

A CONSIDERATION OF THE TELEVISION RHETORIC
ON THE BASIS OF MARSHALL McLuhan

by

MICHAEL J. BOROVICKA

B. S., University of New York at Potsdam, 1963

3735

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

1970

Approved by:



Major Professor

LD
2668
T4
1970
B67
C.2

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. Historical View of Rhetorical Style and Delivery	1
II. Some Suggested Effects of Electronic Media Upon Man	16
III. McLuhan's View of the Possible Effects of Television on Man	33
IV. McLuhan's View of Television Rhetoric	47
V. Conclusion	68
Acknowledgments	78
Footnotes	79
Bibliography	84
Appendix A	88

HISTORICAL VIEW OF RHETORICAL STYLE AND DELIVERY

Rhetoric today has become a word broadly interpreted, often misunderstood, and sometimes feared. On any city street or college path today one hears of his rhetoric being misplaced or misunderstood or another's rhetoric being the "thing". Interpretation of this word has become so broad as to make it seem meaningless. It is little wonder that some usages of the word rhetoric lead to misunderstandings. We can even observe this misunderstanding extending into the masses of our country. After hearing rhetoric associated with the right wing factions, Castro, the black militants, and today's student rebellions, is it any wonder that we might expect the word to be used metaphorically by mothers to frighten children? One must remember that such conceptions of the word have not always been the case.

Traditionally rhetoric has held an honored place in Western history. In the Ancient Greek culture an acute awareness of Rhetoric extended over nearly 1500 years beginning with Homer. With Homer we see the beginnings of a conscious awareness of rhetoric and the emergence of the dicta which future rhetoricians would develop toward maturity. Democracy gave birth to a genuine need for oratory in the revolutions of Sicily and Athens. It was against this background the Corax and Tisias advanced their fortunes by producing a pamphlet concerned with the practice of rhetoric. Greeks, in general, studied the art of rhetoric because their fortunes and their lives depended on it. This necessity to know rhetoric then, nearly five hundred years after Homer,

gave rise to the Attic Orators. Jebb's Attic Orators and J. F. Dobson's The Greek Orators tell of what it may have been. Beginning with Pericles and extending about one hundred years to Demosthenes. Jebb and Dodson described rhetoric as the means of survival for the Greek way. Founded by necessity and practiced as an art, rhetoric was to be later refined and classified by Aristotle in his Rhetoric and Rome's Cicero within his De Oratore.

Later textbooks were written about rhetoric, but in most cases they presented a particular rhetoric suited and adapted to the particular needs of the times, just as the Greeks evolved their rhetoric to suit their needs and time. The Middle Ages lent the art of a church-centered state. Here St. Augustine recognized that through rhetoric, church goals could best be achieved. The period of the Renaissance with Peter Ramus combined the writing of the Middle Ages with a renewed study of Greek Classical rhetoric. But as all practitioners did before them, the Renaissance theorists and practitioners adapted rhetoric to their particular needs and desires. To the Greeks, rhetoric meant survival and to the the Romans it meant perpetuation of their government. The Middle Ages applied rhetoric to church matters and the Renaissance to display ceremonies, and compliments. Each of these ages demanded changes in style and delivery.

Modern history has seen rhetoric practiced in accordance with all of the past methodologies and in some cases we have seen the practice extended even to the furthest extremes in matters of style and delivery. For example, Delsarte began a school which, in the United States, became so mechanical that it sometimes produced the ludicrous effects, while Winans, on the other hand, saw the practice

of rhetoric to be naturalistic in method. Through the history of rhetoric, changes have occurred as to the emphasis of a particular aspect. The United States colonists separated invention from the other four cannons; the church fathers suppressed arrangement while other factions had concentrated on style. The art of rhetoric has seen both good and bad times, being praised during some historic periods and looked at very suspiciously in others. As an airborne seed, the winds of controversy and change have blown rhetoric hither and yon; sometimes it found fertile ground in which to develop and at other times rhetoric had to change with new climatic and environmental conditions. Sometimes it merely withered.

The environment today is one of mechanization in the United States. Public speaking is obviously still occurring daily and is obviously brought into our living rooms through the medium of television. It is through television that most people today can be reached at any given moment. Television has been called the politician's campaigning dream come true as well as the scourge of our society. Nonetheless, it must be admitted that through the technological advance called television comes the greatest potential for the furtherance of rhetoric at this moment in history. It is a new environment and as such imposes a new criterion upon the successful rhetorician. Once again, necessity may alter the art of rhetoric.

The potential influence television has upon the masses had not yet been fully understood. It has, however, been obvious to many observers that television does affect its viewers in many and diverse ways, both directly and indirectly. This has been Marshall McLuhan's area of concern. His observations concern the possible effect of the

media upon man. An understanding of these possible effects and the techniques by which these are achieved could lead the rhetorician to find utility in their application to his needs. If a theory can be drawn from such study and subsequently appropriate applications made, this could have great value to both the practicing rhetorician and the critical viewer. While Quintilian, in his Institutes of Oratory, stated the "orator is a good man speaking well", we know this not always to be the case. A study might be of worth to both the practicing rhetorician and the television viewer. McLuhan's words are applicable to the study since he has examined the technological field as few men have; he did this examination with the realization that these technological advances have affected the masses.

The purpose of this study will be to examine the works of Marshall McLuhan to discover what he believes to be the changes in rhetorical practices which have been occasioned by the electronic media of communication. Since McLuhan directs his writings toward the electronic medium of television, the observations concerning style and delivery which he makes are applicable only to that medium. To facilitate the understanding of McLuhan we will examine the writings of other observers, especially sociologists, who have commented upon the effects of this media upon the mass audience. We will then compare and contrast their observations, specifically those concerning rhetorical matters, with those of Aristotle and Cicero.

Marshall McLuhan has been chosen because of the pertinent issues he raises about certain environmental influences upon man which he believes have not been adequately assessed. This is to say, that the effects upon the human condition created by objects have not, and perhaps may not, be accounted for; they may only be hypothesized. It

may be possible by combining Marshall McLuhan's observations with what is known about rhetoric of the past, that a greater understanding of traditional rhetoric and the modified rhetoric developed for the medium of television might be achieved.

It was Aristotle who best encompassed within his writings the results of his observations concerning those features of rhetoric which had proved to be most effective in the speaking situation during his age. It is to Aristotle's work which generations following looked for rhetorical authority;¹ from the study of Aristotle came the definition of rhetoric, "the faculty (art) of observing in any given case the available means of persuasion".² No longer would rhetoric be merely a formal discipline as Gorgias had contended. Aristotle established rhetoric as an art which would become a central feature of Western civilization. Aristotle's Rhetoric forecast rather clearly what came to be known as Cicero's five canons of rhetoric; Invention, Arrangement, Memory, Style, and Delivery. As indicated previously, we will be mainly concerned with style and delivery as these are most important to the development of this study. Our first consideration then will be Aristotle's treatment of style which relies mainly on the third book of Aristotle's Rhetoric.

"Our next subject will be the style of of expression for it is not enough to know what we ought to say; we must also say it as we ought; much help is thus afforded towards producing the right impression of a speech."³

Unlike the sciences where the adequacy of formulation and expression are sought in the subject-matter which is expressed, rhetoric demands that speaking style be a constituent of persuasion. It is evident that the way something is presented is directly related to the way it will

be received. Inadequate style will result in the loss of audience; adequate style will aid in the reception of material presented. As Aristotle points out,

"The arts of language cannot help having a small but real importance, whatever it is we have to expound to others: the way in which a thing is said does affect its intelligibility. Not, however, so much importance as people think."⁴

While Aristotle did accept that a proper style of speaking was mandatory, he still was reticent about attaching too much importance to it. However he does say that there are two essential virtues of style that must prevail in the presentation of material. It should first of all be clear and secondly appropriate, i.e. not bordering on meanness or pomposity. The greatest virtues then are clarity and appropriateness. Clarity makes the meaning clear to the listener and so ensures that language achieves its function, that of signifying. Appropriateness insists that the word choice not be too low for the audience nor too high. Although Aristotle thought of clarity and appropriateness as being indispensable, he did consider other attributes to which a speaker might adhere. He states that the voice must seem to be natural and unaffected even while raising and lowering the tone in accordance with the dignity of the subject. In this way the emotion and character will be conveyed to the audience through the vehicles of style.⁵ Also, as in the case of two words which can be used to describe the same thing, one can be assumed to be more proper than another. One word of the two in question might be more like the thing signified or it might be better suited to presentation, thereby giving a clearer 'view' to the listener. If inappropriate words are used, the result could be ridiculous or solemn and words too far out of

reason will break down communication since the listener will go elsewhere with his thought. "The proper style is obtained, therefore, not only by considering the subject-matter of the speech but by taking into account also emotional and ethical elements."⁶ As Aristotle had written,

"We all naturally find it agreeable to get hold of new ideas easily: words express ideas, and therefore those words are the most agreeable that enable us to get hold of new ideas. Now strange words simply puzzle us; ordinary words convey only what we know already; it is from the metaphor that we can best get hold of something fresh."⁷

According to Aristotle it is the metaphor that can most effectively and interestingly establish a bridge between the known and the unknown. Therefore, Aristotle leaned heavily upon the stylistic device of metaphorical usage. He states that while the use of the metaphor and simile, which are very much alike in that they give attributes of one thing to another, are important to the poet, their use is even more important to the rhetorician. It is through their usage that new information can be most easily conveyed to the audience since metaphors do utilize familiar words whose significance is well known. But at the same time the rhetoricians must be careful not to be too obvious in their usage lest the audience become annoyed. Further, when preparing a presentation, each sentence should have a clear beginning and end, and not be too long so as not to interfere with audience comprehension. Maintaining open channels to the audience is the leading advice.

Throughout Aristotle's treatment of style it can be readily seen that his development insisted that the material should be properly

presented. To attain this it is necessary that it be both clear and appropriate. It becomes clear to the audience by the proper formation of sentences and word choice with metaphors and similes aiding the rhetorician towards this ideal. Beyond this the speaker should use his natural unaffected voice and seemingly naturally give the high and low tonal inflections in accordance with the dignity of the subject. Care should further be given to the choice of words used in description since the use of the lesser of a possible two will not enhance but rather detract from the intent. So, since the end of rhetoric is to persuade the audience rather than to please, the style should be such as to make the speech agreeable only to the point of not annoying the audience.

In the third book of the Rhetoric Aristotle briefly considers delivery which to this point had hardly been treated by any classical Greek rhetorician.⁸ The fact that delivery does considerably affect the audience whom we are trying to persuade, a point which Aristotle considers a defect inherent in audiences, would appear to be the only reason Aristotle deemed it worthy of consideration.⁹ Aristotle felt that delivery was essentially a "matter of the right management of the voice to express the various emotions."¹⁰ Delivery then manifests itself basically through three things: volume of sound, modulation of pitch and rhythm. Dramatizing, or use of the body to lend emphasis to the content, is frowned upon by Aristotle but recognized as being a necessary evil. It is likely that Aristotle thought that the teaching of a dramatic presentation of an oration could hardly be taught for he states that, "Dramatic ability is a natural gift, and can hardly be systematically taught."¹¹ It was

felt that if the principles of style were worked out to near perfection, then the effect should be the same as if dramatic appeals were utilized. Only the voice should be a consideration as it pertains to a rhetorician's delivery. Thus, the actor will avail himself of gesture on the stage, the orator will avail himself of voice control, neglecting gesture.

Aristotle had his doubt about the dignity of studying delivery, since, he passed lightly over the subject in his treatment of it within the Rhetoric; perhaps he did this with the hope that one day an actor could produce an acceptable work keeping the orator in mind. Rome's writers on Rhetoric, however, took delivery more seriously and did extensive writing concerning the two aspects of delivery, that of voice quality and physical movement. The possibilities attributed to the effect of delivery prompted Quintilian to write,

"But oratory itself has a marvelously powerful effect in oratory; for the nature of the material we have composed in our minds is not so important as how we deliver it;"¹²

And further,

"For my part I would affirm that a mediocre speech supported by all the power of delivery will have more force than the best speech devoid of that power."¹³

And as stated within the Rhetorica Ad Herennium,

"For skillful invention, elegant style, the artistic arrangement of the parts comprising the case, and the careful memory of all these will be no more value without delivery, than delivery along and independent of these."¹⁴

Within the Ad Herennium we find a treatment of the whole range of rhetorical method. Included in this treatise is a description of delivery. It first establishes that delivery includes voice

quality and physical movement. It will be our purpose here to examine these two divisions of delivery and then compare and contrast the discussions with those of Cicero* and Quintilian.

Like Aristotle, Cicero considered that voice quality consisted of three aspects to take into consideration when examining that facet of Delivery. There are volume, stability, and flexibility. Aristotle's rhythm as an aspect would roughly correspond to 'flexibility' at this point. These three facets are acquired by method and application. Vocal volume is explained to be a gift of nature which cultivation will augment somewhat. Stability is basically gained by cultivation and declamatory exercise will augment it. Vocal flexibility, or the ability to vary the vocal intonations, is solely cultivated and achieved by declamatory exercise. Since the first two, volume and stability, are a gift of nature and cultivatable, the author of Ad Herennium states that enough is said when it is recommended that a method of cultivation be sought after. However, in regard to flexibility and to some degree, stability of voice quality, it is necessary to devote more than a passing reference. A way in which to achieve stability and flexibility in vocal quality was to utilize it as a stylistic device. Relaxation through meaningful pauses during an oration is the guiding line here. When flexibility is toughed upon in Ad Herennium we

*Cicero had been awarded first place by his country men who were most competent to judge of such matters according to John C. Rolfe, "Our Debt to Greece and Rome", Cooper Square Publishing Co., N.Y., 1963, pg. 1. Thus he has come down to us as Rome's greatest orators. Cicero has further been called "The epitome of the Roman mind", by John H. Randall, Jr. pg. ix, "Aristotle", Columbia University Press, N.Y., 1960. On the basis of Cicero's renown both in his own time and today will eventually conclusions pertaining to popular Roman oratory be drawn.

find methods suggested to vary the voice physically. When certain application of tonal variances are best used is also suggested.

"For the facetious conversational tone, with a gentle quiver in the voice, and a slight suggestion of a smile, but without any trace of immoderate laughter, one ought to shift one's utterance smoothly from the serious conversational tone of gentlemanly jest."¹⁵

With delivery as a consideration begun by the Greeks, we find that the Romans carried it to a much fuller degree and with more comprehensiveness and completeness. It is through the treatment of physical movement that this is more fully realized. The Ad Herennium instructed the orator when a certain type of movement with the arm, hand, and upper trunk region should be utilized for the best effect,

"For the Pathetic Tone of Amplification, one ought to slap one's thigh and beat one's head, and sometimes to use a calm and uniform gesticulation and a sad and disturbed expression."¹⁶

To practice these suggested movements was to enable the orator to use them correctly at will. Perhaps the statement at the conclusion of the discussion may best illustrate the Roman's view, at least as seen by the unknown author of the Rhetorica Ad Herennium, "good delivery ensures that what the orator is saying seems to come from the heart."¹⁷

From the Romans, in regard to delivery we find encouragement to become dramatic in the methods of delivery since it will aid in establishing responses favorable to the cause the orator is advocating. The Greeks saw it as necessary but certainly not to be elaborated. Physical acting, even of a minor sort, to enhance an oration was discouraged. The Romans encouraged its usage as a valid means to effect persuasion.

As pertains to delivery we find Cicero not to be in disagreement with the author of Ad Herennium. His discussion of delivery in De Oratore begins with,

"But the effect of all of these oratorical devices depends on how they are delivered. Delivery, I assert, is the dominant factor in oratory; without delivery the best speaker cannot be of any account at all, and a moderate speaker with a trained delivery can often out do the best of them."¹⁸

The Greeks allowed delivery to be achieved through watching others perform. That is to say, it wasn't stressed but was to be learned mainly by observation and even then any physical hint of embellishment was not urged. As seen, the Romans not only appreciated its potential as an aid to persuasion but even taught it. Cicero, like other rhetoricians of his time, felt that, "nature has assigned to every emotion a particular look and tone of voice and bearing of its own: and the look on his face and utterance of his voice are like the strings of a harp, and sound accordingly as they struck by each successive emotion."¹⁹ Cicero as well as those others of his day taught what they considered to be the correct movements and tone of voice for any given emotion. Perhaps we can speculate as to why Cicero, as an example, became extremely nervous when he spoke. Realizing that nervousness could be a hindrance to effective delivery. The Romans practiced delivery almost to the point of staging. They could then call upon these acquired 'habits' in a public speaking circumstance thereby negating any possible derogatory effects of nerves upon their delivery. They realize the importance of a seemingly spontaneous delivery. Another factor to take into consideration is that the Romans were classifiers and categorizers centering their skills mainly around the heritage of

the Greeks. While the Greek rhetoricians did not extend their considerations to any great extent into the realm of delivery, they were aware of it. Cicero tells us Demosthenes thought that next to speaking, delivery was most important.²⁰ Aristotle was prepared to await an actor to develop a work pertaining to the acquisition of an acceptable delivery. It is not difficult for us to envision that the Romans took their classifying and categorizing traits into the realm of rhetoric and began breaking effective delivery down into fragmented parts thereby facilitating their teaching of it. In this they may well have been aided by the actors of their day. Plutarch mentions that Cicero's delivery was improved by a study of the famous actors, Roscius and Aesopus.²¹ We are led to believe that in respect to delivery, the Romans broke up delivery into classifiable traits. But it was essentially the same effective delivery that the Greeks practiced. Aristotle had, however, never fully discussed delivery comprehensively on paper.

We have seen how the Greeks tended to place style under such considerations as diction, or choice of words, composition, or forming of sentences, and the figures of speech. The emphasis slanted towards figures of speech. Further they described the style of delivery as plain, ornate, or middle in practice. Aristotle wrote in Chapters 1 through 12, Book III of his Rhetoric, that there is the everyday speaking and the more elevated oration type. Overall, the presentation must be clear, distinguished, appropriate, and natural. The middle style of address is recommended by Aristotle. In these ways will an oration prove to be most effectively persuasive. Cicero didn't entirely agree. Cicero in De Oratore divided the style into three types as did Aristotle and reserved the greatest praise for the grand style. For Cicero the

the extravagant was the epitome of correct style. All the devices of language that would work were acceptable.²²

"There are then three things which the orator contributes towards the decoration and embellishment of his style--rare words used metaphorically."²³

Aristotle and the Greeks in general would have the orator avoid the use of rare words; Cicero recommended it. The Greeks were hesitant in the use of newly coined words, (invented); Cicero recommended their use. However, both the Greeks and the Romans agreed as to the place of the metaphor. Both highly recommended its usage. Further, the Romans and Greeks agreed in theory as to the care that should be taken with the building of an oration beginning with the sentence.

"...and digression from the matter at issue; and after this has supplied entertainment, the return to the subject;... then exaggeration: then irony, or saying one thing and meaning another; which has a great influence on the minds of the audience;... impersonation of people, and extremely brilliant method of amplification; etc."²⁵

It would appear that to the Romans if something was good, more of it must be better. Unlike the Greeks they seemed rather bold in this respect. As has been said of Cicero by John Rolfe and High Duncan "Cicero::was not above resorting to or accepting questionable means of securing his end."²⁶ Rhetoric was considered an art but in the area of style and delivery, whatever worked was recommended for use. The audience was there to be persuaded and if it took extreme means to persuade them, those means were to be used. While all types and method of style and delivery could be advantageous, the preference was for the highly embellished and ornate. The Romans seem to have taken what the Greeks had to offer and to have then expanded

it with exuberance. This was the style and delivery of the Romans as compared and contrasted to the Greeks. They categorized and classified the Greeks in rhetoric and in doing so developed a style and delivery that was applicable to them as Romans.

SOME SUGGESTED EFFECTS OF ELECTRONIC MEDIA UPON MAN

Melvin L. DeFleur in his book, Theories of Mass Communication stated that,

"As society becomes more and more complex-as the members of the society becomes more and more preoccupied with their own individual pursuits and development-they lose ability to identify with and feel themselves in community with others. Eventually, they become a collectivity of psychologically isolated individuals..."²⁷

DeFleur's comment reflects the same basic beliefs held by Norman Brown, Harold Innis, Carl Rogers, Marshall McLuhan, and others. This is to say that when Western man underwent mechanization, the result was that the individual became alienated from the very society in which he was functioning. The specialization required by industry segregated man into compact segments of society; workers in close proximity to each other and doing similar jobs with similar responsibilities and monetary income became their pockets of "culture" with little knowledge or care about any others than those in their imaginary circle. Through this period of industrialization in the late nineteenth century and into the twentieth it became clear to sociologists that the Western world was developing greater individuality. The individual was alienating himself from strong identification with his community as a whole. He was forming segmented social relationships and realizing a psychological isolation from his fellow human beings. As means of travel became more feasible for the individual man, and industry found it to their convenience to move the individual worker from place to place where his abilities

were demanded, this phenomenon of personal isolation manifested itself to an even greater extent. One never really knew whom he might find at work the next day; as a result few deep emotional commitments were made. A recent study made by Vroom and Selznick accents these statements to a greater degree,

"there has emerged a vast mass of segregated, isolated individuals, interdependent in all sorts of specialized ways yet lacking in any central unifying value or purpose. The weakening of traditional bonds, the growth of rationality, and the division of labor, have created societies made up of individuals who are only loosely bound together."²⁸

Due in a large part to industrialization, the reaction of the worker has been to separate, or alienate, himself from what had been traditional ties with society. He became fragmented from it; in effect, he became a piece of ice in an iceflow, along, but still surrounded by others equally alone.

The separation of Western man from his previous group affiliations accompnied the growth of industrialization. Where before, man saw himself as a member of an entity whether it be a tribe as Marshall McLuhan terms it, or as a national, metropolitan, or comopolitan group as Professor Ithiel de Sola Pool tagged it, man has since alienated himself from any mental attachment or loyalty to such structures. Western mans' lack of group affiliation has diminished feelings of unity and mutual regard for others. It became easier for man to alienate himself than to continue the ties that had previously been taken for granted. In this mobile society of industrialization the decrease of emotional ties was necessitated by the pain involved in frequent separations. An attitude of "do the work as you will" towards a fellow worker eliminated binding social obligations, expecially since that worker might never be

seen again if the company transferred him elsewhere. And why bother about civil and national affairs when everyone knew that one vote or a single feeling of concern would not change the status quo. And if people were undergoing hardship elsewhere, all that was heard consisted of, "well, it isn't me". The care of individuals for one another within Western society had deteriorated to the point of apathetic individuality since the industrial revolution. As Ferdinand Tonnies' 'Gesellschaft' theory points out, everybody was by himself and isolated, and there existed a condition of tension toward all others. How many times has it been heard among the better educated that, "I can communicate well and get along with my peers. But if I go to a lower class, such as the laboring class, I can't speak on their level."

It is seen by some observers however, that within the arts, society may well be moving out of the individual's isolationism. Art was once seen as existing on two different levels. The upper level was maintained by Western aristocracy with their more highly developed taste attained through their having had the time and leisure to become educated and learned in the art forms. Contrary to this, the massed or working body, had come to appreciate and accept a watered down version of fine art. They had neither the education, time, nor desire to appreciate the finer attributes which art is capable of giving to an individual. However, as seen by David Manning White, this diversity of appreciative levels is beginning to intermingle as a result mainly of the effects of a mass media,

"Yet, it is just these mass media that hold out the greatest promise to the 'average man' that a cultural richness no previous age could give him is at hand."²⁹

As viewed through the arts perhaps our population is in the beginning stages of re-unite ment. It is perhaps through media that a possible reunion among men may result. Marshall McLuhan believes that one of the effects of industrialization and mass media upon man will be reunion among men.

Marshall McLuhan begins his observations with non-literate man and considers those technological advances to the present day that may have had an effect upon the social behavior that has resulted. As A. N. Whitehead has written, "The major advances in civilization are processes that all but wreck the societies in which they occur."^{29a} From this manner of observation McLuhan has coined the phrase, "The medium is the message". This is the basic pivoting point of Marshall McLuhan's observations. It is the observation that any utilized technological advance, by its very existence, affects society as a whole. But let us look at these theories as explored by Marshall McLuhan.

McLuhan in his book, The Gutenberg Galaxy, 1902, presents his views, supported by others' observation, of the effects of technological advanced on modern man. He begins by stating that man was once tribal in nature and concept. Each person within the tribe considered the tribe to be more than himself individually. McLuhan quoted from J. C. Carothers article entitled, "Culture, Psychiatry, and Written Word",

"...by reason of the type of educational influences that impinge upon Africans in infancy and early childhood, and indeed throughout their lives, a man comes to regard himself as a rather insignificant part of a much larger organism--the family and the clan--and not as an independent, self-reliant unit."³⁰

The tribe was the thing. Within the boundaries of such a "closed" society man was taught the norms of his existence. He was taught how to survive, what was acceptable and non-acceptably social procedure; in effect, he was taught everything that was needed for his survival. Tribal man did not learn this by reading; indeed, he could not read. He learned what he needed to know by observing others. He learned it by listening to the explanations of others. He learned it by doing. Tribal man did, then, learn by the utilization of all of his senses. This is the type of individual learning and perception that McLuhan has termed "cool". Anything perceived "coolly" is received by way of more than one sense. An example would be a child within a tribe learning to make arrow-heads. He is told how it is done while he watches an adult produce the product. Then the child tries to make one by himself. The whole process forces the child to utilize his ear, his eye, and his hands. Since more than one sense was used to learn, the process was termed a "cool" learning experience by McLuhan. Man became totally involved through his senses. Individual man knew his place among the tribe and environment. Everything man did involved the utilization of more than a single sense. He was sensually, totally involved and hence happy. This situation extended even into the establishment of small towns and cities. The work that one did was necessary to the functioning of the unit as a whole. The cobbler worked for a fair share of the town's produce in exchange for his product. The trade was learned much as one had learned to make an arrow-head. The work itself involved more than one sense. Further, the cobbler had his place in society for which he received the respect due to his trade. In all actuality, this form of society was still very tribal in its aspects. According to Marshall

McLuhan, this state lasted until the advent of the Gutenberg press which made printed matter available to greater numbers of people within Western nations.

The word "cool" having been introduced at this point should be more fully treated. McLuhan repeatedly uses the term throughout his writings. It is on the basis of a "cool" involvement that McLuhan orients his theories. To facilitate greater understanding of McLuhan, a more precise clarification of "cool" follows.

The question of a "cool" medium as Marshall McLuhan would define it has been a question eliciting comment from many and diverse individuals. First mentions in McLuhan's book The Gutenberg Galaxy, McLuhan has since evolved the word "cool" into a cause-effect relationship within his writings. The biggest point of contention seems to center around the meaning of the word when utilized within McLuhan's writings.

The word "cool" itself is one that has been used to explain emotion since the late thirties and early forties. It became especially noteworthy through the phrase "cool man" which was heard repeatedly during the fifties among the 'younger' generation. The word as was popularly used seemed to connote to an individual a situation that was self involving or "very pleasing or attractive or satisfactory".^{30a} For example, if a group of musicians were playing in such a manner as to enable the audience to be 'carried away' by the band's rendition of songs, then the band, the music, and the situation were termed "cool". This state in which the audience or individual might enter could be paralleled with the 'dream' state in which a person may find himself when experiencing an especially involving movie. The movie could so impress a person as to allow him to exist elsewhere as though he were

mesmerized by the whole situation. This mesmerization phenomenon might also be termed "cool". An individual could be "cool" as manifested by his actions. This does not connote a "cool head" but rather it means a person who appears involved intensely and fully in his everyday actions. This coolness on the part of an individual might manifest itself by insolence to authority, the way in which he interacts with peers, in short, any behavioral patterns that emotionally involves another person agreeable. It is a combination of all of these definitions and more that McLuhan may mean when he utilizes the word "cool" in his writings.

In his book Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man, Marshall McLuhan devotes the entire second chapter to repeated illustrations of what he means by the term "cool". "Cool" as described by McLuhan is the presence or the absence of data. If in any given circumstance there is data that needs to be "filled-in" by the observer, it is a "cool" circumstance. The more sketchily constructed, the more "cool" the situation according to McLuhan. Applied to print, when the Gutenberg press standardized the medium of print causing the print itself to lose the individuality of handwriting, print itself gradually lost its "coolness". This is explained by the fact that print became so repetitious in its sameness that it gave the viewer nothing to "fill-in". It left no room for imagination or freedom of choice. A book then is not cool. A newspaper however, is cool since the print varies in its intensity, the size of the letters used, and allows freedom of choice. One does not have to read from left to right in a newspaper as he does in a book because there are many choices to be made concerning what to read on a single page of a newspaper. Further, a newspaper allows the reader to fill-in the content by merely digesting the headings. Hieroglyphics

are "cool" since they leave total comprehension up to the individual to who must "fill-in" because the pictures are connotative rather than denotative. A telephone is an example of a "cool" medium since the information normally received from it is of a sketchy nature. Likewise a person wearing sunglasses is "cooler" than a person without sunglasses because the dark glasses hide information from the viewer, thus necessitating use of the imagination to "fill-in" the expressions the eyes would normally transmit with the dark glasses. Radio, as mentioned in the Gutenberg Galaxy, is not a cool medium because of its having become very detailed and precise in its presentations.^{30aa} There is nothing left to "fill-in" in today's radio transmission; however, it could be made "cool" since the ear is said to be our most imaginative sense. The easily suggestible auditory channel can "fill-in" data that is merely suggested. The old radio suspense stories were in this respect a "cool" treatment of the radio medium. The sound effects utilized left much for the ear to "fill-in" thus creating a "cool" situation. This ended with the introduction of "new radio" techniques in the early fifties. Henceforth the radio broadcasts we received were very complete in the nature of content presentation and allowed little or no data to be filled in by the listener.

Cartoons as we perceive them in the newspapers or comic books are "cool" as interpreted by Marshall McLuhan. They are "cool" because the dots which form the figures allow the eye to fill-in between them thereby forming a whole figure. Further, the figures themselves are a study in sketchiness, requiring the viewer to "fill-in" and thereby imaginatively he approaches reality as he views the comic strips. These examples, as McLuhan perceives the situation, are cool since we are required to fill-in data to receive a comprehensive whole. It is

just this "fill-in" requirement that McLuhan says constitutes a "cool" situation. If there is no "filling in" to be done by the observer of any situation, he cannot be emotionally involved to any great extent. McLuhan believes that humans look for this involvement in everyday life, and it is this involvement that they find most satisfying and hence most relaxing. Perhaps this is due to more than one of the senses monitoring each other at the same time thereby providing cross-checks. For example, if the ear hears an explosion and the eye sees the blast, it is mutually interpreted by both senses as an explosion and hence the assessment arrived at is not unsettling to the individual. One sense can be wrong, but two senses perceiving the same thing reduced the possibility of an interpretive error. Arriving at the essence of a situation by having more than one sense agree on what is perceived prohibits undue tension. Conversely, if we merely hear the explosion without having actually seen it, some doubt may exist in the mind as to what exactly the sound connoted. In this respect tension could result since the individual is not totally involved in the event and he has no way of completing a whole picture of the happening. This theory of McLuhan's parallels the theory of the Gestaltist's school of psychology. It is the Gestalt theory that any of the integrated structures or patterns that make up all experience cannot be derived from the sum of the parts. The response of an organism to a situation is complete and is an unanalyzable whole rather than the sum of the responses to specific elements in the situation.^{30b} It is the belief of the Gestalt school that if the sum of the observable parts do not allow the organism to create an acceptable whole then tension will result.^{30c} This might be most easily illustrated by the training of

a pet. If the pet is being disciplined to behave in a manner which the animal cannot interpret, tension will result; the animal, the dog, does not have enough material to comprehend the whole of what is requested of it. This same tension will cause the animal to become uncomfortable and thereby less personal involvement in the situation will result. "While a moderate level of tension is normally adaptive- i.e., it improves the chances of attaining the goal. Tension in the extreme proves disruptive and incapacitating."^{30d} This little involvement slows down the learning rate of the learner. Conversely if enough data are available through various senses to enable the organism to cross-check its interpretive sense perceptions, then less tension results. This decrease in tension results from the organism's having enough verifiable data at hand to enable it to have an acceptable 'whole' conception. With less tension the organism is able to become more satisfactorily involved and hence be better able to learn. As McLuhan might say, with the senses having enough data to allow "filling-in", greater involvement with the situation will take place. If the information

is complete and stereotyped already, no involvement is necessary. It is just this lack of possible involvement that will create a situation that is not "cool" therefore creating more tension, hence less involvement, hence less learning.

Humans are imaginative and apparently rationalize perceptions into understanding most acceptable to the individual. Preconceived conclusions by others become unacceptable to the recipient according to McLuhan. McLuhan describes a medium which will establish undeniable conclusions to the receiver, not a cool medium. The offerings of a cool medium should be composed in such a manner as to provide enough

checks between and among senses to facilitate perception. Yet the cool medium should provide enough information to allow the human to "complete" or "fill-in" the conclusions. An example is the medium of television which allows the eye and ear to cross-check each other, on this basis McLuhan writes that, fragmented material may successfully be presented over a medium since it corresponds to human life perceptions which are already fragmentary. It is this completion process that allows a satisfactory conclusion to be resolved and thus creates a satisfactory involvement with a cool medium. It might all be summed up in the phrase, "Mother, I'd rather do it myself". Given enough parts or elements to satisfactorily allow a person to do a thing by himself, but not given so many as to have it already done, creates for the person the situation which McLuhan terms "cool". This is a conception of the usage of the word "cool" as McLuhan applied it in his observations of man's social development and technological developments.

When printed matter became available to greater numbers of people, they began to separate themselves spiritually from each other. By simply reading instructions he could make his own arrowhead or shoes. He no longer required the aid of another person. According to McLuhan's definition, man then became "linear" in his concepts. Print required that one sense only be used to learn. This was the sense of sight. As society became more and more sight oriented, so did man's view of that around him become more and more limited or linear in concept. Print had imposed perceptual blinders on man and the eye had become the single most important sense. Print has thus been called a "hot" medium by Marshall McLuhan.

A "hot" medium is one in which limited perception is needed by the participant. When a person reads a book, only the eye is necessary for comprehension. It is linear, or single sensed, in that the ear, or any tactile perception is not necessary. Only the eye is needed. "A stepping up of visual values makes a new dichotomy between the spiritual and the material."³¹ The individual man within society had entered into a "hot" culture, which had begun with print. His work became linear; on the assembly line, one job was done by one person, making it difficult for the individual to attach any significance to the product he helped produce. His work had evolved into segments and specialized activity. The worker tended to do one job and do it extremely efficiently. Man transferred this to himself whom he saw as one extremely efficient individual doing one job in life divorced from others. This specialization and self-sufficiency extended to interpersonal contacts thereby isolating the individual from his fellow man. Man was no longer interested in his fellow man because he had neither professional need for him nor dependence upon him for everyday survival. He could no longer comprehend how any connection existed between himself and other individuals. When job personalization was lost, so was the ability for man to see inter-dependency. Society had become "hot", where before, tribal man had perceived the world harmoniously through a balance of the senses, hearing, sight, smell, touch, and taste. The compelling world of the linear, or single sense perception, had now disrupted the balance. Man came out of perceptual balance when his new industrial "hot" environment permeated his life.

Just prior to the publishing of McLuhan's The Gutenberg Galaxy, McLuhan observed that society had moved from an age of mechanics to

an electronic era. This had come to society through the electronic media—the telegraph, radio, television, computers. Through electronics, information became instantly available to the individual. In effect, the world had become smaller. Instant exchange of news, information, knowledge, all could now be instantly comprehended by individuals. McLuhan states that while some of the media is "not", some is also "cool". Television is cool because the viewers have to use more than one sense. They use the eye to see, the ear to hear, and the tactile sense to complete perception. This tactile sense is accomplished through television, according to McLuhan, because, as he explains it, the eye has to put together the dots on the screen to form a comprehensive whole. Hence we find total participation facilitated in a "cool" medium. The result of such experiences with the media will be to again unite people into a greater whole, tribal in concept, with the potential for world involvement. This will become possible in the electronic era because everyone will once again experience awareness of his fellow beings. The "all-at-onceness" due to the rapidity of electricity will allow, even as it does today, everyone to know the concerns of others throughout the world. The man working in a factory is able to see and "feel" where his product has gone and how it is being used. As McLuhan has written,

"In a tribal all-at-once culture, the idea of the 'public' as a differentiated agglomeration of fragmented individuals, all dissimilar but all capable of acting in basically the same way, like interchangeable mechanical cogs in a production line, is supplanted by a mass society in which personal diversity is encouraged while at the same time everybody reacts and interacts simultaneously to every stimulus."³²

McLuhan visualizes a society of harmony reaching world-wide due to the speed of the electronic media; he sees as "cool" culture of the world as opposed to the largely "hot" fragmented culture we are presently experiencing. McLuhan uses the term "tribal" to describe this "cool" culture. On closer inspection, we may find that any dichotomy which exists between McLuhan and such men as Lowenthal, Gains, Carothers, and others as quoted resides in a cause-effect relationship. Marshall McLuhan while generally agreeing to what effects of the industrialization era have been, specifically disagrees as to what the cause has been. He questions whether the studies done in this area are adequate and whether they are moving in the right direction and utilizing the correct approach. He observes,

"The problem is whether, and to what extent, modern social science is equipped to deal with modern social culture. The instruments of research have been brought to a high degree of refinement. But is this enough? Empirical social science has become a kind of applied asceticism. It stands clear of any entanglements with foreign powers and thrives in an atmosphere of rigidly enforced neutrality. It refuses to enter the sphere of meaning".³³

One sociologist's view is expressed in this statement,

"Contemporary man commonly finds that his life has been emptied of meaning, that it has been trivialized; He is alienated from his past, from his work, from his community, and possibly from himself-although this 'self' is hard to locate."³⁴

The reasons given for this alienation seem to flow around the fact that people were removed from the "simple life" to the hustle and bustle of industrial centered life with its added emotional strains. Marshall

McLuhan observes that it wasn't the change of location or environment, that alienated the individual or environment, but rather the change of human involvement. As Marshall McLuhan has stated;

"You can see how print would create an individual person, inner-directed, a kind of person highly self-centered and very much self-analytical."³⁵

To Marshall McLuhan the reason for alienation is, as stated previously, that the modern man was utilizing a single sense in his everyday pursuits. Man is most comfortable when he is more totally involved through the simultaneous use of more than a single sense. This involvement will then allow man to become more interested in himself and others. Comfort in his existence will become more pronounced through his once again having returned to total involvement. The key to this retribalization according to Marshall McLuhan is electronics. Observers other than Marshall McLuhan have become aware of electronic media as well. David Manning White has written,

"Yet it is just these mass media that hold out the greatest promise to the 'average' man that a cultural richness no previous age could give him is at hand. This through 'television (or the other media'."³⁶

And Herbert J. Gans had related to us,

"The preceding analysis can be placed in a broader context by suggesting that the creation of mass media has brought together the masses under one cultural bond."³⁷

and Teilhard de Chardin followed the same general consideration when he wrote,

"-thanks to the prodigious biological event represented by the discovery of electromagnetic waves, each individual finds himself henceforth (actively and passively) simultaneously present, over land and sea, in every corner of the earth."³⁸

These general considerations seem to be the same for McLuhan who observes them to be the basis for retribalization. These media all are electronically transmitted and so it is through these means that Marshall McLuhan envisions a return of harmony to the masses just as it existed in prior times. In this respect the "Medium is the Message".

"the medium is the message' means, in terms of the electronic age, that a totally new environment has been created. The 'content' of this new environment is the old mechanized environment of the industrial age. The new environment repossesses the old one as radically as TV is repossessing film."³⁹

By utilizing the idea of a new environment created by technological advances, McLuhan moves his arguments into a consideration of mass media,

"Automation brings in real 'mas production', not in terms of size, but of an instant inclusive embrace. Such is also the character of 'mass media'. They are an indication, not of the size of their audiences, but of the fact that everybody becomes involved in them at the same time."⁴⁰

Through individual involvement the retribalization process has become apparent as observed by McLuhan.

Having seen what the possible effects of industrialization upon man as viewed by David Manning White, Herbert J. Gans, and McLuhan have been, we might not turn to the effects of media upon man. Treating

the effects of media upon man we will refer mainly to the impact that television has had upon the mass populations as observed by McLuhan. This procedure follows the dictates of Dwight MacDonald; "TV is reforming culture by bringing us the tribal, communal, and analphabetic-and restoring the brotherhood of men."⁴¹ And, "the sealing of the entire family into a single global village. TV is the demiurge that is creating this transformation."⁴² If television can elicit such response by its very existence, we shall examine the exxence of television to attempt to better realize its possible effects upon man.

McLUHAN'S VIEW OF THE POSSIBLE EFFECTS OF TELEVISION ON MAN

"I think we would do ourselves a considerable kindness if we closed down TV operation for a few years. If TV was simply eliminated from the United States scene, it would be a very good thing. Just as radio has a malignant effect in Africa or Algeria, or China-in highly auditory cultures, radio drive these people nearly mad with paranoia and tribal intensity-TV, in a highly visual culture, drives us inward in depth into a totally nonvisual universe of involvement. It is destroying our entire political, education, social, institutional life. TV will dissolve the entire fabric of society in a short time. If you understood its dynamics, you would choose to eliminate it as soon as possible."⁴³

This is an apprehensive view expressed by McLuhan that the effects he observes of the pressure of television upon the population of the United States is not favorable. Having seen in prior treatment how general industrialization has theoretically been affecting populations, and how this industrialization gave rise through technological advances to the development of various media, it remains now to examine that particular medium which Marshall McLuhan considers to be the most influential and possibly the most harmful-television.

It has generally been agreed among educated people that cause-effect studies pertaining to media are questionable in their accuracy and that results obtained from such study are not reliable indications of any behavioral change upon humans. Likewise most scientific efforts to establish any reliable statistics about the behavioral patterns of the Western nations are subject to error and to change. Throughout

his publications McLuhan seems to be striving for an understanding of how the material creations of man have affected his living patterns.

As McLuhan stated,

"My work is designed for the pragmatic purpose of trying to understand our technological environment and its psychic and social consequences...But I've never presented such explorations as revealed truth. As an investigator, I have no fixed point of view, no commitment to any theory-my own or anyone else's. As a matter of fact, I'm completely ready to junk any subject if events don't bear me out, for if I discover it isn't contributing to an understanding of the problem."⁴⁴

It is obvious that since scientific studies have provided us with questionable information in the area of media effects, and specifically television, it is at least worthwhile to examine the works of McLuhan who has probably made a more probing analysis into such effects, however non-scientifically, than any other student. And as Tom Wolfe has written, "what if his is right?".⁴⁵ Realizing that McLuhan may be right we will attempt to overview of the effects of television upon the massed. Following this we will undertake a simultaneous look at television content and its possible role in transforming human behavioral patterns.

To begin on overview of the effects of television upon the masses as seen by Marshall McLuhan we must first examine McLuhan's point of departure.

Television is observed by Marshall McLuhan to be a "cool" medium. Although television is generally conceived of as being primarily a visually oriented medium, McLuhan observes it to be more tactile in nature than anything else,

"-although the idea that TV is a visual extension is an understandable mistake. Unlike film or photography, television is primarily an extension of the sense of touch rather than of sight, and it is the tactile sense that demands the interplay of all the senses. The secret of low intensity or definition and thus, unlike either photograph or film, offers no detailed information about specific objects but instead involves the active participation of the viewer."⁴⁶

McLuhan means by this that television as viewed on the screen is composed of a mesh, mosaic-like in texture. The "picture" is made up of horizontal lines and millions of dots, as a newspaper illustration, that united into a whole is interpreted by the observing human to be a complete form. Of these dots, according to McLuhan, the human is physiologically able to pick up a mere fifty to sixty. The composition of these few dots into a complete image forces the individual to "fill in" the otherwise vague and blurry impression. This process causes the individual to "participate in depth". This whole unconscious process involves the individual to such an extent that great personal coherence and participation with the medium is the resultant effect. Watching television is thus a "cool" experience by McLuhan's standards and hence tactile,

"The essence of TV viewing, is in short, intense participation and low definition-what I call a "cool" experience, as opposed to an essentially "hot", or high definition participation medium like radio."⁴⁷

This same "coolness" is responsible for the vast popularity of television viewing according to McLuhan.

This popularity is unconsciously experienced by the television viewer. He is transported into a region outside his immediate,

realistic surroundings. The viewer becomes so engrossed in "watching" television that he might be said to go inside of himself into another environment.⁴⁸ This same effect is imperceptible says McLuhan, "... a totally new environemtn has been created...TV is environmental and imperceptible, like all environments."⁴⁹ We can equate this "environment" to our daydreaming whereby we seem to exist elsewhere. We become emotionally and perceptually immersed in this new world. Hence a "totally new environment" is created.

The overall generalized effect of television as seen by McLuhan is that of intense participation.⁵⁰ Televisions' effects exceed those of other media presently in existence, "For in television--there is a relationship of high participation and involvement that, for good or ill, no mechanism had ever evoked."⁵¹ It is then the mere existence of the medium and the unconcious fascination it holds for the viewer that allegedly causes human behavioral pattern changes. McLuhan continues,

"Yet it is experience, rather than understanding, that influences behavior, expecially in collective matters of media and technology, where the individual is almost inevitably unaware of their effect upon him."⁵²

According to McLuhan these effects upon man have been widespread as well as varied as has been seen in the treatment of the effects of other technological advances on man.

Overriding, yet interlacing the particular effects of the medium of television is the factor of participation inherent within the experience of watching the screen. This inherent personal participation in the medium is the guide to a popularized McLuhanism,

"...it is the participatory nature of the TV experience itself that is important, rather than the content of the particular TV image that is being invisibly and indelibly inscribed on our skins."⁵³

It is in this statement that we can most easily see and understand the McLuhanism, "The medium is the Message". Since it has been pointed out that McLuhan believes that the nearly total participation does occur, it is appropriate to point out other assertions of McLuhan. He believes that the immediate as well as the long term impressions that are made result not from reaction of a violent nature to what is seen on the television screen but rather from an emotional "sould moving" experience,

"It, (television) involves us in moving depth, but it does not excit, agitate or arouse. Presumably, this is a feature of all depth experience."⁵⁴

In this regard McLuhan is referring to his observations of the mass movements that have taken place world-wide. In these movements he includes student demonstrators, anti-war movements, anti-colonialism, and diverse others. The point McLuhan makes is that behind these movements is a common bond of sentiment. These sentiments, or feelings, were not instigated by a single person, a single group, or even a single international power. According to McLuhan these feelings originated in many and diverse people in response to the common indepth experience of media. These common feelings are experienced not inter-personally or inter-nationally but rather intra-personally or intra-sensuously.⁵⁵ Hence we are undergoing seemingly coordinated efforts directed towards the breaking down of societies' institutions. The countries involved are those that have been highly developed industrially as well as those that have been influenced by the various forms of media.

The major participants in these movements are those youths who have undergone the experience and effects of electronically centered media and especially television which is seen as being the most influential. These electronically induced media are "...immersing us in a world-pool of information movement and are thus enabling man to incorporate within himself the whole of mankind."⁵⁶ Hence a movement begun in the United States might well have its counterpart in Japan or Europe. Yet they have no connection to each other or the participants except the common effects become imprinted on these diverse yet similar groups and individuals within the groups, through the medium of television. Such reasoning by McLuhan prompted him to predict,

It will be a totally retribalized world of depth involvements. Through radio, TV and the computer, we are already entering a global theatre in which the entire world is a happening. Our whole cultural habitat...is being transformed by these media and by space satellites into a living organism. The day of the individualist, of privacy, of fragmented or "applied" knowledge, of "points of view" and specialist goals is being replaced by the over-all awareness of a mosaic world in which space and time are overcome by television, jets, and computers."⁵⁷

We can observe that McLuhan is generally in agreement with socialist theories but he is more specific about the particular reasons he advances for a world-wide unification. To support his observations concerning this "trend" McLuhan features as examples the shifts in the direction of reunification that he has noted in the sociological patterns of populations.

Though research studies have shown the popularity of religion to be diminishing, McLuhan observes the reunification tendencies to

be indicative of the effects of media upon man. In this respect similar practices being introduced among dissimilar religious segments are also seen to be reactions to the influence of media,

"The same new preferences for depth participation has also prompted in the young a strong drive toward religious experience with rich liturgical overtones. The liturgical revival of the radio and TV age affects even the most austere Protestant sects. Choral change and rich vestments have appeared in every quarter. The ecumenical movement is synonymous with electric technology."⁵⁸

It would appear that a basis for comparison in this area would be the need felt by the young for highly decorative ritual occasions. As McLuhan observes it, through the ceremonial functions, the unrealized ends of the effects of the media are expressed. That this impression upon a populace can be furthered by the medium of television is expressed by McLuhan in his book, The Medium is the Message,

"It was the funeral of President Kennedy that most strongly proved the power of television to invest an occasion with the character of corporate participation. It involved an entire population in a ritual process."⁵⁹

This effect is attributed, once again, to the capacity of the medium to involve the individual in depth, and the masses in a like manner simultaneously. "The Kennedy funeral, in short, manifested the power of TV to involve an entire population in a ritual process."⁶⁰ This theory of McLuhan's is extended to include a consideration of drug popularity among today's youth. It is felt by McLuhan that there are two basic reasons which explain the "why" of drug abuse. The first is that drugs seemingly extend the senses thereby causing the young person

to unconsciously equate himself with electronic media, such as the computer, television, and radio. The youth under the influence of drugs feels all-encompassing as a television can seem to be all encompassing. It secondly lends itself to a communal setting and involvement, thereby corresponding with the theory of retribalization.⁶¹ Very few young people turn-on without having friends in attendance. This is generally McLuhan's explanation for the rise of the hippie sub-culture. It is not only that this manner of living returns them to an existence that corrolates with what had been experienced subconsciously through television but it is also observed to be a return to the tribal manner of living,

"The younger generations' whole orientation is towards a return to the native, as reflected by their costumes; their music, their long hair and their socio-sexual behavior."⁶²

Thus, as explained by McLuhan, the electronic media, by stimulating many of the senses simultaneously, cause those that are fully immersed in the media to reflect changes through their everyday social interactions.

Also paramount among McLuhan's observations about the effects attributed to television is the peoples' mass reaction to war. An interview held with McLuhan by Ivan G. Goldberg might best illustrate one facet of this belief,

McLuhan-"What do you think people would do if they saw the operations of meatpacking plants on television?"

Goldman-"I think they'd probably stop eating meat."

McLuhan-"Exactly. If you can't stand to watch it, then you stop it. It's just like war. Television brings you much closer."⁶³

It becomes so tactile oriented according to McLuhan that a vivid repulsion to the business of war, which is killing and destroying, is the only natural result. He says,

"The public is now participant in every phase of the war, and the main actions of the war are now being fought in the American home itself. That the war is being fought in the American home can be illustrated by noting some of the favorite music, painting, and literature of the young teenager, for nearly all of whom this war and all wars are anathema.⁶⁴

These resultant illustrations by the youth through art forms are due to the tactile qualities of television which enables a viewer to "live" what he sees through the media of more than one sense; this has prompted McLuhan to predict an eventual end to all wars. This may not be in agreement with government policy however. "TV news coverage of Vietnam has been a disaster as far as Washington is concerned because it has alienated people altogether from that war."⁶⁵ It has been the alienation from the war which McLuhan blames for the police-demonstrator confrontations concerning the war. These effects are viewed with alarm by McLuhan. In fact, it could be said that McLuhan mainly rejects the effects of the medium of television,

"TV has begun to dissolve the fabric of American life. All the assumptions-all the ground rules-based on visuality, superficiality, blueprinting, connectedness, equality, sameness-disappear with TV."⁶⁶

"If you understood its (television) dynamics, you would choose to eliminate it as soon as possible."⁶⁷

Yet if we accept these views or at least the possibility of their correctness, we must attribute the effects of television to more than its existence as a medium. That television might well involve us through its inherent tactility is a possibility not to be overlooked. But tactility cannot be television's sole means of attraction; otherwise, the viewer would not establish program preferences. The effects of television medium must include a consideration of what is broadcast over the networks. So it appears that a study of the television medium's content is a prerequisite if we are then to attempt to establish a basis for the rhetorical implications of the observations of Marshall McLuhan. Let us consider,

"By stressing that the medium is the message rather than the content, I'm not suggesting that content plays no role-merely that it plays a distinctly subordinate role."⁶⁸

To begin, it is best to show television content prerequisites as noted by McLuhan. In this regard we will find that McLuhan observes television content to be successfully presented when certain precepts are met. We may further observe that television has the tendency to create its own demands among viewers for programs.

It is generally realized by television viewers today that the continuation of any television program is dependent upon the ratings it receives. If of a sufficiently high rating, the program will remain on release. If too low a series of ratings are received we will no longer have that particular program on the television airways. It is on the basis of this condition that McLuhan projects the key to content understanding. McLuhan understands that basically it is the need of the human animal to utilize all of his senses simultaneously

as often as possible. The human being has been graced with five basic senses. McLuhan feels that since human beings possess these senses, these senses 'demand' to be used. Thus, because we have the sense of sight, we have come to depend on sight for our very existence. As McLuhan said,

"But the need to use the senses that are available is as insistent as breathing-a fact that makes sense of the urge to keep radio or TV going more or less continuously."⁶⁹

Since the problem of natural attraction to the television medium is already explained by its inherent attraction to us because we are able to utilize our senses in interpreting the offerings of the medium, all that remains is to find what the audience, by and large, will consider most interesting and enjoyable. In doing this the producer of a television program should take many facets into consideration according to McLuhan's observations. The first consideration is the "compression of time" factor.

"Some may find it paradoxical that a cool medium like TV should be so much more compressed and condensed than a hot medium like film. But it is well known that a half minute of television is equal to three minutes of stage or vaudeville."⁷⁰

This he attributes to the fact that the individual "fills in" the gaps in a television program. This "filling-in" thereby makes it more 'real' or 'pertinent' to the viewer. Meanings become imprinted upon the mind when the mind completes the fragmentary offerings of the television medium. Hence brevity may be practiced in television directing with the expectation of a greater effect upon the viewer than it would have in other forms of media.⁷¹ It is this incompleteness or dearth

of total detail in the formation of content that McLuhan finds peculiarly useful for the television medium.

In conjunction with the above suggested brevity McLuhan also states that the medium of television must exploit both the cultural and the political suppositions of its country's origin. In this respect, anything produced for television in Italy which is purely Italian in its cultural and political leanings should not be well received by the American audience. This may be attributed to the natural uneasiness that a person feels when confronted with the unfamiliar. McLuhan is postulating an Aristotlian dictum when he refers to this trait among audiences. Conversely, "Seen outside the United States, any American production looks like subtle propaganda."⁷² Content cannot be 'foreign' to its audience, especially on a cool medium such as television that will deeply involve the viewer.

According to McLuhan any content that is presented through the medium of television becomes acceptable only if it does not attach issues that are close to the viewers' personal concerns. Accordingly, distance plays an important role. The great issues of the day are best left unspoken and uncovered by the smaller ones are acceptable to the mass audience. Supposedly if a town had a major crime problem that the populace was aware of, the television medium should avoid the presentation of it on the local news. Since it is already realized and felt by this select audience, 'reliving' it on a cool medium will not be acceptable to the audience. If the same problem existed in another town the content would prove acceptable in any other town except the town in which it exists. Content, according to McLuhan, must not strike the audience in home port but

may concern itself with matters elsewhere and thus the content need not be 'relived' by the television viewers' in their everyday lives.⁷⁴

It should be reiterated at this point that Marshall McLuhan is not overly concerned with content. Note what he has said concerning those people, censors if you will, who are pressing for stricter content restriction, especially when such matters as violence are presented,

"Once these censors become aware that in all cases 'the medium is the message' or the basic source of effects, they would turn to the suppression of media as such, instead of seeking 'content' control."⁷⁵

McLuhan finds some agreement with his observations from actual experiments that have been conducted. They showed that anyone watching television spends his time watching the faces of the actors or subjects and not what the actors real performance is. Therefore, according to McLuhan, any violence that takes place is not truly taken seriously by the viewer, but the facial expressions are. He says,

"When equipped with the new experimental head-cameras that follow their eye movements while watching the image, children keep their eyes on the faces of the TV actors. Even during physical violence their eyes remain on the facial reactions rather than on the eruptive action. Guns, knives, fists, all are ignored in preference for the facial expression. TV is not so much an action, as a reaction, medium"⁷⁶

It is then, partially the effects of the television medium and the needed "filling-in" by the viewer that in actuality produces the content which is perceived. It is because of the low intensity or definition that, unlike film, does not permit television to show

detailed information about objects.⁷⁷ In this regard most happenings in real life will involve people to a greater extent. This is explained by the fact that real happenings are of themselves normally perceived sketchily. The individual must "fill-in" the gaps left by the time-lapse needed for the brain to comprehend. Staged action is normally simplified for the audience's benefit. Though done for the audience's benefit, according to McLuhan, staged action does not succeed in involving an audience fully.⁷⁸ The most acceptable content for the medium of television as seen by McLuhan should be fragmented to suit the medium as well as the viewers perceptual senses.

In conclusion to this treatment of content, television is not applicable to black and white issues but rather it shows one side or the other in a real life perspective that involves the audience. The key to television content exists in the medium's ability to involve the audience and this is best done by practicing sketchiness. This sketchiness will allow the viewer to "fill-in" the gaps as if it were everyday life. It is the furtherance of the dictum that is asserted that violence and other forms are not "watched" since the eye focusses mainly on facial expressions. Therefore detailed information is not recommended. Anything treated by the television medium must reflect the cultural and political suppositions of the audience to whom it will be shown. And further, the content must not consist of what are real issues to the viewer. This is the treatment of television programs as observed by Marshall McLuhan.

McLUHAN'S VIEW OF TELEVISION RHETORIC

"The political candidate who understands TV - whatever his party or beliefs - can gain power unknown in history."⁷⁹

It will be the purpose of the paper at this point to attempt to understand successful rhetoric employed on television so far as the view of Marshall McLuhan is concerned. His general approach to disclosing information in the area of television rhetoric can be said to be the same as his approach to disclosing information concerning television programming. He does so only for a price, as he says,

"I won't tell that answer for free to anybody. Why should I? (Professor McLuhan, it should be noted here, has worked as consultant to large corporations, for a price). They haven't the slightest clue as to what to put on television."⁸⁰

However, from observation of his repeated reference to successful rhetoric and from recalling his treatment of the television medium, it may be possible to distill a television rhetoric.

McLuhan states that the television medium promotes depth involvement of the audience in entertainment. In order to further this depth involvement, the material presented to the viewer must be fragmentary in nature as he says,

"Most often the few seconds sandwiched between the hours of viewing-the 'commercials'-reflect a truer understanding of the medium. There simply is no time for the narrative form, borrowed from earlier print technology."⁸¹

Marshall McLuhan is not indicating that material presented over the medium of television should be incomplete but rather he is indicating that the material should be presented in brief form. From this observation perhaps we can say that an outline style of presentation might be more advantageous to a speaker seeking to convince an audience through television rather than the narrative form of presentation. In support of this observation we again look to McLuhan as he states that the television does not pick up detail to any great extent nor does it offer much in the way of detailed information.

"To contrast it with the film shot, many directors refer to the TV image as one of 'low definition', in the sense that it offers little detail and a low degree of information, much like the cartoon."⁸²

For these reasons, as discussed earlier, the audience is allowed to fill in both the visual and the spoken word. This fragmentation and lack of detail in the television medium is unconsciously demanded by the audience.

From the observation by McLuhan that the material presented should not be in narrative form but rather fragmented, it also follows that the use of catchy slogans, and clinches should be included and probably repeated throughout any rhetoric on television,

"They imagine that a more earnest tone and a more austere theme would pull up the level of the book, the press, the movie, and TV. They are wrong to a farcical degree. They have only to try out their theory for fifty consecutive words in the mass medium of the English language. What would Mr. Minow do, what would any advertiser do, without the well-worn and corny cliches of popular speech?"⁸³

McLuhan goes on to say that proper usages of the slogan and cliché stimulate imagination. Through this technique the speaker is able to catch and hold an audience long after the presentation is completed. The rhetor, by avoiding the high-flown language thus coming down to the level of the masses, is able to provide the viewer with material to be remembered long afterwards. If elevated English were used, the television viewer would be likely to find himself another channel to watch. If he did continue to watch the original channel the material presented probably wouldn't be recalled beyond the time it was heard.

This same suggested style of speaking goes along well with what McLuhan had observed in England,

"Dialectal speech since TV has been found to provide a social bond in depth, not possible with the artificial 'standard English' that began only a century ago."⁸⁴

Ideally then a rhetor has a better chance to persuade his audience if a common language level is used. It was perhaps just this thing that gave Goldwater his unforeseen popularity at the polls during the 1964 presidential election. The techniques of common language combined with that of catch phrases, McLuhan would probably regard as acceptable aspects of style for the medium of television.

McLuhan extends this technique to encompass those persons using the same techniques on the television medium to present a solution to a problem when he says,

"Because the low definition of TV insures a high degree of audience involvement, the most effective programs are those that present situations which consist of some process to be completed."⁸⁵

In other words, a politician presenting a societal problem to a television audience would be most effective if he presented his material in a manner which would leave the audience something to fill in on their own. For example, if he were speaking on the problem of pollution in our cities, a tentative plan could be presented which would involve the public in the process. In this way the politician would present to the public a problem which is known to exist and indicate to them that a solution must be found. A fragmented plan could be introduced that would allow the viewer to insert his own ideas as to how the problem should be solved. Then when the actual time arrived to do something about the problem the public might be asked to select a specific solution which they had a part in determining. We need only to look to Castro to see this technique functioning effectively. Castro's "go-along" style exhibits the use of fragmented material as well as an absence of elevated language and it thus allows the audience to fill in the vacant spaces of the material presented. As McLuhan states,

"The success of any TV performer depends on his achieving a low-pressure style of presentation, although getting his act on the air may require much high-pressure organization. Castro may be a case in point. According to Tad Szulc's story on 'Cuban Television's One-Man Show' (The Eight Art), 'in his seemingly improvised 'al-I-go-along' style he can evolve politics and govern his country-right on camera.'"⁸⁶

In this way McLuhan feels that the Cubans see themselves involved in the policy-making process which causes them to become wrapped up in the government they are "running".

"What the Cubans are getting by TV is the experience of being directly engaged in the making of political decisions."⁸⁷

In this regard McLuhan sees a new type of national leader emerging which he has labeled, tribal chieftain. This newly emerging leader governs his people through the mass-participatory television dialogue and resultatn feedback. By governing on television, McLuhan states, the politician gives the people "the experience of being directly and intimately involved in the process of collective decision making".⁸⁸ Inclusive with this view and inseparable from it is the previously discussed idea that the medium does not lend itself to hot issues,

"It is the extra-ordinary degree of audience participation in the TV medium that explains its failure to tackle hot issues. Howard K. Smith observer: "the networks are delighted if you go into a controversy in a country 14,000 miles away. They don't want real controversy, real dissent at home."⁸⁹

In this way Castro has utilized the rhetorical possibilities of television to a high degree. As McLuhan has said in both his books, Understanding Media and in his interview with "Playboy", Castro has presented himself as a teacher to his people. Castro manages to blend political guidance and education with propraganda so skillfully that it is often impossible, even for experts, to tell where one might end and the other begin.⁹⁰

In actuality Castro keeps the problems of the people suppressed by having the people solve the problems of Cuba in relation to the rest of the world rather than having them concern themselves with their personal welfare. This represents a rather ideally suited rhetorical style especially to the medium of television according to McLuhan.

McLuhan's treatment of an acceptable delivery is given greater importance. As had been discussed, it is the process of viewing that plays an important part in establishing the tactility, and hence

the involvement, that is unique to the television rhetor setting out to persuade an audience; he can make his presentation more tactile to the audience through delivery. McLuhan states that the speaker's effectiveness can be enhanced by insuring that the broadcasts are available in color,

"Of course, color TV is very much more tactile than black and white TV. Tactility is in the integral sense, the one that brings all the others into relations."⁹¹

By the rhetor's use of the more tactile form of color television, he has automatically, without saying a thing, enhanced the effectiveness of his delivery. This is possible because of the audience's unconscious favorable tactile response to color television to be received more favorably as well.

Let us now examine those aspects of television image which McLuhan finds most acceptable to the audience. He points out that,

"-the TV image takes kindly to the varied and rough textures of Western saddles, clothes, hides, and shoddy match-wood bars and hotel lobbies."⁹²

It is then acceptable, and recommended by McLuhan that any rhetorician, speaking through the medium of television should probably discard the suit and tie in favor of the more casual form of apparel. In addition to this manner of dress the setting of the presentation should be casual as well. This could automatically eliminate the highly attired individual seated at a desk in a television studio. It would place him perhaps in a den, or a backyard, or a hotel lobby dressed in clothes of a comfortable, casual nature. Perhaps this effect can be achieved by

employing the general theme of Franklin D. Roosevelt's "fire-side chats" as McLuhan has mentioned. Of course, apparel is only one facet of concern when discussing television rhetoric so far as McLuhan is concerned. The very nature of the television camera's selectiveness and the scanning action inherent in the medium tend to provide a profile of the speaker. In this respect it is not the static protrait of the speaker that is provided to the audience but rather an overall effect,

"The continuous scanning action of the TV camera provides, not the isolated moment or aspect, but the contour, the iconic profile and the transparency."⁹³

This, according to McLuhan, demands that the scanning television trait be taken into consideration when examining the delivery of a presentation. Because of the close-up shot of the television camera McLuhan has compared this iconic-like effect to that of a mask in this way,

"But there are very interesting similarities between this mask at one end and the television set at the other. This mask is sculptural, and I believe that the TV image is also sculptural-in the sense that it demands from us certain fill-ins (a tactile quality) for all of our senses, just as the mask came from a world in which all the senses were simultaneous."⁹⁴

We should then examine delivery as it pertains to the actions which McLuhan finds useful to the television medium.

On television at every moment of the television production the performer is picked up by the medium and hence also by the viewer. Therefore the various aspects of delivery in relation to topic content of the rhetor must be subjected to close scrutiny.

"The same salience of process of do-it-yourself-ness and depth involvement in the TV image extends to the art of the TV actor. Under TV conditions, he must be alert to improvise and to embellish every phrase and verbal resonance with details of gesture and posture, sustaining that intimacy with the viewer which is not possible on the massive movie screen or on the stage."⁹⁵

Because of the closeness of the medium to the presented subject, it became possible for the speaker to embellish a phrase by the mere judicious raising of an eyebrow. In a distance shot perhaps a shoulder shrug may suffice for gesture or the movement of a hand. McLuhan uses the word "details" in the above quotation for good purpose. These details of gesture should not be exaggerated but seemingly enacted spontaneously. This technique enchances the speaker's presentation by appearing personal and natural to the viewer.

In the previous observations we have made concerning McLuhan's statements as to advisable speech for a television personality, we find he notes that a television speech should not have the careful precision necessary to the theatre. The television celebrity need not project his voice any more than he need project himself. Likewise, a television performance is extremely intimate due mainly to the in-depth involvement the viewer feels when he completes or "closes" the image he perceives. The television personality must also achieve a great degree of seemingly spontaneous casualness that would not be very effective in the film medium and less effective on the stage. This approach is necessary, according to McLuhan, because of the peculiarities of the television

medium itself. The audience participates in the inner life of the celebrity as though he were a "living" personality. The viewer expects the personality to act in a casual way as if the personality were in actuality in his own living room conversing in face-to-face discourse. To further illustrate McLuhan's beliefs pertaining to acceptable television presentation let us examine his specific observations about successful and non-successful rhetorical endeavors.

McLuhan states that of those politicians that have aspired to the United States presidency, John F. Kennedy was the first to understand the dynamics of the television medium. Kennedy's success with the inherently cool medium of television is attributed to his having a consummate coolness himself. McLuhan explains that this compatibility of Kennedy's came from a basic indifference to power that was a result of his personal wealth. Kennedy seemingly was not aspiring to the position for personal wealth, prestige, or power. He was duly going about the business of a presidential candidate. According to McLuhan, Kennedy did not utilize a hard line concerning any issue. As McLuhan has stated, "the 'hard' sell and the 'hot' line become mere comedy in the TV age."⁹⁶ Kennedy's vaguely defined stand on any issue allowed the television viewer to fill-in the gaps in logic as well as policy thereby favorably involving the voters. Any political candidate who does not have such cool, vaguely defined qualities simply will not interact well with the mass television audience.⁹⁷ Kennedy furthered this low-definition facade by appearing shaggily textured thereby avoiding the sharp, intense image that McLuhan argues contributes to television personality fatalities. Kennedy, as pointed out by McLuhan, appeared more as a Western sheriff or some

other television hero than as a politician,

"President Kennedy did not look like a rich man or a politician. He could have been anything from a grocer or a professor to a football coach. He was not too precise or too ready of speech in such a way as to spoil his pleasantly tweedy blur of countenance and outline. He went from palace to log cabin, from wealth to the White House, in a pattern of TV reversal and upset."⁹⁸

The strict stereotype of an individual should not be portrayed to a television audience if we are to follow McLuhan's recommendations pertaining to rhetorical television speaking. When the individual is strictly and readily classifiable the television viewer has nothing to fill in. The viewer then becomes uncomfortable with such a television image and might say, "There's something about the guy that isn't right."⁹⁹ Likewise, any person who appears too intense in his desire to achieve a goal such as a presidency strikes the audience as being less admirable in his techniques for achieving the goal.¹⁰⁰ Kennedy avoided just this image by his seeming disregard of the prestige inherent in the position to which he was aspiring. Kennedy also did not dramatize or over-emphasize his opinions on any of the issues. Through this lack of dramatization and lack of emphasis as well as his personal appearance and approach to issues, he aided his delivery and style to such an extent that the audience experienced depth involvement and thereby became participants with John F. Kennedy in his television broadcasts. McLuhan's observation is that it was just this command of the television medium that contributed to Kennedy's popularity and eventual success in his candidacy for the presidency.

In opposition to these successfully utilized methods of approach to the television medium McLuhan compares the unskilled Richard Nixon

with the skilled Kennedy during their debates in the 1960 campaign. McLuhan described Nixon as being essentially hot in that he presented a highly defined and sharply stereotyped image of the politician. This image that Nixon created of himself contributed greatly to the establishment of his reputation as a phoney. Nixon became the opposite of the cool, disinterested and objective Kennedy.¹⁰¹ Over television Nixon gave a bad impression of himself but over radio which broadcast the same debates, he made a good impression with the listeners. The difficulty for Nixon at the polls was that most of the audience saw the debates on television while only a few heard them on the not medium of radio. It was this hot approach of Nixon's that helped the image of Kennedy on television according to McLuhan's observations. Nixon suffered this disaster in his campaign by sounding progressively more definite as the debates proceeded. He defended his views with too much flourish for the television medium. As Phillip Deane of the London "Observer" explained using McLuhan's observations as the basis of his comments,

"In fact, by counterattaching and by claiming for himself, as he does in the TV debates, the same goals as the Democrats have, Mr. Nixon may be helping his opponent by blurring the Kennedy image, by confusing what exactly it is that Mr. Kennedy wants to change.

Mr. Kennedy is thus not handicapped by clear-cut issues; he is visually a less well-defined image, and appears more nonchalant. He seems less anxious to sell himself than does Mr. Nixon. So far, then, Professor McLuhan gives (the lead to Mr. Kennedy.)"¹⁰²

However, McLuhan observed that Nixon did eventually improve his television rhetoric. As McLuhan replied to a question from Playboy interviewer Norden,

Playboy-"Did Nixon take any lessons from you the last time around? (Nixon's second presidential candidacy).

McLuhan-"He certainly took lessons from somebody, because in the recent election it was Nixon who was cool and Humphrey who was hot. I had noticed the change in Nixon as far back as 1963 when I saw him on the "Jack Parr Show". No longer the slick, glib, aggressive Nixon of 1960, he had been toned down, polished, programmed and packaged into the new Nixon we saw in 1968: earnest, modest quietly sincere in a word, cool. I realized that if Nixon maintained this mask, he could be elected President, and apparently the American electorate agreed last November."¹⁰³

Nixon had earned this praise from Marshall McLuhan because of some radical changes in his rhetorical approach to the television medium. Nixon began by showing himself to be a, "doggedly creative and modest performer,"¹⁰⁴ on the Jack Parr Show. His delivery to the television camera was not the slick, glib approach he had utilized previously, but he spoke rather modestly and in a fragmented manner. This was to carry over to his 1968 candidacy and into his presidency as became most obvious during his press interviews. He appeared relaxed, replied to questions seemingly off-handedly and spontaneously and used a shy smile often. His gestures became smooth and coordinated with the material upon which he spoke. Nixon, in effect, became that personality who could be anyone, a sheriff or a lawyer, and became vague in his

speech so as to allow the television audience to fill-in what he had said and thus involved them in depth. His audience now "participated" with President Nixon in his speeches and hence his material became a rhetorical success by Marshall McLuhan's predictions.

Throughout this treatment of the rhetorical implications of McLuhan's observations it should be remembered that the comments he makes are about television appearances. Television rhetoric is effective for an audience that has been molded by the pressures placed upon them through industrialization, then electronic media, and finally shaped by the medium of television into their present stage of involvement. At least, this is as Marshall McLuhan observes the situation to be. Without the social aspect taken into consideration, his observations become meaningless and without value.¹⁰⁵ This is because in the end we find ourselves discussing and orienting ourselves to this social body we call the television audience. Thus it is that McLuhan's observations pertaining to effective television rhetoric are oriented toward the effect of the medium upon the populace. Thus what McLuhan has found to be the most influential means of persuasion through the medium of television pertains to those conclusions which influence the mass audience and not the individual within the audience. Unlike Aristotle and Cicero, the audience is not a specific one but is rather a heterogenous audience in nature. The mass audience that has been created by mass media is not esoteric in nature. This audience is composed of white collar workers, labor union members, and diverse others. All of these sub-groups within a mass audience have their own outlooks, interests and behavioral patterns. It is the sum of these groups that we label society. It is this

society that the mass media reach. Therefore, this society is the same we presently term the heterogenous mass audience of today's media. From the previous observations, we find that in order to experience successful television rhetoric, certain techniques must be utilized.

Material presented through the medium of television should be fragmented to allow the audience to "fill-in" the meanings they prefer. The fragmentation of material is a prerequisite of a presentation over a cool medium such as television which requires audience participation. In other words, to insure a more in-depth audience participation, the material should not be presented in detailed, or in tightly logically progressing form. In face-to-face conversation and in the lectern-audience situation we are normally accustomed to presenting our thoughts in complete paragraphs or in narrative form, with the paragraphs flowing logically from thought to thought. In a television presentation, however, it now becomes necessary for the paragraphs to be sketchy in the development of the thoughts presented. This does not mean that the material should be presented illogically but that the material be unified in an overall manner by a central theme as rhetoricians since Aristotle have recommended. The completed manuscript, if composed according to McLuhan's observations, could be said to be composed in subdivisions not entirely developed but still unified by a central theme. This technique has been termed the fragmented style of television rhetoric.

Within the presentations for television, catchy phrases and cliches should be utilized. Using catchy phrases and cliches liberally serves to unify the speech in the minds of the audience as these phrases and cliches are easily remembered by the audience throughout the presenta-

tion. One of the most obvious examples of a catchy phrase is the, "We like Ike" phrase made famous by President Eisenhower's campaign. This phrase was repeated over television throughout his campaign with special emphasis before and after his speeches. One can easily see how it may well have influenced beneficially the addresses directed to Eisenhower's audiences. No matter what was said as far as the actual content of his speeches, the overriding idea remembered was, "We Like Ike". The party workers speaking in Ike's behalf made full utilization of this phrase. Utilized in a presentation for television, this rhetorical device, according to McLuhan, will aid in persuading an audience because they remember central themes and these are facilitated in recollection by easily remembered cliches or short phrases.

McLuhan also implies that presentation prepared for the medium of television should be expressed through the use of common speech or language. This same precept has been known and employed in the general speaking situation since the Greeks first established it in classical times. Common speech and language usage will prohibit the audience from thinking that the speaker is "putting on airs". The audience is not attuned to the usage of terms not heard from day to day in business and other day-to-day pursuits. Their ears are simply not attuned to a formal English nor unusual words. The speaker should say, "This speech I am giving tonight-", to be well received by his mass audience, instead of, "The rhetorical presentation I am relating to you this evening-". By using this common language of his listeners, the speaker runs a far smaller risk of being ill-received. People seem to be naturally suspicious of that with which they are unfamiliar. This observation was known by the Greeks and is now found to be applicable to television

as well. Hence, as suggested by McLuhan, anyone presenting a rhetorical composition over the medium of television should present it though the use of common speech or language.

The fourth observation considered concerns the presentation of solutions. McLuhan suggests that any solution to be given in a speech over television be presented in a fragmentary manner. This recommendation is based upon McLuhan's observation of the nature of television and the nature of the audience. Giving solutions in a fragmentary manner is consistent with the fragmentary nature of the cool medium of television. In order to retain the coolness, inherent within the medium, fragmentary solutions that allow the audience to equate or "fill-in" their own solutions should be utilized. If the solutions are given outright, such as they are in a traditional face-to-face, call to action speech, the effect over television tends to be one of artificiality. Ready-made, or tightly structured, solutions are too pat for the medium. The medium of television demands depth involvement on the part of the audience. The audience must seemingly have a part in structuring the solutions offered in order for them to be acceptable over television.

The fifth technique for presenting rhetorical material over the medium of television which McLuhan advances is that it be featured in a casual manner. This casual manner is synonymous with the shaggy texture of the medium itself because of the individual dots and lines that compose the picture. Finely textured images do not come across the medium very effectively. The dress should not be of a formal nature but rather of a casual, carefree nature. If a shirt and tie is worn the tie might be slightly off center, the jacket left open, and the speakers posture somewhat less than erect. Kennedy presented the personification of this method of delivery. Because of his back problem he always seemed

to slump and his jacket was generally left comfortably open, all of which appealed greatly to the television audience. President Kennedy avoided appearing too "slick" over the medium of television. Extending this same precept of McLuhan's towards casualness, the speech should ideally be staged in a place other than a meticulous office or a television studio. More acceptable to the medium of television would be the staging of a speech in a backyard with trees and the other paraphernalia common to a backyard. Or, perhaps a lakeside setting complete with dock boats, and the speaker in nice but rugged attire placing him in a fisherman's role, would be good as scenery. This technique serves to make the speaker seem more a common person to the audience of television as well as being more acceptable to the rough textures, that according to McLuhan, the television camera records so well. In this respect Theodore Roosevelt would have been well received over television. We can all recall the photographs circulated by President Roosevelt when he was establishing his public image. The photographs were of Roosevelt in his role as a hunter, adventurer, as well as a soldier. This same apparel would have done well on the medium of television because of its rugged texture and casual background. It is this type of approach to television that a rhetorician should take if he is to follow the recommendations of McLuhan as to the proper presentation of speeches over television.

Because of the nature of television, McLuhan observes, color enhances the tactile effect of the medium. This might more easily be understood if we take into consideration the point discussed above--that of casualness in clothes and background over the television medium. The effect of rough-textured clothing and background seems to be greater focus and thus greater effect, if shown in color.

McLuhan goes on to explain that the mere element of color affects our nervous system to a greater extent than a black and white image thereby further enhancing the tactile effect of television. By insuring that the speeches are broadcast in color the rhetorician insures himself that the speech will be received more favorably by the viewers that have color television, since the broadcast will be more tactile in nature. For these reasons the use of color television is strongly recommended by Marshall McLuhan.

We can now direct out attention to McLuhan's suggestions about the use of gesture. When delivering a televised speech, subtle gesture should accompany the verbalization. As is generally known by film theorists and media specialists, the overuse of gestures does not carry well over the medium of television because these gestures become too "stagey" to be acceptable to the viewing audience. This unacceptability is due largely to the fact that television specializes in the close-up shot. Since it is the close-up shot that is featured, fine, discrete gesture can be effectively utilized. Since the viewers' eyes are drawn to facial expressions, the slight raising of an eyebrow, easily picked up and transmitted by television, can connote disbelief effectively and this will be the interpretation of the viewers. A slight wrinkling of a brow can likewise effectively connote bewilderment. These gestures are of course done in correlation with the thought being expressed. The absence of gesture on the speaker's part might leave the viewers with the speaker's stonelike face devoid of meaning and comprehension. The stonelike speaker might possible be interpreted by the audience as being less credible. James Garner the actor is a fine example of a man who could deliver an effective gesture. His slightest emotions

in response to his lines are mirrored in either his facial gesture or his body gesture, yet it never appears "staged" but is seemingly achieved spontaneously as if it were real life. It is this spontaneity of subtle gesture that a rhetorician should strive for to better enhance the credibility of his 'performance' before the television camera.

The clear establishment of goals should be suppressed when utilizing television. The rhetor may vaguely suggest goals that he aspires to but he should not emphasize them to the audience. The audience has for the most part found their own niche in society and usually doesn't have the ability to deviate from this position. For a speaker to state his goals and aspirations over the medium of television might be reason to raise the ire of those people not fortunate enough to successfully aspire to those goals themselves. Because the television medium is so effective in "bolowing up" statements beyond all proportion by the very selectiveness of the medium, the rhetor must consider this when making statements. A person seeking to elavate his station in life must suppress the statement of this desire when appearing on television, and, like President Kennedy, appear indifferent to the power and prestige inherent in such a successful step. Otherwise the audience will look upon their rhetor much the same as the general public looks upon social climbers--with disdain. To be looked upon with disdain by the very people the rhetor is seeking to persuade can only diminish his chances for success. Thus, the clear establishment of goals should be suppressed in television rhetoric.

And finally, according to Marshall McLuhan, the rhetor, when seeking to persuade the mass television audience should attempt to perfect subtle, cool approach to the camera and thus to the audience.

The speaker should never appear hasty or superficial because the television medium still show technique acting for what it is-just acting. This is not to imply that one does not act, but that the acting done must be of the type employed by most people during a party. Naturalness at a party should be aspired to for if it is not effectively achieved in interpersonal relationship one runs the risk of stereotyping himself into a rigid role. For example, if a politician appears over the medium of television to be merely a political candidate with all of the desires, aspirations, and approaches to problems usually attributed to a politician, the response he might receive from the audience could be much the same as if he were to appear as a political candidate at a party. The politician may be considered a person with limited interests to most people; he will be a bore. This person ideally should personify many types of persons at once. Naturalness will allow the audience's imagination to place the rhetor in a position which they would prefer to see him; perhaps they want to see him as a Western hero, or a Southern gentleman, or a New York lawyer. Governor Regan of California meets this criterion in that he does not appear to his constituents as a mere politician, which he certainly is, but he seems rather a person who could be a steel worker, or a farm laborer, or any number of other working types of people if he wished. In addition, over television he also conveys the impression that in any one of these jobs his fellow workers would accept him as being one of them. This all results from his approach to the voters through the main medium of television. And it is just his naturalness on the medium that enhances his delivery so successfully. Governor Regan, in effect, does not fit any rigid stereotype but rather his approach to television rhetoric is one of

naturalness. It is as though the camera were not there and he were reacting in a normal fashion. It is the manner of delivery that McLuhan appears to find most acceptable and successful over the medium of television.

These are the observations which we find made by Marshall McLuhan in his writings regarding the rhetorical techniques which are effective over the medium of television. They pertain to television rhetoric and they should be achieved by the rhetor in order that his presentation will prove more persuasive to the viewer. It can also be said that these observations constitute those aspects of rhetoric which have been altered in response to the comparatively new medium of television.

CONCLUSION

This paper has considered a treatment of the rhetorical aspects of style and delivery which had developed in ancient Greece and Rome. McLuhan's apparent views of the same rhetorically based aspects of the style and delivery considerations were then examined. The ancients were writing about a face-to-face or lectern-to-live-audience type rhetorical presentation. As we synthesized McLuhan, we were concerned with rhetorical matters that were presented to the audience through a medium that negated the face-to-face confrontations that existed for the Greeks and Romans. Aristotle had postulated that rhetoric was "the faculty (art) of observing in any given case the available means of persuasion". This definition has found acceptance through the ages including the modern world. Give this acceptable definition, it remains to compare and contrast that which McLuhan has observed to be effective style and delivery over television to what the Greeks and Romans observed to be most effective upon their audiences.

McLuhan had observed that material contained within a speech is more acceptable to the television audience if it is 'fragmented' in style. He also included solutions within this consideration. In other words, the bulk of the material to be conveyed to the audience should not be made entirely comprehensible. If the material were so clear that the audience would require no

thinking of their own to complete the thoughts conveyed, then the audience would not "fill-in" the logical gaps and participation would not be as complete as McLuhan has indicated is necessary. In this manner McLuhan feels that situations consisting of problems to be completed are the most effective approach to television rhetoric. Aristotle, conversely, wrote that the material presented to a live audience should be clearly and completely organized in such a way that the rhetor seemingly completes problems presented and illustrates the goals and conclusions to the audience. The audience should be persuaded to these conclusions if the speech is to be deemed successful. The major difference in this view is basically that McLuhan observes that people would prefer to, "think for themselves" while Ancients, as reported by Aristotle, felt that the speaker should guide the thinking of the audience from point to point finally arriving at the conclusions(s) which the rhetor feels are best. The difference in view may be attributed to the esthetic distance which television produces. If a speaker on television were to suggest conclusions the viewer might take personal offense by imagining the speaker to be a dictator of way to think. Inherent in this view might be the American mind which has been nurtured on the freedom of arriving at one's own conclusions. The rhetor in face-to-face confrontations with a live audience might yet be able to channel the thinking of an audience. But when done over television the audience may be more clearly stated, might be interpreted as dictatorial and is thus repulsive to the American mind. However, this is extrapolation and

and further study in this area would be needed to verify the probabilities.

McLuhan had written that a television presentation should contain catchy phrases and cliches whereas Aristotle wrote that wise use of metaphors would aid in persuasion. There exists a similarity of understanding concerning these two suggestions. Some cliches are metaphorical in nature such as "Salem is Springtime." Therefore, we might see that Aristotle and McLuhan are on the same general track. Each is observing that embellished speech appeals to an audience. The major difference may be McLuhan's suggesting that the usage of catchy phrases and cliches enable the audience to more easily recall content presented by having received only a few words to be remembered. We might recall that since the advent of print, the minds of men who utilize print may no longer easily memorize material received by the ear. The ancients may not have had the problem of recall that exists today and so may not have had to rely on easily remembered, small groups of words. Metaphorical usage by the ancients added interest and clarity to speech just as it does today. We might have carried this use of the metaphor a step further to evolve the cliché and catchy phrase to enable our differently arranged minds to better encompass a vast range of knowledge and everyday concerns that may not have been a problem to the Greek and Roman aristocracy. But it remains to this day and over the medium of television that metaphorical usage is an aid to communication but that simplified thinking through the use of cliches and catchy phrases should be added to rhetoric over the medium of television.

Rhetorical efforts as observed by McLuhan should be presented through the use of common speech or language. This does not differ from the teachings of the Greeks. Both the Greeks and McLuhan differ from the concept of the Romans as practiced by Cicero. Cicero felt the highly embellished and ornate style of speech to be advantageous due to the impression it made on the audience. Perhaps Cicero's audience did delight in such extravagance. The Greeks as reported by Aristotle and the American audiences as observed by McLuhan respond more favorably to the use of common speech and language. Cicero further advised the use of words not commonly used, words given new meanings, and words placed together to form new words with new meanings. Today, like the Greeks, people consider such language to be pompous and not acceptable to the audience either over a lectern or over television. Common speech usage is therefore common to the rhetor of both ancient Greece and the television speaker of today.

When delivering a televised speech, McLuhan suggests that subtle gesture in support of material would aid the reception of it by the mass audience. Aristotle declined treatment of gesture with a speaker's delivery. Aristotle left consideration of this matter to others. Cicero recommended a very extravagant use of gesture because he felt that such gesture usage reflected the emotions of the speaker. In effect, gesture to the Romans as reported by Cicero, seemed to be a pantomime of what was being spoken. The proper gestures were to have been practiced until the actual delivery, however, when presented they were to seem spontaneous to the audience. McLuhan makes a similar observation as

he suggests that gesture should be used and appearance of the entire performance should seem spontaneous. The major difference in these two men's suggestions is one of degree. Cicero recommended flamboyant gestures for face-to-face speaking while McLuhan observed subtle gesture to be most effective over television. The selectivity of the television medium causes extreme gesture to appear superfleous where in a public circumstance this same gesture technique might prove very effective.

As McLuhan observes television rhetoric, the presentation should reflect casualness in apparel and background. This differs from the ancient Greeks and Romans who delivered primarily from a lecturn. McLuhan is concerned with the television medium, and over this medium he observes that effective delivery is aided by utilization of surroundings other than a static studio, desk, or lectern. One might surmise that an impression of freedom of movement is felt by having speeches given in surroundings that suggest movement or activity. The Greeks and the Romans considered rhetoric to include battlefield oration, funderal orations, and other events in which a lectern would be superfluous to the occasion. However, they probably assumed that dress appropriate to the occasion would be common knowledge among the highly educated orators of that period. Greeks and Romans also did not have to contend with the selectiveness of the television camera with its inherent "fuzziness" as described by McLuhan. To the ancients, public speaking was much the same as it was for our American forefathers. Speaking was considered to be a face-to-face circumstance. The physical separation of the speaker from his audience did not enter into the picture. Staging now takes a different aspect. The speaker

in earlier years knew to whom he was to speak and therefore, his apparel could be adjusted to fit that particular audience. Over television medium, however, the audience reached is the multitudes who dress in everything from burlap to silk. For this reason the television rhetor, McLuhan suggests, suits his clothing to the peculiarities of the television medium. McLuhan thus recommends apparel and staging to be casual in nature while the ancient Greeks and Romans fitted the clothing to the specific occasion.

McLuhan observes that a rhetor on television would be wise not to reveal private goals and aspirations. During the Greek and Roman eras rhetoric was normally concerned with addresses spoken to the elite of their society, and the rhetor was usually already well established financially and socially to be had no need to reveal the advantages that rise in position would give him. The increased status was probably already known by the aristocrats and did not need to be related. McLuhan suggests that the expressing of one's purpose over the television medium, since all classes of people are being spoken to, would create the impression that the speaker was unethically striving for a higher station in life. McLuhan tells us that over television the speaker when mentioning his ambitions or goals appears to be using the people in the audience to attain his aspirations. This not appealing to a modern audience. The statement of goals perhaps being acceptable in ancient rhetorical consideration is not shown by McLuhan as being advisable over the television medium.

In order to avoid stereotyping one's self on the television medium, McLuhan observes the necessity to develop a cool, subtle

approach to the audience. Once again, in the ancient, rhetorical endeavors the audience probably knew full well what a speaker was and accepted his acting the part. In face-to-face rhetoric of today we may expect the same rhetorical approach. But on television as McLuhan views the medium, and the effective rhetorical approaches to it, stereotyping oneself is not acceptable to the viewers. Perhaps the television audience expects the rhetor to be more than he is since he rates time on the stature-building medium of television. Or, as McLuhan relates, the stereotyped individual does not allow the viewer to "fill-in" the character which is the role the viewer wishes most to see the speaker play. In other words, the viewer cannot identify with a stereotyped individual on television. In any case, this last observation, like all of the other observations, is concerned with rhetoric on the medium of television. This medium of communication is a factor which the ancient rhetoricians did not have to take into consideration.

In conclusion, after comparing and contrasting of the treatment of rhetorical matters by Aristotle and Cicero and the modern McLuhan's observations concerning successful modern rhetoric over television, some major points can be made. The first is that the ancients were concerned with rhetorical matters that considered lectern or face-to-face rhetoric. The medium of television was not to be contended with. Television has brought to rhetorical studies new dimensions and influences. Perhaps McLuhan has made some basic observations in this field; with many new developments, time may confirm these observations. Secondly is the fact

that the nature of the audience has changed. As late as our frontier days, a speaker could know what general type of audience he was to speak before. Knowing this, the speakers apparel, manner of speaking, content to be concerned with, and all other considerations could be arranged for. Over television the matter of audience analysis becomes a vast problem. Television reaches all of the many and diverse people within the United States. The audience that is reached comprises the entire society of the United States since this society is the audience of television. The television rhetor, trying to analyze his audience, finds himself immersed in a study of United States sociology. These factors the ancients never did have to encounter. The Greeks and Romans were entirely correct to recommend to a rhetor that he analyze his specific audience. In our history we too have had specific audiences. We have specific audiences to this day within geographical locations as well as trades, clubs, and all the other diverse factions of our society. But over television these diverse factions become one faction which is termed the television audience. This is the major difference between the concept of the Greek and Roman rhetoricians and the television rhetoricians of today. The ancients were concerned with specificities; the modern television rhetorician is concerned with generalities. McLuhan has taken these generalities into consideration when making observations as to what might be effective television rhetoric. This is the difference in approach between the modern television rhetorical observers and those views written of face-to-face rhetoric in years past. So we can observe the possible change taking place in rhetoric because of the new television influence.

It is also possible for the student of television rhetoric to note that there are apparently two types of rhetoric over television. One is the campaign oratory and the second the version of oratory experienced after a person has successfully obtained office. Campaign oratory can be said to be closer to the Aristotlian concept. Campaign oratory seems to depend strongly on pathetic appeals and the established speaker's ethos. Logos is not amplified. After a position is attained by the speaker, television rhetoric takes on a report form. The views of an administration are reported to the television audience, policies explained, and goals established. This post-campaign speaking is more logical than pre-campaign speaking. Post-campaign speaking also appears to rely less on pathetic appeals and the thos is considered to be equated to the speaker's position or title. This later style of rhetoric is similar to the plain style of rhetoric. McLuhan does not consider this aspect of rhetoric. An interesting comparison of the two types of television rhetoric might be effectively done. If so, it is interesting to note that television as a medium might have influenced rhetoric as Marshall McLuhan has observed.

Concerning the matter of sociology as it pertains to McLuhan's observations, it is possible that a further study could be made within this area. Though not of a purely rhetorical nature, such a study could go far beyond what this thesis has considered in the corelation of sociology and McLuhan's view of television rhetoric. Such an endeavor might well illuminate factors concerning audience analysis over a modern medium of communication. It might also show that McLuhan is in

fact a synthesizer as he has professed. Evidence, although at a superficial level in this writing, indicates that McLuhan's treatment of television rhetoric is strongly dependent on the studies of sociologists. As such, the modern rhetor might also find himself concerned with sociological studies when seeking to persuade a mass audience. A study of this nature might well prove to be of value to both the student and the potential television rhetorician.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Throughout the preparation leading up to and including my thesis work I have received encouragement from many individuals. Dr. Bunton through her interest and desire to have others do well, stimulated me to achieve as much as abilities would allow. Dr. Burke was able to establish an intellectual curiosity that aided greatly in the completion of this thesis. To both of these fine individuals goes the compliment of instilling me with the insight to complete this work. Although not directly concerned with the completion of this study, Mr. Kingsley, Miss Rexroad, and Mr. Hamlin must be mentioned as three of the major influences that have encouraged me in my pursuit for academic proficiency. The encouragement and devotion shown by these academicians towards my struggle have been most conducive to a valuable educational experience, and a successful completion of my educational responsibilities.

FOOTNOTES

1. Friedrich Solmsen, Introduction to Aristotle's Rhetoric and Poetics, (Toronto, 1954), pp. Xii.
2. Aristotle, The Rhetoric, trans. by W. Rhys Roberts, (Toronto, 1954), vol. 1355b, p. 25.
3. Aristotle, 1403b, p. 15-18.
4. Aristotle 1404a, p. 9-10.
5. Aristotle, 140461, p. 5.
6. Anfinn Stiger, The Structure of Aristotle's Thought, (New York, 1966), p. 113.
7. Aristotle, 1410b, p. 10.
8. John Herman Randall, Aristotle, (New York, 1960), p. 285.
9. Aristotle, 1403b, p. 20.
10. Aristotle, 1403b. p. 27.
11. Aristotle 1404a, p. 15.
12. Quintilian, Institutio Oratoria, Trans. by H. E. Butler, (London, 1922), vol. 11.3., p.2.
13. Quintilian, p. 5-6.
14. Rhetorica ad Herennium, trans. by Harry Caplan, (Cambridge, Mass., 1954), vol. III,xi, p. 19.
15. Op. Cit.
16. Op. Cit.
17. Op. Cit.
18. Cicero, De Oratore, trans. by H. Rackham, (Cambridge, Mass, 1960), vol, III, Lv, p. 213.

19. Cicero, III, Lvii, p. 216.
20. Cicero, III, Lv, p. 213.
21. John C. Rolfe, Our Debt to Greece and Rome, (New York, 1960), p. 67.
22. John H. Mackim, Classical Rhetoric for Modern Discourse, (New York, 1969), p. 208.
23. Cicero, III, xxxviii, p. 152.
24. Cicero, III, sLiii, p. 172.
25. Cicero, III, Lii, p. 203-206.
26. Rolfe, p. 76.
27. Melvin L. De Cleur, Theories of Mass Communications, (New York, 1966), p. 89.
28. Leonard Broom and Phillip Selznick, Sociology, (Evanston, Illinois; 1958), p. 38.
29. David Manning White, Mass Culture in America; Another Point of View, ed. Rosenbert and White, (New York, 1966), p. 123.
30. J. C. Carothers, Psychiatry, "Culture, Psychiatry, and the Written Word, (1959), p. 308.
- 30a. Eric Partridge, Smaller Slang Dictionary, (London, 1961), p. 34.
- 30b. Max Wertheimer, Productive Thinking, (New York, 1959), p. 206-208.
31. Marshall McLuhan, and Harley Parker, Through the Vanishing Point, (New York, 1968), p. 95.
32. Ibid, p. 72.
33. Leo Lowenthal, Historical Perspectives of Popular Culture, p. 52.
34. Bernard Rosenberg, "Mass Culture in America," Mass Culture: The Popular Arts in America, (New York, 1957), p. 7.
35. Marshall McLuhan, McLuhan: Hot and Cool, ed. Gerald Emanuel Stearn, (New York, 1967), p. 145.
36. David Manning White, Saturday Review, "What's Happening to Mass Culture?", (New York, 1957), p. 12.
37. Herbert J. Gans, Mass Culture in America, An Analysis of Movie Making, (New York, 1957), p. 321.

38. Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, Phenomena of Man, trans. by Bernard Wall, (New York, 1959), p. 240.
39. Marshall McLuhan, Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man, (New York, 1964), p. ix.
40. Ibid, p. 303.
41. McLuhan, Hot and Cool, p. 206.
42. Ibid, p. 207.
43. Ibid, p. 291.
44. Playboy, "Playboy interview: Marshall McLuhan", (Chicago, 1969) March, Vol. 16, no. 3., p. 54.
45. McLuhan, Hot and Cool, p. 31.
46. Playboy, p. 61.
47. Ibid, p. 61.
48. Op. Cit.
49. Marshall McLuhan, Understanding Media, p. ix.
50. Ibid, p. 271-273.
51. Ibid, p. 175.
52. Ibid, p. 277.
53. Playboy, p. 61.
54. McLuhan, Understanding Media, p. 294.
55. Ibid, p. 208.
56. Playboy, p. 62.
57. Ibid, p. 70.
58. McLuhan, Understanding Media, p. 280.
59. McLuhan, The Medium is the Message, (New York, 1967), p. 125.
60. McLuhan, Understanding Media p. 293.
61. Playboy, p. 66.
62. Ibid, p. 64.

63. Kansas City Star Magazine, "McLuhan: Where It's At in the 70's", January 4, 1970, page 29.
64. Marshall and Quentin Fiore, War and Peace in the Global Village, (new York, 1967), p. 124-135.
65. McLuhan, Hot and Cool, p. 270.
66. Ibid, p. 271.
67. Ibid, p. 291.
68. Playboy, p. 61.
69. McLuhan, Understanding Media, p. 73.
70. Ibid, p. 278.
71. Ibid, p. 278.
72. Ibid. p. 271.
73. McLuhan, The Medium Is the Message, p. 128.
74. McLuhan, Understanding Media, p. 269.
75. Ibid, p. 274.
76. Ibid, p. 278.
77. Ibid, p. 273.
78. Ibid, p. 276.
79. Playboy, p. 62.
80. Kansas City Star Magazine, p. 38.
81. McLuhan, The Medium is the Message, p. 126.
82. McLuhan, Understanding Media, p. 273.
83. Ibid, p. 187.
84. Ibid, p. 270.
85. Ibid, p. 278.
86. Ibid, p. 270.
87. Ibid, p. 270.

88. Playboy, p. 61.
89. McLuhan, Understanding Media, p. 279.
90. Ibid, p. 270.
91. McLuhan, War and Peace in the Global Village, p. 77.
92. McLuhan, Understanding Media, p. 279.
93. Ibid, p. 169.
94. McLuhan, Hot and Cool, p. 143.
95. McLuhan, Understanding Media, p. 278.
96. Ibid, p. 40.
97. Playboy, p. 61.
98. McLuhan, Understanding Media, p. 288.
99. Ibid, p. 288.
100. Ibid, p. 257.
101. Playboy, p. 61.
102. Phillip Deane, "The Sheriff and the Lawyer", Toronto Globe and Mail, October 15, 1960, p. 42.
103. Playboy, p. 61-62.
104. McLuhan, Understanding Media, p. 269.
105. McLuhan, War and Peace in the Global Village, p. 4.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

- Aristotle. Rhetoric and Poetics. trans. by W. Rhys Roberts. Toronto, 1954.
- Bell, Daniel. The End of Ideology. New York, 1965.
- Berelson and Steiner. Human Behavior. New York, 1964.
- Broom and Selznick. Sociology. Evanston, Illinois, 1958.
- Buchler and Linkugel. Speech Communication. New York, 1969.
- Chaplan Harry, trans. Rhetorica ad Herennium. Cambridge, 1954.
- Chardin, Pierre Teilhard de. Phenomenon of Man. trans. by Bernard Wall. New York, 1959.
- Cicero. De Oratore. Cambridge, 1960.
- Corbett, Edward P. J. Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student.
- DeFleur, Melvin L. Theories of Mass Communication. New York, 1966.
- Gans, Herbert J. "An Analysis of Movie Making", Mass Culture. New York, 1957.
- Lane, Robert E. Political Ideology. Toronto, 1967.
- Lee, Dorothy. "Lineal and Nonlineal Codifications of Reality", Explorations In Communication. ed. Marshall McLuhan and Edmund Carpenter. Boston, 1966.
- Lippman, Walter. Public Opinion. New York, 1965.
- Mackin, John H. Classical Rhetoric for Modern Discourse, New York, 1969.
- McLuhan, Marshall. Mechanical Bride. New York. 1969.
- McLuhan, Herbert M. Mechanical Bride: Folklore of Industrial Man. New York, 1951.
- McLuhan, Herbert M. and Quentin Fiore. Medium Is the Message. New York, 1967.

- McLuhan, Marshall. "Sight, Sound, and Fury", Mass Culture. ed. Bernard Rosenberg and David Manning White. New York, 1957.
- McLuhan, Marshall and Harley Parker. Through the Vanishing Point: Space in Poetry and Painting. New York, 1968.
- McLuhan, Marshall. Understanding Media. New York, 1964.
- McLuhan, Marshall. Verbi-Voco-Visual Explorations. New York, 1968.
- McLuhan, Marshall and Quentin Fiore. War and Peace in the Global Village. New York, 1968.
- McLuhan, Marshall. "Classroom Without Walls", Explorations in Communication. Boston, 1960.
- Minnick, Wayne C. The Art of Persuasion. Boston, 1968.
- Partridge, Eric. Smaller Slang Dictionary. London, 1961.
- Quintilian. Institutio Oratoria, trans. by H. E. Butler. London, 1922.
- Randall, John Herman, Jr. Aristotle. New York, 1960.
- Riesman, David. The Lonely Crowd. New Haven, 1961.
- Rolfe, John C. Our Debt to Greece and Rome. New York, 1963.
- Rosenberg, Bernard and David Manning White, ed. Mass Culture. New York, 1957.
- Solimsen, Friedrich. Introduction to Rhetoric and Poetics. trans. by W. Rhys Roberts. Toronto, 1954.
- Stearn, Gerald Emanuel, ed. McLuhan: Hot and Cool. New York, 1967.
- Stigen, Anfinn. The Structure of Aristotles Thought. New York, 1966.
- Walsh, Moira. "McLuhanisms", America. May 28, 1966.
- Wertheimer, Max. Productive Thinking. revised by Michael Wertheimer. New York, 1959.
- White, David Manning. Mass Culture in America: Another Point of View. ed. Rosenberg and White. New York, 1966.
- Whitehead, A. N. Science and the Modern World. New York, 1926.

Carothers, J. C. "Culture Psychiatry and the Written Word", Psychiatry.
November 1959.

Deane, Philip. "The Sheriff and the Lawyer", Toronto Globe and Mail.
October 15, 1960.

Fiore, Quentin. "Graphics Convey a Message", Publishers Weekly.
April 3, 1967.

Hefner, Hugh M. Playboy, March, 1969.

Kostelanetz, Richard. "Marshall McLuhan", Commonweal. January 20,
1967.

McLuhan, Marshall. "Great Change-Overs For You", Vogue. July, 1966.

"McLuhan. Where It's At in the 70's", Kansas City Star Magazine.
January 4, 1970.

"McLuhan Appointed to Fordham's Schweitzer Chair", Publisher's
Weekly, December, 1960.

"The McLuhan Metaphor", New Yorker. May 15, 1965.

"Understanding McLuhan", Newsweek. February 28, 1966.

White, David Manning. "What's Happening to Mass Culture?" Saturday
Review. 1956.

APPENDIX I

Vice-President Agnew's speech, delivered before the Midwest Regional Republican Committee Meeting in Des Moines, Iowa, November 13, 1969, is discussed below in terms of at least six of the McLuhan-observed techniques for effective communication on television.

1. Material presented through the medium should be fragmented.
2. This material should contain catchy phrases and cliches.
3. Rhetorical efforts should be presented through the use of common speech or language.
4. Solutions should be posed fragmentarily.
5. The presentation should reflect casualness. This includes dress, staging, etc.
6. Color television broadcasts should be utilized.
7. Subtle gestures should be used in support of material.
8. The clear establishment of goals should be suppressed.
9. A subtle, cool approach to the audience should be taken. Avoid stereotyping one's self.

First consideration: Material presented through the medium of television should be fragmented.

Agnew began his speech by establishing what his major concerns would be. They were established in the form of two questions:--"are we demanding enough of our television news presentations?...And, are the men of this medium demanding enough of themselves?" We would then expect the speech to follow these guidelines as Agnew does follow these main streams of thought throughout his entire speech. But within the body itself the material is fragmented through the use of proof which in some cases follows a sub-outline of its own. For example, Averell Harriman is mentioned on page two as an example of

the television medium's use of individuals as experts when in reality these individuals are not really the experts the medium attempts to suggest. This is support of Agnew's contentions. However, in the third paragraph of page two Agnew swings into personal invective against Mr. Harriman. In the following fourth paragraph of page two Agnew again returns to his established main concerns, that of the medium's misuse of its power. In the last paragraph of page two Agnew mentions Winston Churchill as an example of a leader whose remarks were not disparaged by commentators. Utilization of a great name such as Churchill's can only help aid in the reception of a speech, yet it is fragmented in the way Agnew uses it. The television medium, Agnew's main point of consideration, was not an item of concern during the second world war days. Television was not at that time a factor for the contentions Agnew is discussing in this speech. On page three, sixth paragraph, we find Agnew complementing the networks for the good that they have done. This inserted fragmentation may lend the impression of an unbiased mind to the audience, but it certainly doesn't fit the tone of Agnew's previous invectives leveled against the television medium's commentaries. On page four Agnew jumps from one thought to another for four consecutive paragraphs. The first paragraph, page four, Agnew speaks of the substantive power of the medium to raise people of doubtful character into national prominence. In the second paragraph he introduces how subtle gestures of merely a word or voice inflection can influence millions of people. The third paragraph refers to the power of the medium once again and the fourth paragraph returns us to the matter of the commentator's ethos. While each of these four

thoughts fall under the general theme of the speech as established by Agnew, they are fragmented out of logical order of reference. Within the fifth paragraph of the fifth page, after having previously developed the idea that television commentators do not represent the views of Americans, we suddenly find a conclusive statement made. Agnew stated that the networks should be made more responsive to the American views. We might logically expect this to fall at the end of a speech but we find Agnew in effect ending the first half of the speech at this point. He does fragment the speech into two basic parts. In paragraph seven of page five Agnew once again offers to the content the fact that he is merely raising questions. He leaves this thought fragmented and goes on in page six to again return to the matter of the television medium's power and how it is used by the by the medium's commentators. Agnew suddenly re-introduces the argument about commentators' ethos as it reflects on their presentation and interpretation of the news. His next paragraph mentions violent American's which receive news coverage because of the sensationalism it evokes. After this fragmented content usage, Agnew on page nine sums up his major concerns and concludes. But still he does not do so without introducing a piece of new material. He mentions that the power held by the television medium would never be allowed in the hands of an elected government. Agnew's content in this speech was fragmented. Perhaps this aided the reception of the speech by the mass audience as McLuhan suggests fragmentation will.

Second consideration: Material presented over television should contain catchy phrases and cliches.

Agnew does not make use of the easily remembered phrase or cliché with a singly possible exception. On page seven, paragraph eight, he mentions, "Bad news drives out good news". However, the often repeated suggestion that the commentators are not good men may well serve in place of purely stated phrases or clichés. Agnew throughout his speech is concerned with the overriding fact that the news commentaries are not in a position to make the evaluations that they do. With this topic supported time and time again by the use of artistic and non-artistic proofs the effect becomes one of remembering easily the topic. The audience may find itself remembering in the time to come only the thought that commentators are not 'good' men when it comes to their motives in news evaluation. But this is only hinted at and the audience is allowed to form its own easily remembered phrase. It is just this type of conclusion that will result from successful use of catchy phrases and clichés according to Marshall McLuhan.

Third consideration: Rhetorical endeavors should be presented through the use of common language.

This consideration should be examined in terms of the speech as a whole. Although some words are used that may be termed difficult for the average American to understand, by and large the language Agnew utilized was of a simple nature. In reading Agnew's speech one receives the impression that the repeated use of example would clarify the intent of the speech for a minimally literate mind. Agnew's speech presents an example of common language which may have facilitated the comprehension of its content.

Fourth consideration: Solutions should be posed fragmentarily.

When Agnew stated, "Tonight, I have raised questions. I have made no attempt to suggest answers," on page nine he was referring to both the men in the television medium and the television medium and the people of America. Any solutions that were to be made were to be arrived at by the listening audience who would engage in "filling-in" any final solutions at which they may arrive. Agnew presented solutions in so fragmentary a manner that if, indeed actual solutions did exist in his content, they existed through suggestion only. When Agnew states on page two, "Every American has a right to disagree with the President of the United States, and to express publicly that disagreement," Agnew may also have been conveying the thought that it is acceptable to speak out on any major issues that may confront the American people. And if the television medium's treatment of the news is a major issue, then it is alright to speak out concerning it. In the fifth page, fifth paragraph, Agnew suggests that it is time for the networks to be made more responsive to the views of the nation and more responsible to the people. Agnew does not mention how this is to be done; he leaves it up to the listeners. However, in closing remarks he does mention that the American people are challenged to press for responsible news presentations. He goes on to say, "The people can let the networks know that they want their news straight and objective. The people can register their complaints or biases through the mail to the networks and by phone calls to local stations. Each of these solutions is preceded by the word "can". These solutions are not recommended but only suggested. And they are suggested fragmentarily

at best. The mass audience is expected to "fill-in" the solutions they think best and then hopefully implement them. Agnew's speech does effectively encompass the fragmentary solution recommendation shown by McLuhan,

Fifth consideration: The use of color broadcasts should be utilized.

Agnew's presentation of this speech was televised in color. Therefore, if we accept the analysis of McLuhan, we might say that the effectiveness of this speech was enhanced; at least, for those who had access to a color television it may have been enhanced. One can speculate as to who it was making the final decision to utilize color transmission; was it the networks or was it Agnew's constituents. If it was Agnew, then we can say he followed one of the dicta of McLuhan.

Sixth consideration: The clear establishment of goals should be suppressed.

As a person studies the text of Agnew's speech he might well wonder just what the goals were. Obviously to emphasize the alleged biased treatment of the news by the news commentators probably was one goal Agnew set out to achieve. But it might also be that he wished to show the desirability of curtailing the critical assessment of the actions and policies of the government. He might also have wanted to create a storm of contention, thus utilizing just that facet of the medium which Agnew criticizes. The capacity of the medium to bring a person into immediate, national prominence.

Taking these six McLuhan observations about the television medium, we can observe for ourselves the ways in which the speech of Spiro Agnew utilized at least in part these rules. Since we have not before us a video tape to study in detail the delivery Agnew utilized, we will not examine the remaining three McLuhan observations which he recommended for effective rhetoric on television medium. We can postulate that Agnew may have been unaware of the influence which the dictates of a McLuhan based rhetoric had on him, his message, and his delivery. However, we have seen six of McLuhan's observed techniques utilized in this particular speech. The conclusion may be drawn then, that the medium of television may have already affected the rhetoric used by rhetors who expect to use the medium of television for their speaking.

A CONSIDERATION OF THE TELEVISION RHETORIC
ON THE BASIS OF MARSHALL McLuhan

by

MICHAEL J. BOROVICKA

B. S., University of New York at Potsdam, 1963

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

1970

Rhetoric was first compiled as an art in the West by the Ancient Greeks. The Romans wrote extensively on the study of rhetoric and incorporated it into their training of scholars as had the Greeks. It is basically the Greek and the Roman teachings that have influenced the teaching of rhetoric to the present day.

Rhetoric today incorporates many different aspects of oratory. Notably, rhetoric over our present mediums of communication negates the face-to-face confrontation with which the ancient rhetoricians were concerned. Marshall McLuhan, while not specifically concerned with rhetoric, has applied his theories of the effects of media upon man to rhetorical matters. McLuhan is specifically concerned with the medium of television because he observes this medium to be the most influential. This study is concerned with the rhetoric on television as observed by McLuhan. In examining McLuhan's view of television rhetoric, it was necessary to examine the influence of technology and media upon society today. Having observed a perspective of McLuhan and his application to rhetoric over television, this study compares and contrasts the treatment of rhetorical matters by the ancients to the treatment of rhetorical matters by McLuhan.

The purpose of this study is to examine the possibility that, upon McLuhan's observations, rhetoric may have been changed in style and delivery by the medium of television. McLuhan's observations were utilized since he has probed into the possible effects of the television medium on man.

After examining the modern television rhetoric as compared and contrasted to ancient rhetoric in the areas of style and delivery, this study concludes that television may have some influence on rhetoricians. This influence revolves around the fact that the television audience is composed of many divisions of society which negates specific audience analysis. Also that the nature of television itself may demand rhetorical changes to better fit the presentation to the medium. However, there are similarities between the ancient and the modern television approach to style and delivery in rhetoric.