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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to analyze the rhetorical theory of A. Craig Baird as delineated in the Representative American Speeches series, which he edited from 1937 until 1959. For more than forty years, Baird has made scholarly contributions to the field of speech as a teacher, a rhetorical critic, and an editor, although teaching is his major concern. In addition to editing twenty-two volumes of Representative American Speeches, he has written twelve books and many of his articles and speeches have appeared in speech journals and other publications. As Professor of Public Address at the State University of Iowa, he directed more than a hundred masters theses and over fifty doctoral dissertations.

This investigation centered around Baird's editing of Representative American Speeches. In considering his contributions as a critic and an editor, it analyzed (1) the nature of the series, and (2) Baird's standards for selecting speeches for inclusion. Further, it examined his advocacy of the study of speeches as examples and evaluated the application of this theory in the classroom.

Baird acknowledges that his philosophy is classically oriented, grounded "in the rhetorical traditions of Aristotle, Cicero, Quintilian, and their successors" as modified by later theorists. From the beginning of his career, Baird used speech examples as a teaching device in order to encourage students to evaluate speakers' ideas.
while working to improve their own composition. He began the
Representative American Speeches series because he recognized the
need for collections of contemporary speeches for classroom use.
His use of speeches as examples is based upon four principles:
(1) He sees the study of addresses as a part of a broad liberal
education. (2) He advocates the pragmatic approach, agreeing with
William James and John Dewey that we learn by doing. (3) He contends
that the intellectual content of a speech is its most important
raison d'être, insisting that the superior speaker demonstrates a
philosophical grasp of the problem, an understanding of the basic
issues, intellectual integrity, good will toward his audience, and
ethical standards. (4) While holding that "invention is the one
justification for the speech," Baird adds that "rhetoric is justified
only if it contributes to the 'good society,'" which he defines as
"a satisfactory social-political climate." Such a society, he says,
develops under the influence of ethical and moral values which are in
turn shaped by speechmaking leaders.

Because he sees public speaking as inextricably interwoven
with the social, economic, and political movements of the times,
Baird sought speeches for his collection which were "representative
of the kind and quality of speaking" contemporary at the time of
delivery. He contends that the evaluation of a speech depends upon
the response which it elicits--its "impress on history." Because of
the "societal results of his communication," Baird holds that the
speaker has an obligation to support ethical standards which make
clear his commitment to the "good society." Thus, critical evaluation
of speeches should take place in the light of the total speaking
situation.
As a teacher, Baird makes practical application of his theory of rhetoric, planning class activities to include experiences in research, writing, and speaking, and employing group discussion based on "reflective thinking" rather than using the lecture method. Frequently he asks students to present orally critical analyses of speeches. He contends that the goals of speech education coincide with those of liberal education in aiming to increase the student's appreciation of his cultural heritage while encouraging him to make contributions of his own. The study of speech examples is a means to this end.
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Over a period of more than forty years, A. Craig Baird has contributed to the field of speech as a teacher, a rhetorical critic, and an editor. From his early teaching days until the time of this writing, Baird has evolved concepts related to speech criticism, public speaking, public address, and discussion and debate which have broadened the understanding of students in these speech areas. As important as his writings are to the field of rhetorical criticism and public address, Baird has not limited his influence to that of his twelve books or to the twenty-two volumes of Representative American Speeches which he edited from 1937 until 1959. He has also published articles and speeches in the Quarterly Journal of Speech, Western Speech, the Southern Speech Journal, Central States Speech Journal, the Speech Teacher, Vital Speeches of the Day, and other periodicals. As Professor of Public Address at the State University of Iowa, he directed more than a hundred masters theses.

and over fifty doctoral dissertations. His students have earned positions of importance at educational institutions all over the United States and they readily acknowledge that Baird's influence on them has been "almost immeasurable."

Baird considers himself first of all a teacher and holds that his other pursuits, including his writing, have grown out of his teaching. Admitting that he has been strongly influenced by the Aristotelian tradition as modified by later rhetoricians, he names his theological studies as a second major factor in shaping his thinking. Throughout his writings, Baird views speech as an academic discipline while extolling a liberal education as an invaluable background for the student or teacher in the area of communication.

As editor of the **Representative American Speeches** series over a period of twenty-two years, Baird sees the orator as the spokesman for the times, but he agrees with Emerson that "the times make the orator." He is convinced that it is possible for men to reach unexpected heights of eloquence during times of crisis. He upholds

---


Teachers of argument, this author among them, continue to ground their concepts in the rhetorical traditions of Aristotle, Cicero, Quintilian, and their successors. Particularly, too, have we found stimulation and illumination in the twentieth-century contributions to persuasion by such writers and teachers as George Pierce Baker, James Milton O'Neill, James A. Winans, and Charles Woolbert. Alert to the new era and critical of mere scholastic inheritance, they nevertheless identified their thinking and writing with the broad stream of rhetorical development.
Cato's and Quintilian's concept of the orator as "a good man skilled in speaking," and he places great importance upon Aristotle's interpretation of ethos as "the intelligence, character, and good will of the speaker." The "good" speech, according to Baird, must contribute to the good of society.

Because of his impact on and his contributions to the areas of rhetorical criticism, public address, public speaking, and discussion and debate over a span of more than four decades by means of his teaching, writing, and editing, A. Craig Baird was selected as the subject of this study.

I. THE PURPOSE

Centering around Baird's editing of the Representative American Speeches series from 1937 to 1959, this investigation seeks to describe and analyze his rhetorical theory and the application of this theory especially as it relates to his advocacy of the use of speeches as examples for study. In surveying the philosophy underlying Baird's approach to speech criticism, this writer considers Baird's contributions to the field of rhetoric as an editor and as a teacher.

In order to evaluate Baird's contributions as an editor, this study analyzes (1) the nature of the Representative American Speeches series and (2) Baird's standards for selecting speeches for inclusion in the volumes which he edited.

From his first days as a speech teacher, Baird employed examples in order (1) to facilitate the students' analyses of the ideas and issues represented in the speeches as well as (2) to serve as models for their own speech composition. Rejecting the speech course which
confines itself to the mere mastery of techniques, Baird expects his students to evaluate individual speeches in the light of broad background reading, and then to employ what they learn in preparing their own speeches. Thus this writer considers Baird's application of theory in the classroom as he advocates the use of speeches as examples.

II. SOURCES

Sources of information for this investigation include Baird's publications with concentration upon the twenty-two volumes of Representative American Speeches which he edited. These volumes include 566 speeches which were presented by 285 speakers. Other sources are his letters and comments during interviews with this writer, his speeches, statements from his former students, information from his class assignment sheets and course outlines, and critical evaluations of Baird's editing of Representative American Speeches.

III. ORGANIZATION

This study begins by considering Baird's rhetorical theory especially as it concerns the advocacy of using speeches as examples. Next it analyzes Baird's application of his theory of rhetoric as it is expressed in his editing of Representative American Speeches. Finally, it investigates Baird's use of speeches from the series as examples for study in his classroom. In so doing, it offers a composite picture of Baird in his triple role of rhetorical critic, editor, and teacher.
CHAPTER II

BAIRD'S THEORY CONCERNING REPRESENTATIVE SPEECHES

Baird repeatedly used three terms with reference to speeches: (1) models, (2) examples, and (3) representative speeches. Although in his thinking the three terms overlap, an understanding of the meaning which he attaches to each term is essential to the analysis of his speech philosophy. It is the purpose of this chapter to discuss how Baird uses each one and then to elaborate on the four major aspects of his rhetorical philosophy: (1) the importance of a broad liberal education in the study of speeches, (2) the use of the pragmatic approach in employing speeches as examples, (3) the need to consider the intellectual content of speeches as examples, and (4) the evaluation of the contributions of speechmakers to the "good" society.

I. DEFINITION OF TERMS

Models versus Examples

In his article, "Speech Models and Liberal Education," Baird points out that classical rhetoric "stresses the use of models (mimesis, imitation) in communicative training." He then poses the question, "Is such learning by imitation an outworn Aristotelian-Ciceronian tradition?" It is evident that Baird answers this question in the negative.

Even before his earliest publications appeared to advocate their use, Baird employed speech models as a teaching device in his classes. He points out that he has used his own anthologies as well as other collections throughout his teaching career in an effort to "teach college speech in its function of liberal training."\(^2\) Deploring speech courses at the college level which "deal only in trivialities," he regards compilations of speeches, "properly studied and related to other readings," as valuable to teacher and student alike.

Justification of the use of speeches as models comes easily to Baird, for he believes that (1) they help the student in his analysis and development of thought, (2) that they illustrate speech types, (3) that they aid the study of content, (4) and that they offer techniques to be studied.\(^3\) Admitting that "the classical purpose of models was primarily imitation of style," he warns that "servile duplication" is hardly justifiable in an undergraduate course in speech.\(^4\)

Baird complains that all too often students choose speech topics which are "haphazard and inconsequential." Through a study of important speeches they are forced to distinguish between trivial and worthwhile material. With the help of an instructor, well-grounded in the liberal arts, to guide him, "the student should improve in communicative technique, ability in criticism, 

\(^2\)Ibid., p. 13.  
\(^3\)Ibid., p. 12.  
\(^4\)Ibid., p. 15.
understanding of the theory of communication, and appreciation of public address as a force in history and contemporary society."⁵

What, then are the characteristics of speeches to be used as models? According to Baird (1) they may be either "oral or written compositions;" (2) they should offer ideas which are "robust rather than trivial;" (3) they should include the best of both classical and contemporary speeches; (4) they should demonstrate "originality and vividness of phrasing;" and (5) they should represent important occasions and diversified speech types. Placing great value on the enrichment of ideas Baird believes that a model "should furnish further stimulus to the student's thinking."⁶

Baird acknowledges that the use of a collection of speeches is meaningless unless the speeches are studied in relationship to their surroundings. Such study should stimulate the student to pursue "related research and reporting."⁷ Adamantly he declares that no college speech course is justified in being limited to "mere ephemerality of techniques and performance."⁸ Rather, to him the analysis of speeches means:

The student frames, summarizes, and challenges the chief ideas. He examines the facts, assumed or expressed, traces the analogical, causal, or other modes of inference, inspects the refutations, definitions, the logical and emotional movement, the persuasive devices, the illustrations, stereotypes, audience adaptiveness, and the vigorous language. . . . Provocative criticism, however, is necessary--more than impressionistic reaction, if creative thinking is to develop.⁹

⁵Ibid.  
⁸Ibid., p. 13.  
⁹Ibid., p. 18.
In summary, although in his thinking Baird apparently draws a fine distinction between the terms "model" and "example," in practice he does not clearly maintain the differentiation. Perhaps the key to the difference as he interprets it is found in his statement that "models" as he employs the term "implies an excellence" not always demonstrated in the Representative American Speeches series. He uses the term "examples" more than "models" in reference to speeches selected for the series:

The word "models" bothers me, for I have not consciously used it. "Speech examples" covers the case pretty well. Note the use of "specimens" and "examples" in the volumes. "Models" implies an excellence that I am sure does not always exist.¹⁰

To Baird, "models" are speeches which incorporate the best aspects of the speaker's art, whereas "examples," although worthy of study, do not necessarily achieve excellence.

It is apparent that Baird regards the term "models" largely in the classical context, worthy of imitation particularly in regard to style. He uses the term to denote excellence and to suggest important ideas as well as "originality and vividness of phrasing." He chooses as examples speeches which may not excel to such an extent. As Baird employs the two terms, the distinction between them is qualitative and is therefore difficult to measure with exactness.

**Speeches as Examples**

In his introductions to Representative American Speeches Baird gives the reader insight into his standards as to what constitutes a speech worthy for inclusion. Though he repeatedly disavows any claim

¹⁰Letter to this writer, February 5, 1967, Iowa City, Iowa.
that his selections were the "best" of any given year, he stresses that he has included addresses which are important because of their (1) ideas, (2) organization, (3) language, (4) delivery, and (5) their reflection of major events and trends. This section discusses Baird's use of the term "examples" as he employs the term in *Representative American Speeches*.

Baird makes clear that he does not consider the merits of the speech itself apart from its social and political background. In other words, he judges the speech in relation to the total speaking situation. In several introductions in spite of considering the limitations of space, he accurately and comprehensively traces the major events and influences on the national and international scenes during the year preceding publication of that particular edition. Further, preceding each speech he gives a capsule account of the speech situation and stresses repeatedly that a speech does not stand alone, but that it must be evaluated in the light of all the factors involved insofar as the critic is able to discover them. Proceeding from his assumption that "a speech is the product of (1) a speaker, presenting (2) a given subject, before (3) an audience, on (4) a specific occasion," he concludes that "the effective speech, then is the outcome not of any one of these elements but of the combination." He holds that "these spoken discourses are unique in their sensitivity to the immediate occasion and audience--the integration of a personality, an audience, and a message."

---

12 *Representative American Speeches*: 1937-38, p. 3.
In determining whether a speech merits inclusion in the series he gives consideration to whether the ideas have weight and are adequately supported by evidence and sound reasoning and whether it stirs the student's thinking and encourages his creativity. In testing the ideas of a speech, Baird notes that "such logical appraisal of a speech is difficult at best, but the effort is necessary," and that the speaker's mastery of ideas demonstrates his possession of integrity, originality, mental range, and consistency of principles. Besides these qualifications, Baird lists the following:

The superior speaker as a thinker is an economic and social philosopher. . . . He is a historian and a logician. . . . He states with calm decisiveness the more general assumptions and conclusions. He is thus a genuine philosopher. . . . He enriches his general ideas by specific and varied details, . . . is superior in organizational ability, . . . is effective in his language, . . . and employs style which is oral rather than "literary."  

In addition to valid logical elements, Baird contends that the speech example should make use of emotional appeals directed to the wants, needs, and desires of the audience. He says, "We decide whether these motivational features are justified as logic, as 'good psychology,' and as acceptable moral practice." He regards as another important factor style, the speaker's choice and arrangement of words. "At best," he comments, "language conveys maximum meaning and enhances ideas by original and pleasurable expression."  

---

15 *Representative American Speeches: 1946-47*, pp. 7-12.
17 Ibid., p. 13.
So far as delivery is concerned, Baird maintains that it is not "an end in itself," but must be assessed in regard to how it affects the audience, whether it conveys the speaker's conviction and sincerity. Baird considers the ability to marshall one's thoughts in an organized manner and to express them clearly if not eloquently one of the hallmarks of effective speaking. Noting that the speaker should not be inseparably bound to the manuscript, Baird refers to "this extempore asset" as "one crucial test of one's right to recognition as a 'representative' speaker." The good speaker, then is "good not simply because of his vocal superiority, but also because of his ideas expressed in appropriate language that impresses and affects the audience."\(^{18}\)

Baird refers to the speeches included in the series as "examples of addresses that may guide students in their study of speech composition and delivery,"\(^{19}\) as well as "examples for analysis by those interested in the art of effective speaking."\(^{20}\) He adds that the "ideas, structure, language, and other elements of each speech should be of interest and application to the students."\(^{21}\) His suggestion that speeches be studied as examples is found in another of his collections of speeches, *American Public Addresses: 1740-1952.* In the introduction he points out that "the study of the platform


\(^{19}\) *Representative American Speeches: 1940-41*, p. 11.


\(^{21}\) *Representative American Speeches: 1945-46*, p. 3.
leaders' content and modes of appeal will give us deeper insight into all that comprises our evolving American civilization." And he adds:

The parallel examination of methods and accomplishment of great practitioners will also prove applicable to our own training and performances. . . . The end result of our study of speakers should be a clearer view of the principles in practice and a more mature awareness of our own rhetorical problems and practices.23

Baird summarizes his concept of the terms "example" and "model" while warning the student against limiting his efforts to the imitation of patterns evolved by others, thus inhibiting his own creativity:

There isn't very much difference, as you know, and I admit I prefer the broader term "example," although "model," of course, comes to us from antiquity. I think in the older days the teachers of communication looked to these speeches literally as models, that is to say, documents to be imitated, especially imitated in style. . . .

In these later days, we do play up these speeches in a broader way as examples in which studies we emphasize a good deal the content, as it were, the ideas of the speeches, more than perhaps was done in the earlier days. . . .

On the other hand, there is no gain-saying that if a speech does suggest appropriate methods of using language and adaptation to the audience, then that is all to the good. . . . I have encouraged students here and there to imitate, to use as models, shall we say, some of these documents in the business field or other typical situations. On the other hand, it is very important for us to note that we cannot succumb to the influence of any model.

Good speakers, as well as good literary creative agents, have come up through the study, whether they realize it or not, . . . of these examples. . . . We have to remind ourselves, we have to remind our students, that this above all--you must be original, you must be creative, and you must not let the allurement of other people's methods, language, and so forth


23Ibid., p. 2.
stifle your own development. So the problem there, the practical teaching problem is to use richly examples, but all the time to encourage the individual expression of students, pushing out so these things become merely elements in the educational originality and expansion.24

It is apparent that though Baird expects speeches used as examples to meet high standards, he looks upon them as guides for the student's "study of speech composition and delivery" as well as analysis of "ideas, structure, language, and other elements." At this point, suffice it to say that Baird views his examples in Representative American Speeches as revealing "typical American ideals and modes of thinking." While encouraging the student to analyze and even to emulate these examples, the editor warns him against the temptation to substitute imitation for creativity. Clearly, Baird places his emphasis more upon analysis of the example accompanied by intellectual stimulation on the part of the student, than on imitation, per se.

In arriving at a conclusion regarding the total effectiveness of a speech worthy of use as an example, Baird notes that the critic should not mechanically tabulate the aspects of speaking in a mathematical approach which attempts to compartmentalize each factor separately from the others. Rather he thinks that the speech should be judged as an entity; therefore, a speech may be very effective, indeed, without demonstrating excellence in every single category. Baird advises the student of speech criticism: "Your approach to a just estimate is to view the speaker in relation to his purpose, his mustering of his major resources in accomplishing his speaking ends, and his general

effectiveness in evoking favorable audience response." He warns that the immediate response is to be considered as well as the long-range influence or "ultimate effectiveness" of the speech and he cautions the critic to look at the situation as a whole and the results achieved. Baird adds, "Seldom does any one orator excel in all the categories..." 

In summary, the editor sees his collections of speeches as a "textbook of American ideals." He recommends them for study as examples. He cautions the reader against attempting to evaluate a speech out of context, encouraging him to investigate the total speaking situation. The good speech, he says, is immediately effective, and if it "wields larger historical influence, so much the better." In other words, both "the immediate and ultimate effectiveness of the discourse should be gauged."

The important address centers around worthwhile ideas, which Baird terms "original and significant." These ideas are adequately supported by concrete details, "both 'explicit,' those that directly enforce the logic, and 'implicit,' those that enhance the emotional effect." In addition, every good speech presents a unified pattern which demonstrates organic structure. And finally, a speech worthy of study as an example is couched in effective language. Baird comments,

---

26 Representative American Speeches: 1946-47, pp. 7-12.
27 Representative American Speeches: 1940-41, p. 9.
29 Representative American Speeches: 1942-43, p. 11.
"such power of language characterizes the addresses of Lincoln, Woodrow Wilson, and Winston Churchill."\textsuperscript{30}

**Representative Speeches**

In his introductions to *Representative American Speeches* Baird states repeatedly that he makes no claim to have selected the best speeches of a given year but that he hopes that those included are "representative of the kind and quality of speaking done in this country during the period specified." This point of view grows out of his belief that "public speaking in a democracy, like literature and other art forms, mirrors the social movements and the spiritual mores of the times."\textsuperscript{31} He suggests that contemporary history is "partly the product of the platform influence of leaders. But events in themselves call forth speakers who otherwise might remain inarticulate." Often he restates his contention that "speakers make the times, but events also create the 'voices of history.'"\textsuperscript{32} Baird is convinced that most of the speeches which he includes have been adjudged generally effective before audiences and have made "more than local impression. Most of them presumably affect, if in slight degree, American thought."\textsuperscript{33} While believing that the individual speech should be assessed according to elicited response he holds that speechmaking as a whole is to be judged "by its significance as a social force--its impress on history."\textsuperscript{34}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{30} *Representative American Speeches*: 1944-45, p. 15.
  \item \textsuperscript{31} *Representative American Speeches*: 1937-38, p. 6.
  \item \textsuperscript{32} *Representative American Speeches*: 1957-58, p. 3.
  \item \textsuperscript{33} *Representative American Speeches*: 1943-44, p. 3.
  \item \textsuperscript{34} *Representative American Speeches*: 1951-52, p. 3.
\end{itemize}
He concludes that "the large company of speakers in these . . . volumes has influenced to some extent the social and other trends of the times." 35

Because of his conviction that the speeches selected for the series are typical of their period Baird comments on the value of the collection of speeches to students of public address:

These speakers and speeches . . . furnish a revealing picture of American thought and motive during the period. The classification of the speeches, as given in the Table of Contents of the present volume, suggests the relationship of the addresses to the immediate and recurrent problems facing the American nation--problems of war, peace, national defense, education, labor, industry, religion, science, and social living. Literary artists may sometimes in solitary brooding create great literature. Not so the effective speaker. He weaves his material only in the market place and in the midst of an audience. His ideas articulate at every point with the sentiments and mood of his listeners, both the visible auditors and the larger group who by radio, press, or hearsay report attend his discourse. Hence the student of speaking who reads these current addresses will probably understand better the thought and culture of contemporary America. 36

Baird adds that "if the ideas on the whole seem vigorously to defend democracy and the American capitalistic system, that trend in speaking may be due to the fact that American speakers and audiences support the capitalistic philosophy." 37 Recommending the series he says:

[The unique feature of the Representative American Speeches series] is that the addresses represent recent social and political thinking in America. . . . The student of current affairs who wishes to know the American mind in transition and to interpret the mental and emotional forces abroad in this country to account for our conduct in 1941 and later can do no better than to trace through these pages line by line the unfolding of the national attitudes and convictions.

35 Representative American Speeches: 1954-55, p. 3.
36 Representative American Speeches: 1940-41, pp. 3-4.
Seeing the series as important "in that they deal with issues that have affected millions of Americans," Baird suggests that the speeches offer ideas of "more than passing significance." He implied that representative speeches present a way to study the American attitudes expressed in contemporary speechmaking in its social setting.

Baird envisions a kind of circular response between the speaker and his environment with each influencing and giving impetus to the other. Viewing every speaker as being "heavily affected by the political, economic and cultural climate in which he lives and speaks," and holding that "the times make the orator," he argues that great speechmaking is most likely to occur during times of crisis and he agrees with Ralph Waldo Emerson that "times of eloquence are times of terror."

Within the series, Baird frequently uses the phrase "a good speech," equating the term with "representative speech." What are the characteristics of a "good" or "effective" speech, one which demonstrates platform leadership and exerts a social force? He looks for these same attributes in the representative speech. He gives six in his writing. (1) The good speech deals with important events and has certain historical value. (2) The speaker's ideas have some

---

40 Representative American Speeches: 1954-55, pp. 3-4.
weight. (3) The speaker's motive should be constructive, demonstrating his cognizance of ethical and moral values. (4) The speech should be on the side of the "great society," which Baird defines as a "better operating social unit or civilization." (5) The speech is immediately effective, suggested in applause and comments. (6) The influence of the speech may be greater later than at the time of delivery, but there should be some influence. Further elaborating, Baird suggests possible approaches in determining effectiveness:

Shall we judge audience reaction by the amount of applause? By audience votes? By the ballots cast in November? By the opinions of qualified observers in the audience? By the decision of a courtroom jury? By the size of the radio mail? By the length and prominence of the report in the next morning's paper? By the information given to a Gallup poll investigator? By the number of converts after the sermon?Baird sees all of these indications as pertinent and he notes that the critic of speeches has to do the best he can with the information available to him. As a result, Baird says, his conclusions are tentative and are based pretty much on the immediate audience behavior. Then, like the historian, we note carefully the widening circles of impression made by the speaker and his speech. Time, as in the case of literary judgments, will help us to describe the effectiveness of a given oration.

---

42 Interview with Baird at Carbondale, Illinois, April 28, 1967.  
43 Ibid.  
44 Ibid.  
45 Ibid.  
46 Representative American Speeches: 1942-43, pp. 11-12.  
47 Ibid., p. 12.
In evaluating the overall effectiveness of the representative speech, Baird recognizes that it is seldom that one orator will excel in all the categories discussed, yet he notes that "in the total interplay of these elements the speakers we include in any exclusive category rank high." \(^{48}\)

In summary, Baird describes the representative speech as one having weight and integrity of ideas, typical of the kind and quality of speeches of its time, and acting in some degree as a social force. Such a speech, he believes, achieves immediate response as well as exerting wider influence through its long-range response.

A Summary of the Three Terms

It is clear that considerable overlapping occurs within the terms "model," "example," and "representative speech," and that certainly the terms are neither mutually exclusive nor always clearly delineated. Baird's application of the terms, however, may be summarized as follows: model speeches are synonymous with excellence and represent the best examples of the speaker's art. If imitation can be justified, then model speeches are worthy of imitation, particularly in regard to style. Speeches worthy of study as examples also demonstrate excellence, but the speaker does not necessarily excel in every aspect of speaking from the rhetorical critic's standpoint. Nevertheless, the student's liberally-oriented study of examples offers intellectual stimulation and fosters his own development in speech composition. Finally, representative speeches may be

\(^{48}\) Representative American Speeches: 1946-47, p. 11.
characterized as typical of the public speaking of their time, although not necessarily the "best" speeches of a given period. In addition to the study of representative speeches as examples, the student gains insight into the social, economic, and political problems current at the time of their presentation. He is also better able to appreciate the speaker's role as a contributor to the "voices of history."

II. PHILOSOPHY

In his writings and in his speeches four aspects of Baird's philosophy of rhetoric emerge repeatedly and they are particularly applicable to his theory of using speeches as examples. This section discusses his ideas concerning (1) the importance of a broad liberal education in the study of speeches, (2) the use of the pragmatic approach in employing speeches as examples, (3) the need to consider the intellectual content of speeches as examples, and (4) the evaluation of contributions of speechmakers to the "good society."

The Importance of a Broad Liberal Education in the Study of Speeches

Baird defines the "principal categories of experience and learning" to include "logic, psychology, ethics, politics, science, literature, language, formal learning, communication itself, and metaphysics." In his view, most of these fields of study "compose the traditional divisions of philosophy." Together, he says, "these academic divisions represent the organon of learning as related to a genuine philosophy of communication."\(^{49}\) Since he agrees with Aristotle that "rhetoric has no subject matter of its own, but

utilizes materials 'in any given subject,'" Baird is convinced that the study of speeches serves no useful purpose unless they are viewed in relationship to the political, social, and scientific developments.

From the time of his earliest publications Baird emphasized a liberally-oriented approach to the study of speeches. In College Readings on Current Problems (1925), he offered material for "thought-provoking assignments in oral and written composition" and in Essays and Addresses Toward a Liberal Education (1934), he "attempted to relate the studies to the purposes of liberal education." Recently he reaffirmed that he has always sought to teach college speech "in its function of liberal training," using his own anthologies as well as other collections as a means to this end.

As the five goals of liberal education Baird suggests that speech courses should (1) increase the student's understanding of knowledge and of his intellectual heritage, (2) develop his wish to transmit and help to illuminate further these permanent values, (3) challenge him to explore further a given problem or field, (4) lead him to creative as well as to reproductive contributions, and (5) aid the student to develop intellectual competency. While acknowledging that a single speech course or a single anthology cannot contribute significantly to these five goals, he recommends that it should nevertheless keep foremost these liberal objectives.
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Arguing that a liberal approach encourages the student to pursue research and reporting, Baird says that "the systematic assemblage of topics moreover gives the course structure, stability, and direction in which even disinterested students may find satisfaction." Although he is not necessarily a specialist in the areas represented, it is essential, Baird thinks that the teacher, dedicated to liberal education, is appreciative of the interrelationships of scientific and humane studies. In addition the teacher should be thoroughly grounded in both oral and written communication, "including the history and criticism of public address and of rhetoric, the theory and practice of audience adaptation, and the ends of communication in the social-political matrix."

In keeping with the contention that a speech must be judged in the light of its relationship to other developments, Baird recognizes a close correlation between platform leadership and American trends. He states that "cultural history . . . cannot be properly understood without proper analysis of the oral communicative force so active in that history." By the same token, he is convinced that the study of stimulating addresses involving analysis and appraisal of problems by the student directs him toward the establishment of desirable cultural attitudes. Moreover, it is through his examination of significant points of view in various fields of thinking.

---
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while grappling with these problems that the student acquires genuine education.  

In summary, Baird considers the goals of speech courses as synonymous with the goals of liberal education because each one aims to increase the student's knowledge and appreciation of his cultural heritage. The student draws on the accumulated knowledge in humane and scientific fields in an effort to develop a "philosophic cast." Under the guidance of a liberally-oriented instructor and through the study of speeches in relationship to other developments "the student should improve in communicative technique, ability in criticism, understanding of the theory of communication, and appreciation of public address as a force in history and in contemporary society."  

The Use of the Pragmatic Approach in Employing Speeches as Examples

From his first days in the classroom Baird subscribed to the pragmatic approach in teaching, that is, he emphasized the foundations of the art of speech as a combination of "William James' pragmatism and of John Dewey's logical reconstruction--with strong scientific overtones." With James and Dewey Baird believes that the student learns through doing and the practical approach. "Learning by example," he says, "has been so well established as to need little experimental confirmation." Such foundations he recognizes as characteristically


American as well as "immediate and practical," but he also credits "the old Hellenic-Roman-Renaissance inheritance" as forming the main core of present concepts of communication. Pursuing this philosophy the teacher needs illustrative material in teaching various aspects of speaking. Baird points to the numerous speech anthologies and notes that "the chief interest of most compilers has been to focus on classified problems and basic ideas," as they aim "to provide initial subject matter for the student talks more than examples of specific speech types and occasions." In Baird's philosophy, students become more involved in the speech as a part of the total speaking situation through the study of examples than through the study of textbooks which, he says, "somehow never quite capture the enthusiasm or the imagination of the learners in the classroom as much as the right kind of speeches that you might have them read." Rather than imitating the style of the speech model as did the classicists students today emphasize the ideas of the speech. If, however, an example does involve appropriate use of language and effective audience adaptation, then there are added advantages in studying the speech.

In using speeches in teaching Baird warns that it is necessary to keep in mind the kind of course being offered. He says that the question often arises, "Shall we play up theory through the lectures and the textbooks and whatnot or shall we focus upon outstanding examples?" With regard to fundamentals of speech or beginning public
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speaking, Baird suggests focusing on the examples themselves, thus approaching the initial course inductively: the student gains appreciation and understanding of rhetorical principles through the study of well-selected examples which exemplify these principles. Baird finds that the analysis of current speeches soon after delivery will help the younger student to "much more completely absorb, identify, the kind of language and other elements which give the speech virility." He adds,

It is good, and appropriate, and contemporary to study the methods of John Kennedy and his public utterances because they are somehow so appropriate to the times. I have encouraged students here and there to imitate, to use as models, shall we say, some of these documents in the business field or other typical situations. On the other hand, it is very important for us to note that we cannot succumb to the influences of any model. Good speakers as well as good literary creative agents have come up through the study, whether they realize it or not, . . . of these examples. Wilson and Borah and anyone else you can name studied models, and so we believe very strongly in such usages.67

Despite his enthusiasm for the study of speeches in teaching Baird recognizes that this procedure may inhibit the student's development unless he is properly guided. He warns the teacher,

We have to remind ourselves, we have to remind our students, that this above all--you must be original, you must be creative, and you must not let the allurements of other people's methods, language, and so forth stifle your own development.68

In advanced classes Baird recommends that the student present orally a critical analysis of a speech which he has studied as an example. In this way the student applies the principles of rhetorical

67 Ibid.
68 Ibid.
criticism then he has the additional experience of organizing his
critique and presenting it to the class. Preferring the dialetic
or discussion, Baird does not believe that the professor should spend
the class time in lecturing; rather Baird advocates that the teacher
distribute necessary notes on mimeographed materials which the student
may employ outside the class period. In so doing he contends that the
instructor is better able to use class time to the students' advantage.69
Baird says that the instructor is a catalyst rather than a performer,
and it is the students who interact.

In summary, Baird's pragmatic emphasis is consistent with his
liberally-oriented approach to the teaching of speech. He believes
that students should become engrossed in "the wider point of view" and
should recognize that knowledge and maximum freedom of utterance need
to be tempered by judgment. The study of well-chosen speeches is a
means to this end. Class time should be devoted to student participation.
The initial course in speech fundamentals centers around the study of
eamples, stressing particularly the ideas developed in the speeches.
Advanced classes also employ the study of examples or models for
purposes of critical analysis.

The Need to Consider the Intellectual Content of Speeches as Examples

Threaded throughout Baird's writings is the thought that
"invention, with its mental, emotional, and personal details, is the
one justification for the speech."70 In Representative American
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Speeches he acknowledges that his selection has always been "very heavily weighted in the direction of the message itself, that is to say, of the content, of the ideas." As a teacher of rhetoric he has consistently emphasized "the invention aspect," and in selecting speeches he has looked to those which had "real economic, political, or religious significance . . . and weight . . . , materials which would be related to the great social, political, and other currents."  

In Baird's opinion, not only should the superior speech reflect depth of thought, the speaker should follow the example of Burke in being "deeply moved by the issues and ideas of his day":

... view the immediate problems with more than passing penetration. He should be a philosopher. His thinking and his speaking should reflect a grasp of causes and results. He should be both a historian and a seer. Furthermore he should analyze his problem so clearly that we accept the diagnosis and prescription because of its reasonableness and plausibility.  

While it is not essential that a representative speaker be "erudite nor profound," Baird says that he should (1) be an interpreter of the American mind, (2) offer worthwhile ideas, (3) discover the basic issues, and (4) demonstrate originality. In accomplishing these ends, representative speakers offer "a key to the experiences and ideals of a given generation."  

To determine the worth of ideas Baird poses the following question: "Is the address freighted with thought? Does it reveal important social and political principles? Is its impact upon the problems of the moment decisive? Does the speaker reveal somewhat
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the character of our national thinking?" Baird sees the speaker as "a genuine philosopher . . . like Burke, . . . a philosopher in action."

Concerning the ability to discover the basic issues, Baird points out that the speaker must deal with the essentials of the controversy in analyzing a topic and further that he must be able to view the problem in its proper perspective, never being satisfied with merely surface presentations.

Baird advises that in order to demonstrate originality, the speaker should "weave a fabric of encompassing material . . . that gives color, interest, immediate intelligibility, and logical clarity to the central ideas." He sees the speaker as supporting and making vivid his main ideas through the inclusion of "authorities, statistics, general illustrations, hypothetical or actual cases, events, anecdotes, circumstantial items, figurative or literal analogies or comparisons, definitions, restatements, and cause to effect chains of reasoning."

Baird refers to "explicit details" as those which support logical appeals, and to "implicit details" as those which enforce the emotional appeals.75

In keeping with his contention that "the central factor in rhetoric is invention, involving ideas and intellectual content and method,"76 Baird holds that "the aim of rhetoric is to inculcate sound education and intelligent expression."77 Ideas, he contends,

74 Representative American Speeches: 1942-43, p. 10.
77 Ibid., p. 93.
"are little or nothing apart from their social settings. Intellectual excellence in communication is only sham excellence without impact on the immediate and wider audiences. The character of that social direction is at the heart of our philosophy of speech." Taking issue with those teachers who contend that ethics lies outside the scope of communication, Baird maintains that "intellectual excellence cannot escape the responsibility for moral excellence." Taking issue with those teachers who contend that ethics lies outside the scope of communication, Baird maintains that "intellectual excellence cannot escape the responsibility for moral excellence."79

Baird decries the anti-intellectualism which he says is widespread among the existentialists, and which strikes at the intellectual quality of communication by attempting to obscure or eliminate logic. To Baird, reason and logic form the central core of speech criticism, teaching, and research. Upholding the supremacy of reason combined with the social direction of thought, Baird contends: "Such a goal inevitably incorporates value judgments. Thus the intellectual, logical, and ethical components are an unbroken continuum in their expression and effect."81

While he acknowledges that the orator's use of logic often leaves much to be desired because he tends to reason badly, Baird poses the question: "By what other means can our problems be solved?"82 He recalls John Dewey's statement that "thought is a man's chief
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reliance in the face of his perplexities." And Baird sees communication as "more than ever basic for individual and social salvation."

In evaluating contemporary political discourse, Baird says that it is necessary to consider "the common sense of the ideas, the temper of the talkers, and the clarity of the words used. The end of such communications is not vocal excellence but the audience decisions that will make or break our political progress." Continuing, Baird agrees that the critic must consider whether the speaker (1) understands what he is to communicate and why, (2) demonstrates efficient thinking based on fact and reason, (3) evinces good will toward his audience, their attitudes, traditions, and superstitions, and (4) establishes his ethical standards. Baird points out that "the practical end of political speaking and writing is to give effective support to truth--or whatever we regard as truth."

In summary, Baird sees the intellectual content of a given speech as its most important reason for being. He maintains that ideas must be judged in relation to the social setting and to their impact on immediate and ultimate audiences. According to Baird intellectual excellence carries with it an obligation to achieve moral excellence as well; thus intellectual, logical, and ethical elements cannot be evaluated as separate entities; rather, they form a continuum. Further, Baird says that the superior speaker gives evidence of a
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philosophical grasp of the problem showing that he understands the issues while demonstrating intellectual integrity, sound thinking, good will toward his audience, and ethical standards.

The Evaluation of Contributions of Speechmakers to the "Good Society"

Baird further qualifies his statement that "invention ... is the one justification for the speech" when he says that "rhetoric is justified only if it contributes to the 'good society'" and that the communicative act is inseparable from the social motives of the speaker. He considers only those speeches commendable which "tend to support a more satisfactory social-political climate" and which directly or indirectly support "well-defined American principles" which he enumerates as follows:

(1) The American system of democratic government is worthy of our supreme loyalty; (2) the personalities of our citizens, whatever their race, color, religion, or economic status, are worthy of our highest allegiance; (3) we Americans belong together, and every agency that creates division or undermines that solidarity is to be resisted as foreign to our philosophy and program of toleration and equality; (4) the more fortunate members of our national family are more and more to demonstrate the art of ameliorating the lot of the underprivileged; (5) industry, labor, public and private education, art, recreation, religion and every other phase of our common life should be directed toward the progressive realization of these ideals; (6) through cooperative thinking and speaking, through freedom of assembly, press, speech, and worship, we shall continually interpret our needs and solve our problems; (7) we wish for other nations only stability and permanent opportunity to protect their own national character and destiny, free from foreign oppression; (8) if necessary, we shall enlist our combined civil, military, and moral might, even to the extent of the sacrifice of millions of lives and billions of wealth, to defend this heritage of organized freedom.
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Baird is convinced that "one way to strengthen national morale and to educate young men and women for effective participation in national life is to encourage the study of outstanding contemporary speeches." The "good" speech, according to Baird, should be on the side of the "great society," which he defines as "a well-balanced, better-operating, developing social unit or civilization--one which moves in the direction of developing ethical and moral values."  

Keeping in mind his assertion that "rhetorical discourse is measured by its influence on an immediate or larger audience," Baird contends further that "history, including that of America, in its economic, political, social, and cultural expression, is the record of speechmaking leaders who have importantly influenced attitudes and events. Such speakers are intimately associated with the historical changes." Baird warns that the speaker's impact on history increases his ethical obligation to the extent that the speaker "must develop into something of a moral and social philosopher. He must be aware of the societal results of his communication. . . . Social utility or usefulness of the appeals in a given speech is the measure of ethical worth." The speaker who is committed to ethical motives, Baird contends, adopts the individual-social aims comprising the summum bonum, the highest good. . . . His over-all aims . . . embrace . . . the good of the society."  
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In an address entitled "The Scholar and the Alienated Generation," Baird stressed the need for the scholar to be committed to a concern for human values: (1) that the scholar's role has always been that of decision-making, (2) that the scholar's decisions are aimed toward both individual growth and social betterment, and (3) that the scholar with his intellectual and social conditioning is ethically committed. Elaborating on these concepts Baird says,

The role of the educated is always one of committal to value systems. As somebody said, scholars are those who care. They not only conceive what is desired but what ought to be desired. They visualize justice, right, liberty, freedom, quality, intellectual and social integrity, and character. These intangible but basic concepts become the scholar's assumptions, hypotheses, and tenets. These values pervade the content and details of his communication. And these communications in turn, so he hopes, will contribute to a better world. Such is the place of value judgments in the wisdom of the scholar.

This writer concludes that just as Baird equates the goals of a liberal education with the goals of the teaching of speech, he also equates the intellectual and ethical obligations of the genuine scholar with those of the speaker whose aim is to contribute to the "good society."

In summary, Baird holds that "the ends of rhetoric . . . are to contribute knowledge, instruction and guidance that make for a 'good society.'" Such a society develops, Baird says, under the influence of ethical and moral values which are in turn influenced by speechmaking leaders. Because of the "societal results of his
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communication," Baird contends that the speaker is obligated to uphold ethical standards which demonstrate his commitment to the good of society.
CHAPTER III

THE NATURE OF THE SERIES

The purpose of this chapter is to consider the nature of the Representative American Speeches series during Baird's twenty-two years as editor. As a teacher, he had recognized the need for collections of contemporary speeches affording a cross-section of current problems and of speech types. The format of the volumes reflects his wish to encourage the student to delve into the speaking situation surrounding a given address so that he might evaluate it in the proper context.

The following topics are considered: (1) initiation of the series, (2) selection of speakers, (3) selection of speeches, and (4) arrangement of the volumes.

Initiation of the Series

Baird had long advocated and implemented the use of speeches as examples by the time that Vital Speeches of the Day appeared in 1934. He then became interested in that type of publication for educational purposes. At the invitation of T. F. Daly and F. V. Lindley, the editors of Vital Speeches; Baird, J. M. O'Neill, Herbert Wichelns, and others sent them criticisms of current speeches which were being considered for publication in the fortnightly journal.¹

¹Taped interview with Baird at Carbondale, Illinois, April 29, 1967.
Three issues of the 1938-39 series of Vital Speeches carried endorsements by Baird and others. Baird wrote, "You are doing a splendid service for speech education in American schools and colleges through your publication of representative addresses."²

After Vital Speeches began publication, Baird became interested in compiling and editing a collection of current speeches. Recently he commented:

We were all conscious of the fact that books of that sort were not commercially profitable. But I talked to the editors of the Wilson Company and sent them my manuscript which they immediately printed, and I guess that about explains how the origin of the thing came about. It was really the building up of my own teaching pattern since 1920 at Bates College. . . . The Wilson Company annual publications never did pay me very much and it's a labor, really, to use a trite expression, it's a labor of love, and all that kind of thing--no great motives!³

Although the publication of Vital Speeches no doubt influenced Baird to begin the Representative American Speeches series, the nature of the two publications varies. For example, the speeches included in Vital Speeches were prefaced only by a statement of the time and place of delivery, and the title or occupation of the speaker; whereas Baird featured introductions to the volumes of Representative American Speeches as well as introductions to the individual speeches. Another point of divergence which is readily apparent is that Vital Speeches claimed to offer "the best thought of the best minds," while Baird stresses that the addresses selected for Representative American Speeches are "representative, not best."

In summary, Baird maintains that "primarily all our publications and movements in such direction grow out of our teaching... because of the need of students to have these publications." He initiated the Representative American Speeches series because he recognized the value of the availability of important contemporary speeches to students.

Selection of Speakers

In the initial volume of the series, Baird makes clear that he "disavows sponsorship for the views of these orators" and that his aim is to offer "a collection of speeches and not a document aimed to promote a given political or social attitude." In the 1957-58 volume, he reflects that the speakers selected "are a cross-section of the different types. There are political speakers (the majority) but there are also effective representatives of business, labor, law, religion, education, and other categories." In stressing his efforts to encompass a representative sampling of the speech-making of the period, Baird comments:

No one volume with its few speeches can well encompass a carefully balanced representation of the various political, educational, radio-television, religious, economic, and other spokesmen. The combined anthology... however, should provide a comprehensive cross-section of the various categories of speakers and speaking types.
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Baird suggests that the cumulative index may be useful in compiling "a list of speakers in any one category (for example, preachers) that would represent a fairly satisfactory list of representatives (since 1937) in that group. . . ."  

In addition to choosing speeches with a view toward presenting a cross-section of American speeches, Baird stresses his intention to limit inclusion to those offering important ideas. He reiterates that he does not claim that his selections are the "best" of a given year but that he considers that most of the speeches are important "in that they deal with issues that have affected millions of Americans." He adds,

The speakers selected have presumably had more than passing importance--through the weight of their ideas, or delivery, or through some combination of the communication factors. This editor assumes that these speeches have both reflected the temper of the times and have to some extent influenced national thinking and American character.

Baird notes the fallacy of attempting to limit a collection to the "best" of a given time-span when he comments that "no satisfactory method of voting has been devised to register decisively the 'best' of the gigantic heap of oral productions during a twelve-month period. . . ." He says that "at best it would be necessary to select the top 'best' of a given speaking type (e.g. MacArthur is near the top among military speakers)."
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Although speakers represented are not exclusively Americans, they delivered their speeches in this country. Among the non-Americans included Winston Churchill figures most prominently, with eight of his speeches being selected.

In summary, Baird's "representative" speakers afford the student a comprehensive cross-section of the speaking in this country which was contemporary at the time of their speechmaking. The speeches offer important ideas which reflect the major events and trends of the times.

Selection of Speeches

While recommending the series as a collection which "offers examples for analysis by those interested in the art of effective speaking," Baird acknowledges that "the chief regret has been that a wealth of excellent material has had to be omitted."

Early in the series, Baird noted that "teachers will readily recognize that this book belongs with that considerable number of similar volumes which directors of English composition, extempore speaking, and similar courses have found highly serviceable as 'thought-provoking' materials." In his final volume he comments,

This volume with its predecessors is a reference source, useful for the subject matter of these speeches since 1937 and for the information about the speakers and their methods. Each
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volume in addition to its use as a library reference work, should aid school and college students of discussion and debate, public speaking, the history and criticism of American public address, and the social sciences.\(^\text{17}\)

In offering the speeches, Baird recognized the value of having the speech printed in its entirety but he admits that inclusion of the complete speech was not always practicable. He points out some of the difficulties which confronted him as he made his selections:

The speeches are usually printed complete. Those delivered in the course of Congressional debate may of course represent only a portion of the whole Congressional discussion. In the case of a running Congressional debate it is at times difficult to decide just what a "complete" speech may be. Kaltenborn's radio broadcast of the European crisis last September represented hours upon hours of commentary with brief interruptions. The example here included is necessarily only an excerpt from the thousands of words as uttered. Thomas E. Dewey's speech on the "Hines Policy-Number Case" includes only the peroration of a final speech for the state, which closing argument occupied an entire day.\(^\text{18}\)

In his final volume Baird comments, "Complete speeches are given wherever practicable. Especially long speeches (e.g., some of those before the United States Senate) have been reprinted only in part."\(^\text{19}\)

Baird did indeed include the complete texts of the majority of speeches in the series. Of the 566 speeches in the twenty-two volumes, only twenty-one speeches were printed in part: thirteen were Senate debates, four were courtroom speeches, two were lectures, one was a speech before the House of Representatives, and one was delivered before a joint session of Congress. Baird was careful to make clear

\(^{17}\)Representative American Speeches: 1958-59, p. 4.
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when portions had been deleted, and he often explained that a given speech was too long for inclusion in its entirety.²⁰

In summary, Baird recognizes the importance to the student of having available speeches for study as examples, and he directs this series toward that end. He sees also the advantages of offering the complete text for the student's analysis, and he has sought to include speeches in their complete form except where the length of the speeches made this practice not feasible.

Textual authenticity. As editor, Baird had to face the problems of ghost-writing and textual accuracy in the speeches selected. To resolve this problem he chose speeches which were "created--or largely created--by the alleged authors." In addition, whenever possible he transcribed the speech from the original recording.

Baird expresses his concern for accuracy when he comments,

The authenticity of a speech text is always open to question. Did the man actually say what the printed page reports him as saying? It is to be admitted that even the speeches of President Roosevelt, illustrated by his address "The New Deal Must Continue," do not coincide always with the official text as furnished by the White House. Impromptu interpolations here and there are not always registered in the official version as furnished by the author.

Baird is specific in listing some of the barriers to verbatim reporting of speeches as delivered:
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The speaker may have edited the reprint to enhance his literary merit, or later to qualify unguarded statements made on the platform. I have frequently noted discrepancies between the text as uttered (and recorded) and the version submitted to me for publication. It should be added that these changes are usually inconsequential and that these reprints are made with the cooperation of the speaker and from texts approved by him.

At best the problem of getting an accurate reproduction is complicated. (1) The best speeches—for example, many extemporaneous remarks—may be unrecorded. (2) Shorthand reports are admittedly not entirely accurate. (3) Congressional speakers, for example, have the privilege of correcting in printer's proofs their remarks in minor and even major items. (4) A literal transcription of extemporaneous remarks would not always be fair to the speakers. The broken sentences, loose structure, and even questionable grammar may be entirely acceptable in the speaking situation. Reduced to print, the results may invite readers' criticism. Spoken style is best understood in its setting, accompanied by the voice and manner of the speaker himself.

What shall we do about this problem of textual accuracy? Make electrical or other recordings wherever possible. For other speeches, compare the various texts and select the most authentic copy.25

An interesting example of a problem of textual accuracy which Baird faced is recalled by one of his former students:

I particularly recall his sessions dealing with textual authenticity. Not only did he refer us to one of his introductory sections of Representative American Speeches, but he gave from personal experience his problems and frustrations in collecting authentic speeches for his books, then getting the speakers' permission to use them. I recall his having told us that he had made an audio tape of one of H. V. Kaltenborn's radio commentaries. He carefully had his secretary type out the speech from the tape. When, however, Dr. Baird submitted the typed speech to Kaltenborn for approval, H. V. denied that such were his remarks, then edited the speech for Baird's book!26

Discussing textual authenticity, Baird remarked recently:

Our problem, as you know, for all speech teachers, is to try to get the original words and the situation that
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represents the speech. In my dealing with all these three hundred or more speakers that I tried to incorporate in these volumes, I made a great effort to get the original recording as given by a machine—an electronic recording. In many cases, I had to accept the manuscript as given by the President of the United States or some person of authority, and in such cases I tried to check through recordings of the original speech. I did not have time to do the kind of research that I wanted to do there, but I made the best effort I could to establish the authenticity of the original document.  

With regard to the problem of ghost writing, Baird said in one of his early volumes, "If speeches that are here included turn out to be exclusively 'ghost writer' performances, then this critic has used questionable judgment." By the time of the 1947-48 edition, Baird qualified to some extent his earlier insistence that a speech should be the work of the orator:

My procedure is to select, as nearly as I can do so, only those speeches created—or largely created—by the alleged authors. . . . Your diligence in checking authorship, therefore, is not time wasted. You need to hear many speeches by the orator, note his extempore skill as repeatedly demonstrated, study his habits of composition and delivery, and get from those closely associated with him the most reliable evidence of his compositional skill.

In his introduction to American Public Addresses: 1740-1952, (1956) Baird advises the reader that "not all speakers compose their remarks. Ghost writers abound and have always done so. Prominent government executives, military leaders, and others continually give speeches and official utterances largely written by others." He then


offers the student suggested procedures for checking authorship of a given speech.

In the 1951-52 edition of Representative American Speeches, Baird interprets again his attitude toward the problem of ghost writing, commenting that all the speakers included in that year's volume "have demonstrated, in spite of possible ghost writers at their beck, their skill in improvising their own speeches. All have enough intellectual and moral power in speech to command wide audiences."31 In other words, if the pressures of the speaker's other responsibilities preclude his having the time to devote to speech composition, his speech should nevertheless reflect the thinking of the speaker, and the speaker should have earlier demonstrated his proficiency at speech composition and extempore delivery. As Baird said more recently,

> We have never been able, of course, to decide how original a particular speech or manuscript may be. But we do the best we can to look at the previous extempore and other utterances by any speaker, and in that way we do establish pretty well in our own convictions the originality, the creativity, of the address as given.32

In summary, Baird recognizes the critic's obligation to seek out the most accurate text of a given speech and then to determine, insofar as possible, the extent to which the text is the creation of the speaker.

Arrangement of the Volumes of Representative American Speeches

Baird's theory that the study of speeches as examples can be of great value to the student of public speaking is again evidenced in his arrangement of the content of each volume in the series. He groups speeches according to classification by subject of the speech, and he often includes an additional classification according to the speaking occasion. The general introductions to the volumes offer the student insight into Baird's theory of speech criticism, and the introductions to the individual speeches provide information on the speaker, the speech, the audience, and the occasion. Baird includes brief biographical notes on the speakers of each volume and beginning with the 1939-40 edition he appended a cumulative index.

Classification of speeches. As Baird makes clear, "Classifications either of content or of speaking types obviously overlap. They are set forth for the reader's convenience, rather than as examples of logical scientific division." He notes, for example, that "a speech on foreign policy may also have to do with national defense or the theory of democratic government. A radio talk may be also a political address, one of introduction, farewell, or eulogy." Nevertheless, he believes that "the tentative classifications help students interested in contemporary problems or those concerned with speeches as models for original compositions." 33

Baird chose to arrange speeches according to subject matter, with classification falling into such divisions as "International Policies, 34

33 *Representative American Speeches*: 1947-48, p. 3.
34 *Representative American Speeches*: 1949-50, p. 4.

Although Baird prefers to group speeches according to the subject matter or ideas presented, he recognizes that "students may prefer an alternate classification based upon the speaker's purposes, the speaking occasions, the speech types and audiences." Such speeches, he says

. . . would be classified according to those given before (1) legislatures . . . ; (2) international deliberative bodies . . . ; (3) political gatherings . . . ; (4) professional meetings . . . ; (5) memorial occasions . . . ; (6) university convocations . . . ; (7) learned societies . . . ; (8) court rooms . . . ; (9) business executive dinners . . . ; (10) community groups . . . ; (11) television audiences . . . ; (12) religious assemblies . . . ; (13) labor audiences . . . ; (14) meetings that extend greetings and present awards . . . . . .38

With the possible preference for an alternate classification in mind, Baird reminds the reader that "the introductions to earlier volumes . . . have listed alternate classifications based on speaking occasions and types. . . . . . .39

35 Representative American Speeches: 1956-57, p. 3.
36 Representative American Speeches: 1957-58, p. 4.
37 Representative American Speeches: 1958-59, p. 3.
38 Representative American Speeches: 1953-54, p. 3.
39 Representative American Speeches: 1958-59, p. 3.
In summary, while Baird consistently bases the Table of Contents of each volume on speech content, he acknowledges that considerable overlapping occurs in attempting to categorize speeches, whether by subject matter or occasion. As an aid to the student, he frequently offers an additional classification of the speeches of a given volume according to speaking occasion.

Introductions to the volumes. The introductions which open each collection of speeches were designed for two purposes: eleven expounded some aspect of speech criticism; eight reviewed events of the preceding year as they related to the speakers and their speeches; and three did both. In Baird's view, these treatments of rhetorical criticism when considered as a unit "constitute a well-developed body of speech theory."^40 Baird makes clear that his introductions are planned to serve a useful end when he says, "For a comprehensive survey of this editor's approach to the philosophy and technique of the criticism of speaking and for his own principles of selecting 'representative' addresses, the student is advised to read the introduction to each volume."^41 Later he adds,

The Introduction to each of the sixteen volumes deals with some phase of speech standards. Recent Introductions have treated the speaker's thought (1948-49), language (1949-50), delivery (1950-51), effectiveness in legislative and political speaking (1951-52). The present introduction (1952-53), besides summarizing the events of the period and their impact on speaking, adds a unit on speech types.42

---

^40 Representative American Speeches: 1949-50, p. 4.
^41 Representative American Speeches: 1945-46, p. 4.
In dealing "with some phase of the problem and method of evaluating speeches and speechmakers" Baird seeks to foster the student's ability at critical analysis of speeches. Always he insists that the information which he offers relative to the speeches and speakers is a starting point from which the student should proceed to do his own research. He considers the series to be "a reference source, useful both for subject entries and for speeches and speakers to be studied as types." He advises the student however "to examine further in each speech the forms of support, language, audience adaptation, delivery, and immediate and long-term effects." He adds that he "welcomes any suggestions of public addresses for possible inclusion in these annual collections."

In summary, through his introductions to the volumes Baird sets forth his purpose in editing the series and the uses for which the volumes are intended. In offering the speeches for study as examples, he sets forth pertinent aspects of his theory of rhetorical criticism. In addition, in several of the volumes he traces the leading movements of the immediate months, identifying the speakers with these events and trends. In his words:

These . . . volumes, with their individual Contents and the Cumulative Author Index, provide an excellent basic reconstruction of the important events in American history and affairs since 1937. The successive periods can be studied in detail: (1) the period prior to the Second World

---

43 Representative American Speeches: 1955-56, p. 3.
44 Representative American Speeches: 1951-52, p. 4.
46 Representative American Speeches: 1953-54, p. 5.
Introductions to the individual speeches. In his last volume of *Representative American Speeches* Baird pointed out that the introduction to each speech treats "one or more phases of the background and occasion, ideas, organization, language, audience appeals, the speaker's personality and delivery, and the immediate results of the speech . . . In order to invite the reader to a more complete analysis and criticism of the speech." Throughout the series, Baird prefixed these short introductory notes in order to "facilitate insight into a given speech." He adds that "the reader is thus encouraged to reconstruct something of the circumstances attending the speech, to turn to similar speeches on the same theme, and to evaluate more accurately the address as a possible contribution to the course of our national history." Baird looks upon these opening statements as "a further aid to an analysis of the given address as the product of the speaker, the occasion and the audience, and of the speech . . . ." He used the term "further aid" to suggest "detailed methods for the systematic criticism of a speech" in the general introductions to the various volumes.

47 *Representative American Speeches*: 1957-58, p. 4.
49 *Representative American Speeches*: 1940-41, p. 3.
50 *Representative American Speeches*: 1943-44, p. 3.
51 Ibid.
Baird points out that the prefatory notes preceding the speeches are "often based upon information from the speaker himself concerning his methods and speech-training." While the opening introductions together summarize his philosophy of speechmaking and suggest to the students how to develop as public speakers, the brief introduction to each speech, though making no pretense at completeness, should stimulate research on the speaker and the speech. "The student-reader, it is assumed, will explore each . . . component of the communicative situation."

Commenting on his prefatory notes, Baird remarked that they vary a good deal, with some being more effective and more complete than others. He considers his introductions to the speeches of Franklin D. Roosevelt among the better ones in the series. "Nevertheless," he advises, "the whole procedure, even though in capsule form, ought to be there--the speaker and his background in relation to the immediate audience and the content of what he had to say, his delivery, the language, and his effectiveness."

In summary, while some are limited to a statement of the time, place, and occasion on which the speech was presented, most of the opening statements, although brief, give the student an insight which is essential to understanding and analysis of the speech.

52 Representative American Speeches: 1945-46, p. 4.
53 Representative American Speeches: 1946-47, p. 3.
54 Representative American Speeches: 1956-57, p. 4.
55 Interview with Baird at Carbondale, Illinois, April 28, 1967.
Cumulative index. Beginning with the 1939-40 edition of Representative American Speeches, Baird appended a cumulative index. He points out that the student "will have a better appreciation of a current speech if he has before him the addresses and speakers of the preceding years. From such approach former discourses lose their character as 'dated' or 'unimportant' documents." Referring the student to the table of contents of each volume and to the cumulative author index at the ends of the volumes from 1939-40 through 1958-59 he says that these indices offer "further means of reviewing the issues and speakers of the past . . . years." Baird adds that "such an over-all survey will give the student perspective and will demonstrate the intimate connection between speechmaking and events. The . . . volumes, it is hoped, provide insight into the forces behind the cultural and political history of these years." In addition to the cumulative index according to speakers Baird wanted to supply a cumulative index according to ideas. The publishers rejected this suggestion he said, because of space limitations.

For the student who seeks to gain an overview of the speakers who were prominent during the years in which Baird edited the series, he offers the following advice:

An appraisal of the speakers in any one volume hardly satisfies the question of who are the most important speakers of these . . . years. A survey of all the preachers, military

---


58 Interview with Baird at Carbondale, Illinois, April 28, 1967.
spokesmen, legislative speakers, representatives of labor, industry, education, radio, and other groups cited in the index, should provide a fairly satisfactory preferred list of those in any one category.59

In summary, Baird's purpose in editing the series is augmented by his inclusion of a cumulative author index. He offers the volumes as a reference source of speeches to be studied as examples, and he sees value to the student in studying the successive periods in detail. As Baird comments, "These twenty-two volumes with their individual contents and the Cumulative Author Index provide a reconstruction of the important events of American political, economic, and cultural history and affairs since 1937."60

Biographical Notes. Beginning with his first volume of Representative American Speeches: 1937-38, Baird included "Biographical Notes" in the appendix. His aim is to encourage the reader toward "further investigation of the speaker, especially of those experiences that partly account for his speaking ability and his method of speech composition and delivery."61 The notes are intentionally brief, and "it is assumed that such items will lead the reader to other sources for a full review of the speaker's career."62 The following examples are typical:


60 Representative American Speeches: 1958-59, p. 4.
law practice, New York City, 1911; director, Bank of New York; trustee, Rockefeller Foundation; chairman, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace; chairman, Federal Council of Churches Commission on a Just and Durable Peace; secretary to a delegation, Hague Peace Conference, 1907; Captain and Major, United States Army, 1917-18; member, Reparations Commission and Supreme Economic Council, 1919; member, United States delegation, San Francisco Conference on World Organization, 1945; Council of Foreign Ministers, London, 1945; General Assembly, United Nations, 1946; meeting of Council of Foreign Ministers, Moscow, 1947; London meeting of "Big Four," 1947; appointed United States Senator (Republican) from New York, July-November 1949 (to complete term of Senator Wagner); appointed counselor, Department of State, April 1950; appointed, with rank of ambassador, to negotiate terms of peace for Japan, 1951; representative at signing of Japanese peace treaty, San Francisco, 1951; writer and speaker on international affairs; author of War or Peace, 1950; appointed Secretary of State in the Eisenhower cabinet, 1953. (See also Current Biography: 1953.)

TILLICH, PAUL JOHANNES (1886- ). Born, Starzeddel, Kreis Guben, Prussia; student, University of Berlin, 1904-05; University of Tubingen, 1905; University of Halle, 1905-07; University of Berlin, 1908; Ph.D., University of Breslau, 1911; chaplain, German Army, 1914-18; Th.D., University of Halle, 1926; D.D., Yale University, 1940; theological faculty, University of Berlin, 1919-1924, University of Marburg, 1924-25; University of Dresden, 1925-29, Leipzig, 1928-29, University of Frankfurt-am-Main, 1929-33; Union Theological Seminary, New York City, 1933-35; Harvard Divinity School, 1955- ; minister, Evangelical and Reformed Church; author, The Religious Situation, The Interpretation of History, The Protestant Era, The Shaking of the Foundations, and numerous other books and articles. (See also Current Biography: 1954.) Each volume continued to include biographical notes on the speakers represented in that particular book. In general, the sketches afford the following information: date and place of birth, education, occupation or profession, offices held, honors awarded, publications, and activities related to public speaking. Baird frequently refers the reader to Current Biography for further information, listing the

---

64 Representative American Speeches: 1957-58, p. 199.
edition of that publication which contains information on a given speaker.


In encouraging the reader to examine the "background, personality, and speaking methods" of the speaker, Baird is consistent with his teaching that the speech must be considered in the light of the total speaking situation. A speech cannot be adequately studied as an example, he believes, without some evaluation of the speaker's role as a contributor to the "good society."

Summary

In summary, Baird recommends the Representative American Speeches series as a reference for the study of American trends of thought and action; as a series of specific arguments or other information on problems under investigation; as a series of speeches to be examined in review of the history and criticism of American public speaking; or as materials and methods for the students of extempore-speaking. He considers the collections

---

67 Representative American Speeches: 1945-46, p. 3.
"especially applicable to students of communication, extempore speaking, history, social science, debate, and public speaking." 68

Baird relates that the Representative American Speeches series began as an outgrowth of his interest in the study of speeches as examples coupled with his recognition of the need of students to have access to such collections. The publication of Vital Speeches of the Day, beginning in 1934, gave impetus to his decision to begin editing Representative American Speeches.

The nature of the series reflects Baird's theory of using speech models. His advocacy of the pragmatic approach in the study of public speaking is evident in his frequent reminders that the speeches of the series are recommended as examples for study. As he points out, "The Introductions to each of the first ten volumes together summarize this editor's philosophy of speechmaking..." 69

In addition, his belief that the "representative" speech should contribute to the "good society" is apparent as he discusses the speakers as "voices of history" and the series as "a textbook of American ideals." His approach differs from that of the editors of Vital Speeches of the Day ("The Best Thought of the Best Minds") as he repeatedly asserts that the examples selected for Representative American Speeches are "representative," not "best."

Baird shares with readers some of the problems which he encountered as an editor, including the need to abbreviate lengthy speeches, and to consider textual authenticity as well as the problem

68 Ibid.

69 Representative American Speeches: 1946-47, p. 3.
of ghost-writing. In so doing, he gives further insight into his theory of the use of speeches as examples.

Finally, Baird's intention that the speeches should be studied as examples is evident in his arrangement of the individual volumes of the series. As aids to the student, he arranged speeches according to the subject matter, and adds a cumulative author index at the end of all except the first two volumes. His general introductions to the volumes discuss his philosophy of speech criticism and trace events of the year encompassing the speeches of that edition. He employs introductions to individual speeches to treat one or more phases of the speaking situation, and he adds the Biographical Notes of the appendix to afford information relative to the speaker's background. Throughout, Baird's aim is to encourage the student to do further research regarding the speaking situation.
CHAPTER IV

STANDARDS FOR SELECTING SPEECHES

According to Speech Criticism, "the theory and criticism of public address are inseparable" and "oratory to be great must deal with ideas which make a difference in the affairs of men and states." In choosing examples for Representative American Speeches, Baird sought addresses worthy of study as well as those which mirrored the times.

As noted earlier, most of the selections included may be classified as deliberative (or legislative) speeches. The following excerpt from Speech Criticism is helpful in understanding Baird's preference for deliberative oratory:

... important speech-making must deal largely with the determination of points of fact, and the determination of expediency in proposed courses of action. In other words, forensic and deliberative speaking have always been the two favored branches of oratory since they presumably deal with the urgencies of the times and hence draw most freely upon the capacities and ingenuities of speakers. Furthermore,

---

1Dr. Baird wrote Speech Criticism in collaboration with Lester Thonssen. In an interview at Baton Rouge, Louisiana on February 16, 1968, Waldo W. Braden stated that Chapters 11-16 of the first edition of Speech Criticism were primarily the work of Baird, with changes suggested by Thonssen being of a comparatively minor nature. Braden says that the same is largely true of the second edition at present impress.


3Ibid.
excepting the celebrated forensic speeches of antiquity, the greater share of remembered oratory is of the deliberative variety.

The prominence of deliberative speaking in oratorical literature probably results from the nature of the subject matter . . . , the matter of public expediency with which the orator deals in a deliberative assembly . . . . But, in the main, the ideas which live within the memories of succeeding generations, and the ideas whose integrity is tested and appraised more often in later history, are the ones which deliberative speakers have developed in addresses on the burning issues of their time. Hence, they are ideas directed to expediency of certain conduct or action.4

In studying Baird's selection it is important, then, to keep in mind that he places greatest emphasis upon the ideas presented especially as they relate to the problems of the times. Three aspects of Baird's choice of speeches are considered in this section: (1) How he selected speeches; (2) Why he selected speeches; and (3) Who were the speakers selected.

**How Baird Selected Speeches**

In editing *Representative American Speeches*, Baird encountered the following problems: (1) determining the effectiveness of a speech; (2) meeting the pressure of press deadlines; (3) securing permission to publish each speech; (4) checking textual authenticity; (5) balancing varied types of speeches; (6) representing important events in the collections; (7) limiting the number of speeches to fit the size of the volumes; and (8) avoiding letting his personal prejudices influence his selection.

Accordingly Baird gathered speeches through a purely inductive process, seeking addresses "at all times in whatever way" he could. He heard

---

as many speeches in person as possible and looked always for those having historical value and dealing with important ideas. In addition, he sought orations which had some influence, some evidence of speaker-audience bonds, and worthy motives. He emphasized the importance of style and commented that "trite, unoriginal speeches" were not considered for publication.

Having selected a given speech, Baird faced the necessity of obtaining permission for publication. He consistently cited the source of the manuscript in a footnote following the introduction to each speech. Frequently he noted that the speaker supplied the text. He also consulted the following sources, which are arranged here by types:


Educational institutions: Columbia University Press, the University of Chicago, the University of California Press, and Texas Technological College.

---

5Interview with Baird at Carbondale, Illinois, April 28, 1967.
Government sources: The British Information Services, the Department of State, the Navy Department, the White House, the Educational Policies Commission, the President's Office, the Office of National Defense, the United States Mission to the United Nations, the United States Department of Labor, and the Des Moines Chamber of Commerce.


Special interest groups: The National Wallace for President Committee, Americans for Democratic Action, the Republican National Committee, the Democratic National Committee, and the American Jewish Committee.


Labor: United Automobile Workers and the American Federation of Labor.

Broadcasters: The National Broadcasting Company, the Columbia Broadcasting System, Station WHO, Des Moines, Iowa; and the Chicago Round Table.

Baird also employed tape recordings and stenographic transcripts of the addresses. He chose speeches which represented the viewpoints of political parties, the national government, the news media, organized religion, business, education, medicine, and labor. His sources reflect divergent points of view, i.e., Republicans and Democrats; business and labor; Protestants, Catholics, and Jews.

Reviewers' comments. Although his selections for the series evoked many comments by reviewers writing for the speech journals,

---

6Source: Footnotes accompanying speeches in all Representative American Speeches volumes, 1937-38 through 1958-59.
Baird was not unduly influenced by these critiques. Concerning the reviews, Baird said:

I'll have to admit to you privately, or otherwise, that these comments did not affect me very much. One reason they did not affect me very much was because most who criticized contented themselves with kind of brief summaries of what was there. I don't think I ever once got a real penetrating analysis of what I was trying to do—or worth, or lack of it. It's very easy, as you know, to criticize adversely any collection of speeches or other documents. People always have their individual preferences, and they always want material that you haven't put in, or they want to exclude something that you have put in, and so I never took too seriously those points of view.

Of course, the volumes were limited to about 300 pages, which meant that I could not put in everything, and also, here and there a speech would be included that people didn't like, and they would say to me privately, "Why do you have that there?" I recognize the validity of all this kind of criticism, but you don't do much about it except to proceed as best you can.7

Although Baird did not modify his selection of speeches as a result of reviewers' criticisms, it is nevertheless pertinent to this study to consider comments on his choice of speeches because they represent the viewpoints of able rhetoricians.

The adverse criticisms frequently centered around the speeches which Baird did not include. For example, while acknowledging the difficulty of determining speeches for inclusion, Ernest J. Wrage of Northwestern University was nevertheless critical of omissions from the 1953-54 volume. Wrage said:

Of two or more potentially eligible speeches, which is the more or the most representative? I don't know how these vexing problems are resolved. Surely appraisal must be followed by agonizing reappraisal until the hour of the printing

deadline has arrived. However he does it, in my opinion
Mr. Baird has a pretty high batting average.

So you see I do not wish to cavil about what I find in
the 1953-54 volume. It's what I don't find that surprises
me. Remember, this was the year of the Brownell-Truman-
McCarthy fracas and of "twenty years of treason" demagoguery.
Public and private talk was hopped up with repeated allegations
of communists-in-our-midst and the counterattacks. Yet I cannot
find the heat of this moment in Representative American Speeches.
I cannot find a single speech by McCarthy in any of the volumes.
. . . McCarthy's speeches were fishing expeditions in muddy
waters, and his bait was taken by millions of anxious, frustrated,
hostile people. It is unfortunate that this side of the spoken
record for the year, diatribes and all, are /sic/ not preserved
in this important publication.

Although Wrage protested the omission of speeches by McCarthy up to
and including the 1953-54 edition, A. L. Thurman, in reviewing the
1954-55 volume, commended the editor for selecting speeches repre­
senting both sides of the McCarthy issue: "Particularly well chosen
are the speeches concerning McCarthy--Stennis speaking for censure
and John W. Bricker speaking against censure." Even so, no McCarthy
speeches per se are found in the series. When asked recently why
he saw fit to omit McCarthy speeches from his collections, Baird
said that he did so in the belief that McCarthy did not fulfill the
requirement of "worthy motive" on the part of the speaker.

Wrage also criticized Baird for omission of Billy Graham's
speeches:

I wonder about another omission--this one in religion.
Time speaks of Billy Graham as "the best known, most talked
about Christian leader in the world today, barring the Pope."

8Ernest J. Wrage, "Review of Representative American Speeches:

9A. L. Thurman, "Review of Representative American Speeches:

10Interview with Baird at Carbondale, Illinois, April 28, 1967.
However much Graham depends for his results upon an elaborate revival apparatus, his preaching furnishes the piece de resistance. What is more, the popularity of his revivals tell us a good deal about the state of the American mind. It is true that Baird did omit Graham's speeches but not through choice. When he wrote Graham for permission to publish one of his sermons, Baird did not receive a reply.

Referring to the 1952-53 edition, Dallas C. Dickey takes issue with Baird's selection because "little criticism can be made of the editor's selections, but it is tempting to inquire why three speeches from Eisenhower found a place in the volume at the expense of others, which were necessarily omitted." Regarding the same volume, Richard Murphy differs with Baird's application of standards:

Of particular interest are the editor's comments of evaluation in which he reveals his rhetorical principles and standards in taste and politics. John Foster Dulles is described as "without Churchillian eloquence and with a minimum of nuance in voice technique." More debatable are such statements as the one that Eisenhower's inaugural address "fell just short of the character of Lincoln's second inaugural." Rhetoricians, like theologians, do not always agree when standards are specifically applied.

No doubt Baird would readily agree with Dickey's final statement because he, too, comments on the conflicts which are found in standards for rhetorical criticism.

---

11 Wrage, loc. cit.
12 Interview with Baird at Carbondale, Illinois, April 28, 1967.
15 Thonssen and Baird, loc. cit.
Though he praised Baird's introductions, Frederick W. Haberman denied that the speeches were "representative":

These orators and the issues which they and others deal with are, no doubt, the most "important." They are not representative in the sense of providing a cross-section of American life. There are some areas and some outstanding leaders not represented. Not included are the arts—drama, music, literature, architecture, painting, and their spokesmen, Frank Lloyd Wright, for example. Nor is there anything on athletics, or on entertainment, or on what might be called "personal issues," or on many of the subjects which we associate with the lecture circuit.16

It appears that Haberman disagreed over the definition of "representative" as applied to the speeches of the series. Tempering his adverse comments with praise, Haberman wrote, "Over a thirteen-year period, Professor Baird has made a significant contribution to the literature of rhetorical criticism."17

With some reservation, Warren Guthrie objected to Baird's injection of his own opinions into his introductory statements. Guthrie wrote, "One might regret the occasional evidences of Baird's own political and economic predilections creeping into some of the introductory comments, but to this reviewer such hints of opinion by the editor add considerably to the notes."18 Recognizing the need for objectivity Baird insists that his selections do not imply his endorsement of the speakers' points of view.19


17Ibid.


In a review of the 1952-53 volume, Richard Murphy pointed out that often recordings of the actual presentation were not available to the editor:

The majority of the texts have been supplied by the speaker or his sponsor, and only one is taken from an oral text in possession of the editor. . . . Alas, if we could but know in advance when a representative speech is to be made, that we might have our recorders there.20

Baird acknowledges that an on-the-scene recording of a speech is the ideal way to achieve the greatest accuracy in preparing a manuscript for publication. He comments,

Our problem, as you know, for all speech teachers, is to try to get the primary, the original words and the situation that represents the speech. In my dealing with all these three hundred or more speakers that I tried to incorporate in volumes, I made a great effort to get the original recording as given by a machine--an electronic recording. In many cases, I had to accept the manuscript as given by . . . some person of authority, and in such cases I tried to check through other recordings of the original speech. I did not have time to do the kind of research that I wanted to do there, but I made the best effort I could to establish the authenticity of the original document.21

Commenting on the need for accuracy of texts, Ronald F. Reid says that "textual authenticity, though not as certain as if electronic transcriptions were used, is good in view of Baird's usual practice of obtaining texts from the speaker or his representative."22

In considering these evaluations certain criticisms emerge:

1) some orators are represented repeatedly, while others are

20 Murphy, loc. cit.


omitted altogether; (2) Baird's rhetorical and political prejudices are sometimes apparent in his choice of speeches and his introductory remarks to individual speeches; (3) speakers do not always represent a true cross-section of American life; and (4) texts of some speeches are not verbatim. Despite these criticisms, it should be pointed out that favorable comments from reviewers far out-number the adverse ones, and the overall reaction of the reviewers was that Baird's editing of the series demonstrated competent handling of an extremely challenging assignment over a long period of time. As Kenneth G. Hance said,

In the field of speech criticism Professor Baird has rendered an important service; first, in carefully defining and expounding a type of criticism which is concerned distinctively with "speech"; second, in providing much important material for that type of criticism. . . . No doubt, the annual presentation of this point of view and its frequent application to specific cases should do much to educate students of public address concerning the nature of competent speech criticism. . . . This volume, like its predecessors, is indeed a useful record for the contemporary student of public address.23

Wayne N. Thompson commented that "the collection, because of the variety and the competence of the addresses, provides the basis for a useful course in either speech composition or rhetorical criticism." In addition, he said, "Representative American Speeches: 1947-48 refutes the notion that almost anyone could compile a worthwhile anthology. It is the discriminating judgment and the firm editorial hand of Professor Baird that render this volume useful."24


In the same vein Richard Murphy pointed out that "the editor has a sixth sense for temporal, rhetorical significance, and each of the volumes has the essence of its time." In apparent agreement, Ernest J. Wrage wrote:

In quantity alone this series exceeds all other contemporary collections in book form, and bids to outdistance the encyclopedic efforts of earlier compilers. I am much impressed by Mr. Baird's industry and perserverance in getting out one of these volumes year after year. Useful as these volumes are to us now, they will become invaluable with time.

Wayne E. Brockriede made an interesting observation regarding Baird's editorial policy: "He still disarms those who might feel disposed to criticize his selection of speeches which are included by welcoming suggestions of 'public addresses for possible inclusion in these annual collections.'" Brockriede refers to a statement by Baird in the 1953-54 edition of the series.

When asked what changes he would make in Representative American Speeches if he were to edit the series over again, Baird said that he would choose more of the dissenting or left-wing speakers, because he feels that perhaps he was not broad enough in his selections. He would not, however, include the speeches of "liars and rogues." Speaking, he contends, should uphold the processes of freedom and should demonstrate respect for law and order.

25Murphy, loc. cit.

26Wrage, loc. cit.
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In summary, Baird's selections for the series were the result of his efforts to compile a collection of speeches which were representative of contemporary issues and which afforded examples for study by students of public speaking. His emphasis was upon the ideas presented by the speakers and most of his selections may be classified as deliberative speeches.

Baird sought addresses which had intrinsic historical value and which demonstrated speaker-audience rapport. Further, he believed that the speaker's motives must be directed toward the "good society."

Baird consulted many sources in his search for speeches and these sources represented divergent points of view. Whenever possible Baird obtained recordings of speeches. Frequently the speaker supplied the text for publication, and always Baird secured the speaker's permission to publish his address. The length of the speeches and the size of the volume necessarily limited the number of speeches included in a given book.

Reviewers of the series criticized certain of Baird's omissions and inclusions of speeches; however, his selections, he said, were not influenced by such criticisms. As a whole, his critics praised his "industry and perseverance" in compiling so useful a record for the student of public speaking.

If Baird were to revise his editing of the series, he would include more speeches from the "dissenters" in an effort to offer broader coverage of contemporary issues. But in so doing, he points out that he would have to be convinced of the worthy motives of the speaker.
Why Baird Selected Certain Speeches

Consistent with his purpose of offering speeches as examples for study, Baird makes clear his basis for selecting the addresses. Reflecting a classical background, he states that "students of speech-making have long agreed that the principal components of an effective speech include (1) thought or ideas, (2) structure or organization, (3) language or style, and (4) delivery" and that "none of these essentials may be ignored." Referring to these divisions as "the conventional framework of rhetorical study," Baird relies on four of the five classical canons in his evaluation of speeches. With Thonssen Baird states, "The only part of the conventional scheme not covered by this analysis is Memory, a canon no longer given individual status but usually considered (when its treatment seems relevant) under delivery." Baird says further that speeches are "gauged according to a combination of . . . the factors of audience, occasion, speech, and speaker" and warns that "judgment of the speech is based on the interplay of these constituents" with the critic noting "their fusion into the total performance." Baird based his evaluation, therefore, on "this totality of effect." Baird continues:

Speeches, in the last analysis, emerge from audiences and are to be judged by the audience reaction. . . . The basic question, however, is, Has the speaker stimulated the audience to think or act? . . . The historian-logician weighs the testimony and views the impact of speaker both upon the

---

31 Thonssen and Baird, op. cit., p. 331.
32 Representative American Speeches: 1944-45, p. 16.
immediate visible audience and upon the wider movements of history. His judgments and conclusions are, at best, tentative.\textsuperscript{33}

Baird warns that critics tend to be too unyielding in adhering to certain principles. As noted earlier, he admits that rhetoricians have conflicting points of view and in considering this disagreement he says that "if we apply any standard too rigidly, it collapses." The critic, he thinks, must have some flexibility—or breadth, in his standards in order to use them. He adds that critics are continually trying to break away from a mold.\textsuperscript{34}

In setting forth the reasons underlying his selection of speeches Baird considers in turn each of the principal components: ideas, organization, style, and delivery, while keeping in mind that "response is the key determinant of effectiveness."

**Ideas and forms of support.** Insisting that worthy intellectual content in the "representative speech" is basic to his philosophy of rhetoric, Baird contends that a "good speech" centers around ideas which have intrinsic merit because they contribute to the "good society." Not unlike other teachers of speech composition, Baird insists that (1) one central idea, or thesis, should emerge clearly as the speech unfolds and it should be an important one based upon "a sound analysis of the subject"; (2) main ideas should relate directly to the central theme and at the same time they should be consistent and original; (3) the superior speech evolves as a result of logical thinking; it deals with causes and results, and frequently follows a problem-solution pattern of development; (4) main ideas

\textsuperscript{33}Ibid., pp. 16-17.

\textsuperscript{34}Interview with Baird at Carbondale, Illinois, April 28, 1967.
are supported by reasoning and evidence which reflect the speaker's intellectual efforts and his background; they are intended to appeal to the audience in such a way as to encourage "emotional and reflective thinking"; and (5) ideas presented in the speech "are to be measured ultimately by their contribution to truth." He implies that "those ideas are most enduring and permanent that approximate high standards of value for mankind."  

Reiterating the teachings of Aristotle Baird places "thought or ideas foremost in any judgment of effective discourse." He is convinced that strength and originality of ideas, intellectual penetration, consistency of principles, and the ability to analyze a topic are the hallmarks of the superior speaker. Such a speaker, Baird says, "is a genuine philosopher . . . a thinker as well as a compiler and word manipulator."  

In collaboration with Thonssen Baird states that "rhetoricians since Aristotle have generally accepted his concept that the modes of persuasion, depending upon the effect they produce in hearers, are of three kinds, consisting either in the moral character of the speaker or in the production of a certain disposition in the audience or in the speech itself by means of real or apparent demonstration."

He adds that these modes of persuasion "in the order mentioned by Aristotle, are usually called the ethical, the pathetic or emotional, and the logical." Further, Baird asserts with Thonssen that "while the Rhetoric of Aristotle surely gives emotional and ethical proof  

\[35\text{Representative American Speeches: 1948-49, pp. 7-12.}\]  
\[36\text{Representative American Speeches: 1955-56, pp. 10-11.}\]
due consideration, Aristotle held to his conviction that the most important ingredient of a speech is rational demonstration through severe argumentation.\textsuperscript{37}

Baird holds that no sharp division exists between ethical, logical, and emotional appeals and that in his view the speaker, in addition to expounding a message, deals also with human beings who have emotional responses. The critic, he says, is very much interested in the human being in his totality and in the reaction of the individual, "who is a bundle of emotions." Therefore, he tries to analyze speaking on the basis of the human responding emotionally as well as considering the worth of the message itself in an effort to determine what concepts the speaker seeks to convey. Baird adds that the critic should understand the speaker's adjustment to the human drives of his audience in his effort to achieve circular response or rapport involving intellectual, emotional, and imaginative elements. Such elements, he says, lead to general identification between the speaker-audience and the audience-speaker. Thus the three forms of proof support each other and the distinctions between them cannot be clearly drawn. As an example, Baird points out that the speaker's character does not fall clearly within the province of either ethical or emotional proof; the two appeals overlap, as do character and delivery, and character and style. In order to evaluate the etymology of language (the philosophical sources, causes and results), Baird emphasizes that the critic must get back to

\textsuperscript{37}Thonssen and Baird, \textit{loc. cit.}
the speaker and to the emotional and imaginative elements which lead him to expound. 38

The speaker's use of emotional appeals involves his understanding of and adaptation to the basic wants of his audience. Baird says that the superior speaker is consistent in unfolding his ideas in such a way

. . . that the audience's interests, drives, stereotypes, attitudes, and beliefs are effectively addressed. According to the demands of a speaking occasion, whether it is that of the courtroom, pulpit, Congress, professional society, industrial conference, or convivial dinner, he creates a homogeneous group and secures the maximum mental and emotional response. . . . Much that the orator thinks and expresses is consciously or unconsciously a reflection of the personality of the auditors. Audience beliefs, attitudes and experiences should color something of the speaker's line of thinking, his language, his adaptations in personality, voice, and bodily action.39

According to Baird, the seasoned orator has a "kind of genius for understanding human nature."40 He is constantly aware of such audience characteristics as age, occupation, education, and the like, and he adjusts the ideas which he presents in relation to these factors. He supplements logic with emotional and personal proof. Thus, "his is the art of persuasion."41 Baird sees the adequate use of persuasion as instrumental in helping the speaker to achieve the response which he seeks. He says, "A speech, when effectively developed in the midst of the group, means that the differences between the speaker and his audience melt. Fusion

38 Interview with Baird at Carbondale, Illinois, April 28, 1967.
39 Representative American Speeches: 1944-45, p. 11.
40 Representative American Speeches: 1939-40, p. 10.
41 Representative American Speeches: 1946-47, p. 10.
occurs—but not loss of leadership. The successful speaker takes 'sovereign possession of the audience.'

Baird admits that popular audiences may be "very undiscriminating in their evaluation of speaker qualities" and that they may be influenced by superficial appeals on the part of the speaker. But he maintains that "in the long run, public opinion will reflect proper judgment concerning the virtues and the sincerity of the speaker." In other words, he believes that eventually the public will properly evaluate the speaker's motives and will recognize his sincerity, or the lack of it.

While acknowledging the interrelationships of ethical, emotional, and logical proofs, Baird asserts that the three aspects of ethical appeal which were named by Aristotle are those which are still considered to be desirable in speakers: "(1) their intellectual integrity . . . ; (2) their good will . . . ; and (3) moral force . . . ." He reminds the student of Ralph Waldo Emerson's definition of eloquence: "the art of speaking what you mean and are." In addition to the speaker's intelligence, character, and good will, Baird thinks that he should display "humor, sincerity, tact, . . . conviction, . . . and moral persuasiveness." He adds, "these traits of personal and social adjustment furnish a key to the speaker's ability to dominate

---

44 Representative American Speeches: 1955-56, p. 16.
45 Thonssen and Baird, op. cit., p. 383.
audiences and win their repeated approval."\textsuperscript{46} Baird says that "these qualifications, intangible though they are, are important to the speaker's appeal to audiences. If he has a reputation for these virtues, and if, in addition your appraisal of him reveals his genuine possession of them, you can gauge him as especially strong in his speaking personality."\textsuperscript{47}

Baird views the "good speaker-thinker" as one who has "inherited something of the riches of great minds."\textsuperscript{48} Further, "his prestige, the product of his previous professional public speaking career, is a part of his equipment as he approaches each new speaking situation." Baird believes that this prestige of the speaker "adds to his ethical or personal proofs and blends with his voice, movements, and gestures to enhance his persuasive delivery."\textsuperscript{49}

In answer to a question concerning the importance of the prior reputation of the speaker in winning audience response, Baird said,

\ldots scholars, as we all know, put great emphasis on ethical proof as attested in the document itself, and seemed to minimize the personality of the speaker before he came to the audience. We more moderns, however, recognize that you cannot draw a line between your prior reputation and that which functions as you are actually speaking. Therefore, we do call for the analysis of a speaker's general reputation in the time before--that is to say, his political, social, intellectual, and other qualities, and the general impression by audiences that have to do with him.

\textsuperscript{46} \textit{Representative American Speeches:} 1944-45, p. 16.  
\textsuperscript{47} \textit{Representative American Speeches:} 1947-48, pp. 13-14.  
\textsuperscript{48} \textit{Representative American Speeches:} 1948-49, p. 11.  
\textsuperscript{49} \textit{Representative American Speeches:} 1950-51, pp. 10-11.
These observations, these tests which we might develop have to do especially... with politicians. But in the same degree, they would apply to anybody else who tries to make a speech. If, of course, you are completely unknown, which might be an advantage to you... then... we would follow Aristotle and mark every minute as you proceed. But the other factor... of your prior reputation, carries right along, and in many cases as you know, obscures, negatives, minimizes your utterance to an audience. Therefore, psychologically you and I must play up, in a very important way, what has happened to the speaker, and how much of that prior happening is known to the audience or audiences.50

Baird departs, then, from the Aristotelian concept of ethos as being limited to the speaker's demonstration of intelligence, character, and good will during the delivery of his speech. Rather, he considers the reputation which precedes the speaker as also constituting an aspect of ethical proof.

Baird carries his consideration of ethical, emotional, and logical appeals into his introductory remarks to individual speeches as he considers invention. The following examples are typical of his comments. Regarding Wendell Willkie's speech before the Cooperative Employment Council in St. Louis, on June 6, 1940, Baird said, "This speech reveals a skillful use of ethical proof (establishment of the character and reputation of the speaker...)"51

When President Virgil M. Hancher of the State University of Iowa spoke to the graduating class on June 5, 1948, Baird noted that "he is an excellent example of one who demonstrates the three sources of credibility in orators, as suggested by Aristotle: 'There are three things apart from demonstrative proofs which inspire belief, viz., sagacity, high character, and good will."52


In reference to Senator Paul H. Douglas's Senate speech on January 15, 1951, Baird asserted that "the prestige, experience, and speaking ability of the Illinois Senator commanded respect as he argued. . . ." 53

As an illustration of the use of ethical appeal in combination with emotional appeal, Baird points to Richard M. Nixon's "Apologia," which was broadcast from Los Angeles by radio and television on September 23, 1952 and was in "defense of Nixon's use of some $18,000, received from a group of supporters during the previous two years." Baird commented,

The speech was one of self-vindication, filled with ethical proof, with every attribute of persuasiveness. There was concrete explanation of his use of the fund; highly personal treatment throughout as he recited his earlier career and the part played in it by "Pat"; deep seriousness, frankness, sense of moral indignation; clever transition from a purely defensive position to that of strong denunciation of the Democratic policies; effective oral style . . . and highly effective extempore delivery. 54

Baird's emphasis on ideas is borne out by the frequency with which he points to a speaker's application of sound logic. The following typical comments are selected from his introductions to individual speeches. Regarding a speech broadcast on February 9, 1943, by James F. Byrnes, then Director of Economic Stabilization, and entitled "The War Against Inflation," Baird says, "His argument is buttressed by close reasoning and ample evidence." 55 Concerning Anthony Eden's address before the United Nations Security Conference in San Francisco, on April 26, 1945, Baird notes that "his logical

and psychological plan in the speech was one especially adapted to his audience and the occasion." And Baird calls a baccalaureate sermon by President James Bryant Conant of Harvard to that University's 1948 graduating class "an unusual example of a closely knit series of logical propositions." Another graduation address, delivered by W. Stuart Symington, then Secretary of the Air Force, to the class of 1950 at Baylor University in Waco, Texas, caused Baird to comment, "This obvious logic was set forth in sharp, interesting, layman's language."

With reference to Edward R. Murrow's reputation as an outstanding radio commentator, Baird says that his appeal "is through exposition and reasoning with little oratorical embellishment." Concerning President Eisenhower's address before the United Nations General Assembly on December 8, 1953, he remarked that "in addition to the ideas and structure the document had logical completeness. There was blunt and concrete statement of the need for action and measured unfolding of the solution phase." In addition, Baird found the address to be "free from triteness, but not obviously rhetorical."

In one comprehensive sentence, Baird summarizes his criticism of Judge Learned Hand's "A Fanfare for Prometheus," a speech presented before the American Jewish Committee in New York City on January 29, 1955: "His analysis, organization, ideas, and language, enriched by

56 Representative American Speeches: 1944-45, p. 76.
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59 Representative American Speeches: 1951-52, p. 95.
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literary-historical allusions, were in true harmony with his reasoning and expression in his long line of judicial writings and speeches. 61

Baird cogently comments on Lester Thonssen's address presented at the 75th annual Huron College commencement, on May 26, 1958, in Huron, South Dakota. A former student as well as a colleague of Baird's, Thonssen, as noted earlier, collaborated with him to write Speech Criticism. Baird gives a generalized concept of Thonssen's approach to and application of rhetorical theory, rather than limiting his remarks to the text. Baird probably is in complete accord with the principles and practices which he attributes to Thonssen in the following paragraph:

Dr. Thonssen is deeply grounded in classical rhetoric and the later rhetorical developments. His teaching methods and his own communicative practices reflect his background in such philosophy. In his public discourse as well as in his writings he upholds the primacy of logic and reason. His speeches are models of well-knit organization and arrangement, with an Attic style—perspicuous, adaptable, restrained, yet sufficiently imaginative and emotional to evoke effective audience response—and with delivery that is direct, vigorous, and markedly communicative. 62

Like Thonssen, Baird is steeped in the classical tradition, and it is evident that both men see the precepts which are set forth in the classical canons as still applicable to speeches today.

Deploring the lack of a "philosophical grasp of contemporary perplexities" as a major deficiency of American speakers, 63 Baird insists that the superior orator should think as "a genuine philosopher." In designating certain speeches as having attained the

63 Interview with Baird at Carbondale, Illinois, April 28, 1967.
"philosophical grasp," Baird points to Walter Lippmann as best exemplifying the "genuine philosopher." Regarding his speech, "Education without Culture," delivered December 29, 1940 before the American Association for the Advancement of Science at Philadelphia, Baird says that the "speech should be read in the light of his twenty-five years of theorizing about man and education. The address is typical of its author in its technique of listing a series of theses for demonstration. . . ."64

When Lippmann was awarded the annual Freedom Award by Freedom House on October 24, 1943, he responded with an address entitled, "In the Service of Freedom." In his introduction, Baird says, in part, "His treatment here, as in his other speeches and in much of his writing, was comparatively abstract and philosophical. . . . The entire speech, nevertheless, was a stimulating presentation of a profound thesis."65

In an introduction to Lippmann's "Peace Settlement with Russia," delivered at the annual meeting of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States at Washington, D.C., on April 29, 1947, Baird reiterated his opinion: "Lippmann is chiefly prominent as a columnist, with his 'Today and Tomorrow' publication in some 183 newspapers. . . . Much more than a journalist, he is a philosopher. . . . As a speaker, Lippman is intellectual rather than emotional. . . . His . . . originality of phrasing, analytical insight, and mature

64Representative American Speeches: 1940-41, p. 293.
65Representative American Speeches: 1943-44, p. 248.
interpretation of contemporary problems combine to give him unusual effectiveness before audiences."

Concerning another speech delivered in San Francisco, on March 19, 1954, before an assembly of the National Citizens Commission for the Public Schools, Baird comments:

This address should be read in the light of Mr. Lippmann's forty years of theorizing about man and education. His speeches have been largely analytical, philosophical, rather than concretely constructive and action-bearing. . . . This speaker-writer, avoiding exuberance, is always clear and methodical in unfolding his thesis.67

Baird points to an address by Francis Cardinal Spellman as being "based upon a close analysis and philosophical interpretation of events and national attitudes."68 The then Archbishop of New York spoke at a reception in his honor in New York City on March 5, 1946.

Baird thought that James B. Conant demonstrated a "philosophical grasp." Commenting on his address, "Civil Courage," presented in the Memorial Church at Harvard University on September 25, 1945, he says,

President Conant has continually impressed audiences with the clarity of his statements, the dignity and originality of his prose, the depth of his philosophical insight into American life and patterns of thinking, his grasp of educational trends, and his overtones of inspiration, free from triteness or sentimentality.69

Baird points to a Churchill address as one distinguished by "religious and philosophical overtones" when the "Right Honorable

69Ibid., p. 223.
Winston S. Churchill, leader of the Opposition, British House of Commons," spoke to the Mid-Century Convocation of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in Boston on March 31, 1949. Churchill was then seventy-four years old, but Baird found his "ideas, language, and mode of presentation in this address . . . by no means diminished in their power . . . ." 70

A final example of an address which Baird selected for its philosophical qualities is that of Dwight D. Eisenhower at the February 28, 1949, annual program of the American Red Cross fund campaign in Chicago. In his introduction to the speech Baird concludes: "It was a highly personal reflection of Eisenhower's own experience and lifelong philosophy, couched in language unhackneyed, direct, and convincing . . . . General Eisenhower is considered one of the leading representative American speakers." 71

While many of Baird's introductory remarks constitute praise of the speaker and speech, he did not limit his evaluation to complimentary statements. On the contrary, he did not hesitate to point out rhetorical faults, although he often tempered unfavorable comments by noting good qualities of the speaker or speech. In keeping with his editorial policy of including speeches which he considered to be "representative rather than best" he also reinforced his contention that a "good" speech does not necessarily excel by every standard of the rhetorical critic. For example, in regard to Senator Gerald P. Nye's address, "Keep America Out of War," presented

70 Representative American Speeches: 1948-49, p. 36.
71 Ibid., p. 74.
in Carnegie Hall, New York City, on October 11, 1939, Baird says: "This speech is hardly distinguished by originality in phrasing or its political thinking. It is, however, an example of the kind and quality of argument presented by the isolationist Senators."72

About Herbert Hoover, Baird comments that "his voice quality, enunciation, and articulation were by no means those of Roosevelt. But Hoover's mental force, his strength of personality, gave weight to his addresses."73

Baird finds that Franklin Roosevelt's December 9, 1941 radio address, "America Accepts the Challenge," "apparently lacks the close cohesion of a reasoned argument," but softening his criticism he added, "it does grow directly out of the thinking and sentiments of the vast audience, and it has unity of aim and mood."74

Henry A. Wallace's address, "America and Great Britain in the Postwar World," which was broadcast on December 28, 1942, Baird found "covered too much ground, contained too many ideas, for the average radio listener to assimilate. Each proposition or principle enumerated needed concrete and plausible analysis and explication."75 In 1947, Baird wrote that Wallace "gained wide attention, more from his challenging ideas than from his public speaking skill. He is hardly a first-rate orator."76

72_Representative American Speeches: 1939-40, p. 54.
73_Representative American Speeches: 1940-41, p. 197.
75_Representative American Speeches: 1942-43, p. 93.
76_Representative American Speeches: 1946-47, p. 34.
In introducing a radio speech of April 9, 1944, in which Cordell Hull defended the Administration's foreign policy, Baird says, "Students of language would characterize many of his statements as open to semantic objection and as giving ample loopholes for interpretations to suit the political fancies and conveniences of any party or of the government."\(^77\)

A further example of Baird's inclusion of speeches which did not in every way measure up to his rhetorical standards is his selection of Thomas E. Dewey's acceptance speech before the Republican National Convention in Chicago on June 28, 1944. Baird called the speech "general and non-committal" and said that "those who expected it to unfold in any concreteness or detail the policies and attitudes of the candidate on foreign policy, capital, labor, agriculture and fiscal policies were disappointed. . . ." But he added that "the immediate audience reacted most favorably to almost every utterance."\(^78\)

In commenting on a speech which Reinhold Niebuhr gave before the Sixteenth Annual Forum in New York City on October 21, 1947, Baird says, "The address was probably by no means easy to listen to--even for his highly intelligent audience. It calls for rereading and thoughtful review." Adding that "its language is comparatively abstract and academic," he points out that "it is, however, an address of high ability, 'representative' of one type of public discourse."\(^79\) In a similar manner he observed concerning a radio speech.

\(^{77}\) *Representative American Speeches: 1943-44*, p. 260.

\(^{78}\) *Ibid.*

\(^{79}\) *Representative American Speeches: 1947-48*, p. 228.
address by Secretary of State Dean Acheson, on February 29, 1952: "He was highly communicative--but lacked the dramatic vigor that would hold and persuade the less sophisticated listeners."\(^{80}\)

In introducing Senator J. William Fulbright's Senate speech of March 27, 1951, Baird says, "Fulbright's moral indignation is obvious in this address. His solution is vague--but at least it calls for the appointment of a commission to consider the problem."\(^{81}\)

Baird calls Eisenhower's inaugural address of January 20, 1953, "highly didactic and no doubt reassuring to the millions over the globe who listened," but he adds that "it was not highly original in its phrasing or ideas."\(^{82}\)

About Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court, Earl Warren, Baird says that his voice "lacks resonance and is monotonous." But he adds that "his robust personal appearance . . . and statesmanlike integrity give him strong ethical appeal and compensate for lack of superior oratorical manner."\(^{83}\)

When Democratic candidate for Vice President Estes Kefauver spoke at Orlando, Florida, on September 15, 1956, Baird found that "though not impressive in oratory, or prolific in original ideas, he was sufficiently able to talk convincingly and logically, and his speaking leadership was by no means ended in November, 1956."\(^{84}\)

\(^{80}\) *Representative American Speeches*: 1951-52, p. 47.

\(^{81}\) *Representative American Speeches*: 1951-52, p. 60.

\(^{82}\) *Representative American Speeches*: 1952-53, p. 112.

\(^{83}\) *Representative American Speeches*: 1953-54, p. 87.

\(^{84}\) *Representative American Speeches*: 1956-57, p. 86.
Though he spoke with high praise of Adlai Stevenson's ability as a speaker over a period of years, Baird apparently became disenchanted with Stevenson's speaking during 1956:

Critics of speeches will recall chiefly the originality and persuasive power of Stevenson in the campaign of 1952. Apparently in 1956 he was another kind of communicator. He hewed too much to the line indicated by the "pros" and so lost much of his unique platform leadership. In 1956 he tended to exaggerate for voting purposes the agricultural discontent, the alleged plight of the small businessman, the considerable unemployment, and the school shortages . . . . In the same political maneuver for votes he called for the end of the draft and H-bomb testing, and in Boston on the eve of the election he stated that every scrap of evidence would indicate that a successful vote for Eisenhower would mean that Richard Nixon would probably be President of this country "within the next four years."

Thus the Stevenson of 1956 was apparently limited in philosophic imagination, idealism, and conviction. His slogans were shopworn, his political arguments obvious, his appeals conventional.

History would more fairly judge his communicative creativeness by his series of brilliant addresses in the previous presidential campaign.85

In summary, Baird holds that the final evaluation of a speech must be based upon its total effect as it elicits immediate and long range response. Further, he believes that the ideas presented in the speech are the chief instrument in achieving this response.

In selecting addresses for Representative American Speeches, Baird looked for talks to which he could apply "the conventional framework of rhetorical study," placing primary emphasis upon invention, or the selection of ideas. In stressing the importance of invention, Baird insists that the "good speaker-thinker" has taken

85Ibid., p. 64.
advantage of his intellectual heritage. He believes that the superior orator demonstrates a "philosophical grasp" of contemporary problems. Other major considerations are organization, style, and delivery.

Baird acknowledges that he has included many addresses which do not excel by every standard of speech criticism. His introductory remarks preceding individual speeches include both favorable and unfavorable comments. His policy of selecting talks which are "representative" rather than "best" gives him leeway to include speeches which typify the speaking of the period without necessarily achieving excellence when measured by the rhetorical critic's yardstick. Often Baird tempered adverse remarks with praise of other characteristics of a given speech. Always he looked for speeches which offered worthwhile ideas and which elicited both immediate and long-range response. He did, however, include some speeches which he considered to be weak in logical appeals but which were nevertheless effective.

Organization. Just as he contends that logical, ethical, and emotional appeals cannot be compartmentalized as distinct from each other, Baird upholds the statement in Speech Criticism that "disposition is almost inextricably interwoven with the data of invention." 86 Further, he agrees that "any distinctions that we may draw between finding and organizing arguments" are more for purposes of convenience than accuracy. 87

86 Thonssen and Baird, op. cit., p. 392.
87 Ibid.
Baird sees the effective speaker as demonstrating superior organizational ability. He comments,

He is an artist in design. No matter how complicated the details he fuses them together in sequence and relevancy. He composes a pertinent introduction, evolves a main body of ideas, and concludes with distinction. He inserts transitions, summaries, and controls his extempore adaptations.^[88]

Baird notes that "American speechmakers, although routine in thought, usually rate well in organization."^[89] He says that "even though the 'bones' of the discourse may not stand out, the speech has progress and a satisfying unity of ideas and mood. The logical pattern prevails, with adequate analysis of goals, Things-As-They-Are, and solutions."^[90] Every good speech, he insists, has organic structure, whether successive ideas are arranged deductively (with propositions preceding details), or inductively (with the propositions being withheld until the end of the speech). Baird believes that "in either case, at the end the auditor should visualize a unified, coherent pattern of the whole discourse."^[91]

In his critical comments Baird suggests that the organization employed by the speaker is an indicator of the caliber of his thinking. This belief is reflected in the following four examples which are typical of Baird's introductory remarks.


^[89] Ibid.


broadcast worldwide following its presentation on May 27, 1941, "was uncommonly well organized for a Roosevelt production."\(^{92}\)

Suggestive of his background in debate, Baird says of a speech, "Democracy and Racial Minorities," delivered on November 11, 1943 by Francis Biddle, then Attorney General of the United States, "The speech is developed after the typical forensic pattern."\(^{93}\)

Regarding David E. Lilienthal's address before the Radio Executives Club in New York City on February 5, 1948, Baird remarks, "The address has structural and logical unity and progression--the student of speeches is advised to outline it."\(^{94}\)

Finally, Baird chose a speech of Secretary of State Dean Acheson's as "a model of organization, with well defined introduction, main divisions, and conclusion. . . ."\(^{95}\)

In summary, Baird considers good organization a concomitant of well selected ideas. The carefully organized speech centers around a central theme, and its ideas are arranged so that clarity is achieved. Baird echoes Aristotle's dictum that a speech should be planned to include a beginning, a middle, and an end. Further, he says that the sequence of ideas should follow a logical pattern. On the whole, Baird considers that the speeches selected for \textit{Representative American Speeches} exemplify good use of organization.

\(^{92}\)\textit{Representative American Speeches:} 1940-41, p. 58.

\(^{93}\)\textit{Representative American Speeches:} 1943-44, p. 172.

\(^{94}\)\textit{Representative American Speeches:} 1947-48, p. 69.

\(^{95}\)\textit{Representative American Speeches:} 1948-49, p. 15.
He comments, "Perhaps our national interest in professional, legal, and occupational procedures inclines us to incorporate method in our speech composition."  

Style. Just as Baird considers that invention and organization are "almost inextricably interwoven," he views style, or use of language, as inseparable from the first two canons. In *Speech Criticism*, Baird says,

> Under its older title of elocution, style was regarded as the third part of rhetoric. It referred chiefly to the way in which the speaker clothes his ideas with language. But, like the other parts of rhetoric, it is closely interrelated with its correlative members. Thus style and invention play interacting roles, since the conception of thought and its expression are virtually inseparable. Likewise, the arrangement accorded ideas is in itself a stylistic consideration, for the position an idea occupies in the total discourse may influence materially the way in which language is employed to express it.  

The superior speaker, Baird says,

> ... has absorbed much of the richness of the English vocabulary. He achieves accuracy of statement and connotative liveliness. His style, furthermore, is oral rather than "literary." He is no essayist. As his speaking is for the moment, so is his language of and for auditors. He avoids floridity. His style may be repetitious and broken, as becomes the speaking style. But his phrasing is simple and uncomplicated. Trite phrases are few. The texture of the whole is fresh and distinctive. An emotional-imaginative quality usually pervades the composition. If the occasion calls for it, he is naturally eloquent.... If the report is of factual and scientific validity, he has stylistic restraint. The style suits the subject, the speaker, and the occasion. Each situation invokes an individualistic pattern of words and collocations.  

---

In selecting speeches Baird eliminated trite speeches because he abhors hackneyed, unoriginal "words about words." He continues,

At their worst, words may block real communication and furnish only cloudy meanings by creating logical pitfalls and by setting up bad emotional currents. At best, language conveys maximum meaning and enhances ideas by original and pleasurable expression.

Recognizing that oral style and written style possess differing characteristics, Baird notes that "public addresses are mainly for the moment. Their primary test is their instant effectiveness even though they find no niche in the collection of literary classics . . . ." He adds, "This doctrine is not 'heresy' in the speech profession but rather is a principle long accepted. If, however, a speech, in addition to its immediate power, does incidentally have qualities of permanence and artistic excellence, so much the better." This statement is consistent with Baird's contention that audience response is the chief determinant of the effectiveness of a speech. He sees immediate response as essential, and long-range or later response as desirable.

With respect to language, Baird finds that in contemporary political speeches "commonplaceness, mediocrity, triteness are too often unrelieved." Many speeches, he believes, lack "imagination or emotion-or consciousness that language is the link between effective thinking and full audience response." When asked to what extent
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he considered style in his choice of speeches for the series, Baird said,

I'll have to agree that even though I have always been heavily interested in what people have to say, my discrimination there between what is well said and what is poorly said as far as language is concerned, has been very important. So many public and other varieties of speeches are couched in such trite and conventional language, that in most cases I have thrown them away. Always, we are looking for a certain spark or originality, both in ideas and also in style.

Many speech teachers, like myself, came out of a school of what you might call English composition and literature. We were, therefore, always heavily governed by these standards of adequate and interesting expression. And, other factors being equal, I continually rejected speeches that seemed to be lifeless in their handling of the English language.

As you go through these latest volumes, you'll see, I hope, in almost every speech, some traces of some kind of stylistic character that has some virtue. And style... is a matter, of course, of the personality of the speaker.... But that's only the starting point in good style, because it also involves these ingredients of the situation and the audience.... The speaker who is effective in his style not only is clear, and accurate, but he is tremendously impressive in the idiomatic manipulation of his language in order to awaken interest and attention and to stimulate a certain kind of imagination in his audience.... That's the kind of thing that we critics look to when we pick up a speech and distinguish it from other speeches.104

Baird concludes that the speaker's style is an index to his background, intellect, personality, and temperament.

In his introductions Baird frequently included concise statements evaluating the orator's choice of words. For example, he noted regarding several addresses that the style was characteristic of the speaker. These talks included Wendell L. Willkie's address, "Lidice," which was presented in Chicago on July 12, 1942 as an account of the martyrdom of Lidice, Czechoslovakia during World

Eric Johnston's address before the War Writers' Board in New York City on January 11, 1945, ("the oral style, characteristic of Johnston, is informal, highly concrete, attention-getting"); and the speech, "typical of Vandenberg's style," which was presented to the Senate by Senator Vandenberg on February 27, 1946 as a report on the United Nations Assembly.

Referring to Adlai Stevenson's polished, urbane style, Baird commented that his speeches were "free from slogans or rallying cries . . . . free from bombast . . . ." He termed Stevenson's language "formal, eloquent, original," and added that "apparently he worried little about 'talking over the heads of his listeners.'"

In presenting a speech of Bower Aly, Baird said:

Dr. Aly's compositional style, not marked by Aristotelian ornamentation or journalistic briskness, is nevertheless condensed, uncomplicated, vigorous, and undisguised in its direction. His style is distinctly Contemporary American (in a good sense) more than Asiatic, Rhodian, or Attic.

In summary, Baird sees a close relationship between invention, organization, and style. He believes that the superior speaker should demonstrate mastery of the use of oral language which is suited to the audience and the occasion. The speaker's style, he says, should be aimed toward evoking immediate audience response, and if some lasting literary value emerges as well, so much the better.

---
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Baird contends that contemporary political speakers too often employ mediocre language. He points out that the critic, in evaluating what the speaker says, should consider as well how he says it. He sees the speaker's background and personality as influential in his choice of words.

While Baird placed primary emphasis upon the ideas offered, he also made every effort to select addresses which demonstrated good use of language. He considers that the speaker's ideas must be couched in appropriate words in order to gain adequate response.

**Delivery.** Although Baird does not at any time rate delivery as the primary consideration in determining the worth of a speech, he nevertheless recognizes that the speaker's oral presentation does function importantly in his ability to gain the response which he seeks. With Thonssen Baird states, "... delivery is another means of achieving a response; it is not a terminal value. ... There are places where men assemble to appreciate vocal artistry in its own right, but the platform of the public speaker is not one of them."

He adds, "It is both what and how it is said that makes for effectiveness in public address." Baird, then, does not assign voice and bodily action the importance which he accords to invention, organization, and style. Rather, he considers the speaker's projection of ideas and personality of more concern than perfection of delivery. Regarding the effective speaker, Baird says:

---
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His enunciation may be imperfect; his pronunciation may be Southern or East Side; his bodily movements may be unduly individualistic; but he does project to his listeners; he does communicate to others his own lively personality and active mind. Whatever happens, and whatever speaking habits he uses, he does get intense audience reaction.

Baird devotes the entire introduction to the 1950-51 volume of *Representative American Speeches* to a discussion of the four aspects of delivery: (1) the voice itself, (2) bodily activity, (3) the speaker's personality, and (4) the mode of communication (manuscript reading, memoriter, or extempore). In elaborating on these aspects, Baird recognizes that "speaking is not a science but an art," and he acknowledges that no absolute standards can be applied for measuring effectiveness. He goes on to suggest desirable goals, but he is careful to qualify these criteria by pointing out that they "admit of wide variation" in their application.

Among the qualities which Baird finds contribute to effective oral communication are (1) optimum vocal intensity, (2) good control of speaking rate, (3) excellent voice quality, (4) adequate projection, (5) use of the conversational mode, (6) efficient articulation and socially acceptable pronunciation, and (7) effective communication through bodily action.

In regard to oral performance, Baird considers the method of presentation less important than the manner in which the speaker applies it. Ideally, he says, the orator who reads from manuscript does so in such a skillful manner that the audience is little aware of his reading. Further, he comments that the speaker who memorizes

---

his speech "concentrates on meanings and upon the audience" so that he "retains all the elements of conversational delivery." And finally, Baird points out that the speaker who extemporizes has a facile mind and vocal fluency, presenting to his audience carefully assimilated ideas.

Baird asserts that while the critic is prone to isolate rhetorical skills for purposes of discussion, it is essential that he combine them in determining total effectiveness. "Seldom," he repeats, "does any one orator excel in all the categories." Thus he again supports his contention that the critic should evaluate the speech as a whole, rather than attempting to segregate its various aspects, judging each one separately.\footnote{113\textsuperscript{1}}

Baird says that in order to evaluate a speaker's delivery the critic ideally should be present at the time the speech is given. He adds that a tape recording of the actual presentation is the most accurate substitution for the critic's presence as a member of the audience. Baird notes repeatedly that he personally heard many of the speeches of the series and that he was able to obtain tape recordings of many more. It was not possible, however, for him either to be present for, or to obtain recordings of every one of the 566 speeches which were included over the twenty-two year span. With Thonssen, Baird states, "If the critic has not heard the orator, he must depend upon the word of those who did or of those who knew someone who did." When Baird relied upon opinions other than his own, he consistently gave the source of his information.

\footnote{113\textsuperscript{1}The foregoing discussion is based on Representative American Speeches: 1950-51, pp. 7-12.}
Baird's comments on the oral communication of various speakers should be of considerable value to present and future students of public speaking. He sets forth his most detailed analyses in introductions to speeches made by Franklin Roosevelt and Harry Truman. Baird refers to Roosevelt's "generally high pitch," and to his use of tones that were "thoroughly conversational, intimate, friendly, and yet deeply earnest." He terms the late President's voice quality "clear," and his articulation "precise and distinct." He considered Roosevelt's radio speaking voice to be more effective than his reading of a manuscript before a visible audience.

Baird frequently commented on Truman's delivery. In 1945, he remarked:

His voice was unduly high, at times tense. Harshness was apparent. He attempted no oratorical inflections, although both his voice and his printed manuscript (by capital sentences) stressed key ideas. His enunciation and pronunciation were Midwestern. . . . Although no great orator, he promised to be fully acceptable as the vocal spokesman for the executive branch of American Government. Sincerity and directness were especially evident in his platform manner.

Three years later, Baird wrote:

Mr. Truman's delivery was more effective than that of his previous presentations. He had a more lively sense of communication and full appreciation of the content of his discourse. It sounded less like a paper perfunctorily read.

Still later, Baird concluded that "the President, when he speaks 'off the cuff' is much better than when he reads from a

---
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manuscript. His delivery in his routine reading is often monotonous."

Then he added,

When he becomes aroused on the platform, however, his vocal emphasis increases, and his audience orientation and response are much more effective. He makes the best impression as a popular speaker when he becomes vocally the "fighting" leader of millions of Democratic followers.118

In 1952, Baird observed,"No speaker of high rank, he Truman nevertheless had a down-to-earth quality of voice, language, and ideas that millions of Americans recognized as like their own."119

The following statements are typical of Baird's remarks concerning the delivery of other speakers: John L. Lewis "has a natural eloquence";120 John W. Vandercook has "a rich voice with its wide pitch range";121 Senator Tom Connally is "forcible, . . . often sarcastic, witty";122 Edward R. Murrow has "an unusually good radio voice";123 Thomas E. Dewey uses "excellence of inflection, vocal quality, pitch, variety, pauses," accompanied by "a studiousness" and "a concern for presentation";124 and Lowell Thomas possesses "little regional accent."125
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Concerning Dwight D. Eisenhower, Baird wrote that he "makes no pretense at oratory, and often develops a monotony of vocal pattern as he reads. But his voice and visible manner continue to convey sincerity and have been important in helping him to retain strong popularity."  

In Baird's opinion, Douglas MacArthur's voice "conveyed in turn self-confidence, conviction, sternness, scorn, irony, and appeal for justice." He found John Foster Dulles to be "businesslike and somewhat brusque." He felt that Alben W. Barkley's "impassioned rhetoric" was "not well adapted to television and radio." He judged Hubert Humphrey to have "extempore skill" and "platform persuasiveness," and concerning John Kennedy, Baird said, "As a speaker he is relaxed, informal, candid, without a sign of a 'grand manner.' No orator, he even impresses his audience with seeming shyness. His style is strikingly conversational and boyishly genuine. . . ."  

In summary, while he considers delivery important in achieving audience response, Baird does not assign it the important place which he gives to invention, organization, and style. He believes that a speaker can be effective without encompassing all the qualities
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usually associated with superior oral communication. He contends that since speaking is an art, it cannot be measured by absolute standards. Rather than evaluating rhetorical skills as isolated units, the critic, Baird says, should judge the speech as a whole. He asserts that it is quite possible for a speaker to gain the response which he seeks without "excelling in all the categories" by which speeches may be assessed. Baird frequently comments on the delivery of individual speakers in his introductions to speeches.

**Speakers Whom Baird Selected for the Series**

To understand further Baird's standards for selecting speeches it is worthwhile (1) to identify the speakers whose speeches appeared repeatedly in the series, and (2) to consider Baird's evaluation of contemporary speakers.

**Speakers represented three or more times.** In his introduction to the 1955-56 volume, Baird says that in reviewing the representative speakers of the past twenty years he selected as a basis for examination those "who have each appeared at least three times in the annual publications of *Representative American Speeches* since 1937."\(^{132}\)

He places the speakers in the following categories: (1) deliberative speakers (or legislative-political speakers); (2) business and labor leaders; (3) journalists, radio, or television speakers; (4) military leaders; (5) theologians; and (6) educators. The number following each name indicates the number of that person's speeches appearing in the series between 1937 and 1959.

Of the forty-seven speakers who have three or more addresses included, twenty-five were deliberative speakers: Franklin Roosevelt, (23); Dwight Eisenhower, (20); Harry S. Truman, (14); John Foster Dulles, (11); Robert A. Taft, (9); Winston Churchill, (8); Henry A. Wallace, (8); Thomas E. Dewey, (8); Adlai E. Stevenson, (8); Herbert Hoover, (7); Arthur H. Vandenberg, (7); Paul H. Douglas, (6); Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., (6); Wendell Willkie, (6); Richard M. Nixon, (5); Dean G. Acheson, (4); J. W. Fullbright, (4); Alben Barkley, (4); David E. Lilienthal, (4); William E. Borah, (3); Norman G. Thomas, (3); W. Stuart Symington, (3); Gerald P. Nye, Jr., (3); and Wayne L. Morse, (3).

The following business and labor leaders were selected three or more times: Walter P. Reuther, (4); George Meany, (4); John L. Lewis, (3); Philip Murray, (3), and Bernard Baruch, (3).

In the fields of journalism, radio, and television he included: Walter Lippmann, (6); Edward R. Murrow, (6); Dorothy Thompson, (4); Robert J. Blakely, (4); and Elmer Davis (3).

In the category of military leaders, Baird chose three speeches by Douglas MacArthur and three speeches by George C. Marshall.

He selected four theologians who were responsible for a total of thirteen speeches: Ralph W. Sockman, (4); Reinhold Niebuhr, (3); Harry Emerson Fosdick, (3); and Fulton J. Sheen, (3).

Baird included the following educators: James B. Conant, (5); George V. Denny, Jr., (5); Nicholas Murray Butler, (4); Archibald MacLeish, (4); Denna F. Fleming, (3); and George D. Stoddard, (3).

In his introductions to the various volumes, Baird repeatedly disavows sponsorship for the points of view offered by the speakers.
He points instead to his aim to compile a collection rather than "a document aimed to promote a given political or social attitude." Franklin Roosevelt's twenty-three speeches give him a place of prominence in the series challenged only by Dwight Eisenhower's twenty speeches. Baird comments, "I have deliberately tried to avoid partisanship in the selection. If Roosevelt looms large in this book, it is not because I am a New Dealer, but because when the President speaks, millions listen."  

More recently, Baird noted regarding some of the political speakers who figure repeatedly in the series:

\[\ldots\] fortunately or unfortunately, they all seem to be liberals. They seem to be of the Democratic Party in this country. But that identification, as far as I am concerned, happens to be only incidental. I do hope that my judgments have not been those which would be of a more narrowly political sort.  

The critic has only to review the cumulative index appearing in the 1958-59 edition, the last which Baird edited, to be aware that he did indeed include speakers with widely divergent philosophies, in political as well as in other categories. The fact that Democratic Presidents were in office for sixteen of the twenty-two years may help to explain the inclusion of many speeches by members of this political party.

In summary, Baird's choice of speakers demonstrates his emphasis upon deliberative speakers as figuring prominently as "voices of history." As he points out, many of these spokesmen were liberal
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Democrats whom he chose primarily because he considered them to be representative speakers.

Orators represented three or more times include four labor leaders, while one business leader, Bernard Baruch, has three speeches in the series.

Walter Lippmann figures most prominently among representatives of the news media, and Dorothy Thompson is the only woman among the speakers appearing repeatedly. Two military leaders, four theologians, and six educators complete the list of speakers most often found in the series.

**Overall evaluation of contemporary speakers.** Beginning with the initial volume of *Representative American Speeches*, Baird sought to maintain an objective overview of the character and quality of speaking during the period. As noted earlier, throughout the series he reiterated his conviction that times of stress are more conducive to great oratory than times not marked by crises. In addition, he noted the impact upon public address of radio and television. Most often he centered his comments around the speakers' ideas, although he considered also the quality of organization, style, and delivery found in the speeches.

Regarding the influence of radio and television upon public speaking, Baird recognized the stimulus which both media afforded. He credited this influence with improving the character and quality of speechmaking in this country. He noted, however, that speakers did not always stay abreast of the times when he commented in 1952, "Don't the politicians know that this is a radio-television age and
Baird referred to the "old-fashioned, outmoded declamation" which he said "too often dominates" in the political conventions. Later, however, in discussing the impact of television on the 1952 Presidential election, Baird said:

... although critics proved that the public exposure to endless hours of vapid oratory "unquestionably drove the viewers away in droves," ... /they/ agreed that in general television tended to compel the candidates to focus more sharply on the issues, to minimize old-time political oratory, to help the voter to know "personally" each candidate, to increase public interest in national problems and the stand of each party, and to give each voter a firsthand insight into the political machinery behind the voting processes.137

The following year, Baird again noted the major role played by television on the political stage when he said, "Certainly political speakers exerted tremendous influence over this rapidly expanding medium."138

Exemplifying his search for speeches embodying worthwhile ideas, Baird early in the series stated that American speakers are lacking in "philosophical grasp of the contemporary perplexities . . . ." American speechmakers grope among the details, find themselves at home with economic and other minutiae. But economic wisdom or speculative imagination is usually absent."139 Yet he was convinced that speakers represented revealed "characteristic American ideas and attitudes," while affecting "at least in slight degree, the national current . . . ."140 He commented,

137 Representative American Speeches: 1952-53, p. 11.
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Perhaps only a scant four or five of these hundred orators will be long remembered. Each, however, has contributed to the thinking and feeling of his hour, or has been an interpreter of American thought. These voices, ephemeral though they are, combine to explain clearly the America of 1937-43.\textsuperscript{141}

Although he acknowledged that the speeches of 1945-46 in many cases centered around events of the past, Baird noted that "a more considered insight into these documents, however, yields an interpretation, some of it deeply moving, of situations and issues of more than casual concern to students of American history and life."\textsuperscript{142} He is convinced that these speeches "speak not only of the past but of the present and the future."\textsuperscript{143}

Of the speakers of 1951-52, Baird says that "all represent the mind of typical Americans. . . . All have enough intellectual and moral power in speech to command wide audiences." He commends their ability to talk "in the concrete," but is critical of their failure to "argue broad principles."\textsuperscript{144} He finds them too often lacking in intellectual maturity.

In a discussion of "Political Speaking Today and Yesterday," Baird continued to assess contemporary speakers as being deficient in regard to "philosophic imagination." He says,

Most senators and House members are apparently unconscious of the broader currents on which their minutiae sweep along. . . . Their definitions, analyses, and argumentative developments are usually circumscribed. They are school and college debaters grown older. . . . Why this mediocrity in Congress, in much executive and administrative speaking, and on the stump? . . . too often the speaker has pitched his discourse to the lower popular mind and spirit. . . .\textsuperscript{145}

\textsuperscript{141}Ibid.
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According to Baird, "the real weakness . . . lies in the general lack of training in public affairs and the accompanying training in oral communication. . . ." He adds that "by contrast, the foremost political speakers . . . have had such competency. . . ."\textsuperscript{146}

Although he deplores the lack of "philosophic grasp" on the part of many American speakers, Baird notes that "today's leaders do well in speech structure." He is not so well impressed by their choice of language, however, for he finds their style "direct, uncomplicated, but usually uninspired and often dull. Conventionality and triteness . . . are its marks."\textsuperscript{147} He thinks that speakers too often lose sight of the fact that "language is the link between effective thinking and full audience response." While some speakers are content to employ mediocrity and triteness, Baird finds that others "resort to language of the other extreme--of embellishment and decoration. . . ."\textsuperscript{148} He believes that "the defect of style, like that of thinking processes, is the defect of superficial training in reading, writing, and thinking. The subtleties and nuances of language are seldom present."\textsuperscript{149}

While he does not consider many contemporary speakers eloquent, Baird finds that as a whole they succeed in evoking audience response:

\textit{But whatever their vocal limitations . . . all had at least one characteristic that set them off from mediocre talkers: they were all communicative. . . . They knew how to project to their audiences, hold attention, and . . . evoke spontaneous}
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and repeated response. . . . Our present political speakers no doubt lack the formal eloquence of the late eighteenth and nineteenth century, but on the whole have facility with audiences that well matches the skills of the older orators.150

In summary, Baird is consistent in his contention that the orator is the spokesman for the times, and that critical events breed eloquence. He acknowledges the impact of radio and television upon public speaking, noting that the overall effect of these media results in speakers' "focussing more sharply on the issues." Too many American speakers, he feels, possess a comprehensive assortment of minutiae without an understanding of the broad principles underlying major issues of the times. He points out that this deficiency in ideas is often accompanied by mediocrity in the use of language. But in regard to organization, Baird rates American speakers high. And while he contends that their delivery as a whole does not achieve standards of excellence, he believes, nevertheless, that it is instrumental in gaining response from their audiences.

III. SUMMARY

In his editing of Representative American Speeches Baird clearly demonstrates his advocacy of the use of speeches as examples. Through the nature of the series as well as through his standards of selection, he emphasizes his wish to make available representative addresses which are worthy of study. In so doing, he insists upon the value to the student of a broad liberal background, holding that "the quality of criticism . . . . is proportionate to the critic's understanding and knowledge of the subject under discussion."151

150 Representative American Speeches: 1955-56, p. 15.
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Baird gives evidence of his pragmatic approach as he urges the student to learn from the speeches of others. At the same time, Baird makes practical application of his rhetorical theory in selecting addresses and in commenting on them critically.

He arranged the volumes so as to encourage further research on the orators and the speaking situations. He facilitates additional study by classifying speeches according to content as well as by including introductions to each volume which center around aspects of rhetorical criticism. He also encourages investigation by his introductions to individual speeches as well as by his inclusion of a cumulative index and biographical notes.

Baird centers his criteria for selection around four of the classical canons: invention, organization, style, and delivery. He gives primary consideration to the quality of ideas, and most of the addresses may be classified as deliberative speeches.

In general, Baird finds American speakers lacking in the "philosophical grasp" of major issues, adept at organization, deficient in oral style, and failing to achieve superiority in delivery, although he points to notable exceptions to these criticisms. He notes, however, that these four measures of effectiveness overlap and that the speaker may achieve adequate response without excelling in every phase of speaking.

Baird further exemplifies his application of rhetorical theory as he evaluates individual speakers. Despite their sometimes glaring deficiencies, Baird's optimistic assumption is that "each generation of public orators will have fulfilled the best traditions of effective public address... Thus will American civilization continue to
be motivated toward a genuinely good and enduring society." He demonstrates that his editing of the series is commensurate with his theory of rhetoric through (1) his method of selecting speeches, (2) his reasons underlying the selections, and (3) his choice of speeches.

CHAPTER V

APPLICATION OF THEORY IN THE CLASSROOM

The purpose of this chapter is to analyze Baird's application of his rhetorical theory in the classroom. The discussion centers around his teaching methods as they reflect his emphasis upon (1) the importance of a broad liberal education, (2) the use of the pragmatic approach, (3) the importance of intellectual content, and (4) the contributions of speeches to the "good society."

The Importance of a Broad Liberal Education

Baird holds that training in communicative technique should have as its basis the student's academic experience which includes "insight into the historic records and into those of his day in the library, laboratories, lecture halls, and elsewhere." He warns that a collection of speeches is of little value unless it is "properly studied and related to other readings," but he contends that "the educational approach through the study of thought-stimulating essays and addresses is amply justified."

Because he regards liberal education as "an attempt at understanding and appreciating civilization, and as a program for

---
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directing the 'vast accumulation of knowledge and power . . . toward the end of general human advance,"4 Baird insists that the instructor should make his rhetoric classes "the organon of the other subjects in the curriculum."5 He notes that the teacher's role demands that he demonstrates some mastery of the academic disciplines associated with liberal education: history, literature, politics, ethics, religion, and science and their interrelationships. Baird says that while the instructor is not necessarily a specialist in each area, he should have an understanding of its purpose and scope. In addition,

He is well grounded in communication, oral and written---including the history and criticism of public address and of rhetoric, the theory and practice of audience adaptation, and the ends of communication in the social-political matrix. The materials he selects for his course in speech fundamentals or public speaking should reflect such breadth.6

Baird believes that under the guidance of such an instructor and through the study of speeches as examples, the student should develop critical ability, an understanding of communicative theory, increased effectiveness as a communicator, and comprehension of the impact of public address upon contemporary society as well as upon history.7 He concludes, "These, then, are the outcomes: an understanding of important problems of the times, a technique for work and reflection, an individual mode of expression, a cultural ideal, sympathetic and critical, and motivation for genuine education."8 Although he acknowledges

4Ibid.
5Ibid., p. v.
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that these goals cannot be achieved in a single course nor through the study of a collection of speeches, he maintains that these ends should be pursued by the foundational courses in communication in an effort to initiate some philosophical inquiry.

Baird sees a direct relationship between the objectives of the speech course and the objectives of liberal arts education. He says that both areas should result in:

. . . (1) self-realization, including an inquiring mind, special skills in communicating, intellectual and aesthetic interests, and character; (2) social integration, or the establishment of more satisfactory human relationships and group participation; (3) political responsibility, including knowledge of representative current problems and skill in methods of analyzing them; and (4) economic efficiency. . . . 9

Baird reasons that a background in liberal arts is invaluable to the student who should, through his study of rhetoric, gain in understanding and appreciation of man's accumulated knowledge. Just as Aristotle held that rhetoric has no subject matter of its own, Baird holds that speech classes should draw on the other liberal arts areas to teach a creative and critical approach to the study of rhetoric.

The students of Baird recall that he employed the historical-philosophical approach to speech criticism. He encouraged them to find every available bit of information related to the speeches they studied, often by using Representative American Speeches as a starting point. As part of the procedure involved in this study, this investigator sent letters of inquiry to thirty-six of Baird's former students in an effort to gain information concerning how he used Representative American Speeches in his teaching. This researcher
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asked these people to make available any material which they had retained from Baird's courses, such as assignment sheets or course outlines. Of the thirty-one who replied, nine sent materials which Baird prepared for his classes and which substantiate his liberally-oriented approach. For example, an assignment sheet which he prepared for his course in argumentation and debate states, "Basic to this emphasis of skill in argumentative and extempore speaking is the attempt of this course to realize . . . liberal arts objectives. . . ."11

Another example of Baird's pursuit of the goals of liberal education appears among the "Exercises and Problems" in Argumentation, Discussion, and Debate as he assigns problems requiring value judgments:

1. Present a short (two- or three-minute) oral comment on one of the following excerpts:
   a. "Discussion is more than a means of generating thought and of sharing information. These worthy purposes are valuable concomitants. The thinking that follows a discussion may magnify greatly the value of the initial meeting of minds, and the sharing of information may form a valid end point for certain meetings. Yet, both of these objectives are the results of discussion and are not discussion itself."
   b. "We know that in most instances the product of the group is superior to that of the average individual working alone."
   c. "Discussion and debate, to be consistent with liberal educational ideals, should not foster a sort of predatory attitude—an attitude based upon a driving desire to beat the other fellow. Unfortunately that attitude is being developed in some quarters. As long as it exists, one phase of our subject will not be above suspicion."

10. Excerpts which are pertinent to this study are found in the Appendix.
11. From the files of Don Streeter.
Wilson B. Paul recalls Baird's insistence that the student cultivate a broad background:

There were two points of emphasis that I recall were impressed on his [Baird's] students. One was that rhetorical criticism uses the tools of the historian. The second was that a critic must be a philosopher—without the latter he can only record—and the critic must be able to make a philosophical interpretation of the speaker.13

Carl A. Dallinger also remembers that Baird required his students to explore every possible avenue of inquiry:

We were expected to be well informed on the biography of any speaker we studied, particularly on those aspects of his life that might help to explain the ideas he espoused and his development and capability as a speaker. Further, we were expected to know the social, political, economic, and religious context surrounding each speech we studied.14

In *Rhetoric and Criticism*, Marie Hochmuth Nichols agrees with Herbert J. Muller that "the humane approach to rhetoric and rhetorical discourse can... teach us to 'love reason and to value its limitations, to prize emotion but resist control by it in despite of reason, to cultivate imagination and cope with its aberrations..." She adds that "the historian, H. W. C. Davis has remarked, 'Our common humanity is best studied in the most eminent examples that it has produced of every type of human excellence.'" And she concludes, "Public address in the great tradition provides us with many examples of human excellence."15 No doubt it is this human

---


14Letter to this writer from Carl A. Dallinger, Northern Illinois University, DeKalb, Illinois, February 3, 1967.

excellence which Baird encourages his students to seek and strive toward as he extolls the study of speeches in the light of a liberally-oriented background.

The Use of the Pragmatic Approach

Baird advocates the pragmatic approach as he encourages the teacher to foster the study of examples:

What educational philosophy should govern the contemporary teacher of speech? ... Again we revert to Dewey's thesis of the identity of school and life, of learning and doing. Our goal, then, will be to substitute activity for subjects, to make the classroom a miniature world, to carry the pupils into that world, and so enable them to rebuild their experience by reconstructing their ideas "in the light of newly discovered relationships between the parts of 'their' experience." The tenets are again those of the progressive educationalists. 16

With Dewey, Baird sees great value in "reflective thinking" whereby the individual "views critically the facts, language, hypotheses, beliefs, and assumptions attending his diagnosis and prescription." 17

In Argumentation, Discussion, and Debate Baird says,

What is this pattern of thinking? The complete act of reflective thought, as John Dewey put it, involves the following steps: (1) recognition of a felt difficulty; (2) the description or diagnosis of the problem; (3) the description of representative hypotheses or solutions of the problem; (4) the rational elaboration of these suggestions and the testing of each; (5) experiment and verification leading to acceptance or rejection of the preferred solution. 18

Farther on in the same volume Baird's "Exercises and Problems" ask the student to "Criticize a speaker's reflective thinking as shown


17 Baird, Argumentation, Discussion, and Debate, p. 41. See also p. v.

18 Ibid., p. 42.
in his treatment of facts, inferences, language, or organization in a recent speech. (Consult any standard collection of recent speeches.)" He then suggests a classroom discussion centering around the questions, "What does reflective thinking involve?" and "How can we improve in such process?"  

Baird contends that argumentation is "essentially problem-solving." His assignments often required that the student either uphold or attack the ideas presented in a speech being studied, and then defend his point of view before the other members of the class. In so doing, the student gained experience in the problem of applying rhetorical standards and presenting and substantiating his critique.

Throughout the series, Baird includes in his introductions discussions centering around standards by which speeches should be judged. He offers a concise summary of his suggestions for the criticism of speeches in *Representative American Speeches: 1946-47*:

... (1) You will reconstruct the social and political background of the address or addresses. (2) You will analyze the speaker's audience. (3) You will reconstruct the speaking situation itself. (4) You will determine the speaking type—whether sermon or congressional debate. (5) You will review the biographical facts concerning the speaker that may help in your appraisal of his performance. (6) You will examine the text itself to be sure that the speaker himself composed it and that the report as it comes to you closely reproduces what the orator actually said. (7) You will single out and weigh the ideas of the speaker. (8) You will examine and judge

---


the worth of the concrete details (forms of proof) by which he establishes his ideas. (9) You will outline the discourse and pronounce judgment on the speaker's organizational skill. (10) You will judge the effectiveness of the language. (11) You will view the speaker's methods of audience adaptation, including his modes of "appeal." (12) You will study and evaluate the speaker's delivery—his voice, enunciation, pronunciation, and bodily action. Especially will you attempt to understand his platform personality, including his sincerity, tact, humor, and other traits of character. (13) You will view these elements separately and in combination so that your judgment is a balanced one. (14) Finally, you will appraise the speech in view of its immediate and long-range impressiveness. Your pursuit of this final inquiry does not assume that your successful speaker must always command the most votes. He may be hopelessly in the minority. But he should demonstrate platform leadership and should stir at least a small ripple on history. He should be a social force through his speechmaking.21

Baird's assignments reflect his ability to combine the teaching of rhetorical theory with its application. For example, under "Performance Preparation" for Speech 36:12, Argumentation and Debate, 1948-49, he includes the following:

A. Reading:
   1. Baird's Public Discussion and Debate, Chapter Fifteen, pp. 333-337.
   2. Baird's Argumentation, Discussion, and Debate, Chapter Twenty-seven.
   3. Crocker's Argumentation and Debate, Chapter Twelve.

B. Performance preparation:
   On the basis of the criteria set forth in the assigned readings in not more than one 8x11 page, frame your decision as to which speaker, Dewey or Stassen, did the more effective debating on the question of outlawing the Communist party in the U.S. Be sure to consider each question, except "F" listed on pages 333-334 of Baird's Public Discussion and Debate, "Instructions to Judges." For affirmative "team" substitute Stassen, and for negative "team," Dewey. If Baird is not available, Crocker should be consulted and a similar procedure followed.

CLASSROOM PROCEDURE:
The class hour will be given to a discussion of how debates and debaters should be judged. Bring your written "decision" and hand it to the instructor. Be prepared to explain and defend your decision. If such information is available, in the New York Times, for instance, consideration will also be given to the factor of delivery in these radio speeches.22

In his course outline for Speech 36:11, Public Discussion, for the second semester of the 1949-50 session, Baird sets forth two aims and purposes, both of which exemplify the pragmatic approach:
"A. This course aims to develop skill in the techniques of discusssional and extemporaneous speaking and writing, and B. This course is designed to effect improvement in speaking and in the orderly processes antecedent thereto." Assignments for this course also reflect the combination of theory and its application. For example,

Performance preparation:
1. Be prepared to discuss the attributes of an effective speaker as set forth in Baird's Representative American Speeches: 1946-47.


CLASSROOM PROCEDURE: The class hour will be given to a discussion of the attributes of effective speaking and the canons and methodology of speech criticism.23

Further application of Baird's rhetorical theory is evident in his "Projects and Problems" found at the ends of chapters in General

---

22 From the files of Don Streeter.
23 From the files of A. Craig Baird.
Speech, by Baird and Franklin H. Knower.  For example, one project directs the student to:

Analyze a printed speech, either a recently delivered speech or one by Webster, Calhoun, Lincoln, Bryan, Wilson, or Franklin D. Roosevelt. Determine the general aim and specific purpose. Decide whether the speaker accomplished his goal. Present your analysis in a brief written report.

For recent speeches, consult Vital Speeches of the Day (a fortnightly) or Representative American Speeches (an annual collection). For older speeches, see W. M. Parrish and Marie Hochmuth, American Speeches; or A. Craig Baird, American Public Addresses: 1740-1952. Consult also the speeches in Appendix C. Appendix C includes "some outstanding . . . examples that suggest proper methods for the student in his own speech development."

In another suggested project, Baird combines oral performance with the study of speech examples:

Give a short talk in which you make use of statistics. Explain clearly the meaning of the figures you quote. For examples of the use of statistical material, consult the bulletins of learned societies (for example, Speech Monographs), congressional publications (the current issues of the daily edition of the Congressional Record), or current speeches published in Vital Speeches of the Day.

In pursuing the study of "slanting in persuasion," a project instructs the student as follows:

Read one of the speeches employing persuasive techniques in Baird's Representative American Speeches or in Vital Speeches and make a report to the class on (a) attention-getting devices, (b) slanting, (c) the quality of emotional appeals.

---


25 Ibid., p. 50.

26 Ibid., p. 103.

27 Ibid., p. 29.
Each of these three projects requires the student to employ rhetorical principles in analyzing speech examples and to present the resulting analysis by way of a written report or a short talk.

Former students of Baird recall his emphasis upon the pragmatic approach in the classroom. Waldo W. Braden states that it was Baird's custom to prepare typewritten stencils which included future assignments, additional source materials, and open-ended leading questions centered around the issues being discussed. He mimeographed these materials and distributed them to class members. Classes in American Oratory, Discussion, and Argumentation and Debate benefitted from whatever Baird was currently reading as he collected materials for Representative American Speeches. Baird seldom lectured to his upper division undergraduate and graduate students. Rather, he preferred to use class time for discussion, debate, and criticism and to supply essential information via mimeographed sheets. Although he made assignments in his text, he did not discuss these in class. Instead, he employed activities involving reading, writing, class participation, and performance, thus putting into practice his premise that students learn by doing. He encouraged students to solve their own intellectual problems, often referring them to graduate theses and dissertations which he directed, and literally driving them to the library to seek answers to their questions. He required many short papers during the semester. Preferring to conduct his classes in conference rooms with the group seated around a large rectangular table, Baird often divided classes into three sections so that this arrangement could be used. Graduate assistants would then direct two of the groups. Baird's tremendous reputation at the State
University of Iowa drew many students to his classes. They both admired and revered him, and he pitted them against each other intellectually, thus putting to constructive use their eagerness not to disappoint him. Not only did Baird employ speech models in a variety of courses; he employed a variety of activities ranging from dialogue, discussion, and debate to impromptu and extempore speaking. He also sponsored a weekly radio program over station WSUI. When asked whether radio performance was limited to his superior students, Baird answered that he often put his less able students on the air because this procedure tended to bring out their best performances.  

Another former Baird student, Charles L. Balcer, states, "If you know Dr. Baird you will know that he was more interested in the student doing the analysis than in the student listening to his analysis!"

Regarding Baird's opposition to use of the lecture method, Rex P. Kyker recalls that "he did not lecture except to call certain items to our attention."

Wilson B. Paul notes that Baird's pragmatic approach was not limited to his students. He writes, "When Dr. Baird made a speech himself, he attempted to follow the same theories which he taught

---

28Interview with Waldo W. Braden at Baton Rouge, Louisiana, February 16, 1968.

29Letter to this writer from Charles L. Balcer, Augustana College, Sioux Falls, South Dakota, January 26, 1967.

30Letter to this writer from Rex P. Kyker, Abilene Christian College, Abilene, Texas, January 26, 1967.
in rhetorical criticism. In fact, I recall his having said to me several times after having made a speech, 'You will note that I attempt to use the theories that I have been teaching you people in my classes.'"  

Halbert E. Gulley states that Baird occasionally "would analyze a speech in some depth, showing how he viewed the rhetorical principles as reflected in the message. These sessions were much prized by the students. More frequently, however, his method was to leave us to ponder the materials, wondering how he would react to the stream of papers we produced for him."  

Further evidence of Baird's pragmatic approach comes from his statement that he doesn't believe in lecturing in the classroom, but prefers the methods of dialectic or discussion. He is convinced that people learn by doing, and that class time should be used for student activities rather than formal lecturing. He says that the professor should give necessary notes out on mimeographed sheets. He adds,

You have been asking me about the use of illustrative materials in teaching and exactly how that type of thing would be geared into classroom instruction. As you know, it depends to a considerable extent upon the kind of course that we have in mind, whether it is a beginning or required course at the freshman level or some other variety of specialized course. In general, I have believed very heavily in the use of speeches and equivalent articles as teaching agencies because there you do get not only content, but you do have illustrations of proper methods of expression and expression and

31Letter to this writer from Wilson B. Paul, Michigan State University, February 15, 1967.

32Letter to this writer from Halbert E. Gulley, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois, February 24, 1967.

33Interview with A. Craig Baird at Carbondale, Illinois, April 28, 1967.
the background information that might further explain what is said. In other words, I have always believed very strongly in putting into the center of a classroom program—in speech, that is, the study and application of representative speeches. The reason I emphasize that point is because we always have a great question "shall we play up theory through the lectures and the textbooks and whatnot, or shall we focus upon outstanding examples?" And I am glad to tell you that my position has always been to focus upon the examples themselves. I see the results there because the students do get excited as they go into a speech by Kennedy or somebody else, and they want to talk about it, and they want to apply it, and they want to reflect, and so forth. I must admit that most of the textbooks, including my own, somehow never quite capture the enthusiasm or the imagination of the learners in the classroom as much as the right kind of speeches that you might have them read.34

In summary, Baird champions the pragmatic approach in his publications, his speeches, and his classroom. While emphasizing the theory of rhetoric he also stresses the practical application of this theory as he requires students to analyze examples and then to present and defend their findings. He also expects them to emulate worthy examples in their own speech composition.

The Importance of Intellectual Content

In regard to rhetoric, Baird insists that "the intellectual quality is primary."35 With Thonssen, he contends that "oratory to be great must deal with ideas which make a difference in the affairs of men and states."36 Keeping these concepts in mind, Baird believes that the study of speeches should culminate in class discussion,


during which the group engages in reflective thinking on the issues involved in individual speeches. Here again he gives evidence of his stress upon ideas as the primary consideration in speech analysis, at the same time giving insight into his teaching methods in achieving this end:

The student frames, summarizes, and challenges the chief ideas. He examines the facts, assumed or expressed, traces the analogical, causal, or other modes of inference, inspects the refutations, definitions, the logical and emotional movement, the persuasive devices, the illustrations, stereotypes, audience adaptiveness, and the vigorous language. . . . Thus the student with his reaction to these "thought" readings will engage in informal discussion, dialogue, panels, short speeches, or his written contributions.37

Although he admits that the judgments of the student-critic are not necessarily conclusive, Baird encourages the student to employ the judicial approach to speech criticism. With Thonssen, Baird holds that rhetorical criticism contains "both a process or method and a declaration of judgment," and they offer the following definition:

Rhetorical criticism can thus be defined as a comparative study in which standards of judgment deriving from the social interaction of a speech situation are applied to public addresses to determine the immediate or delayed effect of the speeches upon specific audiences, and ultimately, upon society.38

Not only does Baird agree that the ultimate test of the effectiveness of a speech is the response which it elicits; he also contends that it is the responsibility of the critic to judge the extent to which the desired response occurs, insofar as he is able to do so. For example, *Speech Criticism* classifies rhetorical criticism

38 Thonssen and Baird, *Speech Criticism*, p. 16.
under "four main heads, all of which overlap to a certain extent": the impressionistic, analytic, synthetic, and judicial. With Thonssen, Baird says that "the impressionistic criticism of speeches, least systematic and scientific of all, simply records a judgment based upon personal preference and pre-disposition." They hold that this type of criticism is so subjective that when it results in valid judgments such accuracy occurs in spite of rather than because of the critic's method.

In the analytic approach, the critic "makes a methodical examination of all available facts relating to the speech, ... resulting in an exhaustive structural analysis of the text." Because such criticism "is devoted to the collection of facts relating to the speech alone," the authors declare that "there is little evaluation." With Thonssen, Baird states that synthetic criticism employs analysis of the other elements in the speaking situation in addition to the speech itself, which means that the critic attempts to reconstruct the original situation. But here again, they note that the critic makes no attempt to interpret the results.

The authors of Speech Criticism, therefore, advocate the use of judicial criticism because "it combines the aims of analytic and synthetic inquiry with the all-important element of evaluation and interpretation of results." They value this approach for the following reasons:

39Ibid., p. 17.  40Ibid.  
41Ibid., pp. 17-18.  42Ibid., p. 18.
it reconstructs a speech situation with fidelity to fact; it examines this situation carefully in the light of the interaction of speaker, audience, subject, and occasion; it interprets the data with an eye to determining the effect of the speech; it formulates a judgment in the light of the philosophical-historical-logical constituents of the inquiry; and it appraises the entire event by assigning it comparative rank in the total enterprise of speaking.43

Because the judicial approach includes an evaluation of the effectiveness of a given address, Thonssen and Baird direct the discussion in Speech Criticism "toward the development of criticism of this type."44

In 1947, a year prior to the publication of Speech Criticism, with Thonssen Baird wrote an article for the Quarterly Journal of Speech entitled "Methodology in the Criticism of Public Address,"45 in which he stressed the value of judicial criticism:

The thesis of this article is that the purpose of rhetorical criticism is to express a judgment on a public speech; that such judicial appraisal is a derivative of composite judgments formulated by reference to the methodologies of rhetoric, history, sociology, and social psychology, logic, and philosophy; and that the materials and techniques of experimental science require these other evaluative agencies in any satisfactory appraisal of public address. . . . The chief business of the rhetorical scholar . . . is the evaluation of a speech or speeches. His questions are, "Is this a good speech? If so, why? . . . The critic will employ judgments partly rhetorical, partly historical and sociological, partly logical, and partly philosophical."46

Baird's former students recall his use of addresses from Representative American Speeches in order (1) to stimulate students

43Ibid.
44Ibid.
46Ibid., p. 134.
to think on current issues and (2) to illustrate the rhetorical principles being studied by the class. It is evident, however, that Baird employed speeches as examples before he began editing the series. It is also apparent that his essays in the introductory chapters of Representative American Speeches resulted from Baird's efforts over a period of years to formulate a basis for the critical evaluation of speeches. As Elwood Murray points out, a systematic approach to speech criticism had not been devised during Baird's early teaching days.47 Prior to the publication of Representative American Speeches, however, Elton Abernathy recalls Baird's use of speech models from Goodrich and Shaw.48 And Gregg Phifer offers the opinion that Baird's essays on rhetorical analysis which he features in his introductions to the series foreshadowed the more elaborate treatment of the same areas in Speech Criticism.49 These former students agree that his rhetorical theory has a classical basis, and they recall that he stressed the need to consider invention (logos, pathos, and ethos), organization and style. They remember his emphasis upon the relationship between logical theory and rhetorical theory. They note, further, that his criteria for evaluating speeches were clearly defined.

In addition to stressing the importance of textual authenticity, Baird reviewed for his classes the problems which the critic faces in

47 Letter to this writer from Elwood Murray, University of Denver, Denver, Colorado, January 24, 1967.

48 Letter to this writer from Elton Abernathy, Southwest Texas State College, San Marcos, Texas, March 10, 1967.

49 Letter to this writer from Gregg Phifer, Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida, January 13, 1967.
ascertaining the accuracy of a given text. Fostering the historical-
philosophical approach to the study of speeches, Baird insisted upon an
objective attitude aimed toward judicial criticism. Always he
encouraged students to view the speech as part of the total speaking
situation, and he taught that times of stress call forth the speaker's
best efforts. His former students refer to Baird as a "humanistic
critic" who practised his own principles in speechmaking. They
acknowledge that his influence as a teacher is great, and that their
own concepts have been shaped by their experiences in Baird's class-
room.50

50Information in this section is based upon letters from
the following people: Elwood Murray, University of Denver, Colorado,
January 24, 1967; R. H. Sandefur, The University of Akron, Ohio,
January 24, 1967; Charles L. Balcer, Augustana College, Sioux Falls,
South Dakota, January 26, 1967; Rex P. Kyker, Abilene Christian
College, Abilene, Texas, January 26, 1967; Wilson B. Paul, Michigan
State University, East Lansing, Michigan, February 15, 1967; Samuel
L. Becker, The University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa, February 8, 1967;
Laura Crowell, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington,
February 4, 1967; Earnest Brandenburg, Drury College, Springfield,
Missouri, January 10, 1967; Merrill T. Baker, University of South
Dakota, Vermillion, South Dakota, March 20, 1967; Elton Abernathy,
Southwest Texas State College, San Marcos, Texas, March 10, 1967;
Fred J. Barton, Abilene Christian College, Abilene, Texas, January 31,
1967; Lester Thonssen, Metropolitan State College, Denver, Colorado,
January 11, 1967; Margaret Wood, Northern Illinois University,
DeKalb, Illinois, January 23, 1967; Gregg Phifer, The Florida State
University, Tallahassee, Florida, January 13, 1967; Herman Cohen,
University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon, January 24, 1967; Carl A.
Dallinger, Northern Illinois University, DeKalb, Illinois, February 3,
1967; Donald H. Ecroyd, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania,
February 15, 1967; L. LeRoy Cowperthwaite, Kent State University,
Kent, Ohio, July 24, 1967; Halbert E. Gulley, University of Illinois,
Urbana, Illinois, February 24, 1967; Carroll C. Arnold, The Pennsylvania
State University, University Park, Pennsylvania, January 12, 1967.
The writer also used information from the files of Don Streeter,
University of Houston, Texas; James Parkerson, Northeast Louisiana
State College, Monroe, Louisiana; and G. F. Hostettler, Colorado State
University, Fort Collins, Colorado.
Examples of assignments whereby Baird pointed up the intellectual content of speech models include the following:

ARGUMENTATION AND DEBATE
SPEECH 36:12 (1948-49)

Performance preparation:
1. Each class member will make a careful study of one of the four International Policies speeches included in Baird's Representative American Speeches, 1947-48, pp. 15-67.

2. Each member will prepare for presentation to the class a four-minute extempore speech in which one of the following may be done: (a) agree or disagree with the basic premises, assumptions, ideas or arguments presented, or (b) criticize the speech studied on the basis of the criteria and canons of effective speaking as set forth in Baird's Representative American Speeches: 1946-47, pp. 7-12.

3. You are not simply to parrot the ideas in the speech studied, but you should show familiarity with its contents, using them as points of departure for your own speech. In other words, show some originality in this speech by incorporating your own ideas on international policies. Make your thesis direct and concise. Do not try to cover too much ground. You may choose to dwell upon but one or two of the major ideas presented, or to criticize the speech upon only two or three of the major criteria most applicable.

CLASSROOM PROCEDURE:
Each member will deliver his or her four-minute extempore speech. The other members of the class will write individual criticisms of each speech, judging its effectiveness in the light of the criteria for effective speaking as set forth in Baird's Representative American Speeches: 1946-47.

Another assignment centering around the evaluation of intellectual content comes from Baird's Speech 36:11 course, Public Discussion, 1949-50:

Reading:

51 From the files of Don Streeter.
Performance Preparation:
1. Each class member will make a careful study of one of the three speeches or the Town-Meeting discussion included in the above assigned pages on speeches on Education.
2. You will prepare a four-minute speech in which you agree or disagree with the ideas presented by the speaker studied. Consider his ideas, assumptions, arguments, and evidence.
3. Narrow your speech—Do not give a review of the speech studied. Show originality by relating your own ideas to those of the speaker—Be direct, clear, concise.
4. You are presenting an extemporaneous speech which should not be memorized "word for word," but which should be prepared so that it will not be necessary to use more than a single note card.

CLASSROOM PROCEDURE:
Each class member will come prepared to deliver a four-minute extempore speech. The class will write individual criticisms of each speaker, judging his or her effectiveness on the basis of criteria studied in assignments of the past week or so.\(^{52}\)

The above assignments indicate that Baird succeeded in combining critical evaluation of a speaker’s ideas by an individual student with critical evaluation by the class members of the student’s presentation of his critique.

Baird commented recently that it is important that students become engrossed in the "wider point of view" so that they are alert to the contemporary world. He thinks they should have maximum freedom of utterance but that this freedom should be tempered by knowledge and judgment. He expressed confidence in the fundamental sense of undergraduates, and is convinced that proper discusional methods can solve many problems. As an example of this approach he pointed to the radio programs which he directed during World War II when he had charge of the Army communication program at the State University of Iowa.\(^{53}\)

\(^{52}\)From the files of A. Craig Baird.

\(^{53}\)Interview with A. Craig Baird at Carbondale, Illinois, April 28, 1967.
In summary, Baird sees the following uses of the study of speeches as examples in the classroom: (1) to emphasize the importance of invention in speaking, (2) to increase the student's appreciation of his intellectual heritage, (3) to develop his critical ability, (4) to encourage his understanding of the relationship of public speaking and historical events, (5) to challenge the student intellectually, (6) to foster his concern for enduring values, (7) to stimulate his wish to create and explore, (8) to develop his ability to communicate, (9) to build the study of rhetoric on the foundations of broad liberal education, and (10) to employ the judicial approach to the study of speeches, considering the response gained in the light of contributions to the "good society" and basis in truth.

The Contributions of Speeches to the "Good Society"

Convinced that "the role of the educated is always one of committal to value systems," 54 Baird stresses the need for ethical as well as logical appraisal on the part of the student. He states that "the ends of rhetoric . . . are to contribute knowledge, instruction, and guidance that make for a 'good society.'" And he adds, "These ends, then, become the foundation for an understanding of the true character of rhetoric 'as truth.'" 55 In the studying of rhetoric he contends that the student should stimulate the wish to

---


create and to explore, whether in humane or in scientific fields, and that as a result the student's "intellectual competency should be more and more marked by logical, aesthetic, social, and ethical qualities." 56

Baird holds that "speech education, at least in America, has as a special aim, perhaps a major one, the support of democracy." 57 He believes that a "good" speech should be on the side of the "great society," which he defines as "a better operating social unit or civilization." Such a society, he contends, will move in the direction of developing ethical and moral values. In determining whether an address is a "good" speech, he advises that such a speech deals with important events and has certain historical value in that it grapples with worthwhile ideas. In addition, it should have some influence. This influence, he says, may be minor at the time of delivery and greater later, but it should be evident. Baird's "good" speech also has some weight of ideas which lead to speaker-audience bonds, or psychological connections. Finally, he warns that the speaker's motives should be constructive. Baird says that he attempted to implement these standards in assembling speeches for Representative American Speeches. 58


58 Interview with A. Craig Baird at Carbondale, Illinois, April 28, 1967.
Baird gives further detail concerning the critic's analysis of the impact of a speech in the following comments:

The critic's understanding of the social scene should be attended by a full knowledge of the speaker's audience . . . the education, race, politics, occupation, religion, traditions, economic level, age, and other attributes . . . The purpose of the audience in assembling and the kindred purpose of the speaker in talking to them affect character of the subject, ideas, language, delivery, and other elements of the speaking technique . . . Speeches, in the last analysis, emerge from audiences and are to be judged by the audience reaction . . . The historian-logician weighs the testimony and views the impact of speaker both upon the immediate visible audience and upon the wider movements of history. His judgments and conclusions are, at best, tentative. 59

Examples of Baird's adaptation of assignments so that the student must consider important events having historical significance are found in his assignments for Speech 11-12, Public Discussion and Debate, 1943-44:

DISCUSSION AND EXTEMPORE SPEAKING. January 11.
AMERICA'S WAR AIMS. Readings: Representative American Speeches: 1942-43, Denna F. Fleming, "What is it That We Fight?", pp. 67-71; Joseph C. Grew, "The Menace of Japan," pp. 72-80; Madame Chiang Kai-shek, "Fighting for the Common Cause," pp. 81-84; and "Japan Is First United States Foe," pp. 85-92. Questions and suggested lines of investigation: (1) Analyze each address as an example of speechmaking. (2) What is the thesis? (3) What are the principal points of each address? (4) Why is America fighting the Axis? (5) To what extent is this war one of purely self-defense? Is it true that if Germany and Japan should win that victory could be made conclusive enough to destroy the United States? (6) What would be the economic consequences to the United States of an Axis victory? Be specific in your discussion, especially as it relates the political to the economic factors. (7) What would be the political consequences of an Axis victory? (8) In case Germany and Japan should win the war, would they fall to and fight each other? (9) What alterations would take place in the political geography of the Western Hemisphere if Japan and Germany should win? (10) What would be the effect upon England and the British Commonwealth of Nations if Germany and Japan

should win? (11) Are we fighting this war to uphold the American principles of government and civilization? If so, what is that system? (13) Are we fighting to uphold the principle that the more fortunate members of our society are to support the under-privileged? (14) Are we fighting for the principle that weak nations shall be supported and made independent?

DISCUSSION AND EXTEMPOR SPEAKING. January 13.
Sections A and C will be divided into two groups, and Section B into three groups, each group under a leader. The subject for discussion is "What Are America's War Aims?" Each participant will give a four-minute speech related closely to the preceding remarks. After these uninterrupted speeches are given, the group as a unit will discuss and draw constructive conclusions.60

Another example of Baird's effort to involve the student in the social, economic, and political milieu comes as he addresses his reader directly:

You who read speeches are to identify yourself with the immediate audience concerned with the speaker; to immerse yourself in the economic, social, and other currents that largely account for the attitudes and activities of the orator and of his listeners and observers.61

According to Marie Hochmuth Nichols, "the rhetorician is, in effect, or ought to be, a critic of society."62 She quotes Baird as saying, "In the end we students of speech are concerned with the recognition of truth and the speaker's relation to attitudes and movements that support truth."63 No doubt Baird exemplifies what Nichols refers to as "concern for human purpose and end."64 The

60From the files of G. F. Hostettler, Colorado State University, Ft. Collins, Colorado.


62Nichols, op. cit., p. 16.


64Nichols, op. cit., p. 16.
four major facets of his philosophy of rhetoric: the value of a broad liberal background, the worth of the pragmatic approach, the importance of intellectual quality, and the contributions of speeches to the "good society," give credence to his advocacy of the humanistic and philosophical point-of-view. Nor is Baird content to pay lip-service to this philosophy. It is threaded throughout his works over more than forty years while being implemented in his classroom.
CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS

In reviewing Speech Criticism, Karl R. Wallace said, "This is an important book deserving much praise. The first book in the twentieth century written by rhetoricians and devoted entirely to the criticism of speechmaking, its materials embrace the history, theory, methods, and practice of rhetorical criticism." He concludes, "Serious students of rhetoric and public address will long pay tribute to its authors."¹

A. Craig Baird's influence as author, editor, critic, and teacher, extending over more than forty years, continues unabated. John Jamieson, Editor of General Publications for the H. W. Wilson Company, publishers of Representative American Speeches, states, "It is interesting to note that compilers of textbooks still write to us frequently to request permission to reprint speeches or excerpts from speeches appearing in the various volumes edited by Dr. Baird. There can be no doubt that Dr. Baird's compilations have contributed significantly to the content of more than a few speech textbooks written both during and since the period of twenty-two years which they covered."²


Although his publications include thirty-four books, Baird considers himself first of all a teacher, stating that all of his other interests have come as a direct result of his teaching. As stated earlier, an outgrowth of his teaching appeared when Baird, having employed speeches as examples from the beginning of his teaching career, recognized the need for collections of speeches as reference material for students of public speaking and students of written composition. Realizing that such collections were not readily available, he set about providing his own. Thus Representative American Speeches began publication. Baird planned the format of each volume to foster the student's evaluation of the total speaking situation and to encourage him to do further research on the speaker, the speech, the audience, and the occasion. He recommends the series as "a reference source for the study of contemporary American problems; a partial record of the history of recent months; a collection of material for courses in debate and extempore speaking; a series of speeches for the systematic study of contemporary American public address; and a series of examples of how to proceed with one's own speech composition."3

Further, Baird's own speechmaking is closely aligned to his teaching. Recently he wrote, "I much prefer teaching to public lecturing and have done the latter under some pressure and under some self-incentive to promote our cause of good communication."4

3Representative American Speeches: 1949-50, p. 4.
Because he sees public speaking as inextricably interwoven with the social, economic, and political movements of the times, Baird sought speeches for his collection which were "representative of the kind and quality of speaking" done in the period specified. He is convinced that a speech should be evaluated by the response which it elicits, by its "impress on history." Agreeing with Emerson that "the times make the orator," he contends that a study of these and other collections of speeches will do much to provide the student with an insight into the climate which produced the speeches. He insists that a speech should be studied from the vantage point provided by a broad liberal education, considered in the light of the total speaking situation, and evaluated according to the worth of its ideas, the motives of the speaker, and the contributions of the speech to the "good society," meaning "a satisfactory social-political climate." Such a society, he holds, develops under the influence of ethical and moral values which are in turn influenced by speechmaking leaders. Because of the "societal results of his communication" Baird says that the speaker has an obligation to support ethical standards which make clear his commitment to the "good society."

Baird contends that the goals of speech education are synonymous with the goals of liberal education because both disciplines aim to increase the student's appreciation of his cultural heritage while stimulating him to make contributions of his own. Thus, Baird says, the student is encouraged to develop something of a "philosophical cast" as he approaches the study of speeches from the historical-philosophical viewpoint.
Regarding his rhetorical theory, Baird acknowledges his indebtedness to the influence of Aristotelian theory as modified by later rhetoricians. He says further that his pragmatic approach to teaching stems in part from his acceptance of the teachings of William James and John Dewey. Baird equates learning with doing, and he places great value on learning by example. In his classroom, Baird makes practical application of his theory of rhetoric, planning class activities to include experiences in research, writing, and speaking, while encouraging individual responsibility for problem-solving and group participation in reflective thinking. Constantly challenging the student intellectually, he affords many opportunities for experiences in the judicial criticism of speeches, in speech composition and presentation, and in critical evaluation of the oral performances of class members. Always he prefers the method of dialectic or discussion to that of lecturing.

Uppermost in Baird's rhetorical theory is his assertion that the intellectual content of a speech is its most important raison d'être. He insists that the superior speaker demonstrates a philosophical grasp of the problem, an understanding of the basic issues, intellectual integrity, good will toward his audience, and ethical standards.

Baird's influence is not limited to his individual efforts. His former students, having attained influential positions at educational institutions throughout the country, implement his philosophy in their own spheres of operation. They acknowledge that Baird has had a profound effect on their philosophy of rhetoric and on their application of rhetorical theory. A former student of
Baird comments, "I want to say that my own indebtedness to Baird as a teacher is greater than to anyone else. . . ."

Baird's influence in the field of rhetoric and public address is great indeed. He pioneered in evolving standards for the criticism of speeches, and from the beginning of his career he upheld the value of using speeches as examples.
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APPENDIX

SELECTED EXCERPTS FROM BAIRD'S COURSE OUTLINES AND ASSIGNMENT SHEETS

Nine of Baird's former students sent to this writer mimeographed course outlines and/or assignment sheets from his classes at the University of Iowa. In addition, Baird supplied copies of materials used in his courses. The outlines covered a twenty-year time span, beginning with the academic year of 1929-30 and ending with the school year 1949-50. For the purposes of this study, excerpts are limited to those which relate to the use of speeches as examples, especially with reference to Representative American Speeches.

The earliest allusion to the series appears in the assignments for Speech III, Argumentation and Debate, for the Summer Session, 1939.¹ Assignment No. 36 for July 31, 1939 states:


¹From the files of Don Streeter, University of Houston, Texas.
Two of Baird's courses for the 1939-40 school year used assignments involving model speeches from the first two volumes of the series. 2 Speech 112, Argumentation and Debate, listed as required material, Representative American Speeches: 1938-39; and as recommended material, Vital Speeches (fortnightly), February-June, 1940. Assignments pertinent to this study include the following:


3. **February 5. ANALYSIS AND CRITICISM OF CONTEMPORARY AMERICAN SPEECHES.** Read and criticize one of the following speeches in Representative American Speeches: (a) "The Canadian Position of the United States," F. D. Roosevelt; (b) "Possible Results of a European War," William E. Borah; (c) "The United States' Policy Toward War," F. D. Roosevelt; (d) "Opening of Pan American Conference," Cordell Hull; (e) "The Foreign Policies of Roosevelt," Alben W. Barkley.

During the same session, Speech 208, Criticism of Contemporary American Public Speaking, included these assignments:

**March 1.** Franklin D. Roosevelt
**Readings:** Read the Roosevelt speeches in Baird's Representative American Speeches: 1937-38, 1938-39 and any other speeches. Read also Charlotte Schrier's thesis on the oral style of Roosevelt in selected speeches. See also Chenoweth's papers.

**March 8.** Fosdick, Hoover, and other contemporary speakers.
**Readings:** See the excerpts from Fosdick, Hoover, Borah and other speakers in Baird's Representative American Speeches.

The following excerpts are from a study guide which Baird prepared for his 1940-41 Speech III course in Argumentation and Discussion. 3 He gave the assignments for four of the twice-weekly

---

2 From the files of James Parkerson, Northeast Louisiana State College, Monroe, Louisiana.

3 From the files of G. F. Hostettler, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado.
class meetings at the beginning of the fall semester: September 30, October 2, October 7, and October 9, 1940. Although they refer neither to speeches as examples nor to Representative American Speeches, these excerpts are meaningful to this study because they give insight into Baird's teaching procedures in guiding the student in developing a philosophy of speech.

SPEECH III

1. THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE TEACHER OF PUBLIC SPEAKING AND DEBATE. Problem: What shall be the philosophy of the teacher of public speaking? Suggested Readings: See References and Problems: "Aims and Objectives of Speech Education," page 43. Read also article by Baird on this subject. (Inquire at Book Desk, Reserve Library, for Baird "Problems in Public Speaking.")

2. AIMS AND OBJECTIVES OF SPEECH AND PUBLIC SPEAKING EDUCATION. Problem: What specific aims and objectives shall control the teaching of public speaking in school and college (or the teaching of debate), or control the directing of the public speaking and debate activities? Other subordinate or related problems: (See topics and queries listed in References and Problems, p. 53). (1) What of discussion as a means of stimulating thinking? (2) What shall be the equipment of the teacher in charge of the forensic and public speaking program? (3) What are the differing aims of discussion, argumentation, debate, public speaking? Suggested readings: (1) References and Problems, "Aims and Objectives of Discussion and Debate," p. 53, (2) Baird, A. C., Public Discussion and Debate (Revised Edition); (3) Good, C. V., Teaching in College and University; Atlantic Monthly, 155:346-442, April, 1935, "Free Inquiry or Dogma," Conant, J. B.; (4) California Quarterly of Secondary Education, 6:254-6, April, 1931, "Is a Substitute for Debate Needed to Provide Training in Scientific Group Thinking?" Bursch, James F.; (5) Education, 42:39-42, September, 1921, "Academic Debate: Its Aim and Method," Wetzel, W. A. Write a 300-word paper on one of the topics suggested. Hand to the instructor and be prepared for discussion. Make your paper an answer to the question; or summarize clearly your reading and give some reaction to the ideas of the article or book. Use 8"x11" paper; include your name, number of assignment, date.

3. AIMS AND OBJECTIVES OF DEBATE AND PUBLIC DISCUSSION. Problem: Is contest debating consistent with sound educational aims; or shall we substitute discussion? Or see problem (9) at the bottom of page 53 of References and Problems: "In view of educational aims in general, and of speech education objectives,
what changes, if any, in the forensic aims and methods should be made to enable these activities to serve better the needs of the 'present social order.'?

4. PHILOSOPHY OF DISCUSSION. Problems: Shall we substitute discussion for debates? What is discussion? What is a working definition of discussion? What is the relation of discussion to propaganda? What is the relation of discussion to democracy? What are the values of discussion as an investigative and learning technique? What are some limitations of discussion?

In 1943-44, Baird offered Speech 11-12, Public Discussion and Debate, as a two-semester undergraduate course. The following excerpts are from mimeographed assignment sheets which accompanied that course.

PUBLIC DISCUSSION AND DEBATE
First Semester, 1943-44
Assignments, Speech 11-12

Required Books

Excerpt from QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW
(Page references in Baird)

Chapter III: Research
51. Describe the Reference Shelf Series, including those volumes having to do with Representative American Speeches. (47)

Although the Speech 11 assignment sheet included only a single reference to Representative American Speeches, as shown above, twelve of the assignments for Speech 12 centered around the 1942-43 volume:

4Ibid.
PUBLIC DISCUSSION AND DEBATE
Second Semester, 1943-44
Assignments, Speech 12

1. January 4. INDIVIDUAL SPEECHES.
The members of each section will give their solutions
to the problems discussed in December, 1943.

2. January 6. DISCUSSION AND EXTENPORE SPEAKING. AMERICA'S
WAR AIMS. Readings: Representative American Speeches:
Eduard Benes, "What are We Fighting For?", pp. 46-66.
Questions and suggested lines of investigation: (1) Give
the immediate cause for each discussion. (2) Criticize
the organization of each address. (3) "We do not aim at
any extension of our national territory." (p. 48) Do you
agree? (4) "We do not aim to impose a particular form of
government of any other nation." (p. 49) Do you agree?
(5) "Our central war aim is to put a stop to the pushing."
(p. 52) Is this statement strong enough? (6) Does the
Atlantic charter sufficiently define the war aims of
America? (pp. 54-55) (7) Does Ambassador Hayes try
unduly to conciliate the Spanish people? (8) Do you
agree with Benes' indictment of Britain and France?
(pp. 58-59) (9) Do you agree with the Czech policy of
collaboration with Russia, as indicated in the speech and
as carried out in the recent Russian-Czech treaty?

3. January 11. DISCUSSION AND EXTENPORE SPEAKING. AMERICA'S
WAR AIMS. (continued). Readings: Representative American
Speeches: 1942-43, Denna F. Fleming, "What Is It That We
Fight?", pp. 67-71; Joseph C. Grew, "The Menace of Japan,"
pp. 72-80; Madame Chiang Kai-shek, "Fighting for the
Common Cause," pp. 81-84; and "Japan Is First United States
gation: (1) Analyze each address as an example of speech-
making. (2) What is the thesis? (3) What are the principal
points of each address? (4) Why is America fighting the
Axis? (5) To what extent is this war one of purely self-
defense? Is it true that if Germany and Japan should win
that victory could be made conclusive enough to destroy
the United States? (6) What would be the economic conse-
quences to the United States of an Axis victory? Be specific
in your discussion, especially as it relates the political
to the economic factors. (7) What would be the political
consequences of an Axis victory? (8) In case Germany and
Japan should win the war, would they fall to and fight each
other? (9) What alterations would take place in the
political geography of the Western Hemisphere if Japan
and Germany should win? (10) What would be the effect
upon England and the British Commonwealth of Nations if
Germany and Japan should win? (11) Are we fighting this
war to uphold the American principles of government and
civilization? If so, what are those principles? (12) Are we
fighting to uphold the American system of democratic government? If so, what is that system? (13) Are we fighting to uphold the principle that the more fortunate members of our society are to support the under-privileged? (14) Are we fighting for the principle that weak nations shall be supported and made independent?

4. January 13. DISCUSSION AND EXTENPORE SPEAKING. Sections A and C will be divided into two groups, and Section B into three groups, each group under a leader. The subject for discussion is "What are America's War Aims?" Each participant will give a four-minute speech related closely to the preceding remarks. After these uninterrupted speeches are given, the group as a unit will discuss and draw constructive conclusions.


19. March 7. WRITTEN LESSON. A written lesson will be given on Representative American Speeches, pp. 3-93; 159-234.

20. March 9. DISCUSSION AND EXTENPORE SPEAKING. EDUCATION AND THE WAR. Reading: Representative American Speeches, Robert M. Hutchins' "The University in War and Peace," pp. 235-248; Monroe E. Deutsch's "The Preservation of the University," pp. 248-257; James B. Conant's "Valedictory Service Address," pp. 257-265. Questions and suggested lines of investigation: (1) Indicate special features of Hutchins' address which show adaptation to the immediate audience. (2) Criticize the structure of each speech and point out specifically the thesis. Indicate the specific function of the introductions and the conclusions. (3) Compare and contrast the educational point of view of the three speakers.

23. March 21. EXTENPORE DISCUSSION. RELIGION AND THE WAR. Reading: Baird's Representative American Speeches, pp. 267-403, including addresses by Sockman, Wallace, Jones, and Sheen. As a guide to your criticism of these addresses, note the introduction and be sure to review the biographical notes.
25. March 28. **EXTEMPORE SPEAKING. THE WORLD IN RECONSTRUCTION.**
Reading: Baird's *Representative American Speeches*, pp. 93-115, including addresses by Wallace and Wilkie.


28. April 6. **EXTEMPORE SPEAKING CONTEST.** This meeting will be in the nature of a final test over the material in Baird's *Representative American Speeches*. Each member will be prepared to discuss any of the articles in the book. The article should be reviewed, and the speaker should be prepared to criticize the article, but in no sense to summarize it orally. At the classroom meeting each member will draw by lot one of the articles and before the critic will present a seven-minute speech on the article.

29. April 11. **WRITTEN LESSON--Based upon *Representative American Speeches*.**

30, 31, 32. April 13, 18, 20. **INDIVIDUAL TALKS.** Each member will select a specific problem, worded as an impartial question, and present a seven-minute constructive speech. He will avoid the use of notes and will attempt both to persuade and convince his hearers. After he has given this speech, he will defend it. This speech will be accompanied by a written brief to be submitted to the instructor. Order of speaking: . . . /names listed/.

In the foregoing assignments, Baird directs his students to "analyze each address as an example of speechmaking," (January 11 assignment); reminds them to note the introductions and biographical notes in each volume, (March 21 assignment); and encourages them to investigate and comprehend current problems, and to discuss them knowledgeably.

The following information is selected from Baird's outlines for Speech 207-208 as he taught the course at the State University of Iowa during the school year 1947-48.5

5From the files of R. H. Sandefur, The University of Akron, Ohio.
SPEECH 207

September, 1947-January, 1948

The History and Criticism of American Public Address

(The Middle Period)

I. STANDARDS OF CRITICISM

1. The Principles of Rhetorical Criticism
2. Areas of Investigation
3. Textual Authenticity
4. Social Backgrounds of Speeches
5. The Integrity of Ideas
6. Emotion in Speech
7. Ethical Proofs: The Speaker
8. Structure
9. Style and Language
10. Delivery
11. Measures of Effectiveness
12. The Philosophy of Speech Criticism

Text: Thonssen and Baird, The Criticism of Speeches

Method of Procedure: It is proposed that at each weekly meeting (Monday) one of the topics listed above be reviewed. Read the text. For your own advantage, make an outline of it. Focus on a specific problem suggested; summarize the problem and your reaction to it, in a report about one typewritten page in length. Pass to the Instructor.

Since Speech 207 centered around consideration of Webster, Calhoun, Clay, Douglas, Lincoln, Parker, Phillips, and other earlier speakers, the course outline made no reference to Representative American Speeches. The standards of criticism listed above parallel the chapter headings in Thonssen and Baird's Speech Criticism, and are included here to demonstrate Baird's consistency in setting up rhetorical principles by which speeches may be evaluated. These are the same standards which are threaded throughout Representative American Speeches, both in the selection of speeches and the introductory comments.
The assignment sheet for Speech 208 lists many references to be consulted by the student, including the following speeches of William E. Borah and Franklin D. Roosevelt:

SPEECH 208
Readings in Speeches

\(\text{In part}\)
W. E. Borah


F. D. Roosevelt

The following are in A. Craig Baird, Representative American Speeches annually since 1937-38 series.

"The United States' Policy Toward War," October 26, 1938.
"Italy Enters the War," June 10, 1940.
"War Address," December 8, 1941.
"America Accepts the Challenge," December 9, 1941.
"Message to Congress," January 11, 1944.
"The Fall of Rome," June 5, 1944.
"Yalta Conference," March 1, 1945.
In the following assignments from his 1948-49 course, Speech 36:12, Argumentation and Debate, Baird sets forth his aims and purposes as well as his procedures for using speeches as examples.6

ARGUMENTATION AND DEBATE

SPEECH 36:12

1. Aims and Purposes.
   A. This course aims to develop skill in the techniques of argumentative discourse and extemporaneous speaking (and writing).
   B. This course is designed to effect improvement in speaking and in the orderly processes antecedent thereto.

RELATION OF THIS COURSE TO THE OBJECTIVES
OF LIBERAL ARTS EDUCATION

Basic to this emphasis of skill in argumentative and extempore speaking is the attempt of this course to realize the liberal arts objectives of (1) self-realization, including an inquiring mind, special skills in communicating, intellectual and aesthetic interests, and character; (2) social integration, or the establishment of more satisfactory human relationships and group participation; (3) political responsibility, including knowledge of representative current problems and skill in methods of analyzing them; and (4) economic efficiency (many in this course are preparing for teaching or radio as vocations, law, industry and business, preaching, and other professions and activities).

READINGS

A. Required

B. References**
   Baird, A. Craig, Representative American Speeches (annually since 1938), H. W. Wilson Company.

   **Note: Special reading assignments will be made from time to time in these references.

6From the files of Don Streeter, University of Houston, Texas.
ASSIGNMENT FOUR
(October 5, 1948)
TOPIC: ANALYSIS AND CRITICISM OF A DEBATE

I. OBJECTIVE: To examine critically a debate in preparation for your later use of acceptable techniques.

II. ASSIGNMENT:
A. Reading:
   2. Baird's Argumentation, Discussion and Debate, Chapter Twenty-seven.
   3. Crocker's Argumentation and Debate, Chapter Twelve.

B. Performance preparation:
   On the basis of the criteria set forth in the assigned readings in not more than one 8x11 page, frame your decision as to which speaker, Dewey or Stassen, did the more effective debating on the question of outlawing the Communist party in the U.S. Be sure to consider each question, except "F" listed on pages 333-34 of Baird's Public Discussion and Debate, "Instructions to Judges." For affirmative "team" substitute Stassen, and for negative "team," Dewey. If Baird is not available, Crocker should be consulted and a similar procedure followed.

III. CLASSROOM PROCEDURE:
The class hour will be given to a discussion of how debates and debaters should be judged. Bring your written "decision" and hand it to the instructor. Be prepared to explain and defend your decision. If such information is available, in the New York Times, for instance, consideration will also be given to the factor of delivery in these radio speeches.

ASSIGNMENT THIRTY
(January 20, 1949)
TOPIC: EXTEMPORE SPEAKING.

I. OBJECTIVES:
   A. To prepare and present an extemporaneous speech on International Policies.
   B. To apply the canons of effective speaking to contemporary representative American speeches.
II. ASSIGNMENT:
A. Reading:

   B. Performance preparation:
      1. Each class member will make a careful study of one of the four International Policies speeches included in Baird's Representative American Speeches, 1947-48, pp. 15-67.
      2. Each member will prepare for presentation to the class a four-minute extempore speech in which one of the following may be done: (a) agree or disagree with the basic premises, assumptions, ideas or arguments presented, or (b) criticize the speech studied on the basis of the criteria and canons of effective speaking as set forth in Baird's Representative American Speeches: 1946-47, pp. 7-12.
      3. You are not simply to parrot the ideas in the speech studied, but you should show familiarity with its contents, using them as points of departure for your own speech. In other words, show some originality in this speech by incorporating your own ideas on international policies. Make your thesis direct and concise. Do not try to cover too much ground. You may choose to dwell upon but one or two of the major ideas presented, or to criticize the speech upon only two or three of the major criteria most applicable.

III. CLASSROOM PROCEDURE:
   Each member will deliver his or her four-minute extempore speech. The other members of the class will write individual criticisms of each speech, judging its effectiveness in the light of the criteria for effective speaking as set forth in Baird's Representative American Speeches: 1946-47.

ASSIGNMENT THIRTY-ONE
(January 25, 1949)
TOPIC: EXTEMPORE SPEAKING

I. OBJECTIVE: To prepare and present an extemporaneous speech on Education and Civilization or Religion.

II. ASSIGNMENT:
   A. Reading:
B. Performance preparation:
1. Each member will make a careful study of one of the two speeches of the town meeting discussion on Education and Civilization, or one of the two speeches on Religion included in Baird's Representative American Speeches: 1947-48.
2. Following the same instructions set forth in Assignment Thirty, each member will prepare for presentation to the class a four-minute extemporaneous speech.

III. CLASSROOM PROCEDURE:
The procedure will be the same as that for Assignment Thirty.

The final course outline available for this study is for Speech 36:11, Public Discussion, for the second semester of the 1949-50 session. The outline sets forth two aims and purposes: "A. This course aims to develop skill in the techniques of discoursional and extemporaneous speaking and writing, and B. This course is designed to effect improvement in speaking and in the orderly processes antecedent thereto." Toward the end of the semester the course assignments require the use of Representative American Speeches. These assignments are as follows:

PUBLIC DISCUSSION
Speech 36:11

ASSIGNMENT THIRTY-EIGHT
(May 10, 1950)

TOPIC: CRITERIA OF EFFECTIVE SPEAKING

I. OBJECTIVES:
A. To learn what constitutes an effective speech.
B. To learn how to criticize speeches and speakers.

7From the files of A. Craig Baird, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.
II. ASSIGNMENT:
A. Reading:

B. Performance preparation:
   1. Be prepared to discuss the attributes of an effective speaker as set forth in Baird's *Representative American Speeches*: 1946-47.

III. CLASSROOM PROCEDURE: The class hour will be given to a discussion of the attributes of effective speaking and the canons and methodology of speech criticism.

ASSIGNMENT THIRTY-NINE
(May 12, 1950)

TOPIC: CRITICISM OF SPEECHES

I. OBJECTIVES:
   A. To present a speech of criticism.
   B. To apply the canons of effective speaking to contemporary representative American speeches.

II. ASSIGNMENT:
A. Reading:

B. Performance preparation:
   1. Each class member will make a careful study of one of the four International Policies speeches in *Representative American Speeches*: 1948-49.
   2. Each member will prepare for presentation to the class a four-minute speech criticizing the speech studied on the basis of the canons of effective speaking as set forth in *Representative American Speeches*: 1946-47, pp. 7-12; 1947-48, pp. 7-14; 1948-49, pp. 7-13.
3. You are not simply to review or parrot the ideas in the speech studied, but you should show familiarity with its contents, using them as points of departure for your own speech. Do not try to cover too much ground. You may choose to dwell upon but one or two of the major ideas presented or to criticize the speech upon only two or three of the major criteria most applicable.

III. CLASSROOM PROCEDURE: Each member will deliver his four-minute speech of criticism. The other members will write individual criticisms of each speaker, judging his effectiveness as a speaker in the light of the criteria set forth in the reading.

ASSIGNMENT FORTY
(May 15, 1950)

TOPIC: CRITICISM OF SPEECHES (Concluded).

I. OBJECTIVES: Same as Assignment Thirty-nine.

II. ASSIGNMENT: Same as Assignment Thirty-nine.

III. CLASSROOM PROCEDURE: Those who did not deliver four-minute speeches of criticism on May 12 will do so at this time. Class members will write criticisms of the speeches.

ASSIGNMENT FORTY-ONE
(May 17, 1950)

TOPIC: EXTEMPORANEOUS SPEAKING

I. OBJECTIVE: To prepare and present an extempore speech on Education.

II. ASSIGNMENT:
   A. Reading:

   B. Performance preparation:
      1. Each class member will make a careful study of one of the three speeches or the Town-Meeting discussion included in the above assigned pages on speeches on Education.
2. You will prepare a four-minute speech in which you agree or disagree with the ideas presented by the speaker studied. Consider his ideas, assumptions, arguments, and evidence.

3. Narrow your speech—Do not give a review of the speech studied. Show originality by relating your own ideas to those of the speaker—Be direct, clear, concise.

4. You are presenting an extemporaneous speech which should not be memorized "word for word," but which should be prepared so that it will not be necessary to use more than a single note card.

III. CLASSROOM PROCEDURE: Each class member will come prepared to deliver a four-minute extempore speech. The class will write individual criticism of each speaker, judging his or her effectiveness on the basis of criteria studied in assignments of the past week or so.

ASSIGNMENT FORTY-FIVE
(May 26, 1950)

TOPIC: EVALUATION OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF A SPEECH.

I. OBJECTIVE: To become familiar with the methods, techniques, and procedures to be followed in evaluating the effectiveness of a speech.

II. ASSIGNMENT:
A. Reading:

B. Performance preparation:
   1. Be prepared to discuss the criteria for determining the effectiveness of a speech outlined in the readings above.
   2. Be prepared to apply these criteria to the speeches of Truman and Dewey in Madison Square Garden. In order to determine the effect of the speeches on the immediate audience it will be necessary to refer to comments in the newspapers published in the period immediately following the occasions. Refer to the New York Times and other papers.

III. CLASSROOM PROCEDURE: The class hour will be given to a discussion of the effectiveness of the two speakers on the occasions outlined above.
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