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ABSTRACT

This work is a rhetorical analysis of the speakers, audiences, occasions, and speeches which made the Louisiana Anti-Lottery Movement successful in spite of overwhelming opposition from a wealthy and politically strong gambling monopoly known as the Louisiana State Lottery Company.

Texts of speeches for the study came from an anti-lottery newspaper, the New Orleans New Delta; a pro-lottery newspaper, the New Orleans Daily Picayune; and from the Official Proceedings of the Anti-Lottery Democratic Convention, 1890. Further information came from general reference works, histories, government publications, periodicals, personal correspondence and manuscripts.

From 1869 through 1892 the Louisiana State Lottery Company was the cause of political unrest. With millions of dollars in assets this giant gambling monopoly all but controlled the state economically and politically. Its corrupting influence extended to the legislature and courts. In 1879 an unsuccessful attempt to cancel the Lottery charter left the concern with more power than it originally had. The Lottery charter was to expire January 1, 1894; however, its managers decided to attempt to get a twenty-five year renewal in spite of the fact that the constitution forbade lotteries after 1895. A storm of protest arose from many of the responsible leaders in the state. By mid-1890 the Anti-Lottery League had been formed by a group of lawyers,
politicians, judges, preachers, and merchants. Through the League members, a statewide public speaking campaign was carried on. Many notable Louisianians including Murphy J. Foster, Edward Douglas White, Donelson Caffery and the Rev. Benjamin Morgan Palmer participated as orators for the anti-lottery cause.

In 1891 the anti-lottery crusade merged with the gubernatorial campaign. The central issue was whether the Lottery should be re-chartered. Both sides placed their arguments before the voters. Mass meetings took place with bands, barbecues, and grand balls as added attractions. From the farmlands and from the city streets hundreds, and at times thousands, came to participate in the colorful and lively campaign. They cheered, applauded, and encouraged the orators to speak. Gradually the anti-lottery faction gained strength, mostly from the rural parishes, and victory was in sight.

Debate was at a heated pitch with the anti-lottery advocates claiming that the Lottery (1) dominated the state politically, (2) offered a financially poor contract for a multi-million dollar business, and (3) was an immoral institution. The Lottery backers claimed that the state could not meet its financial obligations without the million and a quarter per year offered by the Company. Each side offered evidence to prove its case, with the anti-lottery group doing the better debating.

In April of 1892 the people of Louisiana went to the polls and gave a winning plurality to the anti-lottery candidate, Murphy J. Foster, and rejected the proposed Lottery charter renewal amendment.
The Anti-Lottery League used the force of the spoken word to defeat a powerful and wealthy foe which had over ninety per cent of the state press supporting its recharter amendment. This study is a tribute to the democratic process of government which allows for discussion, debate, and orderly change, according to the wishes of the majority, exercised through a free ballot.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

The political influence of the lottery was great, and necessarily so, inasmuch as to secure its monopoly it was necessary for it to control every Legislature.

It was this, together with the reassertion of the moral sense of the people, which was shocked by the bad repute to which Louisiana was brought in other parts of the country where lotteries had been abolished and were prohibited, that finally brought the lottery to an end.

A vigorous campaign was started against the renewal of its charter, . . . it is to the credit of the people of Louisiana that, in spite of its immense wealth and its unscrupulous use of it, and its entrenched political position the lottery was finally destroyed.¹

For approximately twenty-five years, from 1866 through 1892, the Louisiana State Lottery Company was a source of discord in both Louisiana and the country. Brought into existence while Louisiana was struggling to rid itself of Federal occupation after the Civil War, this gambling institution entrenched itself so deeply into the political, economic, and social life of the state that both federal intervention and a state "grass roots" campaign were necessary to effect its destruction.

Louisiana was in a state of climactic turmoil from 1890-1892 over the lottery issue. Both the Democratic and Republican parties were split into anti-lottery and pro-lottery segments. The citizenry were divided over the issue, while violence between the opposing factions was anticipated.

Although national sentiment was known to be against the Louisiana Lottery Company, the position of the majority of the people of Louisiana was in doubt. Two opposing forces clashed in a battle to win the votes of the citizens who, alone, had the power of life or death over the Lottery. The Anti-Lottery League became the major opponent of the Louisiana Lottery Company. Since the pro-lottery faction had the support of the state press, the Anti-Lottery League members were forced to rely heavily upon a canvassing of the state by public speakers to win popular support. Gilbert L. Dupre, prominent state legislator and pro-lottery advocate, described the movement in the following manner:

The churches and the preachers waxed eloquent for its destruction. The politicians out of a job, big, little and indifferent, got into the game. It became the burning question of the day. The fight, begun in 1890, terminated in 1892. The state was turned upside down with this upheaval. Men went up or down with it in every community.2

In an effort to counteract the influence of the Anti-Lottery League, the Lottery Company poured thousands of dollars into its own campaign. "Politicians, public speakers, editorial and special writers were handsomely subsidized to disseminate propaganda and influence public opinion in its favor."3

---


The present study is a historical-rhetorical approach to the Anti-Lottery Movement of 1890-1892. It applies rhetorical criticism to the oratory of a significant phase of Louisiana history.

As major objectives, this study attempts to answer five questions:

1. Who were the leading speakers of the movement?
2. What were the characteristics of the audiences?
3. Under what conditions did the speaking take place?
4. What issues, arguments and proofs were used by the orators?
5. What effect did public speaking have within the movement?

These questions are of importance to the speech critic because all speaking takes place within a social environment consisting of a speaker, an audience, an occasion, and a given speech. Thonssen and Baird state that:

Speeches occur in social settings. Consequently, their interpretation and criticism must stem from a knowledge of the forces and conditions operative in the social situation at the particular time. In the broadest sense, therefore, the constituents of the rhetorical judgment are without limit as to number and scope; everything that impinges upon the environment plays a part in shaping a speech, and therefore in determining the criticism of it.¹

Justification of this study in the area of speech rests upon the fact that historians have established the Anti-Lottery Movement as an important phase of Louisiana history in which the powers of oral persuasion played a significant role. Existing histories are adequate for purposes of recording the story of the Louisiana Lottery Company; however, no study is available which analyzes the

Anti-Lottery Movement from the rhetorical aspects of speakers, audiences, occasions, and speeches. This study aims to fill the present void, especially in the area of speech analysis.

In order to prepare the reader for a better understanding of the study, chapter two presents a historical background of lotteries in Louisiana from the first approved lottery in 1805 to the termination of legal lotteries in 1893.

While the second chapter gives a broad coverage of the historical aspects of lotteries in Louisiana, the third chapter covers, specifically, the speaking events which took place during the movement. Detailed information is given about legislative sessions, the Anti-Lottery Convention, Congressional Anti-Lottery action, and anti- and pro-lottery mass meetings.

Fourteen speakers of the movement are studied in the fourth chapter. Major attention is directed toward four of the leading anti-lottery orators. The speech education, personality and character, speech delivery, and reputation as an orator of each is considered. The remaining speakers are given less attention.

Several characteristics of the audiences and occasions of the Anti-Lottery Movement are analyzed in chapter five. Coverage of audience size, composition, and reaction is coupled with four aspects of speech occasion: (1) preliminary arrangements; (2) events giving rise to the meetings; (3) setting; and (4) conditions and events affecting audience-occasion.

In chapter six, the issues, arguments, and proofs used by the anti-lottery advocates are analyzed. Each argument is stated
and then cast into syllogistic form. An effort is made to present representative samplings of the logical and pathetic proofs developed by the anti-lotteryites. Phases of the pro-lottery stand are summarized at intervals to indicate the lines of argument of the opposition.

In the concluding section of the study, answers are given to the previously listed five questions which deal with speakers, audiences, occasions, arguments and proofs, and effectiveness.

Materials used in this dissertation came from histories, biographies, general reference works, academic and governmental journals, theses and dissertations, pamphlets, magazines, newspapers, and correspondence. The analysis of the anti-lottery speeches was based upon twenty-five complete speeches by sixteen orators published in newspapers, biographies, and pamphlets. From the New Orleans Daily Picayune twenty-one speech summaries by reporters were used as a basis for determining the pro-lottery case. In general, the lottery press did not print verbatim texts of the pro-lottery speeches. For this reason, no complete analysis, as that accorded the anti-lottery speeches, was possible.

Textual authenticity is a major factor in a study which attempts to analyze arguments contained in a collection of speeches. All of the anti-lottery speeches used in the present work were printed by the partisan anti-lottery press. This eliminates the possibility of deliberate misquoting, but does not guarantee the accuracy of reporting. It is quite possible that many of the addresses were edited before being printed. However, at least one
speech contained a rather obvious factual error which might have been corrected if editing were practiced. Many of the orations were given at night and appeared in newspapers the following day. This would allow very little time for extensive editing or rewriting. Ungrammatical terms such as the word "ain't" appear in several speeches. This indicates that if editing were used it was rather limited. Further evidence which tends to prove that the addresses were accurately reported exists in the fact that impromptu introductory remarks were not deleted from the texts. Audience reaction, such as "applause," "cheering," and other verbal happenings were presented. Because of the grammatical and factual errors in the speeches, the limited time between the speaking events and the reporting of the speeches, and the unrelated impromptu introductory remarks which were contained in the texts, it is highly probable that the speeches analyzed were, to a large degree, faithful to the utterances of the orators.
CHAPTER II

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF LOTTERIES

IN LOUISIANA

I. Origin and Growth of the Lottery

In order to understand thoroughly and appreciate the significance of the Anti-Lottery Movement it is necessary to narrate the historical events leading to the appearance and development of lotteries in Louisiana. This account begins with the earliest recorded lottery in the state and terminates with the last legal lottery to be tolerated by the people of Louisiana. Because of the scope of the subject, only the more significant events which are necessary for an understanding of the present study are presented.

In 1805, while Louisiana was still a territory, the territorial council of Orleans authorized the first lottery to be held in the state for the institution of a university. On March 6, 1810, the Louisiana Territorial Legislature passed an act incorporating a lottery. Its purpose was to raise $10,000 for the construction of the first Protestant church, Christ Church (Episcopal), in New Orleans. Four years later a lottery was

---

approved by the state legislature to raise funds necessary to improve navigation in Bayou Boeuf. The State Medical Society was authorized in 1819 to acquire $10,000 by means of a lottery for the purchase of instruments and a library. Again, permission to hold a lottery was granted the First Presbyterian Church of New Orleans in 1822 to pay a $30,000 debt. Lottery funds also paid for the construction of a New Orleans Masonic hall built in 1827. Many more were approved by the Louisiana General Assembly. During the early part of the nineteenth century, lotteries were considered morally acceptable by most persons, as is evidenced by their use to support religious, educational, and state needs. Catholics and Protestants, educators and statesmen did not hesitate to spin the wheel of fortune whenever their needs demanded it.

Louisiana was not alone in favoring the use of lotteries to accumulate funds for benvolent, religious, and educational purposes. They were to be found in all parts of the United States during the early days of the republic; and in the latter half of the eighteenth century, the southern states of Alabama, Georgia, and Kentucky also were domiciles of lottery concerns.

---

2John S. Kendall, History of New Orleans (Chicago: Lewis Publishing Co., 1922), II, 482.


4Kendall, op. cit., II, 484.
Once the focus of the greatest political struggle in the history of Louisiana, the old lottery wheel is now a museum piece. When the lottery was the pride of Louisiana, the company attempted to operate in Houston, and moved the wheel to that place. It failed. The wheel was bought back, and is now in the Louisiana State Museum. About thirty thousand in face value of Governor Nicholls' lottery took part in the wheel's adventure in 1854.

Figure 1
From 1833 to 1861 various acts of the Louisiana General Assembly made lotteries a criminal offense. However, the Constitution of 1861 returned to the legislature the power to license the selling of lottery tickets.\(^5\)

While lotteries were held in Louisiana to 1833 to aid various worthwhile organizations to maintain and perpetuate themselves, after 1866 they became "big business." At that time a New York gambling syndicate composed of John A. Morris, Ben Wood, C. H. Murray and others devised a scheme to obtain control of the lottery business in Louisiana. The concern, know as C. H. Murray and Company, was represented in New Orleans by Charles T. Howard. Howard was instructed to use all available resources to persuade the Louisiana legislators to charter the Louisiana State Lottery Company for a period of twenty-five years.

On August 17, 1868, over the protests of a small group of its members, the legislature incorporated the Louisiana State Lottery Company. One historian summarized the event in the following derogatory manner:

Although the legislature cloaked its action with a specious preamble reciting that many millions were lost to the state by "the sale of Havana, Kentucky, Madrid, and other lottery tickets, policies, combinations, and devices;" the act was nothing more nor less than a barefaced charter that granted to this group the rights to operate a lottery monopoly in the state for

---

twenty-five years. That the claim to philanthropy was ridiculous is proven by the fact that although the Lottery Company was incorporated for one million dollars, the bill provided that it should pay only the inadequate sum of $10,000 a year to the Charity Hospital in lieu of all taxes.

C. T. Howard's success in acquiring a charter must be attributed to the prevailing conditions in Louisiana after the Civil War. As a result of the war and military reconstruction by the North, the legislature was composed in 1868 of a carpetbag Republican majority in both houses, with a fifty per cent distribution of whites and Negroes.

Many of these men were adventurers who sought to increase their wealth. Howard took advantage of the situation and, through bribery, secured a charter. Following the granting of a charter, fifty-thousand dollars was paid during the first year of the organization of the Company, "... to redeem promises made for votes in favor of the bill incorporating the Company, and other similar services."

Nine days after acquiring the lottery charter the incorporators signed away their valuable monopoly to the directors of C. H. Murray and Company of New York. Charles T. Howard gained a quarter interest in the trust for his faithful work on behalf

---


7 Ibid., P. 123.

8 C. C. Buel, "The Degradation of a State; or, the Charitable Career of the Louisiana Lottery," Century Magazine, XLIII (1891-92), 623.
of the New York concern. He also retained the presidency of the Louisiana State Lottery Company until 1876. Thus, the "fiction of the Louisiana Lottery Company was always kept up, and a fiction it was because the deed of trust, or deal . . . left the Company neither obligations, nor privileges except the right to name a commissioner to superintend the drawings and to see that the prizes were distributed." 9

The sponsors of the Lottery Company soon realized that they must become politically strong or another legislature might revoke their charter. "From this point on the history of the Louisiana Lottery Company is inextricably bound up in Louisiana politics. The Company must dominate or die." 10

Besides suffering normal growing pains, the Company had to fight numerous court battles to maintain its monopoly against other lottery companies in 1869, 1871, and in 1874. Cases in 1871 and 1886 were fought against the attempts of the City of New Orleans to acquire funds from lottery licenses. Thwarting enemies became a constant pastime for the attorneys of the Lottery. 11

Because the public questioned the honesty of the Company, Charles T. Howard had trouble acquiring the handsome dividends which a lottery was expected to yield. However, when Dr. Maximilian A. 

Dauphin, an Austrian physician, succeeded Howard as president in 1876, the Company became a gold mine for its owners. Dauphin arranged to have some persons of "unimpeachable integrity" supervise the drawings, thus proving to the public that the drawings were conducted fairly. Generals P. G. T. Beauregard and Jubal A. Early were the two gentlemen who accepted the doubtful honor of acting as "fronts" for the gambling managers. Their jobs paid extremely well and consisted of approximately two days work per month.12

The two distinguished old gentlemen were mere window dressings. They knew no more about the management of the business than a one-eyed cat; but, as the Lottery people decided it would be wise to have two popular ex-Confederate generals preside over the drawings to cast an aura of respectability, it was willing to pay them munificent salaries variously estimated at from $12,000 to $30,000 annually for their short appearances on the stage.

One of them, General Jubal Early, with florid face and penetrating blue eyes looking out under bushy eyebrows, was badly stooped, though over six feet tall. Dressed neatly in a suit of Confederate gray cloth, his patriarchal white beard made him look like a Mormon elder, but any appearance of saintliness was belied by his reputation as a daring soldier and as the most decorticating curser in the Confederate Army.

The other, General Pierre Gustave Toutant Beauregard, a Creole of the Creoles, was as typically Latin as Early was Anglo-Saxon. His slight figure clothed in a long frock, had a soldierly erectness, and he carried himself with a certain conscious dignity and cosmopolitan elegance, while his handsome, impassive face was crowned by snow-white, closely-cropped hair. With his white mustache and neat imperial, he would not have looked out of character as one of Napoleon's marshals.13

---

12White, op. cit., p. 20.

13Tinker, op. cit., p. 293.
In 1877 carpetbag rule in Louisiana ended with the withdrawal of Federal forces from the state. Difficulties arose when two men claimed the governorship: Nicholls, the Conservative Democrat; and Packard, the Republican. Since many of the Packard legislators were Negroes, the Conservatives hoped to buy them out. Immediately, the Louisiana Lottery Company offered the money needed for this purpose in exchange for a twenty-five year charter placed in the constitution, which was to be amended as soon as the Democrats took over. "It was a hard bargain, but, as the White Democrats were impoverished and could do no better, they accepted the Lottery's offer."

News of the deal between the Louisiana Lottery Company and the Democrats immediately reached the people. Cries arose for the repeal of the Company's charter, and the legislature of 1879 was elected partially upon this issue. In January of 1879 the members of this body met and proceeded to rescind the Lottery's charter. On March 27, 1879, Governor Nicholls signed the bill which repealed all previous acts favorable to lotteries. Naturally, the Company felt that it had been betrayed.

By this time the Lottery had acquired influence which extended to the courts. Upon the request of the Louisiana Lottery Company, United States Judge Edward Coke Billings of the circuit court issued an injunction against enforcement of the legislative measure...

---

14 White, op. cit., p. 34.
15 Alwes, op. cit., p. 35.
in July of 1879. With this breather, the Company prepared to make itself secure by attempting to get its charter into the new state constitution to be written later in the year. 16

Again the strategy of the Lottery worked, for the Company succeeded in getting its charter recognized in the new state constitution. This was accomplished after an intensive campaign in which the Company stressed the enormity of the state debt and used a formidable lobby of attorneys at the constitutional convention.

The agreement, by which the Company was to operate until the expiration of its charter on January 1, 1894, was considered a compromise, since the Lottery had to give up its "monopoly clause." This limitation was easily overcome, however, for the Lottery blocked the attempts of all rivals to incorporate by using financial persuasion or the Louisiana legislators. 17

After 1879 Lottery stock gained considerably in value. Shares of a par value of $100 rose from $35 in 1870 to $1200 in 1890. This made the market value of the Company's stock greater than the whole banking capital of the state. In its best years the Lottery became a $28,000,000 concern. From all over the country mail was delivered to the Company. An express wagon was required to carry the mail to and from the post office. 18

16 Ibid., p. 35; White, op. cit., p. 37; Tinker, op. cit., p. 302.
17 Kendall, op. cit., pp. 486-487.
Local receipts from the daily drawings were ample enough to pay all the costs of the Lottery, leaving the returns from the national business clear profit, except for the payment of prizes. The highest payment as a prize went to a New Orleans barber who won $300,000 for a ticket costing $20. He was paid without delay, and the Company immediately advertised the good fortune of one of its customers.\textsuperscript{19}

Between 1880 and 1890 the Louisiana Lottery Company enjoyed years of great prosperity. Its business extended to all parts of the Union, with offices in the major cities. Legislators did the will of the Company, while the press was kept silent through enormous sums paid by the Lottery for advertisements. All attempts to curtail its operations or to establish rivals were successfully fought. So-called "policy" tickets could be bought daily on nearly every street in New Orleans for as little as twenty-five cents. Before long the city was policy mad. Agents swarmed over the state tempting the poor and the ignorant to gamble away their meager earnings.\textsuperscript{20}

During this stage of the Company's development, its influence reached almost every facet of life in New Orleans. No important undertaking could be attempted without the aid of one of the men connected with the Lottery. "It entrenched itself in local business

\textsuperscript{19}Kendall, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 487.

\textsuperscript{20}H. E. Chambers, \textit{The South in the Building of the Nation} (Richmond: Southern Historical Publication Society, 1909), III, 173; White, \textit{op. cit.}, Pp. 41-43; Alwes, \textit{op. cit.}, Pp. 41-42.
life, in politics, and to some extent in society. The subtle propaganda was that the owners were content with the provision of the constitution abolishing lotteries after January 1, 1895."21

Another phase of the Lottery's campaign to continue its operations was to court popular favor. It achieved this end in part by being generous in its expenditures for public enterprises. In 1872 Charles T. Howard converted the Metairie Race Course into the beautiful Metairie Cemetery. This was done after the Metairie club refused Howard membership. Morris' sister, Miss Annie T. Howard, had the Howard Memorial Library erected to the memory of her father in 1888. His brother, Frank T. Howard, had the Confederate Memorial Building erected next to the Howard Library at a cost of approximately $40,000. Through 1890 improvements and donations were continued by Dauphin upon the request of various leaders on the local level.22

II. Out-of-State Opposition to the Lottery

A national flavor was added to the history of the Louisiana Lottery Company by the efforts of Colonel A. K. McClure, the editor of the Philadelphia Times, to make lotteries unpopular. In 1883 McClure, aided by several of the best journals in the state, succeeded in getting the Pennsylvania legislature to pass a bill making it a penal offense for publishers, as well as advertisers,

21White, op. cit., p. 55.

to give publicity to lotteries. McClure's curiosity had been aroused when the Louisiana Lottery Company offered to pay extremely high prices in order to have its advertisements placed in the Times. After finding that $50,000 a year was spent to advertise a business which was illegal in Pennsylvania, McClure began a campaign which culminated in the passage of the bill that made it illegal to advertise lotteries in Pennsylvania.23

Since Pennsylvania was the second richest state in the Union, the Lottery Company fought back. M. A. Dauphin filed suit against the Philadelphia Times for libelling the Company. This suit was immediately thrown out because lotteries, as illegal organizations in Pennsylvania, could claim no protection in the courts.

M. A. Dauphin then persuaded the pro-lottery editor of the Times-Democrat in New Orleans to invite McClure to the New Orleans Cotton Centennial Exposition of 1885. McClure accepted the invitation, but when he arrived the United States Marshall served him with a writ. Dauphin sought to collect $100,000 damages from McClure for libelling the Lottery.24

If the Lottery managers thought that McClure would accept his plight without fighting back, they were sadly mistaken. After conferring with Governor Nicholls, who was extremely pessimistic about the situation, McClure managed to out-maneuver his opponents with a bit of legal strategy. With the help of a local attorney,

J. McConnell, and a seventy-six page plea prepared by his friends in Philadelphia, he got the Company to withdraw all suits pending and to pay costs totaling $8,500. Through influential friends in Congress, McClure had received assurance that Justice Wood, of the United States Supreme Court, would hear the case in his district. This development sent the Lottery attorneys retreating, for they knew the Company could not justify its existence at the national level.

The whole McClure incident is of great importance in the history of the Lottery Company in Louisiana. It was through the efforts of several representatives from Pennsylvania, friends of McClure, that the anti-lottery fight reached the halls of Congress where damaging legislation eventually made it illegal for lottery materials to be transported through the mails. Representative Bingham and Senators Edmunos and Hawley of Pennsylvania led the fight to exclude the Lottery from using the United States mails. Their efforts prepared the way for the decisive stand which Congress took against lotteries in 1890.

III. Formation of Anti- and Pro-Lottery Leagues

One of the most significant events in the Anti-Lottery Movement was the formation of the Anti-Lottery League in New Orleans. In the office of Charles Parlange, the first League meeting was

---

25 Alwes, op. cit., p. 49.
26 White, op. cit., pp. 53-54.
held on February 26, 1890. Its purpose was "to combat the renewal of the charter of the Louisiana Lottery Company and to oppose the granting of charters to any other lottery companies."27

Prompted into being by the news that John A. Morris would seek an extension of the Lottery Company's charter, the Anti-Lottery League soon extended itself to every parish and ward in the state. It became the major force acting against the lottery concern in Louisiana. Part of the present study will center around speakers of the Anti-Lottery League, who spoke at public meetings throughout the state and in the chambers of the General Assembly. Their speeches aroused the voters of Louisiana to action against the Lottery.

To list all the members of the Anti-Lottery League would be an almost impossible task; however, several of the leaders may be noted at this point. Among them were: Colonel W. G. Vincent, president; Judge Edward Douglas White; Colonel J. Davidson Hill; Judge Frank McGloin; Judge F. A. Monroe; Colonel C. Harrison Parker; and Charles Parlange. Murphy J. Foster (Governor 1892-1899) was selected the standard bearer for the group, since he had led the anti-lottery elements in the State Senate in 1890. Furthermore, Foster had never been accused of accepting money from the Lottery Company as had many other legislators.

The Anti-Lottery League and the Women's Anti-Lottery League, formed in 1891 to aid the men's group, continued an active speaking

27Alwes, op. cit., p. 92.
campaign. They were a determined and unyielding group who brought the issues directly to the people.

with so much opposition arising and a great financial trans-
action at stake, Robert S. Jay, a representative of the Lottery, organized the "Progressive League" on July 29, 1890. By October of the same year, the Lottery League had branches in seventeen city wards of New Orleans, and had organized, or was ready to organize, in fifty-seven parishes in the state.28

Statewide public speaking at mass meetings, newspaper articles, and pamphlets became the chief campaigning devices used by both the Anti- and Pro-Lottery Leagues.

IV. The Struggle Begins

For ten years, from 1880 to 1890, the Lottery leaders prepared for the day when they would be forced to attempt to perpetuate the existence of their prosperous business beyond the date of January 1, 1894, the terminating point for their twenty-five year charter. They put from five to thirteen million dollars a year in reserve so that they would be ready when the time came.29

In 1890 the Lottery Company was prepared to make its last and greatest bid for continued existence. Financially and politically strong, it braced itself for an all out struggle to down its opposition.

28Alwes, op. cit., p. 100

On April 17, 1890, John A. Morris announced his intention to apply for a twenty-five year extension of the Lottery franchise. The ensuing political struggle which took place between the Lottery and anti-lottery forces is considered among the greatest controversies ever to confront the people of Louisiana.
CHAPTER III

THE ANTI-LOTTERY MOVEMENT

I. Prelude to the Popular Movement

I desire to place upon the journal of the House my objections to House bill no. 66, entitled an act to increase the revenues of the State, and to authorize the incorporation and establishment of the Louisiana State Lottery Company, and to repeal certain acts now in force.

The bill legalizes and sanctions what I consider a great wrong, fosters immorality and vice, and encourages crime; lotteries never being productive of any good, but always conductive of evil, robbing the poor by their seductive charms and infatuations.

This bill creates a monstrous monopoly without any safeguard or assurance that it will not be abused immeasurably. If a lottery is to be established by law there should be a board of control to examine and supervise the conduct of the same. By the provisions of this bill a wholesale robbery can be committed without restriction.

The House passed the bill when there was no quorum present in the bar of the House, undertaking themselves to adjudge what a quorum consisted of, when the constitution expressly states that a majority of the members of the House shall be necessary for a quorum; and the same constitution says that the House of Representatives shall be composed of 101 members.1

Thus did the Speaker of the House, C. W. Lowell, voice his prophetic words of opposition to the Louisiana State Lottery Company on August 11, 1868, when he signed the lottery bill under protest.

---

1Louisiana Journal of the House of Representatives (1869) Pp. 113-114.
Eleven years later, similar words were spoken in the anti-lottery legislature of 1879 when, on March 27, an act which terminated the charter of the Louisiana Lottery was passed. However, as previously pointed out, this act was an abortive effort since the United States Circuit Judge, E. C. Billings, issued an injunction restraining any action toward enforcement of the legislative act.

Months later in the 1879 Constitutional Convention, the lottery article was incorporated into the new state constitution. Many misconceptions shrouded its acceptance by that body. State Senator Gustave A. Breaux, of New Orleans, explained his vote for the article in this manner:

I vote for article 20 because: 1. There is a lottery in existence whose rights cannot be divested. 2. That it is proper that the revenues to be derived under the charter of the existing company should not be withheld from the State so long as the institution cannot be suppressed. 3. That the selling of lottery tickets in New Orleans cannot be suppressed, as is well known from the experience had under the recent stringent laws in favor of a monopoly for the suppression of their sale, attempted to be enforced under the stimulus of private interests, armed with extraordinary powers. 4. That by the abolishment of the monopoly feature in favor of the existing company, to which it assents, further revenue may be derived out of a system from which there is no present escape, and besides, gives the opportunity of bringing the entire matter under proper police regulation. 2

The hopelessness of suppressing the Lottery was the main argument put forth for the passage of the article. Men were

---

erroneously led to believe that the action of the circuit judge meant federal support for the Lottery charter. U. S. Representative Edward W. Robertson of Louisiana stated in 1883:

A grave responsibility rests upon the officers of the State government for not filing an answer and carrying the case up to the Supreme Court of the United States if unsuccessful in the lower court. By their dereliction of duty the lottery company was enabled to deceive the constitutional convention of 1879 into the belief that this mere interlocutory order was an acknowledgment by the United States court that their charter was a binding contract between the states and the corporation. To allow the case to rest . . . was virtually to abandon all defense on the part of the State, and leads but to one conclusion in my mind.  

With the ratification of the constitution of 1879, the Lottery was firmly entrenched in Louisiana. Had the Company chosen to honor the constitution, which put a terminating deadline of January 1, 1895, for all lotteries in the state, there would have been no need for the Anti-Lottery Movement. During the late 1880's, Lottery opposition was sparked by information in New Orleans that John A. Morris would apply to the legislature in 1890 for a twenty-five year extension of the Lottery charter. It is at this point in the history of the Louisiana State Lottery Company that the present study directs its emphasis.

---


II. Rev. B. Carradine: Forerunner of the Movement

On February 24, 1889, at the Carondelet Street Methodist Church, the Rev. Beverly Carradine delivered a sermon attacking the Louisiana State Lottery Company on fifteen counts and offered seven specific steps to eliminate its presence in Louisiana. Rev. Carradine's ideas probably were followed by the organizers of the Anti-Lottery League as a blueprint leading to the destruction of the Lottery. Carradine's presence at the early organizational meetings of the Anti-Lottery League further supports the possibility that his plan of 1889 was the one finally adopted in 1890. His sevenfold plan was:

1. Get the facts concerning the charges of fraudulency and illegality and present them to the courts in order to have the Lottery restrained from holding further drawings.

2. Awaken public sentiment against the Lottery through the spoken and written word.

3. Socially ostracize those who continue to defend and participate in the Lottery.

4. Oppose any convening of a constitutional convention until after the charter of the Lottery has expired, lest we find ourselves fastened to the Lottery for twenty-five additional years.

5. Start an anti-lottery newspaper in New Orleans since no such organ now exists.

6. Form an anti-lottery association in New Orleans with friends and correspondents in every town in Louisiana.

7. Pray to God for the power to defeat the Lottery.

---

5Alwes, op. cit., p. 92.

6Carradine, Louisiana State Lottery Examined and Exposed, Pp. 54-59.
Nearly one year later and twelve days before the first meeting of the Anti-Lottery League occurred, Reverend Carradine gave a "Second Address" on this topic to his congregation on February 16, 1890. He continued his strong logical arguments against the Lottery Company by listing and supporting twelve "facts" about the Louisiana Lottery. His closing comments were surprisingly prophetic:

I see a grave, whose swelling mound is made up of innumerable ballots, with the brief but expressive word No! written therein. I approach the marble slab, and read as follows: Here lies the Louisiana State Lottery Company born in sin, 1868. Conceived: In iniquity, at the same time. Died: According to appointment, December 31, 1893, . . . .

Reverend Carradine prepared the way for the Anti-Lottery Movement. His words in 1889 and 1890 helped to arouse the sentiment which led to the great statewide opposition to the Lottery. With the establishment of the League in 1890, Carradine apparently returned to his church, for there is nothing in the newspapers about his further participation in the movement. However, his name appeared as a member of the Anti-Lottery League in 1892.

III. Early Public Meetings of the League

After two organizational meetings in February and March of 1890, the Anti-Lottery League emerged as a new political and

---


8New Orleans New Delta, May 12, 1892.
moral force in the state. From a meager beginning of twelve members the League grew to enormous proportions with statewide memberships.

By April 28, 1890, it was strong enough to hold its first public meeting in New Orleans at Grunewald Hall. Approximately one thousand persons heard C. Harrison Parker, Henry C. Miller, James McConnell, and Dr. H. D. Bruns attack the Louisiana State Lottery Company.10

Three noteworthy events occurred on May 12, 1890, to strengthen the movement: first, the legislature convened in Baton Rouge; second, the Anti-Lottery League held its second public meeting;11 finally, an anti-lottery element in New Orleans established the New Orleans New Delta.12

IV. The Lottery Battle in the Legislature of 1890

Governor Francis T. Nicholls' opening message to the General Assembly on May 12, 1890, began the intense struggle between the pro- and anti-lottery forces in the legislature. Approximately one-third of Nicholls' message dealt with the subject of the Louisiana State Lottery and its anticipated attempt to extend

9Alwes, op. cit., p. 92.

10Ibid., p. 93; New Orleans Daily States, April 29, 1890.

11Alwes, op. cit., p. 93; New Orleans Daily States, May 18, 1890.

12White, op. cit., Pp. 63-64.
its charter. Governor Nicholls expressed his opposition to any act which would result in the perpetuation of lotteries within the boundaries of the State of Louisiana. He concluded his message by stating:

As the governor of this state and the head of the present administration, and representing the citizens of the commonwealth who believe that the only legitimate end of the government is the enjoyment of life, liberty and property - all three - I will never consent, so far as I am concerned, that the destinies of this great State shall be placed under the control and dominion of any corporation whatever, and especially that it shall not pass under the control of a gambling institution, and I shall exercise all the influence of my official position at all times to avert and avoid what I would consider such a disgraceful event, and in doing so, I expect and invoke the aid and assistance of all good and true sons of Louisiana, both in and out of this General Assembly, and shall I fail in my efforts to preserve the good name, the welfare, and the prosperity of the State, no part of the responsibility nor the shame shall rest upon me.\(^{13}\)

There was little hope for the anti-lottery faction during the initial readings of the lottery bill in the House. Only during the third and final reading, when a two-thirds vote was required, could the outnumbered "antis" have any effectiveness.

Legislative debate centered around House Bill 214: "An act providing for the submission to the electors of the State for adoption or rejection, an amendment to the Constitution of the

State by inserting therein "An article on levees, schools, charities, pensions, drainage and lotteries." \(^{14}\)

On June 20, 1890, the Newgass proposition, a second lottery offer, was brought up by the "antis," but the pro-lottery faction dropped it without further action even though it offered the state more money than the Morris proposal. When the lottery bill was read for the third time, Bernard Shields, of Orleans, Placid Sigur, of St. Mary, Placid Canonge, of Orleans, and Thomas O'Conner, of Orleans, spoke in favor of the amendment, and H. P. Wells, J. M. Kennedy, and G. W. Bolton spoke against it. \(^{15}\) The final vote was postponed until June 25, 1890. Only after considerable amending attempts and other delaying actions did the bill receive a favorable two-thirds vote of 66 to 29. \(^{16}\)

The New Delta reported this colorful description of the events leading to the passage of the lottery bill in the House:

Twice did the lottery secure the number of votes necessary to pass it, and twice did it seem as if the hand of God was interposed to stop it. Once, just as the bill was about to be put upon its passage in the House, one of the members, a "Convert" from the Anti-Lottery side, was seized with a sudden illness, which threatened his life and compelled his instant withdrawal from the Chamber. His seizure was sudden and without warning, and the Lottery lacked one of the required number. The bill was postponed by a majority vote, that being sufficient to postpone it, . . . Further efforts were made and the required sixty-six

\(^{14}\) *Louisiana House Journal*, 1890, p. 232.

\(^{15}\) *New Orleans Daily Picayune*, June 21, 1890.

\(^{16}\) *New Orleans Daily Picayune*, June 26, 1890.
were again mustered; one more man had been won over. Again the bill was about to be put upon its passage . . . when a member of the body, who had that morning for the first time announced his intention of voting for the bill, suddenly fell, stricken with something akin to paralysis and was born out of the hall, never to enter it again during the session.

Again the bill was postponed. Just as it was again about to come up, Shattuck, the Representative who had charge of it, was taken violently ill, and for several days could not be in his seat. At last the bill was brought to a vote. It passed. Its passage was effected during the most violent storms which ever raged in Baton Rouge. The rain poured in torrents, the winds lashed the walls of the Statehouse in fury, the thunder rolled in deep toned disapprobation of the outrage which was being perpetrated, the lightning played almost constantly around the building and just as the Representative who had it in charge cast his vote the capitol was struck by lightning.\textsuperscript{17}

Events leading to the passage of the lottery bill in the Senate were comparable to those which occurred in the House. On July 1, 1890, the Senate passed the controversial bill which had survived nearly every available parliamentary delaying tactic.

An interesting factor in the final passage was the casting of the exact two-thirds vote needed.\textsuperscript{18} This feat was repeated just seven days later when the lottery bill passed a second time in the House over the governor's veto. That the pro-lottery bill managed to maintain a near two-thirds majority during the preliminary passage of the bill through both houses and an exact two-thirds majority during final passage is due cause for speculation.

\textsuperscript{17}New Orleans \textit{New Delta}, May 12, 1892.

\textsuperscript{18}New Orleans \textit{Daily Picayune}, July 2, 1890; \textit{Louisiana Senate Journal}, 1890, p. 327.
When the Senate refused to reconsider the legislation on the grounds that the bill had previously received a two-thirds majority, the Louisiana Supreme Court adjudged the bill a legal act of the legislature.

Up to this point the forces acting against the Louisiana Lottery were not strong enough to be a serious threat. Therefore, the anti-lottery advocates had to create an equal, or greater, force to stem the almost unlimited financial and political power the Lottery had attained in the state. With this objective in mind the Anti-Lottery League called for a state convention.

V. Anti-Lottery Convention in Baton Rouge

One of the most colorful and significant events held during the Anti-Lottery Movement was the Anti-Lottery Democratic Convention in the House of Representatives at Baton Rouge, Louisiana, August 7 and 8 of 1890. The meeting was called to create a branch of the Anti-Lottery League in every parish and ward of the state. Call for the convention came as a result of a resolution passed in July of 1890 which read as follows:

Whereas, at a meeting of the Anti-Lottery League held at Shreveport, at which meeting there were present delegates from various leagues in North Louisiana, it was resolved that it was expedient and necessary to call a State convention of the Democratic opponents of rechartering, or chartering, a lottery in this state; . . . In pursuance of said resolution a convention of the Democratic opponents to rechartering the Louisiana Lottery, or chartering any other Lottery,
is convoked to meet at the City of Baton Rouge on
Thursday, August 7, 1890. . . W. G. Vincent,
President.19

Delegates from 53 of the 59 parishes assembled at one o'clock
in the House of Representatives. The temporary chairman, T. S.
Fontenot, presided while a committee on permanent organization was
elected. After the credentials committee was appointed, the meet­
ing adjourned until four o'clock in the afternoon.

The evening session opened with a report from the credentials
committee stating that 959 delegates were present. Nominations
for permanent officers were reported along with the appointment
of a committee "... whose duty it shall be to prepare an address
to the people of the United States and to memorialize the President
and Congress to enact such legislation as will forever rid our
State of this monster of all iniquity." A further recommendation
asked for an executive committee to conduct a campaign against the
Lottery on a state-wide basis.20

At this point the Hon. T. F. Bell was presented to the con­
vention as the permanent president of the body. He received a
rousing welcome, after which, he made the first speech to be pre­
sented to the delegates. In the address, Bell asked for orderly
behavior on the part of the "antis" in their campaign. He stated:

Democratic Convention (New Orleans, 1890), p. 3. (Henceforth
referred to as Proceedings of Anti-Lottery Convention.)

If ever a people in this world had a cause that they could trust to calm and temperate argument, we have it now. (Cries of "You are right") We can stand upon that platform and proudly challenge our opponents to meet us in temperate, dispassionate discussion, if they will. Hence let me urge upon my anti-lottery friends, who will take part in the discussions of this question throughout the State from now on, calmness and dispassion. Let us remember that we have a cause that has everything to win by calm and temperate argument.  

One of the guests at the evening session was Captain T. S. Adams, President of the Farmers' Union. His organization had been meeting in the House of Representatives but adjourned in order to let the "antis" have the hall. As an act of courtesy he was seated, by the convention, next to the president. As soon as he was seated cries of "Adams! Adams!" came from the delegates, whereupon Adams rose and addressed the assembly. He reminded the gathering that the State Farmers' Union was the first body to oppose officially the rechartering of the Lottery twelve months previously. Capt. Adams' speech, which was filled with time honored clichés, was interrupted four times by applause and followed by cheers.

In response to Adams' message, a resolution was unanimously adopted crediting the State Farmers' Union as being the "first organized body of Louisiana's brave sons to denounce the scheme..."

---


22 *Alwes, op. cit.*, p. 95.

of its [Lottery] recharter." This resolution also initiated an important political union by calling for full cooperation between the two organizations in defeating the recharter effort.24

President Bell tried to carry on the regular business of the meeting while the delegates clamored for Senator-Elect Edward Douglas White to address them. White, a master in the use of rhetorical principles, urged the delegates to use reason, rather than bitterness and recklessness, against their opponents:

If we approach those who differ with us with the irresistible arguments against the amendment, doing nothing to harden and wound, the natural force of reason and association will bring them all into our ranks, and we will thus not only defeat the lottery amendment, but we will defeat it with a triumphant and united Democratic party, (applause) . . . When we adjourn and go to our homes, I implore all to recollect this, that the struggle is also to defeat it, and, at the same time, create no discord, no dissension, no bitterness within the ranks of the white people of this State.25

After a speech by Murphy J. Foster, Felix J. Dreyfous, of Orleans, concluded the afternoon session with an attack on the Lottery "subsidized" press.

At nine o'clock in the evening the convention reassembled. Its first action was a resolution asking for a boycott of the Times-Democrat, Daily States and the City Item of New Orleans, because they were "Republican papers and the people cannot depend on them."

---

25Ibid., p. 18; New Orleans Daily Picayune, August 8, 1890.
E. H. Farrar then submitted "An Address to the People of the United States," which asked for assistance throughout the country in effecting the proper deterrents to the continued life of the use of the mails by the Lottery desirable. After Farrar read the address, he was asked to speak amidst great applause. His speech revealed his abilities as a corporation lawyer, for he presented the dangers of any multi-million dollar corporation, particularly one like the lottery. He offered valuable advice on the psychology of persuasion when he said:

My experience with human nature teaches me that if you get a man committed against a measure and get him angry you never can get him over on your side, but if you can reach his intelligence with an argument, before he commits himself irrevocably and before he gets angry, why you can very easily win him over to your side. Therefore, I think, gentlemen, that every member of this convention ought to convert himself into an amiable proselyte, that we should start out in this campaign intending to proselyte our friends with amiability, if possible.26

The people of north Louisiana were then represented by the Hon. Frank P. Stubbs, who argued against the pro-lottery assertion that Louisiana was in a desperate financial condition.

Amid applause and cheering, the first day of the convention closed with a speech by John C. Wickliffe, of New Orleans. Wickliffe's address stands as the major effort in the convention to collect, analyze, select and present the anti-lottery sentiments and arguments for the assembled delegates.27


27Ibid., Pp. 39 ff.
On the morning of August 8, 1890, the Anti-Lottery Convention completed its business. Four notable events occurred at this session:

1. The New Orleans New Delta was recognized for its support of the anti-lottery campaign, and was aided financially through subscription.

2. Public discussion was invited between the advocates and opponents of the Lottery.

3. Hon. Charles Parlange spoke in French to the assembly.

4. Hon. J. H. Avery closed the speaking events with a discourse on state finances, institutions, and education.

After a few formalities the convention adjourned sine die.28

VI. Congressional Anti-Lottery Action

Through the efforts of the committee on Federal Relations of the Anti-Lottery League, sentiment favorable to an anti-lottery bill was crystallized in Congress. This committee sent a letter to every judge and district attorney in the United States asking for full cooperation in enforcing laws prohibiting the sale of lottery tickets in their respective areas. A letter was sent to President Harrison, one each to the Cabinet members, and one to every member of Congress. The committee's "Address to the People of the United States" was read in newspapers throughout the nation. Earlier in the year, Charles Parlange, the committee chairman, had drawn up the Congressional Anti-Lottery Postal Bill.29

28Ibid., Pp. 56 ff.

29Alwes, op. cit., p. 113.
Although the action taken by the Anti-Lottery League was a strong contributing factor influencing the final passage of the Anti-Lottery Postal Bill, opposition also had been aroused throughout the country by the national press and politicians and businessmen in various states who saw large sums of money leave their areas each month destined for the Louisiana Lottery Company.

As early as July 28, 1890, Representative John A. Caldwell, of Ohio, submitted the majority report of the committee on lottery legislation, which favored a bill to amend certain sections of the revised statutes relating to lotteries. Known as H. R. Bill No. 11569, the bill would tend to "exclude letters, circulars, and other matter from the mails which relate to lotteries . . . ."  

On August 16, 1890, the members of the House of Representatives were ready for debate and final passage of the Anti-Lottery Postal Bill. One of the first speakers who supported the bill was Representative A. J. Hopkins, of Illinois. He was followed by Representative Walter I. Hayes, of Iowa, who had originally written the minority report against passage. Hayes opposed the bill because of its "dangerous and vicious provisions and as not needed to reach the evil . . . ." While he stated that he would accept an amended form of the bill, Hayes delayed conclusion of the matter by offering


\[\text{Ibid., Part 2.}\]
amendments and using parliamentary tactics. After studying the proceedings in the House debate, there is no doubt in the mind of the writer that Hayes was attempting to kill the bill in its entirety or, at least, render it ineffective. Representative W. H. Crain, of Texas, like Hayes, offered an amendment which would have weakened the original bill; but proponents of the measure refused to compromise.

Gren C. Moore, of New Hampshire, blasted the Lottery with these words: "The National Congress and the National Executive are alone equal to the overthrow of this pestilent corporation, which has become the richest, the most audacious and the most powerful gambling institution that the world has ever known."

From the aspect of favorable reception, the speech of Theodore Wilkenson, of Louisiana, was the most popular of the whole debate. His speaking limit was extended several times by his fellow lawmakers so that he could elaborate upon the history of the Louisiana Lottery Company and the desire of the people of Louisiana to rid themselves of its presence.

The debate ended with speeches by H. Clay Evans, of Tennessee; Robert R. Hitt, of Illinois; Henry C. Hansbrough, of North Dakota; and James Blount, of Georgia. All of these men gave their support

---


33 Ibid., p. 8704.

34 Ibid., p. 8706.

to the bill, which passed after Representative Hayes made one final attempt to halt further action.36

President Harrison signed the Anti-Lottery Bill after the Senate had swiftly ratified the action taken by the House.

It was this congressional act, supported by public opposition to lotteries, which caused the Louisiana Lottery Company to withdraw its "munificent" offer in 1892 for a new charter. Considerable credit must be given to the Anti-Lottery League and the national press for arousing national sentiment against the lottery evil, which, in turn, forced Congressional action.

VII. Anti- and Pro-Lottery Public Meetings: 1891-1892

New Orleans was the focal point for all of the activities of the Anti-Lottery League. Most of the propagandistic influences, which eventually brought about the termination of the lottery goliath, emanated from this city. After the birth pangs of the League had subsided with the emergence of a powerful state organization, New Orleans was the scene of one of the largest meetings held during the campaign.

On June 25, 1891, the Grand Opera House was filled to capacity as Colonel William Preston Johnson, Chancellor of Tulane University, introduced the main speaker of the evening, the Rev. Dr. Benjamin Morgan Palmer. Reverend Palmer's speech has been

36 Ibid., Pp. 8717 ff.
given considerable emphasis by his biographer, Thomas Cary Johnson.\(^{37}\) Other writers refer also to the effectiveness of Palmer's "Phillipic"\(^{38}\) which had an "electrical"\(^{39}\) effect upon the audience.

Among the guests present were the Right Reverend Davis Sessums, Protestant Episcopal Bishop of Louisiana, and James David Coleman, Supreme President of the Catholic Knights of America.\(^{40}\)

This was the first of a number of similar mass meetings which took place in Louisiana. Hardly a section of the state was exempt from the presence of anti-lottery orators. On one occasion two meetings were held simultaneously in a New Orleans ward.\(^{41}\)

As the state campaign gained in momentum, three and four meetings were held at various points on the same evening.\(^{42}\)

Not to be outdone by its anti-lottery rival, the pro-lottery element, masquerading for a while under the title of the Progressive League, also campaigned vigorously. Their "barbecues" gained popularity and both anti- and pro-lottery advocates flocked to the meetings to enjoy the appetizing food and eloquent speechmaking.\(^{43}\)


\(^{38}\) Alwes, *op. cit.*, p. 98.

\(^{39}\) Kendall, *op. cit.*, II, 495.

\(^{40}\) *New Orleans Daily Picayune*, June 26, 1891.

\(^{41}\) *New Orleans New Delta*, November 7, 1891.

\(^{42}\) *New Orleans New Delta*, March 16, 1892.

\(^{43}\) *New Orleans Daily Picayune*, September 24, 1891.
By far the largest recorded speaking event during the gubernatorial campaign was the outdoor mass meeting held at Lafayette square in New Orleans on April 7, 1892. Nearly 6000 staunch McEnery pro-lottery supporters came together, amidst the holiday setting of band music and Roman candles, to close, in New Orleans, one of the greatest political campaigns in the history of Louisiana.

Eleven days later the Anti-Lottery League ended its campaign in Shreveport, Louisiana.

Thus, the Anti-Lottery Movement started with a few politicians, lawyers, judges, and preachers, whose ranks grew until they numbered in the thousands. They used every possible legal and popular means to rouse national and local opinion against the Louisiana State Lottery Company. In 1891 their struggle merged with the gubernatorial campaign, and terminated victoriously for the anti-lottery candidate.

---

^44 New Orleans Daily Picayune, April 8, 1892.

^45 New Orleans New Delta, April 19, 1892.
CHAPTER IV
THE SPEAKERS

During the Anti-Lottery Movement men came forward to voice their opinions from the public platform for or against the Louisiana Lottery Company. They were moved for reasons ranging from moral principles to political expediency. This chapter discusses eight of the anti-lottery and six of the pro-lottery speakers. Four anti-lottery orators have been selected for major attention on the basis of: (1) their importance; (2) the frequency with which they spoke; and (3) the availability of descriptive materials end of their presented speeches. These criteria are used as a reasonable basis for selecting for detailed analysis a few men in a movement which abounded with orators.

In this study, emphasis is placed upon the movement rather than the orators. For this reason there is no need to present an exhaustive coverage of all the speakers who participated. A sufficient number of participants are given detailed coverage in order to indicate the calibre and type of men involved.

While this work is primarily concerned with the anti-lottery rather than the pro-lottery campaign, this chapter briefly introduces some of the major pro-lottery debaters in order to emphasize the quality of the men who supported the Lottery cause.

Representing the anti-lottery speakers were: Murphy J. Foster, the leader of the anti-lottery forces in the State Senate
and in the 1892 gubernatorial campaign; Edward Douglas White, Jr., brilliant supporter of the anti-lottery cause who rose from state senator to Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court; Donelson Caffery, eloquent local personality who rode the tide of anti-lotterism into the State Senate and who was later appointed to the United States Senate; and the Reverend Benjamin Morgan Palmer, who attacked the Lottery from both the pulpit and the public platform. Governor Francis T. Nicholls, Charles Parlange, Edgar Howard Farrar, and Senator Randall Lee Gibson are also discussed.

Representing the pro-lottery speakers were the following:
Gilbert L. Dupre, a lawyer and state representative; Henry Warren Ogden, a prominent leader from north Louisiana; Horace L. Dufour, a lawyer from New Orleans; Judge Wilbur Fisk Blackman; Bernard C. Shields; and Judge Lawrence O'Donnell.

These individuals have been selected to represent the more than one hundred men known to have mounted the public platform as participants in the Louisiana anti-lottery campaign.

I. The Anti-Lottery Speakers

A. Murphy James Foster

When the anti-lottery forces in the Louisiana Senate looked for someone with an unimpeachable reputation to lead them, they chose Murphy James Foster. Throughout the entire campaign the "man from St. Mary" Parish had the unusual distinction of never being accused of having accepted money from the Louisiana Lottery Company. Sidney J. Romero, Jr., states:
It was Foster's sincere belief that lotteries were morally wrong. He had witnessed the influence which they exerted on the constitutional convention of 1879. He was especially opposed to the Louisiana State Lottery Company, for it was hindering the progress of constructive state legislation. Fourteen sessions of the legislature had been held between 1872 and 1884 at a cost of approximately $1,500 per day. One hundred and forty days had been given over to the consideration of the lottery interest at a cost of $200,000 to the taxpayers during the fourteen sessions of this period. As early as 1884, Foster introduced a bill to prohibit the sale of lottery certificates or tickets and the drawing of lotteries; but the Lottery Company defeated the bill. Even at this early date, six years before the Lottery Company applied for a renewal of its charter, Foster was earnestly opposed to it.

Murphy J. Foster's battle against the Louisiana State Lottery Company, his greatest single fight, gained national recognition for him.

---

1 Sidney J. Romero, Jr., The Political Career of Murphy J. Foster (M.A. Thesis, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, La., 1942), p. 18.

2 Murphy James Foster was born on his father's plantation near Franklin, Louisiana, in St. Mary Parish, January 12, 1849. He was the son of English-French-Spanish Thomas Jefferson Foster and English-Irish Martha Murphy Foster. His paternal grandparents, Levi and Leida (Demaret) Foster, were residents of Louisiana before its purchase in 1803.

Murphy Foster's father devoted most of his energies toward the vocation of a planter. During the Civil War he served briefly in the quartermaster's department of the first Louisiana volunteer cavalry. Following the Civil War Thomas Foster was a leader in the fight to regain white supremacy in the state. He was a member of the White Camelia and later of the White League. Elected to the Police Jury in 1870, he served on that body until his death in 1892, a part of which time he was its president. Thomas's wife was the daughter of John B. Murphy, the sheriff of St. Mary Parish. They were married in the 1830s.

Young Murphy Foster received his elementary training at a private school in his home town of Franklin. His preparatory training was at White's Creek near Nashville, Tennessee. In 1867, he entered Washington College, now Washington and Lee University. Matriculating at Cumberland University at Lebanon, Tennessee, he received his degree from that institution in 1870. The following
year he passed his bar examination after studying law at the University of Louisiana, presently Tulane University. Murphy J. Foster returned to his Louisiana home at Franklin and engaged in the practice of law in the office of his cousin, the Honorable Donelson Caffery, where he soon became identified with the political activities of his time.

Foster was elected to the Louisiana legislature on the McEnery ticket in 1872, but was prevented from taking his seat when the Kellogg government, with the backing of President Grant, failed to recognize the McEnery government.

In 1879, following the termination of the carpetbag rule in Louisiana, he was elected to the State Senate from the tenth district and served three consecutive terms from 1880 through 1892. Foster was elected president pro tem of the Senate in 1888 and served in that capacity for two years.

Having led the anti-lottery fight in the 1890 senate legislative session, Foster was nominated to run for governor on the Democratic Anti-Lottery Ticket. He won the 1892 gubernatorial election after one of the bitterest political campaigns in Louisiana history.

Foster was re-elected governor in 1896 in a campaign marked by great political opposition between the Democrats and the "Lily White" Republicans, the sugar planters of Louisiana, hitherto Democrats, who felt they were being deprived by the Wilson-Gorman Act of 1894 of the protection they needed against Cuban sugar. As a result of this campaign and very largely through the influence of Foster, a new state constitution was adopted in 1898, which made it impossible for any political party to use ignorant voters in future elections, by denying the right to vote to those who could not read and write or who did not own property whose assessed valuation was at least $300, and by adopting the famous "grandfather clause."

In 1900 Foster was elected to the United States Senate by the Louisiana legislature. Six years later he was re-elected by the people of the state, serving a total of twelve years in that position. He was defeated for re-election in 1912 and returned to Franklin where he practiced law until appointed United States collector of customs at New Orleans. He was holding that position at the time of his death on June 12, 1921.

In 1877 Foster married Miss Daisy Hine, daughter of T. D. Hine, a Franklin merchant, who later became secretary of the police jury. After having been married for a few months, Mrs. Foster died. Foster was remarried on April 20, 1881, to Rose Routh of Ouida Plantation in West Feliciana Parish. To this marriage were born ten children, nine of whom reached maturity.

Figure II

Murphy James Foster
1. Speech Education

In 1867 Foster entered Washington College (Washington and Lee University) and registered for work in Greek, Latin, history, mathematics and literature. He "did creditable work in all of the courses." A year later he matriculated at Cumberland University, Lebanon, Tennessee, where he completed his work for the bachelor's degree in 1870.

Cumberland University is a Presbyterian institution originally founded for young men in 1812. Among the distinguished graduates listed by the university is Murphy J. Foster. At Cumberland University, Foster received his training in the College of Arts which "always had a high standard, both for entrance and graduation, ... before and after the Civil War it has stood in the front rank, so far as the standards are concerned. ... It lays stress on complete education, which always includes instruction in the Bible and training for Christian workers." During the period that Foster was in attendance at the university, the school regulations required the student to be a "gentlemen and prepared to recite." Courses generally offered at Cumberland were: Logic, rhetoric, philosophy, ancient and

---

3Romero, op. cit., p. 4.
5Ibid., p. 276.
6Ibid., p. 280.
7Ibid., p. 108.
modern languages, natural and physical sciences, and mathematics. By 1871 Foster had completed his formal educational after studying law for a year at the University of Louisiana (Tulane University).

From the type of broad education Foster received, the developing orator receives valuable training. Foreign languages give the student a better understanding of the structure and vocabulary of his native tongue. From history, the prospective debater, or advocate, learns to compare current problems with those of the past and to benefit from the judicious decisions and mistakes of his ancestors. Through the study of good literature, the budding orator learns to refine his use of language until he is able to produce an oral style suited to any occasion. The liberal arts education which Murphy Foster received introduced him to much knowledge which is of service to the mature orator.

2. Personality and Character

Murphy J. Foster was one of Louisiana's most capable and dependable public officials for forty years. Throughout this period his integrity was unquestioned. He was one of the few men in Louisiana politics during the 1890-1892 period who could face the opposition and truthfully say that he had never accepted their financial or political aid.

---

8 Ibid., Pp. 85; 107; 113.

9 Letters to the writer from the registrars of Cumberland University and Tulane University Law School state that Foster's school records are not extant.

In 1912 National Magazine praised Foster as a U. S. Senator: Senator Foster is a modest, unobtrusive gentleman, simple in his tastes and thoroughly democratic in his habits and manners. His methods are those of the statesman, rather than of the demagogue, and he works for results, rather than for the applause of the multitudes. Those who know him most intimately, love him best, and among the masses in Louisiana there is a devotion to him on the part of genuine affection. No southern statesman stands higher at Washington than he, nor does any possess greater capacity for effective service to the whole country. 11

Murphy J. Foster was the type of person needed to overthrow the Louisiana Lottery. He could not be "bought." He was a man of high moral principle who "did not change his views to conform with every prevailing popular whim." 12

3. Delivery

No reports are available which indicate the type of preparation Foster made before giving a speech. However, he was an active "stump" speaker in 1872 when he campaigned for Samuel D. McEnery in St. Mary Parish. In 1879 he campaigned for the office of State Senator. 13 It is reasonable to assume that these early speaking experiences helped to prepare Foster for the speaking in the Anti-Lottery Movement. Since most "stump" speaking is done extemporaneously, he probably used this method in delivering his addresses.

11National Magazine, XXXV (February, 1912), 567.


Despite his English name, Murphy J. Foster had a long line of Louisiana Creole ancestors. He had dark hair and a mustache, which, combined with delicate features and light frame, gave him a typically Gallic appearance.¹¹

He was not considered a vigorous speaker. His gestures and facial expression were mild with little or no attention being drawn to them. The same mildness which pervaded his physical being also manifested itself in the vocal aspects of his delivery. He was adequate, though not eloquent, as a speaker.¹⁵

h. Reputation as a Speaker

Although not a vigorous speaker, Murphy Foster was a vigorous campaigner. He helped to conduct the anti-lottery campaign with such perseverance "... that the lottery company, with unlimited money and the State press behind them, withdrew from the field before the election."¹⁶

Because of his adroit maneuvering in the 1890 Louisiana legislature against the pro-lottery advocates, Foster was "acknowledged to be the best debater and parliamentarian in that body" by his colleagues.¹⁷ In 1894 when it appeared that the Democratic Party would

¹¹Thomas M. Manus, Through the Camping Grounds of Louisiana (a pamphlet in the Louisiana Room of the Louisiana State Library, Baton Rouge, Louisiana), p. 2.

¹⁵Ibid.


lose the farm vote in Louisiana, by numerous campaign speeches, he was influential in obtaining a solid bloc of Democratic Representatives to the Congress. This feat earned for him the title of "the young war horse of the Democracy."18

B. Edward Douglas White, Jr.

Edward Douglas White, Jr., was a man of great prestige and influence in Louisiana. He was elected by the state legislature to the United States Senate in 1889. With all the power he commanded in name and position, he became one of the foremost adversaries of the Louisiana Lottery Company. According to the New Delta, from the beginning of the movement White was the anti-lottery mainstay, for his time, talents, and purse were always at the service of the League.19 His thunderous denunciations and the "lightning of his logic" made him an object of admiration to his friends and of fear to his enemies. "To him more than to any other one man in the state is due the credit of the defeat of the lottery."20

Edward Douglas White, Jr., eventually received the high honor of becoming the Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court.21

18Romero, op. cit., p. 63.
19New Orleans New Delta, May 12, 1892.
20Ibid.
21Edward Douglas White, Jr., occasionally referred to as Edward Douglas White, II, was born on November 3, 1815, on his father's plantation six miles north of Thibodaux in Lafourche Parish. He was the son of Edward Douglas White and Catherine S. (Ringgold). His paternal great-grandfather emigrated from Ireland to Pennsylvania where his grandfather, James White, was born. His father was born in Tennessee but was taken at an early age to Louisiana where he
attained considerable prominence in public life as a city court judge, a representative to the Congress of the United States, and as the governor of the state from 1834-1838.

Being a Roman Catholic, young White attended the parochial schools in New Orleans having moved there in 1851 with his family. Later he attended St. Mary's College at Emmettsburg, Maryland. When the Civil War began he was in attendance at Georgetown College in the District of Columbia. Young White left college at the age of sixteen and enlisted as a private in the Confederate Army. On the fall of Port Hudson in 1863, he was taken prisoner and paroled. After the war in 1865, he read law in the office of Edward Bermudez, an influential New Orleans lawyer, and was admitted to the bar in 1868.

Edward Douglas White immediately became active in politics. He was elected to the State Senate in 1874 and appointed to the Louisiana Supreme Court in 1879. Because of the changes brought by the constitution of 1879, his appointment terminated the following year. For the next seven years White again dedicated himself to the practice of law. By 1887 White was active in politics supporting Francis T. Nicholls for governor. After the election of Nicholls as governor, White was elected by the Louisiana legislature to the United States Senate for the term beginning in 1891. Before assuming his senatorial duties he was active in the movement to terminate the charter of the Louisiana State Lottery Company.

On March 12, 1894, White took the oath of office as a member of the United States Supreme Court being appointed by President Cleveland and receiving senatorial confirmation. He remained upon the bench for twenty-seven years, being raised to the chief justiceship by President Taft in 1910. In selecting the chief justice from among the associate justices, Taft broke with tradition. Furthermore a more natural choice would have been Charles E. Hughes, who was Taft's own appointee. Taft was probably influenced by his desire to break the "Solid South" politically. This was the second instance of a Southern Democratic Catholic being appointed to preside over the highest court of the land, Roger B. Taney having been chief justice from 1836 to 1864.

During his service on the bench, White wrote opinions in more than seven hundred cases. He was considered a middle-of-the-roader, since he voted with both liberals and conservatives, depending upon his attitude in each case. White served his country in this capacity until his death on May 19, 1921.

On November 5, 1894, White married Mrs. Leita Montgomery Kent, widow of Linden Kent, a Washington, D. C., lawyer. This marriage, to White's disappointment, was childless. In all other respects, the marriage was said to have been a happy one.

1. Speech Education

In 1856 Edward Douglas White matriculated at Mount St. Mary's, Emmettsburg, Maryland. During his one-year stay, he was recognized for his excellent work in English grammar and history. He also received honorable mention in arithmetic and French composition and translation. His studies included: Latin – Nepos, Ovid, Sallust, and Prosody; Greek – grammar and Xenophon's *Anabasis*; English grammar; arithmetic; writing; geography; and history. White transferred to Georgetown University where his only public appearance was a Commencement Day dialogue on July 10, 1860.22

Georgetown University in the District of Columbia is the oldest Catholic university in the United States, having been founded in 1789. In the 1790's George Washington set a precedent by visiting the university. Almost every President of the United States from the time of that visit has attended the commencement exercises to bestow the diplomas and medals awarded by the faculty to both Catholics and non-Catholics.23 On March 1, 1815, President James Madison signed an act which granted the college the rank of a university.24

---


24Ibid., p. 45.
The university is directed by the Jesuit order, which is noted for its strict and rigorous training of young men. One objective of the institution is the "development of reflective power. By its exercise the student is not allowed to remain a passive recipient of learning, but is compelled to think and judge for himself."25

After moral and religious training:

Mathematics, history, and all the leading lines of Natural Science, are earnestly insisted upon. By the study and practice of poetical writing the imagination is trained, and the taste is refined. During the year of rhetoric, the student's critical powers are thoroughly exercised and developed, poets and prose writers are scientifically analyzed, the principles of oratory are carefully examined, and the speeches of the world's greatest orators are read and discussed. When the imaginative and analytical faculties have thus been stimulated, developed and directed, the reasoning powers are disciplined by the study of logic, metaphysics and ethics, which give a worthy crown to this complete and truly liberal education.26

Edward Douglas White received training in the classics, which was the usual emphasis in colleges during the period. Like so many of his colleagues in the Anti-Lottery Movement, he utilized this broad training and his knowledge as a lawyer to aid in presenting speeches containing a high degree of evidence and illustrative support. In this respect Edward White's speeches, and those of many of his associates in the movement, were superior to the generally conceived forms of "stump" oratory.

25Ibid., p. 45.

26Ibid., p. 89.
2. **Personality and Character**

Edward Douglas White was a man of unblemished character and dignity. "He possessed a philosophic temperament and a keenly analytical mind. His genial disposition and his kindness of heart were almost proverbial. He was a devout member of the Catholic Church, and it was said that he was a generous, though unostentatious contributor to charities."27 Comments upon his character contain such words as "gracious," "courteous," "genial," "modest," "lovable," and "popular."28 Since personality is often reflected in the voice and physical manner of a person, these characteristics probably were factors in his delivery.

3. **Delivery**

Little is known about White's method of preparing his speeches. Having a remarkable memory, as is evidenced by his ability to quote, verbatim, pages of printed matter without glancing at the copy,29 White apparently spoke extemporaneously. When the occasion demanded a polished oration he could employ memorization without serious effort.

He was considered impressive in appearance, being over six feet in height with a massive physical structure. His genial

---


29 National Cyclopaedia of American Biography, XXI, 3-4.
blue eyes contrasted with his ruddy complexion and curling auburn hair.\(^\text{30}\)

White towered above his listeners as he spoke without pacing or swaying. Calmly and with dignity he presented his ideas, with only an occasional gesture to add emphasis to his remarks. His biographer reports that his favorite gesture was that of "shaking both hands before him at arms' length, following the practice of speakers in the French Chamber of Deputies."\(^\text{31}\)

Contrasting sharply with White's lack of physical vigor was his quick and forceful utterance. The pleasing quality of his voice and his clear enunciation contributed to his reputation as an orator who possessed the "eloquent powers of speech."\(^\text{32}\)

4. Reputation as a Speaker

White had a reputation as an unsurpassed debater. Because of his powers of oratory, he was in demand as a platform speaker. During the engagements on behalf of the Anti-Lottery League, people often remained solely to hear his address. Whenever he spoke, his speech was preceded and followed by enthusiastic applause.\(^\text{33}\) As a United States Senator, he is reported to have spoken with such

\(^{30}\)Ramke, Edward Douglas White Statesman and Jurist, p. 236.

\(^{31}\)Ibid., p. 241.

\(^{32}\)Ibid., Pp. 151; 236-237.

\(^{33}\)New Orleans New Delta, November 7, 1891.
logical appeal and forcefulness as to cause his colleagues to put down their correspondence and newspapers and listen attentively.  

C. Donelson Caffery  

Donelson Caffery was a second cousin to Murphy J. Foster. Foster had begun his practice of law in Caffery's office. Apparently the close association caused the two men to form similar views upon the political situation in Louisiana. When the great struggle began, Caffery strengthened the ranks of the anti-lotteryites. He spoke upon the same platform with his cousin during the 1891-1892 gubernatorial campaign. This campaign was Caffery's stepping stone to the United States Senate. During the period Caffery earned the title of "the silver-tongued orator of Louisiana."  

---


35 Donelson Caffery was born on his father's sugar plantation near Franklin, St. Mary Parish, Louisiana, on September 10, 1835. He was of Scotch-Irish decent. His father was Donelson Caffery, a native of middle Tennessee, who came to Louisiana as a young man in 1811, and established himself as a sugar planter. He took part in the political life of the community and at one time was the parish judge. The grandfather was John Donelson, who served as an officer in the Revolutionary Army and whose daughter Rachel married Andrew Jackson. Caffery's mother, Lydia Murphy Caffery, had come to Louisiana from North Carolina with her parents. Her father had been sheriff during the 1830's. Donelson Caffery attended a private school at Franklin and then attended St. Mary's College in Baltimore, Maryland. Upon graduating he returned to Franklin where he read law in the office of Joseph W. Walker. He then studied law at the University of Louisiana in New Orleans, now known as Tulane University. Instead of completing his law studies, he chose to engage in sugar planting on his newly acquired plantation, "Ivanhoe," on Bayou Cypremont. Although he did not approve of secession, he left his plantation in the hands of an overseer and joined the Confederate Army in January, 1862. For a brief period he was a member of the New
Orleans Crescent Rifles. He was then transferred to the 13th Louisiana Regiment and under that command fought in the two days' battle of Shiloh. Later he became a lieutenant and was detailed to the staff of Brigadier-General W. W. Walker where he remained until the end of the war.

After the war, his material accumulations destroyed, Caffery completed his study of law and passed the bar examination around 1866. Through money acquired in the practice of law, he was able to resume sugar planting.

Donelson Caffery was actively engaged in the movement to rid the state of carpetbaggers and was indicted, with several others, for attempting to drive out J. Hale Sypher, a Republican official. In the trial at New Orleans, his masterly speech before the jury is said to have obtained the verdict of acquittal.

Caffery was elected and served in the constitutional convention of 1879. In this convention he spoke out against repudiation of the state debt incurred during the carpetbag regime. Starting the debate on the side of the minority, Caffery gradually won the minds of his listeners with his clear and concise arguments. Until his death, this effort was spoken of as his greatest.

As a member of the Murphy J. Foster anti-lottery Democratic ticket in 1892, Donelson Caffery was among the most active of campaigners. He was elected to the State Senate, but upon the death of U. S. Senator Randall L. Gibson in the same year, he was appointed to the vacant position by Governor Nicholls. When the state legislature again met in 1894, they confirmed the appointment and elected Caffery to serve an additional term in that capacity. His stay in office as U. S. Senator ended in 1901.

During his term in office, Caffery alienated himself from the Democratic Party and his fellow Louisianians by speaking in favor of the gold standard and opposing free silver or bimetallism. He was active in the formation of the National or "Gold" Democratic Party in 1896 after the nomination of Bryan by the Democrats at Chicago on the free silver platform. He was permanent chairman of the convention at Indianapolis that nominated Palmer and Buckner for president and vice-president. In 1900 he was nominated for president by the convention of the National Party, composed of "Gold" Democrats and Anti-Imperialists, but he declined the nomination. His refusal to support the sugar industry beyond what he considered a reasonable point also turned his constituents and the industry against him.

When his term expired in 1901, he did not consider standing for re-election, knowing that his actions in the Senate had placed him in an unfavorable position in Louisiana.

On retiring from the Senate, Donelson Caffery returned to Franklin and resumed the practice of law and the cultivation of his sugar plantation.

He died while on a visit to New Orleans on December 30, 1906. He was survived by his wife, Bethia Richardson, the daughter of a well-known sugar planter, and eight of their nine children. Their marriage had taken place in 1869.
Donelson Caffery

Figure IV
1. Speech Education

Donelson Caffery's son, Edward Caffery, attributed much of his father's ability as a speaker to two major influences: (1) his father's early interest in the court trials in Franklin "in a day when young people went to the court house for amusement and instruction"; and (2) his appreciation of actors and the theater.36

Information available in a history of St. Mary's College, Baltimore, Maryland, suggests the kind of education Caffery received while working there toward a bachelor's degree. Founded in 1791 St. Mary's College, the second oldest seminary in the United States, was a Roman Catholic institution which taught both laymen and clerical candidates. In 1805 the Maryland legislature granted it the rank of a university.37

A full classical training was a necessary qualification for admission to the college. Students were taught a course of science, philosophy, and theology. "Every week disputations on difficult points of philosophy, divinity, and natural sciences are held between the students, under the supervision of the reverend professors."38 Courses listed in the school catalogue of 1848-49 were: Moral philosophy, rhetoric, Greek, Latin, mathematics, astronomy, chemistry, history, and English. Eloquence was also taught.39

36 Letter to the writer from Edward Caffery, Aiken, South Carolina, June 8, 1959.


38 Ibid., p. 272.

39 Ibid., Pp. 272; 274; 277.
This list of subjects suggests a broad liberal education which is usually most advantageous for the prospective orator who often needs a basic knowledge of many areas. The training in disputation is valuable as an aid to the development of logical thinking. From the courses in eloquence and rhetoric, Caffery probably learned the theory and principles of preparing and delivering effective orations. As an orator, he would some day have to draw illustrative and reinforcing material from the wealth of knowledge he acquired by taking courses not directly related to the art of speaking.

St. Mary's College had a reputation for high standards and quality graduates. Donelson Caffery probably developed his basic powers of oratory at this famous institution.

Other contributing factors to his development as an orator were his training in law and frequent appearances as a local political campaigner. As a lawyer, Caffery had to depend upon his ability to support his claims with sufficient logical and persuasive support. Good deliberative speaking and debating demands no less of the orator. Having appeared as a speaker before audiences for approximately fifteen years before the inception of the Anti-Lottery Movement, Caffery was prepared by training and experience to address the citizenry on the issue of the day.

2. Personality and Character

Donelson Caffery's greatest virtue was sincerity. He was a true statesman whose independence of thought and action was motivated by a desire to do the greatest amount of good for the greatest number of
people. "He had strong convictions and obeyed his sense of justice even when it ran counter to his own interests."\(^{40}\)

Caffery was essentially social in nature. He liked the intimate and informal confines of the Senate cloak room where he met with the other "cloak room habitues." He enjoyed social interchange more than listening to senatorial proceedings.\(^{41}\)

The following passage summarizes the admirable traits of Donelson Caffery:

Mr. Caffery was a man of unblemished public life; his record was always clear and free from any breath of scandal. Nor was his private life ever attacked by a political enemy, though he was prominent in several campaigns notable for their bitterness and virulence. If courage and honesty and independence of thought count for anything he must be ranked among the two or three foremost Louisiana statesmen since the Civil War.\(^{42}\)

3. Delivery

Donelson Caffery used the extemporaneous method in delivering his speeches. He prepared himself on a given issue and remained ready to speak on the subject at a moment's notice.\(^{43}\) His son, Edward Caffery, stated that he never saw his father write a speech


\(^{41}\)Horace Chilton, Memoirs of Senator Horace Chilton, Horace Chilton Extract #1298 (Louisiana State University Library, Department of Archives, Baton Rouge, La.), Pp. 1-2.


\(^{43}\)Chilton, op. cit., p. 2.
or make notes. "When preparing a speech he would sit silently in a
darkened room."\(^{1}\)

In appearance Caffery was of medium height and stockily built. One biographical account says, "His strong, masculine features were
accentuated by a luxuriant growth of hair and a flowing beard. He
looked the part of a Southern statesman."\(^{1}\) Having been called
"the silver-tongued orator of Louisiana" by the New Orleans New
Delta,\(^{4}\) one can be fairly certain that he was an orator with
superior qualities.

4. Reputation as a Speaker

As a young lawyer, Caffery began to exhibit the oratorical
skill and logical thinking that later won for him national renown.
He was reported to be an accomplished debater who, at an early age
in his career, had to prove his ability by defending himself and
several of his friends against the charge of attempting to run a
carpetbag Republican senator named Sypher from the state. He de­
livered a speech of "eloquence and stinging determination" which
attributed to his acquittal along with the other men involved.\(^{4}\)

In the Constitutional Convention of 1879, Caffery was credited
by his colleagues for persuading a majority against repudiation of the
state debt. "This speech received unconditional praise . . . nearly

\(^{1}\) Letter to the writer from Edward Caffery, op. cit.


\(^{4}\) New Orleans New Delta, February 7, 1892.

\(^{4}\) Caffery, op. cit., p. 5; New Orleans Times-Democrat,
December 31, 1905.
thirty years later, it was still referred to as probably the greatest speech of his whole career and the single greatest influence in the Convention's decision to guarantee the debt. On January 31, 1896, Caffery delivered a lengthy speech against the pending free silver bill. The address was so strong in its attack against bimetallism that the New York Reform Club had five million copies distributed throughout the South and West, where strong opposition to the gold standard was centered.

D. The Rev. Dr. Benjamin Morgan Palmer

In any movement against gambling, the clergy are likely to take an active part; and the Anti-Lottery Movement was no exception in this respect. The Rev. Benjamin Palmer (Presbyterian), Rabbi Heller (Hebrew), Rev. Beverly Carradine (Methodist), Bishop Davis Sessums (Episcopal), and Archbishop Janssens (Catholic) vigorously opposed the Lottery. Several of these men campaigned to destroy an institution which they considered an evil influence upon their parishioners and a degenerating force upon the state and nation.

The Rev. Dr. Benjamin Morgan Palmer used the pulpit and public platform to denounce the Louisiana State Lottery Company with all the oratorical skill and prestige he possessed. Because of his prominent position in New Orleans, the state, and throughout the South, he became the symbol of church opposition to the Lottery.

---

49 Caffery, op. cit., p. 28.
50 Benjamin Morgan Palmer was born in Charleston, South Carolina,
on January 25, 1818. He was the son of Rev. Edward and Sarah (Bunce) Palmer, and a descendent of William Palmer, who came to America from England in the 1620's, settling in what is now Salem, Massachusetts.

Benjamin Morgan Palmer received his early training from his mother. When he was in his early teens, he entered Walterboro Academy in South Carolina. From Walterboro, in 1832 he went to Amherst College where he was expelled in his second year for refusing to divulge the secrets of an undergraduate society. While at Amherst he led his class and also found friends in Henry Ward Beecher and Stuart Robinson. Palmer returned home to South Carolina where he taught school until he entered the University of Georgia in January, 1837. Eighteen months later, in 1838, Benjamin Palmer graduated with honors. Wishing to become a minister, he entered the Columbia Theological Seminary in 1839 and was licensed to preach in April of 1841.

For a brief period Rev. Palmer was a minister in the Presbyterian Church of Anderson, South Carolina. Early in 1842 he transferred to the First Presbyterian Church of Savannah, Georgia. A year later he was called to the First Church of Columbia, South Carolina. There he and other ministers founded the Southern Presbyterian Review, the first number of which appeared in June, 1847. He lectured at Columbia Theological Seminary, where he was professor of church history and government, after having resigned his pulpit in 1854. In 1856 he gave up his professorship in order to accept the pulpit of the First Presbyterian Church in New Orleans.

During the Civil War he was an ardent defender of slavery and advocated secession. Palmer was active in founding the Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States and served as the first moderator of its General Assembly, which was organized in 1861. So strong were his efforts on behalf of the continuation of slavery that General Butler put a price on the minister's head.

During the occupation of New Orleans, he divided his time between teaching in Columbia Theological Seminary and acting as commissioner of his denomination to the Army of Tennessee.

Rev. Palmer was active in establishing the Southwestern Presbyterian University and a weekly paper, the Southwestern Presbyterian.

After the war, he resumed his duties in New Orleans and remained there until his death on May 28, 1902, which resulted from being struck by a streetcar.

Palmer had married Mary Augusta, step-daughter of the Rev. George Howe of Columbia, South Carolina. They had six children.

During his lifetime he had many works published and received several honorary degrees. Oglethorpe University, Georgia, conferred the degree of D. D. upon Palmer in 1852. In 1870 he received the degree of LL.D. from Westminster College, Fulton, Missouri. In addition to six books, he published numerous pamphlets, and contributed many articles to the Southern Presbyterian Review, the Southwestern Presbyterian, and the Presbyterian Quarterly. His books are: The Life and Letters of James Henley Thornwell, D. D., LL.D. (1875);
The Family in Its Civil and Churchly Aspects (1876); Formation of Character (1890); The Broken Home, or Lessons in Sorrow (1890); The Threefold Fellowship and the Threefold Assurance (1892); and Theology of Prayer (1893).

THE REV. DR. BENJAMIN MORGAN PALMER

Figure V
1. **Speech Education**

Benjamin Morgan Palmer was fortunate to have his mother as his first tutor, for she was a woman with "a love for the beautiful; and an aggressive, dynamic independence tempered with a pleasing degree of sociability." Being an excellent student, Palmer readily acquired these attributes. From his father he learned orderliness, discipline, tenacity, and courteousness.\(^{51}\)

In addition to the rudimentary subjects, his mother read to him: Locke's *Essay on Human Understanding*; the plays of Shakespeare; Milton's *Paradise Lost*; and Scott's novels.\(^{52}\)

From the early associations with his parents, Palmer developed traits and acquired knowledge which were valuable to a minister. Through his mother's training, he developed an early interest in philosophy and in logic by reading Locke's treatise on knowledge and belief. From the writings of the great poets he became aware of the artistic use of the language. All of these factors were important in the growth and development of the orator.

During his early teens, Palmer entered Walterboro Academy, South Carolina, where he was strongly influenced by Rev. J. B. Van Dyck. Van Dyck had established a debating society where vigorous training in argumentation and speaking took place. Palmer participated in the exercises, as did all of the students.\(^{53}\)

---


\(^{52}\)Johnson, *op. cit.*, Pp. 25; 40.

\(^{53}\)Ibid., Pp. 43-44.
At Amherst College in Massachusetts, Palmer was required to take declamation, debate or English composition. The curriculum included: Horace's *Satires, Epistles, and Art of Poetry;* Hedge's *Logic;* Cicero's *De Oratore* and *Philosophy of Rhetoric, Graeca Majora Orators;* and Newman's *Rhetoric.* His professor of rhetoric and oratory was Samuel M. Worcester.\(^5\)\(^4\)

By studying the theory and practice of rhetoric, Palmer laid the foundation for his future career as an orator. From his courses he learned how to compose and deliver speeches. While the declamation exercises aided in the improvement of delivery and the use of supporting materials, English composition was valuable for its teaching of organization and proper grammatical usage. A study of the Greek orators provided acceptable models for comparison, imitation, and criticism.

Although extremely young, "Palmer stood first in his class." Henry Ward Beecher was a fellow classmate at the time. Both of the young men belonged to the Athenian Literary Society,\(^5\)\(^5\) which gave them a further opportunity to develop into practiced debaters and speakers.

At the University of Georgia, Benjamin Palmer took mathematics, philosophy, logic, rhetoric and forensic disputations.

\(^5\)\(^4\)\textit{Eubank, op. cit.}, Pp. 34-35.

\(^5\)\(^5\)\textit{Ibid.}, p. 35.
In less than a month after his arrival at the University, Palmer was initiated into the Phi Kappa Society. The society convened regularly each week. In addition, call meetings were frequently held. At each regular meeting, a question, usually stated in the form of a proposition, was debated by two or four members followed by a decision of the society. Timely and provocative propositions were debated such as, "Is a nullification of an unconstitutional act of Congress by a state the rightful remedy?", "Is it probable that our Republic will last as long as did the Roman Empire?", and "Ought slavery be abolished in the United States?".

Palmer's broad background of knowledge in the liberal arts, his speech training and constant practice, contributed to his ability as an orator.

2. **Personality and Character**

In temperament and disposition, Benjamin Palmer was usually calm and gentle. Given a righteous cause, however, he could throw off his ministerial composure and match the "fire-eating" characteristics of the politician. He did not hesitate to become involved in the major arguments of his day. He spoke in favor of the South's withdrawal from the Union, denounced the Louisiana Lottery, and spoke against the Jewish persecutions in Russia. Courage, intelligence, righteousness, and oratorical skill were the predominant traits which made the Rev. Dr. Palmer one of the best known preachers in the South during the latter half of the nineteenth century.

---


57 *Johnson, op. cit.*, p. 635.

3. **Delivery**

During his early months in the ministry, Palmer had attempted to memorize his sermons. He discovered that this method tended to hamper his delivery and lacked spontaneity. Consequently, he resolved to prepare himself in the extemporaneous manner. After studying broadly and thoroughly, he outlined his thoughts and memorized them. The carpet on his study floor bore the marks of the diagonal path which he made during his lengthy periods of preparation. His biographer reports, "When he came to the pulpit, he came with neither scrap nor line, and gave re-birth to his thought with all spontaneity and freshness." He delivered his famous anti-lottery speech in 1891 in the same extemporaneous manner. Between 1892 and 1902, Palmer is recorded as having memorized or read only two speeches. The first was a sermon, two hours in length, which favored the secession of the Southern states. The second was the main address at the Confederate veterans' reunion in Louisville, Kentucky, May 30, 1900. Eubank says about this second speech, "In view of the grandeur of the occasion, he made laborious preparations. Contrary to his usual custom, he wrote the speech in full and memorized it."

Rev. Palmer was not a handsome individual. His slender figure was not more than five feet seven inches in height and, as he aged, 

---


he became slightly stooped. His small head, heavy eyebrows, abundant and unruly brown hair, large mouth, and misshapen lips added to his homely appearance. Halfway through his ministerial career he grew a three or four inch beard which hid his receding chin.  

Palmer was always simple and neat in his attire. "He wore a vest cut very low, exposing a great deal of white linen, and the coat was left unbuttoned."  

According to Johnson, the following interesting account is a typical reaction to the appearance and oratory of Palmer:  

Amongst the distinguished men on the platform from which he spoke were Mr. John Randolph Tucker and Commodore Matthew Fontaine Maury. As Dr. Palmer began his delivery Commodore Maury turned to Mr. Tucker and said, "He is the ugliest man I ever saw, sir." Ten minutes later he said, "He is getting better looking, sir." Toward the end of the address he said, "He is the handsomest man I ever saw, sir."  

Palmer employed little bodily activity while speaking. He used gestures and movements which were smooth and natural and which attracted no attention from the untrained observer. "He frequently stood with one hand on the pulpit and the other behind him. Occasionally he folded both hands behind him." He never "saws the air" with his hand, nor did he "tear a passion to tatters." Toward the end of a sermon or speech his gestures became more animated;

---

63 Ibid., p. 424.  
64 Ibid., p. 362.  
65 Eubank, op. cit., p. 191.
they were the result of the natural and spontaneous physical reaction to his utterances.66

In all of the vocal aspects of delivery Rev. Palmer was superior. He had a magnificent and flexible voice which was capable of expressing every degree of meaning and sentiment. His superb diction complemented his profound thinking. "Dr. Palmer's words . . . were uttered so plainly and distinctly that they reached clear out to the confines of the vast assemblage."67 His rate of speaking was approximately one hundred and five to one hundred and twenty-five words per minute,68 which is considered a moderate rate.

4. Reputation as a Speaker

Although ministers had spoken against the Louisiana Lottery before Rev. Palmer chose to denounce it, he seemed to have done more than any of them to arouse the people. His reputation as a speaker and a spiritual leader was well established in the South. Correspondence from Palmer to a Mrs. Jennings on July 11, 1891, gives an idea of the effectiveness of his first anti-lottery speech:

I knew of course that I was going to strike with a mailed hand; but I did not know it would prove so ringing a blow. The Pro-Lottery Press in our city have been on a regular howl ever since; to which I listen with incredible satisfaction. . . . The speech has spread over all the country; and I am receiving letters, two or three a day, from the far North asking for a copy of the same. I am told that

67New Orleans Daily Picayune, April 7, 1900.
68Dubank, op. cit., p. 194.
an edition of twenty thousand has been distributed by the New Orleans New Delta. May it prove an omen for good; though there must be no relaxation of effort, until we sing the song of final victory.\textsuperscript{69}

Few men of this period approached the eloquence and reputation of the Rev. Dr. Benjamin Morgan Palmer. "To possess such an orator is a privilege for the generation which he honors."\textsuperscript{70}

II. \textit{Other Anti-Lottery Speakers}

It would be an impossible task to evaluate accurately the effectiveness or importance of all of the many orators of the Anti-Lottery Movement. Approximately seventy speakers are known to have spoken against the Lottery either in the legislature or at public meetings in the state. Upon these men rested the burden of arousing a lethargic public into a realization of the existing evils of the Lottery and of arousing a desire to defeat the Lottery by voting for the members of the Anti-Lottery Democratic Ticket headed by Murphy J. Foster.

A. Francis T. Nicholls

Among the other notable speakers of the movement was Governor Francis Tillou Nicholls, "Chevalier sans peur et sans reproche."

Nicholls took over the government by force in 1877 after the carpetbag

\textsuperscript{69}Letter from Palmer to Mrs. Jennings, July 11, 1891. Hennen-Jennings Papers, Louisiana State University Library, Department of Archives, Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

returning board unjustly declared Packard the governor. Toward the end of his term he aided the anti-lottery cause with all the power he possessed as the chief executive of the state. Nevertheless, he, too, had to take to the public platform since the legislature and the courts were "friendly" toward the Louisiana Lottery Company. He knew that the only means of ridding Louisiana of the strangling political grip of this organization was through an aroused public opinion.

Nicholls' strength in public speaking was his ethical or personal appeal. His messages received popular acceptance. Why shouldn't they? Hadn't he stood against the corrupt carpetbaggers and won in 1877 after giving an arm and foot for the cause of the Confederacy? Nicholls was the proverbial "old soldier" of his day, and he had the scars to prove it.

B. Charles Parlange

Charles Parlange, the candidate for Lieutenant Governor on the Anti-Lottery Democratic Ticket, may be considered one of the "founding fathers" of the movement. His office in New Orleans served as the location for the first official meeting in 1890 in which a declaration against the Lottery was signed. This was the beginning of the Anti-Lottery League.

---

71Brown, op. cit., p. 18.
Parlange was no novice in the political and speaking arenas. He had been a state senator and a United States district attorney. In the movement he was active and influential in mounting the public platform to sway public opinion against the Lottery. His was a rhetoric of persuasion designed to actuate rather than to convince.

C. Edgar Howard Farrar

In presenting logical arguments, few men could surpass Edgar Howard Farrar, corporation lawyer from New Orleans. He used his highly developed talent in argumentation to fight the Lottery. He was most active in the gubernatorial campaign of the Anti-Lottery Movement. Later he helped to organize the "Gold Democrats" in 1896.

D. Randall Lee Gibson

One of the few nationally recognized figures to take part in the Anti-Lottery Movement was Senator Randall Lee Gibson who served in the Congress for seventeen years. From 1875 until 1881 he was a U. S. Representative and from 1881 until his death in 1892 he was a U. S. Senator. Whenever his duties in Washington permitted, he

---


came back to Louisiana in order to lend his support in the suppression of the Lottery. His speeches drew large crowds, and he was respected as one of the early "Redeemers" of his state after the Civil War.

E. Theodore Stark Wilkinson

Theodore Stark Wilkinson, a potent force in the movement, aided the anti-lottery cause both as an influential speaker and administrator of the Anti-Lottery League. As president of the Democratic State Central Committee, he wielded an enormous amount of political control in the state.75

III. The Pro-Lottery Speakers

Scores of prominent and respected men were aligned on the side of the Louisiana Lottery. The opposition of these men made the anti-lottery crusade a difficult undertaking. The pro-lottery forces

could claim judges, lawyers, legislators, and outstanding businessmen as militant advocates of their cause. Several of the Lottery orators are discussed in the following pages in order to indicate the stature of the opposing speakers.

A. *Gilbert L. Dupre*

Gilbert L. Dupre, one of the most active campaigners for the lottery cause, duplicated the feat of the anti-lottery faction by touring the state. Being bilingual, he was a potent force for the pro-lottery candidates. In north Louisiana he spoke English and in south Louisiana, inhabited by the Louisiana French, he spoke French. Whenever the audience was divided between English and French speaking people, Dupre occasionally spoke in one language and then translated his remarks into the second language. He was a product of the French country of south Louisiana.76

---

76Gilbert L. Dupre was born on his father’s plantation at Gradenigo’s Island, near the city of Opelousas, September 20, 1859. He spent his youth in that vicinity, obtaining his education at St. Mary’s Academy and Franklin College. He began his political life as Clerk of the Parish at the age of eighteen. The Supreme Court of Louisiana, in session at Opelousas, Louisiana, admitted him to the bar in July, 1880. Eight years later he was elected to the legislature, where he served through two sessions. After his stay in the legislature, he was elected judge of the 13th Judicial District Court, which at that time comprised the parishes of St. Landry and Acadia. He served in this position for four years. In October, 1900, President McKinley appointed Dupre Postmaster at Opelousas, Louisiana. Five months after the appointment he became a candidate for Congress, as the Lily White Republican nominee, but was defeated. In 1913, he was elected without opposition to fill the unexpired term of A. H. Garland, in the state legislature, where he remained until 1915. Elected to the Constitutional Convention soon afterward, he did not serve because the call for convention did not pass. In 1916 he was elected to a four-year term in the state legislature.

Gilbert Dupre maintained an active practice of law. Around 1917 he wrote a book entitled *Political Reminiscences*, which gives
a vivid account of his experiences in public life. He had supplied the material for a local newspaper to be run as a serial and was then persuaded to have it put into book form.

Dupre was the father of three children. His only son, G. L. Dupre, Jr., preceded him in death. Dupre's wife was Miss Julia Estilette, the daughter of E. D. Estilette, Ex-Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Henry Warren Ogden was representative of the speakers from north Louisiana who supported the Lottery. His language and heritage paralleled that of the predominately Anglo-Saxon people from his section. For eight years from 1880 to 1888 he had represented his area in the state legislature. In 1890 he was attempting a political "comeback" on the side of the pro-lottery forces. His task was an especially difficult one, since the voters in his area were strongly influenced by the rural preachers who opposed all forms of gambling. Besides the handicap of an articulate ministry, Ogden came from a section of the state which was not greatly influenced by the Lottery's wealth and political power. It is rather difficult to explain the pro-lottery attitude which Henry Ogden supported after considering the characteristics of the majority of the people from his area.

Henry Warren Ogden was born in Abingdon, Washington County, Virginia, October 21, 1842. When he was nine he moved with his parents to Warrensburg, Missouri. He received his education in the common schools, working on his father's farm during the spring and summer months. When the Civil War started he enlisted in the Confederate Army. He was a first lieutenant in the Missouri Infantry, and afterward served on the staff of Brigadier-General Lewis, Second Brigade, Parsons' Division, Missouri Infantry. He was paroled at Shreveport, Louisiana, June 8, 1865. Ogden remained in Louisiana and engaged in agricultural pursuits. In 1879 he was a member of the Constitutional Convention. He then served in the state House of Representatives from 1880 to 1888, and was speaker of the House from 1884 to 1888. He was elected to the Fifty-third Congress in 1893 to fill a vacancy caused by the appointment of N. C. Blanchard to the United States Senate. Ogden was re-elected to the Fifty-fourth and Fifty-fifth Congresses serving from May 12, 1894, to March 3, 1899. After his stay in Congress he resumed his agricultural pursuits. His death occurred on July 23, 1905, in Benton, Louisiana. Interment was in the Cottage Grove Cemetery.
Horace Lewis Dufour is typical of the speakers who made New Orleans the stronghold of pro-lottery sentiment. Like so many of his fellow lotterites, he was a prominent lawyer. Dufour, like Gilbert Dupre, spoke both English and French during the course of the gubernatorial campaign. In all probability the Lottery backers were depending on south Louisiana to give them a victory in their struggle for survival. Men like Dufour were valuable assets in appealing to the Latin population. However, the strong anti-lottery position of the Catholic Church tended to minimize his effectiveness.

Judge Horace Lewis Dufour was born in New Orleans, Louisiana, on December 25, 1854. He was the son of Cyprian Dufour, a noted lawyer and jurist of New Orleans. Horace attended Lusher's Academy, St. Stanislaus College at Bay St. Louis, Mississippi, and Washington and Lee University in Lexington, Virginia. He graduated from the latter institution with a degree in law in 1875. He returned to Louisiana where he studied Louisiana law at the University of Louisiana, now known as Tulane University. Dufour was admitted to the bar and began his law practice in New Orleans. His first political office was under Col. E. A. O'Sullivan as Assistant City Attorney. In 1896 he was elected to the bench of the Court of Appeal by the Citizen's League Legislature. He was re-elected in 1904 and again in 1912 by the people. After serving less than a year of the last eight-year term, Judge Dufour died in New Orleans, December 11, 1913.

H. L. Dufour was an able lawyer and judge, and a great reader, student and authority, especially of the Civil law.

IV. Other Pro-Lottery Speakers

A. Wilbur Fisk Blackman

One of the more prominent Louisiana jurists to support the Lottery cause was Judge Wilbur Fisk Blackman who had dedicated forty years to the state judicial system. At the time of the anti-lottery controversy, he had spent thirteen years as a district judge and had served as a state representative and senator. His support of the Lottery came during the 1891-1892 gubernatorial campaign when he spoke for Samuel McEnery, the Lottery candidate.

B. Bernard C. Shields

Bernard C. Shields led the pro-lottery fight in the 1890 Louisiana legislature. His task was not an extremely difficult one, since the Lottery was relying upon its staunch "friends" to vote in its favor regardless of the arguments presented by the opposition. Shields was reported to be an accomplished actor, linguist, and photographer. He worked in the City Hall of New Orleans for over fifty-three years as the secretary of the Board of Liquidation and superintendent of the Premium Bond Department. He was also a successful lawyer. A more versatile man cannot be found among the speakers of the Anti-Lottery Movement.79

C. Lawrence O'Donnell

The distinction of being the only foreign born citizen to speak in the movement went to Judge Lawrence O'Donnell who moved to New Orleans from Ireland as a young man. He was drawn into politics and served as a judge, city attorney and state senator. In the Senate he "won distinction as an eloquent and convincing debater," and "his speeches there, as well as his pleadings before the bar, and public addresses, have been noted for their brilliance and sparkling native Irish wit."80

80 Fortier, op. cit., Ill, 330-331.

CHAPTER V

AUDIENCES AND OCCASIONS

In the preceding chapters the writer has pointed out that the Anti-Lottery Movement reflected the true aspects of a "grass roots" campaign. Legislative assemblies, debates, conventions, and caucuses do not in themselves constitute the kind of movement which developed out of the Lottery recharter controversy. The action against the Louisiana State Lottery Company was an organized effort by a group of men who sought to rouse the public.

This chapter analyzes the audiences and occasions of the Anti-Lottery Movement. What were the characteristics of the people who attended the meetings? How did they react to the orators and their speeches? Under what conditions did the meetings take place? These and other questions must be answered in order to recreate an image which reasonably duplicates the settings and activities of the meetings.

Audiences and occasions are analyzed by the speech critic for two primary reasons. First, they constitute a part of the historical-social context which permits the critic to understand the forces and conditions which were operative during the speaking events. Finally, through knowledge of the constituents of audience and occasion, the analyst is better able to judge the appropriateness and effectiveness of speech content in a given situation.
I. Audiences

A. Size

As a rule, the size of the audiences depended upon the location of the meeting. Outdoor mass meetings had few limiting effects upon the size of the audience, while the indoor assemblies were restricted by the seating capacities of the buildings. A good example of the restricting nature of the indoor meetings occurred at Mansfield, Louisiana, when 500 to 600 persons crowded into the local courthouse while a hundred or more "disappointed men" could not enter the packed hall.\(^1\) In New Orleans similar seating problems occurred. Whenever the Anti-Lottery League or the Progressive League held a meeting in Grunewald Hall, which could accommodate from 700 to 800 persons, gentlemen were forced to stand in the aisles because the galleries and seats were filled.\(^2\) Because of the limited size of the buildings available for public meetings throughout the state, the auditoriums never exceeded the upper hundreds. The largest indoor attendance was at the Anti-Lottery Convention in Baton Rouge where 959 delegates from 53 of the 59 parishes were present.\(^3\)

At the other extreme were the outdoor meetings. Although there may have been other problems introduced, such as, hearing the speakers and maintaining attention, there was abundant space for all those who

---

\(^1\) New Orleans \textit{New Delta}, March 16, 1892.

\(^2\) New Orleans \textit{Daily Picayune}, October 13, 1891.

\(^3\) Proceedings of the \textit{Anti-Lottery Convention}, p. 8.
wished to come. Evidence of this fact was the reports of between 2500 and 3000 persons at a New Orleans meeting and "fully 2,000 persons" at a Bunkie political rally.

B. Composition

According to most newspaper reports, the Anti-Lottery audiences included persons of all ages and both sexes. This was especially true of the afternoon meetings held in the agricultural sections of the state. Farmers of the surrounding countryside "swarmed into town on horseback, buggies, and in vehicles of all sorts, and many brought their wives and children." At night the children were left at home while one, or both parents, attended a ward meeting in New Orleans or one of the colorful indoor gatherings.

The Anti-Lottery Movement was a kind of training ground for the women of Louisiana, who were to play a more important part in state politics with each succeeding decade. As members of the Women's Anti-Lottery League, they worked closely with their male counterparts. As yet, they were not politicians, but they were the best

---

1. New Orleans New Delta, November 1, 1891.
2. New Orleans New Delta, March 16, 1892.
3. New Orleans New Delta, February 7, 1892.
5. New Orleans New Delta, November 1, 1891; December 24, 1891.
auxiliary group to be found in the movement. At the various speaking events, the women matched the men in enthusiasm. 9

Most of the participants at the meetings were probably Democrats. From a political aspect the Anti-Lottery Movement was primarily an upheaval within the Democratic party of the state. Two of the leading gubernatorial candidates, Foster and McEnery, claimed to represent the "true" Democracy. Both factions spoke before Democratic clubs. 10 Even party administrators split over the Lottery issue. Theodore Wilkinson, president of the state Democratic convention spoke for the "antis," 11 while A. W. Crandall, chairman of the Democratic executive committee was an avid supporter of the pro-lottery backers. 12 Thus, the various audiences were largely Democratic. However, like their leaders, they were divided into pro-lottery and anti-lottery wings.

Mention of the economic status of the audiences is sparse and of an indirect nature. Occasionally reports state that persons from "all classes" 13 or "all stations in life" 14 were in attendance. One of the meetings of the Women's Anti-Lottery League in New

---

9New Orleans New Delta, December 24, 1891.
10New Orleans New Delta, February 7, 1892; New Orleans Daily Picayune, September 7, 1892.
11New Orleans New Delta, February 7, 1892.
12New Orleans Daily Picayune, April 8, 1892.
13Johnson, op. cit., pp. 553-554.
14New Orleans New Delta, July 17, 1890.
Orleans had in attendance many of the prominent members of New Orleans society. While all levels of society took part in the city gatherings, the country parishes primarily drew the "sturdy yeomanry" from the neighboring areas who "flocked into the town from all directions." On one occasion labor took an interest in the Lottery recharter controversy by inviting both factions to present their views to the Workingmen's Club of Shreveport.

From the preceding information indications are that persons from all economic levels participated in the "grass roots" campaign.

Religious groups officially agreed upon the evil influences of the Lottery. Nevertheless, Baptists, Catholics, Methodists, and Presbyterians cooperated in opposing the Lottery Company, while members of the same faiths gave support to the recharter effort. Reverend B. M. Palmer's biographer, Cary Johnson, stated that "all creeds" attended an anti-lottery meeting in New Orleans.

Although there is no way of ascertaining the religious preferences of the various audiences, it is logical to assume that in Protestant north Louisiana a majority of non-Catholics were present. Conversely, Catholics would dominate in the French country of south Louisiana.

---

15 *New Orleans Daily Picayune*, January 16, 1892.
16 *New Orleans New Delta*, February 7, 1892.
17 *New Orleans Daily Picayune*, October 15, 1891.
The anti-lottery meetings drew individuals from all professional and social levels. One meeting in New Orleans had present, "Courtly gentlemen, representing every profession and trade from the pulpit to the artisan's bench..."\(^{19}\)

Although the meeting of the New Orleans Women's League drew many of the prominent members of society to their small, exclusive gatherings,\(^{20}\) the considerably larger New Orleans ward meetings, which met near the market places, attracted the rank and file of the working population.\(^{21}\) For the most part, the country meetings were attended by local merchants and farmers accompanied by their wives who could be legitimately classified as homemakers or farmers' assistants.\(^{22}\)

In summary, the composition of the audiences generally consisted of men, women and children of all ages. They were people from various professions and social levels with their claim to membership in the Democratic party being their common ground. Catholics and Protestants participated on both sides of the debate. The clearest distinction between audience "types" can be made between the rural and urban groups.

\(^{19}\)New Orleans New Delta, July 17, 1890.

\(^{20}\)New Orleans Daily Picayune, January 16, 1892.

\(^{21}\)New Orleans New Delta, November 7, 1891.

\(^{22}\)New Orleans New Delta, February 7, 1892.
C. Response or Reaction

Having shown that the audiences were large and heterogeneous, audience response remains to be discussed. The Anti-Lottery Movement did not lack enthusiasm on the part of the participants. This enthusiasm was in evidence when the Anti-Lottery Convention met in August of 1890. The delegates greeted their chairman, T. F. Bell, with "thunders of applause." Pandemonium reigned as the delegates shouted for "Adams," "White," "Farrar," or some other favorite to address them.23 So strong were the feelings of the delegates toward their cause that T. F. Bell, Edward D. White, and E. H. Farrar felt an obligation to ask for "calm and temperate argument" that would create "no bitterness."24 Evidently these delegates, who became the leaders of the Anti-Lottery Movement, transferred their passion and zeal to the general audiences, for reports vividly describe the highly partisan reactions. When Rev. Palmer spoke at an indoor meeting in New Orleans, "men stood up in their places and shouted themselves hoarse, while delicate women waved their handkerchiefs and responded to the storm of passion. . . ."25 At a later meeting, Charles Parlange "carried his audience with him, and his voice was drowned time and again with cheers and exclamation of approval. . . ."

Further comments on this meeting tell of "deafening" applause and

---

24 Ibid., Pp. 11; 18; 35.
"repeated calls" for specific speakers. Murphy Foster entered a hall in Lafayette during his gubernatorial campaign and men cheered, women waved and children, standing on their chairs, waved bunches of violets. A similar audience reaction occurred when Donelson Caffery spoke at Donaldsonville. To say that he was "frequently and strongly applauded would give but an inadequate idea of the immense enthusiasm with which his speech was received." When the anti-lottery faction closed its campaign on April 18, 1892, in Shreveport, the large gathering of approximately 800 persons listened for nearly three hours and displayed the "wildest enthusiasm" as the splendid array of speakers took the stand.

All of the above mentioned indoor gatherings, like most of the outdoor meetings throughout the campaign, were of a highly partisan nature and, as such, were accompanied by noisy cheering, applause, and calls for the speakers.

There was a slightly different kind of response from the audiences participating in the outdoor meetings. At these open air gatherings where the pro-lottery backer rubbed elbows with the anti-lottery advocate, less enthusiasm was displayed. The anti-lottery

26 New Orleans New Delta, July 17, 1890; Alves, op. cit., p. 94.
27 New Orleans New Delta, February 7, 1892.
28 New Orleans New Delta, March 16, 1892.
29 New Orleans New Delta, April 19, 1892.
30 New Orleans New Delta, March 16, 1892.
newspaper, the New Delta, which normally reported on audience reaction, was conspicuously silent on this point when reporting on the outdoor events. Although heckling was recorded on several occasions at pro-lottery affairs, neither the anti- nor the pro-lottery press recorded incidents of heckling at the anti-lottery assemblies.31

As has been shown, the audiences usually were enthusiastic participants. They called for the speakers, cheered and applauded at the indoor meetings. Somewhat less activity was displayed at the outdoor affairs. The audiences seemed to enjoy the festive atmosphere which surrounded the speaking events, and often encouraged the orators with brief words of agreement.

II. Occasions

A. Preliminary Arrangements

Preparations were carefully made for most of the mass meetings. The Anti-Lottery League had created an executive committee which conducted a state-wide campaign.32 This committee apparently organized the speaking tours and, in conjunction with the local Leagues, worked out all the necessary arrangements. The Women's Anti-Lottery Leagues throughout the state prepared the halls for the speaking. Almost

31 In south Louisiana Gilbert L. Dupre "somewhat discomfited an anti present, who was prone to ask questions" during a speaking engagement in Murphy Foster's home parish of St. Mary. On the same day and not too far away, L. O. Macker had to reply to questions in a way as to "invite silence from his interrogators" at Breaux Bridge. (New Orleans Daily Picayune, October 5, 1891.)

every time newspapers reported that a hall was decorated, credit for the work went to the ladies.33

Publicity was handled mainly through the press. Political rallies were highly publicized several days in advance. With the exception of the New Delta, the New Orleans newspapers gave extensive coverage to the pro-lottery meetings. This was to be expected since the Louisiana Lottery Company was one of their major advertisers. Pro-lottery sentiment by the press forced the anti-lottery faction to strengthen its speaking campaign.

B. Events Giving Rise to the Meetings

During the early part of the movement in 1890, the primary cause for meetings was to organize the Leagues, and to strengthen that organization. As a part of the League’s strategy, the popular U. S. Senator-elect Edward D. White was chosen to speak in order to draw a large crowd to a New Orleans meeting. They probably hoped to impress the state legislature, which was opening its session, with the strength of anti-lottery sentiment.34 The anti-lottery forces used every possible excuse for a meeting. For example, after the 1890 legislature passed the Lottery recharter amendment, the

33New Orleans New Delta, December 24, 1891; February 7, 1892; New Orleans Daily Picayune, January 16, 1892.

34Alwes, op. cit., p. 93; New Orleans Daily States, May 18, 1890.
Anti-Lottery League held a "Ratification" meeting in honor of the Orleans legislators who had opposed the Lottery.35

With the advent of the gubernatorial campaign in 1891, both belligerents held a steady series of political rallies until election day in April, 1892.

C. Setting

The pre-speaking ceremonies were often as interesting as the main addresses. Colorful parades with bands signalled the coming political meeting or rally. One such instance was the departure of the New Orleans delegation for the Baton Rouge Anti-Lottery Convention. The event was described in these words:

At 8:15 they formed in line, 160 strong, headed by a brass band, accompanied by the delegations from southwest Louisiana, and escorted by many members of the League, and marched . . . to the depot. At 9:15 the special train engaged for the occasion rolled out of the Mississippi Valley Railroad depot, amid great cheering.

Salvoes of artillery and the local League with a band welcomed the delegates as they got off the train at Baton Rouge. Forming in line, the entire body paraded up the boulevard, around the Confederate monument, and into the statehouse amid the excited and milling crowds.36

35New Orleans New Delta, July 17, 1890; New Orleans, Daily States, July 17, 1890; Alwes, op. cit., p. 94.

36Proceedings of the Anti-Lottery Convention, p. 4; New Orleans Daily Picayune, August 8, 1890.
In the small towns of Louisiana, political mass meetings often became day-long occasions. Thibodaux was the scene of such an affair. Although the speaking was to take place at 3:00 and 8:00 P.M., people crowded the town early in the morning awaiting the arrival of the train bringing the speakers. As the train glided into the station, the depot platform was crowded and a colorful band played "Dixie." Cannons boomed, whistles shrieked, and enthusiasm reigned. Murphy J. Foster and the other visitors had to force their way to the carriage which took them to the hotel to await the afternoon meeting.\(^{37}\)

In New Orleans, indoor sessions were held in the Grand Opera House, Grunewald Hall, Tulane Hall, and Washington Artillery Hall. Washington Artillery Hall was a large brick structure, 90 feet by 340 feet, which fronted on Carondelet and St. Charles streets.\(^{38}\) The Grand Opera House was a beautiful structure built after 1870 on Canal Street where Maison Blanche department store now stands.\(^{39}\) Outside New Orleans, the canvassers held their indoor gatherings in opera houses and courthouses.

One might wonder whether the audiences of this period were able to hear the speakers. Although the newspapers did not comment upon this aspect of the meetings, it may be assumed that the lack of comment signifies that there was no major difficulty in this regard.

\(^{37}\)New Orleans, New Delta, February 7, 1892.

\(^{38}\)New Orleans Times Picayune, April 13, 1918.

Some of the vivid newspaper descriptions of the decorative settings in which the meetings took place aid considerably in recreating a mental picture of the occasions. These reports tell of "magnificent stands of shrubbery," exotic flags and banners, and flowers with streamers decorating the entrances of halls to the meeting places. Upon one occasion the stage curtain of an opera house was raised displaying a shield resting upon two national flags and bearing the inscription: "Article 173. Gambling is declared to be a vice, and the General Assembly shall enact laws for its suppression." Another brilliant white banner bore a quotation from Governor Nicholls' message vetoing the pro-lottery legislation passed by the Assembly: "At no time and under no circumstances will I permit one of my hands to aid in degrading what the other was lost in seeking to uphold, the honor of my native State." Nicholls was referring to the loss of his left hand during the Civil War. At another meeting, Washington Artillery Hall in New Orleans was decorated throughout. Its entrance was gaily decked with bunting, American flags, and banners bearing the word "welcome." The stairs and lobby leading to the main hall were also ornamented with decorations. "On entering the hall a scene of brightness and color struck the eye." The entire room was linked with bunting, and heavy crimson cloth, fringed with gold, was draped over it. Each column in the hugh auditorium was artfully ornamented with a "flag and the coat of arms of a foreign nation."

---

40 New Orleans New Delta, July 17, 1890.
Above all this was a large American eagle holding two American flags. "Beneath the circle of gas jets was a large canopy formed of American colors . . . on it was the inscription, Welcome to all Democrats. Leader, Murphy J. Foster." On the speaking platform the ladies had placed numerous trees, palms, and ferns which gave the appearance of a "dense forest." Holly, vines, and evergreens were decked upon the chandeliers, and flowers were placed on the speaker's desk. It was quite evident that the Women's Anti-Lottery League had been at work.\(^1\)

At the outdoor mass meetings there was little opportunity to create the completely festive environment of the indoor gatherings. However, some color was created by the presence of Japanese lanterns, oil torches, Roman candles, and decorated platforms and wagons.\(^2\)

Having considered factors which acted upon the audiences, the arrangements made specifically for the benefit of the speakers will be discussed. From all indications stages or platforms, chairs, and tables were provided for the speakers at both the indoor and outdoor meetings. The indoor meetings had stages or some other type of raised platform prepared, where the orators sat before being introduced by the chairman of the event. One report tells of "plush" chairs and "marble topped" tables for the comfort of the guest.

\(^1\)New Orleans, _New Delta_, December 24, 1891.

\(^2\)New Orleans, _New Delta_, November 1, 1891; November 7, 1891; _New Orleans Daily Picayune_, September 25, 1891; April 8, 1892.
Temporary platforms were constructed and decorated for the outdoor meetings. In New Orleans wagons and furniture vans were not uncommon sights at the ward gatherings.

D. Conditions Affecting Audience-Occasion

During the Anti-Lottery Movement, the speaking generally took place in the afternoon or at night. One exception was the Anti-Lottery Convention at Baton Rouge in 1890, which ended its second and final day of business between ten and twelve o'clock in the morning.

Considering the fact that three to five speakers usually addressed the audience on each occasion, and that some addresses took as long as two hours to deliver, the question naturally arises as to how the audiences endured such lengthy sessions. Two and three hour meetings were considered to be of average duration.

The apparent willingness of the audiences to sit through hours of oratory might be explained by the presence of entertainment at the meetings. As special inducements to draw and hold large crowds, both political factions resorted to bands, balls, and barbecues. Music generally preceded the meetings and, occasionally, was interspersed between the speeches. *Inspiring tunes were played by the

---

43 New Orleans New Delta, February 7, 1892.
44 New Orleans New Delta, November 7, 1891.
45 New Orleans New Delta, March 16, 1892.
46 New Orleans New Delta, April 18, 1892.
Tunes like "See the Conquering Heroes Come," and the inevitable, rousing strains of "Dixie" were often heard. Bands also provided the music for the popular and entertaining ball which occasionally terminated the day's campaigning activities. All available reports of a "grand ball" came from the pro-lottery press, and these dancing events were sponsored by the pro-lottery canvassers.

Both the "antis" and the "pros" used the barbecue to attract audiences. Frequently, after the rallies "a dinner of barbecued meats and bread was served to all." Crowds of thousands, and whole families, came to enjoy the free food and speechmaking. The Anti-Lottery League was conservative in its use of balls and barbecues; the pro-lottery organization spent money lavishly on such events. Undoubtedly the "antis" would have done more "entertaining" had they access to the finances which were available to the Lottery supporters.

From the beginning of the movement violence was feared. Unfortunately, there was one reported major outbreak of violence at a speaking event. During the preparations for a pro-lottery barbecue

---

47 New Orleans<New Delta>, December 24, 1891.

48 New Orleans<New Delta>, November 1, 1891; February 7, 1892.

49 New Orleans<Daily Picayune>, September 24, 1891; October 5, 1891.

50 New Orleans<New Delta>, March 16, 1892.
at Many, Louisiana, in 1891, a group of armed anti-lottery citizens took "possession" of the bread and meat laid out on the tables and destroyed it. Then they ordered those in charge out of the parish and threatened the crowd with violence if they did not disburse.\(^{51}\)

Considering the strong feelings on both sides of the recharter issue, it is a tribute to the democratic process of government that both factions were able to present their arguments without fear of intimidation from the government or from the financially powerful gambling concern. The one major instance of intimidation must not be permitted to mar the otherwise well conducted campaign waged by the opposing factions.

III. General Summary

Before audiences ranging from a few hundred to several thousand, the Anti-Lottery orators practiced their powers of persuasion. A more heterogeneous group of auditors would be hard to find. Men, women, and children from all social, professional, and economic walks of life went to hear the debaters present their arguments. These people had one thing in common; almost all claimed to be Democrats. Both north Louisiana Protestants and south Louisiana Catholics were divided as to which faction deserved their support.

Enthusiasm was the keynote of the meetings. Cheering, shouting, and applause competed with the marches of the colorfully dressed

\(^{51}\)Alwes, op. cit., p. 102.
bandsmen. Orators were called forth by exuberant listerners and spoke amidst constant interruptions.

Through various committees, the speaking locations were prepared with decorations, shrubbery, lanterns, platforms, or whatever else the occasion demanded.

Newspapers were the chief method of publicizing the meetings, which began as organizational attempts for the Leagues, and later became a part of the gubernatorial campaign. In the rural areas speaking occasions became day-long celebrations with people milling about long before the speaking commenced. After hours of listening to noted state leaders attack the Lottery, a barbecue or ball was often held.

In spite of the color and entertainment, the orator remained the focal point of the meetings. Platforms, chairs, and tables surrounded by banners, shrubbery and lighting focused attention upon his presence. He was the man of the hour, and the crowds gave their close attention to him as he spoke on one of the vital issues of the day.
CHAPTER VI

ANALYSIS OF THE SPEECHES

The purpose of this chapter is to present the major issues, arguments, and proofs employed by the anti-lottery speakers in their successful campaign to halt the perpetuation of the Lottery. Since the movement took the form of an extended debate, this chapter analyses the logical and pathetic proof used to support the proposition that "Louisiana should rid itself of the Lottery."

In order to facilitate analysis, a dichotomy of logical and pathetic proof is employed. However, in actuality, no such clear division exists. Braden and Brandenburg state, "In spite of the efforts to establish the mutual exclusiveness of logic and emotion, there is good evidence to show that the two are inseparably intertwined and extremely difficult to tear apart ... arguments and supporting facts cannot be divorced from the influence of drives, emotions, stereotypes, and language." Full credence to this point of view is acknowledged by the writer.

Since the validity of logical arguments rests upon the strictness of reasoning and the materials used to support them, the reasoning process employed by the orators must withstand critical analysis according to the tests of logic. However, rhetoric, unlike logic,

often contents itself with probable truth, since certainty is difficult to attain when future actions are being contemplated.

One form of support, logical proof, consists of evidence which appeals primarily to the intellect. It consists of the opinions of authorities, statistics, examples and specific instances, analogies and any other materials which might be considered factual in nature. Through the use of logical proof, the orator attempts to establish an argument as a fact or probability. His objective is to create understanding and belief in the minds of his auditors. By examining the logical proof used by the orators to support their arguments, a better evaluation of the Anti-Lottery Movement as a rational effort may be made.

A second type of support, pathetic or emotional proof, consists of materials which appeal mainly to the needs, desires, motives or sentiments of the audience. According to Aristotle, "persuasion is effected through the audience, when they are brought by the speech into a state of emotion; for we give very different decisions under the sway of pain or joy, and liking or hatred." In order to condition the audience for a more receptive attitude, the orator often makes use of pathetic appeals. While logical proof deals with facts or probable facts, pathetic proof is concerned with arousing the desires and emotions of an audience.

---

2Thonssen and Baird, op. cit., p. 341.

In addition to logical and emotional proof, there is ethical or personal proof. Since this type resides primarily in the character, reputation, or personality of the speaker, much of the material presented in chapter four on speakers is related to the orators' ethical appeal. Since a great many speakers participated in the Lottery debate and neither side had a monopoly on men of high character, intelligence, and good will among its supporters, the writer feels that there would be little value in a more extensive treatment of ethical appeal than that afforded in chapter four.

I. Issues

Two major issues emerged in the 1890-1892 Lottery debate: (1) Was the Lottery harmful to the state? (2) Could the state adequately meet its financial needs without Lottery revenue? To both questions the anti-lottery advocates answered yes, while the pro-lottery faction said no. Although the pro-lottery advocates would have liked to have made a major issue of the practical aspects of having the Lottery support the government, the anti-lottery speakers refused to regard feasibility as an issue. The two preceding decades had proved that the Lottery was a practical operation; however, the same decades had served as mirrors to reflect, according to the "antis," countless evils originated and perpetuated by the presence of the Lottery within the state. Therefore, the anti-lottery speakers concentrated their attack on arguments repudiating the desirability of a powerful and wealthy gambling concern as a major source of revenue for the state.
II. Logical Proof: Arguments and Evidence

A. Is the Lottery Harmful to the State

The anti-lottery faction developed three arguments to show the need for delivering the State of Louisiana from further alliance with the Louisiana State Lottery Company. These arguments attacked the Lottery politically, economically, and morally. In essence, they stated that the Lottery: (1) dominated state politics; (2) was economically harmful to the state and its citizens; and (3) was an immoral institution.

In order to test the logical development of the arguments, each will be cast into syllogistic form and analyzed according to the logical proof used to uphold them.

First to be considered is the political argument used by the anti-lottery forces depicting the Lottery as an undesirable institution. Stated in its simplest terms, the argument maintained that the Lottery should be abolished because it dominated state politics. If this argument were cast into a categorical syllogism it would read:

1. Major premise: Any business which dominates state politics should be abolished.
2. Minor premise: The Lottery is a business which dominates state politics.
3. Conclusion: Therefore, the Lottery should be abolished.

Under a democratic form of government, the major premise is valid since the will of the people must prevail over the interests of any one business. Many persons in Louisiana were not aware of the political power which the Lottery wielded. The task of the anti-lottery speakers was to convince the citizens of the state that the
minor premise was a fact. If the minor premise were accepted, then the conclusion must also be accepted. Had the business referred to in the minor premise been one which performed a special service to society, such as a bank or food chain, the conclusion may have called for controls rather than abolition.

In order to prove that the Lottery dominated state politics, the anti-lottery speakers contended that the Lottery controlled: (1) a majority of the state legislators; (2) Samuel D. McEnery, the Democratic nominee for governor; and (3) the state press. If the people could be convinced that these arguments were true, or if a reasonable amount of suspicion and doubt could be aroused against the Lottery, then the anti-lottery orators might hope to get a majority of the popular vote for the anti-lottery candidate.

The anti-lottery orators knew that they must present a strong motive, which would undeniably establish that the Louisiana Lottery desired to control the state legislature. The basic motive which drove the Lottery to the point of controlling the legislature, as presented by Edward Douglas White early in the Anti-Lottery Movement at Grunewald Hall in New Orleans, was:

"... the Supreme Court of the United States has directly held that there can be no contract to carry on a lottery; that although a State government may apparently contract to authorize a lottery for a given period, there is no contract whatever, because there can be no contract to do a wrong or commit crime. The so-called contract is revocable at the will of the creator. This being the case, the corporation is driven to the constant necessity of maintaining its rights. In order to maintain its rights it is forced to the necessity of controlling the government in its executive, its legislative and judicial
departments. It becomes necessary therefore that it should be the lord and master of public affairs, because if it is not, the license which it holds can be revoked.  

With the Supreme Court as his authority, Edward Douglas White offered a motive for the Lottery's effort to control the state legislature. He inferred that a multi-million dollar business would tend to control any group which had the power to destroy it. While he stated that the Lottery needed to control all branches of state government, his colleagues did not venture to make such a broad claim. E. H. Farrar presented a more restricted conclusion based upon the same Supreme Court decision.

Here is a corporation [The Lottery], the extent of whose power and revenue ... [is] greater than that of the largest corporation formed for purposes of trade or transportation; a revenue that goes into the millions upon millions, and how is that corporation rooted, ... It has been declared by the Supreme Court of the United States ... that the granting of a lottery charter is not a contract - is not within the domain of contracts, but that it is a mere license, revocable at the will of the power that gave it. ... What is the result? ... [The Lottery] is compelled by money, to control at whatever cost, a majority of every Legislature that may assemble in your State.  

---

4E. D. White, "May 17, 1890, Grunewald Hall Speech," New Delta, June 10, 1890.

Farrar and many other anti-lottery speakers maintained that the Lottery needed to control the legislature in order to protect its charter from being revoked by that body.6

Peter S. Lawton gave an added reason for the Lottery's attempt to control the Louisiana legislature. He pointed out that the granting of additional lottery charters must originate in the legislative body as an amendment to the constitution. Reasoning causally he concluded that the Lottery was forced to control a majority of the legislators in order to protect its gambling monopoly.7

Granting that self-preservation and the protection of a monopoly were strong motives which might lead the Lottery Company into the position of attempting to control the legislature, the anti-lottery orators were forced to prove that the Louisiana Lottery did, in fact, influence the legislature. To this end, a charge of legislative bribery was made against the Lottery. The anti-lottery speakers hoped to prove that the Lottery actually had controlled their state legislators during the passage of previous bills favorable to the Lottery and that the gambling syndicate would continue to influence the legislature if its charter were renewed. Much of the evidence used to support the bribery charge was invalid as proof. For example,

---


7Peter S. Lawton, "November 5, 1891, Algiers Speech," New Delta, November 20, 1891.
John C. Wickliffe used a quotation from the British essayist and historian, Thomas Babington Macaulay, as part of a figurative analogy which implied, but did not prove, that the Lottery managers resorted to bribery to secure favorable legislation:

... when the gambler throws double sixes once, it is nothing. When he throws double sixes twice it is a coincidence, and when he throws double sixes three times it is most remarkable, but when he throws double sixes four times there is nothing remarkable about it for the dice are loaded. When the lottery passed its [recharter] bill through the House of Representatives by just enough votes it was nothing. When the lottery bill passed the Senate by just enough votes it was a coincidence, when the lottery got its judgment from the Supreme Court by just enough judges it was most remarkable, but when it carried the state Democratic committee by one majority there was nothing remarkable about it - the dice were loaded. (Great cheering.)

J. C. Wickliffe based his charge of bribery upon assertions and insinuations rather than substantial and specific supporting material:

... what man is there throughout the broad expanse of Louisiana that for one instant will dispute the fact that the Lottery Company interferes in and dominates the politics of the State ... after a lease of less than twenty-five years we find it absolutely controlling a Legislature. After a lease of twenty-five years we find it attacking, through the columns of a subsidized press, the acts of a fearless executive. After a lease of twenty-five years the result is whispers and questions to know whether or not the Lottery Company has control of the judiciary. Should they succeed in extending their charter twenty-five years beyond the present lease, the men of Louisiana will be at the feet of this merciless monster and ruled by the most powerful of all governments - a monied oligarchy.

---

Assertions similar to those presented by Wickliffe were repeated by the anti-lottery orators. These assertions had the taint of the "big lie" propaganda technique, which attempts to repeat a probable fact so often as to have it eventually accepted by the people as an established fact.

Senator-elect Edward D. White attempted to establish a causal relationship between the voting habits of the legislature and the influence of the Lottery Company. He asked, "How else except by the great influence of the lottery company [cause] can be explained the defeat of the amendment [effect] providing that if bribery was used to carry the [recharter] amendment the amendment should fail." In his anxiety to brand the Lottery as an evil influence upon the state legislature, White neglected to consider the possibility that a majority of the legislators may have honestly supported the Lottery recharter amendment as a bona fide means of acquiring needed revenue. Secondly, he failed to take into account the fact that the pro-lottery legislators made a habit of overriding anti-lottery amendments, because amendments had become a part of the dilatory tactics of the "antis."


10E. D. White, "July 16, 1890, Grunewald Hall Speech," New Delta, July 17, 1890.
Another approach to the argument of political control was taken by Murphy J. Foster. Instead of claiming that bribes actually had been accepted by the legislators, he stressed the idea of attempted bribery. His support was based upon specific instance:

... it is well known that there are a large number of persons, agents or friends of the lottery company, in the city of Baton Rouge, and it is publicly charged that these agents are attempting to corrupt members of this General Assembly. . . We know that these agents are here; we know that they get free board, free lodging. . . and in some instances a contingent fee of $15,000, provided they can catch a vote; we know that this lottery company had its agents for the last sixteen or eighteen months traveling all over the state. . . for the purpose of influencing their Legislative votes on this Recharter question.

Foster contended that the attempts to bribe the legislature were "well known." If this were true then no further form of evidence was needed on this point for persuasive purposes. Knowledge that Lottery agents were attempting to influence legislative votes through monetary aggrandizement would be sufficient to strengthen the anti-lottery political argument. However, it must be noted that the anti-lottery orators failed to prove with factual detail that the Lottery succeeded in bribing any of the legislators. If the only objective of the orators was to arouse suspicion against the wealthy gambling business, then perhaps their words, falling upon the ears of the thousands of "have nots" in the state, triggered such an effect.

11Murphy J. Foster, "June 18, 1890, Speech on the Bribery Resolution," New Delta, October 1, 1890.
A second argument used to prove that the Lottery exerted excessive political influence was an accusation that the Lottery Company controlled the Democratic gubernatorial nominee, Samuel D. McEnery. Using personal testimony, specific instance, and causal reasoning, the "antis" charged: (1) that McEnery was supported financially by the Lottery managers; (2) that McEnery's actions as a state official had benefited the Lottery; and (3) that McEnery favored the Lottery revenue Amendment.

Through personal testimony, much of which contained unsupported assertions, Theodore Wilkinson attacked McEnery:

I supported McEnery as earnestly and devotedly as any man in the State both times when he was a candidate for governor before, but now it is altogether a different matter. His name is now being used by the lottery managers as a stalking horse for the lottery cause. These lottery managers, who are now the chief ones pressing him forward, are those who have been the beneficiaries of his most important decisions, and no word that I have ever heard of has escaped his lips protesting against the use of his name as the lottery candidate by those beneficiaries who planned, executed and paid for the great McEnery parade of a few nights ago.12

Wilkinson's unsupported assertions and testimony cannot be accepted as proof since he was an extremely biased source. As one of the leaders of the anti-lottery party, he had personal interests at stake. However, Wilkinson's conclusion that McEnery was the Lottery candidate seems justifiable with a little reflection. There were only two popular candidates in the race - Foster and McEnery. Since Foster had established himself as the avowed enemy of the Louisiana

Lottery and McEnery had kept a fairly neutral position during the movement, it seems apparent that the Lottery managers would support the candidate who appeared to be less hostile toward the Company.

Evidence of a more factual and incriminating nature was presented by J. C. Wickliffe when he cited specific instances where McEnery’s actions had directly supported the Lottery cause:

Mr. McEnery has occupied positions in each of the three departments of government. . . In 1880 he was lieutenant governor . . . and president of the State Senate. A bill was introduced to tax the lottery company before the Senate . . . Samuel Douglas McEnery . . . cast the deciding vote against the tax . . . and this is his lottery record in the legislative department. In 1882 there were endeavors made to destroy the monopoly of the Louisiana Lottery by chartering other lotteries . . . McEnery the . . . governor sent a message to the legislature denouncing lotteries and advising against their charter. And this is his record in the executive department . . . In 1888 . . . it became necessary that he should be placed on the supreme bench of the state . . . Last spring the most momentous question which has ever been placed before that tribunal, was before the Supreme Court . . . [The question] was the lottery against the people. Samuel Douglas McEnery . . . again made the usual lottery majority of one. And this is his record in the judiciary department. . . .

Since the instances cited by Wickliffe were true, there appears to be a strong indication that McEnery, willingly or unwillingly, aided the Lottery. His verbal opposition to the Louisiana Lottery was unsupported by overt action. The specific instances cited by Wickliffe have even greater logical appeal when it is considered that McEnery was a member of the regular Democratic party which had refused to place an anti-lottery plank in its platform and, thereby, forced the

---

anti-lottery Democrats to bolt the party. It seems inconsistent of McEnery to have claimed for twelve years that he did not approve of the Lottery and then accept the gubernatorial nomination from a body of men who favored extension of the Lottery charter. So Wickliffe's evidence proved almost conclusively that McEnery's official actions had favored the interests of the Louisiana Lottery.

By the process of causal reasoning, Donelson Caffery maintained that Douglas McEnery favored the Lottery revenue amendment:

He [McEnery] protests that he is anti-lottery . . . that he has never wavered in his opposition to so undemocratic, unwise and impolitic a scheme. But yet, he says the State needs revenue. He says that raising revenue from lotteries is a favored method, and revenue we haven't got, and revenue we must have . . . and as the only mode of getting the desired thing is by constitutional amendment, raising the limit of taxation, which can't be had earlier than four years, Governor McEnery [appears] before the people of the State as preferring one thing and advocating another . . . The State needs the revenue [which] cannot be had by ordinary methods of taxation, the amendment offers the revenue, and as the State can get it from no other source, the inference is absolutely irresistible that Judge McEnery favors the lottery revenue amendment. (Applause)

Caffery's inference was based upon information taken from McEnery's letter accepting the gubernatorial nomination. While Caffery's presentation of the McEnery position may have concluded more than McEnery had wished to imply, the evasive approach which McEnery took toward the Lottery issue strongly suggests that Judge McEnery was playing "middle-of-the-road" politics. Caffery attempted to further

---
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his argument against McEnery by citing another instance in which the judge voiced an opinion favorable to the Lottery:

In scathing terms he denounced this postal law. He pronounces it undemocratic in the teeth of the fact that not a single Democratic vote in Congress was cast against it. Wherefore is it then that his excellency pours out the vials of his wrath on anti-lottery mail legislation.16

Through the use of one specific instance, Caffery implied that McEnery's opposition to the anti-lottery postal law was motivated by the judge's favor for the Lottery. Caffery's inference that the votes of Democratic party members in Congress determined what was democratic in government is too ludicrous for comment. One specific instance generally does not prove a point; however, Caffery's use of a specific instance, combined with those previously cited, strongly indicates that McEnery's actions did favor the Lottery.

If the people wished to rid themselves of Lottery dominance, then McEnery's record did not support him as the best candidate for the job.17

To the accusations of legislative control and domination of the regular Democratic gubernatorial candidate, the anti-lottery orators contended, as their final sub-argument of political domination by the

16 Donelson Caffery, "January, 1892, Shreveport Speech," New Delta, February 7, 1892.

17 McEnery's nomination came relatively late in the Anti-Lottery Movement. Only four speeches were available for analysis of arguments against the pro-lottery candidate during his four months as an active member of the campaign.
Lottery, that the Lottery Company subsidized and controlled the state press. The anti-lottery speakers attempted to discredit the pro-lottery press mainly through causal reasoning. A lack of substantial evidence forced the orators to use extensively unsupported assertions. J. C. Wickliffe used an unsupported assertion in a speech when he referred to the "columns of a subsidized press," which attacked the acts of a "fearless executive"/Governor Nicholls/. Another attempt to discredit the press by assertion was made by Farrar, when he implied that the press was giving only the Lottery side of the issues:

... some of the people of this State ... who are today favoring, or pretending to favor this lottery cause, don't understand this question. They have never heard it discussed ... The majority of the press of this State has been all the other way, and most of those people only read that press. ... 

Through the use of a specific instance and causal reasoning, Edward D. White argued that the press supported the interests of the Lottery above those of the people:

Take the condition of the press of this city and the almost unanimity with which it supports the extension or submitting of the lottery grant. Does it not suggest the danger to come from the perpetuation of the lottery? In a free government the press is the guardian and protector of the people. Normally on any question looking to the creation of monopoly its voice is to warn and to defend. The priceless benefits which free government owes to a free press are beyond enumeration.

---


How is it then that our city press is too nearly unanimous for the Lottery? Does any man question that there exists in the public mind to-day a deep-seated impression that the almost unanimity of the city press is the result rather of its friendship for the lottery company than of its devotion to the people? If this impression does exist in the public mind as to the press of the city, except the new paper New Delta, . . . it points the danger of the Lottery more clearly than words of mine can do.²⁰

Examination of the material presented by the anti-lottery orators against the state press shows a lack of proof which would establish a direct relationship between the Lottery and the press. Assertions were substituted for evidence. It was an observable fact that the state press generally supported the rechartering of the Lottery Company. However, it appears that the orators extended their inferences beyond the point warranted by the evidence presented in their speeches. If White's assumption that the people regarded the papers as friends of the Lottery were true, then the orators may have been capitalizing on the preconceived ideas of their audiences. The rather obvious strategy involved in attacking the press was an effort to discredit the opposition newspapers as reliable sources.

In concluding the analysis of the first major argument against the Lottery Company which charged that the Lottery managers controlled or dominated state politics, it appears evident that the logical proof presented was not substantial enough to support this contention. Nevertheless, the specific instances and causal reasoning presented

²⁰E. D. White, "May 17, 1890, Grunewald Hall Speech," New Delta, June 10, 1890. (Similar reference to the press by White in New Delta, July 17, 1890.)
to the audiences probably were sufficient to create doubt in the people's minds and make them wonder about Lottery domination or an attempt at domination. For this reason, the pro-lottery faction was obliged to answer the attacks.

A summary of the pro-lottery arguments upon the political aspects of the debate should add measurably to an understanding of why the anti-lottery orators chose to debate the political issue as they did.

While the anti-lottery advocates were emphasizing the idea of political dominance of the state by the Lottery Company, many of the pro-lottery addresses centered upon party loyalty. Colonel A. W. Crandall went so far as to state that, "adherence to the Democratic principles were of more importance than the lottery alliance or any other question that will come before the people in the coming campaign. . . ."21

Two basic reactions were given to the anti-lottery argument of political domination: (1) the opposition ignored the accusation and stressed party loyalty;22 and (2) they asserted that if the Lottery attempted to dominate the state, the people would rise against it.23


These arguments are certainly not acceptable to dispel such serious charges as those presented by the anti-lottery faction. The Lottery supporters did not refute the charges of bribery made against the Company. They completely ignored the anti-lottery contention that McEnery was the Lottery candidate and that the press was a "hireling" for the Lottery cause. Failure to answer these charges before a suspicious and questioning citizenry may have weakened considerably the Lottery case.

The second major argument advanced by the anti-lottery forces maintained that the Lottery should be abolished because it was economically harmful to the state and its citizens. Cast into syllogistic form the argument would read:

1. Major premise: Any business which is economically harmful to the state and its citizens should be abolished.
2. Minor premise: The Lottery is a business which is economically harmful to the state and its citizens.
3. Conclusion : Therefore, the Lottery should be abolished.

If the anti-lottery speakers could prove their minor premise, which contended that the Lottery harmed the state and its citizens economically, then the conclusion would be justifiable. Neither side would dispute the major premise.

In an attempt to prove the minor premise, one of the major contentions of the anti-lottery orators was that the Louisiana Lottery Company interfered with the financial prosperity of the state. Through causal reasoning, comparison and contrast, and authority, the "antis" attempted to uphold their argument.
Senator-elect Edward D. White employed statistics to compare and contrast the savings in Louisiana with those in several other states. He stated:

In the last report of the Comptroller of Currency, I find a statement of deposits in saving banks.

- Massachusetts ........... $315,185,070
- New York ................ $523,677,515
- Ohio ..................... $25,306,712
- Louisiana ............... $914,555

What an appalling comparison! In the same report I find a table showing that from 1879 to 1889, the aggregate deposits in saving banks throughout the land nearly doubled. How does Louisiana figure in this increase? In 1878-1879 the deposits in savings banks in Louisiana were $2,010,000; in 1888-1889 these deposits had dropped to $915,000. In other words, while the aggregate saving deposits throughout the land have nearly doubled during the last decade, in this State they have dropped 50 per cent.

... I submit that the inference is legitimate that the exceptional cause, the existence of the lottery company in this State, bears some relation to the exceptional condition of the savings of our working classes....

There is no question as to the validity of the figures presented by White, since they were based upon the Comptroller of Currency report. However, White appears to be guilty of both faulty comparison and illogical inference. First, he compared Louisiana's savings with those of the wealthiest northern states. Had he compared Louisiana's finances with those of other southern states, which had a similar agricultural economy, a fairer comparison would have been presented. The northern and southern states had few economic characteristics in common, and any conclusion based upon a comparison of their respective

---
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finances would only tend to emphasize the unequal distribution of wealth among the sections. Second, from this faulty comparison Edward D. White inferred that the Lottery was the exceptional cause for the existing condition. To add to the weakness of this comparison, he overlooked another cause which was present and could have produced the effect of low savings. This was that during the period from 1879 to 1890 several bank failures occurred within the state and people tended to avoid placing their life savings in the weak banking system. On the basis of the evidence presented by White, no logical connection between the low savings in Louisiana and the presence of the Lottery was established.

A slightly different approach was used by Edgar H. Farrar to support the contention that the Lottery drained the people of their earnings. He cited the United States Supreme Court as an authority when he said:

"It [the Lottery] drains the savings banks and the hoarded money of the people. No other form of gambling appeals so strongly to the speculative instinct inherent in human nature. To use the language of the Supreme Court of the United States twice repeated at intervals of thirty years: "Experience has shown that the common forms of gambling are comparatively innocuous when placed in contrast with the widespread pestilence of lotteries. The former are confined to a few persons and places, but the latter infests the whole community, it enters every dwelling, it reaches every class, it preys upon the hard earnings of the poor, it plunders the ignorant and simple."25"

The test of this particular argument rests upon the reliability of the United States Supreme Court as an authority on the effects of

lotteries upon the financial habits of the citizens of Louisiana. While the Court is an authority upon points of legality, it would be dangerous to assume that the justices were qualified as authorities on the social and economic effects of any form of gambling upon the people. Overlooking the strictly logical aspects of the evidence, it appears that Farrar used the authoritative position of the Court and its ethical appeal to gain acceptance for his conclusions. In all probability, his argument received wide acceptance from an audience accustomed to honoring the opinions of the Supreme Court.

In the same speech, Farrar quoted extensively from a book on the laws of "chance and luck" by the noted English mathematician and astronomer, Richard A. Proctor. Proctor showed that the Louisiana Lottery kept approximately 45 per cent of the total money collected as clear profit. The Englishman then concluded, and Farrar agreed, that the "Louisiana Lottery is a gross swindle, besides being disreputable in the sense in which all lotteries are so."26 Whether Proctor was a known and acceptable authority to the audience is a matter for conjecture. However, his book was written in England before the Anti-Lottery Movement commenced, and this factor gave his study added significance, since he was presented as an unbiased source.

Still another alleged detrimental result of the Lottery was its adverse effect upon increased immigration. Louisiana was trying to

26Ibid.
bolster its economy by enticing immigrants to settle in the state. Edward Douglas White attempted to establish a causal relationship between lotteries and immigration in this manner:

. . . if we permit the renewal of the charter of a lottery company we shall go counter to the moral sentiment and intellectual convictions of the people of the United States from Maine to California . . . If we recharter this lottery for twenty-five years how can we expect immigration? Shall we say, come among us; we have chartered a lottery, we sustain the government by it, come bring your household goods, your children, and rear them in the atmosphere which we have created? I say to you, gentlemen of this Convention, it seems to me if we do this every step we take in the direction of doing it, will serve to raise higher and higher the barriers shutting us off from the way of development and prosperity which awaits us. (Applause)27

In a similar manner Rev. Palmer warned, "Whilst you are holding out our invitations to invite capital and invite population, who shall drain your morasses and stimulate industry and create the wealth of the State, you are holding up this forbidding thing [the Lottery] to drive every desirable citizen away from Louisiana."28

While it is highly probable that some people would not move to Louisiana because of its reputation as the domicile of a giant gambling monopoly, there was a more important factor which discouraged immigration. This was that the South was not considered favorable for immigration because of its highly agricultural nature and over-abundance of cheap labor. In the northern industrialized states,

---


immigrants had a better opportunity for financial security. For these reasons, the South, in general, did not receive large numbers of immigrants.

As a speech device, this argument had the potential of winning the support of business men who were interested in a larger consumer market. On the other hand, many conservative Southerners may have favored the possible exclusion of "outsiders" from the state by any means.

Although the evidence was not conclusive, through these arguments the anti-lottery advocates may have strengthened their case against the Lottery.

As the second, and final, economic sub-argument, the "antis" maintained that the proposed charter was a poor business transaction. John C. Wickliffe used an analogy in an attempt to show the poor economics involved in using the Lottery as a substitute for taxation:

Now, on the economic question. What economy is there in taking $5 out of your breeches pocket, and putting 50¢ back in your vest pocket and throwing $4.50 in the river? (Laughter) Now, that is exactly the proposition of the lottery company. It says to the State of Louisiana: "If you will permit me to take away from your people $4,500,000 a year we will give you back $1,250,000 of it." Would any business man declare that to be a "business proposition?" I think not.\(^2\)

While the analogy shows that the state would get approximately 27.8 per cent of the gross earnings of the Lottery, there is no way to check the $4,500,000 figure as being accurate, since no one has ever

been able to find the financial records of the Company. The force of the analogy rests upon the implication that the state would gain more by omitting the Lottery as the "middle man," and by collecting the needed money through taxation. However, the weakness in the implication was that the citizens are hesitant to pay increased taxes. Many individuals would contend that those who wished to help the state by voluntarily supporting it through the Lottery had a perfect right to do so. A fair conclusion would be that Wickliffe's argument was not welcomed by the audience.

Time and again, the anti-lottery advocates used explanations to inform the people of the economic factors involved in the dispute. For example, Edward Douglas White emphasized the fact that no steps were taken "to ascertain how much this franchise is worth," nor "was any public announcement given, so that all might bid for it."\textsuperscript{30} His colleague, Edgar H. Farrar, chose to point out that the Lottery amendment would be "an absolute, uncontrollable, unlimited grant to this man [Morris] and his associates."\textsuperscript{31}

By presenting expository material which emphasized the idea that the interests of the Lottery would supersede the possible benefits to be derived by the citizenry from the revenue amendment, the anti-lottery orators attempted to show that the Lottery backers had not


\textsuperscript{31}E. H. Farrar, "October 6, 1891, New Orleans Speech," New Delta, October 11, 1891.
been motivated by state interest, but Lottery interest. This was a rather clever method of discrediting the Lottery advocates and must have caused minds to wonder.

One of the strongest economic arguments against the Lottery revenue amendment was given by Edgar H. Farrar. Through a statistical comparison, Farrar showed that the existing Lottery charter added only $40,000 a year to the state treasury, while the New Orleans city tax on the Lottery stock, if allowed, would have added $150,000 a year to the city treasury. The proposed new charter, which would exempt the Company of all forms of state taxation, offered the state $1,250,000. Under the usual tax rates in New Orleans, the new charter would cost the Lottery approximately $1,500,000. If the state taxes were added to this amount, the sum would be considerably greater. Thus, Farrar concluded that the Louisiana Lottery Company offered the state $1,250,000 for a charter which was worth approximately twice that amount in city and state taxes to any legitimate corporation with a comparable capital value.32

If the Lottery revenue amendment was a "business proposition" as the pro-lottery supporters claimed, then Farrar presented strong evidence which placed the amendment in the category of a poor transaction for the state. Farrar, as stated earlier in this work, was a famous corporation lawyer. He was accepted as a reputable authority on matters of finance by the people before whom he spoke.

Weighing carefully the evidence presented against the Lottery on the economic argument, it appears that the anti-lottery orators showed, rather conclusively, that the state had defaulted in its duty to obtain the best possible contract and to regulate properly a multi-million dollar corporation. The other economic arguments, relating to immigration and to effects upon savings, were less conclusive and probably would have had varying degrees of effectiveness depending upon the preconceived notions of the auditors.

In response to the anti-lottery arguments, the pro-lottery element either evaded the issue or offered little evidence in refutation. Colonel R. M. Ogden avoided the major economic argument by reminding the people that the Lottery had aided in overthrowing Republican rule, and it had also assisted flood victims.\(^{33}\) A similar evasive answer was given by Col. Gabriel Montegut who felt that the Lottery amendment was in line with Democratic principles because it secured revenue without overburdening the people.\(^{34}\) Instead of replying to the charge that the worth of the charter had not been ascertained, Horace L. Dufour chose to show that the total 1890 revenue of the state was only $450,000 more than the sum offered for the new lottery franchise. This information did not establish the true value of the charter. In answer to the charge that the Lottery charter would be an unlimited grant to the Lottery managers, Judge W. F. Blackman offered a somewhat


misleading reply. He stated that the lottery amendment did not create a monopoly, since any other company could get a charter under the same conditions. Judge Blackman must have been aware of the fact that during the previous twenty years all outside attempts to establish another lottery company in Louisiana had been successfully halted through the Lottery's influence in the legislature and courts.

Once again, the pro-lottery arguments appear to be wanting in substantial refutative evidence. Those persons in Louisiana who were interested in the financial aspects of chartering the Lottery must have questioned whether the $1,250,000 offer was a fair price to pay for a multi-million dollar business. The anti-lottery orators claimed that it was not; the pro-lottery speakers evaded the argument.

The third major contention of the anti-lottery speakers was that the Company should be abolished because lotteries are immoral. Worded as a hypothetical syllogism the argument maintained:

1. Major premise: If lotteries are immoral, the Louisiana Lottery Company should be abolished.
2. Minor premise: Lotteries are immoral.
3. Conclusion : Therefore, the Louisiana Lottery Company should be abolished.

In the preceding syllogism, acceptance of the conclusion rests upon the validity of the minor premise. Both politicians and preachers labored to establish beyond any reasonable doubt that lotteries were immoral; thus, the Anti-Lottery Movement became a "holy" cause.

---

With the Bible as his authority, Rev. B. M. Palmer elaborated upon the "law of labor" with these words:

It is written in the best of books (Bible), that if a man will not work, neither shall he eat... it has been the fundamental and universal law under which society exists that each unit in society lives by his individual and personal labor. The farmer harrows the ground, ... The common carrier takes the cotton bloom and bears it from the barn of the planter to the distant manufacturer, and in the transportation he stamps a new value upon the original product of the field, and lives by that value. ... The manufacturer brings his industry and his skill and his invention, spinning the staple into thread and weaving it into cloth, and stamps upon the cotton bloom a value a thousand-fold more than it originally had, and the manufacturer lives upon the value which he has contributed to the plant. ... What value does the gambler ever create? What new value does he ever stamp upon the value which existed antecedently? (law, medicine, ministry protect values while they may not produce values. Lotteries do neither.)

Palmer's authority apparently supported the Lottery better than it supported Reverend Palmer. The Lottery's labor must have been great, since its "harvest" was larger than any of the earnings of those mentioned by Palmer. A considerable amount of work must have been necessary to collect the huge sums of money which the Lottery acquired. In many ways the work involved resembled that done by bill collectors, bankers, insurance agents and tax collectors. In the case of the latter two, the returns to the individual compared favorably with the returns offered by the Lottery. Palmer's main difficulty resulted from his use of the Bible, which stated one principle, and his desire to prove a completely different principle. No amount of rationalization can prove that work was not involved in

36Johnson, op. cit., p. 556.
the running of the Lottery business. The generally accepted definition of work is to put forth mental or physical effort. Palmer implied that the definition of the word is to create value.

What has been said against Palmer's use of the Bible as an authority to prove that the Lottery associates did not work is equally true of Theodore Wilkinson's same reference to the Bible. He stated:

In this busy clime of industry there is no room for drones, no room for those who live alone by the exertions of others. Here is no exception to the rule which has existed since seraphs with flaming swords watched the gates of Eden. That law which says by the sweat of thy brow shalt thou earn thy bread.37

Other than the Bible, organized religions and religious dignitaries were cited as authorities who proclaimed lotteries as a form of vice and, therefore, immoral. Donelson Caffery stated that, "Cardinal Gibbons raises his voice against the lottery... alike every Protestant denomination in the United States had spoken..."38 Rev. Dr. Mallard said, "... the Presbyterian general assembly, by repeated decisions running back to the very beginning of our American church has denounced it as sin."39 J. C. Wickliffe reminded his audience that the Methodist Church, the Baptist Church, the Catholic


38Donelson Caffery, "February 8, 1892, Lafayette Speech," New Delta, February 15, 1892.

39Rev. Dr. Mallard, "October 25, 1891, Napoleon Avenue Church Sermon," New Delta, November 1, 1891.
Church, and "every church that has an organized existence in the State of Louisiana," supported the Anti-Lottery Movement.\(^{40}\)

From the moral standpoint the Lottery stood convicted by the various Christian faiths as an immoral institution. No further authority was needed. Nevertheless, Edward D. White wished to use the authority of the United States Supreme Court to reinforce that of the religious institutions. White stated:

In the case of Phalen versus Virginia, decided by the Supreme Court of the United States as far back as 1850, it was said: "The suppression of nuisances injurious to public health or morality is among the most important duties of government. Experience has shown that the common forms of gambling are comparatively innocuous when placed in contrast with the widespread pestilence of lotteries. The former are confined to a few persons and places, but the latter infects the whole community; it enters every dwelling; it reaches every class; it preys upon the hard earnings of the poor; it plunders the ignorant and the simple." . . . Thus expounded in 1850, it was in terms reiterated by the same great court thereafter in Stone vs. Mississippi, decided in 1879, where the court held that no binding contract could be made to authorize a lottery, and it was therefore at all times subject to annihilation by proper authority.\(^{41}\)

Under the "general welfare" provisions of the Constitution, the High Court had the right to adjudge whether lotteries were harmful to the individual. By informing his auditors of the Supreme Court decision, White used an authority which was not only qualified to render a decision, but was able also to enforce it. By combining
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the decision of the highest religious authorities - the organized churches, and the highest legal authority - the United States Supreme Court, most citizens would be forced to agree that lotteries were immoral.

Not all supports for the moral argument were based upon authorities. Edgar H. Farrar and Edward D. White used nearly identical causal reasoning to imply that lotteries were immoral. A close comparison of the two arguments will show their similarity. (Numbers designate points of similarity.)

White said:
(1) "A lottery by its inevitable tendencies and practices saps the very foundation of individual morality and destroys a just sense of the great moral responsibility of life, since it impairs frugality and industry. . . (2) A lottery tends inevitably to destroy these qualities. (3) . . . It destroys the habit of industry by fixing the mind on the alluring prospects of enormous gain without corresponding labor. (4) It rejects frugality by holding out constantly the temptation of fortune without thrift. . . (5) [It] begets material loss by engendering reliance on chance. . . (6) Chance, in her fickleness, begets despair, (7) and suicide increases."

Farrar said:
(1) "The growth of society in wealth, comfort, knowledge and health is based on the two great foundations of industry and frugality. (2) . . . A lottery strikes at both these cardinal virtues. (3) It teaches man that there is a way to get rich other than by the divinely appointed path of honest labor. . . (4) it makes men drunk with the delusive sight of gold within their grasp, (5) and when they have been robbed of their all, (6) it dashes them down to despair. It impoverishes and degrades the people. (7) It provokes embezzlements and suicides."

A comparison of the causal reasoning and word choice strongly suggests that Farrar, whose speech came a year later than White's, had been greatly influenced by his predecessor's argument.

---

42Ibid.

Both men chose to attribute to lotteries the evils which accompany large scale gambling of any type. A close examination of the arguments shows that the moral weakness rests in the individual and not in lotteries as such. However, if lotteries were not available, the individual would be relatively free from temptation. Ridding the state of lotteries under these conditions becomes a protective act for the citizen who is limited in finances and will power. The strength of the material presented by White and Farrar rests upon whether the audiences wished to become their "brother's keeper."

Through the presentation of authorities and causal reasoning, the anti-lottery advocates established the movement as a holy cause. Thus, they put their audiences under a moral obligation to vote against the continuance of the Lottery. There should be little doubt that the injection of the moral issue, and the ensuing evidence in favor of the anti-lottery stand was a contributing factor to the success achieved against the Louisiana Lottery at the polls in 1892. The emphasis placed upon refuting the moral argument by the Lottery debaters indicates the degree to which this issue was considered a threat to a possible Lottery victory.

From the pro-lottery camp replies to the moral argument were numerous. Most of the Lottery debaters used almost identical arguments to answer the allegations. They maintained that since Washington, Jefferson, and Madison had supported and endowed lotteries, this fund-raising business was legal and moral. The same argument was usually extended to show that churches, schools and asylums were
built from lottery proceeds. The implication was that if respected men in government and church leaders had accepted lottery money, lotteries were not immoral. What the pro-lottery advocates failed to realize, or refused to consider, was the fact that privately-owned business lotteries, with personal profit as their basic end, were not to be confused with charitable lotteries, which usually went out of existence whenever a predetermined sum was collected. The former acquired wealth and power to the detriment of the people, while the latter built institutions which served the public.

B. Can the State Adequately Meet Its Financial Needs Without Lottery Revenue

The first major issue, which maintained that the Lottery was undesirable, was initiated by the anti-lottery forces. Pro-lottery forces, on the other hand, initiated the second major issue of the debate maintaining that Louisiana needed Lottery revenue in order to maintain its institutions. In refutation, the anti-lottery faction contended that the state could function satisfactorily without Lottery aid. Their argument formally stated was:

1. Major premise: If Louisiana can adequately maintain its institutions, it does not need the Lottery revenue.
2. Minor premise: Louisiana can adequately maintain its institutions.
3. Conclusion: Therefore, Louisiana does not need the Lottery revenue.

Hon. Harry W. Ogden, Daily Picayune, October 9, 1891; John N. Ogden, Daily Picayune, September 25, 1891; Hon. O. B. Sansum, Daily Picayune, September 25, 1891; Horace L. Dufour, Daily Picayune, September 27, 1891.
If the state were in a position to satisfy its financial needs, then it certainly did not need the Lottery aid. Placed before the anti-lotteryites was the challenging task of proving this contention. Through the use of specific instances, comparison and contrast, analogy, statistics, causal reasoning, and authority, the orators sought to establish the veracity of their argument. They attempted to prove that Louisiana had the available resources to maintain its levees, insane asylum, and schools. At best the orators indicated that, with wise budgeting bordering on an austerity program, the state could survive its dollar deficiency and eventually approach a degree of prosperity.

Statistics compiled by authorities were the main form of support used to support the levees argument. During the Anti-Lottery Convention, the Hon. J. M. Avery used statistics and authority when he stated:

It has been said, . . . that we are unable to build our levees that have been broken. We are able to place them in a better condition than we were before the last terrible catastrophe and still leave a surplus in the treasury. (Applause) Captain Dan C. Kingman has told us that the levees could be repaired and built for $100,000. He certainly had no interest in this lottery question one way or the other, and consequently had no interest, in his responsible position as engineer in charge of the government works, in deceiving the people of the levee districts. . . . I find from the auditor himself . . . that there are two hundred and six thousand and odd dollars in the treasury to the credit of the general levee fund, and that there was only the sum of $50,000 to be paid out under contract, leaving in cash in the treasury over $200,000 to complete the $100,000 work required, according to the report of Captain Kingman. We find, also, that from the different sources, from the general levee tax - not the special district
tax at all - and the sale of public lands, the revenues received by the State will average the sum of $75,000 per year; and these figures were also given to me by the auditor; so that we will have $370,000 at the end of this year, before the expiration of 1890, to build the levees and put them in repair. Do we need any of Mr. Morris' money to build our levees? (Cries of "No!" "No!")

Avery presented his figures in simple, clear terms which could be easily understood by his auditors. His use of the state auditor as an authority was valid. There may have been some doubt that the government engineer could accurately estimate the cost of levee repairs. He also could have been a biased source. However, Avery's argument and evidence did receive a somewhat favorable reaction from his audience, as is evidenced by the applause and the cries of "no, no" which followed his question, "Do we need any of Mr. Morris' money to build our levees?"

Edward D. White also used statistics and authority to show that Louisiana could maintain its levee system with funds already available in the treasury. But, then he proceeded to contradict the very argument he was developing. After presenting figures which showed that levee repair costs would be less than funds available, he said:

---
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... this does not include any aid from the federal government which was so efficiently given after the flood of 1889, and since. Why, fellow citizens, at this moment we are looking to Washington for the passage in the Senate of a bill already passed by the House of Representatives for a million dollars. 47

There appears to be a gross inconsistency implied in White's argument. If Louisiana had the means to maintain its levees, why did it look to Congress for aid? What arguments had convinced the House of Representatives to pass the Louisiana levee aid bill, which the Senate was in the process of considering? White's argument was inherently inconsistent and thereby unacceptable as proof.

An entirely different approach was the argument of the Hon. Theodore Wilkinson. Wilkinson employed causal reasoning with respect to the levee problem. He asked:

Do we need the money - are our levees in bad condition? That break in the levee at Ames was not due to lack of money. The levees are having more work done now than was ever done, and soon . . . our levee system will be in such shape as to successfully resist the worst floods that yonder river ever brings down against our banks. 48

In questioning whether lack of money was the cause of the levee breaks, Wilkinson hit upon a point which many citizens had overlooked. Perhaps, the cause lay in the design of the levee system. Since breaks occurred in the existing levees, the fault could rest upon the specifications of the engineers, who determined the height

47 E. D. White, "May 17, 1890, Grunewald Hall Speech, New Delta, June 10, 1890.

and thickness of the earthen walls necessary to withstand the rampaging Mississippi River. While Wilkinson's argument was not widely used in the movement, it brought to light a point which deserved consideration. His argument also minimized the pro-lottery argument that Lottery money would alleviate the flood danger.\footnote{Similar levee arguments were used by: Charles Parlange, "August 8, 1890, Anti-Lottery Convention Speech," Proceedings of Anti-Lottery Convention, p. 52; Frank P. Stubbs, "Anti-Lottery Speech," Proceedings of Anti-Lottery Convention, p. 39.}

With emphasis upon statistics, specific instances, and authorities, the anti-lottery advocates upheld the contention that the state asylum was also adequately supported. Edward D. White gave a detailed account of the institution's finances with these words:

It is said that the condition of the insane in this state is deplorable that as a matter of humanity we must re-charter the lottery . . . the figures which I give are official, and have been handed me by Mr. Reddy, the able and efficient chairman of the finance committee of the Insane Asylum . . . The appropriation for the years 1888 and 1889 . . . was $184,000. During the last two years, and up to the 1st of May the buildings have been thoroughly repaired, a new and valuable sewerage system has been added and a proper heating apparatus supplied. For these objects there has been disbursed during this period a sum of between eighteen and twenty thousand dollars, outside of the ordinary expenses of the institution . . . Doing all these things, and supporting the asylum at the same time, from the appropriations named, the board had on hand on the 1st of May the following sums: Cash . . . $66,890; Warrants of 1890 equivalent to cash . . . $20,000, total . . . $66,896. (sic) There were due outstanding bills of about $10,000, leaving over $56,000 in actual cash or its equivalent . . . the board will find itself at the
end of the fiscal year with the asylum renovated and repaired, heated and sewered, with all its expenses of maintenance paid, and with a surplus of actual cash on hand, over and above the appropriation, of $41,000.  

Three months after White's speech, J. M. Avery offered statistics which supported the estimates given by the former speaker. Financially, the asylum had terminated the fiscal year with slightly more than the $41,000 reserve fund estimated in the White address. Avery used the report of the Senate Committee of Charities as his authority. To prove further that there would be adequate facilities for the insane, Avery cited the fact that the General Assembly of 1890 had appropriated the sum of $10,000 to the institution, "... the aggregate of which amounts is simply sufficient to admit of the immediate construction of additional buildings sufficient to accommodate 150 or 200 more people. With this explanation, considerable weight was given to the argument that the asylum was being improved to meet the needs of the state.

Weakest of all the arguments on available state finances were those which pertained to the needs of education. Even the best evidence used to support the anti-lottery assertions did little to prove that Louisiana had an adequate educational system. The best argument which J. M. Avery could support went like this:

---

50 E. D. White, "May 17, 1890, Grunewald Hall Speech," New Delta, June 10, 1890.

The report, . . . of the Superintendent of Education shows that the session of our public schools averages six and a half months in the year, running up in some of the parishes as high as seven months and a half. I call the attention of this Assembly to the fact that no matter how much money you are willing to pay; no matter to what school you send your children, it is an impossibility, unless you hire a private tutor, to afford them more than eight months of school session during the year . . . as I have said, the children of our State receive on the average educational facilities for six and a half months per year.52

Through the use of authority, it appears that Avery showed the need for more education. His figures become more distressing when one considers the inevitable financial hardships and uncertainties which the teachers had to face under a system which did not guarantee a full school term. The six-and-a-half month figure was an average one, and suggests that some schools had shorter sessions. These figures could not have been consoling to parents with children of school age.

It seems justifiable to conclude that Avery's argument lent support to the opposition, while it weakened his own contention.

Similarly weak were statements made by Professor Alcee Fortier, of Tulane University, and Edward Douglas White. Fortier did not attempt to support his assertion that, "As a State we are annually making educational progress in every direction."53 Using the same authority as Avery, White concluded more than appears warrantable when he said:

52 Ibid.

53 Prof. Alcee Fortier, "October 31, 1891, Speech before the Women's League," New Delta, November 1, 1891.
... many as are the wants of the schools, after a full conference with our admirable Superintendent of Education, now Associate Justice Breaux, it can be affirmed that our public school system is improving. The means and the methods to do better are at hand without rechartering a lottery.54

White admitted that the educational system was in great financial need. From his authority he received assurances that the system was "improving." He did not explain how or where the improvement was taking place. His assertion that the "means and methods to do better" were at hand received no factual support. For these reasons, White's argument left much to be desired in the way of logical support. He offered hope but not proof.

In retrospect, it appears that the anti-lottery orators were offering the people a program of slow development in public works and institutions, and freedom from fear of Lottery dominance. At best, the anti-lottery arguments indicated that the state could maintain itself just slightly better than it had in past years. While the levee system was being improved yearly to meet the onslaughs of the Mississippi, education apparently suffered the greatest need for lack of finances. Facilities for the sick and mentally ill were inadequate, in spite of the evidence used to show that one insane asylum had been recently renovated.

Arguments from Lottery advocates were most extensive against the anti-lottery faction's contention that the state could adequately support itself. Colonel R. H. Snyder, an avid Lottery supporter,

54E. D. White, "May 17, 1890, Grunewald Hall Speech," New Delta, June 10, 1890.
used authority to countermand the argument of Edward D. White. Synder showed that $10,000,000 rather than $82,000 would be needed to "put the levees in condition; . . ."55 Similarly, most of the other pro-lottery speakers used the fear of floods to help persuade the people that they must accept the Lottery revenue in order to protect their land and homes.56

A few pro-lottery supporters offered the audiences a choice of higher taxes or acceptance of the Lottery amendment.57

Although the pro-lotteryites pointed to a general need for improvement and support for charities, it was in the area of educational needs that some of their best arguments were developed. Judge Lawrence O'Donnell asserted that $709,000 in back wages was due the teachers58 and cited a recent instance where a festival had been held to raise money "to open the schools."59 Another orator emphasized the need for more and better schools with higher wages for teachers who worked for "starvation wages." He further cited a quotation of


56Horace L. Dufour, Daily Picayune, October 5, 1891; Col. R. N. Ogden, Daily Picayune, September 24, 1891; O. B. Sansum, Daily Picayune, September 25, 1891.


58Judge Lawrence O'Donnell, Report of Covington Speech, Daily Picayune, October 9, 1891.

the Superintendent of Schools pointing to the unsanitary conditions of the existing schools and the average of about five months of teaching time. One of the best uses of specific instance was made by the Hon. Larry O'Donnell when he emphasized the fact to an Amite City audience that their city had no schools.

There can be little doubt that Louisiana was in need of better levees, charitable institutions, and schools. However, the pro-lottery speakers implied that the $1,250,000 per year offered by the Lottery Company would be a cure-all. Their solution, Lottery revenue, was not sufficient to meet the inherent financial weaknesses of a state which had tried to sustain itself from the fruits of an overbalanced agricultural economy. Through the defeat of the Lottery revenue amendment, the people of Louisiana forced their government to seek a more substantial solution to the growing financial demands of an expanding population. The Lottery revenue would have been perhaps a palliative method, serving at best to delude the citizenry into believing that their economic problems had been eliminated. Regardless of the personal motives involved, the anti-lottery orators deserve praise for preventing the people from accepting a nearsighted solution to a basic financial problem which would eventually demand correction.


III. Pathetic Proof: Emotional Appeals

If reason is the key to the intellect, then emotion is the stimulus which activates the soul. While the intellect revels with facts and figures, the soul pleads for love, joy, security and hope. Since ancient times men such as Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian have known that emotions are the springboards of human action. Modern man, being no less aware of this fact, continues to use pathetic proof in an effort to guide humanity toward acceptance of actions which appear to be beneficial to society. This section on the presentation and analysis of the pathetic proof used by the anti-lottery orators attempted to introduce: (1) the kinds of emotions to which appeals were made; (2) the method of presenting the appeals; and, (3) a judgment on the possible effectiveness.

In their effort to get the people to act against the Louisiana Lottery Company, the orators relied primarily upon appeals to liberty, patriotism, duty, family security, morality and humor. Occasionally, an appeal was made to fear, tradition, hope, fair play, or financial security. The latter appeals were so seldom used as not to warrant more than a mention of their use.

A. Liberty: Freedom

To a people whose ancestors had left their homelands and created a new nation which rejected monarchy and tyranny in favor of democracy, the appeal of liberty has special significance. Americans pride themselves on the freedom for which they fought. Donelson Caffery must have realized this fact when he said;
We are fighting, not for an ordinary principle, my friends and fellow citizens. We are fighting for the very existence of this people as a free community. It is as impossible to engraft this wretched iniquity upon our organic law and have a free government as it is to wrench the stars from their courses or this planet from its orbit . . . This amendment is something which strikes at the very root of our liberties. Everyone of you knows that in order to perpetuate this revenue amendment the lottery is bound to have control of the government.62

A similar appeal was given by Frank P. Stubbs during the Anti-Lottery Convention when he warned the people that they would not only be selling their state, but the freedom of her citizens as well, if Morris were permitted to acquire the Lottery charter. Stubbs further warned that the people would become the "servants" of the Lottery executive.63 At the same convention, Charles Parlange posed the question, "Are you willing for a sum of money to sell your proud privilege of being your own masters, to half a dozen men whom only one has the courage to confess his name?"64

One interesting technique was used by Edgar H. Farrar when he attempted to use a rationally developed argument in order to prove that the Lottery and freedom were incompatible. Although the approach and language are different from the usual colored language of pathetic proof, the goal sought remained the same. Farrar said:


Aristotle says that an oligarchy is formed for the purpose of wealth, and that its object is the acquirement of wealth; but that a democracy is formed for the purpose of freedom, and that its object is the acquisition of individual freedom for its citizens. The result of this principle is that wherever you erect in a democracy - the object of which is freedom - anything which operates contrary to the principles of democracy, you necessarily impair the result for which democracy was established - freedom. If you attempt to run a democracy and oligarchy together, the oligarchy will swallow up the democracy. It has always been so throughout the history of the world. Hence, the principle that, in a free government, the organization of any great centralizing power - especially a money power - is inimical to the freedom of the people of that community. . . . 65

From the examples cited, it is evident that the orators were sowing the seeds of fear that the Lottery would threaten personal liberty. While there is no absolute means for determining the effectiveness of these or subsequent emotional appeals, the strength of the appeals and the method of presenting them directly influences the degree to which an audience may respond. The warnings of impending danger to personal liberty coming from highly respected men must have alerted the people to reflect carefully before accepting any further toleration of the ever growing Lottery Company.

B. Patriotism

In Louisiana patriotism had a special meaning to the generation which had seen the Civil War come and go. Many of the men, having fought for their homes and families, maintained a burning love for

their Southland. Into this environment the anti-lottery rhetoricians offered their cause as the one which demanded the allegiance of all patriotic citizens. The words of Peter S. Lawton ring with patriotic sentiment:

Come forward then, my fellow citizens, and prove to the world that you are not mendicants, prove to the world that you intend to maintain the principles for which the heroes of this Sunny Southland gave up their lives, prove to the world that you will not have a lottery as the corner-stone of the edifice of this proud old Pelican State, and when you shall have done this you will have what the immortal Lee told his immortal soldiers, on the immortal battlefield of Appomattox that they had that satisfaction and that consolation which proceeds from a consciousness of duty faithfully performed.66

Rev. Benjamin Morgan Palmer used vivid descriptions to awaken Louisiana's native sons to a realization of their love for the state. In highly figurative language he said:

These beautiful plains, this delicious climate, . . . these beautiful streams which like silver threads almost convert a portion of our State into a modern Venice - Are we, sir, to abandon such a land as this, created by beneficent heaven and secured by the patriotism of the fathers that went before us? (Cries of Ho, No.)67

Another appeal to patriotism was used by Murphy J. Foster during his speech accepting the nomination for governor. After asserting that Louisiana did not need the "gambler's gold," Foster stated:

To our cause, to the cause of true Democracy, we can well summon the true sons of our State to our standard; we can well summon every lover of liberty, and upon our

66Peter S. Lawton, "November 5, 1891, Algiers Speech," New Delta, November 20, 1891.

cause we can invoke the blessings of a Christian world and the prayers of every wife and mother in the land. (Prolonged applause.)

Foster made similar statements in another speech, while several of his colleagues also appealed to patriotism.

Both politician and preacher claimed the anti-lottery struggle to be a part of the patriotic duty of every citizen. Through references to Civil War heroes, the beauties of the state, and "true sons of our State," efforts were made to correlate patriotism with anti-lotteryism.

C. Duty

Closely allied with liberty and patriotism is the motivating appeal to duty. Society demands that men do certain things under given conditions; for example, if the home is threatened or an enemy approaches, men are obliged to give protection. The Lottery Company was depicted as such an enemy to the people and the state. Donelson Caffery demanded that:

... we have got to stand to our guns and carry our banner to victory, whether or not the lottery corpse lies moldering in the graveyard. (Loud applause) And we would be recreant to the principles we have avowed, and to the steps we have taken should we surrender to

---

68 Murphy J. Foster, "December 17, 1891, Acceptance Speech," New Delta, December 19, 1891.

this crew that have been hounding on this State to its destruction, and trying to place upon her brow the inef­faceable mark of shame. We have got to fight them. We will fight them, through the blessing of God, until we have routed the last enemy of our State. (Loud Applause.)70

Early in the movement, Edward D. White told an audience that,

"Everywhere comes to us words of encouragement to do our duty."

Later in the same speech he elaborated upon this idea by saying:

Thus the question is one so momentous and far reaching that every suggestion of honor, every dictate of morality, of patriotism, of duty to God and man, call upon us to reach a sound, a safe, and a just conclusion. We cannot shirk it; since not alone the present but the future is involved.71

Peter S. Lawton made a similar reference to "duty" in one of his addresses.72

The people were called upon to protect their state from shame and disgrace. Honor, morality, and patriotism demanded that the voters do their "duty" by helping to defeat the Lottery recharter amendment.

D. Family Security

Many of the anti-lotteryites labored to show that the Lottery Company would prove to be an evil influence upon the lives of young

70Donelson Caffery, "February 8, 1892, Lafayette Speech," New Delta, February 15, 1892.

71Hon. E. D. White, "May 17, 1890, Orunewald Hall Speech," New Delta, June 10, 1890.

72Peter S. Lawton, "November 5, 1891, Algiers Speech," New Delta, November 20, 1891.
children. They knew that a man would do all in his power to guarantee his family freedom from domination and corruption. Professor Alcee Fortier of Tulane University presented the appeal to family security with the following words:

I consider that a man must be blind who cannot see the evils of the Louisiana Lottery. How can any man who is a father advocate the principles of the Louisiana Lottery? They would be justified when they reached the age of manhood to reproach us and ask what have you done with my liberty?  

Professor Fortier was one of many anti-lottery speakers who used this motivational appeal to add strength to his arguments. One orator professed that the Lottery charter proposition would involve the selling of "honor," "wife," and "children." In two of Edgar H. Farrar's addresses the desire for family security received a degree of emphasis. He said:

... it /Lottery question/ must take hold of every man in the State who possesses the power of reflection: who stops and thinks about what is going to happen to-morrow, the next week and the next year; especially a man who has a family, who has children to bring up and who, naturally in his paternal affection, looks to the atmosphere that is going to surround these children as they grow up in life; ... 

---

73 Prof. Alcee Fortier, "October 31, 1891, Speech before the Women's League," New Delta, November 1, 1891.


I say that as a man, as a citizen, and above all, as a Democrat, I cannot consent, for any purpose on earth, to the erection of a great money power of this sort in my native State - a power so situated that it must live by politics, it must die by politics, . . . I say that I do not propose to spend the rest of my life in fighting a money power of that sort, and that even if I were so combative as to have such a desire I do not wish to transmit a battle of that sort to my children. (Great applause) No man in this State who has got any of the feelings of manhood, no father in this State can say that he desires to surround his children with a political atmosphere which will lead to their degradation or will lead to revolution. (Applause)

Emphasizing the words "family," "wife," and "children," the anti-lottery speakers repeated the warning that the Lottery would bring ill effects upon the family. They envisioned an unpleasant atmosphere crowded with Lottery influences.

E. Morality

Perhaps no other appeal was given more emphasis than the one which alluded to the moral dignity and sentiment of the Christian people of Louisiana. A few examples will indicate the manner in which the appeals were made. Donelson Caffery used this approach:

No party can ask me to turn my back upon the God whom I adore. (Loud applause) No party can ask me to dishonor my children in my sight. No party can ask me to put the stigma of shame upon the brow of the wife of my bosom. (Loud applause) No party has the right to demand of a citizen that he shall get upon his bended knee and render obeisance to the false gods of Baal and of Mammon. (Loud applause)


77 Donelson Caffery, "January, 1892, Shreveport Speech," New Delta, February 7, 1892.
Professor Alcee Fortier explained his personal experience with the Lottery. His appeal appears to be directed toward his fellow French-Americans. He stated:

The State law that permits these daily temptations is wrong. Many are lottery's votaries because they are tempted and do not stop to think about its nefarious workings. It was so in my own experience, and it was only after reading Governor Nicholls' proclamation on the subject that I realized what a precipice I had been standing on. From that day I would not buy a lottery ticket and would consider the honor of my home soiled by a lottery ticket . . . It has been asserted that the lottery has only been condemned in forcible language in the English tongue, but I think that statement will be qualified when I proclaim with the full force of the French language that the Louisiana Lottery is contemptible.78

One of the more interesting appeals to Christian sentiment was offered by Edward D. White through the use of an illustration, which challenged Christian morality to equal Pagan morality. White asserted:

The question then is a simple one. It is, shall we uphold our morality? Shall we respect the teachings of our fathers? . . . my attention was called the other day to what strikes me as an apt illustration. Phryne, famous for her beauty and signally infamous in her life, had amassed a vast fortune by shame and sin. When Alexander had thrown down the walls of Thebes, she offered to rebuild them at her own cost, not in consideration of obtaining a valuable and exclusive license to debauch and deprave, /like the Lottery/ but simply that she be allowed to write upon the risen walls, "Destroyed by Alexander, the Macedonian; rebuilt by Phryne." The offer was refused. Mark, this was the strength of Pagan morality; and we, today, with the bright sunlight of Christian civilization shining on us, we are asked to associate forever the name of this great commonwealth with a licensed gambling lottery.79

78Prof. Alcee Fortier, "October 31, 1891, Women's League Speech," New Delta, November 1, 1891.
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Similarly based emotional appeals were offered by the Hon. Henry C. Miller and John Wickliffe. All of these appeals were designed to stigmatize the Lottery with the mark of moral weakness. If the people were made to believe that lotteries were not acceptable in the light of Christian moral teaching and sentiment, in all probability, their votes would be cast against the Lottery revenue amendment and for the anti-lottery ticket.

F. Humor

On the lighter side of the Anti-Lottery Movement, there was a constant, though not excessive, use of humor employed by the anti-lottery element. Humorous analogies and sarcasm which may have gained a friendly, receptive hearing for the more important arguments were used. The use of humor also gave variety to the mood of the speeches.

By far the cleverest presentation of humorous material was offered by Donelson Caffery when he used a parody of Shakespeare's "dagger scene" in Macbeth to cast aspersions at McEnery, the pro-lottery candidate. Caffery mused:

Is this an office which I see before me;  
The chair toward my hand? Come let me  
Clutch thee - (Great laughter)  
I have thee not, yet I see thee still,  
(Tremendous cheering and applause)

---

Are thou not, fatal vision, sensible
to feeling as to sight, or art thou but
An office of the mind, a false creation,
Proceeding from an office-oppressed brain,
I see thee yet in form as palpable,
As that which now I have;
Thou marshaled me the way I was going,
And on thy borders hang bags of revenue,
Which was not so before.
(Tremendous cheering and applause.)

From the response recorded by the newspaper, Caffery's audience displayed a considerable degree of overt reaction consisting of "laughter," "tremendous cheering," and "applause." This kind of response apparently proves that his attempt at humor was successful.

A humorous analogy given by Edgar H. Farrar merited "laughter" and "applause" when he said:

Indeed, it [the Lottery] operates almost like a contribution which a man once made for the benefit of the heathen - he contributed a dollar and a cent, and when asked what the cent was for, he said: "My friend, the cent is for the heathen and the dollar is to get it there." (Laughter) So that the amount of money which goes into the State treasury is the copper for the heathen and the dollar is the rich plum which the gambler gets in order to get the copper from the pockets of the people into the government. (Applause)

Similar in development was the analogy drawn by John C. Wickliffe during the Anti-Lottery Convention. Wickliffe related this story:
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The story has been told of an old gentleman who went out to the race track to see his first quarter-mile race. He said that after sitting on a hard plank in the sun for four mortal hours he turned his head to spit, and before he got it around again the race was run, won, and lost. So it is gentlemen, with John A. Morris and his unknown associates who are either ashamed of the lottery or the lottery is ashamed of them . . . They had their plan all cocked and primed and while they turned their heads to spit, before they could get them back, they were whipped and whipped clean out of their boots. 83

Representative of the sarcasm employed by the Lottery opposition are the words cast against the pro-lottery gubernatorial candidate by Donelson Caffery:

I shall now . . . take up the letter of acceptance of Judge McEnery. It starts out with a gentle dalliance, with an amorous coying, as of sweethearts, between the judge and the office of governor. (Laughter) The imperial crown has been unanimously tendered him. He sees no peculiar deserts in himself - yet, he is impelled, he says, by an imperative necessity to accept it. What mysterious power is behind the governor, is left to the imagination of our people. (Laughter) What imperative necessity forces his excellency to jump into the breach and rescue the warring fortunes of the lottery from defeat, is left solely to our conjecture. 84

In public speaking, as in conversation, laughter can relieve tension and often change opposition to willing support. From the appeals already studied, it is obvious to the casual observer that the anti-lottery orators were systematically appealing to the basic emotions and motivational factors which actuate human behavior.


84Donelson Caffery, "January, 1892, Shreveport Speech," New Delta, February 7, 1892.
IV. Historical Perspective

Few significant events take place without leaving their mark on later generations; therefore, the question arises as to what were the effects of the Anti-Lottery Movement upon the State of Louisiana. To isolate the role of speeches from other factors in determining change is difficult. However, there seems to be a fairly clear and direct relationship.

One of the immediate results of the movement was the election of Murphy J. Foster. He received 79,388 votes while his nearest opponent, McEnery, polled 47,037 votes. Foster's plurality represented 44.5 per cent of the vote cast. The remaining 55.5 per cent of the total vote was divided among the three other candidates.

Concern had been voiced by the pro-lottery advocates over the ability of the state to meet its financial obligations with reference to levees, the insane asylum, and education. Anti-Lottery speakers pointed out that the state would manage to give adequate funds for the maintenance of each. History vindicates the anti-lottery orators to the extent that all of the needs of the state were met without lottery revenue. W. W. Heard, the State Auditor, reporting for the 1894-1895 period stated:

85Kendall, op. cit., p. 499.

All debts created since the year 1880 have been paid or provided for and there now remains outstanding no floating indebtedness created since that time. To those who have labored earnestly and diligently to maintain the State's credit it is most gratifying to be able to announce that the financial affairs are now conducted on a cash basis and all obligations are promptly met upon presentation.87

In only one major respect are the pro-lottery orators vindicated, for they warned that the state would have to resort to higher taxation without the Lottery funds. The State Auditor reported, "The increase in revenue 1892-18937 was achieved largely by a better assessment of personal property and improved laws which aided in the detection of delinquent payments on licenses."88 Schools and levees were supported partially through the issuance of state bonds.89 Further aid was given to the state system of education in 1898 when the poll tax and a levy of one and one-quarter mills were dedicated to education. Another provision of the same year permitted an increase in taxes for schools on a local option basis. After 1904 most of the parishes and many of the cities provided for schools by local taxation.90

The one important factor to keep in mind is that Louisiana met its financial obligations by placing the responsibility of government


89Ibid., p. v; Report of the State Auditor 1894-1895, p. 66.
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upon the people. In this way the government became dependent upon, and responsible to, the citizenry rather than a gambling institution. Perhaps the bitter struggle engendered by the Lottery recharter attempt left an indelible mark in the minds of the political leaders and people of the state, for no further efforts have been made to charter a lottery in Louisiana.
CHAPTER VII
CONCLUSION

In the introduction five questions, which were to be answered as the major objectives of the study, were asked. They were:

1. Who were the leading speakers of the movement?
2. What were the characteristics of the audiences?
3. Under what condition did the speaking take place?
4. What issues, arguments and proofs were made by the orators?
5. What effect did public speaking have within the movement?

These questions and their answers will constitute the body of this, the concluding chapter of a description and analysis of the speaking in the Louisiana Anti-Lottery Movement.

I. Who Were the Leading Speakers of the Movement?

From all sections of Louisiana men came together and formed Anti-Lottery Leagues in an effort to stay the expanding power of the Louisiana Lottery. They had been aroused by a core of leadership consisting of some of the most prominent political and religious figures in the state - men who had confronted the people and guided them with the power of oratory. This section indicates that the leading orators, who were also the leading organizers, were men with years of experience as officeholders, lawyers, judges, or ministers. For the most part these orators had gained the aura of fame as
participants in the "lost cause" of the Southern Confederacy. They came home to find that while the North had won the war, they themselves, had won the allegiance of the people.

A close examination of the lives of the anti-lottery speakers shows that they were men with prominent family backgrounds - generally from the planter class. Their formal education was acquired at local and out-of-state institutions. In most instances the men were re-tracing the footsteps imprinted by their fathers. Their successes often matched those of their fathers, and at times superseded them.

To the unknown and obscure men who worked toward the success of the Anti-Lottery Movement, their master spokesmen, the anti-lottery orators, must stand as a historical symbol of their great effort for the commonweal.

A. Murphy James Foster

Murphy James Foster worked his way up the political ranks of his state to become the governor of Louisiana. In the process he became an accomplished "stump" speaker. Although Foster was only adequate as an orator, he was a vigorous campaigner and an expert at parliamentary maneuvering. His excellent character and moral fiber helped to make him a symbol of leadership for the anti-lottery campaign. Few men, if any, could claim to have been more active as a public speaker in the movement than Murphy Foster.

As a young man Foster received an excellent liberal arts education and studied law. This training coupled with approximately twenty years of political campaign speaking helped to make Foster a formidable
orator. His reputation as an honest man added considerable ethical appeal to his utterances. The word "mildness" best describes Foster's physical and vocal delivery.

B. Edward Douglas White, Jr.

The "Gibraltar" of the Anti-Lottery Movement was Edward D. White, who in later life gained added fame as the Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court. White appears to have served as a source of ideas for several of the major arguments advanced against the Lottery. Many of his best arguments, expounded early in 1890, were repeated by later participating orators in 1891 and 1892.

This tall, impressive figure with a pleasing voice and genial blue eyes was a major attraction at all the speaking events he attended. We have read that people often waited only to hear his speeches. This is understandable, for White was an excellent orator. His speeches were clear and to the point, and his arguments were well supported with evidence. In the opinion of the writer, Edward Douglas White deserves recognition as one of the best orators the State of Louisiana has ever produced.

C. Donelson Caffery

Being an aspiring office holder, Donelson Caffery entered the movement as a speaker during the gubernatorial campaign in 1891. Like most of the major orators, he toured the state, participating in a torturous marathon of oratory. He was an excellent speaker who had the ability to artfully combine logical and emotional appeal according to the "golden mean."
Caffery received the traditional classical liberal arts education of his day including studies in rhetoric and eloquence, which helped to prepare him for his legal, political and speaking career. Sincerity and sociability were his chief character traits. Caffery spoke with ease and self-control. He was conservative in dress and speaking gestures.

D. Rev. Benjamin Morgan Palmer

Perhaps no orator was more "speech conscious" than Rev. Palmer. Trained for the ministry, he naturally practiced the art of public speaking as a day to day activity.

During the advent and development of the Anti-Lottery Movement, Rev. Palmer had already attained a position of respect, if not admiration, from the people he had ministered to in the South. His popularity had begun before the Civil War when he supported the Southern cause. Then, in the twilight of his career, he joined the ranks of the crusading politicians, and gave authority to the moral arguments propounded against the lottery wheel.

His major strength as a speaker in the political upheaval rests upon his June 25, 1891, oration, and the ensuing publicity which resulted from that somewhat unrestrained public sermon. As was the case with Edward D. White, Palmer's speeches served as a source of ideas for material on the implications of lottery gambling.

As a speaker, he had more versatility in delivery than the other orators. At times he employed self-control in both voice and gesture,
and, then again, he was capable of actions bordering upon those characteristic of the "fire-eaters." Because of his slender and handsomeless figure, Palmer's one mark of distinction appears to have been his eloquence. His voice was a magnificent instrument capable of conveying varying degrees of meaning and sentiment, while his diction was impeccable. His best speaking efforts often brought his audiences to their feet in a surge of emotional reaction.

E. Other Notable Speakers

Charles Parlange was a part of the great movement from its inception in his New Orleans office in 1890, to its successful conclusion at the polls in 1892. His addresses were more stylistic and inspiring in content than those of many of his colleagues. As a French-American he helped to gain the support of the French element in south Louisiana by voicing anti-lottery sentiment in the French language.

No man did more to add to the economic arguments against acceptance of the Lottery proposal than Edgar Howard Farrar, the brilliant corporation lawyer from New Orleans. Farrar presented figures and tax schemes which made the Lottery offer appear to be one of the most unbusinesslike propositions ever presented to the people of Louisiana for consideration. He probably knew more about state financing than any single orator in the movement. His verbal denunciations of the Lottery revenue amendment as an unworthy contract must have gained considerable support from those individuals who were sincere in their efforts to find the best solutions to the economic problems which faced the state government.
Two other orators who deserve mention as major speakers in the Anti-Lottery Movement were Felix J. Dreyfous and John C. Wickliffe, both of New Orleans. These men joined the caravan of campaigners and gave added strength to the corps of speakers who swept the state with the anti-lottery flood of propaganda. Their speeches indicate that they were capable orators, and the reported responses to their efforts indicate a considerable degree of acceptance by the audiences.

Although men such as Governor Francis T. Nicholls, Senator Randall Lee Gibson, Theodore S. Wilkinson and scores of others were prominent within the organized effort to eliminate the Lottery, they were not primarily significant as public speakers. However, their behind-the-scene influence and reputation produced the foundation upon which the Anti-Lottery League was built. Consider the almost incalculable power wielded by Nicholls as the chief executive, and Wilkinson as chairman of the Anti-Lottery Democratic State Central Committee. Senator Randall L. Gibson, like Nicholls and Wilkinson, made relatively few public appearances during the movement, but his power and prestige as a U. S. Senator gave inestimable strength to the anti-lottery cause. These factors are mentioned as answers to anticipated questions as to why such prominent men were not placed in the category of major speakers.

In summarizing the general characteristics of the recognized leading orators, five points should be noted. First, all of the speakers had acquired a broad liberal, or classical, education during their youth. Second, they were professional men primarily from the
fields of law and the ministry. Third, they all professed or implied belief in Christian principles. Fourth, all of the men had had extensive experience as public speakers. Finally, they were all past the age of forty, which eliminates the possibility of "tagging" the movement as an outgrowth of rebellious youth.

The pro-lottery speakers were given consideration in chapter four with the intent of establishing the comparable quality of the opposing forces. Added significance is given to the Anti-Lottery Movement and its successful termination, when one realizes that the campaign pitted judge against judge, lawyer against lawyer, and last, but by far most important in a study such as this, capable orator against capable orator.

II. What Were the Characteristics of the Audiences?

The audiences of the Anti-Lottery Movement were an orator's delight. For the most part, they were large and enthusiastic partisan groups, which represented every facet of the economic, professional, and social life of the state. Except for a few meetings given by the New Orleans Women's Anti-Lottery League, the mass meetings were noisy with cheering, applause, and calls for the speakers. An occasional response, "a haute voix," of agreement or disagreement was not unusual. Speakers had the challenging task of adapting their ideas to the heterogeneous audiences of the cities and then readjusting to the predominantly rural folk.

Women took an active part in the campaign, and the orators frequently catered to their sentiments. Children were in attendance
generally, but did not influence the occasion beyond adding to the
noise and confusion initiated by their overly enthusiastic progenitors.

Because of the growing influence of women and the voting power
of men, the anti-lottery orators adapted their political addresses
to meet the demands of both. The highly partisan nature of the audi­
ences caused many of the orators to become overzealous in their
attacks, which resulted in exaggerated claims, unwarranted deroga­
tory language, and moments of emotionalized outbursts. However, the
audiences did not seem to mind, and often encouraged such practices
by cheering and applauding, as evidenced by reports in the New Delta

III. Under What Conditions Did the Speaking Take Place?

The Anti-Lottery Movement was well organized by executive com­
mittees which functioned through the various Leagues. Meetings were
strategically planned and executed initially as part of a membership
drive. In 1891, all of the meetings became a part of the gubernatorial
campaign, which had the Lottery question as its major issue.

League meetings were often the occasion for day-long festivities,
especially in rural Louisiana. Parades with bands tended to heighten
the holiday atmosphere as people lined the streets sporting their
campaign buttons or colors. Whistles, cannons, and rousing tunes
announced the arrival of the speakers.

If the meeting happened to be an outdoor affair, there was a
platform or wagons decorated with bunting for the dignitaries and
speakers. Oil torches and Japanese lanterns generally were used for lighting. Most of the indoor meetings were conducted in highly decorative settings consisting of shrubbery, bunting, flags, and drapery. Spirited marches were rendered by bands between the speeches.

As the orators delivered their addresses, they were frequently interrupted by cheering, yells, applause, or verbal responses. Except for a few occasions, the audiences lacked restraint.

After hours of listening and cheering, the people usually were treated to a barbecue.

Bands, barbecues, decorative settings, and enthusiastic audiences were the usual conditions surrounding the speakers of the movement. This gay and festive environment made the often lengthy speeches more exciting, aside from being a motivating factor in bringing more people to the events. Generally, the audiences displayed as much enthusiasm over the speeches as they did the festivities.

From the direct responses made to the remarks of the speakers, the gay atmosphere seemed to increase, rather than decrease, audience-speaker contact and empathy. The audiences were active, yet attentive listeners. They apparently came to hear the speakers first and above all.

IV. What Were the Issues, Arguments, and Proofs?

Arguments against the Lottery Company centered upon the two issues of Lottery desirability and need for state revenue. The anti-lottery advocates argued that the Company was undesirable for political,
economic, and moral reasons, while the pro-lottery faction put emphasis upon the need for, and benefits of, the Lottery revenue. Essentially, the "antis" argued that the end did not justify the means, while their opponents elaborated upon the benefits and minimized the evils of the means.

In an endeavor to prove that Louisiana could maintain its institutions without Lottery revenue, the anti-lottery persuaders relied heavily upon the testimony of authorities and statistics. Their efforts indicated that Louisiana was slowly improving its levee system, and one insane asylum, while its schools were sorely in need of increased funds to pay teachers' back salaries, build and repair schools, and extend sessions to the full nine month period. The anti-lottery orators attempted to minimize the significance of the poor educational facilities by asserting that the state had the available means to improve the system. Behind all the confidence displayed with relation to the future prosperity of Louisiana, one could almost detect that the speakers were saying, "Yes, we need more revenue, but it must not be Lottery revenue, for reasons more vital to the interests of the state and its people than immediate financial prosperity."

Public opinion, generally, favored the anti-lottery orators, except in New Orleans where pro-lottery sentiment commanded a majority vote throughout the movement. From the political aspects of the question, the "antis" had only to reinforce the belief among most of the people that the Louisiana Lottery Company had used its wealth to acquire pro-lottery legislation, and judicial decision. When no substantial
reply to the accusation came from the pro-lottery camp, the first breach in the Lottery armor appeared.

Another unchallenged argument contended that the revenue offered the state by the proposed Lottery grant was less than the normal sum which might accrue from city and state taxation of the gambling company. Thus, an economic dart was cast into the heart of the Lottery case, which supported the revenue transaction as a good "business deal."

A significant blow was struck against the Lottery by the open denunciation of that institution by organized religious bodies, which gained a hearing through their articulate ministry. The stigma of sin was placed upon all who aided in fostering the Lottery "vice." Preachers, as well as politicians, maintained that lotteries were immoral, first, because they degraded and impoverished the individual, second, because lotteries encouraged disobedience to the Biblical "law of labor," and, finally, because the Supreme Court had adjudged it as detrimental to the citizenry and, therefore, immoral. From the authority which resides in the Bible and the ministry as a moral guide for Christians, and from the prestige which attends the decisions of the High Court, the Anti-lottery rhetoricians placed a definite moral obligation upon the audiences to support the Anti-Lottery Movement.

While authority was the main form of logical support given the anti-lottery arguments, the movement was not lacking in the other general forms of evidence. Examples and specific instances, analogies,
and illustrations also contributed to the fabric of proof weaved by
the anti-lottery speakers in order to clothe their contentions with
an aura of truth.

Logical proof was wedded to pathetic proof in order to augment
the chances for success. Through emotional appeals to patriotism,
liberty, duty, family security, morality, and humor, an effort was
made to place the audiences in a receptive mood. Morality appears
to have received the greatest emphasis, with liberty and family
security in a secondary position. Explanation, description, figura­
tive and literal analogies, and illustrations were the main media
through which flowed the emotionally charged language.

It would be rather difficult to judge which form of proof,
logical or pathetic, received greater emphasis. Both forms were
used extensively with neither being conspicuously exaggerated.

From the vantage point of historical retrospect, the ouster of
the Louisiana Lottery as a political force can be considered a
blessing. The state government was forced to seek a sound basis for
solving its economic deficiencies, instead of depending upon the
palliative aid of a politically inclined gambling monopoly. Time
has vindicated the major arguments of the anti-lottery orators.
Their successful and commendable efforts to retain the rights of
self government for the people have received favorable recognition
in the annals of the history of Louisiana.
V. What Effect Did Public Speaking Have Within the Movement?

In Richard H. Wiggins' study, *The Louisiana Press and the Lottery*, Wiggins concluded that the Louisiana press was not effective, since it supported the losing Lottery faction. This admission cancels one possible answer to the query as to what were the major forces which caused the presumably omnipotent Louisiana Lottery Company, with all its wealth and political power, to lose its battle for life.

In 1892 when John A. Morris withdrew his offer of revenue for the state in exchange for a Lottery charter, he stated that before he made the offer no opposition to the Lottery was voiced, but public opinion had become so aroused against the continuance of the Company that he felt it in the best interest of the people and the state to withdraw the offer. Regardless of the true reasons for the Morris withdrawal, the statement referring to the status of public opinion was a fact. If we assume that public opinion was aroused against the Lottery Company, and that the newspapers in the state were ineffective, since they supported the losing faction, then the likely, logical and justifiable conclusion is that the anti-lottery sentiment was largely the result of the well planned public speaking campaign conducted by the Anti-Lottery League of Louisiana.

So powerful was the effect of the anti-lottery orators that their rival organisation, the "Progressive League," became defunct by late 1891. People were no longer willing to support openly the Lottery

1New Orleans *Daily Picayune*, February 4, 1892.
backed organization. The taint of sin placed upon the gambling concern by the orators, and officially supported by the churches, left little choice for the religious minded people, except to reject the revenue amendment. By giving evidence that the state could survive without the revenue, the anti-lottery speakers cushioned the anticipated blow of financial chaos.

It appears highly unlikely that a majority of the voters of Louisiana would vote against the offer of $1,125,000 revenue, unless they had been thoroughly convinced that the Lottery was an evil which would dominate their state, financially harm the individual, and morally weaken society. These were the warnings given by the anti-lottery orators.

The writer does not maintain that the persuasive power of the anti-lottery speakers was the only force acting against the Lottery. However, the painstaking, face-to-face campaign which reached every major section of the state and many of its by-roads, was a major factor in arousing and changing public opinion in favor of the anti-lottery cause.

This study reaffirms the ancient rhetorical theory that public speaking conducted by respected leaders in a socially acceptable manner is a potent force in arousing and molding public opinion. The anti-lottery advocates had no alternative but to turn to the common man with his uncommon vote, for it was with the voter that the final power rested to accept or deny the continuance of the Lottery. The anti-lottery leaders went to the people and presented their case.
Thus, the death-blow was struck, and the Louisiana State Lottery Company, as predicted by Rev. Carradine, was buried beneath thousands of ballots inscribed simply, "No."
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