

FREE SPEECH ON THE CAMPUS:
AN ANALYSIS OF PERSUASIVE TECHNIQUES USED
BY SELECTED CAMPUS LECTURERS

by

BONNIE STALLINGS COVERT

B.S., Kansas State University, 1973

M.S., Kansas State University, 1974

A MASTERS THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Speech

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1975

APPROVED BY:

Harold A. Nichols

Major Professor

TABLE OF CONTENTS

An Introduction to the Speakers	1
Methodology	8
William Kunstler at Indiana State University (1970)	24
William Buckley, Jr. at Kansas State University (1973) . . .	37
George Lincoln Rockwell at Fort Hays State University (1967).	44
Dick Gregory at Kansas State University (1974)	60
Conclusions	73
Appendix	80

LD
266F
T4
1975
C6F
C.2
Document

ILLEGIBLE DOCUMENT

**THE FOLLOWING
DOCUMENT(S) IS OF
POOR LEGIBILITY IN
THE ORIGINAL**

**THIS IS THE BEST
COPY AVAILABLE**

ILLEGIBLE

**THE FOLLOWING
DOCUMENT (S) IS
ILLEGIBLE DUE
TO THE
PRINTING ON
THE ORIGINAL
BEING CUT OFF**

ILLEGIBLE

**THIS BOOK
CONTAINS
NUMEROUS PAGES
WITH ILLEGIBLE
PAGE NUMBERS
THAT ARE CUT OFF,
MISSING OR OF POOR
QUALITY TEXT.**

**THIS IS AS RECEIVED
FROM THE
CUSTOMER.**

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE SPEAKERS

For many years college students were isolated or "protected" from speakers with radical ideas. In 1968 Science magazine stated that "proposals to insulate students from the extremes of political opinion" are in evidence in the hierarchy of both school and state government administrations.¹ In 1966 students at the University of North Carolina initiated a lawsuit against their state's restrictive policy which banned ultra-leftist speakers from college campuses. The district court, which consisted of three judges, unanimously ruled in 1968 that the speaker ban policy was unconstitutional.² This ruling set an important legal precedent which other courts were to follow. Because of the ruling in the North Carolina case, and subsequent rulings based on that case, a new era of rhetoric began on college campuses. Men with extreme political ideas were given the chance to express them.

The reactions to the new freedom of speech on college campuses were varied. Evidence of former President Nixon's dislike of radical speakers was shown by his statement quoted in the Saturday Review, "America has suffered from a fever of words; from inflated rhetoric that promises more than it can deliver, from angry rhetoric that fans discontents into hatreds; from bombastic rhetoric that postures instead of persuading."³ Perhaps the most interesting reaction to the new freedom of rhetoric came from Richard G. Kleindienst, Deputy Attorney General of the United States. "The best thing that happened to violent revolutionaries and radical militants is free speech.

Be sure that they speak and everybody hears them. Young people who hear them a few times realize that what they are saying is poppycock."⁴ Obviously stating that everything revolutionaries say is "poppycock" is making a gross over-generalization. However, what Kleindienst is saying is that young Americans have enough intelligence to judge what a speaker says on its own merits.

The purpose of this study is to analyze the persuasive devices utilized by certain contemporary speakers in their attempt to persuade college audiences. The speakers were selected because they represent the "new freedom" type of rhetoric spoken on college campuses by guest lecturers during the late 1960's and early 1970's. The speakers who will be studied are William Buckley, Jr., Dick Gregory, William Kunstler, and George Lincoln Rockwell. All but Rockwell, who was assassinated in 1967, continue to voice their opinions on current issues.

Speeches of all four men will be analyzed by a combination of methods that will be explained in the chapter on methodology. At the termination of this project tentative answers to the following questions will have been sought:

1. Are there any common goals among the speakers being studied?

2. What, if any, are the basic persuasive techniques used by these speakers?

3. Assuming these speakers are representative of the new freedom of expression on college campuses, has this type of

rhetoric exposed college students to any unusual messages or persuasive techniques?

The first speaker, William Kunstler, is perhaps best known for his work as a civil rights lawyer. He has become one of the most trusted white lawyers in America, being referred to by a black militant as "... the blackest white man I ever saw. He can be trusted."⁵ He has represented many famous militants such as Malcolm X, Rap Brown, and Martin Luther King. Since many of his clients are unable to pay fees, Mr. Kunstler is predominantly financed by anonymous donors.⁶

Mr. Kunstler does not defend only black militants, but has also had an active role as the leading defender of anyone whose civil rights may have been denied. Perhaps his two most widely publicized involvements were the Attica prison riot and the Chicago conspiracy trial. Britannica Book of the Year describes Kunstler in the following way, "William Kunstler has become the best-known legal defender of the new-style revolutionaries."⁷ Perhaps we can understand why he does what he does, and why he does it with such vigor and personal sacrifice if we see what he has said of his personal philosophy towards change. "I think people must take a stand for what they believe in, and if conventional protest does not achieve a reaction, then the only natural, reasonable thing to do is to go another step."⁸ If Kunstler truly believes this, he has a moral obligation to continue to represent others who are protesting because of personal beliefs.

The second speaker, William Buckley, learned his distrust of revolutionary ideas from his father, who had developed a

strong distrust of revolutionary governments when he was barred from Mexico by its new government in 1921 thus losing quite a fortune.⁹ Mr. Buckley is perhaps better known for his journalism than for his speaking. His career has included writing a syndicated column, editing the National Review, hosting a politically oriented talk show, and speaking as a guest lecturer. Though his political philosophy reeks of conservatism, his way of expressing his ideas is anything but conservative. He says what he thinks regardless of how it may affect others.

Mr. Buckley's manner of presenting his ideas has been described as "Tricky, yes; outrageously illogical, yes; ap-
pallingly partisan, yes; show bizzy, yes--but tiresome, never."¹⁰ His manner of sounding-off has delighted many liberals to the point that, according to Time magazine, "He stands in grave danger...of being adopted by the liberal establishment he deplores."¹¹

The third speaker, George Lincoln Rockwell, was the "Führer" of the American Nazi Party. His feelings of prejudice toward Negroes and Jews influenced his concepts of any national event. As Dotson Rader said in New Republic, "Except when he touched on Jews or Negroes or such fantasies as mongrelization and international conspiracies, he could be reasonably coherent."¹²

George Lincoln Rockwell was assassinated in 1967 by his most devoted follower, John Patler, for reasons that remain unclear. Mr. Rockwell did not have many followers, but those he did have were as fanatical as he was. After his death a demon-

stration, verging on a riot, was held to demand that he have a Nazi burial. Because Rockwell was a Korean War veteran, he was legally eligible for a military burial in a national cemetery. However, because of the demonstrations made by his Party and their insistence on having the Nazi insignia present, Rockwell was denied such a burial. Some say that Rockwell in death had managed to stir more attention than any of his street rallies attracted during his life.¹³

The fourth speaker, Dick Gregory, lectures about what he believes to be the rights of all people, not just the rights of one race. He doesn't follow conventional methods or retain steadfast faith in the constitution because he, as a black man, has seen all too clearly that established institutions and methods do not always work fairly.

Dick Gregory first entered the public eye because of his skill as a comedian. Newsweek has said that, "No black comedian of comparable stature or exposure in the last decade has wielded the cutting edge of social criticism as forcibly as Dick Gregory."¹ He is also an accomplished writer and lecturer. When he lectures, people listen not only because he is a famous personality, but because he has demonstrated, through various means, that he believes in what he says. Because Gregory has been an avid protester in civil rights movements, he has sometimes been subjected to great personal loss. For example, he was shot in the leg while trying to quiet the Watts rioters in 1965.¹⁵

Many of Gregory's protests have been peaceful. An example of this is his fasting. In 1970 he fasted for 71 days to protest

the American drug problem. "For this, Gregory gained the label 'the world's foremost freelance humanitarian'."¹⁶ He speaks out for change, but he has come to believe that these changes must come through peaceful means if they are to be lasting. "He uses his own being as a sacrifice to right some of the wrongs in America...and gives all he has to give to a cause in which he truly believes."¹⁷

There are both advocates and opponents of these men. Regardless of whether people believe in what each of the men represents, these men must be admired because each has the courage to voice his convictions. Each of these men has truly believed in what he has tried to persuade others to believe.

The remainder of this paper will be structured in the following manner. Chapter two will establish the methodology, or methods of analysis, which will be utilized in the speech analyses. Each of the next four chapters (Chapters 3, 4, 5 and 6) will specifically concentrate on a speech given by each of the four men to be studied. Both transcripts and tape recordings of the speeches were available for examination. Chapter 7 will summarize the techniques found in each speaker's presentation. Conclusions and comparisons of the various persuasive devices which were utilized will be made. Also, it is hoped that the questions stated at the beginning of this chapter will be at least partially answered.

FOOTNOTES

¹"Speaker Ban: Court Decides North Carolina Controversy," Science, 159 (1968), p. 964.

²Ibid., p. 963.

³"De-escalating the Rhetoric," Saturday Review, 52 (1969), 20.

⁴Alan F. Pater and Jason R. Pater (ed.), What They Said In 1970 (Beverly Hills: Monitor Book Company, Inc., 1971), p. 224

⁵"The Blackest White Man I Know," Life, 67 (1969), 51.

⁶Ibid., p. 51.

⁷"William Moses Kunstler," Britannica Book of the Year (1971), p. 147.

⁸"The Blackest White Man I Know," p. 50D.

⁹"The Sniper," Time, 90 (1967), 72.

¹⁰John Reddy, "Bill Buckley: Blithe Spirit of the Right," Readers Digest, 99 (1971), 113.

¹¹"The Sniper," p. 72.

¹²Dotson Rader, "The Deadly Friendship," New Republic, 157 (1967), p. 13.

¹³"Extremists: Ashes to Ashes," Newsweek, 70 (1967), p. 23

¹⁴"Return of the Native Son," Newsweek, 75 (1970), p. 74.

¹⁵The Negro Almanac (New York: Bellwether Publishing Company, 1967), p. 714.

¹⁶Donna Brown, "Black Activist Really Peaceful," Uhuru (1974), p. 7.

¹⁷Ibid., p. 7.

METHODOLOGY

Before our attention is directed to the persuasive devices utilized by the various men, the criteria for analyzing those devices must be established. Four basic plans of analysis will be utilized in this study. Briefly, the methods used to analyze the speeches will include:

1. Aristotle's concepts of ethos, pathos, and logos.
2. Techniques of group identification.
3. Various propaganda devices as enumerated by the Institute for Propaganda Analysis; name calling; glittering generality; transfer; testimonial; plain folks; card stacking; and band wagon.
4. Kenneth Burke's Pentad.

Since Aristotle authored the first extensive work on rhetoric, the inclusion of some of his rhetorical concepts in any rhetorical analysis seems necessary. He defined rhetoric as being "the faculty of observing in any given case the available means of persuasion."¹ Rhetoric has no subject-matter of its own. Rather the different aspects of rhetoric are utilized by the various disciplines to illustrate or persuade in relationship to the discipline. In The Rhetoric Aristotle stated that there are three major rhetorical appeals, ethos, pathos, and logos.

The first major appeal is ethos which, according to Aristotle, is determined by the speaker's sagacity, high character, and goodwill. Lester Thonssen and A. Craig Baird in Speech Criticism set forth certain means which speakers may employ in order to establish their sagacity, high character, and good will.

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

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

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

It must be kept in mind that the ethos is determined by the listeners' perception of the speaker's character rather than what the speaker's character actually is.

Most empirical studies indicate that two factors, competence and trustworthiness, are inherent components of a speaker's ethos.³ Other factors have been considered by various rhetoricians but have not been universally accepted.

The competence of the speaker depends heavily on whether the audience sees the speaker as a source of valid information. This only refers to whether the speaker is perceived as being knowledgeable on the matter that is under discussion at the time. Qualities that help make the speaker seem knowledgeable include his education, age, experience, and leadership ability. Bert E. Bradley says that "A speaker should attempt to establish his expertise on the matter under discussion if he is going to be most effective."⁴

Trustworthiness, the second component of ethos, refers to the objectivity and honesty projected by the speaker. If the speaker should somehow benefit personally from the results or outcome of his persuasibility, the audience may not perceive him as being honest because he is not truly objective. "Most people are suspicious of the speaker whose self-interest will be served by the proposal he is advocating."⁵ Studies have shown that the speaker who projects sincerity in what he says is found to be more credible by audiences.⁶

Several experimental studies indicate that various techniques can enhance the ethos of a speaker. First, James C. McCroskey's 1969 study on evidence showed that the use of

evidence can increase a speaker's credibility.⁷ Second, a study done by B. Goss and L. Williams in 1973 found that vague phrasing was more effective in improving ethos than specific phrasing.⁸ Finally, H. J. Sharp proved that the organization of a speech can affect the ethos of a speaker.⁹ Other studies have indicated that an organized speech aids the credibility of a speaker whereas a speech that is unorganized lowers the speaker's ethos.¹⁰

Aristotle's second appeal, pathos, is the appeal to the emotions of the audience. "The emotions are all those feelings that so change men as to affect their judgments, and are also attended by pain or pleasure."¹¹ According to Aristotle, speakers must come to a full understanding of the emotions "that is, to name them and describe them, to know their causes and the way in which they are excited."¹² This is necessary because "our judgments when we are pleased and friendly are not the same as when we are pained and hostile."¹³ Aristotle goes on to state that the arousing of the various emotions has nothing to do with the essential facts of the case, rather it is merely an appeal to the listeners, a means of persuading the listener.¹⁴

There are certain basic principles or rules that should be adhered to when a speaker utilizes the pathetic appeal. The principles that will be used in this analysis are those of Hugh Blair, an eighteenth century rhetorician.

Hugh Blair, George Campbell and Richard Whately, have been called the fathers of modern rhetoric.¹⁵ They combined the traditional rhetoric of men like Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian with modern interpretations to initiate a new era of rhetoric.

The fact that Blair refused to be identified with a single school of thought is said to have contributed to the long-range effect of his work.¹⁶ Blair's writings on rhetoric, particularly pathos, are quoted extensively in Speech Criticism by Thonssen and Baird. Blair has established the following criteria for the use of emotional appeals:

- "1. Decide whether the use of emotional appeals would be appropriate to the subject matter.
2. Do not forewarn the listeners that you will appeal to their emotions.
3. The speaker himself must be emotionally moved.
4. Emotional or "loaded" language should be used.
5. Avoid digression during the emotional appeal.
6. Be careful not to prolong the emotional appeal"¹⁷

In reference to number six it is not necessarily meant that emotional appeals cannot be used throughout the entire speech. Rather the speaker should vary the intensity of the emotional appeal so as not to place an unnecessary strain on the audience. The audience can follow a strong emotional appeal for only a short period of time. The speaker "who attempts to carry them further in passion, then they will follow him, destroys his whole design."¹⁸

One specific aspect of the pathetic appeal is the arousal of fear. While the results of early experimental studies on fear appeals were unclear, the most recent studies indicate that a message with a high fear appeal is more effective than one with a low-fear appeal. The most important criterion for using

various fear appeals is that the speaker provide some means to alleviate the fear before he concludes the speech.¹⁹

The third appeal cited by Aristotle was the logical appeal or logos. The logical appeal deals directly with the intellect of the audience. It basically consists of "the proofs proper, the arguments which the speaker advanced to establish the truth or untruth or what is asserted, the probability or improbability of success in the policy recommended to his audience."²⁰ Logos, then, is focused primarily upon evidence.

Evidence, when used correctly, can be very beneficial to the speaker. It can help enhance the ethos of a speaker, aid in changing the attitudes of an audience, and assure a more sustained attitude change.²¹ The criteria which must be met if the evidence is to be most effective are "(1) the qualifications of the source should be cited, (2) the evidence should be specific, and (3) the evidence should be substantially unfamiliar to the listeners."²² Evidence must be credible in order to prove the speaker's statements. According to Aristotle, the only way a statement can be both persuasive and credible is when it appears to be proven by some form of evidence.²³

The second method of analysis will deal with the appropriateness of the subject-matter as it relates to both the speakers and the audience. Aristotle stated that a speech is composed of three elements, the speaker, the subject-matter or speech content, and the audience to be addressed.²⁴ In order for effective communication to take place, some adaptations must be made in the content of a speech to make it suitable for both the speaker and the audience.

First the topic of the speech must be suited to the speaker involved. It must not only be a subject that the speaker is interested in but a subject the speaker is knowledgeable about. In other words, it is necessary for the speaker to prove that he is an authority on the subject. He can do this by thoroughly discussing the subject, citing examples of other authorities, demonstrating his leadership ability by proving he has people who believe in what he says, and citing examples of past activities done in connection with the topic. If the speaker cannot prove he is an authority on the topic, his ethos and thus his persuasibility is weakened.

In addition to suiting the speaker, the topic must be suited to the audience. It is vitally important to adapt the content of the speech to the audience. "Speakers can make adjustments without distorting, supressing, or in any way vitiating the integrity of their ideas, but practical wisdom decrees that they expound their views with forethought of the emotional makeup of the audience, with full recognition of the possible reactions of the group to the presentation."²⁵ In order to adapt the subject-matter of the speech to the audience, the speaker must take the characteristics of the audience into consideration when he prepares and presents his speech.

Thonssen in Speech Criticism lists the following audience characteristics which must be considered:²⁶

"(1) age level; (2) sex; (3) intellectual and informational status with regard to the subject; (4) political, social regligious, and other affiliations; (5) the economic status;

- (6) known or anticipated prejudices and predispositions;
- (7) occupational status; (8) known interest in the subject;
- (9) considerations of self-interest in the subject; and
- (10) temper and tone of the occasion."

Certain of these characteristics will be more important than others in specific situations. It is up to the speaker to determine which adaptations must be made in any given situation. Simply because the speaker needs to consider these characteristics in order to make the subject-matter relevant or appropriate to his audience does not mean that he must deal with all of these areas in his speech. However, it will be interesting to see how the various speakers will adapt to their audience.

Two of the principles of group discussion formulated by Cartwright deal directly with how the speaker adapts to the needs of any specific audience. These principles are:

1. "If the group is to be used effectively as a medium of change those people who are to be changed and those who are to exert influence for change must have a strong sense of belonging to the same group."
2. "The more attractive the group is to its members the greater the influence the group can exert on its members."

The third method of analysis will examine the speakers' use of propaganda devices. Too often the term propaganda arouses only negative connotations. The Propagandist is not necessarily inherently evil. H. L. Childs explains it this way, "To propagandize is to propagate--not human beings, animals,

or plants--but ideas, principles, and doctrines. To propagate ideas is to advance, further, spread, transmit, disseminate, promote, and increase them."²⁸

Because of the vast spread of various forms of propaganda into every imaginable area, the Institute for Propaganda Analysis was established in 1937. The Institute defines propaganda as an "expression or action by individuals or groups deliberately designed to influence opinions or actions of other individuals or groups with reference to predetermined ends."²⁹ By this definition it could be assumed that anyone who knowingly tries to persuade anyone else is a propagandist.

Many different techniques have been given the label of "propaganda". In an effort to establish a structure in utilizing propaganda devices as elements of rhetorical analysis, the propaganda devices used will be limited to those that were designated and defined by the Institute for Propaganda Analysis. They will be listed and defined according to the definitions of the Institute.

- "1. Name calling: giving an idea or object a bad name.
2. Glittering generality: associating something with a "virtue" word or idea.
3. Transfer: the transferring of the acceptability or unacceptability from one object to another.
4. Testimonial: having a respectable person (or an unrespectable person) say that something is good or bad.
5. Plain folks: identifying oneself with the audience.

6. Card stacking: selecting and presenting only the evidence that will support the speaker's idea.
7. Band wagon: saying that everyone is doing it so therefore the audience must do or accept the subject in question."³⁰

The device commonly referred to as name calling "is used to make us reject and condemn the idea without examining the evidence."³¹ There are many words that have negative connotations which some speakers may use to label an opponent or opposing idea in an effort to make the audience reject the opposing side. Many times words used in this manner may not even apply to the opposing side. A few terms that could be used in this manner are "Nazi," "Heretic," "Communist," and "Revolutionary."

Glittering generalities could be construed as being the opposite of name calling. This is basically the practice of associating a word or idea with a word that has a positive connotation. It "is used to make us accept and approve the thing without examining the evidence."³² A few examples of words that generally carry a positive connotation are "Christianity," "Love," "Good," and "Peace." The devices of name calling and glittering generality are usually expressed by one or two words.

As stated in the definition, the device known as transfer basically means projecting the respectability, authority, and prestige of one thing to something else. When using this particular device, symbols (i.e., words used in name calling and glittering generalities) are constantly used along with physical

objects. A hypothetical situation utilizing the transfer device could be the speaker taking the Bible to the stand with him, crossing his heart before he begins speaking, saying "God bless you," and then speaking on a completely unreligious topic. By incorporating the various devices utilized above, the speaker is establishing the idea that he is religious and thus whatever he says will be right and good.

Testimonials are an attempt to show that someone the audience knows, trusts, and respects will endorse a particular idea. When this is done, many people will feel that they should believe because someone they know and respect believes. Testimonials are not necessarily given in person. All the speaker has to do is to refer to the person and state that the person supports or doesn't support an issue. Testimonials need not be from positive sources since negative sources can also be utilized. A person of questionable credibility can be cited as supporting an issue thus damaging the worth of the issue itself.

The term plain folks refers to the method used by the speaker to identify himself with his audience. If the audience feels that the speaker is like them, a common person, and not someone talking down to them, the audience will be more apt to believe or do what the speaker has requested. One simple way to manipulate this feeling of identifying with the audience is to include pronouns such as "we," and "us" in the speech.

Card stacking is the selection of only the evidence which supports one side of an issue. It in fact "involves the selection and use of facts and falsehoods, illustrations or distractions,

and logical or illogical statements in order to give the best or the worst possible case for an idea, program, person or product."³³ This technique is not as dangerous or as overwhelming as it may seem at first glance. The American public is subjected to card stacking all of the time through the various media of communication. Fortunately, this happens so frequently that people generally have the opportunity to hear both sides of the issue and can then decide for themselves.

The band wagon technique is a technique to persuade people to do something merely because their peers are doing it. This technique attempts to convince people that all of the members of a particular group that they identify with accept a certain program, and that they must therefore follow the crowd and "jump on the band wagon."³⁴ The question that is raised here is simply "Everybody's doing it. Why not you?"³⁵ Again no real, logical evidence is given to support the issue in question.

Using propaganda devices is not inherently evil. They are effective persuasive tools. However, evidence to support the issue should be a strong part of the speech. "Once we know that a speaker or writer is using one of these propaganda devices in an attempt to convince us of an idea, we can separate the devices from the idea and see what the idea amounts to on its own merits."³⁶ Once a person becomes familiar with persuasive techniques, he is better prepared to look for the real truth in an issue rather than to simply be swayed by appeals to the emotions.

The fourth method of analysis, Kenneth Burke's pentad, provides a structure which can be utilized in the examination of any act. Basically the pentad provides a means to ascertain the motivation of the speaker. It allows one to examine a given act to determine the motivation of both the act itself and the motivation of the person relating the incident. David A. Long has said that "the pentad can be used as a means of examining how the persuader has attempted to achieve the restructuring of the audience's view of reality."³⁷

Burke describes his pentad in the following manner:

"We shall use five terms as a generating principle of our investigation. They are: Act, Scence, Agent, Agency, Purpose. In a rounded statement about motives, you must have some word that names the act (names what took place, in thought or deed), and another that names the scene (the background of the act, the situation in which it occurred); also, you must indicate what person or kind of person (agent) performed the act, what means or instruments he used (agency), and the purpose..."³⁸

He goes on to simplify this description even further by stating that the act is what was done, the scene is where or when it was done, the agent is who did it, the agency is how he did it, and the purpose is why it was done.³⁹

Burke says that any speaker will tend to emphasize one or two areas of the pentad more than the others. The areas a speaker will emphasize reflect the perspective on life that the speaker is expressing in his message. Thus, the pentad will provide a means to examine the structure of various incidents to help determine how a speaker is trying to influence the audience's perceptions of different events.

The methods in this chapter are meant to be the basis for the analysis of the speeches. However, if other persuasive techniques are recognized and would significantly add to the analysis, they will be discussed.

FOOTNOTES

¹Aristotle, The Rhetoric (New York: The Modern Library, 1954), p. 24.

²Lester Thonssen, A. Craig Baird, and Waldo W. Braden, Speech Criticism (New York: Ronald Press Company, 1948), p. 387.

³Raymond S. Ross, Persuasion: Communication and Interpersonal Relations (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1974), p. 159.

⁴Bert E. Bradley, Fundamentals of Speech Communication (Dubuque: Wm. C. Brown Company, 1974), p. 71.

⁵Ibid., p. 73.

⁶Ibid., p. 207.

⁷James C. McCroskey, and R. Samuel Mehrley, "The Effects of Disorganization and Nonfluency on Attitude Change and Source Credibility," Speech Monographs, 36 (1969), p. 13-21.

⁸Goss Baine and Lee Williams, "The Effect of Equivocation on Source Credibility," Central State Speech Journal, 34 (1973), p. 162-167.

⁹Thomas McClung and Harry Sharp, Jr., "Effects of Organization on the Speaker's Ethos," Speech Monographs, 33 (1966), p. 182-183.

¹⁰Eldon E. Blaker, "The Immediate Effects of Perceived Speaker Disorganization on Speaker Credibility and Audience Attitude Change of Persuasive Speaking," Western Speech, 29 (1965), 148-166.

¹¹Aristotle, p. 91.

¹²Aristotle, p. 25.

¹³Aristotle, p. 25.

¹⁴Aristotle, p. 20.

¹⁵Edward P. J. Corbett and James L. Golden, The Rhetoric of Blair, Campbell, and Whately (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1968), p. 1.

¹⁶Ibid., p. 3.

¹⁷Thonssen, p. 363-4.

¹⁸Ibid., p. 364.

¹⁹Bradley, p. 60.

²⁰Herbert J. C. Grierson, Rhetoric, (London: Oliver and Boyd LTD, 1945), p. 5.

²¹Bradley, p. 153.

²²Bradley, p. 154.

²³Aristotle, p. 27.

²⁴Grierson, p. 15.

²⁵Thonssen, p. 360.

²⁶Thonssen, p. 361-2.

²⁷Dorwin Cartwright, "Achieving Change in People: Some Applications of Group Dynamics Theory," Human Relations, 4 (1951), p. 387.

²⁸Harwood L. Childs, An Introduction to Public Opinion (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1940), p. 75.

²⁹Ibid., p. 81.

³⁰The Institute for Propaganda Analysis, The Fine Art of Propaganda (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1939), pp. 23-24.

³¹Ibid., p. 23.

³²Ibid., p. 24.

³³Ibid., p. 95.

³⁴Ibid., p. 105.

³⁵Ibid., p. 105.

³⁶Ibid., p. 24.

³⁷David A. Ling, "A Pentadic Analysis of Senator Edward Kennedy's Address to the People of Massachusetts, July 25, 1969," from Robert L. Scott and Bernard L. Brock, Methods of Rhetorical Criticism (New York: Harper and Row, 1972), pp. 329-330.

³⁸Kenneth Burke, A Grammar of Motives (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969), p. xv.

³⁹Ibid., p. xv.

WILLIAM KUNSTLER AT INDIANA UNIVERSITY

William Kunstler, a prominent civil rights lawyer, came to be a very popular campus lecturer in the late 1960's. This particular speech was given at Indiana University on October 7, 1970. Because of the publicity given to his activities connected with the Chicago 7 Conspiracy Trial, he attracted quite a large audience. The auditorium, completely filled, was closed approximately forty-five minutes before he was scheduled to begin. A closed circuit television broadcast was provided at certain areas on the campus for those unable to attend the lecture.

The organization of the speech follows a very logical pattern. First Kunstler makes an effort to establish audience identity. Then he goes into a lengthy attack on President Nixon's credibility, eventually inferring that the entire government is untrustworthy. Logically the next step is to examine governmental actions toward students and the reasons behind these actions. Finally he asks the students how they interpret these actions and what they are prepared to do about their interpretations.

The effort to establish audience identity is initiated at the beginning of the speech. The early attempt at audience identification establishes the good will of the speaker which helps Kunstler's ethos. He attempts to identify his feelings with those of the audience by referring to the Bobby Seale trial, which had just commenced. Bobby Seale informational activities are planned for the following weekend, and he urges

the audience to attend as many as possible. He briefly discusses the background material relating to the trial without citing sources because the audience has some knowledge of the incident, and he points out certain relevant facts that the audience may not be aware of. In doing this and in encouraging members of the audience to attend the planned activities, he is trying to open their minds enough so that they will want to learn more about the case before they pass judgment on it.

After attempting to open the audience's mind so that they will seek more information about current affairs, he states that he will simply relate facts and observations to the audience. He does not forewarn the audience that he will attempt to persuade them, which in fact he does do. The reason for this lack of warning is fairly obvious. When a speaker is attempting to persuade any audience, it is sometimes best not to admit the true purpose because he may automatically put the audience into a defensive state of mind.

Kunstler does not spend time trying to establish himself as an authority. The probity of a speaker's character is, in part, established by his relying upon authority gained from past experience and undermining the credibility of his opponent. Because he is such a prominent public figure, he may feel that the probity of his character is already established. He does devote a lot of attention, in the first segment of his speech, to undermining the credibility of the government and its head at that time, President Nixon. The manner in which this is accomplished is incredibly sly. Without even referring to

Nixon by name, he relates an incident concerning Nixon's relationship with students. This incident involved Nixon's rising at 4:30 a.m. to talk to students at the Lincoln Memorial, an action which Kunstler says is commendable. He goes on to state that Nixon discussed nothing of any worth at the monument but at "least he wasn't watching the Ohio State-Purdue football game." According to Kunstler the only time Nixon seems interested in students is at football games. Thus, in addition to attempting to undermine President Nixon's credibility, Kunstler also will attempt to transfer the unacceptability of the President's attitude and relationship with students in one particular incident to unacceptability in all cases.

Before Kunstler really begins his attack on Nixon's credibility, he first destroys the credibility of a close friend of Nixon's, Alf Landon, who was probably completely unknown to the audience. Then he tries to weaken Nixon's credibility by emphasizing the relationship between the two men.

Kunstler must first acquaint the audience with Alf Landon, who was dramatically unsuccessful candidate for the presidency in 1936. He attempts to transfer Landon's failure to Nixon by stating that Nixon was only narrowly more successful than his friend.

While discussing Alf Landon's presidential quest, Kunstler states that the sunflower was Landon's political motto. Since Kunstler is about twenty years older than most of the audience he tries to promote the idea that he can understand how the audience thinks. He attempts to do this by referring to the

sunflower as "a flower which some people tell me can be smoked with great effect."

The attack on Nixon's credibility resumes with the citation of an authoritative source who also questions Nixon's credibility. This is accomplished by discussing the speech given by President Nixon at the first Landon Lecture at Kansas State University. Kunstler compliments whoever wrote the speech, thus inferring that the content of the speech did not originate from Nixon. Then he paraphrases what Tom Wicker had to say about the speech in the New York Times which basically was "...it is hard to take such a speech seriously when the man who speaks it perpetuates violence every day in Vietnam."

The attacks on Nixon's credibility, often interrupted by positive feedback from the audience, are continued in this segment of the speech. After Nixon's credibility has been successfully weakened, emotional language is utilized to initiate a fear appeal. This is accomplished by saying that the Lincoln Memorial incident was simply a means of buying some time to find a way to "nip you in the bud." This refers to terminating student rebellion.

As Kunstler begins to build the next segment of the speech laughter is no longer heard. The students have begun to recognize the seriousness of the content of the speech as Kunstler tries to convince them that students are a threat to society, thus the government will deal with them accordingly. Sporadic applause continues throughout the speech but the intensity of the fear appeals changes the mood of the audience.

The audience is more attentive and less prone to interrupt what is being said by applauding. The polarization of the audience is unique in its intensity. Kunstler makes attempts at humor to help alleviate, temporarily, the tension produced by his fear appeals but over all the attitude of the audience has become serious.

After planting the seed of doubt as to the questionable character of the President, Kunstler goes on to relate what the President wants to do to students. First, Nixon asked Congress for 7,000-8,000 special agents to spy on college campuses. The vice-president, Spiro Agnew, came forth to state that "it is the responsibility of the campuses to isolate and destroy ...those on the campus who are the radical and violent few." These two things by themselves are enough to arouse, at the very least, resentment if not actual fear in the audience. Kunstler goes on to further establish the fear by comparing these happenings to those written about in Inside the Third Reich. To substantiate that students should be fearful, Kunstler goes on to reaffirm the memory of what happened at Jackson State and Kent State.

The accusation, which logically follows the discussion of increased governmental restrictions on college campuses, is that universities and institutions are programming students to "accept the governmental policies and edicts without questioning them." This is supported by the use of the testimonial technique in which an authoritative source is cited to support what has been said. The testimonial is from the prominent Yale law

professor who asserted that the Nixon Administration demands compliance with its edicts. Attempt at transfer is also evident in that the audience may think that whatever a Yale professor says is the truth.

In addition to the above mentioned techniques, Cartwrights' first principle, also referred to as "plain folks," is implemented by the skillful use of the word "our" when referring to society. Thus Kunstler is beginning to condition the audience to feel that he is one of them. From this point on, he will continue to use terms such as "we" or "our" to establish himself as a part of the group without really making an issue of it. In another instance he uses a personal pronoun when discussing how Daniel Barrigan outlined the difference between legality and morality "for us at the Catonsville trial." By saying "us" rather than "you" he is establishing a feeling of identity with the audience.

In an effort to establish a fear of governmental controls in the audience, Kunstler's next step is to discuss what happened to people who have not agreed with governmental edicts in the past. To do this Kunstler compares what is happening on the college campus in America today to what happened in Germany in the days of the Nazis. He is quite effective in developing the concept that one radical act, the burning of the Reichstag, was used to totally destroy the student movement at that time. Then he tries to show how burning of the Army Mathematics Research Center at the University of Wisconsin could become the modern version of the Reichstag fire. The authorities could

then cite this as an example of the results of student rebellion in order to quench all student questioning of authority.

He goes on to establish a strong fear appeal, a fear against the government and what it has done. He cites the following specific incidents as examples of what the government does to people: B-52's bombing Vietnam, defoliating land in Vietnam, blacks being shot in riots, students being killed at Jackson State and Kent State, and the bayonetting of women and babies at My Lai. This is also a good example of how he incorporates emotional words into the speech. These incidents are well known to the general public and could have involved the members of the audience. The real fear here is that the government was supposedly in control of these situations. This being so, the students should have a real question as to future dangers.

At this point it must be noted that Kunstler does indeed effectively use evidence to support his contentions. The evidence and situations referred to are familiar to the audience, but Kunstler's interpretations of these situations are unique. He also uses the device known as card stacking, which simply means that he only uses evidence which backs his contentions. Basically he is presenting an overwhelming amount of evidence to show that the government is inept, unjust and perhaps even evil while showing no evidence what-so-ever that there is anything good in the government.

Vague phrasing, one of the methods that can be utilized to enhance speaker credibility, is used throughout the speech. This is especially evident when Kunstler tries to establish a

fear of society within the audience. He repeatedly gives vague warnings against a "society" but fails to explicitly state who to be afraid of or what to expect. An example of this is "societies ignore realities and it's in the ignoring of those realities that they run counter to human desire and need and that they frequently fall or are significantly altered." Obviously this is filled with many vague, undefined terms such as "societies", "realities", and "significantly altered." The fear is there, but one is quite unsure as to what he is supposed to fear. The fact that Mr. Kunstler is able to create fear within the audience illustrates his credibility. A speaker must first be deemed credible before he can exert such strong influence on his audience.

In order to further strengthen his credibility, Kunstler uses the testimonial device to support the contention that historical incidents must be analyzed so that people can learn from mistakes of the past. First, Kunstler discusses information from Points of Rebellion, a book by Supreme Court Justice Douglas, in an effort to bring in an authoritative source to support his contention. He goes on to cite an extensive supportive quote from General Eisenhower which makes a plea to find some other way for a society to live. Kunstler effectively applies the last line of the quote, "Is there no other way, dear God, the world may live," to the inequities of present times.

Another testimonial is evidenced in the discussion of the Daniel Berrigan Case. Since Father Berrigan is a Catholic

priest, he should represent a credible, respectable figure. Kunstler agrees with the morality of what Father Berrigan did because he followed Kunstler's own philosophy of change, that of moving at a "slow and steady acceleration, of leaving one plateau for another." In an effort to establish the credibility of Berrigan's actions, Kunstler compares them to the Boston Tea Party. This is a prime example of transferring the morality of one act to another; this also illustrates that an act can be moral without being legal, according to Kunstler.

The flashback to the Berrigan incident provides a smooth transition into the conclusion of the speech where the audience is asked to consider two points. First, the fear appeal is re-emphasized by Kunstler's pleading with the audience to recognize and remember "the hands where the real blood lies," which refers to the government. Finally he appeals to the students "to ask yourself essentially where you're at and what it all means to you."

Even in the conclusion fear appeals are evident, as they have been throughout the speech. At some points humorous anecdotes are used to help temporarily alleviate the build of tension. Examples of this are the repeated references and jokes about Martha Mitchell. Finally he helps alleviate the fear by telling the audience that they should prepare themselves emotionally for what awaits them. Notice he does not make a dramatic appeal for drastic action, thus relieving the audience, at least temporarily, of any real responsibility for immediate action.

Throughout the speech Kunstler attempts to create a fear of high government officials by shifting the audience's perception of certain events. The Burkeian pentadic structure will illustrate where the shifts in perception are attempted. As Burke has pointed out, individual speakers tend to emphasize a shift in certain areas of the pentad. Kunstler tends to shift both the agent and the purpose.

One incident that clearly illustrates a shift in the pentadic structure centers around the message in a letter written by John Mitchell. Sent to fifty selected colleges, it offered to provide high-level government officials "to create a dialogue with students to dispell the rhetoric of the violent few and to open up the air to a mutual exchange." In the audience's original perception, the agent is John Mitchell, the act is writing and sending the letter to college administrators and the agency is the letter. The purpose is to create communication with college students. Kunstler shifts the agent from John Mitchell to the administration. He then shifts the purpose from creating communication with students to suppressing student rebellion. These shifts in perception are directed at creating a strong feeling of fear and distrust of U.S. government officials.

Another example of shift in perception comes in the discussion of the Nixon news conference. The news conference was held in order to publicly ask Congress for funds for additional FBI agents so that such agents could be sent to college campuses. In this situation the audience perceives that the agent is Nixon,

the agency is the news conference, the act is asking Congress for additional special agents, and the purpose is to stop violence on college campuses. Kunstler shifts the agent from Nixon to the administration. The purpose shifts from stopping violence on college campuses to spying on students. Again, through shifts in perception, Kunstler attempts to create a fear of the government.

Kunstler links isolated events (i.e. Mitchell's letter and Nixon's request) together to prove that the government is trying to control the actions of college students. These isolated events are initiated by different people or groups in the United States Government. Kunstler shifts the audience's perception of the situations to the belief that all of the events are undertaken by one group for one purpose. In reality each situation should be examined separately to determine its purpose.

Another technique Kunstler uses to strengthen the fear appeal is the use of colorful language. Not only does the language sound educated, it plays upon one's emotions and imagination. Following are a few examples taken from various parts of the speech, of the emotion packed or "loaded" words or phrases: "Torquemada, J. Edgar Hoover, Cardinal Wolsey, John Mitchell"; "noisome hogwash"; "Christ legalized onto the cross"; "You can be legalized into nullification"; and "this morass we're in." From the variety of examples, it seems obvious that Kunstler uses "loaded" words rather freely.

Another language technique, the metaphor, is used to emphasize important points throughout the speech. Following are examples

of the metaphors found in Kunstler's speech: "weather-eye to windward"; "the slow atrophy of a life stifled by useless shadows"; "like unto an arrow in the hand of a child"; "to say that students can be bottled up and be programmed to come out in replicas"; "humanity hanging from a cross or iron"; "tremble on the lips of history"; "too jelly brained to act chained to a portfolio." Not only do these metaphors illustrate various points very concisely and vividly, they add interest to the context of the speech.

One other technique which adds to the effectiveness of the speech is the use of Cartwright's second principle. The group being discussed is inherently attractive to the students because they are the students, the particular segment of society that Kunstler is trying to persuade. The audience identifies with other students regardless of the situation simply because of the title of "youth" or "students".

The persuasive devices employed by Kunstler are fairly well balanced in their appeal. The emotional appeal utilizes colorful language and is balanced by adequate evidence. Most of this comes in the form of testimonials and comparisons of historical events to present day incidents. Also the evidence presents only Kunstler's views. Attempts are made to build audience identity with favorable audience responses suggesting that this is successful. Since the organization of the speech is very good and the basic appeals are balanced, one could conclude that the speech was well thought out in advance. The delivery, as evidenced from a tape recording, was smooth with points following one another

logically and pauses being used when needed. From the audience response one could conclude that Kunstler's message was well received.

WILLIAM BUCKLEY, JR. AT KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

William Buckley, Jr. is perhaps best known because of his success as a journalist. However, he is becoming better known as a speaker because of guest appearances on television and through lectures on college campuses. The speech to be examined here deals with his observations on the free market system. It was given at Kansas State University in 1974.

Buckley's speech is divided into three major sections. First, he attempts to destroy the credibility of Jean Revel and John Galbraith supposed economic experts who disagree with Buckley's point of view. Second, Buckley attacks what Galbraith has said about economic and political life in China. He concludes with a weak emotional appeal promoting the free market system. Buckley's purpose is relatively unclear throughout most of the speech. Indeed, if one did not know the title of the speech one might be unsure of its topic. The real purpose, defending the free market, is not clearly stated until the last paragraph.

The major contentions in the speech are difficult to ascertain. The entire speech is filled with vague statements and much of the language which is utilized is not appropriate to the intelligence level of the audience. Obviously Mr. Buckley is a very intelligent man but he suffers one of the faults of the intelligent, the inability to bring his ideas down to the level of the common man. In this case he would only have needed to relate his material to the typical college student. In other words, he did not really need to simplify his ideas, only to explain them better.

When he is trying to attack the contentions of others he does clarify his thoughts to a greater degree than when he is stating his own contentions. However, it is vital to the context of his speech to make his contentions clear. One of the best examples of the vagueness of his ideas comes after he spent considerable time questioning the credibility of others. He says:

"I myself view the mechanization of the individual as the principal commitment of American secularism, who have lost hold of the metaphysical arguments, leaving them with a philosophy of positivism to which they now can enjoin with great facility, the phenomenological opportunism."

Many of the words are not only vague but totally unfamiliar to the audience at a point when the audience should know exactly what Mr. Buckley is trying to accomplish.

Vague phrasing and the use of a large and varied vocabulary are Buckley's way of projecting credibility. He does not make over attempts to establish credibility, but many of the things that promote credibility are very subtle. Buckley promotes the probity of his character through associations with religious matters. He demonstrates sagacity by displaying common sense and good taste. And, even more importantly, his vast knowledge and ability to discuss current events strengthens his sagacity.

One of the ways to establish probity of character is by demonstrating that the opponent is not credible. Throughout the speech Mr. Buckley repeatedly tries to destroy the credibility of others, particularly that of certain men who may be thought of as economic experts. John Kenneth Galbraith and Jean Francois Revel are the two who are under the heaviest attack. In the first few sentences of the speech Buckley tries to show that since

Mr. Revel wrote a book entitled A Future Without Marx or Jesus, anything he says may have its validity questioned.

This attack on Revel's credibility can be readily analyzed through the use of Kenneth Burke's pentad. The audience's original perception is that a book was written (act) by Francois Revel (agent) for the purpose of discussing new revolutionary trends. Buckley attempts to shift the purpose of the act to show that Revel is promoting a possible future without God. Thus Revel must be untrustworthy. As the audience probably is unfamiliar with the book, they may simply accept Buckley's interpretation of it.

Buckley goes on to state what Revel and Galbraith have had to say in broad general terms and then attacks these statements. He supports these attacks with authoritative testimonials and cites statements from two professors in an attempt to question what Galbraith and Revel have said. It is interesting to note that the professors mentioned, Christopher Dawson and David Riesman, are possibly unfamiliar to the audience and no attempt was made to acquaint the audience with them.

Next Buckley begins his real attack, which questions what Galbraith, in particular, has had to say regarding the economic system of China. Again the Burkeian pentadic structure offers a clearer view of how Buckley shifts the audience's perception of certain events to serve his own persuasive purpose. The audience's original perception is that John Galbraith wrote a book discussing the government of Mao Tse-tung. The act was the writing of the book, the agent was John Galbraith, the agency was the book

and the purpose was to inform about life in China. Buckley shifts the purpose of the act to Galbraith's justifying the Mao Tse-tung regime. In Buckley's words "in Mr. Galbraith's book, Mao Tse-tung emerges as a sort of Rector of Justin."

After completing the attack on Galbraith's credibility, Buckley promotes the free market system. His use of evidence to support the free market system is accomplished in two distinct ways. First he uses testimonials or authoritative evidence to support his ideas and then he cites examples of what has happened to individual rights in countries such as Russia and China which do not have a free market system.

The writings of Professor Ross Terrill are utilized as a testimonial to support the contention that the loss of a free market results in the loss of individual freedom. He says that Professor Terrill tells people the truth about how life is in China by stating that

"there is no freedom to practice religion, nor to vote, nor to express oneself freely, nor to read books or periodicals one desires to read, nor to join a labor union nor to change one's job nor to travel to another city or another country."

Effort at transfer is also evident since Professor Terrill is a Harvard professor, the audience will recognize that Harvard is prestigious, and thus the man should be reputable.

An example of what the loss of freedom can mean is illustrated by a quote from Terrill's discussion of Ku Mojo, an author who once wrote books for small groups of people. Now the Chinese authorities require him to write books that will appeal to millions.

Obviously, this hampers the author's creativity and he may even be required to do something that he is incapable of doing.

Another good example of loss of freedom comes in the concluding paragraph which relates to personal freedom in Russia. Mr. Buckley contends that the only free market left in Russia is the black market where some people will go to great lengths to read material forbidden to them. He states that

"there are old men and old women and young men and young women who transcribe by hand not for profit from Radio Liberty, risking prison by the very act of listening to it, the latest novel of Solzhenitsyn, word after word, sentence after sentence, page after page. A process that takes them months to complete. Resulting not in thousands, let alone millions of copies, but a few dozen or perhaps a few hundred, the oddments of cloth. But it is worth it. Worth everything to preserve those oddments. To make them available to those who are graced with a thirst for them."

Thus he is trying to prove the necessity of individual freedom and show that people feel that freedom is a vital part of life and will even risk their lives, if necessary, to have the right to make certain decisions for themselves.

While fear appeals have not been an integral part of the speech, the fear of the loss of personal or individual freedom is established in the conclusion of the speech. First, Buckley emphasizes that the American political system needs to find a way to appeal to large numbers of American people or the current political parties will not remain strong. He puts it quite aptly by saying "it will find itself voted into singularity." Next he asserts that if people are truly concerned about the American society they should concern themselves with "the survival of the individual...focus on him and on his needs." Finally he gives the

example which was discussed before about what has happened in Russia.

Though the fear appeal is present, it was not fully developed. If Buckley had incorporated examples of what the loss of freedom has done to other young people, the fear appeal would have had more relevance to the audience. Buckley's dull, lackluster delivery did nothing to strengthen the fear appeal. More emotional involvement on his part, which could have been manifested by vocal variety and word emphasis, would have also strengthened the effect of the fear appeal on the audience. Since the fear appeal came so late in the speech, the tension or fear could not build throughout the major part of the speech. The use of emotional language would have also helped, particularly in the conclusion.

Also if Mr. Buckley had paid more attention to gaining audience identity, the conclusion would have been more effective. Only a very few times during the speech did he actually try to establish audience identity. Even then he did not emphasize this most vital aspect, he simply used the terms "we" and "our" once or twice. If he had even stressed these terms in the conclusion it would have had more of an appeal to the audience.

The lack of personal pronouns may have alienated the audience. This is also true of the obvious failure to adapt the subject to the audience. The intellectual language, in many cases, was far above the audience's understanding. Also, too many references were made to men and incidents that were totally unfamiliar to the audience.

Perhaps the best aspect of Buckley's speech was the implementation of good comparisons. This is characteristic of his writing

and speaking, and the comparisons are interesting, if a bit far fetched at times, and do demonstrate quite a vivid imagination. Examples of these analogies are stating that Mao Tse-tung emerges as a sort of Rector of Justin and comparing Professor Galbraith's examination of economic matters to Charles Darwin's whipping out his magnifying glass.

Certain basic techniques were emphasized by William Buckley, Jr. Perhaps the most emphasis was placed on undermining the credibility of the so-called economic experts. This was primarily accomplished through shifts in the audience's perception of the purpose of certain incidents. The attack on the credibility of others was balanced by evidence to support Buckley's own contentions. The supportive evidence came chiefly through the use of testimonials and examples.

Factual material, logos, was emphasized to the point that ethos and pathos were almost totally excluded. As noted before, very little attempt was made to establish speaker credibility, ethos. Very little was done to establish fear appeals except in the very end, and even here the appeals were not fully developed. The use of good analogies was typical of his style, as was the intellectual vocabulary that was employed. The vagueness of his statements, which was evidenced throughout the speech, may have enhanced speaker ethos but left the audience with a desire to know what Buckley had really tried to say.

GEORGE LINCOLN ROCKWELL AT FORT HAYS STATE COLLEGE

George Lincoln Rockwell founded and led the American Nazi Party from 1958 to 1967. He became well known to the American people because of his radical ideas and the violent way that he expressed those ideas. The speech to be examined here was given at a small state supported college at Hays, Kansas, in 1967 shortly before Mr. Rockwell was assassinated. It illustrates some of his more controversial beliefs

One of the most interesting aspects of the speech is the desperate attempt that Rockwell makes to strengthen the probity of his character. Unlike most speeches where the establishment of speaker credibility takes place primarily in the beginning of the speech, Mr. Rockwell tries to enhance the probity of his character, in various ways, throughout the entire speech. He carefully documents most of the evidence that he presents, attempts to transfer acceptability from one object to another, and utilizes language which illustrates the technique of glittering generality or "virtue" word association.

At the very outset of the speech he attempts to transfer the acceptability of his past military record to his current character by discussing his war activities. Furthermore, he tries to transfer the respectability of citizens of Hays to himself. This is accomplished by referring to his past relationship with the father of one of the members of the student council, which is sponsoring his speech. He also states that the mayor of Hays was one of his assistants during the war.

Although the idea of establishing credibility by associating himself with the respectable elements of Hays' citizenry is commendable, it was not successful. After saying that the student's father was his best buddy during the war, he has to admit that he has forgotten his name. To make matters worse, he goes on to state that he has also forgotten the name of his assistant who currently is the mayor of Hays. It probably did no good to emphasize a close relationship with these men if he could not remember their names. Still, he might have been successful if he hadn't told the audience about his forgetfulness.

Rockwell damages further his credibility by mentioning the necessity for evidence documentation and then presenting weakly documented evidence to support his contentions. In addition to this, his speech seems to lack organization. Rockwell changes subjects every few minutes making it very difficult to follow his train of thought. Indeed, one wonders whether he has any real purpose in the speech. His use of evidence and lack of organization will be dealt with in depth later in the analysis. First, his major contentions will be examined.

Since one of Mr. Rockwell's strongest contentions relates to his feeling that he is constantly being misrepresented to the public, he thanks the audience for the chance to present his own ideas before they have been "filtered through the brain and pan" of others. Here he begins his first real attempt to persuade the audience. Examples are cited to illustrate that two articles, supposedly expressing his ideas, were not really doing so. The first example is an article, published in Playboy, that he claims

was edited by a Jew who admitted, only to Rockwell of course, that the article was falsified. Second, there was an article published in Esquire which was tampered with by another Jew.

With these attacks on the editing of his articles, Mr. Rockwell is beginning a slow but steady build of accusations against Jews. A technique which will be utilized throughout the speech, name calling, makes its first appearance here. Though Mr. Rockwell does not use any term other than Jew to refer to the Jewish people, it is evident from listening to a tape of the speech that he spits out the word Jew as though it were something dirty and disgusting. Whenever the term Jew is mentioned in the speech, the same method of delivery is utilized.

Mr. Rockwell tells the audience that his purpose in speaking to them is to "enlighten" them, to simply give them facts. However, the careful observer will realize that since the Jews have already been accused of being the ones responsible for misrepresenting him to the American people, it is very likely that they may remain the scapegoat for many of the other evils which will be reported "factually" throughout the speech.

After his accusation of the Jews the first attempt at establishing a fear appeal is made through a reference to the United States as being "supposedly" a free country. Here Mr. Rockwell is suggesting, through a play on words and vocal emphasis of "supposedly", that the U.S. may not really be a "free" country. From this point he warns that if the public continues "to be the victims of managed and phony news" that the country will end up with another "atrociousness of Vietnam."

This assertion leads into a discussion of his views on Vietnam with intermingled attempts to establish his credibility and develop audience identity. He reminds the audience of his past military record, thus trying to establish himself as an authority on war. He expresses his love for his country and his fear for the safety of American servicemen. The reference to his military record, in addition to the use of "we" when referring to events connected with the war, is an attempt to build a feeling of oneness with the audience through the use, of Cartwright's first principle and/or the propaganda device of plain folks. At the same time, the fear appeal is being stressed, with Rockwell pronouncing "We're almost finished." By saying this, Rockwell is attempting to make the audience feel that their life, as they now know it, will soon be over.

Cartwright's second principle is also utilized during the discussion of the Vietnam War. The fear of war is emphasized by stating that some members of that very audience will be in Vietnam soon, either because of being drafted or volunteering. In fact, he says that some of them will be killed. He maintains that one of the biggest reasons for this is the poor handling of the war. An example of this poor handling is that the army cannot use tear gas in Vietnam, while "our" government can use it on coeds at the University of Mississippi.

In dropping the subject of the Vietnam war, Mr. Rockwell returns to one of his original suppositions, that Americans are being grossly misinformed or uninformed. He employs propaganda devices by effectively utilizing both namecalling and glittering

generality. In the following phrase, which refers to Castro, both techniques are employed: "Patriots who are trying to go down there and get that communist, bearded, beatnik, skum, dictator out of their country." Many times the term "communism" or "red" is utilized both as name calling and as an attempt to establish fear. An example of the dual usage of this word along with an attempt at audience identity is "You must risk your life in Vietnam stopping communism."

Rockwell's discussion of Castro is one of the many digressions within the speech. Many times these digressions arise from an attempt to enhance credibility. At other times they seem to be more of a rambling attempt to arouse the emotions of the audience. One of the best examples of a digression is Rockwell's repeated reiteration of his experiences during World War II. He colors these references with emotional language, which involves name-calling and glittering generalities. But the biggest emphasis seems to be on establishing his credibility by showing how he risked his life to defend America.

After this digression Rockwell emphasizes documentation of evidence. Before he actually begins this documentation he cleverly tries to transfer the acceptability of reputable historical happenings to un reputable ones. Two such comparisons are given, the first relating to the Alamo. Mr. Rockwell states that future generations will liken the Nazi Movement in Germany to what happened at the Alamo, but he fails to explain this, so it is difficult to understand his meaning. The second analogy compares his stance for Nazism to that of Christians supporting Christianity 2,000 years ago.

Mr. Rockwell returns to the point he was trying to emphasize concerning evidence documentation. He tells the audience that each document that he presents during the speech will be made available to anyone in the audience who will send away for it. The documents will be photographically reproduced to help insure their validity. He goes on to plead with the audience to send away for the documents so that his integrity will not be doubted. Obviously, through his overemphasis on documentation, it can be seen that in the past his integrity has been questioned.

Although the evidence is well documented, he only presents one-sided information. That is to say, the card stacking device, giving only the information which supports one's contention, is employed. Rockwell tries to explain why he will present only a few documents by saying that he is limited by time. Since he boasts of having hundreds of documents, one wonders why he only offers to send copies of the few documents (3 or 4) which he discusses during the speech.

An interesting aspect regarding the presentation of evidence is demonstrated later in the speech. Indeed though Mr. Rockwell utilizes the cardstacking of evidence in his speech, he will later accuse a mystical "they" of only allowing certain facts to be communicated to the American people. At one point, close to the termination of the speech, he will tell the audience that he can not blame them for thinking that the Negroe race is equal to the white race because the audience has never seen the facts which prove otherwise. So while Mr. Rockwell will repeatedly cry that the public gets misrepresented facts, or that the evidence is

"stacked", he will do the very same thing in his own presentation.

The first document cited by Mr. Rockwell, a newspaper article dated February 8, 1920, quotes what Winston Churchill had to say about the Russian Revolution. Much time is spent giving careful documentation of the article. Two propaganda devices are utilized in an effort to establish the article's believability. Glittering generality is employed when referring to "the right honorable Winston Churchill" and transfer is evident in trying to pass Churchill's credibility of the 1960's to an article that the British statesman wrote nearly a half century earlier. The basic information given in the article states that many Jews were involved in the Russian Revolution. Later, Mr. Rockwell will twist this piece of material to fit his own purpose.

The next document to be presented consists of excerpts from the 1939 and 1965 editions of Who's Who In American Jewry. Biographical sketches of Russian leaders, such as Trotsky, were given in these books. Mr. Rockwell claims that powerful politicians, of questionable credibility, who are listed in these books are being presented as examples of what good Jewish people are like. What Mr. Rockwell fails to recognize or admit is that being Jewish does not necessarily have a religious connotation because it can also refer to an ethnic group. These books list prominent men of either the Jewish race and/or religion. The men listed in these books are simply prominent Jewish people. They are not meant to be examples to illustrate high Jewish credibility or morality.

Mr. Rockwell returns from this little digression to another document related to the Russian Revolution. This document is an U.S. Government intelligence report, now declassified, stating that most of the leaders of the Russian Revolution were Jewish. From this bit of information Mr. Rockwell concludes that "The Russian Revolution was the capture of Russia by international athiest Jews". Though his document is from an authoritative source, Mr. Rockwell's interpretation is unjust and slanted. If a group of people who live in a country decide to join with other ethnic groups within the country to revolutionize the government, it does not constitute the overthrow of the government from outside sources. All of the discussion on the Russian Revolution is interjected with such appeals to the audience as "Don't you think they should have told you that in your history classes?" This is an attempt to make the subject more relevant to the audience.

After citing well documented evidence which is twisted through slanted interpretations, Mr. Rockwell states that 15 or the 16 Soviet spys captured in America have been Jewish. Since Mr. Rockwell always makes a point of stressing documentation, one wonders why no effort is made to document this fact. However, this is another good example of the digressions that are apparent throughout the speech. From this point the digressions will be more numerous and will mainly be aimed at attacking the Jews.

Finally, mid-way through the speech, Mr. Rockwell bluntly states his real thesis. Always before he has complained that the American public is being misinformed about many things. However, he finally reveals his real grievance, or fanaticism, that the public is not allowed to know the truth about one group, the Jewish

people. From this point he will freely direct his attack at the Jewish people.

One weapon in his attack is to use words that simply drip emotions such as "sadistic", "vicious", and "vile". He also claims that his next contention will cause Jews to "start running around and start frothing at the mouth." Through his use of language Rockwell seems to be making an effort to dehumanize the Jewish people.

Rockwell emphasizes the term "Jew". He spits out the term not referring to them as being Jewish or using any other descriptive terms. This must be reemphasized because it is such an important part of his speaking style. He cannot disguise his feelings for the Jewish people because no matter what he discusses he disgresses to a reference to "Jews", always saying it as an aristocrat would disdainfully state a four letter word.

With the increased use of the term "Jew" the tempo of the speech begins to increase as Rockwell really begins his direct attack. First he discusses the practice of labeling products with "k's" and "u's". He tries to show that this practice, making products "kosher", shows that the Jewish people rule the economy of the U.S. This process by which this "rule" is carried out is not fully explained, indicating vague phrasing. While vague phrasing seems to enhance the credibility of a person who already seems somewhat credible, the effectiveness is questionable in Mr. Rockwell's case. Since he has failed to establish an "aura of credibility", it seems unlikely that being vague in this instance will really be beneficial to him.

The discussion of making products "Kosher" is really the first part of a three step attack on Jewish businessmen. It is an attempt to show how powerful Jewish businessmen are, thus creating a fear within the audience. The next two points will deal respectively with how the Jewish businessmen can control both written and televised material. Weakly documented material, taken out of context, illustrates that Jewish businessmen have attempted to stifle books which are demeaning to the Jewish people. Even if Rockwell's contention is proven to be true, it can hardly be construed as a power play but rather as human nature. Also he can only show one incident where this may have taken place. He goes on to compare the book incident with how the truth about Negroes is not given to the public. However, he does not say who is responsible for this.

Interestingly enough, he now goes on to state that the three major television networks are controlled by Jews. Then he complains that television does not show the true hideous side of the Negro. He fails to show why these Jewish controlled networks show only good Negroes.

Name calling and the transfer of unacceptable terminology are utilized in this digression to make an attack on Rockwell's second to least favorite ethnic group, the American Negro. The language utilized is strong and full of connotative meaning. He says "Most of the serious murders, rapes, robberies, and muggings are committed by Negroes." He also states that FBI statistics support this contention. Again, the documentation is weak because he fails to tell the audience where they can find these statistics.

Next Mr. Rockwell makes a vain attempt to wander back to his original thesis: how facts in general are withheld from the American public. He utilizes both strong language, which includes name calling, and the discussion of testimonials. The name calling refers to the usage of terms such as "hate-bigots", "liars", and "red-baters". He then discusses how testimonials have been used on the American people through the public support of communistic leaders of other countries by such prominent people as Eleanor Roosevelt, Walter Lippman, Dean Rusk, and Dean Acheson.

To implement another little digression, Rockwell tries to illustrate that physical appearance can indicate credibility. This is really most incongruous since he is discussing physical attributes when throughout the speech he has consistently emphasized that "Jewish" refers to a religion rather than to a race of people. Rockwell implies many communist spys are Jewish. To prove his assertion he simply tells the audience to examine the length of a spy's nose. He says, "From now on when they present a communist spy you'll see how long the nose is."

Mr. Rockwell again tries to establish his credibility before moving to his next contention. He restates his World War II activities and then tries to show how he alone is fighting the battle against the filth of communism. One might wonder why he is still trying to establish his credibility. This possibly results from two factors. First, he obviously is insecure in his position of leadership and must doubt his own persuasiveness from past failures. Second, and possibly most important, from listening to a tape of the speech it is evident that there has been a lack of positive audience response to any part of the speech.

From this point Mr. Rockwell begins to develop the conclusion of his speech by building a fear appeal. He restates facts that he has previously presented regarding revolutions in other countries. He tries to point out a pattern, that of the oppressed minority taking over the governments of various countries, and attempts to show that this will happen in America. The weakest part of this argument is that he has not previously made an attempt to show that an "oppressed minority" was responsible for the overthrow of any of the governments that he has discussed.

Another weak appeal is his attempt to create fear by asserting that Martin Luther King is the dangerous communistic leader who will take over this country. Here he is saying that a credible person who has proven his love for peace by attempting to squelch violent riots of his own people will try to take over the U.S. through violent means. The fear appeal could have been much more effective if he had chosen one of the more violent black leaders such as Malcomx.

In an effort to continue to build fear against blacks Rockwell brings in an incident, taken quite out of context, which nevertheless has quite a pull on one's emotions. It involves what black men did to a white woman in the Congo. "They cut off a nun's arm in one of the recent ceremonies and made her eat it, right in the middle of this town square here." While this doesn't directly relate to the situation at hand, it might arouse fear particularly in those in the audience who harbor racial prejudice.

Continuing to develop a fear appeal, he discusses the beauty of a pure race. He tells the audience that America is in great danger of losing her pure white race. To emphasize this fear he

says other countries have lost their racial purity giving Brazil as an example.

The speech concludes with an appeal to the audience to rise up and become prepared to fight "the communist conspiracy that is out to destroy you...I beg you to stand up for what you are...the greatest nation and the greatest race in the world...white power".

The conclusion does not seem to bring the speech to a reasonable climax because it does not effectively bring the major points of the speech together. Instead of providing a logical conclusion, Rockwell begins an unreasonable, fanatical raving. Obviously the audience who attended the lecture was shocked because there was absolute silence after the termination of the speech.

Rockwell did not give members of the audience time to respond, to come out of that shock. He began a tirade against them by saying that it was rude not to applaud. He claimed that this had never happened to him before and charged that the audience must have been told not to applaud. He then accused the audience of letting themselves be manipulated in a laboratory experiment. In the midst of the raving, a member of the audience yelled out the truth, that Rockwell hadn't given the audience a chance to respond in any manner.

It seems almost sad that Rockwell spent the entire speech trying to establish credibility only to ruin what little prestige he might have gained after the termination of the speech. A question and answer period followed the speech. Questions were asked that were worded very intelligently, including good documentation, and Rockwell responded childishly by avoiding the

questions he couldn't answer, attacking the questions, or attacking their author. An example of this is when he was asked if he could support Hitler's slaughter of the Jewish people. Rockwell responded that Hitler did not deliberately kill the Jews, rather that many of them died simply because people die whenever there is a war. Another example is when a member of the student organization which sponsored his speech asked a well documented question regarding Hitler's philosophy of government. The student obviously knew more about this than Rockwell did. Rockwell couldn't answer, so he attacked the person who asked the question by implying that the student was the one who was ignorant. Because of these "avoidance" tactics, Rockwell's credibility was probably worse at the end of the experience than before he began his speech.

In an effort to create fear of Jewish people, Rockwell attempted to change the audience's perception of certain incidents. Kenneth Burke's pentad is useful in examining these shifts in audience perception. One should take particular notice that Rockwell attempted shifts in perception of both the agent and the purpose.

An example of the attempted shift in audience perception is illustrated in Rockwell's discussion of the Russian Revolution. In this situation the audience's original perception is that the act is the overthrow of the Russian Government, the agent is revolutionary Russian citizens, the agency is physical violence, the the purpose is to establish a new government in Russia. Rockwell shifted the agent from Russian citizens, some of whom happened to be Jewish, to an international Jewish organization. He then shifted the purpose to indicate that the Jewish people

were out to conquer the world. To quote Rockwell, "The Russian Revolution was the capture of Russia by international atheist Jews." This statement might have created a fear of Jewish people if Rockwell had been deemed credible.

Another event in which Rockwell tried to shift the audience's perception of both the purpose and the agent dealt with the "stifling" of a book. The B'nai B'rith Anti-Defamation League sent a letter to Scribners and Sons in an effort to keep a book that had derogatory material about Jews off the news stands. The audience's original perception would be that the act is keeping the book from being sold, the agent is the Anti-Defamation League, the agency is a polite letter requesting that the book not be sold, and the purpose is to keep slanted racial prejudice out of the public's reach. Rockwell attempted to shift the agent from the religious group, the B'nai B'rith Anti-Defamation League, to powerful Jewish businessmen. The important shift is in the purpose. Rockwell tried to show that since the book was never sold that prominent Jews were trying to manipulate the American people's views through stifling of printed materials. Rockwell's shifts in audience perception were slanted and not supported by logical reasoning or factual evidence. He not only had to shift the purpose of certain incidents to comply with his persuasive goals, he also had to shift the agent.

Rockwell employed many persuasive techniques in this speech with careful documentation of evidence being stressed the most. The propaganda devices which were used were transfer, name calling, plain folks, and glittering generality. Fear appeals were utilized and enhanced by the use of emotional language and name calling.

Audience identity was emphasized through the use of Cartwright's 1st principle. Although he did not use testimonials himself, he did discuss how they are being utilized to sway the American people. All in all, quite a variety of techniques were employed although their effectiveness might be questioned since the speaker's credibility was never fully established.

One of the reasons Rockwell's credibility was never established was the disorganization of the speech. Persuasive devices by themselves are not enough to convince an audience. They must be used in a logical, analytical manner. There really was no organizational plan for the speech. The transitions from one point to another were very weak if indeed there were any. It was impossible for the audience to follow Rockwell's train of thought.

DICK GREGORY AT FORT HAYS STATE UNIVERSITY

Dick Gregory was first introduced to the American people as a comedian. Although he now lectures on college campuses, he has not lost his ability to entertain audiences. He combines his talents and experiences as an entertainer with his personal beliefs to give quite a performance.

The speech to be examined here was given before a packed auditorium at Kansas State University in the Fall of 1974. Mr. Gregory's purpose in lecturing to college audiences is not as radical as some may believe. Although his speeches express radical ideas, his goal is to wake-up the young people in America. He does not support or condone violence. He believes that the key to changing the bad elements in the American way of life is to make America's youth aware of the problems. He feels that service is the answer to America's problems, "defending the needy against the greedy". Gregory's expression of these beliefs is vibrant with energy and conviction.

Before discussing Mr. Gregory's enthusiastic delivery and use of persuasive devices, the organization of the speech will be briefly outlined. The speech is divided into four basic segments with the introduction making efforts to establish audience identity and to destroy the credibility of past presidents. Questioning the credibility of LBJ and Nixon provides a smooth transition into Mr. Gregory's attack on government agencies. This attack centers around current political activities and is directed at the FBI and CIA. Next he discusses what he feels are the major problems that America faces today. According to Gregory, these

are being "morally bankrupt on one side, and nature closing in on the other". Quite logically, the conclusion offers the audience a way to solve these problems.

From the very beginning of the speech Mr. Gregory tries to establish identity with the audience, thus enhancing his ethos. Various methods are employed in this attempt with the first being a reference to the upcoming KSU vs. KU football competition. Unfortunately, Gregory makes the mistake of referring to KSU as the Panthers rather than Wildcats. Ordinarily this would hurt a speaker's credibility, but not in this case. Very shortly after this mistake Gregory has the audience laughing and applauding with a great deal of enthusiasm. Gregory begins the speech by complimenting the audience. He not only says that it's a pleasure to be giving the speech but also says that he and other blacks are "glad you young white kids is on the scene, cause many of you is just like a breath of fresh air." It is very important for Gregory to deal with the racial matter since many of the white students in the audience grew up in predominantly white communities with only white friends. Many members of the audience are not accustomed to even speaking with blacks let alone listening to a lecture given by a black lecturer.

Humerous references to black myths help alleviate the tension that may be present in both the white and black members of the audience. As Gregory makes light of racial differences and causes members of the audience to be aware of the ridiculousness of the myths, the audience feels more comfortable. They can see one another as individuals, fellow human beings, rather than as races

of people. Gregory's in-depth discussion of black myths will be treated more fully later in this chapter as his major use of the idea comes later in the speech with a very definite purpose in mind.

Another method which creates audience identity is the use of language. Words and phrases such as "on the scene", "mellow trip", and "freaks" are used in an effort to incorporate the students' own colloquial language into Gregory's style. Cartwright's first principle and/or plain folks is also evidenced through the use of personal pronouns. The terms "we" and "us" are used to make the audience feel that Mr. Gregory is one of them.

It is important to note that various appeals to audience identity are not only used in the introduction. While they are emphasized in the introduction, they are continued, to a lesser degree, throughout the speech.

The humor in the introduction is not solely directed at blacks. In an effort to question the credibility of past presidents, jokes are made concerning LBJ and Nixon. Though Mr. Gregory intends for the audience to respond with laughter and applause, which they do, the real purpose is to plant the seed of doubt concerning the credibility of high government officials. This logically leads into the first main contention of the speech, that the CIA and FBI are corrupt agencies.

The attack on the credibility of government agencies starts with a fear appeal. Mr. Gregory tells the audience that they must care about what is happening in their country. He claims that if the younger people today do not care they must "prepare

for death, cause you gonna die." The fear is further stressed by implying that the American public isn't told the truth about the CIA's activities in other countries. Since the public is beginning to find out about such involvements Gregory's next assertion, that the CIA will one day bring these activities home, is very effective.

Gregory uses testimonials to support his contention that the CIA and FBI are untrustworthy. First he refers to what a judge said about the FBI's actions at Wounded Knee, "he held his head in shame and say he never thought he'd live to see the day in his lifetime he'd have such a low view of the FBI." Another incident which Gregory uses as a testimonial is basically an attempt to transfer meaning so that the incident appears to be a testimonial. The fact that Nixon was afraid to be hospitalized and actually didn't even eat any food prepared at the hospital supposedly shows that he doesn't trust the CIA and FBI. While this may prove that Nixon is afraid of someone or something, there is no proof that he fears the CIA or FBI. Nixon could simply be paranoid of everyone since his resignation, thus the testimonial is not decisive.

A comparison of Jim Garrison to Ted Kennedy is another example of Gregory's use of the testimonial device. Gregory contends that while both Kennedy and Garrison know the truth about the CIA, only Garrison has the courage to tell the American people about it. Garrison's credibility is enhanced through the use of glittering generalities such as saying that he is "one of the most honored, ethical politicians". Gregory contends that Kennedy is afraid of the CIA because the CIA threatens the lives

of his children. These threats have resulted in Kennedy's dropping out of the presidential race.

The Kennedy/Garrison comparison also illustrates the transfer of meaning from one situation to another. While Kennedy did drop out of the political race and his children's lives were threatened at one time, the conclusion that Kennedy is afraid of the CIA is pure speculation. There was no evidence to support this supposition.

Another frequently used form of support is evidence which shows a discrepancy in what the public was told about certain events and what the facts actually proved. Several events are discussed including the John F. Kennedy and Robert Kennedy assassinations, the attempt on George Wallace's life, and the Patty Hearst kidnapping. Detailed facts are given that supposedly prove that either the FBI was involved or that they withheld vital information concerning these incidents. Gregory claims that his information is well documented, but in fact he does not give any documentation of it. However, at the end of the speech he gives an address to write to if anyone desires additional information about the incidents discussed or wishes to investigate the validity of any facts.

Gregory goes into detail when discussing the evidence surrounding the Patty Hearst kidnapping. Facts regarding the SLA are thoroughly discussed with Gregory proving either one of two things. He attempts to prove that the FBI is a corrupt organization. However, his examination of the evidence could simply show that the FBI's handling of the Hearst case was grossly inept.

One method Gregory uses with extreme skill is demonstrated in the discussion of the SLA case. He builds a strong fear appeal but helps temporarily ease the tension by incorporating humor with the facts. A good example of this is the discussion of the initial kidnapping of Patty Hearst at a time when she happened to have identification with her. Gregory says, "I ain't never been to bed with a rich white lady in my life, but I wonder if they put driver's licenses and credit cards on their negligees." This elicited laughter and applause from the audience.

Humor is also apparent in Gregory's discussion of the supposed SLA shootout or, as he says, "better known as that barbecue." The real discrepancy relates to finding a dead cat on the lap of a dead girl whose body was in a rocking chair in the remains of the gutted SLA hideout. He makes fun of the situation and has a mock conversation with the cat saying, "Oh cat, I hope you understand revolution, me and you gonna sit here until the fire." The cat incident is brought to a climax by Gregory claiming that if he ever gets caught in a burning building he hopes "to God I could be so lucky as to get my hand on a cat's tail" because he would then surely escape. This brought even more positive response from the audience than the humorous anecdote about negligees and credit cards.

The use of humor is not unique to one segment of the speech, rather it is utilized throughout. The effective use of this device demonstrates Gregory's talent as an entertainer. It also shows his ability to create fear within an audience without the by-product of extreme tension.

Two basic phrases or ideas are repeated many times during the speech to enhance the fear appeal. One of the phrases gives the responsibility of having a moral government to the students. "You youngsters have got a big job, and you haven't got much time." The other idea emphasizes that the youth of America must hurry to act before it is too late. This idea is expressed in various ways such as saying "your Saturdays are almost over", and "recess is almost over."

Another example of repetitious phrases is the restatement of the thesis of the third major segment of the speech. Basically it is "We're morally bankrupt on one side, and nature's closing in on the other." After this statement Gregory proceeds to treat the morality and nature aspects separately.

First Gregory examines the moral bankruptcy of America. He contends that President Ford is a poor excuse for a moral leader and gives two arguments to support this contention. First, Gregory claims that Ford was only chosen for office because he had agreed to pardon Nixon. Second, Ford should be more concerned with helping veterans than with promoting amnesty programs.

Gregory's use of metaphorical language when he refers to the problems that war veterans have is very effective. He says that Americans appear to be patriotic because they support wars but fail to help veterans who really need help readjusting to society. When this happens, Gregory contends that "that ain't no flag waving, baby, that's a rag." Another comparison is used when Gregory illustrates how he would fight crime, "I'm going to mug crime tonight. I'm going to rape the syndicate."

Another persuasive technique utilized in Gregory's attack on crime is name calling. Examples are "petty peons, purse snatchers, muggers," and "little petty, stealing, conniving muggers." The name calling device was used earlier in the attack on the CIA by saying the CIA was "vicious" and "degenerate". When Gregory wants to express his personal dissatisfaction with something he uses name calling.

Next Gregory discusses the second part of his thesis. His treatment of "nature closing in" is very limited. It seems that this is included to create a general fear appeal without being specific. The major proof that "nature is closing in" is that the trees began budding in the Spring of 1973 but did not reach full bloom until the middle of July. As Gregory says, "...that's nature telling you I got you on a famine course." Since the subject is not thoroughly discussed, Gregory is probably only reinforcing what the audience has heard from environmentalists. This enhances Gregory's credibility because it makes him seem concerned about the environment and everyone who has read a paper or watched TV in the last three years knows that they should be concerned about the environment.

After the general fear appeal regarding nature, Gregory begins to conclude the speech. First he reemphasizes that the government, not blacks, is the one to be concerned about. He compliments the audience by saying that the young people in America today do not have the fears and prejudices that their parents had. After this compliment Gregory tries to further dispel black myths that may linger in the minds of those in the audience.

The discussion of black myths, interjected with humorous appeals, is Gregory's way of dispelling any fear the audience may have about blacks thus enhancing his own credibility. He says that the civil rights movement forced integration and thus resulted in alleviating many of the black myths because "anything that puts me next to you will get them fears off your head." Gregory very aptly explains away one of the myths, the rape syndrome fear, by saying, "One simple deduction, that black men down through the years been as busy raping white women as America wants you to believe we have, then how come white folks in America ain't getting darker and darker instead of niggers getting lighter and lighter?"

The reference to black myths provides a smooth transition into Gregory's contention that the white kids in America are the new "niggers", thus further stressing fear of the establishment in the minds of the audience. His proof is to have the members of the audience listen to what older whites say about young people; these are the same things that were said about blacks 5-10 years ago. He gives the following example: "Oh, just what's wrong with them." "What do they want?" "Who do they think they are." "They are getting lazy and shiftless and don't want to work." "They just want to be hitchhiking all the time."

The next appeal to the audience is emphasized by namecalling and glittering generalities. Actually, this appeal is a plea to the audience not to be deluded into believing that smoking and drinking will help change the establishment. "I beg you youngsters to understand that the more reefers you smoke and the more alcohol

you drink, the only thing that you will liberate by that act is a good, strong, healthy, clean body into a sick, degenerate, weakly, dirty body." Then Gregory quickly tells the audience that he doesn't mean to insult them or to say that they don't have a right to make choices for themselves. Name calling is again utilized by saying, "You got a right to be as sick and as insane as the rest of us old folk." This is done so that he will not alienate the audience.

Another point which could have easily alienated the audience was the concluding point that service not violence is the answer to America's problems. Since many of the audience may feel that violence is the only resource, Gregory quickly says that he can understand violence but that it is not the answer.

The final minutes of the speech probably do more to enhance Gregory's credibility than any other part of the speech. Because of the radical views which Gregory expresses in the speech, it is normal to conclude that he will end with a radical plea. This is not the case. He emphasizes traditional beliefs such as avoiding smoking and drinking and giving service to mankind. Even when he does this, he reassures the audience that he can understand their point of view.

Throughout the speech Gregory attempts shifts in the audience's perception of various incidents. The shifts in perception are always attempted in an effort to discredit the CIA. By breaking the various events into the Burkeian pentad a pattern becomes apparent. Gregory's attempted shifts deal with the agent and/or the purpose. While he does not always attempt to change the

perception of both the agent and the purpose, the changes in perception always deal with the CIA.

Gregory's discussion of the Hearst kidnapping illustrates how he attempts shifts in the audience's perception of both the agent and the purpose to suit his own ends. The scene is Patty Hearst's apartment. The act is her kidnapping with the SLA as the agent. The agency is the actual plan to kidnap Patty with the purpose being the publicizing of the SLA movement. Gregory changes the agent from SLA members to the CIA and FBI. The purpose is changed to prove that the kidnapping was a staged performance by the FBI and CIA to prove their competence and power. These shifts in meaning are undertaken so that Gregory can establish a fear of government agencies.

Sometimes Gregory tries to change the audience's perception of the agent. This was the case in the discussion of illegal smuggling of drugs into the United States. The act is heroin being smuggled into the U.S. inside the bodies of dead American soldiers (agency). The agent presumably is dope pushers and/or syndicated crime. In this incident, as in the next one to be examined, Gregory does not deal with the purpose. Gregory tries to change the audience's perception of the agent by saying, "Who's slick enough to do that but the CIA?"

Another example of a shift in the perception of only the agent is the incident involving the assassination of John F. Kennedy. The act is the actual assassination, the agent is Sirhan Sirhan, the agency is the rifle shots, and the scene is Dallas, Texas. Again Gregory makes no mention of the purpose. He tries

to shift the agent from Sirhan Sirhan to the CIA by saying, "There's pictures and evidence of E. Howard Hunt and Thurgess being arrested five minutes after Kennedy got hit...." Gregory does not explain that Hunt and Thurgess are CIA agents, he expects the audience to recognize their names and make the connection.

The only time Gregory attempts to change the audience's perception of just the purpose comes in the discussion of why Ted Kennedy excused himself from the 1976 presidential race. The act is Kennedy's dropping out of the presidential race, the agent is Ted Kennedy, and the agency is a public announcement. Kennedy stated that the reason (purpose) as being family commitments. Gregory tries to show that there are deeper reasons. "That's why Teddy Kennedy got out of that race, because that same vicious, degenerate CIA that's been gunning everybody else down has been threaten' to do something to his kids...."

While Gregory does not always attempt shifts in the same components of the pentad, he does have one reason or goal for the shifts in audience perception. Those shifts in perception are meant to discredit the CIA and to create a fear of government agencies.

Gregory truly adapts himself to his audience by utilizing Cartwright's principles, plain folks, and language adaptation. All of this makes his final traditional appeals more effective. Gregory's true beliefs shine in the final moments of the speech. While he may be antiestablishment, his true concern is with the fate of America's youth. He believes that they must strive to be both morally and physically pure because this is the only way

to change the problems in America. One can only agree with this belief and compliment Gregory for his ability to persuade young people toward this end. The persuasion was particularly effective as the audience was probably unaware of Gregory's true purpose.

CONCLUSIONS

The speakers in this study were selected because they represent the new freedom of expression that has swept college campuses since the late 1960's. This chapter will attempt to answer the questions which were asked in the introductory chapter. The answer to the first question, "Are there any common goals among the speakers being studied?" has to be "Yes."

Because of the variety of political viewpoints of the speakers it is most interesting to discover that they had a common message in their speeches. Each speaker attempted to convince people that the American public is either misinformed or unable to comprehend the facts of various political incidents. Rockwell, Kunstler, and Gregory blatantly accused the government of concealing and misrepresenting facts to the American people. Buckley did not specifically accuse anyone of misrepresentation, but he did attempt to prove to the audience that they do not have a complete understanding of one international matter, the free market system.

The second question to be answer is, "What, if any, are the basic persuasive techniques used by these speakers?" In order to fully answer this, each major section of the methodology must be examined individually. As the Aristotelian appeals of ethos, pathos, and logos comprise the first section of the methodology, the similarities in their use will be examined first.

Various techniques were employed by the speakers to enhance their ethos. All four speakers attempted to promote probity of character by undermining the credibility of people with opposing ideas. Kunstler, Buckley and Gregory displayed a vast

knowledge of current events as well as relying on past experiences to increase their credibility. Kunstler and Buckley utilized vague phrasing, which helped establish speaker credibility. In addition, Buckley demonstrated sagacity by exercising common sense and good taste in his selection of subject matter.

Rockwell made the strongest attempt of the speakers to establish positive ethos. Since his credibility was questioned by most people because of his unfavorable reputation, it was only logical for him to try to improve the audience's perception of his character. However, due to lack of organization, inconsistent use of evidence, and his loss of composure at the termination of the speech, Rockwell probably failed to establish positive ethos.

Pathos, or emotional appeal, was prominent in all of the speeches with the exception of Buckley's. Kunstler, Gregory, and Rockwell all developed strong fear appeals with the aid of emotional or loaded language. In addition, Gregory and Kunstler occasionally interjected humor to temporarily relieve tension but failed to suggest a specific plan of action to alleviate the fear.

Buckley's mild fear appeal came in the closing minutes of the speech and was not well developed. In fact his appeal to the emotions was given in such a casual manner that it could have easily been missed by the audience.

The way in which the speakers developed logos, or the logical appeal, was strikingly similar. All used testimonials

or evidence originating from an authoritative source to support their contentions. Also they attempted to draw comparisons of past historical events with current incidents. Specific, unfamiliar evidence was incorporated into the speeches, but the documentation of evidence was weak. Rockwell stressed evidence documentation in an effort to strengthen his credibility, while the other three weakly documented their evidence.

Group identification, the second major section of the methodology, involves gaining the audience's interest and acceptance. One of the easiest ways to accomplish this is by making the audience feel that the speaker has the same interests and desires as the audience. All of the speakers made some use of Cartwright's first principle and/or plain folks to help establish identity with the audience. Buckley did very little to identify with the audience while Gregory, Kunstler, and Rockwell emphasized group identification.

Since the effectiveness of a speech is largely determined by the effect of the content on the audience, it is vital that the subject matter be adapted to the interests and experiences of the audience. Dick Gregory's speech was probably the best example of adapting the speech to the interests and experiences of the audience. He did this by using informal language and by structuring his speech around incidents involving young Americans and college students. Kunstler and Rockwell did an adequate job of adapting the content to their audiences while Buckley made no attempt at all.

The third section of the methodology involves propaganda devices. Those devices which were used by all of the speakers

were card stacking, name calling, testimonials, plain folks, and transfer. Card stacking and testimonials were techniques utilized in the presentation of evidence. Each speaker presented only evidence which supported his contentions. All of the speakers cited information which supposedly originated from credible and authoritative sources in an effort to support their contentions.

Name calling and transfer are the application of meanings to objects, words, or incidents which do not ordinarily elicit such meanings. The transfer device was used extensively by all of the speakers, while name calling was only used occasionally. Gregory and Rockwell used name calling more extensively than the other speakers.

The plain folks technique, which is basically the same concept as Cartwright's first principle, was utilized to promote the acceptance of a speaker by his audience. Each speaker attempted to do this by using personal pronouns to establish the speakers as members of the social groups to which the members of the audience belonged.

Gregory was the only speaker who adapted his style of speaking to the language of the audience. He did so by using words and phrases (i.e. "mellow trip" and "freaks") that are frequently associated with the colloquialisms of young Americans. The adaptation of language strengthened Gregory's use of the plain folks technique.

Glittering generalities were used infrequently by a couple of the speakers and did not seem to contribute to the persuasive-

ness of the speeches. The band wagon technique was not used at all as the speakers were trying to convince their audiences to believe in ideas not readily accepted by the general public.

The fourth section of the methodology centers upon the Burkeian pentad which provides a means to examine attempted shifts in the audience's perception of significant events. All four speakers attempted to change the audience's perception of certain components of the Burkeian pentad. The purpose term was the major area where shifts in perception were initiated. All of the speakers tried to change the audience's original perception of the reasons (purpose) behind certain events, so that those incidents would be supportive of the speaker's contentions. Isolated events were linked together and given one unified purpose when in fact the purpose of each event was different.

Kunstler, Rockwell and Gregory attempted to change the agent from the individuals actually involved in an incident to the "administration" as a whole. However, they failed to explain who the administration was. Rockwell shifted the agent from a group that contained some Jews to an international Jewish organization.

Rockwell and Kunstler always combined shifts in audience perception to include both the agent and purpose. Gregory's shifts were somewhat sporadic in that he shifted the agent and/or the purpose according to what he wanted to accomplish at the moment. Buckley shifted only the audience's perception of the purpose. All of the shifts in audience perception were intended to create a fear of certain organizations or people.

The third and final question to be answered is, "Assuming that these speakers are representative of the new freedom of

expression on college campuses, has this type of rhetoric exposed college students to any unusual messages or persuasive techniques?" The techniques utilized by the speakers were reasonably standard. The Aristotelian concepts of ethos, pathos, and logos, along with the other techniques of persuasion discussed in the methodology, provided an adequate means to analyze the speeches in this study. No particularly unusual techniques were found. Although the persuasive techniques utilized by the speakers were not unusual, the messages of the speakers were. The freedom to express ideas has allowed college lecturers to question specific elements of our society. The speakers discussed here exercised their freedom of speech by questioning both the activities and the policies of the United States Government.

While some may disagree with the messages expressed by the speakers in this study, it seems important that such individuals continue to have the freedom to express their ideas. One must agree with Archibald Cox, Professor of Law at Harvard when he says, "Freedom of speech is indivisible. You cannot deny it to one man and save it for others...The price of liberty to speak the truth as each of us sees it is permitting others the same freedom."¹

FOOTNOTES

¹Alan F. Pater and Jason R. Pater (ed.), What They Said
In 1971 (Beverly Hills: Monitor Book Company, 1972), p. 518.

Speech Delivered by William Kunstler at
Indiana University, October 7, 1970

Thank you very much, I really am kind of overwhelmed by one, such a large crowd and such a reception. It isn't always thus, as some of you may know, from place to place. In fact, I go up on next Monday to Toronto, Canada, to stand trial for assault with a water pitcher. All I have is a glass now.

But I am very happy to be here and to talk to students; all of the people that were involved in the conspiracy trial except Bobby Seale, who is incarcerated and who starts his trial; started it really yesterday with the preliminary motions in New Haven; he and Erika Huggins who will be tried together and I know there will be a Bobby Seale weekend here which I think is extremely important. I think that anyone who understands what is being done in Connecticut with the device of taking a dead body of Alex Rackley and converting it into the dead body of Bobby Seale will understand why I think that all of you can participate in Bobby Seale weekend which runs from the 9th to the 11th and I was asked to indicate to you Friday there will be speakers from the Indiana Black Panther Party in Ballantine 7:30-10 p.m. Saturday there'll be a whole film series which is in Ballantine 013 starting at 12 noon and going til 5 p.m. and then on Sunday there'll be workshops in the same room from 11 a.m. til 2 p.m. and I hope that many of you who get there, can get there, will get there even those who know nothing about it or want to know something about it or even those who have made up their mind about some aspect; it is important.

Bobby Seale has been incarcerated now since August of '69 without being tried for anything. He was accidentally in Chicago during the 1968 Democratic Convention as a replacement for Catherine Cleaver who was a replacement for Eldridge Cleaver and he was in New Haven on much the same basis, as a replacement. And in both cases, he was dragged into trial with which he really had no connection, and with the purpose of not only silencing him but the purpose of killing the black liberation movement in this country. So I urge you to support the weekend and to go to any or all of what's going on on this campus this weekend.

What I'd like to talk about today is not a prepared speech but a series of observations about what's happening to students in the United States and what I think the plan is and then let you ask questions and draw your own conclusions from what I say. I think you've got to listen to me with minds that are not made up and that you have to make your own minds up from the rational processes of what goes on under your skulls and not be swayed by me or anybody else as to what you should or should not do with your own lives and with your own futures. But I think that a lot of people are thinking of your lives and your futures and I would like to outline for you what's happened since Kent State and Cambodia.

I thought that the students who went into action by the juxtaposition to the two events put the fear of God in their society. That was evidenced by one dramatic episode by his eminence in the White House who got up one morning at 4:30 a.m. and went to the Lincoln Memorial. Although he could think

of nothing more to talk about than the fortunes of the Syracuse University football team and surfing off Santa Barbara, he at least talked to real live students in the shadow of his illustrious predecessor's statues and I thought that for a man of remarkably gross insensitivities to most of the moving forces of life that to get up at 4:30 a.m. was a remarkable concession to the seriousness of the moment. Least he wasn't watching the Ohio State-Purdue football game.

But then the summer recess came in and essentially saved the society from you for a several months period. During that time, your government was not idle. Your president was thinking in terms of how to "nip you in the bud" while you were away from the university. And so he talked an old friend Alf Landon.

For some of you who may not remember Alf Landon, the few in the audience that haven't kept up with him, he was the Republican candidate for the presidency of the United States in 1936. He was then the governor of Kansas. His motto was the sunflower, a flower which some people tell me can be smoked with great effect. After a hard-fought campaign against Franklin D. Roosevelt, he managed to pull eight electoral votes. He swept through the states of Vermont and Maine and narrowly missed being elected president of the United States. He then retired, I assume, back to Kansas where after some 34 years, he is now the originator (or at least his name is used) of the first Alf Landon lecture series. And that was given at Kansas State University at Manhattan, Kansas, by a more successful Republican candidate, narrowly so, but more successful, Richard Nixon, who spoke on that campus in a very excellent speech. Whoever

wrote it, I think deserves a great deal of credit. In that speech he said a lot of things with which I think most sane people can agree. He said what corrodes a society more deeply than violence itself is the acceptance of violence, the condoning of terror, the excusing of inhuman acts in a misguided effort to accommodate the community standards to those of a violent few. The only problem with the speech, of course, was not with it, but with the speaker, because, as Tom Wicker observed in the New York Times several days after the speech, it is hard to take such a speech seriously when the man who speaks it perpetuates violence every day in Vietnam, has not raised his voice against the police violence, that has attempted to decimate the Black Panther Party from one end of the country to the other, puts a hard hat on his head and welcomes to the White House a man whose employees have just brutally beaten peace demonstrators in New York City, and urges Americans to adopt the law and order standards of John Wayne in "Chisum."

Two days after Kansas State, he sent a letter to 900 university administrators and trustees and he urged them to restore order and discipline to the University campuses. And he enclosed a pamphlet with his letter and I'm sure the administration here has a copy of the letter and the pamphlet. The pamphlet is one by Dr. Sidney Hook, who is known as an anti-Communist liberal, whatever that is. And the Sidney Hook pamphlet urges all academic people to understand academic freedom is lost on the campus and not from outside forces. He says it's noisome hogwash to claim that the threat to academic

freedom comes from outside the campus and again pinpointed the radical element on the campuses of the most problems.

A day later, Mrs. Martha Mitchell made one of her rare public utterances. She said the academic society is responsible for all our troubles in this country, which is putting it squarely if nothing else.

Four days later on September 22, the President appeared at a news conference and on his right hand side he had his Torquemada J. Edgar Hoover, and on his left, his Cardinal Wolsey John Mitchell; and he asked Congress for 23 million dollars to increase the Federal Bureau of Investigation, to increase from 7000 special agents to 8000 special agents. The thousand extra agents, a 15 per cent increase, are to be sent to college campuses to watch out for all those who buy iron pipe, or are walking around with suspicious looking sticks or are putting up a supply of coke bottles far in excess of what is normally needed.

The next day, John Mitchell wrote a letter to 50 selected colleges, one of them is the United States Military Academy, the other is the United States Naval Academy, and there are 48 similar selected institutions, and he offers to send free of charge, Justice Department high-level people to create a dialogue with students to dispell the rhetoric of the violent few and to open up the air to a mutual exchange. He ends his letter with the following comment: "It is not a disservice to this country to segregate out of the campuses the small radical element that wants to burn down buildings."

Now this was an echo of something that Spiro Agnew had said in London four weeks earlier. Agnew said it is the responsibility of the campuses to isolate and destroy, in one way or another, those on the campus who are the radical and violent few.

If some of you could read the speeches of Alfred Rosenberg, who was the theoretician of the Nazi party, particularly his speeches on campuses and on campus disorders in Germany, you would find a remarkable parallel between those remarks. And I think that if you look at Albert Speers' new book, "Inside the Third Reich," you will find one of those speeches and then you can compare it to the vice president's rhetoric.

Four days after Mitchell's invitation to the colleges to accept the dialogue, the President's commission on campus unrest issued its main report and it was a report which had essentially something for everybody. It called for a ceasefire on the campuses. It said that there were many things wrong and the students had many legitimate grievances but on the other hand, you could not obtain the redress of those grievances by resorting to violence, and that, therefore, the students should channel themselves through what it called accepted norms of protest.

I was surprised when William F. Buckley in commenting on this, and the first thing I ever agreed with him on, he said, this had something for everybody and that's true. It's like the typical New York Times editorial on any controversial subject. On one hand this is awful, but on the other hand, you really shouldn't do something awful about it. That's

essentially what the report was.

It was followed by two subsidiary reports on Jackson State and on Kent State and I think you're all familiar with those.

In Jackson State, it put most of the blame on the sheriff's deputies who stitched the side of Alexander Hall, the women's dormitory, with machine gun fire and killed two innocent young men, one a high school student, and one a pre-law student. At Kent State, it stated essentially that the Guardsmen were wrong but the students were provocative; so it was very much like the main report.

And on the same day that report came out an article was published in the New Yorker magazine by a professor of law at the Yale University Law School, Charles Wright. It was an article I commend to all of you called the "Greening of America," and it's the most bitter indictment of the world which you are being programmed by this and other universities. I picked out of that seven points which Wright raised and they're serious points and they go to the government's design. When I say the government, please believe me it has nothing to do with Republicans or Democrats, but with the corporate society and whatever form of government it's adopting or using at any particular time.

In the "Greening of America," he says America has reached the following position: it has the following characteristics:

One, he says, it is a land of disorder, corruption, hypocrisy and war.

Secondly, it is a land of poverty, distorted priorities, and legislation by power.

Thirdly, he says, it has an uncontrolled technology and is destroying its own environment.

Fourthly, he says, it practices the decline of democracy and liberty and the upraising of powerlessness as a virtue.

Fifthly, it has an artificiality of work and culture.

Six, it has lost any community, any national or local community.

And, seven, its citizens are suffering a loss of self. And he says one important thing about the institutions which control these seven lists of sins that he has categorized.

He says this about our society. He says while the tendency of the administration may appear benign and peaceful as opposed to the turbulence of conflict, it is actually violent for the very idea of imposed order is violent, it demands compliance; nothing less than compliance will do.

And they must obtain compliance by persuasion or management if possible, by repression, if necessary. And that is what the panorama of the future holds. You are going to be reduced to compliance, so the hope goes, by persuasion or management, if possible, and by repression if necessary, and the repression if used, will be, I am ashamed to say, the repression of the law.

The law will be the device which will be used to curtail you. By the laws, like the anti-riot statute or laws that are presently on the book, or the marijuana statute or a dozen others, born or yet to be born, which will be applied to you. Or it may be that sitting next to you will be one of those 1,000 FBI agents, bearded, probably learning how to give a

double or triple inhalation from a cigarette, so that he can pass, and he will be reporting back, not on plans to bomb the administration building--those are very rare--but on other aspects of what people say, do, think and believe, and those will be reported to the proper authorities: so that scholarships may be manipulated or tuitions may be raised, a very insidious device to provincialize and neutralize a student population, but one way or another, some legal aspect will be found to do to you what is ordained if our society has its way.

Charles Wright discusses the law and its use in this respect and he says that the law is used by those in power as a weapon against those who are powerless. The bitter truth is that despite all our ideals of law and all the talk of law and order we are today, in the most literal sense, a lawless society for our law has ceased to be law and has become instead its opposite, mere force at the disposal of whoever is at the controls.

And that is what will be used here. Force by those who are at the controls. But you don't do this overnight. You need an excuse. You need an incident, you need something to persuade what our President calls the silent majority--a term taken from Homer to describe the dead--you need some incident, some succession of incidents and the President has seized on what he and the society he represents intends to use. The sporadic disturbances on campuses are going to be the new Reichstag fire, and one in particular.

In Germany in 1933, at the March elections, two months after Hitler had become chancellor of Germany, the Nazi party, polled only 41 per cent of the vote. Something was needed to give a reason to apply the law as a control. But it couldn't be done even there overnight. Something had to occur to, one, divert people, from the real problems of their country, and, two, focus hatred on a dangerous area which could be utilized to neutralize all dangerous areas. And so some one thought of burning the Reichstag, and it was a very beautiful and very symbolic building in Germany and so it was destroyed one night.

Two people were arrested and tried for the crime. One was a half-witted Dutch youth by the name of Vanderlubber, and the other was the chairman of the German Communist Party Dmitrof, and there was a trial in Germany. The trial resulted in the conviction of Vanderlubber and in the acquittal of Dmitrof. Dmitrof tried his own case and he won because he called to the stand Herman Gehring, and Herman Gehring was destroyed by Dmitrof on the stand, so that Herman Gehring practically admitted setting fire to the Reichstag and then left the stand saying that he would see that Dmitrof was killed as soon as he left the courtroom. The judges, the last free court in Germany, acquitted Dmitrof but the acquittal had very little meaning.

It meant Dmitrof's life was saved and he left Germany, but the Reichstag became the symbol and focus of hatred against first the Communist Party and then a succession of successors to the Communist Party so that by a year and a half later, it

could safely be said that the nightmare had begun because all elements of the left, from the liberals to the most radical, had been destroyed by the Reichstag fire.

It was a device which was eminently successful. Today we have the Army Mathematics Research Center at the University of Wisconsin. It is going to be used up and down this country until something takes its place as the Reichstag. The destruction of that building and the loss of a life are going to be used by society to defuse you. Wherever you go, wherever discussions are heard, people are going to say, "What about violence on the campus?" How can you condone the destruction of a building in which a man died and people are going to forget that everyday B-52's go out over South Vietnam; people are going to forget what happened to the demonstrators on Lower Wall Street in New York; people are going to forget who was responsible for the defoliation of millions of acres in Vietnam; people are going to forget about six black men who were shot to death by policemen in Augusta, Georgia, for the capital crime of stealing a television set during a disorder; people are going to forget who killed the students at Kent State; and who killed the students at Jackson State; people are going to forget My Lai 4 and the bayonetting of grandmothers and babies; people are going to forget where the real violence exists; people are going to forget that Fred Hampton was murdered in his bed on September 4, 1969 and that no one will ever answer for that crime.

People are going to forget all of the violence perpetrated against white and black, whether it be in student ghettos or in

the ghettos of large cities. And concentrate on a building destroyed by a bomb in Madison, Wisconsin, and violence institutionalized by our society is going to be pushed aside while a thousand FBI agents are hired to go after the replicas of the Army Mathematics Center.

It would have been probably less hard to take if after the 40 bombings in Birmingham, the FBI had asked for a thousand agents to solve those unsolved crimes; of course they did not.

The Daily Cardinal at the University of Wisconsin has been thus far the only voice that I have heard which has put in proper perspective the destruction of that building. And I want to read you a portion of their editorial, because I think it makes sense to look at it in the perspective they see. They wrote as follows:

"The bombing of the Army Mathematics Research Center destroyed an object of widespread political hatred and struck a blow to the American military machine. It also killed a man. The AMRC was a physical and symbolic installation whose sole purpose was to serve the strongarm of American military interests across the globe."

"Over and over again, members of this community asked those in power to discuss the AMRC's purpose with them, they were refused. Over and over again, members of this community stated that they opposed what the AMRC stood for and what it was doing. They were ignored. Finally, some members of this movement decided to stop talking, to stop asking that the place be shut down and so they blew it up."

"We mourn Robert Fassnacht because we love life. His death has been used in the power structure effort to reinforce the

bizarre status quo that is this country. This is not what his death means to us. The AMRC has been destroyed. In order for its physical and symbolic destruction to have any meaning, beyond a specific point in time, the movement from which the bombing sprang must be expanded."

And we need to figure out collectively the most important question of all: Where do we go from here? I think that editorial puts into, at least, reasonable perspective what happened in Madison, Wisconsin. Only a madman or a fool would even dare say that he can condone the death of a man, but we can't bring Bob Fassnacht back. Some of us knew him; some of us did not. We can't also make up for the fact, that the police, warned some 18 minutes in advance regarded it as a crank call, and did not clear the building. They received a six-minute notice and reacted to that, but it was too late. But those are the imponderables of life and we can't really rehash them at this point.

We can mourn this man's death, we can even be sorry for the destruction of a professor's life work, although we can't put that in the same category as a human life. But the important point was not, that this incident happened, but why it happened and how it's being used. It was after this incident that the FBI asked for the 1,000 additional men.

But the 1,000 additional men are not really to handle 25 bombings out of 333 that occurred in the United States in the first nine months of this year--only 8 per cent on college campuses.

The real reason is that you have become an absolute danger to your society. You have become an element that--as soon as the Black Panthers are disposed of--you will essentially be next. You probably are next already, but just don't know it yet. You are a danger, you are a danger to any society that wants to perpetuate itself. You are a danger because you are seeking a new culture, you are seeking a new consciousness, you are seeking new country. And there are those will fight to the death to prevent you from winning any of those goals, and they will utilize every means at their disposal.

Sometimes it takes assassination, like Malcolm X or Fred Hampton; sometimes it takes the legal processes of the courts, the imprimatur of legality, but just remember that Christ was legalized onto the cross and you can be legalized into nullification of any future whether it be one of joy or of anything else.

The courts will be used in this process. Every available resource of government will be used, whether its high bail, no-knock bills, preventive detention, the reactivation of the concentration camps under Title II of the McCarran Act, the spoilation of scholarship funds, the raising of tuitions, which I hope some of you can put together into its real perspective.

The raising of college tuitions is one of the most insidious of devices because it is politically motivated and it can be explained in dollars and cents basis to a state legislature. But the real purpose and the real end result is that those who couldn't afford to go to school under the new rates, do not go to school.

It also indicates that universities like this one, which are great universities, which are universities which are not provincial, which call people from all states, tend to become provincialized by the raising of tuition for out of state students so that it makes it difficult, if not impossible for many, to return to school, thus reducing these universities to uni-state, provincial areas which are easily controlled because the students' parents live in the state and because the students' parents are far more manipulative than the parents of people from out-of-state.

This is just one of the utilizations of governmental power, society's power to attempt to destroy students.

Now this may sound a little far-fetched, a little extraordinary, but I think if you follow the sequence of my analysis, the sequence of the high-level approach at Kansas State, through the low-level approach of the FBI through the remarks of Mrs. Mitchell, who at least speaks honestly. I would rather listen to her say what she thinks than listen to our president say what he doesn't think.

If you follow this analysis and see all this concentrated effort directed at you, then maybe you can understand and see handwriting before it appears on the wall, because handwriting is not so difficult to spot, if one keeps a weather-eye to windward, and observes what's going on around him.

But in doing this, in utilizing these resources societies ignore realities and it's in the ignoring of those realities that they run counter to human desire and need and that they frequently fall or are significantly altered.

A society that needs bread doesn't need it the less because Marie Antoinette said "Let them eat cake" and will react accordingly. And a society that needs change doesn't react the way that those opposed would desire, because a president says that it is naughty and immoral to resort to force.

Alfred North Whitehead, some 40 years ago, in discussing the role of society and the role of people in society said some words which I think are important. He said it is the first step in sociological wisdom to recognize that the major advances in civilization are processes which all but wreck the society in which they occur.

Like unto an arrow in the hand of a child, the art of free society consists first in the maintenance of the symbolic code and secondly in fearlessness of revision to secure that the code serves those purposes which satisfy an enlightened reason. Those societies which cannot combine reverence to their symbols with freedom of revision must ultimately decay--either from anarchy or from the slow atrophy of a life stifled by useless shadows.

That is the life which I hope we will not lead, a life stifled by useless shadows. That is the life which I think will bring down individual lives to the level of the robot and the automaton. Dr. Whitehead saw that societies must so often go down into the shadow when change is needed and then struggle up again. There's nothing wrong in that. There's nothing immoral in it. There's nothing which signifies a lack of courage and intelligence. All that anyone can ask of any population,

student, or otherwise, or any individual is that he goes from plateau to plateau, seeking a remedy and a change and that if one plateau fails he goes naturally to another, just as the colonists did between 1734 and 1776.

There's nothing wrong in that. To say that it's wrong and unnatural is to defy all morality, psychology and history. To say that students can be bottled up and be programmed to come out in the replicas of their parents and to continue a society which they may no longer feel is relevant and which they may certainly feel is immoral, destructive and corrosive of all of the values which have value to them. To say that they must come out of these universities in that fashion, that they must resist or protest along only conventional routes and stop at a point when conventionality has failed is to be exactly the same as Marie Antoinette with her "let'em eat cake" statement.

She took an awful beating for that statement. She went all to pieces. And remember when Patrick Henry in making the same type of analogy and I may indicate he was a young lawyer when he did this, three years at the bar, he pointed to all historical examples and he mentioned I think that Caesar had his Brutus, and Charles I his Cromwell, and when he got to George III, everybody yelled "Treason" and he said that George the III may profit from their examples.

That's what Justice Douglas says too in his book "Points of Rebellion." He says if governments and societies do not look behind them and see what other governments and societies went through when they resisted nature and human psychology then they deserve the same fate as those societies and he

particularly mentioned George III whose fate was unknown to Patrick Henry.

By the way, I may remark parenthetically, that if Patrick Henry were to give that speech after crossing state lines today, he would violate the federal anti-riot statute.

General Eisenhower in the beginning of his administration in an interview in the New York Times, said some words that I think are some of the few that are worth repeating. These are important words, and I'm almost willing to say that it's worth going through that administration, both of them, for these words. He said at a very contemplative moment, "We are living a life of perpetual fear and tension. A burden of arms draining the wealth and the labor of all people. A wasting of strength that defies the American system or the Soviet system or any system to achieve true abundance and happiness for the people of this earth. Every gun that is made, every warship launched, every rocket fired, signifies in the final sense a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, those who are cold and are not clothed.

"This world in arms is not spending money alone. It is spending the sweat of its laborers, the genius of its scientists, the hopes of its children. The cost of one modern heavy bomber is this: a brick school in more than 30 cities; it is two electric power plants, each serving a town of 60,000 population; two fine, fully equipped hospitals; it is some 50 miles of concrete highway.

We pay for a single fighter plane with half a million bushels of wheat. We pay for a single destroyer with new homes that

could have housed more than 8,000 people. This is not a way of life at all, in any true sense. Under the cloud of threatening war, it is humanity hanging from a cross of iron. If there no other way, dear God, the world may live?"

That statement is a statement I think all of you have to ask. Is there no other way, dear God, that the world may live? Must we stand idle in the face of an immorality and indecency? Must we live as if there are not Black Panthers being destroyed, as if we can wash away every Appalachian, poverty-stricken farmer, as if we can ignore chicanos, and Japanese-Americans, that we may ignore what happens to women in our society, that we may ignore a war that despoils and destroys us all and do nothing about it except write to our congressmen?

There must be more to do than this, there must be more ways for people to react. If they are saying to you that you are limited to picketing around the ROTC building, or to writing to your congressman or to electoral politics, none of which are bad, but which are not the only ways of protest, by a long shot, then they are saying to you that you must restrict yourselves to the unattainable, you must restrict yourselves to those things which lack power, you must utilize the protest of the powerless, which of course, are not designed to invoke the responses of the powerful. You must give up any thought or hope that any thing you do which goes beyond a certain mode is prohibited because it is immoral and wrong.

I suspect that what is immoral and wrong are the men who say these things, are the laws which sanction their own tyranny

and are these the perpetuation of an absolute reign of terror both here, in Cambodia, in South Vietnam, in every urban ghetto, on college campuses, an absolute reign of terror, some of it with a gloved hand, some of it with a cocked rifle, to make you accept what they call the rule of law and order, to make you accept that the only way a society functions is without a single voice in anger, or a single angry act. This is not true psychologically, it is not true morally, it is not true historically.

There is a morality in protest and resistance. There is morality in destroying draft records. And there can be a morality in destroying a building. If you feel that you have exhausted, reasonably, one plateau of protest and you go to another and in that other plateau you utilize only that force minimally necessary to achieve the results, symbolic or otherwise, I think that is moral. I don't think it's legal, but there's a vast difference between legality and morality.

Father Daniel Berrigan who is a really old client of mine, outlined this for us at the Catonsville trial. He explained that he had indeed written to his congressman four years ago, that he had indeed joined a picket line around General Wheeler's home at Fort Myer, he had gone to visit his senator and his congressman, that he has written letter after letter to the joint chiefs of staff, to the governor of Maryland, whose name then was Agnew, and to a great many other people, that he had attempted to be indicted for speaking out but was not, and that he finally decided to make some napalm from a special service handbook formula, leaving out only the soap flakes which are added to stick to human flesh he couldn't bring himself to

follow those instructions. But he made the kerosenes into a napalm, beat it as the formula indicated, and then he and eight others, all Roman Catholics, all but two clerics, went into the Catonsville draft board, took out every A-1 file, removed it from the building and burned it with the napalm.

As a moral act, I thoroughly approve of what he did. I approve of the slow and steady acceleration of leaving one plateau for another, of taking them out of the building so as not to destroy the building because that plateau had not yet been reached, and then burning the records.

It was illegal and he was convicted and he is now in Danbury Correctional Institute with his brother Phil who did the same thing with blood in the Baltimore County draft records and then joined Dan with the napalm.

This is a natural progression. It is no more unnatural than the colonists in 1776, those who say it is bad to try and burn draft records must say it's bad to throw tea in Boston Harbor. The difference between the two of course, is that Dan and Phil did not disguise themselves as a minority group when they burnt the draft records.

I just want to leave you essentially with one or two thoughts and then open up with a question and answer period here.

The first thought is not to let them divert you from the hands where the real blood is. And when people tell you students are violent, ask them if it's students who pilot the B-52's, ask them if students started the war in Vietnam or invaded Cambodia, ask them if students killed Fred Hampton and Mark Clark, ask them if students shot down the Kennedy Brothers,

Martin Luther King, Medgar Evers, Malcolm X and others, ask them if students were in Charlie Company when it went into Song My, ask them if students bludgeoned the peace demonstrators on Wall Street while the police stood by even handing out an occasional night stick to someone who had forgotten his lead pipe, ask them if students defoliated 5 million acres in South Vietnam; or if students extoiled a John Wayne western as the ultimate in a society's search for law and order. Ask them where the real blood is, ask them who are the real murderers in society; ask them if students killed themselves at Kent State on the Commons or killed themselves in Alexander Hall at Jackson State. Did students gun down the six in Augusta, Georgia?

Who does the murdering and the killing and who is trying to divert attention away from it by pointing out an isolated event, tragic as it may be, but an isolated event, and try to build that up into our new Reichstag so that it can serve as the springboard to further repression.

That's what you can ask them, then you have something to ask yourselves. And that's probably more important. I think you have to ask yourselves in the days that lie ahead, and they are going to be, putting aside all claims of prophecy, they are going to be difficult days under any circumstances.

I think you have to ask yourself essentially where you're at and what it all means to you. I think you have to ask yourself where you stand, where you will go and what you will do. And this is a most serious question.

It can't be answered facetiously, it can't be answered without great insight, and thought and self-analysis. It's

a moment that trembles. I imagine, on the lip of history.

It's a moment where anything can happen. People are watching and waiting in this auditorium and elsewhere trying to see where the future is going. You're going to be asked, I would imagine, to make certain commitments of yourself, certain moralities are going to come into play. I think you have to analyze those very seriously, and think very seriously.

I don't think that it would be right for you to foreclose any type of action depending on the circumstances. On the other hand, I think it would be immoral and have no moral base to merely jump from plateau A to plateau Z. That is not a reasoned choice.

But when you have analyzed yourself, where you are, and what you are about to do and you have satisfied yourself that you have met your moral commitments, then I think you have to go ahead in the hopes that what you're doing will bring something better out of this morass we're in to yourselves and the rest who will come after you. In doing this, I hope that you can in some way reach your parents, in some way radicalize them or neutralize them, because they can be radicalized, some of them, and they can be neutralized, most of them, if you will not give up the contact.

On the other hand, you cannot let them give you the rationalizations which turn you back into robots, you cannot let them use the arguments that it is better for you to wait until you have an education and until you're settled and have a bank account and then you can fulfill all your causes, as they say.

This is not a cause, this is life and death. This is survival of a culture, a community, a people both here and abroad. This is not like giving alms at the poorhouse every Tuesday. This is serious business with revolutionary overtones, and therefore, there may not be time to wait until you've grown too jelly-brained to act, until you're chained to a portfolio and a bank account.

I would just like to close with one quotation from someone who is probably irrelevant to a lot of what we're talking about, who never lived to see it, who died 60 years ago, a man named G. K. Chesterton, whose main concern was with the effect of the industrial revolution in England on men, women and children in its factories, and he looked around and in a bad couplet which doesn't scan, for any of the English majors, and the purists, but which makes some sense. He looked around at all and he said, "We are all a drift on the same stormy sea, and we owe each other a terrible loyalty."

Well, it's that terrible loyalty, the nature of it, the extent of it, which you may have to answer to. It may bind you into the collectivization of action, it may bind you in to what your brothers and sisters are doing, it may bind you in a movement that could seriously alter the fabric of our society.

When the loyalty is demanded, I hope that you will listen to it and then make up your mind as to your own individual response. Thank you.

THE ASSAULT ON THE FREE MARKET
By William F. Buckley, Jr.

A few weeks ago I listened attentively to Mr. John Kenneth Galbraith and Mr. Jean Francois Revel discussing the virtues and vices of America, mostly of the latter. Mr. Revel, some of you will recall, is the French philosopher who two or three years ago wrote a book tantalizingly entitled A FUTURE WITHOUT MARX OR JESUS. Parenthetically, I can understand a future without Marx, but it has always seemed to me that if our future is indeed to be without Jesus, the decision will likely be His, not ours. And that in any event, Jesus is not bound by the deliberations even of best-selling French philosophers. Not that He should disdain them. Jesus desires a good press, even in France. Though to be sure he is mostly ignored by the press. I have no doubt that the great religious revival in America will occur only after Jack Anderson reveals that on the third day in fact Christ arose.

Mr. Revel joined Mr. Galbraith in deploring economic assumptions in America, assumptions that would become the theme in due course, or had been the theme of George McGovern's campaign. But Mr. Revel said there is in America: "An increasing rejection of a society motivated by profit, dominated exclusively by economic considerations, ruled by the spirit of competition and subjected to the mutual aggressiveness of its members." This passage he concluded by saying that beneath every revolutionary idea, we find the conviction that man has become the tool of his tools, and that he must once more become an end and a value in himself.

Concerning these comments, a few observations:

1) I do not know of any society that is dominated exclusively by economic considerations. I think that what we have been seeing rather is the continuing disposition of many people to ascribe an economic motivation to every human transaction. It was after all only two years ago that an organization of militant ladies who called themselves Another Mother for Peace bombarded the Congress of the United States with 600,000 signatures of Americans who protested the Vietnam War, after having been advised by that committee that the war was actually being fought in behalf of the oil interests of America. And indeed it transpired that a report has been circulating to the effect that U.S. oil companies were poised to take 400 million barrels of oil per day out of the Indo-Chinese shelf beginning on the week that South Vietnam won its victory. To move on with the story, a Congressional committee discovered after patient investigation that (a) 400 million barrels of oil per day is indisputably a lot of oil. In fact it is ten times as much oil as is taken daily out of the rest of the entire world combined, that (b) the United States owned no concessions off Indo China, and (c) no oil had been discovered off Indo China. But those clerical corrections, and others like them, did not significantly diminish the ranks of the true believers, who continued to contend that the principal motive of the United States in Southeast Asia has been economic.

2) Once we have fought our way through the lines of the orthodox economic determinists, whose arguments are soft and

sloppily deployed, we come upon a superior force which is ethical in nature, suggested by Mr. Revel's contention that our society inasmuch as it is "motivated by profit" is therefore subjected to the mutual aggressiveness of its members. It is as you know widely suggested that it has been a reaction against such aggressiveness that caused the great upheavals of the past years. Yet during the most vociferous years in the late sixties and early seventies, there were student riots not only in Chicago and Berkeley, but in Paris and Madrid, Tokyo and Berlin, New Delhi and Mexico, not to say the whole of China. On and on they came, their geographical coordinates unrepdictable, such that the taxonomists finally threw up their instruments in dismay after attempting unsuccessfully to correlate the dissatisfactions with private enterprise, or for that matter the Vietnam War, or racism which, if you throw in clitoral orgasm, constitute, I suppose a comprehensive list of the major student concerns of that decade. And they say the social convulsions, whose reality we cannot dispute, did not so greatly surprise observers whose Richter scales are less easily disturbed than those of the New York Times. Professors Christopher Dawson and David Riesman, a historian and a sociologist, to name only two of the scholars who come readily to mind, had long been aware among so many others of the phenomenon of what they called anomie, the great fault in human nature which like the geophysical faults that cause elemental disturbances beneath the surface of the earth, caused deracinated man to shudder with fright and loneliness and despair. Even so I think it is instructive to ask, why so often as in the works of Professor Revel and

Galbraith, the thrust of their criticism is lodged against the free marketplace, against the institution of private property. What is it that they prefer?

Mr. Galbraith, whose most recent book was reviewed the other day in the New York Times, proclaims himself now I think belatedly as a socialist, no doubt in the book in which he spoke so enthusiastically about the People's Republic of China, he did so in part because he found Mao's China liberated from the afflictions of the free marketplace. Mind you, in the book he acknowledged the authoritarian character of the regime, but quickly he puts a gloss on it. "Dissidents," he writes, that is how he describes Chinese who want to read books they want to read, or who want to change their jobs or leave the country or practice their religion--"dissidents are brought firmly into line in China, but one suspects with great politeness. It is a firmly authoritarian society," he says, "in which those in charge smile and say please." In Mr. Galbraith's book, Mao Tse-tung emerges as a sort of Rector of Justin.

But we focus now narrowly on the economic arrangements in China. Authoritarianism can indeed we all know work marvels, as Mr. Galbraith, ever the wistful former head of the Office of Price Administration during the second world war discerns, listen: "In any other country," Mr. Galbraith observes, "the difference between urban and rural incomes would set in motion a large movement of people to the cities, and in China it once did. This is not now happening. The reason is straight forward. The Chinese are assigned jobs and remain where they are assigned."

And then Professor Galbraith, perhaps the leading cultural critic in America of the free market, gets quite specific. After all, he was in China as an economist, indeed as President of the American Economics Association, and he was traveling there with the two predecessor presidents of the Association. And so in one chapter the great economist strips for action and becomes all professional, like Charles Darwin whipping out his magnifying glass. "While the higher authority decides what prices are to be," writes Professor Galbraith about the workings of a municipal market place in Peking, "such authority is intelligently susceptible to suggestions as to when abundance requires reduction and scarcity an increase. The keeper of the apple stall whom I consulted informally told me that of course apples were reduced in price as the autumn advanced and the supply became more abundant." Leaping Lizards! The socialist alternative to the free marketplace. Reduce the price of apples when they are abundant, increase the price of apples when they are scarce. Score one more thought for Chairman Mao.

Now granted "higher authority,"--that is the term they use in China--isn't always finely tuned to the vagaries of human nature, to such things as harvest yields and fluctuating tastes and reallocations of still higher authority, and when the highest authority himself makes wrong decisions, well Professor Tobin, writes Mr. Galbraith about his traveling companion, a former head of the American Economics Association and economics advisor to the late George McGovern--Professor Tobin observes

that there are no dogs or cats in China, the reason Mr. Galbraith explains is presumably economic. If food has been scarce and rationed, affection for a participating pet must diminish. This seems especially probable, he concludes, if the pet is itself edible. Let me tell you something, Professor Galbraith, and Professors Revel and Tobin and anyone else who wants to hear it. The reason for eating one's pet dog isn't economic, it is biological. It is the assertion of biological need over economic choice, and it is to such biological compulsions that the Chinese were recently driven by higher authority and when higher authority, assuming the mantle of the marketplace, makes miscalculations so serious that not even great politeness serves to bring dissidents into line, why then the muzzle of a gun becomes the only relevant article in the marketplace and the supply of guns in China never fluctuates with the seasons.

By that time Mr. Galbraith has finished his brief passage in China and is back now in America, preaching the anachronism of the free marketplace and the price system and dealing with his own dissenters not always with great politeness.

Perhaps Samuel Johnson went too far when he remarked 200 years ago that man is seldom so innocently engaged as when in pursuit of profit. But I confess to being more shaken by the complementary suggestion that the free marketplace introduces mutual aggressiveness. Surely that, not Johnson's, is the climactic effrontery. The notion that it is an act of aggression to lay before the individual a choice whether of canned soups or of economic textbooks or of newspapers, by that token

it is an act of aggression to write another song, or paint a canvas or set down a verse or write a judicial opinion, on the grounds that by doing so we muscle into territory already spoken for. The ethical case against the free marketplace retreats but leaves us facing the entrenched positions of the critics of our society whose complaint is against the dehumanization of Western economic arrangements as summarized by Professor Revel's conclusion that over here, man has become the tool of his tools, ceasing to be an end and a value in himself, and reminding us that the search of our revolutionist is for the restoration of the individual as once again an end and a value in himself.

I myself view the mechanization of the individual as the principal commitment of American secularism, who have lost hold of the metaphysical arguments, leaving them with a philosophy of positivism to which they now can enjoin with great facility, the phenomenological opportunism.

I remember it was ten years ago the analysis touching on the quick of the problem done by a stylish young intellectual who put it this way: Once upon a time, he told the audience, it was worth the risk of dying for two reasons. The first was that heroism was rewarded in another world. The second was that heroism was rewarded in the memory of man, who built the foundations of freedom upon the sacrifices of others. But now, he said, now that we know from the scientific evidence that there is in fact no other world, no future world, no transcendent heaven, and now that we have invented weapons that are capable of destroying all of mankind and therefore all of human memory along with it, what is the reason left for heroism, for war, or

even for the risk of war, he asks.

One can see that the cutting edges of the argument nowadays stress, you have noticed, not so much as they did ten years ago the nuclear war that would abolish mankind, as they do the senselessness of any war. The senselessness even of the threat of war. Indeed derivatively the senselessness of a convincing army, navy and air force. Tools of our tools. Why, then ask in effect, what is the justifying point of an armed service in a nuclear age? It seems to me, finding oneself in a polemical corner, that one had merely to reach into one's arsenal as Patrick Henry did and pull out the arrow that has freedom written on it, and touch it down on the skeptic and he would waste away like the witch come in contact with water. You will have noticed it doesn't work any more. Freedom is increasingly accepted as a condition describable only by subjective postulation.

Professor Ross Terrill of Harvard, author of the two most influential articles that have appeared in our time on the subject of Red China, articles that were avidly read by the President of the United States and all the press who accompanied him to Peking two years ago, is to be distinguished from the famous apologists for Stalin's Russia who made their way by simply denying the crimes imputed to Stalin during the thirties and forties. Terrill denies nothing. He doesn't disguise the condition of life in China today, not for a minute. After informing us that in China there is no freedom to practice religion, nor to vote, nor to express oneself freely, not to read books or periodicals one desires to read, nor to join a

labor union nor to change one's job nor to travel to another city or another country, he notes ingenuously: people ask me, is China free? He answers with great difficulty: "depends what you mean by freedom," he says. Freedom is always defined with reference to the limitations of the relevant entity, and whereas the operative entity in the west is the individual, in China it happens to be the whole state, and he illustrates. Consider the writer Ku Mojo. In the thirties he wrote books for a mere four or five or at most eight thousand people. Now, he is required by the state to write books that will appeal to 20-30 million people. Is that wrong, the Harvard professor asks? Then there is the researcher at Peking University whose affinity had been for abstract science, but who was recently directed to concentrate all of his time on pest control. Is that wrong, Terrill asks, once again. And I think we begin to understand the phenomenon.

The ideological egalitarianism that rushes in after practical diplomacy, such that Richard Nixon who went to China to establish a dialogue with Mao Tse-tung, ended by likening Mao's revolution to America's revolution, ended by proclaiming that we would have a "long march together" as if to say that Mao too is entitled to his Via Dolorosa, why should we not ecumenically share our own with him. Where is Vatican Three? And there is Mr. Nixon, seated next to Madame Mao Tse-tung, watching resignedly in the little chamber ballet become agitprop, a violation of art as well as of manners. It was as though we had invited the Presidents of the black African republics to the White House there to show them a ballet on the theme of Little Black Sambo,

and Mr. Nixon returning to the United States, proclaiming at Andrews Air Force Base the great enthusiasm the Chinese people feel for their government. Indeed the Chinese have done much to illustrate ways of generating enthusiasm for their government and no doubt Mr. Nixon is professionally fascinated by them. But we see through him the movement of western opinion.

What really is so bad about Red China? Their ways are not our ways to be sure. But is it seriously proposed that we should be prepared to die if necessary in order to avoid living by their word rather than by our own, which is in any case corrupt, racist, decadent, and above all materialist? The ongoing search for a new American revolution that would restore meaning to the individual is up against the most conspicuous precedents of this century. Two great revolutions whose extirpative passion however proved to be the elimination of the individual. And indeed we note that the revolutionary rhetoric of the day pays only formalistic attention to the individual, preferring to appeal to "the people." Indeed metaphysical defenses of man are somehow just a little embarrassing, irrelevant. Even Whittaker Chambers, the ardent counter-revolutionist, would make gentle scorn of the inflexible defenders of the individual. The late Mr. Frank Meyer, for instance, whose implacable book which he called IN DEFENSE OF FREEDOM, was current when the Republicans suffered their great Congressional defeat of 1958. If the Republican Party does not find a way to appeal to the mass of the people, Chambers wrote me at that time, it will find itself voted into singularity. It will become then something like the little shop you see in the crowded parts

of great cities, in which no business is done or expected. You enter it and find an old man in the rear fingering for his own pleasure oddments of cloth, caring not at all if he sells any. As your eyes become accustomed to the gaslights, you are only faintly surprised to discover that the old man is Frank Meyer.

I submit to the critics of American society that if they are truly concerned about the survival of the individual, they should focus on him and on his needs. Focus on those oddments of cloth, by a familiarity with which a few men and women know to hesitate not at all when someone asks the question, is it wrong for the state to tell the writer what to write? It is wrong for the state to tell the scientist what to study? Those few who do not hesitate to answer, yes, it is wrong, it was always wrong, it is now wrong, and will forever be wrong. The old man with the oddment of cloth is fingering some of the great truths that enable us to penetrate the sophistries by which we are somehow dissuaded that we can serve the individual by moving against the principal institution through which the individual asserts what freedom of movement our modern architects have left him with, or that we can make a profitable beginning by revolutionarily renouncing religion which tells us in the words of Ecclesiastes that God has made man upright.

The subject is strangely, quitely saddening, as we meet here to defend the free market. In Russia the people crowd to the only free market left. It is the black market, and they pay their 80 rubles, a month's wages, for a single novel by Solzhenitsyn. And there in Russia, whose rulers denounced the marketplace fifty years ago with a blaze of trumpets and a rain

of bullets aimed righteously at the temples of teenage girls and a hemophiliac boy in a cellar in central Asia, there in Russia fifty years after the advent of socialism, there are old men and old women and young men and young women who transcribe by hand not for profit from Radio Liberty, risking prison by the very act of listening to it, the latest novel of Solzhenitsyn, word after word, sentence after sentence, page after page. A process that takes them months to complete. Resulting not in thousands, let alone millions of copies, but a few dozen or perhaps a few hundred, the oddments of cloth. But it is worth it. Worth everything to preserve those oddments. To make them available to those who are graced with a thirst for them. The books of Solzhenitsyn accumulate even as the disdain for the institutions for freedom preversely accumulates. For an understanding of which paradox we find no help at all in the modern utopian gospels, but considerable help in Christ, whose servant Paul observed that though our outward man perish, yet the inward man is renewed, day by day.

GEORGE LINCOLN ROCKWELL LECTURE

Introduction

On behalf of the Fort Hays State College All Student Council, I would like to welcome you all here today to our first lecture in the new ASC Speakers Series.

Before making a formal introduction of our speaker, and most of you would probably agree, he needs no introduction, I would like to announce that if any of you have a question to ask Mr. Rockwell please write it on a piece of paper and give it to one of the ASC members, who has a badge like this, walking around the coliseum and it will be given to the panel.

A little bit of history on Mr. Rockwell. He was born, the first of two sons, to a vaudeville comic and his wife and spent his early life traveling between his mother's home in Illinois and his father's home in Maine. In 1938, he entered Brown University, which he attended until the end of his junior year, when he joined the Navy. He was married in 1941, shortly before being shipped overseas. After the war, he mustered out, spent his time as a sign painter, art student, and advertising agency executive. He was reactivated by the Navy in 1950, and it was during the second hitch that he read "Mein Kampf" and found his belief in Nazism and became an admirer of Adolf Hitler. In 1958, he formed the American Nazi Party, and since then he and his storm troopers have been making themselves quite well-known, you might say, across the country through speeches, demonstrations, and riots. And the Student Council now presents the Head of the American Nazi Party, George Lincoln Rockwell.

Speech

Thank you very much Mr. Chairman, and let me say that your chairman left our one very important item, I think from the introduction, which I think you will be interested in. Was when I was at the Pensacola Naval Air Station studying to be a photo pilot, this gentleman's father was my best buddy down there. He was a marine pilot. I might also mention the fact, that although I am very ashamed to tell you that I have forgotten his name. When we invaded Guam, I was in charge of an air support group that directed the air support for the marine troops there, as a pilot, and one of my assistants was the mayor of Hays, Kansas. I have forgotten his name. He was a little chubby fellow, but he was a mighty good guy. He had one fault, though, I taught him to play chess and he beat me.

Before I start my speech, ladies and gentlemen, I would like to say how grateful I am for this opportunity to address the academic community. It is the only place left in the country where I can present to the American people, or any segment of it, what I have to say directly, for your judgment rather than be filtered through the brain and the pen of somebody else.

An example, let me show you what they usually do. The only time I have had an opportunity to be exposed to a national audience, two times, about a year and a half ago, there was an interview printed in Playboy magazine, purportedly with me. It was written by Alex Haley, a negro, who wrote the "Autobiography of Malcolm X." And incidentally, I found he did a fairly honest job. I saw the manuscript he submitted, but then it went to Chicago to the offices of Playboy where a Jew by the name of

Murry Fisher got hold of it. And he said to me, and it was truthful. "There is lots here that you won't recognize--totally unfamiliar to you," and it was. I don't remember saying almost any of the things they put in there, many of them. The next thing we saw was in Esquire magazine last month, February, I believe. They published an article by George Lincoln Rockwell, by Fred Schaperio, another Jew.

Well, now I wonder what you folks would think about an article called, "The Truth About David Ben Gurion," by George Lincoln Rockwell. This is what they do, ladies and gentlemen, every chance they get. When there's an opportunity to present anything about me. It is never presented by anybody even neutral, certainly not sympathetic. It is always somebody who is violently in opposition. And the results is, I have people say, well, when you said this in Playboy, what did you mean?--and when you said this in so-and-so. I didn't say a lot of those things. And this is the only chance, ladies and gentlemen, that I have to correct the impressions that are spread abroad by people who are not interested in letting you know what I have to say. And I am very grateful for it.

The main thrust of my speech today is going to be that you young folks are going to very shortly be the navigators of the Great American Ship of State. You young folks in a few years will be determining the domestic and foreign policy of the United States. And to do it--to do it intelligently, you need all the facts. You need valid facts, you need facts that there is no question about, and you cannot be the victim of lies and do a good job. And it's my most sincere belief that you are the victim

of some of the most atrocious managed news and suppressed news in the history of the world--in this country, supposedly a free country.

As I mentioned, as the man who introduced me mentioned, I was a navy pilot, a fighter pilot for almost 20 years. I fought Adolf Hitler, I was in the Korean War. I love my country. I fought for it. And when I got out of World War II I began to examine what I had fought for and what was happening to the world and I came to the conclusion that I am a Soviet war veteran. All I fought for was the establishment of communism on over all the places I was supposed to make free from the Germans. I believe that all we did in World War II was enter to make the world safe for communism and the Jews. This is all that happened. We got nothing out of it. I believe that if we continue to do this, ladies and gentlemen, if we are continued to be the victims of managed and phony news, you're going to wind up not only with more of these sort of wars but the atrocity of Vietnam.

All sorts of things are said about what I say about Vietnam. Let me tell you what I do say, personally. Having commanded three navy squadrons with young Americans and knowing what kind of fighters they are and knowing what our great country can do, I think that it is the utmost tragedy in my time that we send young American boys over to Vietnam and we don't let them win. Every day there's more of them being killed and we have less and less chance of being able to win. What we're doing, ladies and gentlemen, over there is helping LBJ maintain a phony economy with a war economy using the lives of American young men. And I don't look kindly upon that and I think it's the result of 20 or 30

years of betrayal of all the information that you are given.

If you were the navigators of a great ship and you were given phony charts--charts that showed rocks where the channel is; and the channel where there are rocks what would happen? Would you not be sure to pile the ship up on the rocks? And whose fault would it be? I maintain, ladies and gentlemen, that the United States is piling upon the rocks. When we can have a war like Vietnam, going on right now, this country is piling up on the rocks. We're almost finished. No nation can survive the sort of thing that's going on in Vietnam--that's going to happen to a lot of you young boys here.

Let me tell you precisely what I mean. Some of you young men here will probably be drafted or maybe even volunteer. And a year from today, as I speak now, a year from today you'll be in Vietnam. And do you know what they're going to do with you young fellows? They're going to give you a flashlight and a pistol and send you down these rat holes looking for these "reds" in these rat holes in Vietnam--with a pistol and a flashlight. Do you know what's going to happen to some of you? You're going to get killed. Do you know all you need to get those "red" rats out of those holes is tear gas. But we can't use tear gas in Vietnam, ladies and gentlemen, because world opinion is against it. They tried it and you can't have it. So down you go in the holes with a pistol and a flashlight, because tear gas in this country is reserved by our government for the girls at the University of Mississippi. We can't use it on communists. This is the insanity that we are piling upon, ladies and gentlemen, the rocks

of lies and insanity and their result of not sure stupidity or foolishness, I have the greatest confidence in the American people if they are told the truth. If they are not lied to, they tell you in Vietnam we're fighting to stop communism. Is that so? Well, there's a big load of it only 90 miles away from the United States in Cuba. And we are not only fighting it, we are arresting and shooting at Cuban refugees. Patriots who are trying to go down there and get that communist, bearded, beatnik, skum, dictator out of their country. Your navy is stopping Cuban patriots from trying to protect their country from communism while they tell you that you must risk your life over in Vietnam stopping communism. Is this sanity? Or is this lies and on-sanity. I maintain that we can't survive much more of it.

What I would like to do, ladies and gentlemen, in this speech today is to show you some of the most atrocious examples of the lies and the misinformation and the suppression of news and facts of which I, myself, was a victim. You must remember that when I left Brown University in 1940 to enlist in the navy, and to join this young man's daddy here, as he was a marine pilot; I was a Navy pilot. I would have strangled Adolf Hitler with my bare hands. And I would have been happy to do it. I couldn't understand why they paid me. If Adolf Hitler was out to conquer the world, then why did they have to pay me to do it? If someone was trying to rape my wife or my mother I wouldn't charge to defend her. I love this country and if anybody is going to try to invade it I'll fight. You don't have to pay me to do it. So I went out there with the highest idealism to save my country.

And then I saw the same people that sent me out, turn it over to the communists. They had me fighting and attacking and killing, to the best of my ability, millions of young German, white, Christian, anti-communist boys. And they had me joining all the communists who said they're going to bury us and are busy doing it. This is what I did in World War II. This is what some of your daddies did. What his daddy did. We went out and made the world safe for the Soviet Union. Because they lied to us and they'd tell us one continual lie after another and I'm going to today to present some of the atrocious lies and misrepresentations that they have pawned off on you and they have kept you from knowing about.

New before I do it, ladies and gentlemen, let me explain this. I have a period of perhaps 40-45 minutes here in which to present some ideas and some facts. In that period I have no hope of being able to convert you and turn you into a bunch of Nazis so you all run down here for an armband. I expect no such result today. The best that I can do in 40 minutes, as against all your lifetimes, you've heard the other side--the liberal side. How wonderful the liberals are and how wonderful Eleanor was and Stevenson was--all these people are so great. And how rotten Hitler was, how vile McCarthy is and George Wallace is--anybody that's a patriot--General Douglas McArthur--they're all fascists, bigots, and haters, and so forth. I can't overcome that in 40 minutes. What I do hope to do, ladies and gentlemen, what I have become increasingly successful at doing at every college where I've spoken, is to give you a very few of the shocking facts as samples.

I can't carry the trunks fulls of documents I have here, I can bring 5, 6, 7, or 8 documents which shocked me when I saw them. And that's all I can do. I can't present you with thousands of them. I can present you with some shocking documents.

One particularly that started me along the path and made me begin to wonder who was lying to me and why, to turn me from a young man who was almost a liberal at Brown University. I almost was a liberal. I just couldn't get down Eleanor Roosevelt. But all the rest I went along with. From that day I have seen some facts so that I now stand before you, proudly as the Head of the American Nazi Party in a world Nazi movement.

Because I believe that future generations will discover that the Nazi movement in Germany actually performed what Davy Crockett and the boys performed at the Alamo, in Texas. They bought us time to find out what the communist tryanny and conspiracy is all about and to be able eventually to stop it. Some day the world will recognize that. Just as two thousand years ago, in the religious sense, the most hated and evil name in the world was that of Jesus Christ. Had I stood up in an audience like this, 2,000 years ago and said I think Christ was a good man, they would have fed me to the lions in the morning. But he was right. And there were some brave men and women that stick up for it, and as a result you have the powerful movement of Christianity all over the world.

I maintain somebody has got to tell you the truth--no matter how you get smeared or get threatened with assassination, as I am all the time, put in jail as I may be Monday in Chicago. No

matter what they do to me I believe I've got to tell you what's in my heart. What I think has happened to my country that I love and you people that I want to see protected and preserved, and what I think they're doing to you. No matter what they call me or what they say or what you think about me, I'm going to do my best to tell you these things and show you why I have changed to a man who has prepared his life to do this.

Before I start showing my documents, let me say this, inevitably, especially in colleges, there are the "know-it-all" liberals who always know better than anybody else that happens to be speaking on the other side. And whenever you present a document, as the great Joe McCarthy used to, he'd say I have in my hand, he'd have a document. I'd read the transcription--it was true. The liberals say it's a fake. He doesn't have it. And I know there are some here who will turn to their neighbor and say Rockwell doesn't have any such a document. It's phony. Well, I've learned how to beat that. Here's what I'm going to do. I can't present my documents and pass them around the audience so you can all read them here. What I can do is this, ladies and gentlemen, every document that I will present today has been photographically reproduced--not just copied word for word--but photographically reproduced so that you can see what the original looked like. We will make it available to every person who is willing to send in a stamped, self-addressed envelope. Your name won't go on a list. You're not responsible or obligated for anything. I simply ask you, if you have any doubts as to my integrity in what I am telling you and showing you, please send

for the documents. Even if you don't have any doubts, send for them anyway, because there will be many around you who do. And when they say to you, ah, he's a phony--show them the documents and say explain this, which is what I say to you today.

I'm going to show you documents which I don't see how they can be explained. Many times when I present them at colleges they have a panel and they say, well this guy of course changed his mind, that's old-fashioned, so forth. The truth is the truth. If these documents are what they preport to be then they should shock you because you've been deprived to a mighty big piece of information. And I think you will find you will be shocked, many of you. And many of you will send away. In every college about this size we've been getting about two or three hundred responses. And I think that's about what I'll get here.

I'll go further, in addition to, well let me first, I forgot one item. In order to get these documents you have only to address me, George Lincoln Rockwell, Arlington, Virginia. That's all the address you need. They know where I am. If you will send a stamped, self-addressed envelope, right back will come a copy of every document that you are about to see. And I beg you, ladies and gentlemen, do it for the safety of your country and our people.

I want to show you these documents and I'm going to go a little step further. In addition to making the documents available, I will make the same offer that I've made time and again for the last few years all over the country, in every college. If anybody can prove that one of these documents is a fake--just

one of them--or I'm misrepresenting them, then I will pay a reward of one thousand dollars--cash. And nobody's ever even tried to collect it. They're not fakes.

And I'll go still further. If anybody can show that these documents are a fake or anyone of them are fake or I'm misrepresenting them, I will fold up the American Nazi Party and go to work for Martin Luther King and Harry Golden for nothing.

Remember, ladies and gentlemen, I've told you I would like to be able to present hundreds of them. I can not do it. I can present only a very few and I'm going to start with one of the most shocking.

Let me tell you what it is before I show it to you. It is a full-page newspaper article written for one of the most respected newspapers in London--the London Illustrated Sunday Herald, February 8, 1920, right after the Russian Revolution. It was written by an officer of the British government. A man who none of you can say is a hate-monger or a bigot or an evil man, his name is Winston S. Churchill--not Joe Churchill, as some guys try to say--the guy that runs a garage. This is the right honorable Winston Churchill whose picture is here. He's the author of this full-page newspaper article. And one of the ones that shocked me and turned me more than anything I've ever seen because I couldn't believe a man of this stature would lie. And I found out he's not lying--he's telling the truth. And I think you will be shocked when you hear what he tells you.

The article is called, "Zionism vs. Bolshevism: A Struggle for the Soul of the Jewish People." In words he's saying that half of the Jews want to be Zionists, to take Palestine away

from the Arabs and the other half of the Jews want to be Bolsheviks, communists and rule Russia and then the world. This is what he's saying in here. The first part of the article he says he believes in Zionism. I can't make out whether it's because he wants them out of Britain or why. But he believes in Zionism. He thinks they should take over Palestine and Isreal. The second part of the article, and this is where I'm going to read you a few paragraphs, and again, I urge you get the whole thing. This is the sheet we send out, just like this, with every bit of the documentation in there.

I want to read you some of the paragraphs of what Winston Churchill now says about the international Jews and the communist movement that they dominate. As he says, right here he says, "International Jews (remember he's talking about the Zionists first), in violent opposition to all the Zionist fear of Jewish effort rise the schemes of the international Jews. The adherence of this sinister confederacy are mostly men reared up among the unhappy populations of countries where Jews are persecuted on account of their race. From the days of Sparticus Wisehout to those of Karl Marx, (and surely you all know Marx was Jewish) and down to Trotsky in Russia (maybe you didn't know Trotsky was Jewish); Bella Kohn in Hungry (surely you didn't know that Mr. Kohn's name was Kohen) and Emma Goldman in the United States." Now he's going to describe communism for you. He says, "This world-wide conspiracy for the overthrow of civilization and for the reconstitution of society on the basis of arrested development of envious malevolence and impossible equality has been steadily growing." Now listen to what Winston Churchill says about the

Russian Revolution. He says, "And now at last, this band of extraordinary personalities from the underworlds of the great cities of Europe and America (not Russia) have seized the Russian people by the hair of their heads and have become practically the undisputed masters of that great empire." Here is Winston Churchill, ladies and gentlemen, telling you and telling me the first time I read it, that the Russian Revolution wasn't Russian it was the capture of Russia by international atheist Jews. That's not hate. That's not bigotry. That's a fact--Winston Churchill says it.

And as the afternoon proceeds, I'll show you a lot more documents that prove it beyond any shadow of a doubt--including documents from the Jews, themselves.

Now before I proceed with any further proof, I would like to ask you, even before you're convinced, to just go over in your mind if this is true. If the Russian Revolution was not an uprising of the poor Russian peasants for justice, but if it was the capture of Russia by international communist Jews, don't you think you should know it? Shouldn't it be discussed? Shouldn't you hear about it in your history classes when Look runs a great big issue on the 50th Anniversary of the Russian Revolution? Don't you think that they should at least mention that this was a Jewish operation? They don't--but let me read a little further what Winston Churchill says about it--so you'll understand why and what they do. He says, "With of notable exception of Lenin (by the way Lenin's wife was Crups Kayen, a Jewis) with of notable exception of Lenin, a majority of the leading figures are Jews.

Moreover, the principle inspiration in driving power comes from the Jewish leaders. Thus, Checheran, a pure Russian, is eclipsed by his nominal subordinate, Litvinoff. And the influence of Russians--Bunacart, Bucarn of Lunacarskv cannot be compared with the power of Trotsky. And remember what Mr. Churchill says, he says that the Jews stay in the back as number two and put out in front a Russian or a gentile who has no real power. The real power he says belongs to Litvinoff and Trotsky. That's what Mr. Churchill tells you.

Now I want to show you something that I think will really shock you from the Jews--not from Rockwell or Churchill or anybody else--or Wallace or bigots--but from the Jewish sources. And before I do, ladies and gentlemen, let me ask you something. When I was in college, until I was 30 years old, in fact, I believed that the Jews were a religious group. Are you not under that impression now? Are you not told the Jews are believers in Judaism? Isn't that what most of you believe? In fact, whenever you point out that there seems to be some communists who are Jewish, like the Rosenbergs, do you know what the Antidefamation League of B'nai B'rith says--they said--why they're not Jews. They're thrown out of the Jews because you can't be a religious Jew and be an atheist communist. And that used to sell me. I used to believe it. Well now I want to show you how much they (Jews) mean this and what's really going on with them.

The Jews have put out a book in 1939, called, Who's Who in American Jewry. Now let that sink in--this is the top

American Jews--put out by the Jews--a directory of great American Jews. Here is the title page for your inspection-- "Outstanding Living American Jews of America and Canada." That's what this title page says. You send for it and get it from me. And you know what you find in this book put out by the Jews--you find here Leon Trotsky listed as an American Jew by the name of Bronstein. There he is. There's his picture. You send for it and get it from me. How do you explain the Jews claiming that this is a religion and yet they claim as one of their own proud men the leader of the "red" army in the Soviet Union who murdered 20 million Christians. How do they explain this? I couldn't figure it out when I first did. Here's another one on page 674, Who's Who in American Jewry--Maxim Litvinoff--what does it turn out his name is--Fickelstein. Well, maybe you say this is old stuff. They're not doing that stuff anymore. The Jews maybe did that at one time because they were persecuted--now they've changed. Is that so? In your library here--in the library of any ordinary size school or any library in the country perhaps you will find a very expensive book--it cost me 35 dollars to get hold of it.

Reproduced this section here is, Who's Who in World Jewry--just published in 1965. Here's the title page and it says, "A Biographical Dictionary of Outstanding Jews." It's published with the authorization of the American Jewish Committee, the American Jewish Historical Society, the B'nai B'rith, the Central Conference of American Rabbis, the Jewish Theological Seminary of American--all of them. Here's a whole long list of the top

Jewish organizations in the world, who say this is a listing of the noble Jews of whom we are proud in the world, just published. On page 29, ladies and gentlemen, what do we find--Herman Opthicker the chief theoritician of the communist party--listed right last year by these Jews as one of the noble Jews of the world. Do you think that if the Christians put out a biographical dictionary of great Christians they'd list George Lincoln Rockwell? But the Jews--when it comes time for those Jews to list who they're proud of--they list the communist leaders of the world. Even if the Soviet Union, as members of your country, as American Jews. I can't begin to give you all the facts but maybe these will start you thinking. Just what is going on? How can they tell you this stuff.

Here's another one. These little red ribbons you see hanging off these documents here are the mark of the United States Archivists. That's so you can't tear the pages apart. This is put on--it was gotten from the United States Archives in Washington, D.C. They were once classified documents. They have been declassified which is how I got my hands on them. We send them to you in photographic form so you can read the whole thing. I can't read all of it to you. I'm going to tell you what it is. This document here is the intelligence report sent back to the United States of America by G-2 of the United States Army after the Russian Revolution. The armed forces at the time, the Senate, and the President asked for a report on the nature of the Russian Revolution. It was a very big problem at that time. And this is the report of Montgomery Skyler, the intelligence officer in

charge of the nature of the Russian Revolution. This is your own government reporting to your own government on the nature of the Russian Revolution. I'd like to read you a sample here, one paragraph. You can read it all. This is one paragraph in which he describes the nature of the commissars in the first Soviet. The first government of Russia--here it is. Listen to who it's composed of: "two Negroes, 13 Russians, 15 Chinamen, 22 Armenians and more than 300 Jews." This is the government of Russia. I never knew this when I went to college--when I went out to fight Hitler. I don't think you know it now. Just in case you think this is a little too esoteric and I'm equivocating, let me put it in real simple words where Mr. Skyler gets really brutal about it here on the next page. He says--this is a direct quote--"It is probably unwise to say this loudly in the United States, but the Bolshevik movement is, and has been since its beginning, guided and controlled by Russian Jews of the greasiest type." Now there's no equivocating with that, ladies and gentlemen, here is your government telling you that the Russian Revolution was Russian in a "pig's eye." The Russian Revolution was the capture of Russia by international atheist Jews. Now if that's true, folks, my point is this. If that's true--good or bad; right or wrong--maybe the Jews were justified. But don't you think they should have told you that in your history classes?

If given another two hours here, I can stand up here for two straight hours and present you documents from the Universal Jewish Encyclopedia put out by the Jews in which they say the

Russian Revolution was the product of the Jewish Socialist Bund--the organization in the pale of settlement from which the Russian Bolshevik Revolution came. And it names all the Jews who did it. I could prove it with no questions about it. And everytime somebody says he's going to debate me in one of the colleges--is just like yesterday up in Fargo, North Dakota. Two professors were going to debate me and I said fine. I'm prepared to fold up and quit if I lose the debate. You just prove that the Russian Revolution was not Jewish. Or prove that the Civil Rights Revolution is not communist--and I'll quit. And they wouldn't debate. They squirmed and wriggled around. They weren't about to debate the subject because they know--just as I know--that I speak the truth. But you're not allowed to know it. And the reason, ladies and gentlemen, is they built up an atmosphere of terrorism. If you ever discuss Jews in this country and even ask about it and say how come--out of the 16 people convicted of treason in this country--since I got back from World War II--how come out of 16 Soviet rotten "red" traitors that sold us out to the Soviet Union--out of 16--15 have been Jews and 1 a Negro? You can't ask that. If you get up and ask that in class somebody will start looking at you and you're an anti-semite. Something wrong with you--you're a hater. Ladies and gentlemen, why is it hate to name any fact? If it hate to say $2 + 2$ is 4? And if I find someone saying $2 + 2$ is 5--why is it hate for me to say, no that's not true--it's 4. That's all I'm doing. That's what I go around the country doing and they want to assassinate me--they're going to throw me in jail

if they can Monday--they put me in a booby hatch, just for telling these facts. That's what's going on in your country. You're not allowed to know the truth about one group.

Do you know how you can tell who is the dictator in a country that you just arrived in? Just find out who you can't criticize. You go down to Cuba. You've got free speech. You can criticize anything you want--the weather--anything you want except Fiedel Castro. In Russia you've got free speech. You just can't criticize Mr. Brezhnev. In China you've got free speech, but you'd better stay off Mao Tse-tung. In this country you can criticize Irishmen, Italians, Negroes, people from Kansas, Germans, in fact it's even especially good to criticize Germans--now that's very popular. Any of you who are German here you might be aware of the fact that you're supposed to be sadistic and vicious and vile. And a man named Theodore Koffman before World War II put out a book called Germans Must Perish; he says you all got to be sterilized. He says as long as there's Germans in the world, we're going to have war because Germans are vile. So, you can criticize Germans. But Mr. Koffman, who wrote that is a Jew. And you better not criticize him. You criticize that Hebrew and boy you're going to have to fight for your life. And that's wrong, ladies and gentlemen, that's terrible. In this country that I fought for and saw so many die for, why can't we discuss and criticize anybody--even the Jews. And I'm doing it here. I'm the only guy that I know of in the country that goes around in public criticizing Jews and I'm still alive. And they don't like it. I don't know what they're going to do about it--maybe Monday we'll find out in Chicago.

Well now, ladies and gentlemen, before I proceed politically, I have plenty more, but before we proceed politically, let me show you the secret little world of the Jews that has nothing to do with politics--just plain money--cash--that you don't know about. This is one that has nothing to do with politics but boy was I surprised when I found this one and so will you be. And usually if there's any Jews present this is where they jump out of the balcony and start running around and start frothing at the mouth and being carried off, and so forth. Anything to interrupt the proceedings. I've had a many instances with rabbis running up and down the aisles when I present this because they don't want you to hear this at all. This really squeals on them.

Here is a cover of a little booklet. I'm putting it in my new book that's being published in Dallas although they only have a part of it here. This booklet, it is called, "Kosher Products Directory," and it's got a big "U" on it encircled. And it says here you can get one, take the address down if you'd like to send for it, instead of me send to the Jews, Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America, 85 Fifth Avenue, New York 11. That's where you get this directory. Now it says, "Kosher Products Directory" you might think this is gafiltafish and matzahballs and so forth--it isn't. You know what's in here? Sanka coffee, Maxwell House coffee, Ajax cleanser, when you get home from here or if you have a little apartment or room where you keep coffee or something, look on the coffee can, look on the labels of your food, of your cleanser and so forth and you will find either a little "u" or a "k"--the "k" means kosher. Well, so far so good.

What's so bad about this? Well, I'll tell you what's so bad about it. This is called a hacksher in the Hebrew or Yiddish language, I'm not sure which it is. But this little "k" and "u" costs you money to put on these food products that you eat. Because in every factory where they make food, in order for the manufacturer to keep in with the Jews--a sort of like little protection racket so the manufacturer won't be blasted as antisemitic, he has to pay them to put this "k" or the "u" on your food. Every CARE package if you send a dollar to CARE, you're buying kosher food to send to Germany, for instance. You can't send anything anywhere that isn't kosher. One time we decided we weren't going to buy this kosher food and we almost starved to death. It can't be done. Now my point, ladies and gentlemen, is not that this may be wrong because maybe you think it's right, but don't you think you should know about it, and you don't. You've never heard about it, in fact, most people sitting here don't believe me yet--not till you go home. I'll start getting letters tomorrow. My God you're right. Everything's covered with "k's" and "u's". I didn't know this. I get lots of letters saying this is awful. You're just beginning--you're on the way. A few years from now you'll be wanting an arm band. All you've got to do is find out what's going on. All you got to do is find out what's going on and you're going to go the route. I've never seen anybody become a Nazi and then go the other way. There's a lot of people become communists and then give it up because it's lies. You can't turn around from the truth. I've never met anybody who did. I've seen people who ran away and hid but nobody who

ever went from a Nazi to a communist. It's impossible. Once you're a Nazi you know what's going on and you know who's doing it to you.

Now I would like to show you how far this hacksher business has gone and what to do with it. Here is the Jewish Newsletter, published by the Jews, not by me, and again you can get a copy of it. And on this column over here called, "Facts and Comment the Kosher Racket," I can't take time to read it, you know what it says. It says, fellow Jews we've got to do something about these rabbis, they're getting too greedy with these "k's" and "u" bit. They say one rabbi, in Cleveland, just sued the Coca-Cola Company for 30 thousand bucks for one summer's blessing of the Coca-Cola. And he says the gentiles are finding out about this and they don't want to pay 30 thousand dollars to put our little "k" and "u" on their Coca-Cola. And they're right. The gentiles didn't like it. So he says we've got to stop these guys. They're beginning to spread into everything, even anti-freeze, now it's kosher. You can't get anything anymore that's not kosher because these rabbis want the money. And he says the sum has gotten into the multi-millions of dollars. That you're paying these people to make your food kosher. Would you tolerate it from the Catholics? You would not--neither would the Jews. But you're supposed to tolerate it from Jews because they're so wonderful--and everybody loves them. Well now how do they get away with this? Let me show you their method. I will confess right now that Hitler did one thing that I think was not only wicked--it was stupid. And that was to burn books. If there's anything in the world

I've learned in public relations and working on Madison Avenue, is that if you want a book thoroughly read and to sell heavily, you can do one of two things. Either get it banned in Boston or get the Kennedys to sue to prevent publication. And even better, of course, is to burn it. I've got a book out and another one on the way out. You've never heard of it of course, as I'll explain here. If you folks would get my book and burn it on your campus, I would be made. I wouldn't be starving to death anymore--I'd be doing great. Burning books just makes everybody want to read what was burned. The Jews aren't so stupid. Here is how they have kept you from knowing all of these things I've presented and lots more. Here is a letter from the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith that explains their method. In fact, this is when we caught them right in the act. This is an actual letter sent out by the B'nai B'rith Anti-Defamation League to publishers around the country. Let me read you the first paragraph or part of it. "Scribners & Sons have just published a book by Madison Grant entitled, The Conquest of a Continent. It is extremely antagonistic to Jewish interests." Well, so far so good. If they oppose a book that's all right with me--let them oppose it--but let us know about it. That's not the way they do it.

Now I'll tell you what they did about that book. Paragraph three--"We are interested in stifling the sale of that book." You all know the meaning of the word "stifling." Well--they did. They stifled it. You can't get it. You haven't heard about it. It's not in your library. It's a very rare book and hard to get. And this is only one letter that we happened to get. There are

thousands of books, ladies and gentlemen, that they have stifled. The Jews are perhaps the world's greatest businessmen. I will not deny them that and they have every right to rise as high as they can. That's not the problem. What they do when they rise is that they abuse the power they have won over from us--they promptly use that power to lie to you. And the worst kind of a lie is the kind of a lie that you don't even know exists. Whenever anybody writes a book that says Negroes are not equal, whether you like that doctrine or not, you should be able to see such a book and judge for yourself whether there's any evidence. You can't. Any book that shows anything derogatory of Negroes never gets in a bookstore. You just don't see it. You don't know it exists. So all you kids out there tell me all the evidence shows Negroes are equal. I don't blame you for believing that. That's all you've ever seen and heard. That's all the evidence you're ever told. There's tons of evidence on the other side and it's not allowed to be published in your books. It's not in your bookstores. You see always and only side.

Let me give you an example of exactly what I mean in popular terms. Those textbooks are hard to prove. The most powerful medium in the world is television. Certainly nobody here will argue me that. In one-half hour the President of the United States can get on television and have more impact than all the Presidents before television put together. Reach a hundred and eighty million people at once with a tremendous impact. You only have three television networks, ladies and gentlemen, ABC, CBS, and NBC. NBC--you all know the name of the Chairman of the

Board, you're familiar with it. His name is Robert Sarnoff, but perhaps you haven't realized that's a Russian-Jewish name. Robert Sarnoff, the Chairman of the Board of NBC; Chairman of the Board of CBS is William Paley, listed in "Who's Who in World Jewry" as Palensky, another Russian-Jew; and the Chairman of the Board of ABC is Leonard Goldenson, not a Swedish gentlemen but another Russian-Jew. Three Russian-Jews control everything you see on the boob-tube. And as a result, just like your textbooks, let me ask you this folks--most of you surely, whether you like it or not, you're aware that the FBI's statistics show that almost 85% of our serious crime is committed by Negroes. Whether there's a reason for that move--what I talking about is the fact. Most of the serious murders, rapes, robbings, and muggings are committed by Negroes. Have you ever seen a Negro in any of the crime pictures on television one--no you haven't. Never a Negroe--the guy that's the dirty rat that did it is usually unshaven, a white Protestant from the South, with tabacco juice running down his face and he's kicking his mother, beating his kid--he's a no good bum. And on the other hand, whenever a Negro appears on the television, what is he? He's a judge or a statesman. He's a great man. You are never shown Negroes as they are. They all want to be on television. They say we want more characters on television. I'm for putting them on. Let's have television programs showing the Negro rapists and murderers and muggers and robbers, the people that are knifing the young ladies that are trying to serve the Senate and the House of Representatives in Washington. They can't walk out of

the office anymore. The Supreme Court has to have armed guards to get their women in and out of the Supreme Court. I only hope they'll get into Warren's office some day.

Well, ladies and gentlemen, I can't possibly present endless documentation on all this, but I can tell you what it has led to. It has led to a situation where everybody in the country knows there's something rotten with 2 or 3 major things and yet nobody ever really does anything or says anything. Let's take the assassination of the President. Finally, of course, I've been making the same type of speech all around the country and it was recently down in New Orleans they're beginning to find a few of the loose ends flying around. But I've been preaching exactly this for a long time--so all the tape recordings will show. What I would like you to think about--have you ever heard the following fact? Maybe some of you have if you've read a very obscure document. Did you know that just before the President was shot that Fidel Castro held a "Hate America Parade"--that's what it was called--in Havana, Cuba. And at the head of the parade they carried a big, black casket. And on it it said, "Here lies the body of John F. Kennedy killed by the Cuban Revolution." And did you know that Robert F. Williams, a leader of the NAACP from Monroe, North Carolina, got up at that parade and he said quote, "John F. Kennedy has persecuted the American Negro long enough, so we shall be avenged. And Mr. Kennedy was shot by a member of the "Fair Play for Cuba Committee." And now, of course, they're beginning to find the little rats crawling around in the sewers and they're dropping dead of suicide and so forth, of natural causes. As fast as they dig them out they fall over dead with

shot 5 times in the back by rifle fire--as one of LBJ's opponents was found as a suicide. This is what's going on and we all accept it. We all accept this sort of thing. We're just being used and abused, and nobody really protests except me. I go around screaming well this is terrible.

I've shown you in the case of the assassination just how bad this is and I could give you lots more. But let me show you, even more importantly, what they're doing directly to you. How they're using you folks. After World War II, when I got back here I didn't know much about politics. I didn't know anything about it at all, to tell the truth. I got back and I thought I had saved my country. I thought I had fought the last dam war for this world was ever going to see. I didn't want to ever see another war as long as I lived its vile. I thought I'd saved the world from tryanny and murder and bloodshed. And I got back here and no sooner did I get back then some guy over in China started raising hell--called Mao Tse-tung. And I didn't know too much. I even read Walter Lippman in those days. But I felt alright because I read my Walter Lippman and Walter Lippman said Mao Tse-tung wasn't a communist. He was an agrarian reformer. Mao Tse-tung was trying to help the peasants because they were oppressed in China. So, I felt a littel better. Lippman said it's alright. I read where Mr. Atchison said he was a fine patriot. He was an agrarian reformer he wasn't a communist. Herbert Matthews, of the New York Times, said he wasn't a communist--he was a patriot. Even Eleanor told me he was alright--he was a patriot. And I got a little worried then. But actually all our great leaders, ladies and gentlemen, of all the people

right now that you listen to told you that Mao Tse-tung wasn't a communist. He was only an agrarian reformer helping the poor peasants. In those days I wasn't even a "conservative," yet. I wasn't a Nazi--I would have been appalled at the thought, just as you probably are. But I did know there were some people called "extremists," red baters, and haters, and so forth. And all of these people were running around and saying Mao Tse-tung is a communist. The evidence is all there. He's a "red." But the Saturday Evening Post, by pro-reds saying Mao Tse-tung was an agrarian reformist. He couldn't be a communist. So after all of this had been spread all over you folks heads and you all believed it--including me, all of a sudden it turns out our government completely disarmed Chiang Kai-shek. George "Cat" McMarshall quote, "With one stroke of the pen, I disarmed Chiang Kai-shek." Twenty divisions, I think he said, and with the same stroke of the pen he armed, with Russian arms, Mr. Mao Tse-tung. And Mao Tse-tung took over China. And did he reform it for the peasants--no. He killed 40 million of them and set up the biggest tyranny in the history of the world. And of course, Eleanor said, Oh--How I've been betrayed. How could this be? It was just absolutely unbelievable to all these people that this awful man was a communist, but he was. And he so announced. And, of course, Atchison, Dean Rusk, all these people were astounded that this had happened to them. They couldn't understand it.

So the next scene is in Cuba. And by this time I was a "conservative"--a follower of Joe McCarthy and a believer in conservatism in those days, which I regret now. But in any case, I went along with the conservatives and here came this bearded

"skid" named Castro. And all the people with whom I associated with, not only said but knew that Mr. Castro was a communist--and were saying so. But once again Walter Lippman, Eleanor, Dean Rusk, Dean Acheson, all our great leaders announced that Castro wasn't a communist. Herbert Matthews in the Times ran endless articles about what a great guy he was and he couldn't be a communist. And all of the conservatives, including myself, were hollering we have his record. He's a "red." And some of you kids may remember, we weren't listened to. We were called hate-bigots, liars, red-baters, and so forth. So Mr. Castro won. And when he won, he was taken over the United States with the greatest triumphal tour in the history of the country. I don't know if he got Disneyland, but he got everything else in the country. The grand tour--they even put him on the "Ed Sullivan Television Show" to millions and millions of Americans. Maybe some of you saw it. And Ed Sullivan put his arms around this guy and said he is the George Washington of Cuba. That's what we were told--that's what you were told. We knew better, but you didn't. So, Mr. Castro went right down to Cuba, stood up a few days later after his big scene where all our guys were supposedly made suckers and he jumps up in Havana and says, "I'm a communist. I've always been a communist," and then he proceeds to start the slaughter. And the communist tyranny hasn't ended yet, which we're backing--or your government is backing, rather. And once again Eleanor, and Dean Rusk, and all these people--Oh, How could this happen? What a betrayal? How could this man do this? Who could have thought he was a communist? In spite of the fact that he led a communist revolution in Venezuela before he became so

famous. We have plenty of evidence of what he was, but you people aren't allowed to know it. You're always told that people like me are hate-bigots, extremists, and you should despise me and not listen. Or if you do, you should do it with disrespect and pay no attention to my facts. And I don't believe you can do it, ladies and gentlemen. I don't care how you've been set before you come in here, how you've planned to be silent, or how you've decided to hate me--you will walk out of here different than you ever were before. From now on when they present a communist spy you'll see how long the nose is. You might not have noticed it before, but you will now. From now on you'll begin to notice that there's something different with the communist than with somebody else. When a communist comes to speak at your college the Jews don't say a thing. It's when I come to the college that the Jews go crazy or even poor Robert Welch--they don't like even that. Of course one of the saddest things of all is that some of the greatest patriots in the country--the VFW, the American Legion--invariably go out issuing proclamations knowing nothing about it or what I preach or what I believe. I fought just as hard as any of them. I've got 9 decorations and yet these people will issue statements that I'm a dirty rat, and no good, and so forth. And they're Soviet war veterans just like me. They helped fight for communism just like me. And yet they'll do everything they can to hurt me.

Robert Welch goes around preaching I'm a communist provocator; Billy James Hargis says the same thing. The other side is fanatically united; my side is divided and trying to tear itself to pieces. Instead of doing what they could, for instance, everytime

do you know that they're carrying communist Viet-Cong flags in these demonstrations in front of our White House. I have gone to these the first time it happened and seen communist flags. The flag of the enemy that's killing American boys being paraded in front of the White House. So I went out there and tore them down and went to jail for it. And I'm proud of doing it. I'll do it again. I tell the cops I will not break the law except in that one case. There should be no such law. When anybody carried the flag that's killing American boys, I'm going to tear it down. And boy did I enjoy it. By the way, I got a hold of the New York Jew that was carrying that thing and he won't carry another flag for a while.

Now I might ask the VFW and the American Legion, that I understand have been issuing statements against me here, where were you guys. I called up the American Legion and I called the VFW and I said will you go down there and help tear those flags down, there's more there than I can tear down. Did they?--No. They haven't torn down flag one. In our camper that I have right here with me, I'm proud to say that I have one of these filthy trophies. We got it in Seattle and the filthy little "red" that was parading around with it. I carry it around as a trophy just to remind people that we don't talk--we act. I'm not going to tolerate anybody parading with a flag that right now is killing American boys. You say well, I carry a Nazi flag. Sure I carry a Nazi flag because I found out the Nazi flag was fighting against all this filth. And I was helping the filth. There's no crime in being wrong if you admit it. The crime is continuing right down the same old error. Had we not helped Russia, Mr. Hitler

would have put communism out of business. There would have been no nuclear war possibility. There had been no problem. And don't say he would have conquered this country. Even our State Department admitted no Nazi ever had any desire to conquer this country. All Hitler wanted to do was to get communism out of Germany and get back the parts of Germany that belonged to Germany, and he did. And for that they sent me over to go get him. You couldn't get me to go again. I'd be like these peace creeps in this one particular case. If anybody wants me to go out and kill my Christian, German, anti-communist brothers, they'll find me in the jail. I'm not killing any more of my own people.

Ladies and gentlemen, I want to point something out now. I pointed out what they did in Cuba and what they did in China. I'm going to close with this. I want to show you the pattern. In China you remember what they said. They said the oppressed people of China need a champion and it's Mao Tse-tung. He's not a communist; he's an agrarian reformer for an Agrarian Revolution. And we helped get rid of Chiang Kai-shek and put in Mao Tse-tung. It turns out he's a communist and a tyranny is set up.

In Cuba, the same thing happens. All our leaders tell us he's not a communist. In the name of the oppressed people of Cuba, we put in a dictator who then oppresses the people worse than ever. That's the pattern--get the pattern? Oppressed people, great leaders, we back the great leader, and then the great leader turns out to be a "red" and it sets up a dictatorship and a tyranny.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, I want you to look at your own country, the United States of America. Examine this country and

what are we in the throes of? In this country we don't have peasants. Many of you may be wheat farmers here and you're not peasants--you're not starving to death. Our country is able to feed itself and do magnificently. In fact, you're feeding the world. So we don't have any peasants. What we have in this country as an oppressed class are black people. And you won't find me standing up here and being a big fake liar like so many, so called, segregationists and state riders. I will confess that the lot of the black people stinks. It's terrible. If I were a black man I would have been Malcolm X. I wouldn't tolerate it. But neither would I go crawling around with hat in hand saying I want to mix Mr. White Man, I'm going to lay in and crawl in and squirm in and wet in, and so forth until you let me in your lunch rooms, and so forth. You wouldn't catch me doing that. I would have done like our pilgrims. When they didn't like how they were being treated in Europe they went to a world and built their own country. So I'm all for the Negroes being able to help themselves, but not by pulling us down, and tearing down our society and spreading anarchy and terror in our city streets.

The pattern that I want to show you is the oppressed minority. In the name of the oppressed minority, they set up a leader they tell us is not a communist. They get lots of you good people helping and then the leader of the oppressed people turns out all the time to have been a communist. Do any of you begin to see the pattern in this country? You haven't got peasants you got black people, so instead of an agrarian reformer revolution, they call it a Civil Rights Revolution. The pattern is exactly the same, the same people that said Mao Tse-tung couldn't be a com-

munist; the same people that said Castro couldn't be a communist now tell you; you believe them, Martin Luther King couldn't be a communist, he's a preacher. He loves the Negro people. His little heart goes pitty-pat and he's trying to help these Negroes. Martin Luther King, ladies and gentlemen, has a record just like Mr. Castro, just like Mr. Mao Tse-tung. Robert Welch has been telling Americans this but they've got him blacked out. Billy James Hargis has been telling people this; they've got him blacked out. I'm telling you that they haven't got me blacked out yet. I'm not telling it to a Right Winged meeting--I'm telling it to you. And a lot of you are going to begin to think about it and worry. Do you realize that 3 strikes and you're out? You lost in China, same leaders. You lost in Cuba, same leaders. Now you've got the same leaders telling you the same garbage and this is your third strike and it's your country. And they've got most of you people helping them--for the best motives in the world. From the goodness from your hearts you want to help the Negro People and I can't blame you. They have a terrible life.

But you have no way of organizing yourselves. You don't know which way to go and what to do, so they say come on down to Selma March and march. And you find you're being led by communists and don't know it. Those of you who are trying to help the Negro by pushing the intergration movement and helping Martin Luther King and people like that are engaged in the Castro, in the Mao Tse-tung, and now the American Communist Revolution without meaning to be. This is what I'm telling you. Our country is in the gravest danger in the history of all its existence. It's almost finished because they taught the white people to be guilty, to

feel ashamed of what they are. And I'm not about to be ashamed of the greatest race in the greatest country that's ever appeared on the face of this planet, ladies and gentlemen. I fought for it then and I'm prepared to fight for it now if I have to fight all alone. And the only way I know how to fight for it now is to alert you folks as to what's going on. And I'm doing my best to do it.

The last thing I want to say to you is what you can do about it. I would like to tell you something about National Socialism, what it did for Germany, what Hitler was able to do, not the lies you heard about 6 million poor Jews with the violin music and the tears pouring down. I would like to tell you what he was unable to do positively for a great country and a great people. I haven't got time. The best I can do is tell you how you can save your country without breaking any laws, without shooting any Negroes, without doing anything illegal, only doing what you're supposed to do as an American. And the first thing is think. Let me ask you this something, ladies and gentlemen. Some of you are probably proud that you're Republicans and some of you are proud that you're Demoncrats. Well, Eastland is a demoncrat, so is Adam Clayton Powell. What is a demoncrat? John Tower is a republican, so is Jacob Javits. What's a republican? I can't find out. It makes no sense. Republican isn't anything except a gang of people and I think it's a fake. And democrat isn't anything except a gang of people, and I think it's a fake. You know what it does? It's the oldest trick in the world. They have got you folks, just like you're divided into two sections in the audience here.

Supposed everybody on this side is democrats, white democrats, and everybody over here is white republicans. Do you thing there's any sense in these two sides going to the polls? You might all as well stay home because you'll just cancel each other out. In other words, if this room is empty except for the people on the floor here and everybody on this side cancels out everybody out here and we all vote together we got you beat. And that's what they're doing to you in this country. The Jews aren't stupid enough to vote democrat or republican. Every study we've made shows in Brooklyn, in the Gossa Strip, as we call it in Hollywood, in every part where you have a lot of Jews, wherever you go you will find out the Jews vote in block. They vote for whatever candidate says he's going to give Israel the most. The most pro-Jewish candidate is what they vote for--not the Republican or Democrat, or the Liberal or Conservative. They vote for Jewish candidates. Jews don't vote Republican-Democrat; Liberal-Conservative--they vote Jewish.

Negroes, can you imagine a Negro voting for Goldwater just because he's a Republican or if he was a Democrat? I can never find a Goldwater Negro. There must be some but I have never met one. The Negroes aren't stupid enough to do as you folks do and play this little Democrat and Republican game. The Negroes vote black. Well, maybe you think that's terrible.

How about this, ladies and gentlemen, let me ask you what you think. Reverse the situation, sometimes when you don't understand a thing, you can't get persepctive on it--let's reverse it. What do you suppose would happen to a group of you people who went over to the Congo or Ghana and formed a white pressure group and ran

around the Congo hollering, "Get blackie." Do you know what would happen. They'd eat you. And yet, ladies and gentlemen, they won't tolerate it. But you're told that they're oppressed and it's a sad thing to be a Negro, and so forth.

The fact is, if you were over there in the Congo it'd be a sad thing to be you, too. They cut off a nun's arm in one of the recent ceremonies and made her eat it, right in the middle of this town square there. I think it was Stanleyville or wherever it was. This is quite tough to be a white person there. So you might say we have a right to riot, too. The white people should riot because we're oppressed in the Congo. But if we did it you folks would all be taught isn't that terrible. Look at those white terrible people pushing those nice Negro people around. You've been taught to be so guilty you can't think anymore. In Ghana, the black people dominate and they're not about to allow white people to come in there and tyrannize them in a minority tyranny.

In Israel, can you imagine Israel allowing some of you folks to go over there--you Christians--and say we don't like you singing Jewish songs and having Jewish prayers in your Jewish schools. But that's what they do to you here. In New York State--all over the state, in California, in all the big industrial states that are full of Jews, they are stopping you from praying and singing Christmas Carols in a white Christian country--you can't do it. But you couldn't go to Israel and do it--you couldn't go to the Congo and do it.

What I'm saying to you, ladies and gentlemen, is that there is nothing wrong and there's everything right with the people who built a country and who dominate it as the majority in running

that country. That's not bad or wrong. That's what everybody else in the world does and you approve it. And yet when I suggest it you have been taught to think that this is hate and bigotry. It's not--It's love. What I love is you people. I love my white, Christian-American brothers and sisters. I went by a school yard on the way in here today and I saw some of the finest people that I've ever seen--the little kids in there--beautiful racial types--wonderful people. But even my mentioning the beautiful racial types some of you feel guilty. Oh--he said race. Well--I'm proud of them. They're blond and they're beautiful--they're handsome.

When anybody wins a beauty contest, have you ever seen a real flat-nosed, fuzzy-haired, Congo-type female win a beauty contest? No--they always take a white girl with a little color above their heads--features just like you pretty girls out here and they see she won the beauty contest. She didn't--the white race won it. And you're all ashamed to admit to what you are. We have beautiful people, wonderful people, and I'm for protecting them. If you don't you're going to lose them. Other countries have. Brazil has.

When I was a navy pilot down there I would take or show some of my mess attendants--stewards--mess boys as we called them, and then they were American-Negroes and compared to the South American they looked like "supermen." They were big, strong, husky, pure Negroes and compared to these little, stunted, mongrels--mixture of every kind of race in the world--you'd have been proud of them. They're not going to do that to my people as long as I can fight and talk.

I'm saying to you, ladies and gentlemen, quit running away--quit being ashamed of what you are--begin to get ready to fight the worst power, the worst tyranny the world has ever seen--the communist conspiracy that is out to destroy you. And the only way you can to it, ladies and gentlemen, I beg you to see, is to stand up for what you are--the greatest nation and the greatest race in the world--white power.

DICK GREGORY

But are you really worried about it? I mean, you're really worried about a panther and a jayhawk? Jayhawk don't even exist. You ever see that old funny-looking bird? And if there was a real jayhawk in life, a jayhawk wouldn't stand a chance with a panther. So we'll check ya'll out Saturday and see what happens. And if you win 7-6, we know they slipped him in the game again, right? Can you people up in the cheap seats hear okay?

You know, as I travel around the country I'm really amazed today to see so many people that were surprised at what eventually happened to Dick Nixon. I must say it didn't surprise me, matter of fact. People say he was stealing money, doing shady things, anytime the President of the United States' best friend's named BB? I knew four years ago Nixon wasn't paying no income tax! And when he got on television one day and slipped and referred to April 15 as Christmas? To be honest with you, I was glad that Nixon, you know, became President of the United States. I didn't vote for him, and Lord knows I wouldn't have been hugging him. Let me tell you something, particularly you black folks, one day you're gonna be sorry about the way you treated Sammy Davis. I mean, if you just stop and think about it, Nixon didn't start having no problems till after that hug. I was glad Nixon became President mainly because Nixon ain't got no class. And I knew if he got in, it would all hang out. Nixon ain't done no more than the rest of them, but he just ain't got no class.

See, one thing we do in America, regardless of what kind of mentality we have, we love you if you just be yourself. That's

what Nixon didn't want to do. He gets to be President and he wanted to be Napoleon. Sleek Willie. Hey, listen, you don't ever hear no Americans bad-mouthing Frank and Jessie James because Frank and Jessie never pretended that they loved banks. You can say what you want to say about LBJ, LBJ made it and people really dug him because LBJ never pretended to be nothing more than an old barbecue-licking cowboy. And, had LBJ got caught with the Watergate, he could've dealt with it. He would've got on television that day and said, "Darn right, I done it. What you all gonna do about it?" And he'd have just sit there and looked at you, with barbecue sauce all over his coat.

And I'll tell you something else, you can say what you want to say about Dick Nixon, but you have to admit one thing. Nixon was honest with us. Nixon told us a long time ago if he ever got elected to the presidency, the first thing he was gonna do is take all of the crime off the streets. And it's your fault, you should've asked him, "Where you gonna put it, friend?" Another reason I was glad Nixon became President of the United States is because he was a poor white boy. Anytime you give a poor white boy that much power, that quick, you know he gonna steal too much too fast. You can say what you want to say about niggers but at least when we gets the shopping bag full, we quits.

Cause you know last year at this time Watergate was really breaking big and everybody in the White House was trying to find some body to blame it on and couldn't. I don't know how many of you in this audience is aware of the fact that last year at this time when Watergate was really breaking big and they couldn't find nobody to blame it on, all the black leaders in America

decided to send Dick Nixon a telegram thanking him for not having no blacks in the administration. Yea, you can't blame Watergate on us. Had it been one black, no had it just been a rumor, we'd have got all the blame. I can just see Liddy standing in court now. "Uh, Judge Sirica, your Honor, uh, Jambo Jones did it all by himself." And Judge Sirica saying, "Can you explain to me how one man can bug the whole Watergate by himself?" He say, "He did it with a watermelon, Judge."

That's why many of us blacks--we're so glad you young white kids is on the scene, cause many of you is just like a breath of fresh air. See, you don't be lying on us twenty four hours a day like alot of them old white folks used to do. Used to be lying on us, bad-mouthing us, talking about the way we look. Coloreds got them big old funny-looking lips. No, they used to have alot of effect on some blacks, walking around all day with their lips tucked in. Running around with twenty pounds of meat in his mouth. Had nerve enough to bad-mouth the way we talk. "You know them coloreds just can't speak no English at all." Which ain't never bothered me. I ain't got no English blood in me. And what little bit of English they do talk, the reason it sounds so bad, I learnt all my English from a bad-English-speaking white boy. And you can check that out. Cause when they first brought me over here on the big boat I wasn't speaking nothing but pure Swahili. Till that dumb white boy looked at me and said, "Go over yonder and get that there pot and bring it over here." I been talking like him ever since.

You young white kids--I'm telling you - if you knew - old white folks would lie - had nerve enough to try to blame slavery on us! They'll just look you right in the eye and tell you - we didn't have anything to do with it. We went over there to Africa to get some elephants and niggers just jumped on the ship." "Take me Guwana." "Get back boy. It's elephants we want." "Oh, Guwana, take me." "All right, boy, if you insist. Get up on the boat. Anything else you want me to do for you?" "Yes sir, put a chain around my legs so I won't slip off." I sure would hate to miss that mellow trip.

Let me say it's a pleasure to be with you young folks this morning. Pleasure to be back here with you. You know, as I travel around the country today I can't help but wonder, do you young folks really know who you are and what you're all about? I would dare say that never before in the history of this country, or probably could be safe in saying never before in the history of this planet earth, have young people had the burden of responsibility dropped upon them that we older folks in America have dropped on you young kids today. Now you can play with that if you want. You can have the same prejudices, fears, and hang-ups that your mothers and fathers had, or you can take the same don't-give-or-care attitude about changing this country that many of us old folks had when we was your age, just one difference. If that's the route you're planning on going today--I tell you right here and now--prepare yourself for death, cause you gonna die.

The very faith and destiny of this here country depends on you young kids. Oh, I hear a lot of people talking about nine-

teen hundred seventy six of a supposedly free democratic society, it'll be because you youngsters have banned together with your moral force to turn this country all the way around. If nineteen hundred and seventy six is heard the way that you think it is; if most folks really know what's going on in America today; oh, you think you know what's going on in China and what's going on in Russia; we call ourselves the most educated, most sophisticated nation in the world. But the whole world's laughing at you--you know less what's going on than anybody on this planet. The whole world knew we was bombing Cambodia for two years before you knew it, and the only way you know it--James Bond had told you. Anybody in their right mind knew the C.I.A. was involved with the overthrow of a government in Chile, and then when you find out about it you say, "Oh, did they do THAT? The C.I.A.?" That's like being surprised, somebody sitting there and being surprised, that Frankenstein had choked somebody to death.

The C.I.A. is the most degenerate, inhumane, beastly organization that's ever been put together in the history of this planet earth. And one day if you're not careful, you're gonna find out about them the hard way, cause if you're insane enough to believe that you can train that degenerate organization to go all over the world and topple down governments and assassinate leaders and treat people's elections and think one day they're not going to come home and do it to you--you're really out of your mind. If you really knew what was going on with many of the members of the F.B.I. Everybody looks at the F.B.I. like, "They're so good, they so this and they so that." If you followed that trail

down at Wounded Knee. If you understood what that fellow judge was saying that day when he had to cut them two Indians loose-- when he held his head in shame and say he never thought he'd live to see the day in his lifetime he'd have such a low view of the F.B.I. And that's because he found out a lot of conspiracies that go on in this country, a lot of conspiracies was going on at Wounded Knee was perpetrated primarily by the F.B.I.

We get one political assassination after another and they know darn good and well it's conspiracy, but the F.B.I. runs ins and says, "Ah, no conspiracy--just crazy." One day, when you wake up and find out - if most of America knew what the C.I.A. was doing right here at home. Two hundred million people got wrapped up--and Dick Nixon--in the Watergate coverup. And I have no doubt Nixon was involved with the coverup. But I'm not worried about the coverup. I'd like to know about Watergate. I don't wanna know who covered up the body, I'd like to know who committed the murder. And if we push Watergate, you would find out that Dick Nixon had nothing to do with the Watergate, it was bigger than him. That goes all the way into the C.I.A., and if you keep pushin it, it would head all the way into Dallas, Texas the morning J.F.K. got shot. That's how big Watergate, it is. And Nixon knows, and that's what Nixon meant a couple weeks ago when he said he's afraid to go into the hospital cause he don't believe he'll come out alive. And I wanna know how many of you all thought of his hospital stay, when he didn't eat no food in the hospital. All that food he ate was prepared at his house and brought sixty-miles away. What I'm trying to say, when the

ex-President of the United States hasn't been out of office two months, is worried about those freaks killing him, then don't none of you all stand a chance--OK? Now you all goin to play games with yourself, but you'd better have a lot of fun, and you'd better play quick and fast because recess is just about over.

Go back and study how Hitler and the Nazis came to power. It was Hitler and the Nazis that was creating violence from one end of Germany to the other. And the German people was in the same bag most Americans are in. We're so busy worrying about money and trinkets, and playing games, and all, that nobody's interested in this country and the United States Constitution. We're not interested in what day will Indians get their rights, what day will women get their rights, what day will Chicanos and Puerto Ricans and Black folks and poor folks--we so busy playing games wondering how much money can we make and what kind of job--nobody cares about the United States Constitution, for some reason. One day it'll probably be too late, but you'll wish you had've cared. The thing is moving fast. There's documented evidence that all of them degenerated freaks that got caught in Watergate that night were supposedly ex-C.I.A. agents. What composes an ex-C.I.A. agent? When you get caught? Is this nation simple enough to believe that them Watergate burglars would go by the C.I.A. and say, "Look we're fixing to do something bad. We really don't want to get you involved. But what we need is you to give us some rubber gloves, some masks, some wigs, a camera, and develop the film." And they say, "OK, we'll do that, but we're not involved." There's documented evidence that many of those Watergate

plumbers that was caught in the Watergate was also down in Dallas, Texas the morning JFK got shot. There's pictures and evidence of E. Howard Hunt and Turgess being arrested five minutes after Kennedy got hit up on the grassy lawns down there by the book depository dressed like winos and dressed like bums, and I know if my research people can find that out and get hold of pictures, I'm sure that the government can find that out and get hold of the pictures too.

Just one conspiracy taking place in this country after another. I got hold of Bobby Kennedy's autopsy report, and again I say if I can get ahold of that autopsy report, the United States government can get hold to it. That shows beyond a shadow of a doubt that Bobby Kennedy was assassinated with three bullets--one entered him in the back of the head and lodged in the brain, the other two entered Kennedy in the back--with Sirhan Sirhan standing in front of him. Why don't the F.B.I. ask some questions--how can Sirhan Sirhan shoot that man in the back three times, standing in front of him? And the state of California knows, and has already admitted it was two guns used in the assassination of Bobby Kennedy.

They keep playing games, and they keep playing games, and the when somebody tries to tell you what's happening, you gonna believe they're crazy. Jim Garrison tried to wake up all of America--Jim Garrison's one of the most honest, ethical politicians this country's ever produced. But most folks in America wanna believe Jim Garrison's crazy because Jim Garrison told you the C.I.A. was involved in shootin J.F.K. in Dallas, Texas. And it's amazing what has happened to Jim Garrison. They've just misused that man--the man's been indicted five times--and every

time he goes in, takes this government on by himself and wins and survives. Teddy Kennedy also know what happened, but Teddy Kennedy's not gonna tell you, cause Teddy Kennedy put his little personal things above America. And regardless as to how you feel about your family and your momma and your wife, they still not bigger than America, and anything you know that could save this country, then dammit, you deserve to lay it on the line if it means your whole house gettin blown to bits, because America is bigger than that. And we run around the country wantin' to believe that Teddy Kennedy is the hero when the real hero, baby, is Jim Garrison. Because if Teddy Kennedy told you, you would be more apt to believe it than if Jim Garrison told you, but Jim Garrison went out of his way to tell you all what was going down. Since you keep missin' things on your own. That's why Teddy Kennedy got out of that race, because that same vicious, degenerate C.I.A. that's been gunning everybody else down has been threatenin' to do something to his kids--he's simple enough not to realize that they're not only dirty enough to do it to you--be you get out of the race or stay in--it ain't such a thing as I know something on somebody that can save a nation and if I keep my mouth shut, ain't nothin' gonna happen to me. They'll get him anyway in the long run.

Sirhan Sirhan, James Earl Ray--if James Earl Ray shot Martin Luther King, my momma shot Martin Luther King. Why do these government agents keep tellin' us. And we have such a low view of Dick Nixon, but I tell you somethin', one day you find out Nixon wasn't quite as bad as we thought he was. One day this Earl Warren who everybody has so much respect for, Mr. Integrity,

one day you find out had Earl Warren had of been honest with you with the Warren report, there never would've been a Watergate, baby. Cause it all leads into the same thing.

Arthur Bremer who was arrested for shootin' George Wallace? F.B.I. took the gun away, examined the gun, found out that the gun Arthur Bremer had was a five-shot 38 caliber pistol. Carried George Wallace to the hospital, examined him before they operated on him, found out George Wallace had been hit five times. Now I can understand you not asking the question cause you busy doing other things. But it looks like the F.B.I. would've asked the question. If Arthur Bremer got a gun that shoots only five times and George Wallace got hit five different times, then who shot them other three people up on that platform that day? The Alabama State Trooper, secret service agent, and that woman-- somethin' wrong. Y'all gonna play games, yeah? Have fun Saturday, cause your Saturdays is comin' to an end. If you don't watch yourself. And it looks like they're gettin' away with it. That's what I can't believe. If it was happenin' anywhere else, y'all could see it. Boy, if they can pull the Symbonese Liberation off, they can pull anything off. Symbonese Liberation, who told us about it? The government. Didn't anybody even know they existed. Then the government told us. Symbonese Liberation, they say, who is it? They're a group dedicated to liberate niggers with only one nigger in the whole group, and you all simple enough to buy that. Didn't even have one black woman in the whole group, a group that's dedicated to liberate black folks and I ain't met no black cat in America that knew we was about to be liberated. Well, we sure was glad the F.B.I. told us somebody

was takin' care of business cause we were just about gettin' ready to give up. One black cat in the whole group, DeFreeze.

And I'm sure if my research people can find out five days after the girl get kidnapped that DeFreeze had been on the L.A. Police Department payroll for five year, I'm sure the government can find it out. I'm sure if my research people can find out that DeFreeze testified for the State of California against Charlie Manson in the Charlie Manson trial, I'm sure the government knows it. I'm sure if my research people can find out that DeFreeze had been arrested twenty or thirty times with handguns, shotguns, double barrel shotguns, machine guns, dynamite, hand grenades, and for some strange reason everytime the trial get ready to come to court, it get dropped. I'm sure if my people can check that arrest record out and find that out, I'm sure the government can. Then if the government knows what I know, why do they keep playin' him up as being so anti-American and anti-establishment when they know darn good and well he works with the establishment.

And y'all keep playin' games with yourself, here, go back and read in the library, read about that kidnapping--go back and read how they snatched that girl out the door--kicking and screaming. Had on one of them negligees', half naked. Her boyfriend ran and grabbed him, snatched him, beat him up and the F.B.I. and the eye witnesses and all the law enforcement agents that dealt with that kidnapping say at no time did they enter into that house--they snatched that girl at the door, beat up her boyfriend at the door and split with her half naked, kicking and screaming in the negligee'. A few days later, we get a message from Patty Hearst--and we have no doubts that it came from Patty Hearst--

because, on that paper they sent in, clipped to it was half of her driver's license. The next message we get from Patty Hearst we knew it was Patty Hearst because they had clipped some of her credit cards, now I ain't never been to bed with a rich white woman in my life, but I wonder if they put driver's licenses and credit cards on their negligees'.

Now, all the F.B.I. and the law enforcement agencies in this country had a hunt lookin' for that car that they used to kidnap Patty Hearst in, and they claim that no time in the history of law enforcement agents has that much manpower been used to look for a car. And they found the car. F.B.I. didn't find it, a newspaper reporter with the Chicago Tribune found that automobile in Berkeley, California. Up on the F.B.I. parking lot. When the F.B.I. was pressed to explain how the car could be there when they were looking all the world for it, they explained it by saying Lynn Perry sold the car to a used car dealer and unbeknown to them, one of the F.B.I. secretaries just happened to have bought it. Ah, Ah nothin'! That's the excuse that they give, and one pretty excuse after another they've given to cover up all the vicious, degenerate things that these government agencies is doing. And you gonna keep on sleepin' it and keep on sleepin' it, and you gonna get this country gonna be terrorized with violence in the not-to-distant future, and these government agencies gonna blame it on left-wing and right-wing groups and one day it's gonna get so bad, they gonna tell you that they gonna have to suspend the constitution, dissolve the senate and the congress and we have martial law till further notice and one day we'll find out when it's too late that the same groups that was

supposed to protect you was the ones that was creating it.

If you just keep looking at that Patty Hearst kidnap thing, there's so much mess that come out of that that didn't make sense. The Symbionese Liberation had their bank account in a bank in Berkeley, California across the street from the F.B.I. Headquarters. Fifteen days after Patty Hearst was kidnapped, Lynn Perry goes into the bank, withdraws the money, the F.B.I. admits they knew the bank account was there, they also admit that normally they would've staked out the bank but they knew they wouldn't dare come in that bank. That's how they explained not havin' the bank staked out.

And then the Symbionese Liberation moves from Northern California to Southern California, to the Symbionese Liberation shoot-out, better known as the barbecue. And now the F.B.I. and the law enforcement agencies did something that they never done before in the annals of crime. They called the three major network television media and then the press and said, "Uh, we got a shoot-out coming at 2:30, if you all can be here with your cameras, lights, and your directors at 12:30, we'll let you film it." And I don't know if they ran it here, but it ran live in most people's houses across this country, the whole shoot out. They said it burnt up. Many people said, "Wow, we don't understand how those human beings could withstand those flames." Oh, they probably withstood them good, because they was probably dead when they put them in there. People got to checking that didn't believe, they got to checking the autopsy reports and started seeing some bullet projections that didn't make sense. Now the L.A. Police Department have admitted that two of them

did get shot outside the house. But being such great revolutionaries, they decided, "I'll die with my comrades. Give me fire.", and they walked back in.

They said this one white girl said her cat loved her so much the cat burnt up in her lap with her. You ever been around a cat? Stupid Jayhawks, might burn up in your lap with you, that's right Jayhawks don't exist. Anything that ain't real will burn up in your lap with you. But a cat? I can see that scene now. "Oh cat, I hope you understand revolution, me and you gonna sit here until the fire." You know, if a building ever caught on fire and I was trapped in it, I hope to God I could be so lucky as to get my hand on a cat's tail. Well, I know I'd get out of that building. Then they shipped the bodies back home. They shipped DeFreeze's body back to Cleveland. I don't know why they didn't nail the coffin. His parents opened up the coffin and said, "That's not him." The government said, "Well, prove it." They said, "We can't, his head and all his fingertips is missing." They say normally for autopsies they don't take all the fingertips off of people, but for him they decided they would. One day, we're gonna wake up and we're gonna find out what's really going on in this country. You all got a job.

America's being closed in upon the basis of two sides. We're morally bankrupt on one side, and nature's closing in on us on the other side. And no supposedly free demoncratic society can function much longer when the laws of that land have reached the depth of lowness that we've reached in America today. And the President of the United States is supposed to be the moral

leader. Can you imagine Gerald Ford being the moral leader? Gerald Ford, a few weeks ago, he said to them Arab leaders, "If you don't lower the price of your oil, we might have to go to war with you over your oil."? That makes about as much sense as I go to Kansas City tonight and threaten to whip a pimp because a prostitute is charging me five dollars more. Wouldn't it be nice if we had a president in the White House that was so morally sound he could've dealt with the Arabs from a moral basis? He could've got on television and radio and have a press conference and say to the Arabs, "I know we can't get involved with your oil, but the way the price is going up, you're really throwing the world economy off. And as President of the United States, what I am going to do if this keeps up is ask the Senate and the Congress to give me legislation that will demand that all the automobile manufacturers in America and anybody that is going to ship cars to this country will have to start having engines that will get 100 miles per gallon, since we have the knowledge and the technology to do that, all we have to do is bottle up the holes. Now that upsets people, now.

I wish he would've said to the Arabs, we own six per cent of the population, but control 83% of the world's natural resources, because we got a money system over here that makes money on making new things that gonna break down. Everybody in the world can make a car last for ten years but us. Our car just lasts through that last month, then the motor jumps out. And do you realize it takes just as much gasoline and energy to create power to manufacture cars that last for ten years as it do to manufacture one that's going to last for three? We waste

so much stuff because they can hustle--they got a nylon, they make a nylon rope that you can pull a truck with, but when I make you nylon stockings you tear when you put them on...something wrong. What we got to do is stop wasting this tremendous amount of natural resources that we waste in this country and we will automatically cut back with the energy.

Can you believe that Gerald Ford will threaten the Arabs about that hustle they got and didn't say nothing to the American Oil companies whose admitted they made as much as 400% profit since the Arabs jacked the price up on us? Somethings wrong. You mean we got a president in office with them white folks acting like fools in Boston, Massachusetts, and I had a cat tell me, he say, "Well, you know Boston's not as bad as Mississippi, because it's worse because Mississippi didn't pretend to have a MIT and a Harvard and a Boston U. right down the street from where them white folks was acting like fools. Tell me that Cambridge area is like the Citadel of Intellectuality in the whole country, and if that's the answer the people that's that close to the Citadel of Intellectuality, is that scared and have that many suspicions, then we might as well close the whole school system down in this country until we change and do something else.

And then the President yesterday say, "Well, I don't agree with bus....," well, man, just keep your mouth shut. All your negative thoughts you keep to yourself. And I'm sure that if Ford decided to go out and get drunk tonight, he ain't going to get no television and tell nobody he's going out to get drunk tonight. Sure, he do some other little petty things he don't want nobody to know about, so why in the hell is he going to say

something like that? He'll just inflame things and get a bad situation going.

The President of the United States can make one statement and decide if the stock market is going to go up or go down and so what we need is to try to get somebody in office that leads from a moral stance. Can you imagine Nixon being the moral leader when he was president. Constantly talked about. Under no circumstances will I ever give amnesty to the draft resisters; but when they get caught, he wants immunity for his Watergate friends? And how come so many people was upset over Nixon being pardoned? Come on. That makes about as much sense as you finding me wiping out all the money Saturday night from you all's football ticket money. And just getting it on. You know that's gonna be alot of money. Alot of people be here for that. Hey, Gregory, caught you stealing. I say, "OK, but check the laws in Manhattan, Kansas if I get caught stealing in Manhattan, Kansas, the law says I get to pick the sheriff that's gonna arrest me. So make it my brother. And I also get to pick the prosecutor who's going to prosecute me, so make that my wife." My brother's the sheriff to arrest me, my wife's the prosecutor, and in three days from now you'll read where all charges were dropped. And you really surprised? You knew when Nixon picked Ford, Nixon was having problems. He knew he was on his way out. He knew there was a possibility he would end up in jail. You don't even need much imagination to even hear that conversation. "Hey, Jerry, come here pooch, come here, boy." "You want me?" "Yea, how would you like to be President?" "Of what?" "The country,

stupid." "President of the country, what do I have to do?" "Let me hear you say, pardon me." You should've know that Gerald Ford was going to come out of that boxing bag when we talked about amnesty for draft resisters. You ain't never heard anybody talk about amnesty before. Why did he start talkin' about it at once? "Well, I want these draft resisters to come back home. But you got to work your way back. I got a work program for you. And you got to pledge allegiance all over." Well, I got to pledge allegiance because I didn't want to participate in your murderous war? No, you oughta.

These syndicate mafia hoodlums. That's who you need to set up a work program for. That's who you need to take a pledge of allegiance. If Ford wants to bring this country together, he should've let amnesty wait for a few minutes. And he should've asked all you flag-waving patriotic Americans, all you veterans of foreign war, American Legion mentalities. Yea, he should've asked all you all to take a trip with him Sunday morning. And he should've just told you, "Stay in your homes, cause I want you to watch something on television." And then Gerald Ford should've announced he wasn't going to play golf this Sunday, that he was going to get all the major networks in the news media to go with him on Sunday morning and going to visit V.A. hospitals and let you flag-waving Americans see how your veterans, how them boys that believe in you is all shot up and wounded, how they laying stacked up in them V.A. hospitals going unattended. That's what he should've showed you. He should've interviewed some of those V.A. officials and let them tell you that we don't

have enough money to run these hospitals properly, we understaffed and then you flag-waving patriotic veterans of foreign war, American Legion mentalities, that's what you should've spent your time instead of being so busy against amnesty, you should be for those boys that loved you. You should be for them getting proper attention. That's what you should do. Yea, you patriotic folks, you all gonna leave cold, baby. Anytime you can wave a flag to get your young folks to the front line of battle, and get killed and wounded and shot up and injured, you ain't there waving that flag to make sure they get taken care of when they get back. That ain't no flag you waving, baby, that's a rag. And don't you never ever forget it.

You know what really surprised me about you patriotic folks. Why don't you raise your hands. How many of you remember last year the news broke that hundreds of millions of dollars of heroin had been shipped into this country from Viet Nam was sewed up in the bodies of dead American servicemen. How many of you all read that? Yea. Well, isn't it funny that those patriotic folks didn't get outraged, ain't it funny that the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign War didn't demand a full investigation? Hundreds of millions of dollars of heroin? Sewed up inside the bodies of dead American servicemen? Who's slick enough to do that but the CIA? Cut open those dead bodies, load them wit heroin, sew them back up, ship them across the Pacific with the rest of them bodies, have somebody meet them on this side, separate them, cut them open, take the heroin out of them, sew them back up, and ship them back home. Who can do something like that but government agencies? But that didn't seem to

bother you flag wavers. That didn't seem to bother you patriotic folks. Something wrong.

I have a cousin of mine who came by my house not too long ago. My cousin, you talk about American, gung-ho, he went to Viet Nam before he was old enough to get drafted. Went on his own! Yes, jumped on the plane and started grabbing folks. "Hey, boy, hey, get on back to Chicago with that muggin! You can't do that over here." He say, what do I have to do to keep so it won't be mugging?" "Just put that uniform on. I can be an American serviceman, then I can do the same thing, and it ain't mugging. Go through those villages and kill women and kids and rape anybody you want, it's in the national defense. We'll pay you to do it. Go ahead." Well, now he's back home now. Been out two years. Medals all over the place. Purple, he had a purple heart, when he was born. Medal of honor. Came by a couple weeks ago, he say, "I got to see you, I'm in trouble." I say, "What's wrong?" He say, "I been out to war two and a half years." "Well, you don't look it, you still got the uniform on." "Yea, I love it. Love it. Damn, white kids, messed up, we can't fight no more wars." He's looking for a war. I said, "What you come by to see me for." "I haven't had a job since I been out the military. I'm hungry, ain't got no place to stay, I need a job, can you help me?" I said, "Sure, I can get you a job. President's taking care of that." "What do you mean?" "Got to take that uniform, get out them GI underwear. Grow your hair out long. Get you a beard. Get you some dungarees, and some sandals, a lollipop and an icecream cone."

"What's that for?" "You got to look like a draft resister and Ford got some legislation through that all you got do to is go to any federal court and say I'm a draft resister. They got a work program for you for two years, they'll feed you, they'll give you a place to stay, and some money." Do you believe the insanity of this nation? We fixin' to go into some unemployment that's been unparalleled to the history of this country. Veterans can't find work, but you can find work for draft resisters, who don't want it. But veterans that do want it, they are out on the streets can't find a job.

You youngsters have got a big job, you haven't got too much time, now everyone talkin' about crime. Oh, the crime is running rampant in America. That's what they tell us. Everytime you look around, they tell us we have to do something about crime. The Attorney General said, "Well, we don't know what we can do." Give me the job. I know what to do. I can stop crime. Sure, how do you stop crime? The American mentality, cowboy boots, cowboy hat, two guns strapped to your rump, and say, "Crime, you're under arrest, by golly." Now I can stop crime because I have enough sense to know when you get ready to stop crime in the whole nation you don't start trying to stop crime from the bottom working up, you start at the top and work down. Make me the attorney general, I'll stop crime. I'll get on television and stop it. "Tonight as your attorney general, tonight I'm threatening crime. I'm going to mug crime tonight. I'm going to rape the syndicate. You little petty peons, purse snatchers, muggers, I'm not talking to you this week. You mafia

syndicate hoodlums, I want you all to know as attorney general of the United States you have three days to be good and on the fourth day I'm going to have all of you in trouble. I'm not going to use no gangster tactics, I'm going to use tactics out of United States Constitution, because we know who you are. If my FBI can follow fifteen-year old kids who demonstrate against anti-war movement and run dossiers on them, they better have dossiers on you. I'll give it to all of them tonight. But you criminals, you thick degenerate freaks, I want you to understand one thing. Study those trials and Wounded Knee, them two Indians that we kept locked up in federal courts for eight months and that's what I'm going to do to you Mafia syndicate hoodlums. I'm going to keep you all in court, eight months at a time. If you all can still run your operations from one of those federal courts, then we'll just close this country down and give it to you. And to you little petty, stealing, conniving muggers and purse snatchers I want you all to know that anytime we threaten to close down the syndicate, you know you don't stand a chance."

It's simple. We can get crime once we decide to get honest with it and start dealing from an intelligent base. You know what crime is all about. In order to break down crime in America, there is a whole lot of judges you're gonna have to bust, baby. There is a whole lot of police departments you're gonna have to bust. You know darn good and well. Let's assume that none of us in this room have ever been to Manhattan, Kansas, in our life. Let's assume that we just got here today at 11:00. How many of you all believe we can come to Manhattan, Kansas, for the first

time at 11:00 o'clock today and by 11:15 be meetin' with the reefer man. Raise your hand. How many of you all believe this can happen. Don't raise it too quick, now don't blow your hustle. Sure you can. You really hard up enough to believe that we can come to Manhattan, Kansas, for the first time in our life, haven't been here before, and in 15 minute's time we can be meeting with the reefer man but the police who live here, many of them born here, work here, they can't find the reefer man. In many of these colleges across this country they don't care about you getting high, because they figure the higher you all get, the less they got to worry about the builing burning down. They'll probably put it in your soup if they had to.

You youngsters got a big job. America's morally bankrupt on one side and nature's closing in on us on the other side. I am surprised I see so few people in this country that understand what nature's fixin to do. Oh, we understand math and trigonometry and geometry but we don't understand nature. I guess I should understand that. We live in a system today that go out of their way, go out of their way, to wash out your head to teach you intellectuality, go out of their way to do this. I guess that's right though; you can't hustle knowledge. You can't put knowledge on a transcript. You can't lay up all night and cram knowledge and trick someone with it the next morning.

You youngsters got big jobs. You haven't got much time to understand nature. Had you understood nature, you would have known watching the leaves on the trees this past spring, the spring of '73, it is not normal for leaves to start budding on the trees

in the spring but never reach full bloom until way up in the middle of July. And when that happened, that's nature telling you I got you on a famine course. And we headed into a critical food shortage in this country and the world and we cannot just look around and say we'll let the world fare for themselves. We're going to have to find ways of feeding the world and feeding the American people. The same if I got six month's food supply right up here on this stage and you all ain't got no food and can't get out of this room and I say I'm not going to share mine with you, you know what you're going to do, don't you. Well, make believe that America is up here and the rest of the world is out there and we got some food, ain't going to give you. You know what they're going to do don't you. Well let me tell you something, baby, you ain't got guns big enough to keep hungry people from getting to you. There's a lot of things we're going to have to start changing in this country. We're going to have start eating for nutrition and not eating for taste. We are going to have to start putting laws through to preserve food for the masses. We put a law through to say you can't do but 55 miles per hour but to preserve gasoline for a dead automobile. How come we can't put a law through to preserve food for live bodies. How come we can't put a law through and say no more fertilizer to be used on lawns, no more fertilizer to be used in cemeteries. We used enough fertilizer this past spring on lawns and cemeteries to produce enough food to feed India for the next ten years. This cannot be tolerated no more.

You youngsters have got a big job. I don't believe we've

gone beyond the point of no return, but I believe we are fastly approaching it. How can you deal with it? You youngsters got to rally behind your moral force. And when you rally behind your moral force, the first thing you got to start doing is to start talking about the sicknesses that confront America. I meet so many people today that ask me how come you don't say something nice about America. Cuz I've got too much sense. I've got enough sense to know that nice things and a sick boy will never, ever cure the disease and until we can start talking about the problems that confront America today, until we can examine this country. They tell me that 98% of everybody that dies in this country from cancer would die if they had the examination and knew they had it. So I say what good is the cure if you don't know you need it. Venereal disease is running rampant in America; it reached epidemic proportions. Why? Because nobody in America wants to talk about syphilis, gonorrhea, and crabs. You might as well start talking about it, you got it. We're one of the few countries in the world that can wipe out venereal disease in seven day's time but nobody wants to talk about it.

One day we're going to have to tell the truth about how Nixon got in the White House. Nixon became President of the White House by appealing to the fears of white folks in America. All them white folks that voted for Dick Nixon ain't never voted Republican in their life. But Nixon didn't invent that. You got a hand full of rich, white aristocratic families on the east coast that have always controlled white folks in America by manipulating your fears. Oh, they knew what to do. Popcorn, bubble

gum, pretzels, beer and fears. That's why you young white kids today have upset the whole country. You don't have the fears and prejudices, and hangups that your mothers and fathers had and this country is set up to manipulate your fears and when they can't do that there it comes apart. Fifty years ago when black folks stopped being afraid of the system, it wasn't no accident they ran those big guns through my neighborhood. It wasn't no accident they put a junkie on every corner! Now that you young white kids have stopped being afraid of the system, it ain't no accident that junkies can find you with no police interference. It ain't no accident that for the first time in history of America they had to run the military up on a white college campus at Kent State. They didn't need that for your mommy and daddy cuz they could terrorize them with fear. That same gun that they've been gunnin' niggers down with they will use on you now to make you behave. And they get that fear instilled back in you because up until you white kids came along being so mellow they could control white folks. All they had to do was tell them "Watch them niggers, watch them niggers. Ed, what you gonna do tonight? I'm gonna watch these niggers. Don't watch me, baby. I'm not your problem. There is not one black person alive today on this here planet earth that is in a position to start World War II in the morning and get them big bombs dropped on white folks in America; only white folks can do that. That's who you all had better be watching. Ain't one black person in America decide that you white folks was going to Vietnam and be killed. That was white folks that made that deci-

sion. And the ones that sent you didn't send any loved ones. That's who you had better be watching.

Oh, they knew just what to do to terrorize white folks down through the years. All kept white men scared. Say know all them nigger men is born with testicles hanging down below their knees. Yeah. Nigger walkin' down the street with rheumatism. White folks thought that was his testicle draggin'. Well, that testicle line don't work on you young white boys today. Thanks to the civil rights movement. That's right. The civil rights movement we forced this country to integrate. Whether you like it or not you young white boys get to take a shower with me now, you get to check it out for yourselves. Many of us black folks been knowing for years that integration was going to do more to liberate white folks than black folks because anything that puts me next to you and get them fears out your head. You can't get liberated until you drop your fears. You say what you want to say about integration, but you got to admit one thing, you white folks is better off today. At least you know all niggers can't play basketball now. You didn't know that when they didn't let me around and all they showed you was them super niggers. "Oh, look at those muscles, look at those biceps. Oh, they so well coordinated." You see niggers now that can't even clap their hands. Oh, they knew what to do to scare white folks. Kept that white woman scared. "Girl, you know all them niggers men will rape you, girl. They'll do it to you." "But he's only four years old." "If he's got one he'll use it." And it worked, it worked! I'm telling you ten years ago I'm walking down the street in New York City. Broad, open daylight. Sun out, 12:00

o'clock noon. I looked down the street. Here comes an old, ugly, wrinkled face, dirty, old white woman, with a foot missing. She looked up and see me and go, "Ohhhhh!" I say, "Come on lady, you got to be putting me on. I'm thinking about calling the police myself." I mean I heard of wishful thinking. And that's the sad thing about fear. You can't have fear and knowledge in your head at the same time. One simple deduction would have wiped out that whole rape syndrome. One simple deduction, that black men down through the years been as busy raping white women as America wants you to believe we have, then how come white folks in America ain't getting darker and darker instead of niggers getting lighter and lighter.

So, fear. You young white kids getting so hip, getting so slick and upset America so much. That's why America has decided to make you young white kids the new niggers in America today. Nigger. And we ex-niggers. Yeah. We sure want to thank you new niggers. Yeah, you really got a lot of pressure off us. And if you young white kids don't believe you the new nigger, don't take my word for it. No, you get around some older white folk and listen to many of them discussing you young kids. Many of them sound the same way discussing you today as they used to sound discussing us. "Oh, just what's wrong with them. What do they want? Who do they think they are. They just lazy and shiftless and don't want to work. They just want to be hitchhiking all the time." Matter of fact, they even putting them little nigger signs up for you white kids today. Oh, they don't call you nigger like they used to call us. But you see them signs popping up all over the country. "No barefooted folks

allowed." And you know who is going barefooted today, don't you? Not like niggers, wearing too much shoe. You know who invented those high-heeled shoes for black folk. The police, so niggers can't run. "Come here, boy."

You know, in closing, let me briefly deal with a couple of points and then we all are going to get out of here. As I travel around the country I meet a lot of young kids today I refer to as revolutionary pimps. I meet a lot of young kids that believe this system has to be changed and they are willing to do anything they have to do to change this system, but they is stupid enough to believe that the more reefers they smoke and the more alcohol they drink, the sooner they are going to change this system. I beg you youngsters, don't be no fool, fool. I beg you youngsters to understand that the more reefers you smoke and the more alcohol you drink, the only thing that you will liberate by that act is a good, strong, health, clean body into a sick, degenerate, weakly, dirty body. No more, no less. Don't get me wrong. Don't get me wrong. I would never insult you youngsters in America and tell you you don't have a right to smoke pot and drink alcohol. You got a right to be as sick and as insane as the rest of us old folks. I will tell you, don't get into your little reefer, alcohol bag under the false pretenses that you are going to change something. You gonna get changed. And I meet a lot of youngsters stupid enough to believe that smoking pot is an anti-system act. Who do you think supplies it to ya? Do you really believe a nine-year-old kid in St. Louis, New York, Cleveland, Chicago can find a heroin man but the FBI really can't find him?

You all got a big job. And you haven't got much time. I beg you as I leave you today, you got a lot of questions you have to ask. You have to say to these institutions of higher educational learning around the country, you got to let them know in no uncertain terms that they exist to satisfy your needs and you don't exist to satisfy their needs. You must say to these so-called institutions around this country, these colleges and universities, you have to let them know they'd better start educating you and stop indoctrinating you. They had better start teaching you how to live and stop wasting all their time teaching you how to make a living.

You gotta a big job and you haven't got much time. Now, I beg you youngsters, take care of your body and understand what this thing is. We go all over the world looking for pyramids. Go all over the world looking for temples. And the greatest temple and pyramid you will ever come into contact with, you was born with. Take care of your body. We go all over the world looking for God. You was born with God. Seek God within yourselves. You'd be surprised to see how mellow it'll be. Oh, you can be Catholic, you can be Baptist, you can be Muslim, you can be Mohammedan, you can be Christian, you can be anything. If you ain't spiritual, baby, you just wastin' your time. If you ain't spiritual, you just wastin' your time.

You all got a big job. You haven't got much time. As I leave you, I say thanks to the civil rights movement, I say thanks to the peace movement, because these two movements and my involvement have permitted me to go around the world and meet people I

wouldn't have met just being a rich American or a funny comedian. And in the process of meeting some very beautiful folks, I know something today that I never knew before. I know that there is a universal force that controls this entire universe and you too, and one day it's going to balance out everybody's ledger and it's just going to ask one, simple question. And the universal order do not deal with complexities, it deals with simplicities. And if you all win that game Saturday, you'll find out it won't be a whole lot of complex things you had to do, just simple, everyday things you'll do. That's what nature deals with. And that one simple, question is going to ask you to balance out your ledger, not who was your mother, who was your father, where'd you live, where'd you go to school, how much money did you have. How much service did you give to your brother-sister human beings while you was on this here planet. That's the name of the game, is service. And I challenge you youngsters today to get involved with service. Decide right now now that you will dedicate your life, or a piece of your life, defending the needy against the greedy. Dedicate your life that you will not go or tolerate a college or institution no where in America where people three blocks from that institution cannot read or write. That's not a reflection on them. That's a reflection on you.

You've got to get involved. And once you do that, you'll be surprised how much it will help you and the people that you are helping. You must say to America today that honesty and integrity will become the cornerstone of this here nation. You must say that Chicanos and Puerto Ricans and Asian Americans and black folks and women. You must say that peace, freedom, and justice

will become as famous in this country in the not too distant future as wealth is today. We have to say to our Chicano brothers that we will boycott lettuce, we will boycott grapes, we will stop drinking all that wine until you win your battle.

You got a big job. Only you. And violence is not the answer. No, if violence was the answer to solving problems, America would never tolerate us looking at violent television shows for free. No, violence is not the answer. You young kids ran LBJ all the way back to the ranch and you did it with your moral force. You couldn't have gone to China, India, and Russia and brought an army back that would have run Dick Nixon out of the White House. Violence is not the answer. I can understand violence, but it's not the answer to dealing with the problems confronting America today. And I got a lot of people that ask me, you know, about what can you do to research the CIA to find out what happened in Dallas. If you would write me, I have a booklist that I'll send you. I'll give you two quick addresses. For those of you that have a pencil and paper, I'll give you one. For those of you that have to depend on your memory, I'll give you another one. For those of you that have to memorize, you just write Dick Gregory, Health, Plymouth, Massachusetts. Just think of Plymouth Rock. Now the post office don't like letters like that, but you tell them I told you it was okay. For those of you that have a pencil and a piece of paper, you write Dick Gregory, Health, P.O. Box 266, Plymouth, Massachusetts, 02360. And get involved with those books on that list and you'll be surprised how much aware you'll be. As I leave you, I say may peace be with you, my friends. Thank you.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- "The Apostle and the Fool." Look, 32 (June 25, 1968), 69-75.
- Aristotle. The Rhetoric. Translated by W. Rhys Roberts. New York: Random House, 1954.
- Arnold, Carroll C. and John F. Wilson. Public Speaking as a Liberal Art. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1968.
- Baine, Goss and Lee Williams. "The Effects of Equivocation on Source Credibility." Central States Speech Journal, 34 (1973), 162-167.
- Baird, Craig A. and Lester Thonssen. Speech Criticism. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1948.
- "The Blackest White Man I Know." Life, 67 (July 25, 1969), 50-50D.
- Blaker, Eldon E. "The Immediate Effects of Perceived Speaker Disorganization on Speaker Credibility and Attitude Change in Persuasive Speaking." Western Speech, 29 (1965), 148-161.
- Bradley, Bert E. Fundamentals of Speech Communication. Dubuque: Wm C. Brown Company Publishers, 1974.
- Brown, Donna. "Black Activist Really Peaceful." Uhuru (October, 1974), 7.
- "The Buckleys: Extraordinary Family." Newsweek, 76 (November 6, 1970), 38.
- "Buckley's Prank." Time, 78 (August 2, 1971), 21-22.
- Burke, Kenneth. A Grammar of Motives. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969.
- Cartwright, Dorwin. "Achieving Change in People: Some Applications of Group Dynamics Theory." Human Relations, 4 (1951), 387.
- Childs, Harwood L. An Introduction to Public Opinion. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1940.
- Corbett, Edward P. J. and James L. Golden. The Rhetoric Of Blair, Campbell, and Whately. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1968.
- "The Deadly Friendship." New Republic, 157 (September 23, 1967), 13-15.
- "De-escalating the Rhetoric." Saturday Review, 52 (March 15, 1969). 20.

- "Dick Gregory." The Negro Almanac, (1967), 713-14.
- Doob, Leonard W. Public Opinion and Propaganda. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1948.
- Douglas, Carlyle C. "In Dick Gregory, The World Has Found An Honest Man." Ebony, 25 (April, 1970), 73-83.
- "Extremists: Ashes to Ashes." Newsweek, 70 (September 11, 1967), 23-4.
- Grierson, Herbert J. C. Rhetoric and English Composition. London: Oliver & Boyd Ltd., 1945.
- "Hoaxes: The Buckley Papers." Newsweek, 78 (August 2, 1971), 21-2.
- Lee, Alfred McClung. How To Understand Propaganda. New York: Rinehart & Company, Inc., 1953.
- Lee, Alfred McClung (ed.). The Fine Art of Propaganda. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Company.
- McCroskey, James C. and R. Samuel Mehrley. "The Effects of Disorganization and Nonfluency on Attitude Change and Source Credibility." Speech Monographs, 36 (1969), 13-21.
- "Newsmakers." Newsweek, 78 (July 5, 1971), 50.
- Oliver, Robert T. The Psychology of Persuasive Speech. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1957.
- Pater, Alan F. and Jason R. Pater (ed.). What They Said In 1970. Beverly Hills: Monitor Book Company, Inc., 1971.
- Reddy, John. "Bill Buckley Blithe Spirit of the Right." Readers Digest, 99 (September, 1971), 112-116.
- "Return of the Native Son." Newsweek, 75 (June 29, 1970), 74.
- Ross, Raymond S. Persuasion: Communication and Interpersonal Relations. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1974.
- Scott, Robert L. and Bernard L. Brock. Methods of Rhetorical Criticism. New York: Harper and Row, 1972.
- Sharp, Harry Jr. and Thomas McClung. "Effects of Organization on Speaker's Ethos." Speech Monographs, 33 (1966), 182-183.
- "The Sniper." Time, 90 (November 3, 1967), 70-79.
- "Speaker Ban: Court Decides North Carolina Controversy." Science, 159 (March 1, 1968), 963-964.

"William Kunstler for the Defense--of Himself." Life, 71
(October 1, 1971), 77-80.

"William Moses Kunstler." Britannica Book of the Year (1971),
147.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to take this opportunity to thank the members of my committee, Dr. Harold Nichols, Dr. Norma Bunton, and Dr. William Burke, for their assistance in the preparation of this thesis.

I wish to express a special "thank you" to Dr. Nichols for his patience, assistance, and encouragement.

FREE SPEECH ON THE CAMPUS:
AN ANALYSIS OF PERSUASIVE TECHNIQUES USED
BY SELECTED CAMPUS LECTURERS

by

BONNIE STALLINGS COVERT

B.S., Kansas State University, 1973

M.S., Kansas State University, 1974

AN ABSTRACT OF A MASTER'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Speech

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1975

In the late 1960's restrictive policies which banned radical speakers from the college campus were ruled unconstitutional. As a result many speakers who had never been allowed to freely express their ideas to college students suddenly became popular lecturers on college campuses.

The speakers in this study were selected because they represent the new freedom of expression that has swept the college since the late 1960's. The speeches that were used were: William Buckley, Jr. at Kansas State University in 1973; William Kunstler at Indiana State University in 1970; George Lincoln Rockwell at Fort Hays State University in 1967; Dick Gregory at Kansas State University in 1974.

There were three purposes in this study. The speeches were examined to determine if the speakers had common goals, if the persuasive techniques were similar, and if any unusual messages or persuasive devices were utilized. The methodology relied on theories of Aristotle, Kenneth Burke, and Dorwin Cartwright. Additional group identification techniques were utilized along with the propaganda devices established by the Institute for Propaganda Analysis.

The study indicated that the persuasive devices were reasonably standard. However, the messages of the speakers were unusual. The speakers exercised their freedom of speech by questioning both the activities and the policies of the United States Government.