative example of a practicing rhetorician.

Jordan is in the public eye constantly, and it is quite possible to collect pertinent primary materials from which to work. Just now, many current publications contain articles with Jordan as the topic. She is alert to the needs and desires of mankind as is evidenced by her frequent inclusions in the Congressional Record. She has been very cooperative in this effort, having answered the author's communications personally. She has sent materials from her offices and continues to do so.

The purpose of this report is to show that by using certain persuasive skills, Barbara Jordan demonstrates that effective oral rhetoric is "alive and well" at least in her career. The report is divided in chapters, some of which may include sub-sections.

The first chapter is a biography of Jordan. The second chapter presents a discussion of Jordan's view of her own character and cites the assessment of other public figures of her character.

The third chapter presents an analysis of selected deliberative speeches, the first of which is "The Testimony of Barbara Jordan before the House Judi-

ciary Committee," July 25, 1974. This speech was included in the book published at the time of the Nixon investigations and includes the complete text of all the proceedings of the Judiciary Committee. An outline of this speech and a rhetorical analysis with emphasis on style and persuasive skills are included. Also, there is an analysis of a superb address before the Democratic convention in Kansas City which was included in the Congressional Record of December 11, 1974, at the request of the Honorable Wm. Jennings Bryan Dorn of South Carolina.

In the fourth chapter Jordan's humanity, her character or ethos, in selected Epideictic speeches is analyzed. There is an inclusion from the Congressional Record of Jordan's tribute to Justice William O. Douglas on the occasion of his retirement November 19, 1975. This section closes with an analysis of a memorial address to an Oriental family that was killed in an airplane accident. The writer points to the different purpose of and the different rhetorical aspects of these last two as contrasted with those represented in the deliberative-political speeches.

The author's desire is that through this limited analysis there will be a challenge to readers to engage in expressive and apt rhetoric and particularly to recognize and appreciate the rhetorical efforts of others which complement further, traditional rhetoric.

CHAPTER II

BIOGRAPHY¹ OF BARBARA CHARLINE JORDAN

Barbara Jordan was born on February 21, 1936, in Houston, Texas, the youngest daughter of Benjamin M. and Arlyne Jordan. Her father, a Baptist minister, supplemented his income by working as a warehouse clerk. She attended Houston public schools. Her father, a strict disciplinarian, reprimanded Barbara whenever she deviated from her straight "A" average, and she set equally high standards for herself. After hearing an address by Edith Sampson, a black lawyer from Chicago, during high school days, Barbara decided she wanted to be a lawyer.

When Jordan graduated from Phyllis Wheatley High School in 1952, she was ranked in the top five percent of her class. She enrolled at Texas Southern University, an all black college in Houston, where she majored in political science and history, and ran unsuccessfully for president of the freshman class. A spellbinding orator, she led the debating team of Texas Southern to a series of championships. In 1956 she obtained her B. A. degree, magna cum laude. She earned an LL.B. degree at Boston University in 1959 and later that year was admitted to the bar in both Massachusetts and Texas.

Returning to Houston, Jordan moved in with her parents and began to practice general civil law, with the dining room table as her desk. Three years later, she managed to scrape enough money together to open an office of her own. She still maintains a red-carpeted, panelled, air-conditioned office

¹Current Biography "Vol. 1974," pp. 189-192.

above a print shop at the same address, 5302 Lyons Avenue. The address of her Washington office is Room 1725, Longworth House Office Building. In addition to engaging in private practice, she worked as an administrative assistant to a county judge in Harris County, Texas.

Convinced of the effectiveness of legitimate political change, she became active in the county's Democratic party organization. During the 1960 presidential campaign, she directed Houston's first black "One person-per-block" precinct drive to secure support for Democratic nominee John F. Kennedy and his running mate, Lyndon B. Johnson.

Jordan first ran for public office in 1962. In a losing bid for a seat in the Texas House of Representatives, she gathered a respectable 46,000 votes and, undaunted, ran for the same seat in 1964. Defeated for the second time she turned her attention to the Texas senate and in 1966 defeated former state representative J. C. Whitfield, a white liberal, to become the first black woman elected to the state senate. She ran unopposed in 1968 and was reelected to a four year term.

As a state legislator Jordan saw about half of the bills she submitted for consideration enacted into law. Among the legislation credited to her efforts were a law establishing the Texas Fair Employment Practices Commission, an improved workmen's compensation act, and the state's first minimum wage law designed specifically to include workers not covered by federal minimum wage standards--"the really poor people, laundry workers, domestics, and farm workers." Angered by the discriminatory hiring practices of the state, she forced the government to include antidiscrimination in the restrictive Voter Registration Act.

During her two terms in the state senate, Jordan was chairman of several committees, including the Labor and Management Relations Committee, and her

impressive record on that committee won her much political support from organized labor. She was named the outstanding freshman senator during her first year in office and was chosen senate president pro tempore in March 1972.

On June 10, 1972, as the state's traditional "governor for a day," she became the first black chief executive in the country. Some political observers belittled her brief gubernatorial term as a "publicity stunt." Unperturbed, she told reporters at a news conference following the official swearing-in ceremony, "Someday, I may want to retain the governor's seat for a longer period of time."

Jordan announced her candidacy for the Democratic nomination to the United States Congress from the Eighteenth Congressional District in late 1971. This was a newly drawn district, a populous and ethnically mixed section of Houston. Curtis Graves, a black man and her principal opponent in the hotly contested primary race, accused her of "Uncle Tom-ism" and of "selling out" to the state's political establishment.

Jordan received eighty percent of the total votes cast in the May 1972 primary contest, thus soundly defeating the three male contenders for the nomination. "If I got eighty percent of the votes, lots of white people voted for me," she said shortly after her victory, "and it was because they felt their interest would be included." In the national election on November 7, 1972, she won over her Republican opponent, Paul M. Merritt, polling more than 85,000 votes for a plurality of 66,000 votes. By comparison, Senator George McGovern, the Democratic Presidential nominee, carried the heavily Democratic Eighteenth Congressional District by a plurality of 37,000 votes.

When Jordan was elected to the House of Representatives she became the first black Congresswoman to come from the Deep South. Shortly after taking

office following the constitutionally prescribed course, she joined forces with thirty-five like-minded Democrats, including all but one of the black Congressmen, and attempted to block the confirmation of Gerald F. Ford as Vice-President, charging he was weak on civil rights. Unlike many of her black colleagues, she questions the reliance on busing as the answer to the problem of racially segregated schools. Although she supports "the letter and the spirit" of the 1954 Supreme Court decision that held that segregated education was inherently unequal, she believes busing to achieve racial balance in the schools "should be resorted to only where the ends of equal educational opportunity, an education of quality, will result."

Jordan has consistently backed legislation to raise the standard of impoverished Americans. On the House floor she approved the continuation of the programs of the Office of Economic Opportunity, the establishment of an independent public corporation to provide free legal services to the poor, and the creation of a powerful Consumer Protection Agency. She voted for an increase in the minimum wage, and, with Representative Martha W. Griffiths of Michigan, sponsored a bill to extend Social Security coverage to American housewives. To ease the economic pressures of inflation, she recommended the continuation of the administration's wage and price controls program. She supported bills to create federally funded programs for the treatment and prevention of diabetes, cancer and alcoholism. She also endorsed the creation of a National Institute on Aging and the expansion of a program to guarantee nutritionally balanced meals to elderly citizens.

In other domestic affairs Jordan backed increased federal aid to cities and recommended direct grants from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration to metropolitan police departments and the subsidization of the operations of urban mass transit systems. She voted for increased aid to elementary and

secondary schools, the continuation of the guaranteed student loan plan, and the extension of the national school lunch program. An environmentalist, she disapproved of the construction of the Alaska oil pipeline because of the potential ecological threat it posed to the Alaskan wilderness; and because of the fuel shortage in the winter of 1973, she voted to suspend temporarily auto emission standards except in high pollution areas. Because of huge profit margins of some oil companies during the crisis, she approved a rollback on the price of domestic crude oil and called for a limitation on such profits.

In foreign affairs Jordan voted to override President Nixon's veto of the War Powers Bill limiting Presidential war-making authority. To limit American military involvement in the continuing war in Southeast Asia, she approved of a bill forbidding the Department of Defense to divert money from other military programs to South Vietnam. One of a handful of Congressmen with a 100 percent voting record in the House, she voted with the majority of her party on eighty-eight percent of the issues during her first year in office.

As a member of the House Judiciary Committee, Jordan was one of thirty-eight Congressmen charged with the task of examining and evaluating the evidence bearing on the possible impeachment of President Nixon. The freshman legislator, whom CBS News correspondent Bruce Morton once called "the best mind on the committee," subscribed to a broad definition of impeachable offenses that included "neglect of duty" and "subversion of the system of government."

Jordan keeps in close touch with her constituents.

CHAPTER III

BARBARA JORDAN COMMENTS UPON HERSELF —

OTHERS COMMENT ON HER — REFLECTIONS OF JORDAN'S ETHOS

If there is a question, the author desires to justify the inclusion of this chapter by stating that eloquence is the art of speaking what you mean and what you are. One can't be affected by what a speaker says unless he be a man of probity who believes, himself, what he says. Barbara Jordan insists that she does not lie or hedge; does that help establish her as a credible speaker?

All speaking communicates both the content of stated ideas and the impression of the speaker's character and attitudes. We hear what the speaker says; then we speculate about him as a person. What the speaker seems to be, partly determines whether and why we accept his invitations to believe. A speaker's personality may be counted as a genuine part of the contents of a message.

The audience should know of and about the speaker if it is to determine whether his style is consistent with the image the speaker himself projects. Ethos refers chiefly to what the speaker wishes to do. It is the quiet attention and comprehension followed by a willing belief and confidence quite different from the more powerful torrent like the effect of pathos.

It is important that a speaker's style be appropriate to his personality, his age and his character. By these features the quality of the speaker's oratory may be evaluated. The audience may find evidence of the speaker's inborn traits, his training, habits and general outlook on life in his oratory;

therefore, these have been influential forces.

Although the word charisma has become somewhat trite and ambiguous and to the author's thinking overworked, whether a speaker has it or does not have it depends on his own make-up. The charisma of Kennedy in the debates with Nixon has been said to have caused the defeat of Nixon and the election of Kennedy.

In the book History of Oratory and Orators by Henry Hardwicke, published in 1896, prior to the inclusion of the texts of the orations of the famous practicing rhetoricians are sections which include glimpses into the lives of the orators. For example, as a preface to one of the orations of Daniel Webster are the statements, "Webster was very fond of geology, astronomy and the classics. The person of Mr. Webster is singular and commanding; his height is above the ordinary size, but he cannot be called tall; he is broad across the chest. His head is large, his forehead high, with a good shaped temple. He has indomitable moral courage. He wears a brown coat with a velvet collar, a buff waistcoat, dark small clothes and Wellington boots."

Since other rhetorical critics have seen fit to include descriptions of the appearance, personality, and character of practicing orators, this author feels that it is appropriate to follow a similar practice in discussing Jordan's oratorical efforts.

This section of the report then includes statements by Jordan about herself as well as those of critics and observers of her work.

Jordan seems to have had a purpose in life early. In an article appearing in The Washington Post, October 22, 1972, by Molly Ivens in which Jordan was interviewed she stated, "I always wanted to be something special. I never wanted to be the run of the mill. I thought of being a pharmacist, but then I thought whoever heard of being an outstanding pharmacist? So I went in for

declamation and public speaking. The podium became my way of making something of myself to excel. There is no obstacle in the path of young people who are poor or members of minority groups that work and preparation can't cure. Do not call for black power, call for brain power."¹

In an article which appeared in Time magazine May 22, 1973, Jordan discusses her relation with her fellowmen; "I do not know what it is that makes me get along with people; if I did I would bottle it up, it would sell well. All blacks are militant in their guts, but militancy is expressed in different ways, my approach is to respect the humanity of everyone no matter who he is, or how he thinks or feels."²

Jo Levine quoted Jordan after an interview in The Christian Science Monitor, March 18, 1974, as saying, "My father was a strict disciplinarian, and I always had to keep the lid on, no matter how angry I got. It did not have to do with his being a minister, it was my respect for him. I developed self control. I nearly always had A's, but if I had a B he always asked 'Why'? My mother thought a lawyer was not the right thing for a girl. My father told me to do whatever I could."³

When questioned about her personal life Jordan answered an interviewer for Ebony Success Library, Volume 11, 1973 with these observations: "I like to read for pleasure, political history and biography particularly. I'm fascinated with the biography of President Kennedy. My idea of fun is to get together with friends and sing. I play the guitar. A department store knows my sizes and tastes and orders clothes for my approval with no obligation. I like good clothes and will spend some time shopping. I get my hair done. No, I do not like to cook. My favorite dish? Whatever mother cooks for supper."⁴

Critics and observers have registered comments about Jordan as a functioning political personality. In the Ebony magazine, October 1972 these

observations were quoted. "Jordan has immense dignity, composure and a deliberate manner. No one can recall when she was not in complete control of herself. She is as she has always been. She has a habit of knowing what she is talking about, more than anyone else. She is very, very smart and incredibly competent and has good instincts. God gave her many talents, much is expected of her. She is an eloquent spokesman; perhaps the most effective against injustice. Her pragmatism has won her liberal enemies. She speaks only if she has something to say, never simply to be polite. She is a beautiful speaker, captivates one, plus she is going to tell one something."⁵

More observations of a negative nature were quoted by Molly Ivens in The Washington Post; "Jordan's self-confidence is considered overweening by some. The endless tales of her coldness, vanity and rudeness stem from her distinct style. She never changed her mind on a subject, nor do others change hers. She can drip contempt on some hapless dunderhead. Peter Lorre could not improve on the way she can spew out 'Weasel Words.' Anyone who tries to dump butter on her gets a dead, cold steel stare like a slap along the head by Joe Frazier. Some like her, some fear her and all respect her."⁶

Louis Robinson in the Ebony magazine of October 1972 reports of Jordan's decision to enter politics, "When I am a candidate I stick to my campaign. I think that rule of thumb has served me well." Following a successful campaign she commented, "I did not play up the fact of being a Negro and a woman. It feels good to know that people recognize a qualified candidate when they see one." After one of her several defeats for political office she concluded, "I figure anyone who could receive 46,000 votes should keep on trying."⁷

Molly Ivens in The Washington Post sums up her observations in these words, "By sheer force and incredible confidence she got herself elected. She is one of the most brilliant lawyers of politics. In her first day in the

State Senate, she knew more about the business than those who had been there forever. She does not act like a woman, a black or a liberal. She acts like a Congresswoman. Getting her to talk about anything but politics is not easy. She has courage of her convictions and was one of two to vote against a program to demonstrate the commercial feasibility of using solar energy to heat and cool buildings. She runs a committee like a martinet, they start on time, bills are presented, discussion is to the point, no fooling around, they vote and adjourn. She is a comer in politics."⁸

In her own Barbara Jordan Reports she expresses, "I do not vote to score. I ask 'Is it the position in which I believe and does it represent the people of my district?' In the future I do not see that we will see much in legislation for civil rights. Our future is in the political process and the gains will have to be made there." From the same source she comments on Women's Liberation in this way: "Whatever I do, I am a woman, and so it helps in the movement, but I do not participate in the activity part of the feminist movement." Another fundamental belief she expressed in the Reports concerned busing, "I believe busing should only be resorted to where the ends of equal opportunity, and education of quality will result." Finally in her own reports she includes a rather inclusive statement regarding her aims, "I intend to concentrate on the substantive issues--how a person lives, eats, sleeps and lives."⁹

In the Congressional Record of December, 1975, page 521767-69 is a copy of an article by Liz Carpenter which was published in the Red Book magazine of November 1975. Much of Jordan's character is evident in this article. Carpenter asked eight prominent Americans to nominate women who could be likely candidates for the office of President of the United States. Persons asked for nominations were: Hugh Scott, Pennsylvania; John Rhodes, Arizona;

Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr.; Mary Lou Burg, Vice Chairman of the Democratic National Committee; Mary Lou Smith, Chairman of the Republican National Committee; Sarah McClendon, Journalist; Walter Cronkite, CBS-TV; Howard K. Smith, ABC-TV; and Jack Anderson, Columnist.

This committee of eight selected six women as candidates: Barbara Jordan, Ella Grasso, Shirley Chisholm, Martha Griffeths, Frances Farenthold and Anne L. Armstrong. Then seven hundred men and women were polled. Jordan won with a score of 44%.

Liz Carpenter asked the candidates pertinent questions regarding political positions they held. To the first question Carpenter asked Jordan, "How would you handle the press if you were President? She replied that a President should be candid and if mistakes were made they should be admitted. To Carpenter's second question, "What is your approach to foreign policy?" Jordan said that the time has come for a realistic appraisal of American power in the world. We must recognize the strength of the under-developed nations and try, through a series of conferences to meet on a plateau of understanding so the propagation of imperialism will lose all its sting. We must share our wealth in a real sense, a technological sense. And to the third and last question, "What legacy would you desire to leave the nation?" Jordan replied that she would like to leave a strong, moral, compassionate leadership from the top.¹⁰

FOOTNOTES

- ¹ Molly Ivens, The Washington Post, micro film, Kpl+0 22, 1974 pors.
- ² Time Magazine, May 22, 1972, p. 50.
- ³ Jo Levine, The Christian Science Monitor, p. 6. Mr. 18, 1974, pors.
- ⁴ The Ebony Success Library, Volume II, 1973, p. 50.
- ⁵ Louis Robinson, Ebony Magazine, micro film 27:48+0 1972 pors, p. 70.
- ⁶ Molly Ivens, The Washington Post, micro film, Kpl+0 22, 1974 pors.
- ⁷ Ebony Magazine, 27:48 + 27:48+0 1972, pors.
- ⁸ Molly Ivens, The Washington Post, micro film, Kpl+0 22m, 1974 pors.
- ⁹ Barbara Jordan Reports, October 1973.
- ¹⁰ C. Liz Carpenter, Redbook Magazine, Congressional Report Library, 1975, p. 521767-69.

CHAPTER IV
RHETORICAL ANALYSIS OF TWO OF JORDAN'S
DELIBERATIVE SPEECHES

The author has selected two deliberative speeches of Jordan's for analysis from points of view of logos, ethos and pathos as reflected in these speeches. The first to be considered contains the content of her message to the House Judiciary Committee, of which she was a member, July 25, 1974. This committee whose chairman was Representative Peter Rodino had the awesome responsibility of considering Articles of Impeachment against Richard M. Nixon. The duty and privilege of impressing the committee with the importance of the matter at hand devolved upon Representative Jordan.

This chapter will begin with the presentation of a formal sentence outline of Jordan's remarks, the full text of which may be found in the appendix. This outline will identify what the author believes to be the purpose, the thesis and the main points made in the speech; TESTIMONY OF CONGRESSWOMAN BARBARA JORDAN BEFORE THE HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE, JULY 25, 1974.

Testimony of Congresswoman Barbara Jordan before the
House Judiciary Committee, July 25, 1974

Purpose of this speech is to persuade.

THESIS STATEMENT

President Nixon has betrayed the public trust in acting with malicious intent in a course of conduct which cannot be tolerated by the Constitution of

the United States of America.

INTRODUCTION

The speaker establishes a proper rapport with the chairman. Then she emphasizes that she is a qualified member of the group whose existence she justifies. With great zeal she states that her faith in the Constitution is total and that she has come to defend it not just to sit as an idle spectator. She states that she comes with a question that commands an answer. The introduction requests attention and creates an aura of solemnity.

BODY

- I. The process and purpose of Impeachment is clearly explained in the Constitution.
 - A. Impeachment was designed in the Constitution to use against certain individuals.
 1. It is designed to call the President into account.
 2. It is designed to call the President's high ministers into account.
 - B. The Constitution provides a method for impeaching.
 1. The House of Representatives has the right to accuse.
 2. The Senate has the right to judge.
 - C. The prescribed method was so constructed to serve as a system of checks and balance.
 1. Impeachment is designed to bridle the Executive if he engages in excesses.
 2. The independence of the Executive is preserved.
- II. Instances through the entire history of the nation justify the use of impeachment.

A. The state ratification conventions made statements in regard to impeachment.

1. The following state ratifications conventions are quoted in favor of the process of impeachment: North Carolina, Virginia and South Carolina.
2. They state that the President is impeachable if he betrays the public trust; we need not fear that those that do will pass with immunity.

B. Past leaders of the nation have argued for impeachment.

1. James Madison said that if a President be connected in any suspicious manner he may be impeached.
2. Woodrow Wilson said that public indignation must overgrow party interest.

C. Jordan herself argues conditions for impeachment.

1. Impeachment must not proceed within the confines of political parties.
2. The task is a big one and we must not be petty.
3. The time is now.

III. President Nixon was aware of and participated in acts contrary to the Constitution.

A. President Nixon was aware of these overt actions.

1. He knew of Watergate.
2. He knew of the Huston Plan.
3. He knew that Republican campaign money was involved.

B. President Nixon committed acts contrary to the Constitution.

1. He counseled his aides to commit perjury.
2. He attempted to compromise a federal judge.

C. President Nixon committed acts of omission.

1. He failed to supply evidence.
2. There was a question as to whether he would even obey the order of the Supreme Court.

CONCLUSION

In the conclusion the last effort is made in trying to persuade the group. The statement is made that the President is impeachable if he attempts to subvert the Constitution.

The conclusion ends on a positive tone. The speaker asks the group to do something. They are asked to answer the question in all sincerity.

Testimony of Congresswoman Barbara Jordan before the
House Judiciary Committee, July 25, 1974

When Representative Jordan spoke before the House Judiciary Committee she knew her audience well. She knew there were liberals, conservatives, Republicans and Democrats. She was well aware that there were those easily persuaded and also those that were very dogmatic, even aggressive and opposed. The group was composed largely of lawyers, and she knew the workings of the legal mind.

Aristotle required: "The introduction does enlist the attention and interest of the listeners, it renders the audience well disposed toward the speaker, and prepares the way for the ideas to come."¹ Most audiences respond most favorably to a message in which the persuader does not state his purpose in the introduction, but rather uses that introduction to emphasize areas of agreement between himself and his audience.

In this Judiciary speech Jordan gained the attention of her audience quickly. She established good rapport with the chairman by calling him a

strong man. Then she lists insubordinations as evidence. McCroskey defines evidence as factual statements originating from a source other than the speaker, objects not created by the speaker and opinions of persons other than the speaker which are offered in support of the speaker's claims in the book Persuasion by Gary Cronkhite, published by Bobbs Merrill Publishing Company.²

Since the outline provides the blueprint for the logos or logical content of the speech, the author now intends to analyze Jordan's use of logical materials to support her three major arguments in this speech. In paragraph four of the text she appeals for the first of many times to history, by citing The Federalist Paper #65 which not only helped establish her respect for history, but showed her reliance on it for explanation and definition to fortify her arguments. Again in paragraph five she quotes Alexander Hamilton as he explained the nature of impeachment. In the same paragraph she relies on the Constitutional definition of impeachment; she detailed the means by which the Federal Convention of 1787 limited the definition of impeachment. Following the quotation from the Federal Convention of 1787, she cited for further support of her interpretation and argument the specific instances of the North Carolina Ratification Convention and the Virginia Ratification Convention, which were very clear in their understanding of the process and purpose of impeachment.

Again in paragraph six she appeals to the authority of Alexander Hamilton who warned that, "Prosecutions of impeachments will seldom fail to agitate the passions of the whole community."

In paragraph seven, Jordan limits the terms under which her arguments will proceed, "high crimes and misdemeanors." In the very next paragraph she appeals to the authority of Woodrow Wilson on the prosecution of the impeachment proceedings. Abandoning history and authority for a moment, Jordan in

paragraph nine makes a strong appeal to common sense and practicality. Then she cites Nixon's acts of insubordination in paragraphs ten to fifteen. She appeals to the historical legal mind of Justice Story in paragraph eighteen. The last appeal made to the authority of history was that of the South Carolina Ratification Convention in paragraph twenty-one. She appeals to a respected leader in American history, James Madison, as the authority of the definition of impeachment as understood in the Constitution.

An extravagant supposition as to the end of the Constitution is stated by Jordan to the effect that if we do not follow historical definitions and processes, we might as well take it to the nearest paper shredder.

In summary, Jordan's logical stratagems in this speech consist of: appeals to historical facts or specific cases, to respected American leaders who had been prominent for their statements regarding the process of impeachment, factual statements used at least six times, definition, authority, common sense and explanation.

Leaving the analysis of this speech in regard to logos the author will now consider the ethos of same. Jordan knew that it was imperative that her colleagues receive her as an equal if she were to be successful in influencing their decision.

Rhetoric is not concerned with permanence nor beauty, but rather with effect. The speaker must do enough of the right things to make his claims credible.

In the first two paragraphs Jordan strives to establish her ethos by describing a good hard working committee. Then she creates a friendly relation with the entire group and assumes the position of a credible member. She used this clever method of linking herself with the group. She said, "We the people, but, I was not always included in 'We the people.'" What did she

mean with these words? Did she refer to her race? Did she refer to the fact that she came from a once controversial geographical area? Or did she allude to the fact that women have not always been allowed to vote? Because she overlooks the term black the author thinks she means that women have not always been allowed to help make governmental decisions. Vagueness has a proper position in rhetoric as it may cause an audience to attend. She sets the mood by stating that it is a moment for solemnity.

Jordan promises a complete commitment and devoted defense of the Constitution in the ninth paragraph. Because she held the same beliefs every time she cited historical characters her ethos was elevated. She cites such illustrious men as Alexander Hamilton, James Madison and Woodrow Wilson. The opinions of the Virginia, North Carolina Ratification Conventions served a like purpose when cited.

In the complimentary references to the committee as to their being big and not petty, the ethos of each member is elevated. In considering statements included in chapter two we would not expect Jordan to be petty. She compliments herself as well as the entire committee when she alludes to their use of common sense. Jordan waited with the entire committee far beyond the call of duty for further evidence which demonstrated a strong sense of loyalty. As in being linked in beliefs with traditional historical men of stature, so in citing a member of the legal profession, Justice Story, her ethos was elevated. Still creating ethos, Jordan closes with this emphatic statement, "It is reason, not passion which must guide our deliberations, guide our debate and guide our decision."

The author now considers Jordan's persuasive powers as exemplified in this speech. It is interesting to note some comments on persuasiveness made by masters of the art or by those scholars who wrote principles that are a

part of the background of rhetoric. Aristotle made the term persuasion embrace not only the appeals to the emotions of the hearers, but the logical and ethical modes as well. He made persuasion nearly synonymous with the goal of speaking.³ What we see in Aristotle's definition of rhetoric is an attempt to point out that in some of what people do with words there is an obvious effort to change other people's views in direct, deliberate ways.⁴

Cicero indicates that persuasion is the objective of the orator's art, asserting that three things contribute to its achievement: "that we prove what we maintain is true; that we conciliate those who hear; that we produce in their minds whatever our cause may require."⁵

In Arnold's Criticism of Oral Rhetoric, Harold Zyskind, a twentieth century philosopher points out that rhetoric creates issues which become what Freke thought of as truth on our side.⁶ Oral rhetoric is always a personalized request for adherence to some proposition or position.⁷

With persuasion as the goal, speakers often resort to fear appeals. Some interesting facts regarding fear are observed. On an initial study Janis and Feshbach (1953) found that the listener exposed to a minimal fear appeal showed greater conformity to the behavior suggested in a speech.⁸ Another statement of significance is that with a high fear appeal accompanied by a specific plan of action the audience will take the action suggested. These studies were made by Goldstein (1959), Leventhal and Perloe (1962), Dabbs (1964), and Niles (1964). The speaker then is well-advised to present a specific plan of action and to demonstrate its feasibility and effectiveness whenever he uses a strong fear appeal.⁹ In an attempt to link the past with the present the author quotes from Aristotle again, "Proofs may be conveyed through the audience when it is worked up by a speech to an emotional state," as is stated by Arnold in Criticism of Oral Rhetoric.¹⁰

In delivering the convention speech we feel that Jordan knew the characteristics of her adult audience and as the author would suspect she used minimal fear appeals. In the opening paragraphs she states that the cornerstone of the republic was threatened through the destruction of the balance between departments. She offers the solution to be that Congress re-establish itself to its rightful position. She fears that cabinet members will become mere puppets. She also fears that monied interests will control governmental procedures. A general fear for humanity is expressed in the statement, "There are the poor that cannot afford a doctor." Jordan offers a solution to the problems and alleviations for these fears. She states that the election of a strong President (a Democratic one) and the building of a strong Congress must be accomplished. As is often the case there is no way of measuring the results of her appeals.

Jordan's persuasive powers have been examined and now the author will analyze the style used in her deliberative speeches. Particular emphasis will be placed on her effective use of figures of diction and tropes. She is particularly skillful in selecting those which are forceful and will most likely lead to conviction. Her figures have a modern character; there is not the archaic, ornamental use of ancient rhetoricians. They serve a purpose or they are omitted.

From Speech Criticism by Thonssen and Baird the following are quoted: Hugh Blair said that style is the peculiar manner in which a man expresses his conception by means of language¹¹ and John F. Genung said that style is the skillful adaptation of expression to thought.¹²

In the days of declamation schools in Greece and Rome style was of paramount importance. Later, display became the keynote and was a matter of decoration and exhibitionism. The following quotations are from Speech Criti-

cism by Thonssen and Baird: Aristotle said that correctness of language is the foundation of all good style¹³ and Cicero said that copious language springs directly from the copiousness of matter; and, if there is an inherent dignity in the subjects on which the orator speaks, there must be a certain splendor in his expression.¹⁴

It is very difficult to make precise rules for construction. We believe that Jordan fits the construction to the material to be presented, the purpose she has in mind, and her audience. Certainly there is an interesting variety in the length of her sentences. She refrains from the use of long drawn out ones which may cause the audience to lose the meaning of the message. Quintilian stated that nothing is to be done for the sake of words. Words are the most to be commended which express our thoughts best and produce the impression which the speaker desires.¹⁵

Here the author wishes to insert a list of verbs selected from the analyzed speeches. Surely they do what verbs are intended to do. These often bristle with action and meaning: bridle, remove, strike, opposed, check, commit, agitate, divide, proceed, secure, revolt, support, arrested, behave, discredit, cautioned, juxtapose, obey, implicate, shelter, betray, rescue, thwart and subvert.

These limiting and descriptive expressions are picturesque: astute framers, high ministers, delicate balance, swollen with power, tyrannically, narrowly channeled, petty reasons, common sense, overwhelming problems, thin evidence, obfuscated opinion, suspicious manner, extra ordinary cases, superior power, absolute complete discretion, surreptitious entry, behave amiss, and false assertions.

The choice of words is a very important aspect of clearness and correctness. Just as important is the use of them. They must be connected carefully

into phrases, clauses and sentences. This necessitates a careful use of connecting words. Words chosen should be used currently by the majority of distinguished speakers and writers. They should be in good usage nationally. The time and period in history must be considered. Current language must not be sprinkled with archaic expressions. The author selects from the above lists the verbs implicate, subvert and thwart as examples that are appropriate for the Nixon trial and which seem persuasive in their intent.

Figures and tropes have always been used to enhance and give meaning to the language of effective oratory. Jordan used many of these which served her logical and emotional purposes in The Judiciary Speech and it would be negligent on the part of this author to omit them. Figures of diction and figures of thought are considered in the distinction of the style of oral discourse. A figure of diction results in an adornment of the message which comes from the very words expressed, not from the words alone.

Considering the figures of diction first, the figure epanaphora occurs where the same word forms successive beginnings for phrases or clauses with expressive similar and different meanings. Seven examples are found. In paragraph twenty-seven: Which must guide our deliberation, guide our debate and guide our decisions; We know that. We know the question. We the people. We know the people. In paragraph three: My faith in the Constitution is whole, it is complete, it is total. In paragraph five: It is designed, it is designed to bridle, it is designed as a model. In paragraph nine: Petty reasons. Pettiness cannot be allowed. We must not be petty. In paragraphs nine, ten and eleven: What the President did know, etc.

An example of synchorexis is observed when in the introduction Jordan yields or admits in the statement, "I am not interested in who opened the door, I will leave that to the police."

Antithesis occurs when the content of the phrase or clause, etc., is based upon contraries. These are four examples of antithesis. In paragraph one: The glorious opportunity of sharing the pain. In paragraph three: Hyperbole would not overstate. (It usually does.) In paragraph twenty-seven: It is reason, not passion. In paragraph twenty-five: He faithfully executed and yet counseled, too.

Prolepsis is the removal of any obstruction of any sort that the speaker foresees might prevent the success of a cause. This may be done by a process of amendment or interpretation. There is an example in paragraph twenty-five: Relieves any problem that might interfere—We the—.

Anastrophe, or inversion, is a figure by which we suspend our sense, and the hearer's expectation; or a figure by which we place last, and perhaps at a great removal from the beginning of the sentence, what, according to common order, should have been mentioned first. In paragraph five is this example: That the Constitution said.

Prosopopoeia is a figure in which an inanimate object assumes movement. In paragraph five: The Constitution was narrowly channeled (like a river).

Interrogation occurs when the speaker sums up his opponent's points by questions and at the same time reinforces his own points just delivered. In paragraph four there is this question: Who can be the inquisitors for the nation? In paragraph twenty-seven: Has the President committed offense?

Disjunction occurs when each of two or more clauses ends with a special verb. These are three examples of disjunction which occur in paragraphs twenty-four and twenty-seven: counseled his aides—disregarded the secrecy; concealed entry—attempted to compromise; committee—planned—directed—acquiesced.

Asyndeton occurs when conjunctions are suppressed. Conjunctions are dropped either to express vehemence or speed; or sometimes it may be from a

noble negligence or nice accuracy, arising from an attention to our ideas.

In paragraph twenty-five is this: ~~counseled—disregarded—concealed—attempted.~~

Then in paragraph twenty-seven is: ~~diminution—subversion—destruction.~~

And finally Jordan employs surrender, which occurs when the speaker indicates in his speech that he is willing to yield, to submit the entire matter to another's will. In paragraph twenty-eight is, "I yield."

Jordan uses a moderate number of figures and tropes. There is none of the flowery oratory used by some ancient rhetoricians, therefore in analyzing her style one notes the lack of such tropes as metaphors, similes, synecdoches and others.

There is an urgency and a compulsion in the rhetoric used in Jordan's deliberative speeches. She knows her time limits and stays well within them, but fills each moment with purpose. Surely her style is individualistic. She has worked to develop it. There is none like it. With Cicero let us say, "If there be an inherent dignity in the subjects there must be a certain splendor in the expression." There is a pleasant flow of words and sentences that create pleasant listening or reading.

Earlier in this chapter a sentence outline of the speech before the Judiciary Committee was printed. Below is a similar one for another deliberative speech: PRESIDENTIAL LEADERSHIP AND CONGRESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY—A SPEECH DELIVERED BY REPRESENTATIVE BARBARA JORDAN AT THE DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION IN KANSAS CITY—1974.

Purpose of this speech is to persuade.

THESIS STATEMENT

The balance of power between the executive and legislative departments as defined in the Constitution needs to be restored.

INTRODUCTION

Immediately the speaker launches into the purpose of the speech by stating the status quo of the powers of the executive and legislative branches of government. She states that the power of the presidency through an autocratic party has increased and that of the Congress has eroded.

BODY

- I. At the present time the powers of the President and Congress have become unbalanced.

- A. The Presidency is considered.

1. There is need for a strong President.
 2. The President must provide moral leadership.
 3. The President must provide firm, competent, sensitive and unequivocal leadership.
 4. The President must select a strong cabinet.

- B. The Congress is considered.

1. Congress must be revitalized.
 - a. The Congress must decide how the people's money will be spent.
 - b. The Congress must consider the levying of taxes.
 - c. The Congress must reclaim the right to wage war.

- II. Congress has begun to reclaim its rightful role in governing the nation.

- A. These reform steps have been begun.

1. Changes have been made in campaign finances.
 2. More qualified people may seek office.
 3. Influence of special monied interests has been curbed.

- III. Much remains to be done.

A. A panel and the delegates considered improvements that should be made.

1. The archaic filibuster rule must be abolished.
2. Committee jurisdiction must be rationalized.
3. Emphasis must be placed on performance rather than on procedure.
4. Legislation to solve critical national problems must be instigated.
5. Attention must be given to inflation and recession.
6. Concentration of money in great powers must be studied.
7. Medical problems must be considered.
8. Energy must be considered.
9. Conservation must be considered.
10. Arms must be limited.

IV. The Democratic party must be alive and active.

A. The Democratic party has a great future.

1. The actions of the Kansas City convention must be constructive.
2. The content of the commitment of the party must match actions with words.
3. The Democratic party must have faith in the future and not fear it.
4. The Democrats must propose a program to provide for the general welfare.

CONCLUSION

The closing of the speech is a challenge to the members to go forth from the convention determined to elect a strong Democratic President and

make an effort to fill the vacancies in Congress with men who will revitalize the body. The Democratic party may be inspired by the challenging statements of five recent Democratic Presidents.

In the House of Representatives on Wednesday, December 11, 1974, the Hon. William Jennings Bryan Dorn said this:

Barbara Jordan, our distinguished colleague, delivered a superb address to the Democratic Convention in Kansas City. This timely, challenging and truly outstanding speech was enthusiastically received by the delegates, news media and guests. I commend this great address to the attention of Congress and to the American people. A copy of this address, Presidential Leadership and Congressional Responsibility, was entered in the Congressional Record.

The author of this report will now consider the character of the logos, pathos and ethos as evidenced in this speech, the complete text of which may be found in the appendix. Assuming that the audience was favorably disposed toward the speaker because there was no reason for it to be otherwise, Jordan omits a formal introduction and opens the speech with stating conditions as they are without any specific instances to support the statements.

In paragraph two she makes factual statements supported by chronological steps taken by Congress to redress the present trend. In the next paragraph she again makes statements with no supporting evidence. In the next paragraph she lists eight steps which must be taken to cure the evils. Then in paragraph seven she makes a specific citation to support one of the needs of the last step of the eight. She also makes two statements to support that step. If these needs are supplied, Jordan lists and visualizes the benefits that will accrue therefrom. Specific actions to cure the evils are listed as factual statements with which she knows her audience is already familiar. Specifically in paragraphs ten, eleven and twelve she outlines the work which remains to be done to cure the ills in the executive and

legislative departments. There is a dramatic conclusion which is a Democratic answer to the problems stated and elaborated upon in paragraphs five, six and seven.

If there is sluggish indifference in the audience it is the task of a speaker to banish it. In order to arouse interest and attention Jordan established the importance of the subject. She even said that the very cornerstone of the nation was threatened. She had a group of presumably like-minded people so her chief purpose was to instruct. This process was practiced by enumerating the accomplishments completed such as reform in campaign financing. The list of tasks still to be accomplished is momentous. She not only tells the audience this, but she uses considerable skill in making them understand that the subject at hand is of more than ordinary consequence. Humanity of mankind is stirred when she mentions the poor that are always with us. She is positive in her statement that the Congress will produce, it will enact legislation to deal with the problems. This helps to keep the audience in a conciliatory mood. Throughout this speech there is a reasonableness that appeals to common sense and sober judgment.

In the actual conclusion she states the point at which we are: The legacy of our party is a mosaic of men and ideas firmly etched in the fabric of America. At Kansas City we have begun for America—We must continue. And as is her usual custom, Jordan states something which must be done or a challenge to be met.

Briefly, consideration has been given to logos and pathos, and now attention will be given to ethos. The very fact that Jordan was chosen to deliver a keynote address before such an august body as a national convention shows that her ethos was well established. Evidently she realized this, as she makes no formal or conscious effort in her introduction to establish

herself as she did in the opening paragraph before the Judiciary Committee.

The manner in which she has organized and presented the speech would increasingly build her stature as she progressed. The evidence that she has such a complete and thorough knowledge of the workings of government is forceful. She is able to visualize the present and the future and conveys the picture to her audiences. The appeals to historical characters of great stature and established institutions which were employed so many times in the speech before the Judiciary Committee are not used here except when she links herself and other Democrats with the late Democratic Presidents. Linking herself with the panel, the revitalized Congress and other organized units is a means of establishing ethos. Each time she reiterates, "We, the Democrats," helps to maintain ethos.

Style of this speech will be considered. Surely her style was clear, appropriate, proper and intelligent. More than in any other of the analyzed speeches does she state everything, "Just as it is." Appropriateness has been observed carefully in regard to the material to be discussed, to the audience, to the occasion and to the speaker herself. The urgency of the matter at hand determined the need for a style that was important for what it does rather than for what is with a minor quantity of ornateness and exhibition. Within her style the speaker does what she feels she should in the particular situation, and through all there is a sincerity and a faith.

FOOTNOTES

- ¹ Aristotle, Great Books of the Western World, Encyclopedia Britannica, Inc., p. 595.
- ² McCrosky, Persuasion, Gary Cronkhite, Bobbs Merrill Publishers, p. 188.
- ³ Lester Thonssen and A. Craig Baird, Speech Criticism, p. 373.
- ⁴ Carroll C. Arnold, Criticism of Oral Rhetoric, p. 5.
- ⁵ Lester Thonssen and A. Craig Baird, Speech Criticism, p. 373.
- ⁶ Carroll C. Arnold, Criticism of Oral Rhetoric, p. 10.
- ⁷ Arnold, p. 12.
- ⁸ Janis and Fishbach (1953), Persuasion, (Gary Cronkhite), p. 180.
- ⁹ Goldstein (1959), Leventhal and Perloe (1962), Dobbs (1964), Niles (1964), Persuasion, Gary Cronkhite, p. 180.
- ¹⁰ Arnold, p. 358.
- ¹¹ Hugh Blair, Speech Criticism, Lester Thonssen and A. Craig Baird, p. 405.
- ¹² John Genung, Speech Criticism, Lester Thonssen and A. Craig Baird, p. 405.
- ¹³ Aristotle, Speech Criticism, Lester Thonssen and A. Craig Baird, p. 410.
- ¹⁴ Cicero, Speech Criticism, Lester Thonssen and A. Craig Baird, p. 415.
- ¹⁵ Quintilian, Speech Criticism, Lester Thonssen and A. Craig Baird,

CHAPTER V

ANALYSIS OF SELECTED EPIDEICTIC SPEECHES

Two epideictic (epidictic) or occasional speeches delivered by Barbara Jordan before the House of Representatives have been selected for analysis. The first was given at the time of the resignation of Justice William O. Douglas from the Supreme Court and the other at the death of an Oriental group as a result of an airplane accident.

The dictionary definitions of the Greek word epideictic are: to display, to show, to demonstrate, serving to display, exhibit or explain, demonstrative as applied by the Greeks to oratory of a rhetorical character. Occasional speeches have certain qualities which distinguish them from the other two types. Epidictic address designates forms of public speech which are called forth by occurrences of unusual importance. In America the customary uses of occasional speeches are to commemorate worthy lives, to recall the turning points of history, or to enforce the lesson exemplified in noble characters. Often these speeches impel toward noble, patriotic and honorable sentiment. The speaker usually makes praises or blames the object and honor or dishonor the result of such speech. In other words, commendation or condemnation is used. The discourse will be demonstrative in the sense of showing forth the true character of persons or actions. Admirable traits of character often inspire respect and provoke imitation of ideals. The character of prominent individuals often serves as legitimate fields for occasional speeches. The future field is as wide as the world of universal truth and as specific as personal character.

In epideictic speeches the speaker is the discoverer. He must be able to unveil what is sometimes dimly seen. To see the unseen and find what is hidden from the unobserving audience is the foundation of demonstrative discourse. Some speakers have the gift of doing this intuitively, but many need to cultivate the ability. In ancient rhetoric this process was called invention.

The most common method used in epideictic speech is expository in nature. The speaker needs to be able to make others see as he sees and to understand as he understands, however the appearance of logical formality is to be avoided. If the reasoning processes are used they should be of the plainer sort. Philanthropy, humanity, welfare of others, service to mankind, reverence for God and gratitude for blessings are considerations often employed.

As in all oratory, perspicuity or clearness is essential. Words are the tools and must be well chosen and be pronounced correctly. Figurative speech is a mark of occasional speech and is based upon the comparison of the less known to the well known. A well chosen metaphor or simile often sheds light on an unclear meaning; however, it is better to use plain language than to cause discord by using two compared objects that are not on the same plane. Figures should only be used when obscurity or abstruseness of thought requires them.

Since the earliest recognition of rhetoric the eulogy has been an adapted form of occasional address. The history of eulogies may be traced in every country to this date. Perhaps one of the most famous was that of George Washington delivered by Edward Everett many, many times and contributed more than fifty-three thousand dollars with ten thousand dollars added from written copies. It is the perfect fruit of eulogistic speech which has

been ripening for these two hundred years.

The quality of elegance of a speech used must be determined by the purpose of the orator. All that is said must have a fitness of diction to dignified thought. Underneath the best expression must always be the beautiful thought, as the inner glory of life is behind every outer manifestation of elegance. There is a great wealth of words for the things which bring joy into human life and peace into human hearts.

More than any other, epideictic oratory deals with the understanding of all men as related to their sensibilities, their affections and their emotions.

The text of the speech given by Jordan before the House of Representatives at the time of the retirement of Justice William O. Douglas from the Supreme Court does not contain all the component parts of an epideictic speech as it is a segment of a long undertaking in which many Congressmen engaged. When Jordan's time to speak arrived she summarized that which had been stated before. A concluding summary is one of the most forceful sections of any speech. Jordan has a special gift for fulfilling this important function.

The author desires to mention an inclusion from the Congressional Record. When a group of Congressmen returned from a trip to China it was Jordan who was asked to give a long, detailed and concise report of the entire trip. Her colleagues recognize her abilities and pay homage to them. Her very customary ending was used in closing this report. She asked the group to be very wise in their judgment of their views of what they had observed in China.

As Jordan listed the many fine qualities of Justice Douglas, of which others had spoken, she used a perfect example of asyndeton by leaving out

all conjunctions. Because of a limiting force she may have done this to save time, but perhaps she knew it was a very emphatic manner of saying much in a few words. She recited phrases which characterized Douglas as a jurist who had accomplished monumental tasks in his long tenure. Then she states that even this long list falls far short of capturing the entirety of his contributions, both in and outside his chambers.

Whenever an occasional speech is delivered as a tribute, memorial or eulogy, human nature seems to prompt some to think, "To err is human," but the custom of honoring the praiseworthy and commemorating good in human lives continues. It is the good in men's lives that should be commended and their virtues that should be perpetuated; while the evils, the imperfections and faults should be overlooked.

Even in this short passage Jordan has effectively used figures and tropes. The expression laundry list is, of course, a gross exaggeration—a hyperbole. She said the idea of equality is not easily cabined, likening it to a wild animal. Also, one isn't actually thirsty for equality as he might thirst for water in a desert.

When Jordan added her part, her sentences seem to each exceed the other in vehemence toward a climax. Each sentence within itself is an enantiosis in that the second part is a clause or phrase following another, and in so doing sets off or enhances that which went before.

More and more the author is impressed with the fact that Jordan has an intense inner feeling toward the statements she makes. In fact, she must even be passionate toward them. In the many times she uses the word passion it connotes that of noble quality. In this ending she admonishes the audience not to get caught up in the passions of the moment, but rather to remember that Justice Douglas' passion was that of human rights. At the close she

employs the figure ecphonesis, a strong feeling, when she says, "We all have a lot to learn from his example."

Now we turn to a beautiful little memorial to an Oriental family who were killed in an airplane accident. It is offered as a definite contrast to that given for Justice Douglas. These remarks are contradictory to Jordan's usual style. Gone is the lack of conciliation and the direct, abrupt and forceful persuasion of her often cutting remarks. There is complete submission.

In Jordan's entire career it has been very natural and to be expected that she work zealously for the interests of minorities and indeed she has. It is apropos that she include, "Were they black people?" and the reply was, "One was white, one was yellow and the other was a mixture of both." She never misses an opportunity to try to better the lives for children through legislation. Her tender love for children shows in the tender manner in which she speaks of Benjy; "He was only four."

The appealing qualities of beauty and sincerity are enhanced by the use of figures and tropes. In the first paragraph Jordan employs the figure epanaphora, by repeating the verb, worked. Again the same figure appears, One was white, one was . . . and one was" The use of live or lived occurs four times in a short paragraph. Another example is: They lived, they were, they. Then the lovely closing is: Their lives, their laughter, their spirit She omits all conjunctions in this asyndeton: big, large, gregarious people. There is irony in the use of big as an adjective to describe a four-year-old. They really did not live their lives to the full literally, but they filled their lives. The figure of eriotesis, meaning an expression of strong feeling is, Were they black?

Jordan needed nothing else to impress her audience of the sincerity, but what better method than to quote from Virgil, "As long as rivers shall run down to the sea, or the shadows touch the mountain slopes, or stars graze in the vault of heaven, so long shall your honor, your name, your praises endure."

Their laughter, their lives, their spirit shall be missed and I will not forget them.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

This report is a characterization of Barbara Jordan. From an humble home of limited financial means, but filled with love and sacrifice, as is evidenced by her parents' desire to provide excellent educations for Barbara and her two sisters even under great difficulties, she aspired to and has risen to a stature recognized by her friends and colleagues. Her scholastic achievements in high school, college and law school have been observed. Especially has her political life been of interest.

Deliberative and epideictic speeches have been selected and analyzed as to logos, pathos and ethos. The general style is observed. One is never at a loss to know what Jordan means, as her style is very clear. Sometimes statements have double meanings; not so with Jordan. There is no lack of intelligibility because there is no confusion of thought. Although there is a wise and correct choice of words, evidence of superfluous words of obscure meaning is absent. There is judicious selection and arrangement of words.

Jordan's speeches are prepared appropriately. She studies and knows her audience thoroughly. Because she habitually appears before her own working group, often judicial in character, her choice of words is intelligent, businesslike, persuasive and timely. She is prone to stick to her subject. When weighty matters are discussed a casual style should not be used. In no way can one imagine Jordan being flippant or even too casual in a political speech. There is a dignity, almost a solemnity in the manner

In which she speaks of national institutions and traditions. Although one may not know her personally, he feels that her speeches are consistent with her expressed tenets. Her speeches help to reveal her inner character rather than to clash with her personality. Her style is full of verve and vigor. It is pleasing and moves the feelings.

In comparing the style used in epideictic and deliberative speeches, the character of persuasion used is perhaps the element which shows the most contrast. The language used for the deliberative is more forceful than that used in the epideictic. Especially in the epideictic speech used for memorials or eulogy does one expect an ornamental style often embellished with a variety of figures and tropes. The logical arrangement of the deliberative speech is a necessary quality. If effective, both types require careful and thorough preparation. Jordan is a master of both, but if there is one in which she excels it may be the balance swings toward the deliberative. That might be explained by the fact that she has a thorough legal training and has used it in practical life.

The author has enjoyed these weeks spent vicariously with Barbara Jordan, and it is her desire that this report is meaningful and purposeful.

A P P E N D I X

TESTIMONY OF REPRESENTATIVE BARBARA JORDAN
BEFORE THE HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE
JULY 25, 1974

I recognize the gentlelady from Texas, Ms. Jordan, for the purpose of general debate, not to exceed a period of fifteen minutes.

Ms. Jordan. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

1. Mr. Chairman, I join my colleagues, Mr. Rangel, in thanking you for giving the junior members of this committee the glorious opportunity of sharing the pain of this inquiry. Mr. Chairman, you are a strong man and it has not been easy, but we have tried as best we can to give you as much assistance as possible.

2. Earlier today, we heard the beginning of the Preamble to the Constitution of the United States. "We, the people." It is a very eloquent beginning. But, when that document was completed on the 17th of September in 1787, I was not included in that "We, the people." I felt somehow for many years that George Washington and Alexander Hamilton just left me out by mistake. But, through the process of amendment, interpretation and court decision, I have finally been included in "We, the people."

3. Today, I am an inquisitor. I believe hyperbole would not be fictional and would not overstate the solemnness that I feel right now. My faith in the Constitution is whole, it is complete, it is total. I am not going to sit here and be an idle spectator to the diminution, the subversion, the destruction of the Constitution.

4. "Who can so properly be the inquisitors for the nation as the

representatives of the nation themselves?" (Federalist, No. 65). The subject of its jurisdiction are those offenses which proceed from the misconduct of public men. That is what we are talking about. In other words, the jurisdiction comes from the abuse or violation of some public trust. It is wrong, I suggest, it is a misreading of the Constitution for any member to vote for an Article of Impeachment means that that member must be convinced that the President should be removed from office. The Constitution doesn't say that. The powers relating to impeachment are an essential check in the hands of this body, the legislature, against and upon the encroachment of the Executive. In establishing the division between the two branches of the legislature, the House and the Senate, assigning to the one the right to accuse and to the other the right to judge, the Framers of this Constitution were very astute. They did not make the accusers and the judges the same person.

5. We know the nature of impeachment. We have been talking about it awhile now. "It is chiefly designed for the President and his high ministers to somehow be called into account." It is designed to "bridle" the Executive if he engages in excesses. "It is designed as a method of national inquest into the conduct of public men." (Hamilton, Federalist No. 65). The Framers confined in Congress the power, if need be, to remove the President in order to strike a delicate balance between a President swollen with power and grown tyrannical; and preservation of the independence of the Executive. The nature of impeachment is a narrowly channeled exception to the separation of powers maxim, the Federal Convention of 1787 said that. It limited impeachment to high crimes and misdemeanors and discounted and opposed the term, "maladministration." "It is to be used only for great misdemeanors," so it was said in the North Carolina Ratification Convention. And in the Virginia

Ratification Convention: "We do not trust our liberty to a particular branch. We need one branch to check the others." The North Carolina Ratification Convention: "No one need be afraid that officers who commit oppression will pass with immunity."

6. "Prosecutions of impeachments will seldom fail to agitate the passions of the whole community," said Hamilton in the Federalist Papers No. 65, "and to divide it into parties, more or less friendly or inimical to the accused." I do not mean political parties in that sense.

7. The drawing of political lines goes to the motivation behind impeachment: but impeachment must proceed within the confines of the constitutional term, "high crimes and misdemeanors."

8. Of the impeachment process, it was Woodrow Wilson who said that "Nothing short of the grossest offenses against the plain law of the land will suffice to give them speed effectiveness. Indignation so great as to overgrow party interest may secure a conviction; nothing else can."

9. Common sense would be revolted if we engaged upon this process for petty reasons. Congress has a lot to do: appropriations, tax reform, health insurance, campaign finance reform, housing, environmental protection, energy sufficiency, mass transportation. Pettiness cannot be allowed to stand in the face of such overwhelming problems. So today, we are not being petty. We are trying to be big because the task we have before us is a big one.

10. This morning in a discussion of the evidence we were told that the evidence which purports to support the allegations of misuse of the CIA by the President is thin. We are told that that evidence is insufficient. What that recital of the evidence this morning did not include is what the President did know on June 23, 1972. The President did know that it was Republican money, that it was money from the Committee for the re-election of the Presi-

dent, which was found in the possession of one of the burglars arrested on June 17.

11. What the President did know on the 23rd of June was the prior activities of E. Howard Hunt, which included his participation in the break-in of Daniel Ellsberg's psychiatrist which included Howard Hunt's fabrication of cables designed to discredit the Kennedy Administration.

12. We were further cautioned today that perhaps these proceedings ought to be delayed because certainly there would be new evidence forthcoming from the President of the United States. There has not even been an obfuscated indication that this committee would receive any additional materials from the President. The committee subpoena is outstanding and if the President wants to supply the material, the committee sits here.

13. The fact is that on yesterday, the American people waited with great anxiety for eight hours, not knowing whether their President would obey an order of the Supreme Court of the United States.

14. At this point, I would like to juxtapose a few of the impeachment criteria: with some of the President's actions.

15. Impeachment criteria: James Madison, from the Virginia Ratification Convention. "If the President be connected in any suspicious manner with any person and there be grounds to believe that he will shelter him, he may be impeached."

16. We have heard time and time again that the evidence reflects payment to the defendants of money. The President had knowledge that these funds were being paid and that these were funds collected for the 1972 Presidential campaign.

17. We know that the President met with Mr. Henry Peterson 27 times to discuss matters related to Watergate and immediately thereafter met with

the very persons who were implicated in the information Mr. Peterson was receiving and transmitting to the President. The words are, "If the President be connected in any suspicious manner with any person and there be grounds to believe that he will shelter that person, he may be impeached."

18. Justice Story: "Impeachment is intended for occasional and extraordinary cases where a superior power acting for the whole people is put into operation to protect their rights and rescue their liberties from violation."

19. We know about the Huston Plan. We know about the break-in of the psychiatrist's office. We know that there was absolute complete direction in August 1971 when the President instructed Ehrlichman to "do whatever is necessary." This instruction led to a surreptitious entry into Dr. Fielding's office.

20. "Protect their rights." "Rescue their liberties from violation."

21. The South Carolina Ratification Convention impeachment criteria: "Those are impeachable who behave amiss or betray their public trust."

22. Beginning shortly after the Watergate break-in and continuing to the present time the President has engaged in a series of public statements and actions designed to thwart the lawful investigation by government prosecutors. Moreover, the President has made public announcements and assertions bearing on the Watergate case which the evidence will show he knew to be false.

23. These assertions, false assertions, impeachable, those who misbehave. Those who "behave amiss or betray their public trust."

24. James Madison again at the Constitutional Convention: "A President is impeachable if he attempts to subvert the Constitution."

25. The Constitution charges the President with the task of taking care that the laws be faithfully executed, and yet the President has counseled

his aides to commit perjury, wilfully disregarded the secrecy of grand jury proceedings, concealed surreptitious entry, attempted to compromise a federal judge while publicly displaying his cooperation with the processes of criminal justice.

26. "A President is impeachable if he attempts to subvert the Constitution."

27. If the impeachment provision in the Constitution of the United States will not reach the offenses charged here, then perhaps that 18th Century Constitution should be abandoned to a 20th Century paper shredder. Has the President committed offenses and planned and directed and acquiesced in a course of conduct which the Constitution will not tolerate? That is the question. We know that. We know the question. We should now forthwith proceed to answer the question. It is reason, not passion, which must guide our deliberations, guide our debate, and guide our decision.

28. I yield back the balance of my time, Mr. Chairman.

PRESIDENTIAL LEADERSHIP AND CONGRESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

Hon. Wm. Jennings Bryan Dorn

of South Carolina

In the House of Representatives

Wednesday, December 11, 1974

Mr. Dorn, Mr. Speaker, BARBARA JORDAN our distinguished colleague delivered a superb address to the Democrat Convention in Kansas City. This timely, challenging and truly outstanding speech was enthusiastically received by the delegates, news media and guests. I commend this great address to the attention of the Congress and to the American people.

PRESIDENTIAL LEADERSHIP AND CONGRESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

1. In the last few years, the nation suddenly realized that the balance of power between the Congress and the President was in danger of destruction. The flow of power to the President had steadily increased, and the powers of the Congress had steadily eroded. Rather than co-equal branches of government, the nation was increasingly governed by an autocratic President who ruled almost by decree. A cornerstone of the republic was threatened.

2. The 93rd. Congress began to stop this trend. Reacting first to its accelerating loss of power and then to a President who flouted the law and ignored the Constitution, the Congress began to reclaim its rightful role in sharing the governance of the nation. The panel and the delegates were unanimous in their belief that this power must be restored and that the nation can no longer tolerate an imperial President with a subservient Congress. Instead, we must re-establish the Congress as a strong and vigorous

institution, which can check the President through healthy tension and competition.

3. The power of Congress to check the actions and/or excesses of the President is a people-safeguard which helped the Constitution with ratification. Total rubber stamp agreement between the two branches was never intended.

4. This revitalization of Congress need not result in a weak Presidency or a legislative dictatorship, but rather counter-balanced centers of power. The need for a strong President in the years ahead is beyond challenge. The President is the only official who is elected by all the people and who can provide the moral inspiration and leadership, the faithful execution of the laws, and the effective management of the machinery of Government. The dangers of the present demand firm, competent, sensitive and unequivocal leadership. If you doubt the importance of a powerful White House, imagine what could be done if we had a strong and progressive Democrat in the White House to work hand in hand with the 94th Congress.

5. There is a need for restraints on the almost unlimited power of the President, and some of these restraints must come from within the executive branch itself. Restraint is not synonymous with diminution. We cannot allow cabinet officers to be mere puppets on a White House string for example, but instead must insist that the President select persons of integrity and independent judgment, and involve them directly in the operation and decision-making of the national government. The Senate, in its advise and consent role can do much in this regard.

6. The President himself must acknowledge that he is a servant and not a proprietor of the people and he must have respect for the truth, the law and the Constitution. The doctrine of executive privilege, which allows the

President to withhold information from the people, continues to haunt us and its limits have not been defined by the incumbent President.

7. But we must concentrate most of all on a revitalization of the Congress to check and balance the powers of the Presidency. Major steps have already been taken. The budget and impoundment control act, written into law by the 93rd Congress, restores to the legislature the power of the purse. Never again will a President be able lawfully to refuse to spend monies appropriated by the Congress, nor will the Congress haphazardly decide how the people's money will be spent.

8. In the future, Congress will be able to set its own priorities and weigh individual spending decisions against a comprehensive plan for allocating tax dollars. Similarly, the war powers act will prevent the President from waging an undeclared war. This reclaims the right of the Congress to declare war. Major reorganizations of the committee of Congress, both in procedure and jurisdiction, have been accomplished.

9. In the past week, historic steps have been taken by the Democratic caucus to increase the power of the leadership of the Congress to move a legislative program into law. These steps, labelled reform, have stripped the power of a small clique to block legislation. Sweeping changes in campaign financing have been initiated and enacted by the Congress which will allow more qualified people to seek elective office. Reducing the influence of monied special interests should inspire new confidence and pride in the democratic process.

10. Much remains to be done. Abolition of the archaic filibuster rule in the Senate, and further rationalizing of committee jurisdictions are must items.

11. But the panel and the delegates who participated in this discussion

on Friday put the emphasis now not on procedure, but on performance. A revitalized Congress, with the vibrancy of 75 new progressive Democrats in the House and nine in the Senate, must now match its rhetoric with constructive legislation to solve this critical problem confronting this nation.

12. A revitalized Congress is a sham if it does not address the problems of inflation and recession, of excessive concentration of economic power, of the poor who cannot afford a doctor, of energy conservation and development, of arms limitations.

13. We all have enormous confidence that the Congress will produce, that it will enact legislation to deal with these problems and many more.

14. The future cannot be postponed. A moratorium on it cannot be ordered.

15. Let the word go forth from Kansas City that the Democratic Party is alive. It is substantive. It is real.

16. Let all who will hear know that the content of the commitment of this Party matches the marvel of its words.

17. We, the Democrats of the United States have faith in the future. We do not fear it.

18. Franklin Roosevelt taught us that "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself."

19. We, the Democrats of the United States propose a program to promote the general welfare of the people of the United States.

20. We know as Harry Truman reminded us that "what you're going to do is more important than what you have done."

21. We, the Democrats of the United States know how to start anew. We welcome the untried and the unknown for our tomorrow was inspired when John Kennedy said, "Let us begin."

21. We, the Democrats of the United States reject the harbingers of defeat when we remember the words of Lyndon Johnson, "Let us continue."

22. The legacy of our party is a mosaic of men and ideas firmly etched in the fabric of America. At Kansas City we have begun for America—we must continue.

BARBARA JORDAN'S TRIBUTE TO

JUSTICE WILLIAM O. DOUGLAS

At his Retirement from the Supreme Court

November 19, 1975

Ms. Jordan. Mr. Speaker, I recite the words which have been used in this House to describe the tenure of Justice William O. Douglas on the Supreme Court: independent, individualistic, strong convictions, intellectually gifted, monumental ability and energy, activist, master of complex problems, guardian of individual liberties, a dissenter protecting the rights of dissenters. The list falls short of capturing the entirety of his contributions. The volume of his work both in and outside his chambers overwhelms us. We almost necessarily use a laundry list to summarize his career. But we should also remember that Justice Douglas has contributed an unerring sense of dispassionate analysis of the social, economic, and political issues during this past half century. Adroit at explaining complex legal problems, he also understands more than most the ramifications of his reasoning. An ardent defender of constitutional liberties and civil rights, he knew also that the idea of equality reached beyond the individual case before the Court. In a 1965 dissent he wrote that the idea of equality, once loosed, is not easily cabined. He knew that an individual's thirst for equality is insatiable, and not to be readily quenched with token offerings.

Justice Douglas has the rare talent to understand the consequences of the goals he seeks to achieve. It is easy for us to get caught up in the passions of the moment. Justice Douglas' passion was the rights and liberties of the Bill of Rights. From that course he never swerved. We all have a lot to learn from his example.

IN THE MEMORY OF SUSIE, JAKE AND BENJY APPLEWHITE

Congresswoman Barbara Jordan asked and was given permission to address the House for one minute and to revise and extend her remarks.

Miss Jordan. Mr. Speaker, Susie Applewhite worked for me, and she worked hard. She was a Chinese American.

When the plane crash occurred, the question was asked: "Were they black people?" And the answer was given as this; "One was white, one was yellow, and the other was a mixture of both."

They did not have time to think about the consequences of their lives or their death. They lived fully. They were big, large, gregarious people, and they wanted to live and live a long time.

Benjy was only four, and Benjy thought he had a long future ahead of him. But something happened. We are very fortunate that the God above us does not dictate the tragedies of our lives on a case-by-case basis.

Mr. Speaker, when I think of the Applewhites, I am reminded of the words of Virgil, who can better describe my feelings than I can: "As long as rivers shall run down to the sea, or the shadows touch the mountain slopes, or stars graze in the vault of heaven, so long shall your honor, your name, your praises endure."

Their laughter, their lives, their spirit shall be missed, and I will not forget them.

CONGRESS of the UNITED STATES

House of Representatives

Washington, D.C. 20515

U. S. Representative Barbara Jordan

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Representative Barbara Jordan has represented the Eighteenth Congressional District of Texas since January 1973. She attended public schools in Houston, Texas and graduated Magna Cum Laude from Texas Southern University with a B. A. degree in Political Science and History. She then received her law degree in 1959 from the Boston University School of Law. Barbara Jordan has since been awarded 15 honorary Doctorate degrees.

Miss Jordan served as Administrative Assistant to the County Judge of Harris County, Texas until her election in 1966 to the Texas Senate. She became the first Black elected to the Senate since 1883. In 1972, the Senate unanimously elected her President Pro Tempore and on June 10, 1972, in the traditional "Governor for a Day" ceremonies, she became the first Black woman governor in United States history.

Congresswoman Jordan is a member of the House Committee on Judiciary, the House Committee on Government Operations, and the Steering and Policy Committee of the House Democratic Caucus. Also, Rep. Jordan serves under appointment by the Speaker to a Special Task Force of the 94th Congress.

Rep. Jordan has been named Democratic Woman of the Year by the Woman's National Democratic Club. Ladies Home Journal picked her as 1975 Woman of the Year in Politics. Time Magazine recognized her as a Woman of the Year. And, in a poll by the Redbook Magazine, Miss Jordan was selected as top

"Woman who could be President."

Professional organizations include the State Bar of Texas, the Massachusetts Bar, American Bar Association, and the Texas Trial Lawyers Association. She maintains membership in the NAACP and Good Hope Baptist Church of Houston. Miss Jordan is a member of the Democratic National Committee and serves as Vice-Chairman of the Texas Democratic Party.

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aristotle. *The Rhetoric*. Translated by Lane Cooper. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1932.
- Arnold, Carroll C. *Criticism of Oral Rhetoric*. Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1974.
- Carpenter, Liz. *Redbook Magazine*. November, 1975. *Congressional Record*, December 11, S 21767-69.
- Cronkhite, Gary. *Persuasion*. Bobbs Merrill Company.
- Current Biography*. September, 1974. pp. 22-24.
- Ebony Success*. Volume 11, p. 50.
- Greenfield, Meg. *Newsweek*. March 3, 1975.
- Hardwicke, Henry. *History of Oratory and Orators*. G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1896.
- Howes, Alan B. *Historical Studies of Rhetoric*. Rowledge and K. Paul.
- Impeachment Proceedings of the Judiciary Committee*.
- Ivens, Molly. *Washington Post*. October 22, 1972. micro film, Kpl+0 22m 1974 pors.
- Jordan, Barbara. *Barbara Jordan Reports*.
- Ladies Home Journal*. May 1975.
- Lawson, John. *Lectures Concerning Oratory*. Dublin, 1759.
- Levine, Jo. *The Christian Science Monitor*. March 18, 1974, pors, p. 6.
- Robinson, Louis. *Ebony Magazine*. October, 1972. p. 50.
- Thonssen, Lester and A. Craig Baird. *Speech Criticism*. The Ronald Press Company.
- Time Magazine*. January 5, 1976. p. 50.
- Sears, L. *The Occasional Address*. G. Putnam Sons, February 6, 1975.
- Wall Street Journal*. February 6, 1975.
- Who's Who in American Politics*.

REPRESENTATIVE BARBARA JORDAN
AN ANALYSIS OF HER PERSUASIVE SPEAKING SKILLS IN
SELECTED DELIBERATIVE AND EPIDEICTIC SPEECHES

by

OLIVE REED SCHAFER

B. S., Fort Hays State College, 1936

AN ABSTRACT OF A MASTER'S REPORT

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Speech

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1976

Congressman Barbara Jordan is a leader in politics. She is a fluent speaker having an excellent background in rhetorical studies. This report contains two biographies: one the short official one of the House of Representatives, the other a longer one containing more details and concerns of her busy life.

The second chapter is an attempt to portray the ethos of Jordan through the use of many of her own statements as well as the opinions of others who know her.

As a member of the Judiciary Committee she sat with the other thirty-seven members during the Watergate proceedings. A report of this experience is included.

The texts of several political speeches appear in full. One of these, a superb address delivered to the Democrat convention in Kansas City in 1974, is followed by a rhetorical analysis. There is an outline, a rhetorical analysis, and a study of her particular style of persuasion of her speech before the Judiciary at the time of Watergate.

Especially for the purpose of showing contrasts in style two epideictic speeches are included. These depict Jordan's humanity. One was delivered at the resignation of Justice William O. Douglas from the Supreme Court. The other was published in the Congressional Record when three Oriental friends were killed in an airplane accident. Analyses of these speeches are given.

In all of the analyses Jordan's style is observed especially through her powers of persuasion and a careful study of tropes and figures which are employed.

The conclusion is a summary of the general characteristics of Jordan and her activities especially in her position as a modern rhetorician.